This report is based on research conducted by the Tufts Evidence-based Practice Center (EPC) under contract to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), Rockville, MD (Contract No. HHSA 290-2007-10055-I). The findings and conclusions in this document are those of the author(s), who are responsible for its content, and do not necessarily represent the views of AHRQ. No statement in this report should be construed as an official position of AHRQ or of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The information in this report is intended to help clinicians, employers, policymakers, and others make informed decisions about the provision of health care services. This report is intended as a reference and not as a substitute for clinical judgment.

This report may be used, in whole or in part, as the basis for the development of clinical practice guidelines and other quality enhancement tools, or as a basis for reimbursement and coverage policies. AHRQ or U.S. Department of Health and Human Services endorsement of such derivative products may not be stated or implied.

Evidence Report/Technology Assessment
Number 183

Vitamin D and Calcium: A Systematic Review of Health Outcomes

Prepared for:
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
540 Gaither Road
Rockville, MD 20850
www.ahrq.gov

Contract No. HHSA 290-2007-10055-I
Task Order No. 4

Prepared by:
Tufts Evidence-based Practice Center, Boston, MA

Investigators:
Mei Chung, M.P.H.
Ethan M Balk, M.D., M.P.H.
Michael Brendel, B.A.
Stanley Ip, M.D.
Joseph Lau, M.D.
Jounghee Lee, Ph.D.
Alice Lichtenstein, D.Sc.
Kamal Patel, M.B.A., M.P.H.
Gowri Raman, M.D.
Athina Tatsioni, M.D., Ph.D.
Teruhiko Terasawa, M.D.
Thomas A Trikalinos, M.D., Ph.D.

AHRQ Publication No. 09-E015
August 2009

This document is in the public domain and may be used and reprinted without permission except those copyrighted materials noted for which further reproduction is prohibited without the specific permission of copyright holders.

Suggested Citation:
Chung M, Balk EM, Brendel M, Ip S, Lau J, Lee J, Lichtenstein A, Patel K, Raman G, Tatsioni A, Terasawa T, Trikalinos TA. **Vitamin D and Calcium: A Systematic Review of Health Outcomes.** Evidence Report No. 183. (Prepared by the Tufts Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. HHSA 290-2007-10055-I.) AHRQ Publication No. 09-E015. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. August, 2009.

No investigators have any affiliations or financial involvement (e.g., employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties) that conflict with

Preface

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), through its Evidence-based Practice Centers (EPCs), sponsors the development of evidence reports and technology assessments to assist public- and private-sector organizations in their efforts to improve the quality of health care in the United States. The Office of Dietary Supplements/National Institutes of Health, the Public Health Agency of Canada, Health Canada, and Food and Drug Administration requested and provided funding for this report. The reports and assessments provide organizations with comprehensive, science-based information on common, costly medical conditions and new health care technologies. The EPCs systematically review the relevant scientific literature on topics assigned to them by AHRQ and conduct additional analyses when appropriate prior to developing their reports and assessments.

To bring the broadest range of experts into the development of evidence reports and health technology assessments, AHRQ encourages the EPCs to form partnerships and enter into collaborations with other medical and research organizations. The EPCs work with these partner organizations to ensure that the evidence reports and technology assessments they produce will become building blocks for health care quality improvement projects throughout the Nation. The reports undergo peer review prior to their release.

AHRQ expects that the EPC evidence reports and technology assessments will inform individual health plans, providers, and purchasers as well as the health care system as a whole by providing important information to help improve health care quality.

We welcome comments on this evidence report. They may be sent by mail to the Task Order Officer named below at: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 540 Gaither Road, Rockville, MD 20850, or by email to **epc@ahrq.gov.**

Carolyn M. Clancy, M.D.
Director
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Jean Slutsky, P.A., M.S.P.H.
Director, Center for Outcomes and Evidence
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Beth A. Collins Sharp, R.N., Ph.D.
Director, EPC Program
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Stephanie Chang, M.D., M.P.H.
EPC Program Task Order Officer
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Paul M. Coates, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Dietary Supplements
National Institutes of Health

Elizabeth A. Yetley, Ph.D.
Senior Nutrition Research Scientist, Retired
Office of Dietary Supplements
National Institutes of Health

Mary Frances Picciano, Ph.D.
Senior Nutrition Research Scientist
Office of Dietary Supplements
National Institutes of Health

Margaret de Groh, Ph.D.
Manager, Risk Factors Unit
Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
Health Canada

Linda Greene-Finestone, Ph.D., R.D.
Nutrition Advisor
Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
Public Health Agency of Canada

Kimberly D. Elmslie, M.Sc.
Director General
Centre for Chronic Disease Prevention and Control
Public Health Agency of Canada

Hasan Hutchinson, Ph.D., N.D.
Director General
Office of Nutrition Policy and Promotion
Public Health Agency of Canada

Paula R. Trumbo, Ph.D.
Supervisor, Nutrition Science Evaluation
Office of Nutrition, Labeling and Dietary Supplements
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
Food and Drug Administration

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge with appreciation the following members of the Technical Expert Panel for their advice and consultation to the Tufts Evidence-based Practice Center during the preparation for this report:

Steven Abrams, M.D.
Professor of Pediatrics
Baylor College of Medicine
Section of Neonatology
Texas Children's Hospital
Houston, Texas

Stephanie Atkinson, Ph.D.
Professor and Associate Chair
Department of Pediatrics
Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences
Health Sciences
McMaster University
Hamilton, Canada

Patsy M. Brannon, Ph.D.
Professor
Division of Nutritional Sciences
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Rebecca D. Jackson, M.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Internal Medicine
Division of Endocrinology, Diabetes, and Metabolism
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Glenville Jones, Ph.D.
Professor and Head
Department of Biochemistry
Queen's University
Ontario, Canada

Susan Taylor Mayne, Ph.D., F.A.C.E.
Professor
Division of Chronic Disease Epidemiology
Yale School of Public Health
New Haven, Connecticut

Clifford J. Rosen, M.D.
Senior Scientist
Maine Medical Center Research Institute
Scarborough, Maine

Structured Abstract

Background: Since the 1997 Dietary Reference Intake (DRI) values for vitamin D and calcium were established new data have become available on their relationship, both individually and combined, to a wide range of health outcomes. The Institute of Medicine/Food and Nutrition Board has constituted a DRI committee to undertake a review of the evidence and potential revision of the current DRI values for these nutrients. To support this review, several US and Canadian federal government agencies commissioned a systematic review of the scientific literature for use during the deliberations by the committee. The intent of providing a systematic review to the committee is to support transparency of the literature review process and provide a foundation for subsequent reviews of the nutrients.

Purpose: To systematically summarize the evidence on the relationship between vitamin D, calcium, and a combination of both nutrients on a wide range of health outcomes as identified by the IOM, AHRQ and technical expert panel convened to support the project.

Data sources: MEDLINE; Cochrane Central; Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews; and the Health Technology Assessments; search limited to English-language articles in humans.

Study selection: Primary interventional or observational studies that reported outcomes of interest in human subjects in relation to vitamin D and/or calcium, as well as systematic reviews that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Cross sectional and retrospective case-control studies were excluded.

Data extraction: A standardized protocol with predefined criteria was used to extract details on study design, interventions, outcomes, and study quality.

Data synthesis: We summarized 165 primary articles and 11 systematic reviews that incorporated over 200 additional primary articles. Available evidence focused mainly on bone health, cardiovascular diseases or cancer outcomes. For many outcomes, it was difficult to draw firm conclusions on the basis of the available literature concerning the association of either serum 25(OH)D concentration or calcium intake, or the combination of both nutrients. Findings were inconsistent across studies for colorectal and prostate cancer, and pregnancy-related outcomes including preeclampsia. There were few studies for pancreatic cancer and immune function. Among trials of hypertensive adults, calcium supplementation lowered systolic, but not diastolic, blood pressure by 2-4 mm Hg. For body weight, the trials were consistent in finding no significant effect of increased calcium intake on weight. For growth rates, a meta-analysis did not find a significant effect on weight or height gain attributable to calcium supplement in children. For bone health, one systematic review found that vitamin D plus calcium supplementation resulted in small increases in BMD of the spine and other areas in postmenopausal women. For breast cancer, calcium intakes in premenopausal women were associated with a decreased risk. For prostate cancer, some studies reported that high calcium intakes were associated with an increased risk.

Limitations: Studies on vitamin D and calcium were not specifically targeted at life stages (except for pregnant and postmenopausal women) specified for the determination of DRI. There

is large variation on the methodological quality of studies examined. Use of existing systematic reviews limits analyses that could be performed on this source of information.

Conclusions: The majority of the findings concerning vitamin D, calcium, or a combination of both nutrients on the different health outcomes were inconsistent. Synthesizing a dose-response relation between intake of either vitamin D, calcium, or both nutrients and health outcomes in this heterogeneous body of literature prove challenging.

Contents

Executive Summary

Evidence Report 15

Chapter 1. Introduction
- Background
- Sources, metabolism and functions of vitamin D
- Sources, metabolism and functions of calcium
- Challenges for the DRI committees
- Key Questions addressed in this report

Chapter 2. Methods
- Overview
  - Sponsoring Federal agencies
  - AHRQ Task Order Officer (TOO)
  - Technical Expert Panel (TEP)
  - EPC methodologists
- Development of the analytic framework and refinement of key questions
- Definitions
  - Vitamin D and calcium exposures
  - Clinical outcomes
  - Indicators of exposure (nutrient intake)
  - Surrogate outcomes
  - Intermediate outcomes
  - Life stages
- Key questions
- Literature search strategy
- Study selection
  - Abstract screening
  - Full text article eligibility criteria
    - Primary studies
    - Systematic reviews
  - Other specific eligibility criteria
  - Data extraction
- Data analysis
- Meta-analysis
- Grading of studies analyzed in this evidence report
- Critical appraisal and grading of primary studies
  - Additional considerations of methodological quality of primary studies for the purpose of DRI decision making
- Critical appraisal of systematic reviews
- Reporting of the evidence
  - Evidence tables
  - Summary tables

Graphical presentation of dose-response relationship
Grand summary tables (evidence map)
Units of measurement
Assay method
Sunlight exposure
Primary and secondary outcomes
Study quality
Organization of the Results Section

Chapter 3. Results
Literature search results
Vitamin D and health outcomes
Vitamin D and growth
Vitamin D and cardiovascular disease
Vitamin D and body weight
Vitamin D and cancer
Cancer from all causes and total cancer mortality
Prostate cancer
Colorectal cancer
Colorectal adenoma
Breast cancer
Pancreatic cancer
Vitamin D and immunologic outcomes
Vitamin D and pregnancy-related outcomes
Preeclampsia
Other outcomes
Vitamin D and clinical outcomes of bone health
Rickets
Fractures, falls, or performance measures
Vitamin D and all-cause mortality
Vitamin D and hypertension and blood pressure
Hypertension
Vitamin D and blood pressure
Vitamin D and bone mineral density or bone mineral content
Calcium and health outcomes
Calcium and growth
Calcium and cardiovascular disease
Calcium and body weight
Calcium and cancer
Cancer from all cause and total cancer mortality
Prostate cancer
Colorectal cancer
Colorectal adenoma
Breast cancer incidence
Breast Mammographic Density
Pancreatic cancer

Calcium and pregnancy-related outcomes
Preeclampsia
High blood pressure with or without proteinuria during pregnancy
Preterm birth
Small for gestational age infant
Calcium and all-cause mortality
Calcium and hypertension and blood pressure
Calcium and hypertension
Calcium and blood pressure
Combined vitamin D and calcium and health outcomes
Combined vitamin D calcium and growth
Combined vitamin D and calcium and cardiovascular disease
Combined vitamin D and calcium and body weight
Combined vitamin D and calcium and cancer
Cancer from all causes and total cancer mortality
Colorectal cancer
Colorectal adenoma
Breast cancer
Combined vitamin D and calcium and pregnancy-related outcomes
Preeclampsia
Other pregnancy-related outcomes
Combined vitamin D and calcium and clinical outcomes of bone health
Rickets, fractures, falls, or performance measures
Combined vitamin D and calcium and all-cause mortality
Combined vitamin D and calcium and hypertension and blood pressure
Combined vitamin D and calcium and hypertension
Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure
Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone mineral density or bone mineral content
How does dietary intake of vitamin D from fortified foods and vitamin D supplementation affect serum 25(OH)D concentrations (arrow 4)?
RCTs on dietary intakes of vitamin D from fortified foods and serum 25(OH)D concentrations
RCTs on vitamin D supplementation and serum 25(OH)D concentrations
Outcomes for Tolerable Upper Intake Levels
Renal outcomes
Adverse events reported in RCTs

Chapter 4. Discussion
Strengths of this report
DRI and the literature on vitamin D and calcium
Limitations of our methodological approach
Comments on the observational studies
Sources of heterogeneity and potential biases
Vitamin D intake and response in serum 25(OH)D concentration
Considerations for future DRI committees

Abbreviations

Latitudes of selected cities

Tables

Table 1. Number of primary studies on vitamin D intake or concentration and specific health outcomes that could be applicable to certain life stages
Table 2. Number of primary studies on calcium intake and specific health outcomes that could be applicable to certain life stages
Table 3. Number of primary studies on combined vitamin D and calcium intake and specific health outcomes that are relevant to certain life stages
Table 4. Vitamin D on growth outcome: Characteristics of interventional studies
Table 5. Vitamin D and growth outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 6. Vitamin D and growth outcomes: Results of RCTs
Table 7. Vitamin D and growth outcomes: Results of cohort studies
Table 8. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 9. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of RCTs
Table 10. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 11. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of cohort studies
Table 12. Vitamin D and weight: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 13. Vitamin D and weight: Results of RCTs
Table 14. Vitamin D and total cancer: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 15. Vitamin D and total cancer: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 16. Vitamin D and total cancer: Results of RCTs
Table 17. Vitamin D and total cancer: Results of cohort studies
Table 18. Vitamin D and prostate cancer: Characteristics of nested case-control studies
Table 19. Vitamin D and prostate cancer: Results of nested case-control studies
Table 20. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 21. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Results of RCTs
Table 22. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of observational studies[A]
Table 23. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Results of observational studies
Table 24. Vitamin D and colorectal adenoma: Characteristics of observational studies
Table 25. Vitamin D and colorectal adenoma: Results of observational studies
Table 26. Vitamin D and breast cancer: Characteristics of observational studies
Table 27. Vitamin D and breast cancer: Results of observational studies
Table 28. Vitamin D and pancreatic cancer: Characteristics of observational studies
Table 29. Vitamin D and pancreatic cancer: Results of observational studies
Table 30. Vitamin D (mother) and immunologic outcomes (offspring): Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 31. Vitamin D (mother) and immunologic outcomes (offspring): Results of cohort studies
Table 32. Vitamin D and preeclampsia: Characteristics of nested case-control studies
Table 33. Vitamin D and preeclampsia: Results of nested case-control studies
Table 34. Summary of systematic review of the effect of vitamin D on bone health
Table 35. Vitamin D and bone health: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report
Table 36. Vitamin D and bone health: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Table 37. Summary of systematic review on vitamin D supplementation and all-cause mortality
Table 38. Vitamin D and all-cause mortality: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 39. Vitamin D and all-cause mortality: Results of cohort studies
Table 40. Vitamin D and hypertension: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 41. Vitamin D and hypertension: Results of cohort and nested case control studies
Table 42. Vitamin D and blood pressure: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 43. Vitamin D and blood pressure: Results of RCTs
Table 44. Vitamin D and bone mineral density: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report
Table 45. Vitamin D and bone mineral density or bone mineral contents: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report
Table 46. Summary of systematic review of calcium on growth in children
Table 47. Calcium and growth: Characteristics of primary studies
Table 48. Calcium and growth: Results of primary studies
Table 49. Calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies[B]
Table 50. Calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of cohort studies
Table 51. Systematic reviews of calcium supplementation and weight
Table 52. Calcium and weight: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 53. Calcium and weight: Results of RCTs
Table 54. Calcium and total cancer mortality: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 55. Calcium and total cancer incidence or mortality: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 56. Calcium and total cancer mortality: Results of RCTs
Table 57. Calcium and total cancer incidence or mortality: Results of cohort studies 50-71, males
Table 58. Calcium and prostate cancer: Characteristics of observational studies
Table 59. Calcium and prostate cancer: Results of observational studies
Table 60. Systematic review of calcium supplementation and colorectal cancer incidence or adenoma recurrence
Table 61. Calcium and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of observational studies
Table 62. Calcium and colorectal cancer: Results of cohort studies
Table 63. Calcium and colorectal cancer: Results of nested case-control studies
Table 64. Calcium and colorectal adenoma: Characteristics of interventional studies
Table 65. Calcium and colorectal adenoma: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 66. Calcium and colorectal adenoma recurrence: Results of RCTs
Table 67. Calcium and colorectal adenoma recurrence: Results of nonrandomized comparative study
Table 68. Calcium and colorectal adenoma: Results of cohort studies
Table 69. Calcium and breast cancer: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 70. Calcium and breast cancer: Results of cohort studies
Table 71. Calcium and breast mammography density: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 72. Calcium and breast cancer: Results of cohort studies
Table 73. Calcium and pancreatic cancer: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 74. Calcium and pancreatic cancer: Results of cohort studies

Table 75. Summary table of systematic review on calcium supplementation and preeclampsia, small for gestational age, preterm birth
Table 76. Calcium and preeclampsia and other pregnancy outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 77. Calcium and preeclampsia and other pregnancy outcomes: Results of cohort studies
Table 78. Calcium intake and all-cause mortality: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 79. Calcium intake and all-cause mortality: Results of cohort studies
Table 80. Calcium and hypertension incidence: Characteristics of cohort studies
Table 81. Calcium and hypertension incidence: Results of cohort studies
Table 82. Summary of systematic reviews of calcium and blood pressure
Table 83. Calcium and blood pressure: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 84. Calcium and blood pressure: Results of RCTs
Table 85. Combined vitamin D and calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 86. Combined vitamin D and calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of RCTs
Table 87. Combined vitamin D and calcium and weight: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 88. Combined vitamin D and calcium and weight: Results of RCTs
Table 89. Combined vitamin D and calcium and total cancer incidence: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 90. Combined vitamin D and calcium and total cancer incidence: Results of RCTs
Table 91. Combined vitamin D with calcium and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 92. Combined vitamin D with calcium and colorectal cancer: Results of RCTs
Table 93. Combined vitamin D and calcium and breast cancer outcomes: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 94. Combined vitamin D and calcium and breast cancer outcomes: Results of RCTs
Table 95. Combined vitamin D and calcium and preeclampsia: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 96. Combined vitamin D and calcium and preeclampsia: Results of RCTs
Table 97. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone health: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report
Table 98. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone health: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report (stress fracture)
Table 99. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone health: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report (performance measures)
Table 100. Combined vitamin D and calcium and incident hypertension: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 101. Combined vitamin D and calcium and incident hypertension: Results of RCTs
Table 102. Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure: Characteristics of RCTs
Table 103. Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure: Results of RCTs
Table 104. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone mineral density/content: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Table 105. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone mineral density/content: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report
Table 106. The relationship between vitamin D_3 daily doses and changes in 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs
Table 107. Adverse events reported in RCTs

Figures

Figure 1. Summary of the vitamin D endocrine system
Figure 2. Generic analytic framework to assist formulation of key questions for the development of DRIs
Figure 3. Analytic framework for vitamin D and/or calcium EARs
Figure 4. Analytic framework for vitamin D and/or calcium ULs
Figure 5. Literature flow in this report
Figure 6. Cardiovascular outcomes risk stratified by vitamin D concentration
Figure 7. Prostate cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration
Figure 8. Colorectal cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration
Figure 9. Colon cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration
Figure 10. Rectal cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration
Figure 11. Cardiovascular outcomes risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 12. Stroke risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 13. Prostate cancer risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 14 Colorectal cancer risk in both sexes stratified by calcium intake
Figure 15 Colorectal cancer risk in men stratified by calcium intake
Figure 16 Colorectal cancer risk in women stratified by calcium intake
Figure 17 Colon cancer risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 18. Rectal cancer risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 19. Colorectal adenomatous polyp risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 20. Breast cancer risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 21. Hypertension risk stratified by calcium intake
Figure 22. Forest plot of trials of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation and effects on all-cause mortality
Figure 23. Relationship between doses of Vitamin D3 supplementation and net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs
Figure 24. Relationship between doses of Vitamin D_3 supplementation and net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs by baseline vitamin D status among adults
Figure 25. Relationship between doses of Vitamin D_3 supplementation and net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs by duration of supplementation among adults

Appendixes

Appendix A. Search Strategy for Primary Studies
Appendix B. Search Strategy for Systematic Reviews
Appendix C. Evidence Tables
Appendix D. Existing Systematic Reviews

Appendix E. Blank Data Extraction Form and Quality Assessment Checklists
Appendix F. Excluded Studies With Reasons

Appendixes and Evidence Tables for this report are provided electronically at http://www.ahrq.gov/downloads/pub/evidence/pdf/vitadcal/vitadcal.pdf.

Evidence Report

Chapter 1. Introduction

Background

The Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine (IOM), with funding from agencies and departments of the US and Canadian governments, recently completed their 10-year development of nutrient reference values entitled Dietary Reference Intakes (DRI).[1] In September, 2007, the IOM held a conference to examine the lessons learned and future challenges from the process used to develop the DRI values.[2] One improvement identified at that meeting for DRI updating was the use of systematic reviews to enhance the transparency and rigor of the literature review process that is a necessary component in the deliberations of DRI committees. To assess the feasibility of implementing this approach in the DRI updating process, the Office of Dietary Supplements (ODS) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) through the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) requested the Tufts Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center (Tufts-EPC) perform an exercise to identify the issues and challenges of conducing systematic reviews as a component of the process used to support the development and updating of DRI values. The Tufts-EPC assembled a group of nutrition experts from academic institutions and federal government agencies, led participants in teleconferences and meetings, and conducted exercises in formulating questions that would be amenable to a systematic review of the scientific literature and abstract screening.[3] One of the intents of this exercise was to identify limitations, challenges, and unanticipated issues that IOM committees may face prior to actually initiating the use systematic reviews as a routine part of the DRI process.

Following these activities, a working group of US and Canadian government scientists convened to determine whether the scientific literature was sufficient to justify a new review of the vitamin D DRI. To address this issue in May and September of 2007, two conferences were held on the topic of vitamin D and health.[4] As a result of these conferences in March of 2008 the IOM convened a working group of US and Canadian government scientists to determine whether significant new and relevant scientific evidence had become available since the 1997 IOM publication of vitamin D DRI to justify initiating a formal review and potential revision of the values.[5] The working group reviewed the proceedings of the two conferences and the results from a systematic review commissioned by the ODS on the effectiveness and safety of vitamin D in relation to bone health conducted by the University of Ottawa EPC (Ottawa-EPC).[6] They concluded that there was sufficient new data on bone health for several of the lifestage groups, on potential adverse effects, and on dose-response relationships between intakes and circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D [25(OH)D] concentrations, and between 25(OH)D concentrations and several health outcomes to warrant a formal review and potential revision of the values.[5] As a result, the NIH/ODS, Public Health Agency of Canada, Health Canada and FDA commissioned the Tufts-EPC to update the Ottawa-EPC report, and systematically review the data related to vitamin D and calcium with respect to a broader spectrum of health outcomes.

Sources, Metabolism and Functions of Vitamin D

Vitamin D was classified as a vitamin in the early 20th century and in the second half of the 20th century as a prohormone ("conditional" vitamin).[7,8] There are two forms of vitamin D, vitamin D_3 (cholecalciferol), which is produced from the conversion of 7-dehydrocholesterol in

the epidermis and dermis in humans, and vitamin D_2 (ergocalciferol) which is produced in mushrooms and yeast. The chemical difference between vitamin D_2 and D_3 is in the side chain; in contrast to vitamin D_3, vitamin D_2 has a double bond between carbons 22 and 23 and a methyl group on carbon 24.

The major source of vitamin D for humans is exposure to sunlight. The efficiency of the conversion of 7-dehydrocholesterol to vitamin D_3 is dependent on time of day, season of the year, latitude, skin color and age. There is little vitamin D that occurs naturally in the food supply. The major naturally occurring food sources include fatty fish, beef liver and egg yolk. In the U.S. and Canada, the major dietary source of dietary vitamin D is fortified foods, including cow's milk and, depending on country, other fortified foods and dietary supplements. These sources cannot be relied on in countries other than the U.S. and Canada. Dietary vitamin D is absorbed from the intestine and circulates in plasma bound to a vitamin D binding protein.

In its native form vitamin D is not biologically active, the active form is $1,25(OH)_2D$. The conversion of vitamin D to $1,25(OH)_2D$ requires two hydroxylation in tandem. Vitamin D is first hydroxylated by the liver to form 25(OH)D, which is then hydroxylated by the kidney to form $1,25(OH)_2D$. 25(OH)D has low biological activity, but it is the major form of vitamin D that circulates in the blood stream. Serum 25(OH)D concentrations are generally thought to reflect nutritional status.[7,8] When adequate amounts of vitamin D are available, the kidney, the major site of $1,25(OH)_2D$ production converts some of the 25(OH)D to alternate hydroxylated metabolites, which have low biological activity (e.g., $24,25(OH)_2D$ or $1,24,25(OH)_3D$). Renal synthesis of $1,25(OH)_2D$ is tightly regulated by plasma parathyroid hormone, together with serum calcium and phosphorus concentrations. Additional tissues that express the enzyme that catalyses the conversion of 25(OH)D to $1,25(OH)_2D$, 25-hydroxyvitamin D3-1-α-hydroxylase, include colon, prostate, mammary gland, macrophages, antigen-presenting cells, osteoblasts and keratinocytes.[9]

Vitamin D has both genomic and nongenomic functions. For the genomic functions, $1,25(OH)_2D$ interacts with nuclear vitamin D receptors to influence gene transcription. Nuclear receptors for $1,25(OH)_2D$ have been identified in over 30 cell types, including bone, intestine, kidney, lung, muscle and skin. For the nongenomic functions, $1,25(OH)_2D$ acts like a steroid hormone, working through activation of signal transduction pathways linked to vitamin D receptors on cell membranes. Major sites of action include intestine, bone, parathyroid, liver and pancreatic beta cells. Biological actions include increases in intestinal calcium absorption, transcellular calcium flux and opening gated calcium channels allowing calcium uptake into cells such as osteoblasts and skeletal muscle.

One of the major biological functions of vitamin D is to maintain calcium homeostasis which impacts on cellular metabolic processes and neuromuscular functions. Vitamin D affects intestinal calcium absorption by increasing the expression of the epithelial calcium channel protein, which in turn enhances the transport of calcium through the cytosol and across the basolateral membrane of the enterocyte. Vitamin D also facilitates the absorption of intestinal phosphate. $1,25(OH)_2D$ indirectly affects bone mineralization by maintaining plasma calcium and phosphorus concentrations, and subsequently extracellular calcium and phosphorus concentrations at the supersaturating range necessary for mineralization. $1,25(OH)_2D$, in concert with parathyroid hormone, also causes demineralization of bone when calcium concentrations fall to maintain plasma concentrations within a narrow range. It has yet to be determined whether $1,25(OH)_2D$ directly influences bone mineralization.

In addition to intestine and bone, a wide range of other tissues and cells that are influenced by vitamin D. Five biological systems have vitamin D receptors and are responsive to $1,25(OH)_2D$, as summarized in Figure 1.[10] These systems include immune, pancreas, cardiovascular, muscle and brain; and control of cell cycle. The biological effects of $1,25(OH)_2D$ are diverse. For example, as recently noted, $1,25(OH)_2D$ inhibits PTH secretion and promotes insulin secretion, inhibits adaptive immunity and promotes innate immunity, and inhibits cell proliferation and stimulates their differentiation.[11] A number of recent reviews have appeared on these topics.[10-17]

Figure 1. Summary of the vitamin D endocrine system



From Norman AW. A vitamin D nutritional cornucopia: new insights concerning the serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D status of the US population.[10]

Sources, Metabolism, and Functions of Calcium

The major source of dietary calcium in the North American diet, but not necessarily other counties, is dairy products (about 70 percent). Additional sources include commercial white bread made with calcium sulfate, foods made with milk products, leafy greens, canned fish and calcium fortified foods. Oxalic acid impedes the absorption of calcium from many plant foods. Intestinal calcium absorption is regulated by two processes. One route of intestinal calcium

absorption is dependent on $1,25(OH)_2D$. This process occurs primarily in the duodenum and proximal jejunum, is saturable, is energy dependent, and involves a calcium binding protein. The $1,25(OH)_2D$-dependent absorption of calcium is stimulated by low dietary calcium intakes. The other route of intestinal calcium absorption is independent of $1,25(OH)_2D$ and is termed paracellular. This process is passive (does not depend on carrier proteins or energy) and occurs primarily in the jejunum and ileum. Calcium is absorbed between cells, rather than through cells, and down the concentration gradient. Calcium can be transported in blood bound to albumin and prealbumin, complexed with sulfate, phosphate or citrate, or in a free (ionized) state.

Calcium is transported in blood bound to proteins (~40 percent), primarily albumin and prealbumin, complexed with sulfate, phosphate or citrate (~10 percent), and in the ionized form (~50 percent). Blood calcium concentrations are controlled extracellularly by parathyroid hormone, calcitriol and calcitonin. Intracellular calcium concentrations are maintained at relatively low levels. Increased intracellular calcium concentrations occur in response to second messengers by stimulating release from intracellular sites (endoplasmic reticulum, mitochondria) and hormones by facilitating influx from extracellular sites by transmembrane diffusion or channels.

Calcium balance measures provide information on calcium absorption relative to calcium loss in urine, sweat and endogenous intestinal secretions. During periods of growth, positive calcium balance implies bone mineralization but does not provide an indication of whether the rate of bone mineralization is optimal. During adulthood negative calcium balance implies calcium lost from bone but does not provide an indication of which site(s). Calcium balances measures provide an indication of current but not prior calcium balance. An alternate approach to assessing bone mineralization is by measuring bone mineral density.

Approximately 99 percent of the calcium in the human body is in bone and teeth. In addition to structural roles, calcium has other critical functions. These include serving as a second messenger (e.g., cytosolic calcium, calcium-dependent trigger proteins, removal of calcium stimulus) and protein activator (e.g. phospholipase A_2, calpains [calcium dependent proteins that contain calmodulin-like domains], blood clotting enzymes, annexins [calcium and phospholipid binding proteins]). $1,25(OH)_2D$ plays a critical role in regulating plasma calcium concentrations through its role in intestinal calcium absorption, bone resorption and renal calcium resorption. These functions of calcium are frequently classified into the following general categories; bone development and maintenance, blood clotting, transmission of nerve impulses to target cells, muscle contraction and cell metabolism. In addition, calcium may play a role in colon cancer, kidney stones, blood pressure, body weight and lead absorption.

Challenges for the DRI Committees

The following generic challenges must be addressed, preferably in a standardized way, before additional systematic reviews are conducted for use by upcoming DRI committees to ensure the resulting product will yield a maximally useful document.[3] Because the potential volume of peer reviewed literature on the biological effects of most essential nutrients is large and continues to grow, rational and well defined eligibility criteria will need to be identified by the committee to manage the workload. Appropriate questions must be formulated so that the answers to those questions can be used to inform the DRI development process, ensure transparency and reproducibility, and serve as the foundation for future updates as new data emerge. Experience has shown that in the absence of unlimited resources, only a limited set of

questions can be addressed. Hence, it is critical that the committee prioritize the topics and refine the questions in a way that will address critical issues for development and revision of DRI values.

Age specific intermediate or surrogate outcomes will need to be identified by the committee when few or no studies directly link specific nutrient intakes with clinical outcomes. Preferably, these would include only validated surrogates of the clinical outcome, that is outcomes that are strongly correlated with the clinical outcome (e.g., bone mineral density as a surrogate for fractures in postmenopausal women), and changes in their status reflect corresponding changes in the risk of the clinical outcome (e.g., changes in bone mineral density reflect changes in fracture risk in postmenopausal women).[18] In the absence of validated surrogate outcomes, intermediate outcomes must be identified and considered (e.g., absence of anemia as an intermediate outcome for the absence of disease or serum osteocalcin [bone turnover index] as an intermediate marker for fractures). When a nonvalidated intermediate outcome must be considered, the implicit assumption is that they would have the properties of a validated surrogate outcome. Not only should this assumption be made explicit, but the uncertainties involved in applying this assumption should be identified, documented, and discussed by the committee.

Reliable indicators of exposure (or biomarkers) need to be identified by the panel. A reliable biomarker should accurately reflect the degree of biological exposure to the nutrient of interest and fulfill the classic risk assessment model (e.g., exhibit a dose-response relationship). To that extent, the measurement of biological exposure should be independent and free from any interaction with the self-estimated intake of the nutrient of interest. It is important for the DRI committee to recognize that use of a biomarker to evaluate the strength of downstream associations requires that the biomarker concentrations be back translated into levels of nutrient intake and that if an association is found between a given biomarker concentration and risk of a clinical outcome, an estimate of the nutrient intake that corresponds to the clinical outcome will likewise be necessary.

Additional challenges for the DRI committees with respect to the conduct of systematic review include defining relevance of studied populations with respect to nutrient distributions and health risks to those for which reference values are being established, generalizability of well-controlled experiments with few subjects, generalizability of studies of subjects having narrow eligibility criteria, applicability for findings of animal studies to humans when data in humans are nonexistent, generalizability of early studies that used methodologies not considered state of the art or directly comparable with contemporary methods (e.g., change in analytical techniques or standardization), appropriate approaches to evaluating, interpreting and integrating data from observational studies with interventional data, and approaches to factor contemporary issues into the process, such as the role of genomics and nutrient fortification into the systematic review.

Key Questions Addressed in this Report

The aim of this report is to answer specific questions formulated to support the review and updating of DRI values by the DRI committee. The primary purpose of this report is to summarize all existing literature of vitamin D and calcium, and clinical outcomes in a way that will facilitate the deliberations of the IOM committee commissioned to review and potentially revise the DRI values for these nutrients. Specific clinical, surrogate and intermediate outcomes that are relating to vitamin D or calcium functions were selected by a technical expert panel. Detailed methods and analytic frameworks are described in Chapter 2. The intent of this report is not to make recommendations on specific outcomes nor specific values for DRI to be based upon, the intent of this report is to provide information for use during the deliberations of the IOM committee. The federal agencies of the US and Canadian governments involved in the DRI process formulated the key questions listed below based on the generic analytic framework as recently described (Figure 2).[3] The key questions are:

- What is the effect of exposures on functional or clinical outcomes? (Arrow 1)
- What is the effect of exposures on indicators of functional or clinical outcomes? (Arrow 2)
- What is the effect of indicators of exposure or body stores on functional or clinical outcomes? (Arrow 3)
- What is the effect of exposures on indicators of exposure? (Arrow 4)
- What is the effect of indicators of exposure or body stores and intermediate indicators of outcomes? (Arrow 5)
- What is the effect of intermediate indicators of outcomes and functional or clinical outcomes? (Arrow 6)

For each of these questions, the mandate was to also address factors that affect these relationships.

Figure 2. Generic analytic framework to assist formulation of key questions for the development of DRIs.



Arrow 1: Association of exposure with clinical outcomes of interest.
Arrow 2: Association of exposure with surrogate or intermediate outcomes (with good or possible evidence for linkage with clinical outcomes).
Arrow 3: Association of indicators of exposure to clinical outcomes.
Arrow 4: Association between exposure and indicators of exposure.
Arrow 5: Association of indicators of exposure to surrogate or intermediate outcomes (with good or possible evidence for linkage with clinical outcomes).
Arrow 6: Association between surrogate outcomes (with good or possible evidence for linkage) and clinical outcomes.

The focus of this evidence report is on the relationship of vitamin D only, calcium only, and combinations of vitamin D and calcium to relevant health outcomes. Serum 25(OH)D concentration was used as an indicator of vitamin D status and calcium intake (dietary and supplement) as an indicator of calcium status. Evidence was sought for the life stages as defined in the DRI process. For the above questions, information relevant to benefit (efficacy) and safety (adverse effects) were considered. The questions were refined with input from a committee of vitamin D and calcium experts, discussed in the Methods chapter.

Chapter 2. Methods

Overview

This report is based on a systematic review of key questions on the relationships between vitamin D [either 25(OH)D concentrations or supplements] or dietary calcium intake, and health outcomes. The methodologies employed in this evidence report generally follow the methods outlined in the AHRQ Methods Reference Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews (http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/repFiles/2007_10DraftMethodsGuide.pdf). The initial questions identified by the federal sponsors of this report were refined with input from a Technical Expert Panel (TEP). This report does not make clinical or policy recommendations. The report is being provided to an IOM committee charged with updating vitamin D and calcium DRIs.

A description of roles and responsibilities of sponsoring federal agencies, AHRQ, the TEP and the EPC is included to clarify the relationships that support the process and ensure transparency and that the approach adhered to the highest standards of scientific integrity.

Because of the large number of abbreviations for unfamiliar terms are used, their explanations have been repeated whenever deemed necessary. A table of **Abbreviations** can be found after the references in page 316. We also provide a table with the latitudes of several major cities in Central and North America, right after the **Abbreviations** table, on page 320.

Sponsoring Federal agencies.

The sponsoring agencies were responsible for specifying the topic-specific task order requirements. They participated in a Kick-Off meeting with the EPC and the Task Order Officer (TOO) to facilitate a common understanding of the topic-specific work requirements, and responded to inquiries from the TOO if modifications to the work order were requested by the EPC. Any communication between the sponsoring agencies and the EPC occurred with oversight from the TOO.

Review by Federal sponsors was limited to comments on factual errors, requests for clarification, and consistency with the original contract task order. Comments on the scientific content of the report were not provided. In all cases, reviewer comments are advisory only and are not binding on the scientific authors of the final report.

AHRQ Task Order Officer (TOO).

The TOO was responsible for overseeing all aspects of this Task Order. The TOO served as the point person for all communication required between the sponsoring agencies, the EPC, and other AHRQ officials. The purpose of this communication was to facilitate a common understanding of the task order requirements among the sponsors, the TOO, and the EPC, resolve ambiguities and to allow the EPC to focus on the scientific issues and activities.

Technical Expert Panel (TEP).

The TEP is comprised of qualified experts including, but not limited to, individuals with knowledge of DRI decision making processes, vitamin D and calcium nutrition and biology across the life cycle, health outcomes of interest, and the methodology of conducting systematic reviews. The EPC worked closely with the TEP in the formative stages of the project on question

refinement and throughout the evidence review process to address questions that occurred. The EPC conducted the actual systematic review of the questions independent of the TEP and other stakeholders. It was specified, a priori, that a TEP member who served as a peer reviewer for the final report could not also serve as a member of the subsequent calcium and vitamin D DRI Committee.

Those serving on the TEP provided input on such factors as reviewing search terms to ensure they were adequately inclusive, assessing search strategies to ensure they comprehensively covered the questions of interest, and answering questions about technical details (e.g., nuances of laboratory methods of performing an assay). Members of the TEP did not participate in EPC research meetings or in reviewing and synthesizing evidence. Their function was limited to providing domain-specific knowledge and advising the proper context that is relevant to the process of evaluating DRI. They did not have any decision making role and did not participate in writing any part of the evidence report.

EPC methodologists.

This evidence report was carried out under the AHRQ EPC program, which has a 12-year history of producing over 175 evidence reports and numerous technology assessments for various users including many federal agencies. EPCs are staffed by experienced methodologists who continually refine approaches to conducting evidence reviews and develop new methods on the basis of accumulated experience encompassing a wide range of topics. The Tufts EPC has produced many evidence reports on nutrition topics[19-24] (http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/epcix.htm). We have also conducted methodological research to identify the issues and challenges of including evidence-based methods as a component of the process used to develop nutrient reference values, such as the DRI, using vitamin A as an example.[3]

Development of the Analytic Framework and Refinement of Key Questions

The focus of this report is on the relationship of vitamin D only, calcium only, and combinations of vitamin D and calcium with specific health outcomes. Key questions and analytic frameworks were developed by defining each box in the generic analytic framework described in Chapter 1 with specific reference to vitamin D and calcium.

A one-day meeting of the federal sponsors, TEP and Tufts EPC staff was held in Boston on September 20, 2008. At this meeting, the analytic framework was discussed, the key questions refined, and study eligibility criteria established. Two analytic frameworks were developed: one for vitamin D and/or calcium Estimated Average Requirements (EARs) and one for Tolerable Upper Intake Levels (ULs) (Figures 3 & 4). We used the PI(E)CO method to establish study eligibility criteria. This method defines the Population, Intervention (or Exposure in the case of observational studies), Comparator, and Outcomes of interest. Details are described in the sections that follow.

Figure 3. Analytic framework for vitamin D and/or calcium EARs



Arrow 1: Association of exposure with clinical outcomes of interest.
Arrow 2: Association of exposure with surrogate or intermediate outcomes (that have good or possible evidence for linkage with clinical outcomes, respectively). (Surrogate outcomes are depicted in boxes with a solid outline, and intermediate outcomes are depicted in boxes with dashed outline.)
Arrow 3: Association of indicators of exposure to clinical outcomes.
Arrow 4: Association between exposure and indicators of exposure.
Arrow 5: Association of indicators of exposure to surrogate or intermediate outcomes.
Arrow 6: Association between surrogate or intermediate outcomes and clinical outcomes.

Figure 4. Analytic framework for vitamin D and/or calcium ULs



Arrow 1: Association of exposure with clinical outcomes of interest.
Arrow 3: Association of indicators of exposure to clinical outcomes.
Arrow 4: Association between exposure and indicators of exposure.

Definitions

Vitamin D and Calcium Exposures

Vitamin D exposure included intake of vitamin D_2 or vitamin D_3 from foods and supplements, including human milk and commercial infant formulas. Because the primary source of vitamin D in the human body is produced in skin exposed to sunlight, background information on ultraviolet B (UVB) exposure was captured to the extent possible. However, we did not include studies that evaluated the effect of or association between exposure to sunlight (or UVB) and clinical outcomes or serum 25(OH)D concentrations. In other words, we did not investigate sunlight exposure as a proxy for or a source of vitamin D intake. Sunlight exposure was considered only as a potential confounder or effect modifier of associations between vitamin D or calcium and clinical outcomes.

Calcium exposure included intake of calcium from foods and supplements, including calcium-containing antacids, mineral-supplemented water, human milk and commercial infant formulas.

Combined vitamin D and calcium exposure included any relevant combinations of the above.

Clinical Outcomes

Clinical outcomes are measures of how a person (e.g., a study participant) feels, functions or survives, or a clinical measurement of the incidence or severity of a disease (e.g., diagnosis of disease or change from one disease state to another). Examples of clinical outcomes used in this report are incidence of cancer, vascular events, and preeclampsia. The clinical outcomes of interest in this report are described in the "Specific Outcomes of Interest" section.

Indicators of Exposure (Nutrient Intake)

Indicators of exposure are measures that correlate with dietary intake of a nutrient, such as nutrient biomarkers, nutritional status, or markers of nutritional status.

Indicators of vitamin D exposure (i.e., vitamin D intake and sun exposure) included serum 25(OH)D and $1,25(OH)_2D$ concentrations.

Indicators of dietary calcium intakes included calcium balance (i.e., calcium accretion, retention, and loss).

Surrogate Outcomes

Surrogate outcomes are biomarkers or physical measures that are generally accepted as substitutes for or predictors of specific clinical outcomes.[18] Changes induced by the exposure or intervention on a surrogate outcome marker are expected to reflect changes in a clinical outcome. Examples of surrogate outcomes used in this report are bone mineral density (as a surrogate marker of fracture risk) and breast mammographic density (as a surrogate marker of breast cancer risk). The surrogate outcomes of interest in this report are described in "Specific Outcomes of Interest" section.

Intermediate Outcomes

Intermediate outcomes are possible predictors of clinical outcomes that are not generally accepted to fulfill the criteria for a surrogate outcome. However, in the absence of data for surrogate outcomes, intermediate markers are often used. Examples of intermediate markers used in this report are prostate cancer antigen (as a marker of prostate cancer risk) and blood pressure (as a marker of stroke risk). All intermediate markers of interest in this report are described in "Specific Outcomes of Interest" section.

Life Stages

In consultation with the TEP, the 22 life stages defined by the FNB/IOM for the development of DRI were consolidated to 9 categories to facilitate the reporting of results. Within each life stages, men and women (or boys and girls) were considered separately when possible. There are also some inevitable overlaps between these categories. For example, most women in 51-70 years life stage are postmenopausal women. The 9 categories created for this report are:

- 0 – 6 months
- 7 months – 2 years
- 3 – 8 years
- 9 – 18 years
- 19 – 50 years
- 51 – 70 years
- ≥71 years
- Pregnant and lactating women
- Postmenopausal women

In summarizing studies for each given outcome, we used our best judgment to describe the study results for each applicable life stage.

Key Questions

In agreement with the TEP, the following key questions were addressed in this evidence report. It was decided that arrow 6 in the analytic framework (What is the relationships between intermediate or surrogate outcomes and clinical outcomes?) is outside the scope of the DRI literature review in this report. All outcomes of interest in this report are described in "Eligibility Criteria" section.

Key Question 1. What is the effect of vitamin D, calcium, or combined vitamin D and calcium intakes on clinical outcomes, including growth, cardiovascular diseases, weight outcomes, cancer, immune function, pregnancy or birth outcomes, mortality, fracture, renal outcomes, and soft tissue calcification? (Arrow 1)

Key Question 2. What is the effect of vitamin D, calcium or combined vitamin D and calcium intakes on surrogate or intermediate outcomes, such as hypertension, blood pressure, and bone mineral density? (Arrow 2)

Key Question 3. What is the association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations or calcium balance and clinical outcomes? (Arrow 3)

Key Question 4. What is the effect of vitamin D or combined vitamin D and calcium intakes on serum 25(OH)D concentrations? (Arrow 4)

Key Question 5. What is the association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and surrogate or intermediate outcomes? (Arrow 5)

Literature Search Strategy

We conducted a comprehensive literature search to address the key questions. For primary studies, the EPC used the Ovid search engine to conduct searches in the MEDLINE® and Cochrane Central database. A wide variety of search terms were used to capture the many potential sources of information related to the various outcomes (see Appendix A). Search terms that were used to identify outcomes of interest, for both EARs and ULs, can be categorized into the following groups: 1) body weight or body mass index; 2) growth (height and weight); 3) fracture or bone mineral density; 4) falls or muscle strength; 5) cardiovascular diseases; 6) hypertension or blood pressure; 7) cancer or neoplasms, including adenomas, colon polyps, and mammography; 8) autoimmune diseases (e.g., type 1 diabetes, psoriasis, rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis, inflammatory bowel disease, ulcerative colitis, and Crohn's disease); 9) preeclampsia, eclampsia and pregnancy-related hypertension; 10) preterm or low birth weight; 11) breast milk or lactation; 12) death; 13) infectious diseases; 14) soft tissue calcification (for ULs only); and 15) kidney disease or hypercalcemia (for ULs only). The different outcomes were crossed with terms to identify vitamin D and calcium exposure: "vitamin D", "plasma vitamin D", "25-hydroxyvitamin D" and its abbreviations, "25-hydroxycholecalciferol", "25-hydroxyergocalciferol", "calcidiol", "calcifediol", "ergocalciferol", "cholecalciferol", "calciferol", "calcium", "calcium carbonate", "calcium citrate", "calcium phosphates" and

"calcium malate". Literature searches of the outcomes alone without references to vitamin D or calcium were not conducted.

The searches were limited to human studies, English language publications, and citations from 1969 to September 2008 for all but bone outcomes. For outcomes related to bone health (i.e., bone mineral density, fracture, fall or muscle strength), we relied on a recent comprehensive systematic review performed by the Ottawa EPC.[6] The Ottawa EPC report was updated from January 2006 to September 2008. The electronic search was supplemented by bibliographies of relevant review articles. Unpublished data, including abstracts and conference proceedings, were not included. An updated literature search was performed in April 2009 for all the topics to include relevant primary studies published since September 2008 for the final report.

For potentially relevant systematic reviews, we also searched MEDLINE®, the Cochrane Database of Systemic Reviews, and the Health Technology Assessments database up to December 2008. We searched for systematic reviews of the relationships between vitamin D or calcium and the prespecified outcomes. In this search, terms for identifying vitamin D or calcium exposures were crossed with terms for identifying systematic reviews, such as "systematic," "evidence," "evidence-based," "meta-analysis," or "pooled analysis"; specific terms for the outcomes were not included (Appendix B).

Study Selection

Abstract Screening

All abstracts identified through the literature search were screened. Eligible studies included all English language primary interventional or observational studies that reported any outcome of interest in human subjects in relation to vitamin D and/or calcium.

Full Text Article Eligibility Criteria

Articles that potentially met eligibility criteria at the abstract screening stage were retrieved and the full text articles were reviewed for eligibility. Rejected full text articles were examined only once, unless the articles were equivocal for inclusion or exclusion. In that event, the article in question was examined again by a different reviewer and a consensus was reached after discussion with the first reviewer. We recorded the reason for rejection of all full text articles.

Primary studies.

Because the outcomes of interest ranged from very broad topics with common occurrences (e.g., cardiovascular disease) to narrowly focused topics with relatively few occurrences (e.g., preeclampsia), the number and types of studies available for each outcome varied widely in the distribution of study designs and sample sizes. It was neither possible nor desirable to use a uniform, strict set of inclusion and exclusion criteria applicable to all outcomes. Therefore, additional eligibility criteria germane to the specific outcome were applied to all accepted full text articles. Details are described in the "Eligibility criteria" section.

General eligibility criteria for the full text articles were:

Population of interest:

- Primary population of interest is generally healthy people with no known disorders

- Studies that include a broad population that might have included some people with diseases. For example, some hypertensive and diabetic patients were included.
- People with prior cancers (or cancer survivors), prior fractures, and precancer conditions (e.g., colon polyps) were included
- Studies that enrolled more than 20 percent subjects with any diseases at baseline were excluded. An exception was made for older adults (mean age ≥65 years old) due to high prevalence of diseases in this population. For studies of older adults, only studies that exclusively enrolled subjects with particular disease (e.g., 100 percent type 2 diabetes) were excluded. In addition, for studies of blood pressure, studies of people exclusively with hypertension were included.
- For UL outcomes, we included any adverse effects of high intake in any population.

Intervention/exposure of interest.

- For observational studies:
    - Serum 25(OH)D or $1,25(OH)_2D$ concentration
    - Dietary intake level of vitamin D were not included due to inadequacy of nutrient composition tables for vitamin D.[25]
    - Dietary intake level of calcium from food and/or supplements
    - Calcium balance (i.e., calcium accretion, retention, and loss)
- For interventional studies:
    - Vitamin D supplements (but not analogues) with known doses
    - Calcium supplements with known doses
    - The only combination of dietary supplements of interest was the combination of vitamin D and calcium. Any other combinations of supplements and/or drug treatments were excluded unless the independent effects of vitamin D and/or calcium can be separated. Thus studies of multivitamins were excluded.
    - Trials in which participants in both study groups took the same calcium (or vitamin D) supplement were evaluated as vitamin D (or calcium) versus control trials. In other words, the intervention common to both study groups was ignored (though it was noted).
    - Food based interventions were included if the doses of vitamin D and/or calcium were quantified and there were differences in the doses between the comparison groups. For example, a trial of dairy supplementation (with 500 mg/d calcium) versus no supplementation was qualified to be included. However, a trial of calcium fortified orange juice (with 1200 mg/d calcium) versus milk (with 1200 mg/d calcium) was not qualified to be included because there are no differences in the calcium doses.
    - Non-oral routes of nutrient delivery were excluded

Specific outcomes of interest.

- Growth outcomes
    - In infants and premenarchal children: weight and height gain
- Cardiovascular disease clinical outcomes
    - Cardiac events or symptoms (e.g., myocardial infarction, angina)
    - Cerebrovascular events (stroke, transient ischemic attacks)
    - Peripheral vascular events or symptoms (diagnosis, claudication)

    - Cardiovascular death
    - Study-specific combinations of cardiovascular events
- CVD intermediate outcomes
    - Diagnosis of hypertension
    - Blood pressure
- Weight outcomes
    - In adults only: incident overweight or obesity, body mass index, or weight (kg)
- Cancer (incident or mortality)
    - Cancer from all cause (or total cancer)
    - Prostate
    - Colorectal cancer
    - Breast cancer
    - Pancreatic cancer
    - Cancer-specific mortality
- Cancer intermediate outcomes
    - Colorectal adenoma
    - Aberrant cryptic
    - Breast mammographic density (quantitative whole breast density)
- Immune function clinical outcomes
    - Infectious diseases
    - Autoimmune diseases
    - Infectious disease-specific mortality
- Pregnancy-related outcomes
    - Preeclampsia
    - High blood pressure with or without proteinuria
    - Preterm birth or low birth weight
    - Infant mortality
- Mortality, all cause
- Bone health clinical outcomes
    - Rickets
    - Fracture
    - Fall or muscle strength
- Bone health intermediate outcomes
    - Bone mineral density or bone mineral content
- Dose-response relationship between intake levels and indicators of exposure (arrow 4 of Figures 2 and 3)
    - Serum 25(OH)D concentration
    - Breast milk or circulating concentrations of 25(OH)D in infants
- Outcomes of tolerable upper intake levels (ULs)
    - All-cause mortality
    - Cancer and cancer-specific mortality
    - Renal outcomes
    - Soft tissue calcification
    - Adverse events from vitamin D and/or calcium supplements

Study design.

- Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)
- Nonrandomized, prospective comparative studies of interventions
- Prospective, longitudinal, observational studies (where the measure of exposure occurred before the outcome)
- Prospective nested case-control studies (case-control study nested in a cohort so the measure of exposure occurred before the outcome)
- We excluded cross-sectional studies and traditional, retrospective case-control studies (where the measure of exposure occurred after or concurrent with the outcome)

Systematic reviews.

We included relevant systematic reviews that addressed the key questions. Systematic review is defined as a study that has at a minimum the following three components: a statement of the research questions (aims or objectives); a description of the literature search; and a listing of the study eligibility criteria. We did not attempt to contact authors for clarifications of outstanding questions. In addition, the following types of reviews were excluded: reviews of foods or diets that did not quantify vitamin D or calcium intake; reviews that included non-oral routes of nutrient delivery; reviews that did not evaluate the association between vitamin D or calcium intake to health outcomes; reviews of nonhuman data; and pooled analyses of primary databases (i.e., secondary database analyses of multiple cohorts) that did not include a systematic review (except possibly as a replacement for data from the original cohorts).

To determine the relevance of a systematic review to this report, the following inclusion criteria were applied:

- Address key question(s) of interest (i.e., similar PI(E)CO criteria used):
    a. Systematic review must include only healthy population at baseline or have separate analyses for population with diseases and without diseases.
    b. Systematic reviews of interventional studies had to include only vitamin D or calcium interventions. Cointerventions with other nutrients had to be disallowed or separate analyses were needed for studies of vitamin D or calcium interventions alone.
    c. Systematic review of observational studies had to report the baseline concentrations of serum 25(OH)D and the assay methods used or the dietary assessment methods used to measure dietary calcium intake (e.g. food frequency questionnaire, 24 hour recall).
    d. Exposure levels (e.g., level of 25(OH)D or calcium intake) or doses of interventions had to be reported
    e. Outcome definitions had to be reported
    f. Designs of primary studies had to be reported. If cross-sectional or case-control studies were included, the systematic review must provide sufficient information or separate analyses to separate them from RCTs or cohort studies.
- We include only the most recent update if there were multiple systematic reviews from the same group of investigators using the same review process.
- Where there were several systematic reviews on the same topic with similar conclusions and the same set of primary studies, we selected the systematic review with either the latest cutoff date for the end of the literature search or the most included primary studies.

Other Specific Eligibility Criteria

- Growth outcomes (weight and height gain)
    - Only infants (<1 year old) and children (age <18 years old) were included
    - For infants, we include all eligible study designs. The vitamin D and/or calcium intervention or exposure can be administered to the mothers or to the infants in the study.
    - For infants, premenarchal girls, and boys of similar age, only RCTs that reported weight as a primary or secondary outcome were included. RCTs of weight loss were excluded.
- Cardiovascular disease clinical outcomes
    - Only adults (aged ≥18 years old) were included.
- Blood pressure and body weight
    - Only adults (aged ≥18 years old) were included.
    - Only RCTs of calcium or vitamin D interventions were included. We did not include observational studies of associations between calcium or vitamin D intake or serum vitamin D concentrations and blood pressure or weight measurements (as continuous outcomes). This decision was made in agreement with the TEP in part because it was agreed that any conclusions based on observational studies (e.g., associations between baseline calcium intake and change in systolic blood pressure) would be weak and difficult to interpret.
- Bone health clinical outcomes
    - The Ottawa EPC report[6] was updated with literature published between January 2006 and September 2008. Only RCTs qualified for inclusion.
    - Studies of calcium and bone health clinical outcomes were excluded.
- Bone health intermediate outcomes
    - The Ottawa EPC report[6] was updated with literature published between January 2006 and September 2008. For adults, we included only BMD indices. For children, we included only BMC indices. Only RCTs with duration of more than 1 year were qualified for inclusion.
    - Studies of calcium and bone health clinical outcomes were excluded.
- Dose-response relationship between intake levels and indicators of exposure (arrow 4 of Figures 2 and 3)
    - Studies for this question were identified in our literature search that crossed vitamin D terms with various outcomes terms. Some studies that addressed this question but do not report any of the outcomes of interest would not have been identified in this manner. Because the availability of serum 25(OH)D concentration is unlikely to be adequately indexed in the Medline citation, it would be difficult to comprehensively search the literature for this question. To do so would require retrieving all full text articles mentioning vitamin D supplements (in excess of 10,000) to look for data on serum 25(OH)D concentration.

- Only RCTs were included for this question. However, RCTs of different regimens but with the same dose of vitamin D supplementation were excluded (e.g., comparison of daily, weekly versus monthly dose).

Data Extraction

For outcomes that had not been subjected to a prior systematic review, we extracted and summarized the relevant data from the primary studies. Where previous systematic reviews were available, we summarized their results into our report. In addition, we updated the previous systematic reviews (with our eligibility criteria) and extracted and summarized the additional primary studies.

Data extraction forms (evidence tables) were developed separately for extraction of systematic reviews and primary studies. For primary studies, the items extracted were: study characteristics, baseline population characteristics, background diet data, dietary assessment methods for calcium intake, 25(OH)D assay methods, interventions (for interventional studies only), confounders and effect modifiers that were adjusted for in statistical analysis, results, and quality assessments. Whenever the type of vitamin D supplement (D_2 or D_3) was clearly reported, we extracted and reported this information. Otherwise, we used the general term "vitamin D". Evidence tables for all eligible studies are available in Appendix C. For systematic reviews, items extracted were: design, population, intervention (exposure) and comparator, results, and AMSTAR[26] checklist criteria (a measurement tool created to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews). A table with a list of all systematic reviews with the evaluation of their relevance to this report, and evidence tables of the qualified systematic reviews are available in Appendix D.

Data Analysis

We explored the dose-response relationship between the level of intake of vitamin D (with or without calcium) and serum 25(OH)D concentrations graphically, using a scatter ("bubble") plot. We plotted the observed net changes in 25(OH)D concentration, against the doses of vitamin D supplementation. In these plots studies were represented by empty circles (bubbles) with area proportional to the inverse of the within-study variances. Typically, the larger the bubble, the larger the sample size and the smaller the standard error of the changes in 25(OH)D.

Studies were included only if they reported sufficient data to estimate both mean net change and SE of the net change. We required data on both the mean net change in outcome level and the SE of the change. However, many studies provided only the SEs for the baseline and final outcome levels. In order to include these studies in the analyses we had to make several assumptions to estimate the SE of the change. To do this we used the equation:

$$SE_{12} = \sqrt{(SE_1^2 + SE_2^2 - 2\rho SE_1 SE_2)}$$

where SE_1, SE_2, and SE_{12} are the SEs for baseline, final and change, respectively, and ρ is the correlation between the baseline and final measurements.[27] We arbitrarily chose the correlation, ρ, to be 0.50, the midpoint value. In our experience, using different values for ρ generally does not greatly affect the meta-analysis results of quantitative analyses or conclusions.

For each RCT, the SE of the net change was then calculated using the standard calculation for determining the SE of 2 independent cohorts. Namely, in the above equation where the correlation factor ρ becomes 0, and thus the final term drops out. Where studies reported either within-cohort SEs or net change SEs, these numbers were used. Some RCTs may have more than

two arms (e.g., two different doses of vitamin D supplement compared to the placebo), and in this case, the same control arm was used to calculate the net change and the SE of the net change as for two independent comparisons.

Meta-analysis

Overall, we did not perform new meta-analyses in this report because of large degree of clinical and methodological heterogeneity across studies. However, we reanalyzed an existing meta-analysis using available data in the all-cause mortality section. We performed random effects model meta-analyses of risk ratios using the DerSimonian and Laird model.[28] The random effects model assigns a weight to each study that is based both on the individual study variance and the between-study heterogeneity. Compared with the fixed effect model, the random effects model is more conservative in that it results in broader confidence intervals when between-study heterogeneity is present. We tested for heterogeneity using Cochran's Q (considered significant for $P < 0.10$) and quantified its extent with I^2 [29,30]. I^2 ranges between 0 and 100 percent and quantifies the proportion of between-study variability that is attributed to heterogeneity rather than chance.

Intercooled Stata SE version 9.2 and Meta-Analyst version 3.2 (developed by Tufts EPC) were used for analyses. All P values are two tailed and considered significant when less than 0.05, unless otherwise indicated.

Grading of Studies Analyzed in This Evidence Report

Studies included as part of accepted in this report have been designed, conducted, analyzed, and reported with various degrees of methodological rigor and completeness. Deficiencies in any of these items may lead to biased reporting or interpretation of the results. While it is desirable to have a simple evidence grading system using a single quantity, the quality of evidence is multidimensional. A single metric cannot adequately capture information needed to interpret a study. Not withstanding these limitations, providing an indication of study quality adds an important dimension to the summary of published data.

Critical Appraisal and Grading of Primary Studies

Critical appraisal of the evidence is an important aspect of conducting a systematic review. For the assessment of interventional studies, the criteria were based on the CONSORT[31] statement for reporting RCTs (a checklist with specifications for reporting important aspects of a trial). We primarily considered the methods used for randomization, allocation concealment, and blinding as well as the use of intention-to-treat analysis, the report of well-described valid primary outcomes, and the dropout rate.

For interventional studies with nonrandomized design, we used the report of eligibility criteria and assessed the adequacy of controlling for differences between compared groups in terms of baseline characteristics and prognostic factors. We also considered the reporting of intention-to-treat analyses and crossovers when so designed, as well as important differential loss to followup between the compared groups or overall high loss to followup. The validity and the adequate description of outcomes and results were also assessed.

For the assessment of prospective cohorts and nested case-control studies (cross-sectional and retrospective case-control studies were excluded from this review), we developed a rating checklist specifically designed for nutritional epidemiology study based on some of the reporting items for cohort study in STROBE (STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology) checklist[32] and the nutrition-specific items in our previous publication.[33] Items assessed include: eligibility criteria and sampling of study population, blinding of exposure and outcome assessors, dietary assessment methodology (when applicable), assay methodology of biomarkers of intake (when applicable), clear reporting of comparisons in the study, statistical analyses, adequacy of controlling for baseline characteristics and prognostic factors (including confounders), clear reporting of outcome definitions, and prospective study design with preplanned hypotheses.

The quality assessment checklists for intervention or observational studies can be found in Appendix E. Additional considerations that were not included in the checklists are described later in this section.

In this report we adapted a three-category grading system of the AHRQ Methods Reference Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews. This system defines a generic grading system that is applicable to each type of study design including interventional and observational studies:

A

Studies have the least bias and results are considered valid. These studies adhere mostly to the commonly held concepts of high quality including the following: a formal study design; clear description of the population, setting, interventions, and comparison groups; appropriate measurement of outcomes; appropriate statistical and analytic methods and reporting; no reporting errors; less than 20 percent dropout; clear reporting of dropouts; and no obvious bias. Studies must provide valid estimation of nutrient exposure, from dietary assessments and/or biomarkers with reasonable ranges of measurement errors, and justifications for approaches to control for confounding in their design and analyses.

B

Studies are susceptible to some bias, but not sufficient to invalidate the results. They do not meet all the criteria in category "A", they have some deficiencies but none likely to cause major bias. The study may be missing information, making it difficult to assess limitations and potential problems.

C

Studies have significant bias that may invalidate the results. These studies have serious errors in design, analysis, or reporting; there are large amounts of missing information, or discrepancies in reporting.

If the initial assigned grade was equivocal, then the study received a second round of review by an independent reviewer, and the final grade was reached via consensus. Lastly, it should be noted that the quality grading system evaluates and grades the studies within their own design strata (i.e., RCTs, cohorts, nested case-control). It does not attempt to assess the comparative validity of studies across different design strata. Thus, it is important to be cognizant of the study design when interpreting the methodological quality grade of a study.

Additional Considerations of Methodological Quality of Primary Studies for the Purpose of DRI Decision Making

Randomized controlled trials of all outcomes.

The Tufts EPC debated about the quality assessment of RCTs. A consensus was reached to include additional considerations for RCTs to receive grade A. The general quality assessment of interventional studies as described earlier has been widely adopted for the purpose of grading high quality effectiveness trials (in contrast with a more standardized efficacy trial) which are most relevant to the actual use of supplements. Thus the crossover of interventions (i.e., contamination between supplementation and placebo groups) affects the applicability more than the methodological quality. However, it was the consensus among the Tufts EPC methodologists that the RCTs with contamination between supplementation and placebo groups cannot receive grade A because this issue affects the actual differences in the doses given to the subjects. Therefore it is particularly important when the trial results are used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual.

Observational studies of cancer outcomes.

When cancer cases were identified based on cancer registries or questionnaire-based data, we perused whether the investigators verify the diagnoses independently (e.g., by medical records or pathological reports). An observational study of cancer outcomes cannot receive grade A if the cancer diagnoses were not verify independently. We also examined if the study adequately control for other risk factors for specific cancer. We used the suggested risk factors by National Cancer Institute (www.cancer.org). An observational study of cancer outcomes cannot receive grade A if important risk factors for the specific cancer were not fully controlled for in their analyses.

Critical Appraisal of Systematic Reviews

We also critically appraised systematic reviews utilized in this report. However, a summary quality grade for systematic review is difficult to interpret. While it may be straightforward to assign a high quality grade to a rigorously carried out systematic review of high quality primary studies, a rigorously conducted systematic review finding only poor quality primary studies to summarize has uncertain value. Similarly, a poorly conducted systematic review of high quality studies may also result in be misleading conclusions. Therefore, to appreciate its validity, the various dimensions and nuances of the systematic review must be understood.

To help readers appreciate the methodological quality of a systematic review, we applied the AMSTAR checklist,[26] a tool that was created for this purpose. This tool does not assign a composite grade. Instead, the items evaluated are made explicit for the reader. Another challenge in evaluating systematic reviews is that none of the existing systematic reviews were specifically conducted to be used for DRI development; therefore their "quality", for the purpose of DRI development, is impossible to reliably define.

In addition to using AMSTAR, we made comments on special considerations, issues or limitations concerning design, conduct and analyses of the systematic review, and interpretability of the results for the purpose of DRI development.

Reporting of the Evidence

Evidence tables.

Evidence tables offer a detailed description of the primary studies we identified that address each of the key questions. These tables provide detailed information about the study design, patient characteristics, background diet, inclusion and exclusion criteria, interventions (or exposures), comparators used, and outcomes assessed in the study. A study, regardless of how many interventions (or exposures) or outcomes were reported, appears once in the evidence tables. Evidence tables are ordered alphabetically by the first author's last name to allow for easy searching within the tables. Evidence tables are available electronically in Appendix C.

Summary tables.

Summary tables were created to assist (qualitative) synthesis of primary studies of the same outcomes and life stage. If feasible, data were also grouped by sex. Typically, in each outcome section, we presented one summary table for the study characteristics of all included studies, followed by another summary table for study findings.

We created different summary tables for different exposures (i.e., vitamin D or calcium) and for different study designs (i.e., interventional or observational studies). Key study characteristics, such as population characteristics (i.e., health status, age and sex), vitamin D assay method and season in which blood was drawn, dietary assessment methods and whether the instrument was internally validated, patient or participant adherence, and study comparisons, were presented in the summary table for study characteristics. We reported daily vitamin D doses (IU/d) and/or elemental calcium doses (mg/d) in all summary tables.

For observational studies, we also list the confounders adjusted in either design (e.g., matching factors) or analyses. If any confounders or effect modifiers in each prespecified category (i.e., nutrients, demographics, anthropometry, medical conditions, ultraviolet exposure, and life styles) were controlled for, we marked "X" in the category. Otherwise, the category was left blank.

Graphical presentation of dose-response relationship.

We present graphically the results of studies associating outcomes with categorical exposures (e.g., percentiles or other arbitrary categories of 25(OH)D concentration or of total calcium intake). The graphs complement the information mentioned in the tables and allow the reader to appreciate the direction of the estimated effects, even when the choice of the reference category is inconsistent across studies. The graphs do not readily convey the slope (strength) of the dose-response relationship between exposure and outcome, because the exposure categories are simply ranked and their spacing does not necessarily correspond to the actual values that they represent within study or across studies.

Grand summary tables (evidence map).

In the beginning of the Results section, we created a grand overview table. The table details how many studies reported an outcome of interest (either as a primary or non-primary outcome) and also listed the total number of unique studies (including systematic reviews) as each study may have provided data on more than one outcome. The number of primary studies included in each existing systematic review is also reported.

Units of measurement.

In this report, we converted serum 25(OH)D concentrations as reported by various studies as different units (i.e., ng/mL, μg/dL, μg/L and ng/dL) to nmol/L. The conversion formula is 1 ng/mL = 2.5 nmol/L. To limit the variation in the reporting of vitamin D unit (e.g., nmol, IU, μg and mg), IU was chosen as the standard unit and all other units were converted using a standard formula. The conversion formula for micrograms is 1 μg = 40 IU.

Assay method.

For 25(OH)D measurements, we present information on the assay used in our evidence tables, and summary tables describing individual studies. When reported, we also recorded details on the methodology or kit used (e.g., RIA–radioimmunoassay, RIA "DiaSorin") used. Often, additional information was lacking. We did not perform any subgroup analyses based on the type of 25(OH)D assay used.

Sunlight exposure.

We report information on country where the study took place and its latitude (when this was meaningful), and when available, the season when serum 25(OH)D concentrations were measured. A substantial amount of vitamin D is formed in the skin in humans. The amount of vitamin D synthesized in the skin depends on a person's exposure to UV irradiation. Therefore, information on country's latitude (and season of serum 25(OH)D measurements) informs on whether different populations are likely to have similar or different amount of endogenous vitamin D production. Latitudes were extracted directly from the published reports, or extrapolated from the city or country where the study took place (by searching Google for "<county/city> latitude"). For national or international studies that spanned a wide range of latitudes (e.g., NHANES), the latitude information was summarized simply as "various." To facilitate the reader, we also provide a Table with the latitudes of major cities in Central and North America (this table is found right after the **Abbreviations** table on page 316.

Primary and secondary outcomes.

For intervention studies, we distinguished primary from secondary (or nonspecified) outcomes. Outcomes were considered primary only when they were clearly reported as such or when the outcome was used in an ad hoc sample size calculation. For observational studies we did not separate primary from secondary outcomes. For example, many observational studies are analyses of the same well known cohorts for several different outcomes. Each of these studies may have a different "primary" outcome.

Study quality.

We summarize methodological and reporting quality of individual studies and meta-analyses. More details on the reporting characteristics of individual studies and systematic reviews are found in the evidence tables (Appendix C).

Organization of the results section.

The Results section is organized in the following way:

- Nutrient (vitamin D | calcium | combined calcium and vitamin D)
    - Outcome (e.g., growth, cardiovascular diseases)
        - Synopsis
        - Detailed presentation (depending on availability of data)
            - Findings per calcium intake level / vitamin D concentration
            - Findings per age and sex
        - Findings by life stage

Chapter 3. Results

Literature Search Results

The original MEDLINE® and Cochrane Central database search for primary studies yielded 15,621 citations of EAR outcomes and 194 citations of UL outcomes. The update search for primary studies published between September, 2008 and April, 2009 yielded 918 citations We identified 654 of these as potentially relevant and retrieved the full-text articles for further evaluation. Of these, 478 did not meet eligibility criteria (Appendix E); thus, a total of 165 primary study articles met the inclusion criteria and were included in this report (Figure 5). Of the 165 primary study articles, 60 were randomized controlled trials (RCTs), 3 were nonrandomized comparative studies, and 102 were observational studies (either cohort or nested case-control studies). The publication dates of the 165 primary study articles ranged from 1980 to 2009.

The MEDLINE®, Cochrane Database of Systemic Reviews, and the Health Technology Assessments database search for systematic reviews yielded 1746 citations. We identified 68 of these as potentially relevant and retrieved the full-text articles for further evaluation. Of these, 46 did not meet eligibility criteria. After examining the 22 qualifying systematic reviews, 11 were excluded for various reasons (Appendix D; Figure 5).

The grand overview tables (Tables 1, 2, and 3) detailed how many studies reported an outcome (either as a primary or secondary outcome) that is of interest and also listed the total number of unique studies (including those from systematic reviews) as each study may have provided data for more than one outcome.

Figure 5. Literature flow in this report



Table 1. Number of primary studies on vitamin D intake or concentration and specific health outcomes that could be applicable to certain life stages

	Growth	CVD clinical	Body weight (adults)	Total cancer	Prostate cancer	Colorectal cancer	Colorectal adenoma	Breast cancer	Breast mammographic density	Pancreatic cancer	Immune function clinical outcomes	Preeclampsia & pregnancy outcomes	All-cause mortality	Bone health clinical outcomes	Bone mineral density or content	Hypertension	Blood pressure
0 – 6 mo	8																
7 mo – 2 y	1										1[B]						
3 - 8 y																	
9 – 18 y	2														2		
19 – 50 y		1	1	1	2	1		1			1				1	1	1
51 – 70 y		3	2	1	10	6	1	2		2	1		8		1	1	1
≥71 y		2		1		1					1		8	3		1	2
Pregnant & lactating women	7										1	1					
Postmenopause		1	1	1		1					1[B]					1	2
Total unique studies per outcome	**9**	**5**	**3**	**3**	**12**	**9**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**8**	**3**	**3**	**2[C]**	**3**
[Total number of RCTs per outcome]	**[6]**	**[1]**	**[3[A]]**	**[2]**	**[0]**	**[1]**	**[0]**	**[0]**		**[0]**	**[0]**	**[0]**	**[8]**	**[3]**	**[3[A]]**	**[0]**	**[3[A]]**
Systematic reviews (unique studies) per outcome	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1 (4)**	**1 (73)**		**0**	**0**

Shaded cells indicate that either the eligibility criteria excluded outcomes in those life stages or the outcomes are not applicable to those life stages. Blank unshaded cells indicate no primary studies were identified in this report in those life stages.

[A] Only RCTs were eligible for this outcome
[B] Relationship between maternal 25(OH)D concentration and atopic eczema in infants
[C] 1 study was a combined analysis of Nurses Health Study and Health Professionals Follow-up Study

Table 2. Number of primary studies on calcium intake and specific health outcomes that could be applicable to certain life stages

	Growth	CVD clinical	Body weight (adults)	Total cancer	Prostate cancer	Colorectal cancer	Colorectal adenoma	Breast cancer	Breast mammographic density	Pancreatic cancer	Immune function clinical outcomes	Preeclampsia & pregnancy outcomes	All-cause mortality	Bone health clinical outcomes	Bone mineral density or content	Hypertension	Blood pressure
0 – 6 mo	1																
7 mo – 2 y																	
3 - 8 y	1					1[B]											
9 – 18 y	3																
19 – 50 y		2	3	1		3		1	1	1			1			5	3
51 – 70 y		9	5	1	12	17	6	5		2			1			4	2
≥71 y		1	1	1		1[B]				1							2
Pregnant & lactating women	1											14					
Postmenopause		1	4	1				4								1	2
Total unique studies per outcome	**3**	**11**	**8**	**3**	**12**	**21**	**6**	**6**	**1**	**2[C]**	**0**	**14**	**1**			**5[D]**	**5**
[Total number of RCTs per outcome]	**[1]**	**[0]**	**[8[A]]**	**[2]**	**[0]**	**[0]**	**[1]**	**[0]**	**[0]**	**[0]**						**[0]**	**[5[A]]**
Systematic reviews (unique studies) per outcome	**1 (17)**	**0**	**3 (41)**	**0**	**0**	**1 (2)**	**1 (2)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1 (12)**	**0**			**0**	**6 (64)**

Shaded cells indicate that either the eligibility criteria excluded outcomes in those life stages or the outcomes are not applicable to those life stages. Blank unshaded cells indicate no primary studies were identified in this report in those life stages.

[A] Only RCTs were eligible for this outcome
[B] Association between total calcium intake in childhood and colorectal cancer after 65 years of followup
[C] 1 study was a combined analysis of Nurses Health Study and Health Professionals Follow-up Study
[D] 6 analyses, including 2 separate analyses of NHANES I

Table 3. Number of primary studies on combined vitamin D and calcium intake and specific health outcomes that are relevant to certain life stages

	Growth	CVD clinical	Body weight (adults)	Total cancer	Prostate cancer	Colorectal cancer	Colorectal adenoma	Breast cancer	Breast mammographic density	Pancreatic cancer	Immune function clinical outcomes	Preeclampsia & pregnancy outcomes	All-cause mortality	Bone health clinical outcomes	Bone mineral density or content	Hypertension	Blood pressure
0 – 6 mo	1																
7 mo – 2 y																	
3 - 8 y																	
9 – 18 y															1		
19 – 50 y			1											1			1
51 – 70 y		1	1				1						3			1	1
≥71 y			1										8				
Pregnant & lactating women	1											1					
Postmenopause		1	1	2		1	1	1					8	1	3	1	1
Total unique studies per outcome	**1**	**1[B]**	**2[B]**	**2[B]**	**0**	**1[B]**	**2[B]**	**1[B]**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**11[BC]**	**2[B]**	**4**	**1[B]**	**2[B]**
[Total number of RCTs per outcome]		**[1]**	**[2[A]]**	**[2]**		**[1]**	**[1]**	**[1]**					**[11]**	**[2]**	**[4[A]]**	**[1]**	**[2[A]]**
Systematic reviews (unique studies) per outcome	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1 (10[B])**		**1 (119[B])**	**0**	**0**

Shaded cells indicate that either the eligibility criteria excluded outcomes in those life stages or the outcomes are not applicable to those life stages. Blank unshaded cells indicate no primary studies were identified in this report in those life stages.

[A] Only RCTs were eligible for this outcome
[B] Including the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) trial
[C] A de novo reanalysis of the 10 RCTs in a previous systematic review and one newly added trial

Vitamin D and Health Outcomes

Vitamin D and Growth

We reviewed primary studies that evaluated relationships between vitamin D and growth parameters in infants and children.

Synopsis.

Seven intervention studies and two observational studies evaluated intake of or exposure to vitamin D and growth parameters in infants and children. Two intervention studies from the same center found a significant association of maternal vitamin D intakes with infant birth weights. Study methodologies were incompletely reported in these two studies. The rest of the studies did not find a significant association between either maternal or offspring vitamin D intake and offspring's weight or height. No overall conclusions could be drawn as the studies reviewed had diverse populations and methodological approaches.

Detailed presentation (Tables 4, 5, 6 & 7).

Six RCTs[34-40] and one nonrandomized comparative study[41] in eight publications reported on the effect of vitamin D supplementation on growth parameters in infants and children. Two cohort studies reported on the association between maternal serum 25(OH)D concentration and her offspring's growth parameters.[42,43] The number of subjects in the RCTs ranged from 19 to 200. The two cohort studies had 374 and 466 subjects, respectively. The latitudes of the studies ranged from 38º to 51º. Four studies administered vitamin D exclusively to expectant mothers during the third trimester of pregnancy. One study administered vitamin D to both the lactating mothers and her offspring. Two studies administered vitamin D only to the infants or children. Followup ranged from delivery until 9 years. Methodological quality of two studies were rated B and seven studies were rated C. The studies were limited by such factors as incomplete reporting and small sample sizes.

Infant 0 - 6 months; 7 months - 2 years; pregnant or lactating women.

One RCT from UK administered vitamin D 1000 IU/d or placebo to 126 expectant mothers (first generation Asian immigrants) during the third trimester and found no significant difference between the infants' birth weights or birth lengths and those of the control population.[34,38] There were twice as many low birth weight infants (<2500 g) in the control group compared to the supplemented group (21.7 percent vs. 11.9 percent); however, this difference was not significant. A study from US supplemented 10 lactating mothers with vitamin D 400 IU/d and their infants with 300 IU/d for 6 months. Compared to the group where nine mothers received 6400 IU/d and their infants none, there was no significant difference in the infants' weight or length at 1 month, 4 months, and 7 months of age.[39] A study from China randomly assigned 255 newborn infants to 100, 200, or 400 IU/d of vitamin D for 6 months and reported no significant difference in weight or length among the three groups at 6 months of age.[36] One study from India randomly selected 100 expectant mothers to receive a total of 1.2 million IU of vitamin D (600,000 IU of vitamin D_2 in 7th and 8th month) during the third trimester. The newborns' birth weight was significantly increased compared to those from 100 unsupplemented expectant mothers (difference 190 g).[37] Important elements of the study methodology like randomization technique and any blinding of outcome assessors were not reported. An earlier nonrandomized comparison from the same study center involving smaller samples reported similar findings.[41] The estimated baseline mean

dietary vitamin D intake in the expectant mothers from these two studies was less than 30 to 35 IU/d (the validity of these measures is unclear). An RCT from France supplemented 48 expectant mothers with either vitamin D 1000 IU/d in the third trimester or 200,000 IU one time dose at 7 month pregnancy and found no significant difference in the infants' birth weights between the two methods.[40] A cohort study from Australia analyzed the maternal serum 25(OH)D concentration in 374 women at 28-32 week gestation (geometric mean in winter 48 nmol/L; summer 69 nmol/L) and found no association with infant birth weight or length.[43] One cohort study from UK analyzed the serum 25(OH)D concentration in 466 white women in late pregnancy (~33 wk) and found the concentrations (from <30 to >75 nmol/L) were not related to their offspring's weight or height at birth, 9 months, and 9 years.[42]

9 - 18 years.

One RCT of vitamin D_3 (placebo, 200, or 2000 IU/d for 1 year) on girls in Lebanon aged 10-17 years found no significant difference at 1 year followup in weight or height among the 34 girls who were premenarchal at time of enrollment.[35]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** One RCT found that supplementing expectant mothers with vitamin D 1000 IU/d during the 3rd trimester has no effect on infant birth weight or length. Another RCT found that supplementing expectant mothers with a total of 1.2 million IU of vitamin D during the 3rd trimester effected a significant increase in birth weight (+190 g). Background diet is low in vitamin D in this study. A study compared supplementing lactating mothers with vitamin D 400 IU/d and their infants 300 IU/d for 6 months with mothers supplemented with 6400 IU/d and their infants none, there was no significant difference in the infants' weight or length at 1 month, 4 months, and 7 months of age. Another study compared supplementing newborn infants with 100, 200, or 400 IU/d of vitamin D for 6 months and reported no significant difference in weight or length at 6 months of age. An RCT supplemented expectant mothers with either vitamin D 1000 IU/d during the third trimester or 200,000 IU one time dose at 7 month pregnancy and found no significant difference in the infants' birth weights between the two methods. A cohort study analyzed the maternal serum 25(OH)D concentration at 28-32 week gestation (geometric mean in winter 48 nmol/L; summer 69 nmol/L) and found no association with infant birth weight or length. Another cohort study found that serum 25(OH)D concentration (ranged from <30 to >75 nmol/L) in late pregnancy (~33 wk) was not related to the newborn's weight or height at birth, 9 months, and 9 years.
- **7 mo – 2 y** A cohort study found that serum 25(OH)D concentration (ranged from <30 to >75 nmol/L) in late pregnancy (~33 wk) was not related to the newborn's weight or height at birth, 9 months, and 9 years.
- **3 – 8 y** No study covered this life stage.
- **9 – 18 y** A cohort study found that serum 25(OH)D concentration (ranged from <30 to >75 nmol/L) in late pregnancy (~33 wk) was not related to the newborn's weight or height at birth, 9 months, and 9 years. One RCT of vitamin D_3 (placebo, 200, or 2000 IU/d for 1 year) on girls 10-17 years old found no significant difference at 1 year followup in weight or height among the girls who were premenarchal at time of enrollment.
- **19 – 50 y** Not reviewed
- **51 – 70 y** Not reviewed

- **≥71 y** Not reviewed
- **Postmenopause** Not reviewed
- **Pregnant & lactating women** One RCT found that supplementing expectant mothers with vitamin D 1000 IU/d during the 3rd trimester has no effect on infant birth weight or length. Another RCT found that supplementing expectant mothers with a total of 1.2 million IU of vitamin D during the 3rd trimester effected a significant increase in birth weight (+190 g). Background diet is low in vitamin D in this study. A study compared supplementing lactating mothers with vitamin D 400 IU/d and their infants 300 IU/d for 6 months with mothers supplemented with 6400 IU/d and their infants none, there was no significant difference in the infants' weight or length at 1 month, 4 months, and 7 months of age. An RCT supplemented expectant mothers with either vitamin D 1000 IU/d during the third trimester or 200,000 IU one time dose at 7 month pregnancy and found no significant difference in the infants' birth weights between the two methods.

Table 4. Vitamin D on growth outcome: Characteristics of interventional studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
RCTs						
Maxwell 1981[38] Brooke 1980[34] UK (51ºN) [6793058] [6989438]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	pregnancy nd 0	25(OH)D at 28-32 wk: 20.1 nmol/L	Vit D 1000 IU/d 3rd trimester only	nd	First generation Asian immigrants only
Feliciano 1994[36] China (22ºN to 47ºN) [8078115]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	healthy term newborn nd	86% infant breastfed until 5-6 mo	Vit D 100 IU/d vs. 200 IU/d vs. 400 IU/d	nd	
El-Hajj 2006[35] Lebanon (33ºN) [16278262]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	healthy 13.2 (10-17) 0	25(OH)D 35 nmol/L; dietary Ca 677 mg/d	Vit D_3 200 IU/d vs. 2000 IU/d vs. placebo x 1 y	98% in placebo; 98% in low dose; 97% in high dose	7.4 h sun exposure/wk
Wagner 2006[39] Charleston, US (32ºN) [17661565]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Fully lactating; <1 mo postpartum 29 0	Lactating mother's dietary Vit D 273 IU/d; dietary calcium intake: 1125 mg/d;	Mother Vit D_3 400 IU/d + infant 300 IU/d vs. mother 6400 IU/d + infant 0 IU/d	≥80% in mothers; as low as 61% for infants	78% white; 11% black; 11% Hispanic
Marya 1988[37] India (28ºN) [3243609]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	no pregnancy-related complications 24 0	Expectant mother's dietary Vit D 35 IU/d; calcium 429 mg/d	Mother Vit D 1.2 mil IU (total; 600,000 IU vit D_2 in 7th & 8th mo) vs. no supplement	nd	
Mallet 1986[40] France (48º N) [3755517]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	pregnancy newborn nd	Ca intake 550 to 1000 mg/d in 55% of the subjects	Vit D 1000 IU/d vs. 200,000 IU 1x dose	nd	
Nonrandomized comparative study						
Marya 1981[41] India (28ºN) [7239350]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	no pregnancy-related complications nd 0	Expectant mother's daily milk intake <500 mL; dietary Vit D <30 IU/d	Vit D 1200 IU/d + Ca 375 mg/d (3rd trimester) or Vit D 1.2 mil IU (total; 600,000 IU in 7th & 8th mo) or no supplement	nd	

Table 5. Vitamin D and growth outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Morley 2006[43] Australia (38ºS) [16352684]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	singleton pregnancy; no disease 29 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA winter & summer	Length and weight in offspring stratified by mother's 25(OH)D		X	X		X	X	99% white; excluded dark skin or women with concealing clothing
Gale 2008[42] PAHSG UK (50ºN) [17311057]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	singleton pregnancy <17 wk 26.3 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA nd	Length and weight in offspring stratified by mother's 25(OH)D		X			X		White only

Table 6. Vitamin D and growth outcomes: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change (SD)	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Maxwell 1981[38] Brooke 1980[34] [6793058] [6989438]	Pregnant women & infant 0-6 mo (Asians)	Infant birth weight	2°	until delivery	Vit D 1000 IU	59	g	NA	Final 3157	3037, 3277	Diff +123	-50, 296[C]	NS	B
					Control	67		NA	3034	2909, 3159				
		Infant birth length	2°	until delivery	Vit D 1000 IU	59	cm	NA	Final 49.7	49.6, 49.8	Diff +0.2	0.1, 0.3[C]	NS	
					Control	67		NA	49.5	49.4, 49.6				
Feliciano 1994[36] [8078115]	0-6 mo	Weight gain born in spring, N. China[A]	1°	6 mo	Vit D 400 IU	12	g	nd	3745	2613, 4877	-463	-1852, 926[C]	NS	C
					Vit D 200 IU	13		nd	5296	4718, 5874	1088	96, 2080[C]	NS	
					Vit D 100 IU	17		nd	4208	3402, 5013				
		Length gain born in spring, N. China	1°	6 mo	Vit D 400 IU	12	cm	nd	18.8	17.4, 20.2	-0.5	-2.7, 1.7[C]	NS	
					Vit D 200 IU	13		nd	19.0	18.1, 19.9	-0.3	-2.2, 1.6[C]	NS	
					Vit D 100 IU	15		nd	19.3	17.6, 21.0				
El-Hajj 2006[35] [16278262]	9-18 y female, premenarche	Height	2°	1 y	Vit D_3 2000 IU	nd, ≤34 total	%	nd	5.6%	~4.8, 6.4[C]	~1.8%	~0.6, 3.0[C]	0.07	C
					Vit D_3 200 IU			nd	5.0%	~4.2, 5.8[C]	~1.2%	~-0.01, 2.4[C]		
					Placebo			nd	3.8%	~0.9, 6.7[C]				
		Weight	2°	1 y	Vit D_3 2000 IU	nd, ≤34 total	%	nd	18.4%	~14.7, 22.1[C]	~3.5%	~-1.3, 8.3[C]	0.25	
					Vit D_3 200 IU			nd	15.3%	~12.5, 18.1[C]	~0.4	-3.7, 4.5[C]		
					Placebo			nd	14.9%	~11.8, 18.0[C]				
Wagner 2006[39] [17661565]	Lactating mothers & infant 0 - 6 mo; 7 mo - 2 y	Infant weight[B]	1°	7 mo	Mother (400) +infant (300)	10	g	NA	Final 7600	7100, 8100	Diff -800	-2300, 700[C]	0.30	C
					Mother (6400) +infant (0)	9		NA	8400	7700, 9100				
		Infant length	1°	7 mo	Mother (400) +infant (300)	10	cm	NA	Final 65.5	64.4, 66.6	Diff -3.8	-7.8, 0.2[C]	0.06	
					Mother (6400) +infant (0)	9		NA	69.3	67.4, 71.2				
Marya 1988[37] India [3243609]	Pregnant women & infant 0-6 mo	Birth weight	1º	Delivery	Vit D 1.2 mil IU total	100	g	NA	Final 2990	2920, 3060	Diff +190	90, 290[C]	<0.001	C
					No supplement	100		NA	2800	2730, 2870				
		Birth length	2º		Vit D 1.2 mil IU total	100	cm	NA	Final 50.06	49.7, 50.4	Diff +1.6	1.1, 2.1[C]	<0.001	
					No supplement	100		NA	48.45	48.1, 48.8				
Marya 1981[41] [7239350][E]	Pregnant women & infant 0-6 mo	Birth weight	2º	Delivery	Vit D 1.2 mil IU total	20	g	NA	Final 3140	2940, 3340	Diff +410	166, 654[C]	0.001	C
					Vit D 1200 IU + 375 mg Ca (3rd trimester)	25	g	NA	Final 2890	2760, 3020	Diff +160	0, 320[C]	0.05	
					No supplement	75		NA	2730	2650, 2810				

Continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change (SD)	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Mallet 1986[40] France (48º N) [3755517]	Pregnant women & infant 0-6 mo	Birth weight	2°	delivery	Vit D 1000 IU	21[D]	g	NA	Final 3370 (80)		Diff +160		NS	C
					Vit D 200,000 IU 1x dose	27[D]		NA	3210 (90)					

[A] See Table 1 in original paper for complete results stratified by North vs. South China and birth in spring vs. fall
[B] See Table 3 in original paper for results on 1 mo and 4 mo
[C] Estimated from available data
[D] Estimated from number of mothers; number of infants not reported
[E] This is not an RCT; the supplemented groups were randomized, but not the control (non-supplemented group); data from comparisons between the supplemented groups not reported.

Table 7. Vitamin D and growth outcomes: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Maternal 25(OH)D concentration, nmol/L	No. in Category	Final value	Final SD	P value	Study Quality
Morley 2006[43] Australia [16352684]	Pregnant women; infant 0-6 mo	Birth weight (N=374)	Delivery	<28 at 28-32 wk	27	3397 g	57	NS	B
				≥28 at 28-32 wk	347	3555	52		
		Birth length (N=374)	Delivery	<28 at 28-32 wk	27	49.8 cm	2.7	NS	
				≥28 at 28-32 wk	347	50.4	2.4		
Gale 2008[42] PAHSG, UK [17311057]	Pregnant women; infant 0-6 mo	Birth weight (N=466)	Delivery	<30 (Quartile)	nd	3.38 kg	0.46	0.25[A]	C
				30-50	nd	3.40	0.56		
				50-75	nd	3.49	1.57		
				>75	nd	3.43	0.51		
		Weight at 9 mo (N=440)	9 mo	<30	nd	15.9	1.14	0.58	
				30-50	nd	15.8	1.26		
				50-75	nd	16.1	1.34		
				>75	nd	15.9	1.09		
		Weight at 9 y (N=178)	9 y	<30	nd	27.4 kg	1.19	0.10	
				30-50	nd	29.4	1.21		
				50-75	nd	30	1.20		
				>75	nd	29.3	1.19		
	Pregnant women; infant 0-6 mo	Birth length (N=466)	Delivery	<30	nd	50 cm	1.83	0.15	
				30-50	nd	50	2.29		
				50-75	nd	50.5	2.25		
				>75	nd	50.1	2.09		
		Length at 9 mo (N=440)	9 mo	<30	nd	71.2 cm	2.85	0.86	
				30-50	nd	71.4	2.60		
				50-75	nd	71.7	2.89		
				>75	nd	71.1	2.67		
		Height at 9 y (N=178)	9 y	<30	nd	129.6 cm	5.88	0.19	
				30-50	nd	131.5	6.66		
				50-75	nd	131.8	5.09		
				>75	nd	130.6	6.45		

[A] Non-adjusted

Vitamin D and Cardiovascular Disease

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews have evaluated the association between vitamin D intake or serum 25(OH)D concentrations and incidence of hypertension. One RCT of almost 2700 elderly British who received either vitamin D_3 100,000 IU every 4 months or placebo for 5 years found no statistically significant difference in event rates for various cardiovascular outcomes, including total events and cardiovascular deaths. No effects were also found in subgroup analyses of men and women. Three cohort and one nested case-control studies have analyzed the association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and cardiovascular outcomes (cardiovascular events, nonfatal myocardial infarction or fatal coronary heart disease, cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, and stroke). Significant associations were found between progressively lower 25(OH)D concentration and progressively increased risk of cardiovascular events in two studies of people approximately 40 to 75 years old. No significant associations were found between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, or stroke in one study each.

Detailed presentation (Tables 8, 9, 10 & 11; Figure 6).

Total cardiovascular events.

Total cardiovascular events were evaluated by an RCT,[44] the Framingham Offspring Study (FOS),[45] and a nested case-control study derived from the Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS).[46] The RCT found no significant effect of vitamin D; both cohort studies found significant associations between lower serum 25(OH)D concentrations and increased rates of outcomes.

The RCT randomized almost 2700 elderly participants (65-85 years) from the general population in Ipswich, UK (52° N) to vitamin D_3 100,000 IU every 4 months or placebo.[44] After 5 years, 36 percent of the participants had a cardiac or cerebrovascular event, but there was no statistically significant difference between those taking vitamin D or placebo. Similar results were found in subgroups of men and women. The RCT was rated quality B primarily due to inadequate verification of outcomes.

The FOS cohort evaluated 1739 men and women with no history of cardiovascular disease and a mean age of 59 years (based on the standard deviation, with an approximate rage of 41 to 77 years).[45] After 5.4 years, 6.9 percent had a cardiovascular event (including myocardial infarction, coronary insufficiency, angina, stroke, transient ischemic attack, claudication, and heart failure). Overall, the methodological quality of the study was A; though their secondary analysis of three categories of serum 25(OH)D concentrations (as opposed to two categories) was rated C due to incomplete reporting and lack of adjustment for important variables including season of blood draw. In their primary analysis, people with serum 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L were 70 percent more likely (P=0.02) to have a cardiovascular event. In their secondary analysis, those with 25(OH)D concentrations between 25 and 37.5 nmol/L were about 50 percent more likely (P=0.01) to have an event than those with higher concentrations. Furthermore, a multivariable analysis of continuous 25(OH)D concentrations suggested increased likelihoods of cardiovascular events in those with 25(OH)D concentrations below approximately 50 to 55 nmol/L.

In a nested case-control study of the HPFS, 454 men 40 to 75 years old with no cardiovascular history who had a nonfatal myocardial infarction or coronary heart disease death over a 10 year period were matched with 1354 controls.[46] The methodological quality of the analysis was A, although due to limitations on analyzable serum, the investigators had to use a case-control analysis instead of a complete analysis of all eligible men in the HPFS. Across four categories of men based on their serum 25(OH)D concentrations, lower concentrations were significantly associated with increased cardiovascular events (trend across categories P=0.02). Compared with men who had 25(OH)D concentrations above 75 nmol/L, those with 25(OH)D concentrations 56 to 75 nmol/L had an adjusted relative risk (RR) of 1.6 (95 percent CI 1.1, 2.3), those with 25(OH)D 37.5 to 56 nmol/L had an RR of 1.4 (95 percent CI 0.96, 2.1), and those with 25(OH)D below 37.5 nmol/L had an RR of 2.1 (95 percent CI 1.2, 3.5).

Cardiovascular death.

The British RCT of vitamin $D_3$100,000 IU every 4 months versus placebo analyzed cardiovascular death as a primary outcome; 8 percent of the participants had cardiovascular deaths within 5 years.[44] Fewer people taking vitamin D_3 supplements had cardiovascular deaths (RR = 0.84), but this finding was not statistically significant (95 percent CI 0.65, 1.10). Similar results were found in subgroups of men and women.

An analysis of NHANES III (methodological quality C) evaluated cardiovascular death (due to hypertensive disease, ischemic heart disease, arrhythmia, heart failure, cerebrovascular disease, atherosclerosis or other disease of the arteries) in over 13,000 men and women regardless of baseline medical history.[47] During almost 9 years of followup, 5.8 percent had a cardiovascular death. The analysis compared four categories of serum 25(OH)D concentrations ranging from less than 44.5 nmol/L to more than 80 nmol/L. No significant association was found between serum 25(OH)D concentration and cardiovascular death.

Ischemic heart disease.

The RCT evaluated total ischemic heart disease.[44] In this elderly British population, 17 percent had an ischemic heart disease event; no effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation was found. Similar results were found in subgroups of men and women.

Ischemic heart disease death.

The RCT evaluated total ischemic heart disease death as a primary outcome.[44] In the trial, 3.4 percent had an ischemic heart disease event; no effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation was found (RR = 0.84 [95 percent CI 0.56, 1.27]). Similar results were found in subgroups of men and women.

Myocardial infarction.

In one small analysis, 755 elderly (age 65 to 99 years) Finnish men and women, regardless of cardiovascular history, were evaluated on the basis of myocardial infarction (methodological quality C due to lack of reporting of relevant data including information on the serum 25(OH)D or $1,25(OH)_2D$ concentrations within the tertiles).[48]
During 10 years of followup, 17 percent of the participants had a myocardial infarction. Both analyses of serum 25(OH)D and $1,25(OH)_2D$ concentrations found no significant association with risk of myocardial infarction.

Stroke.

The RCT evaluated total cerebrovascular disease.[44] In this elderly British population, 7.7 percent had a cerebrovascular event; no effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation was found. Similar results were found in subgroups of men and women.

Stroke was evaluated in the same small Finnish study. During 10 years of followup, 9.3 percent of the participants had a stroke. Both analyses of serum 25(OH)D and 1,25$(OH)_2$D concentrations found no significant association with risk of stroke.

Cerebrovascular death.

The RCT evaluated cerebrovascular disease death as a primary outcome.[44] In the trial, 2.0 percent had a fatal stroke; no effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation was found. Similar results were found in subgroups of men and women.

Findings per vitamin D concentration.

The RCT compared vitamin D_3 supplementation 100,000 IU every 4 months with placebo, but found no effect on cardiovascular outcomes. Two cohort studies found a significant association between higher serum 25(OH)D concentrations and lower risk of combined cardiovascular events. Both found that those people in the highest 25(OH)D category analyzed within each study had the lowest risk. The FOS used a maximum threshold of 37.5 nmol/L; the HPFS used a maximum threshold of 75 nmol/L. The FOS provided a graphic representation of a multivariable regression of continuous 25(OH)D concentrations (Figure 2 in the study).[45] The risk of cardiovascular events rose below 37 to 50 nmol/L serum 25(OH)D concentration. The Finnish cohort did not report the range of serum 25(OH)D and 1,25$(OH)_2$D concentrations.[48]

Findings per age and sex.

The single RCT included elderly people from the general population. No effects on various cardiovascular events were found. Subgroup analyses of men and women yielded similar findings. The four cohort studies included adults across the full age range. Three of the cohorts included about half men and women; one included only men. None evaluated potential differences in associations based on age or sex, but no differences were evident across studies.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** For cardiovascular events, only a minority of evaluated participants were within this life stage (almost all above 40 years). The NHANES III study, which found no association between serum 25(OH)D concentration and cardiovascular death, included largely people within this life stage.
- **51 – 70 y** The majority of people investigated for the association between serum 25(OH)D concentration and cardiovascular events were within this life stage. Significant associations were found between lower serum 25(OH)D concentrations and increased rates of cardiovascular events, across a range of 25(OH)D concentrations. The NHANES III study likely included many people within this life stage; no association was found with cardiovascular death.
- **≥71 y** The majority of participants in the British RCT included men and women within this age group. Vitamin D supplementation was not found to have an effect on

- **Postmenopause** Only the RCT provided data on a subgroup that included only postmenopausal women. No effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation was found.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 8. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Trivedi 200[44] Ipswich, UK (52°N) [12609940]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	General population 75 (65-85) 76%	742 mg/day (at 4 years, no difference by treatment allocation)	Vit D_3 100,000 IU vs placebo every 4 months	76% with at least 80% compliance; 66% at last dose (80% if excluding deaths)	

Table 9. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex (Subgp)	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Trivedi 200[44] [12609940]	65-85 y, Both	CVD, total	2°	5 y	Vit D_3 100,000 IU every 4 mo	477	1345	Age adj RR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.90[A]	0.77, 1.06	0.22	B
					Placebo	503	1341					
		IHD, total	2°		Vit D_3	224	1345	Age adj RR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.94[A]	0.77, 1.15	0.57	
					Placebo	233	1341					
		CeVD, total	2°		Vit D_3	105	1345	Age adj RR (Vit D/Placebo)	1.02[A]	0.77, 1.36	0.87	
					Placebo	101	1341					
		CVD death	1°		Vit D_3	101	1345	Age adj RR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.84[A]	0.65, 1.10	0.20	
					Placebo	117	1341					
		IHD death	1°		Vit D_3	42	1345	Age adj RR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.84[A]	0.56, 1.27	0.41	
					Placebo	49	1341					
		CeVD death	1°		Vit D_3	28	1345	Age adj RR (Vit D/Placebo)	1.04[A]	0.61, 1.20	0.89	
					Placebo	26	1341					

[A] Similar results for subgroups of men and women

Table 10. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Specific CVD Outcomes
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Wang 2008[45] Framingham Offspring Framingham, MA (mostly) (42°N) [18180395]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	No CVD 59 (9) 45	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All	Outcome stratified by 2 or 3 categories	X[A]	X	X	X	X[A]	X	CVD event
Giovannucci 2008[46] HPFS US (various) [18541825]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No CVD 64 (40-75) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	RIA (Hollis 1993) All	Outcome stratified by 4 categories[B]	X	X	X	X	X	X	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 45 (≥20) 46	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All (even distribution)	Outcome stratified by 4 categories	X	X	X	X	X	X	CVD death
Marniemi 2005[48] Turku, Finland (60°N) [15955467]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 79 (65-99) 48	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Incstar) All	Outcome stratified by tertiles		X				X	MI Stroke

[A] Not in 3-category analysis
[B] Case-control study

Table 11. Vitamin D and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
CVD Events											
Both Sexes											
Wang 2008[45] Framingham Offspring [18180395]	Mean (SD) 59 (9), Both	CVD event (120/1739; 0.069)	5.4 y	25(OH)D	<37.5	50	481	1.70	1.08, 2.67*	0.02[A]	A
					≥37.5	70	1258	**1**	**Reference**		
					<25	nd	nd	1.80	1.05, 3.08*	0.01	C
					25-37.5	nd	nd	1.53	1.00, 2.36*		
					≥37.5	70	1258	**1**	**Reference**		
Men											
Giovannucci 2008[46] HPFS [18541825]	40-75 y, Men	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD (454 cases; 1354 controls)	10 y	25(OH)D	≤37.5	63	150	2.09	1.24, 3.54	0.02[BC]	A
					37.5-56.25	156	463	1.43	0.96, 2.13		
					56.25-75	165	464	1.60	1.10, 2.32		
					>75	70	277	**1**	**Reference**		
CVD Death											
Both Sexes											
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III [18695076]	≥20 y, Both	CVD death (777/13,331; 0.058)	8.7 y	25(OH)D	<44.5	nd	nd	1.20	0.87, 1.64	nd	C
					44.5-60.75	nd	nd	0.88	0.69, 1.14		
					60.75-80.25	nd	nd	0.83	0.65, 1.07		
					>80.25	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
Myocardial Infarction											
Both Sexes											
Marniemi 2005[48] [15955467]	65-99 y, Both	MI (130/755; 0.172)	10 y	25(OH)D	nd	nd	~252	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
					nd	nd	~252	0.99	0.64, 1.53		
					nd	nd	~252	0.77	0.47, 1.27		
				$1,25(OH)_2D$	nd	nd	~252	**1**	**Reference**	nd	
					nd	nd	~252	1.05	0.68, 1.62		
					nd	nd	~252	0.82	0.52, 1.30		

Continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Stroke											
Both Sexes											
Marniemi 2005[48] [15955467]	65-99 y, Both	Stroke (70/755; 0.093)	10 y	25(OH)D	nd	nd	~252	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
					nd	nd	~252	1.13	0.62, 2.05		
					nd	nd	~252	1.00	0.51, 1.94		
				$1,25(OH)_2D$	nd	nd	~252	**1**	**Reference**	nd	
					nd	nd	~252	0.63	0.37, 1.09		
					nd	nd	~252	0.41	0.22, 0.77*		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)

[A] Multivariable Cox regression with continuous 25(OH)D and regression splines with nonlinear relationships suggests an increased hazard of CVD events at serum 25(OH)D concentrations below approximately 50-55 nmol/L. See Figure 2 on page 508 of article.

[B] Adjusted regression analyses found OR=0.98 (0.96, 0.998) per 2.5 nmol/L increase in 25(OH)D and risk reduction of -2.1% (-0.2%, -4.0%) per 2.5 nmol/L increase in serum 25(OH)D concentration.

[C] In a subgroup analysis of participants on no cholesterol lowering drugs at baseline, comparing the highest serum 25(OH)D concentration category (>75 nmol/L) to the lowest (≤37.5 nmol/L), adjusted RR=2.30 (1.33, 3.97).

Figure 6. Cardiovascular outcomes risk stratified by vitamin D concentration



Vitamin D and Body Weight

We searched for systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated associations between vitamin D intake or body stores and *incidence of overweight or obesity*; no such studies were found. For the outcome *weight change* (in kilograms or body mass index units), we included only randomized controlled trials. The EPC and the TEP agreed that the limited resources would not be expended on reviewing observational studies for the surrogate outcome body weight (where overweight or obesity are considered to be the clinical outcomes). We included only studies of adults. Studies of weight gain in children are included in the "Growth" section.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews have evaluated the association between vitamin D intake or serum 25(OH)D concentrations and body weight in adults. Three RCTs from Finland, Norway, and India compared different doses of vitamin D (300 IU daily, 20,000 or 40,000 IU weekly, or 120,000 IU every 2 weeks) to placebo, with or without supplemental calcium in both groups. The study participants also varied: they were postmenopausal women, obese men and women, or only obese men. In the Finnish and Norwegian studies, the participants on average, gained weight in all groups over 1 or 3 years; in the Indian study weight remained mostly stable over 6 weeks. All studies found no difference in weight change with or without vitamin D supplementation.

Detailed presentation (Tables 12 & 13).

Three RCTs of vitamin D reported body weight (or body mass index [BMI]) as an outcome. The Kuopio (Finland) Osteoporosis Risk Factor and Prevention Study (Kuopio ORFPS) included postmenopausal women in a four-arm study.[49] Two of the study arms included hormone replacement treatment and are not further discussed here. The remaining two arms compared vitamin D_3 300 IU (83 women) versus placebo (95 women), where all women were taking low dose calcium lactate 500 mg/d (equivalent to 93 mg Ca^{++}/d). Women on cholesterol-lowering medication at any point during the trial were excluded. The primary outcome of the trial was the serum lipid profile. The women ranged in age from 47 to 56 years. After 3 years, women, on average, gained weight in both study arms (about 1-2 kg). Those in the placebo arm gained an absolute 1.5 percent more weight than those in the vitamin D arm, but the difference was not statistically significant. The study had a methodological quality of C due to an uneven distribution of body weights between study arms at baseline (means 71.5 and 67.6 kg) and an overall withdrawal rate of over 30 percent.

The second trial was conducted in Norway among healthy overweight and obese women and men.[50] The participants' mean baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration was 53 nmol/L. The trial compared vitamin D_2 40,000 IU weekly (116 participants completed), 20,000 IU weekly (106 participants), and placebo (112 participants). All study participants also took calcium carbonate 500 mg daily. Almost all participants complied with the vitamin D (or placebo). Changes in weight and BMI were primary outcomes. The participants ranged in age from 21 to 70 years. After 1 year, changes in weight were small (increases of 0.1-0.5 kg) in each trial group. Compared to the placebo group, those taking the larger dose of vitamin D had less weight gain than those taking the smaller dose, but none of the differences among study groups were statistically significant. The study was rated methodological quality B, primarily due to the high dropout rate (25 percent), which was not explained.

The third trial was conducted in New Delhi, India among healthy obese men.[51] The participants' mean baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration was about 33 nmol/L. The trial compared vitamin D_3 120,000 given under supervised conditions every 2 weeks and placebo in 100 men, of whom 71 were analyzed; most dropouts occurred because of refusals for subsequent blood draws (to assess the primary outcome). After 6 weeks, weight in kg and BMI were essentially stable, with no difference in weight change between the interventions. The study was rated methodological quality B because of the high dropout rate; for weight (in kg), the study was of quality C because baseline weights were not reported.

Findings per vitamin D dose.

There was a lack of effect found across a range of doses from 300 IU to 8570 IU (prorated) daily.

Findings per age and sex.

There was a lack of effect found in studies both of men mostly in their 40s, somewhat older people of both sexes, and postmenopausal women.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No effect was found in one trial of men mostly within this life stage after 6 weeks.
- **51 – 70 y** The majority of people in the trials were within this life stage. No significant effect was found on weight from vitamin D supplementation for 1 or 3 years.
- **≥71 y** No data
- **Postmenopause** All the women in the Finnish trial were postmenopausal.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 12. Vitamin D and weight: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Heikkinen 1997[49] Kuopio ORFPS Kuopio, Finland (63°N) [9405029]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	All, post-menopause 53 (47-56) 0	nd	Vit D_3 & Ca lactate vs Placebo & Ca lactate	nd	
Sneve 2008[50] Tromsø, Norway (70°N) [19056900]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy overweight and obese 48 (21-70) 36	25(OH)D 53.1±16.9 nmol/L Ca intake 940±398 mg/d	Vit D_3 40,000 IU per week vs Vit D_3 20,000 IU per week vs Placebo All: Ca carbonate 500 mg/d	The compliance rate for cholecalciferol/placebo capsules were 95% in all 3 groups, and for the calcium tablets 81-85% across all 3 groups.	
Nagpal 2009[51] New Delhi, India (28.5°N) [19125756]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy, obese 44 (8) 100%	25(OH)D: 36.5 nmol/L (treatment group), 30.0 nmol/L (control group)	Vit D_3 120,000 IU every 2 weeks vs Placebo	100% (implied); supervised home visits	Excluded subjects who refused subsequent blood draws

Table 13. Vitamin D and weight: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex (Subgp)	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Isocaloric Diet														
Heikkinen 1997[49] Kuopio ORFPS [9405029]	47-56 y, Women	Weight	2°	3 y	Vit D_3 300 IU + Ca lactate 93 mg	83	kg	71.5	+1.84%	+0.43%, +3.25%	-1.5%	-3.6%, +0.6%[A]	NS[B]	C
					Ca lactate 93 mg	95		67.6	+3.32%	+1.73%, 4.91%				
Sneve 2008[50] [19056900]	21-70 y, Both	Weight	1°	1 y	Vit D_3 40,000 IU weekly+ Ca carbonate 500 mg	116	kg	101.0	+0.1	-0.6, +0.8	-0.4	-1.3, +0.5[A]	NS	B
					Vit D_3 20,000 IU weekly + Ca carbonate 500 mg	106		98.6	+0.3	-0.3, +0.9	-0.2	-1.1, +0.7[A]	NS	
					Ca carbonate 500 mg	112		100.6	+0.5	-0.2, +1.2				
		BMI	1°	1 y	Vit D_3 40,000 IU weekly + Ca carbonate 500 mg	116	BMI	35.0	0.0	-0.2, +0.2	-0.2	-0.6, +0.2[A]	NS	
					Vit D_3 20,000 IU weekly + Ca carbonate 500 mg	106		34.4	+0.1	-0.1, +0.3	-0.1	-0.4, +0.2[A]	NS	
					Ca carbonate 500 mg	112		35.1	+0.2	-0.1, +0.5				
Nagpal 2009[51] New Delhi, India [19125756]	44 (8, SD) Men	Weight	2°	6 wk	Vit D_3 120,000 IU every 2 wk	35	kg	nd	+0.03	-0.6, +0.6	+0.42	-0.4, +1.2	NS	C
					Placebo	36		nd	-0.38	-0.9, +0.2				
		BMI	2°	6 wk	Vit D_3 120,000 IU every 2 wk	35	BMI	26.7	-0.02	-0.2, +0.2	+0.02	-0.3, +0.3	NS	B
					Placebo	36		26.0	-0.04	-0.3, +0.2				

[A] Estimated from reported data
[B] Per estimated 95% confidence interval, P=0.17

Vitamin D and Cancer

Cancer from all causes and total cancer mortality.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews have evaluated relationships between vitamin D and total cancer incidence or mortality. One RCT showed no effect of combined vitamin D_3 (1000 IU/d) and calcium (~1500 mg/d) supplementation versus calcium supplementation (~1500 mg/d) alone on the risk of total cancer in healthy postmenopausal women (>55 years old) living in Nebraska (latitude 41°N). Another RCT also found no difference in total cancer mortality or incidence between supplemental vitamin D_3 (100,000 IU every 4 months) and placebo in elderly (71+ years old) men and women living in the United Kingdom (latitude 52° N). Both RCTs were rated B quality.

Analyses using NHANES III data (general adult populations living in the US) showed no significant association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and total cancer mortality.

Detailed presentation (Tables 14, 15, 16 & 17).

A 4-year population-based RCT,[52] sampled from a 9 county, largely rural area in eastern Nebraska (latitude 41°N), aimed to determine the efficacy of vitamin D_3 (1000 IU/d) plus calcium (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d) or calcium alone (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d) compared to placebo in reducing fracture incident. Only the comparison between the combined vitamin D and calcium versus the calcium alone groups is discussed here. The other comparisons are described in the calcium and combined vitamin D and calcium sections. This study was rated methodological quality B. Incidence of cancer was a secondary outcome of this trial. A total of 1179 postmenopausal women, aged more than 55 years old, were randomized. The mean 25(OH)D concentration at baseline was 72 nmol/L. The relative risk of developing cancer at the end of study was 0.76 (95 percent CI: 0.38, 1.55). On the hypothesis that cancers diagnosed early in the study would have been present, although unrecognized on entry, the analyses were restricted to women who were free of cancer at 1 year intervention. The relative risk of developing cancer at the end of study for the vitamin D_3 plus calcium group changed to 0.55 (95 percentCI 0.24, 1.28).

Another 5-year RCT compared the effects of supplemental vitamin D_3 (100,000 IU every 4 months) with placebo on total cancer mortality and incidence in 2686 elderly participants with a mean age of 75 years in the United Kingdom (latitude 52° N).[44] Total cancer mortality and incidence were evaluated as two of multiple secondary endpoints. The primary endpoint was the prevention of fracture. At 5 years vitamin D_3 supplementation had no significant effect on the prevention of total cancer mortality (HR 0.86; 95 percent CI 0.61, 1.20) or incidence (HR 1.09; 95 percent CI 0.86, 1.36). This trial was rated B because it did not report in sufficient detail the randomization method, and the outcome ascertainment was based on death certificates or self-reported data, not verified with another objective documents (e.g., medical records or pathology reports).

Reported in two publications (one was rated B and one was rated C), there was no association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and total cancer mortality in the total NHANES III study population[47,53] or in subgroup analyses by either season or latitude after a median 9 years of followup.[53]

Findings by age, sex and/or ethnicity.

There were no differences in the total cancer mortality and incidence between men and women, reported in a 5-year RCT compared the effects of supplemental vitamin D_3 (100,000 IU every 4 months) with placebo. In the NHANES III analysis, there was a suggestion of increased risk of total cancer mortality in men whose baseline 25(OH)D were in the two highest categories (80 to <100 nmol/L; ≥100 nmol/L) compared to the reference category (<50 nmol/L) [80 to <100 nmol/L: RR = 1.21, 95 percent CI 0.83 to 1.78; ≥100 nmol/L: RR = 1.35; 95 percent CI 0.78 to 2.31; P for trend=0.08]. However, this relationship was not seen in women (P for trend=0.12).[53] When racial/ethnic groups were considered separately, there was also no association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and total cancer mortality in non-Hispanic whites (P for trend=0.80), non-Hispanic blacks (P for trend=0.14), or Mexican Americans (P for trend=0.37).

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** Analyses using NAHANES III data showed no significant association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and total cancer mortality. NHANES III included participants mostly within this life stage.
- **51 – 70 y** A proportion of participants in NHANES III were in this life stage, but no unique conclusions are possible for this life stage separate from those for people 19 to 50 years.
- **≥71 y** One RCT included elderly men and women mostly in this life stage. The trial found no difference in total cancer mortality or incidence between supplemental vitamin D_3 (100,000 IU every 4 months) and placebo.
- **Postmenopause** One RCT with healthy postmenopausal women showed no effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation (1000 IU/d) on the risk of total cancer.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No Data

Table 14. Vitamin D and total cancer: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Lappe 2007[52] Nebraska, US (41º N) [17556697]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Mentally and physically fit; post-menopause 67 (7.3) 0	25(OH)D: 71.8 nmol/L	Vit D_3 1000 IU/d + Ca (citrate 1400 mg/d or carbonate 1500 mg/d) vs. Ca (citrate 1400 mg/d or carbonate 1500 mg/d) vs. placebo	nd	
Trivedi 2003[44] Oxford, UK (52°N) [12609940]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	General population 75 (65-85) 76%	25(OH)D: 53.4 nmol/L Calcium intake= 742 mg/d (at 4 years, no difference by treatment allocation)	Vit D_3 100,000 IU vs placebo every 4 months	Participants taking ≥80% of study medication: 76%[A]	Previous CVD: 28%, previous cancer: 6%, steroids user: 5%, and HRT taker: 7%

[A] No difference between the vitamin D and the placebo arm.

Table 15. Vitamin D and total cancer: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Cohort												
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III US (various) [16481636]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 44 (≥17) 45	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All	Cancer mortality stratified by prespecified baseline 25(OH)D cut points	X	X	X	X	X	X	Final model includes sex, race/ethnicity, and smoking pattern. Other potential confounders were examined but not chosen.
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	DM 7.4%, history of CVD 7.9%, HTN 25% 45 (≥20) 46	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All	Cancer mortality stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Table 16. Vitamin D and total cancer: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Lappe 2007[52] Nebraska, US (41º N) [17556697]	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (all causes)	2°	4	Vit D_3 1000 IU + Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	13	446	RR (Vit D+Ca vs Ca)	0.76	0.38, 1.55	NS	B
					Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	17	445					
	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (restricted to subjects who were free of cancer at 1 y intervention)	2°	4	Vit D_3 1000 IU + Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	8	403	RR (Vit D+Ca vs Ca)	0.55	0.24,1.28	NS	B
					Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	15	416					
Trivedi 2003[44] [12609940]	65-85 y, Both sexes	Incident cancer (all causes)	2°	5	Vit D_3 100,000 IU every 4 mo (~833 IU/d)	188	1345	HR (Vit D vs placebo)	1.09	0.86, 1.36	NS	B
					Placebo	173	1341					
		Total cancer mortality	2°	5	Vit D_3 100,000 IU every 4 mo (~833 IU/d)	63	1345	HR (Vit D vs placebo)	0.86	0.61, 1.2	NS	
					Placebo	72	1341					

Table 17. Vitamin D and total cancer: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	25(OH)D, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted HR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III US [16481636]	Adults, both sexes	Cancer mortality (536/16818; 0.032)	105 mo	<50	175	5744	**1**	**Reference**	0.65	B
				50 to <62.5	103	3143	1.22	0.91, 1.64		
				62.5 to <80	117	3713	1.02	0.69, 1.50		
				80 to <100	80	4218 (total, ≥80 nmol/L)	1.00	0.71, 1.40		
				100 to <120	41		0.92	0.58, 1.46		
				≥120	20		1.49	0.85, 2.64		
	Adults, males	Cancer mortality (318/7632; 0.042)	105 mo	<50	88	1993	**1**	**Reference**	0.08	
				50 to <62.5	57	1461	1.03	0.73, 1.44		
				62.5 to <80	71	1845	0.99	0.57, 1.74		
				80 to <100	58	2333 (total, ≥80 nmol/L)	1.21	0.83, 1.78		
				≥100	44		1.35	0.78, 2.31		
	Adults, females	Cancer mortality (218/9163; 0.024)	105 mo	<50	87	3751	**1**	**Reference**	0.12	
				50 to <62.5	46	1682	1.40	0.94, 2.08		
				62.5 to <80	46	1845	1.02	0.62, 1.67		
				80 to <100	22	1885 (total, ≥80 nmol/L)	0.72	0.40, 1.26		
				≥100	17		0.78	0.40, 1.53		
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	Adults, both sexes	Cancer mortality (N=13331)	Median 8.7 (IQR 7.1-10.2) y	>80	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
				61-80	nd	nd	0.8	0.54, 1.19		
				44-60	nd	nd	1.08	0.8, 1.46		
				<44	nd	nd	0.91	0.63, 1.31		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)

Prostate cancer.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews have evaluated the association between serum vitamin D concentrations and incidence of prostate cancer. Eight nested case-control studies (2B, 6C) found no association between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer. One study rated C found a significant association between lower baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations (<30 compared to >55 nmol/L) and higher risk of prostate cancer (adjusted OR 1.8, lowest compared to highest quartile). The same study found that the prostate cancer risk was increased in subjects less than 52 years at study entry and who had serum 25(OH)D concentration less than 40 nmol/L (adjusted OR 3.5). However, there was no difference in risk between low and high serum 25(OH)D concentration for those older than 51 years at study entry. A C study suggested an U-shaped association between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer.

Detailed presentation (Tables 18 & 19; Figure 7).

A total of 12 nested case-control studies in 14 publications reported on the association between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer.[53-66] The number of cases ranged from 61 to 749. The latitudes of the studies ranged from 21º N to 60º N. The mean age of the subjects ranged from 44 to 68 years. Baseline serum concentrations of 25(OH)D in these studies ranged from 12.8 to 194 nmol/L. The time between blood drawn and the diagnosis of prostate cancer varied from 2 to 16 years. The methodological quality of three studies was rated B and nine studies were rated C.

19-50 years.

Two studies provided data on younger subjects. Ahonen et al. analyzed subjects from 40 to 57 years of age.[55] The study found that the prostate cancer risk was increased in subjects less than 52 years at study entry and had low serum 25(OH)D concentration (≤40 nmol/L) (adjusted OR 3.5, 95% CI 1.7, 7.0). The corresponding adjusted OR for those older than 51 years at study entry was 1.2 and was not significant. This study adjusted for factors related to insulin resistance syndrome but not those potentially related to prostate cancer.

Freedman et al. analyzed data from NHANES III and reported on subjects with a mean age of 44 years and found that the adjusted relative risk of mortality from prostate cancer was 0.91 (95% CI 0.39, 2.14) in the group with baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration of at least 62.5 nmol/L compared to the group with less than 62.5 nmol/L.[53]

51-70 years.

Ten studies reported data on subjects with a mean age ranged from 51 to 68 years. Eight studies did not find an association by trend analysis between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer.[54,56-63,66] One study found no association between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and mortality from prostate cancer.[58] One study found an association between lower baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations (<30 compared to >55 nmol/L) and the risk of prostate cancer (P for trend = 0.01).[55] The adjusted OR of the lowest compared to highest quartile was 1.8. The study also found that the prostate cancer risk was increased in subjects less than 52 years at study entry and had low serum 25(OH)D concentration (≤40 nmol/L) (adjusted OR 3.5, 95 percent CI 1.7, 7.0). However, there was no difference in risk (adjusted OR 1.2, P=NS) between low (≤40 nmol/L) and high (>40 nmol/L) serum 25(OH)D

concentration for those older than 51 years at study entry. This study did not adjust for factors potentially relevant to prostate cancer. One study reported an U-shaped association between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer: the odds ratio in the group with 25(OH)D concentration of at least 80 nmol/L was 1.7 (95 percent CI 1.1, 2.4) compared to the group with a 25(OH)D concentration of 40-49 nmol/L; the odds ratio in the group with 25(OH)D concentration of no more than 19 nmol/L was 1.5 (95 percent CI 0.8, 2.7) compared to the group with a 25(OH)D concentration of 40 to 49 nmol/L.[64] Even though this study used a conditional logistic regression in its analysis to maintain matching status, it was unclear if additional factors potentially relevant to prostate cancer were also entered into the regression analysis.

1,25(OH)$_2$D.

Five studies reported on the association between 1,25(OH)$_2$D serum concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer. Four studies did not find an association.[59,62,63,66] One study found that the risk of prostate cancer decreased with higher serum concentrations of 1,25(OH)$_2$D in men with low serum concentrations of 25(OH)D (unadjusted OR 0.15, comparing 4th quartile of 1,25(OH)$_2$D (104-211 pmol/L) to 1st quartile (13-68 pmol/L) in men with serum 25(OH)D concentrations that ranged from 7.5-45 nmol/L).[58] When stratified by age and race, this association was only found in men above the median age of 57 years at time of blood drawn but not in younger men; the association was similar in black and white men.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** One study found that the prostate cancer risk was highest in subjects less than 52 years at study entry and had low serum 25(OH)D concentration (≤40 nmol/L) (adjusted OR 3.5, 95 percent CI 1.7, 7.0). Another study analyzed data from NHANES III and reported on subjects with a mean age of 44 years and found that the adjusted relative risk of mortality from prostate cancer was 0.91 (95 percent CI 0.39, 2.14) in the group with baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration of at least 62.5 nmol/L compared to the group with less than 62.5 nmol/L.
- **51 – 70 y** Eight studies did not find an association by P for trend analysis between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer. One study found an inverse association of baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations (<30 compared to >55 nmol/L) and the risk of prostate cancer (adjusted OR 1.8, lowest compared to highest quartile, P for trend = 0.01). This study found that the prostate cancer risk was increased in subjects less than 52 years at study entry and had low serum 25(OH)D concentration (≤40 nmol/L) (adjusted OR 3.5, 95 percent CI 1.7, 7.0). However, there was no difference in risk (adjusted OR 1.2, P=NS) between low (≤40 nmol/L) and high (>40 nmol/L) serum 25(OH)D concentration for those older than 51 years at study entry. One study reported an U-shaped association between baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of prostate cancer: the odds ratio in the group with 25(OH)D concentration of at least 80 nmol/L was 1.7 (95 percent CI 1.1, 2.4) compared to the group with a 25(OH)D concentration of 40-49 nmol/L; the odds ratio in the group with 25(OH)D

concentration of no more than 19 nmol/L was 1.5 (95 percent CI 0.8, 2.7) compared to the group with a 25(OH)D concentration of 40 to 49 nmol/L.

- **≥71 y** No study specifically targeted men older than 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not applicable

Table 18. Vitamin D and prostate cancer: Characteristics of nested case-control studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		25(OH)D		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	
Ahn 2008[54] PLCO US (21ºN to 44ºN) [18505967]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	8% current smoker 67.8 (5.3) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Heartland) nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles	X		X	X		X	
Platz 2004[63] Mikhak 2007[61] HPFS US (multiple latitudes) [15090720] [17440943]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	Smoked 18%; DM 3.6% 66 (7) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	6% nonwhite
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III US (multiple latitudes) [17971526]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	28% current smoker 44 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA South: Nov to Mar; North: Apr to Oct	Prostate cancer mortality stratified by 2 baseline 25(OH)D categories	X	X	X	X	X	X	71% white; 14% black; 6% Hispanics
Tuohimaa 2004[64] Helsinki Heart Vasterbotten; Janus Project; Finland (60°N) [14618623]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	Gemfibrozil vs. placebo subjects <40 to >60 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Incstar) nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by 5 baseline 25(OH)D categories		X			X		
Li 2007[60] Gann 1996[66] PHS US (multiple latitudes) [17388667] [8850273]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	on ASA, β-carotene, placebo trial; 9% current smoker 58.9 (8.3) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Bruce Hollis) 24% spring or winter	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles		X				X	94% white
Corder 1993[58] San Francisco US	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y	nd 57 (38-81)	Assay	Competitive protein-binding (Haddad, 1971)	Prostate cancer risk compared by baseline 25(OH)D		X			X		50% black; 50% white

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		25(OH)D		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	
(37ºN) [8220092]	Male (%)	100	Season blood drawn	nd								
continued												
Ahonen 2000[55] Helsinki Heart Finland (60°N) [11075874]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	Gemfibrozil vs. placebo subjects 40-57 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Incstar) Jan-Feb; Mar-May; Sep	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles		X	X	X	X	X	
Nomura 1998[62] Honolulu Heart US (21ºN) [9794175]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	64% smoked 58 (49-70) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	Protein-binding nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles		X			X	X	100% Japanese Americans
Tuohimaa 2007[65] Helsinki Heart Finland (60°N) 17301263	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	Gemfibrozil vs. placebo subjects 51 (3.7) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Incstar) Most in winter	Prostate cancer risk stratified by 3 baseline 25(OH)D categories		X	X	X			
Jacobs 2004[59] NPC Eastern US (25º46'N to 41ºN) [15225833]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	Selenium vs. placebo subjects[A] 68 (nd) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D tertiles		X	X	X	X	X	
Braun 1995[57] WCC, MD US (39°N) [7612803]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	nd <45-75+ 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Bruce Hollis, 1993) Aug through Nov	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles		X					100% white
Baron 2005[56] CPP US (multiple latitudes) [15767334][B]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	had >1 colon adenoma removal 62 (8.7) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	Competitive protein-binding (Quest) nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D tertiles	X	X			X		5% black
continued												

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		25(OH)D		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	
Braun 1995[57] WCC, MD US (39°N) [7612803]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	nd <45-75+ 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Bruce Hollis, 1993) Aug through Nov	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles		X					100% white
Baron 2005[56] CPP US (multiple latitudes) [15767334][B]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	had >1 colon adenoma removal 62 (8.7) 100	Assay Season blood drawn	Competitive protein-binding (Quest) nd	Prostate cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D tertiles	X	X			X		5% black

[A] For prevention of recurrence of non-melanoma skin cancer
[B] This is a cohort study, not a nested case-control study.

Table 19. Vitamin D and prostate cancer: Results of nested case-control studies

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage (male), y	Outcome (no. of cases; no. of control)	Time to diagnosis, y	25(OH)D concentration, nmol/L	No. of cases	No. of control	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for trend	Study Quality
Ahn 2008[54] PLCO [8505967]	51-70	Prostate cancer (741; 781)	2-8	12.8-42.5	119	157	**1**	**Reference**	0.20	B
				42.5-51.	125	156	1.10	0.78, 1.56		
				51.4-60.5	190	157	1.53	1.10, 2.13*		
				60.6-71.7	167	156	1.33	0.95, 1.86		
				71.8-129.5	148	155	1.18	0.83, 1.68		
Platz 2004[63] Mikhak 2007[61] HPFS [15090720] [17440943]	51-70	Prostate cancer (460; 460)	2.2 (mean)	Quartile 1[A]	109	114	**1**	**Reference**	0.59	B
				Quartile 2	115	113	1.00	0.67, 1.49		
				Quartile 3	94	120	0.77	0.51, 1.15		
				Quartile 4	142	113	1.19	0.79, 1.79		
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III [17971526]	19-50	Mortality prostate cancer	nd	<62.5	22	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.95	B
				≥62.5	25	nd	0.91	0.39, 2.14		
Tuohimaa 2004[64] Helsinki Heart [14618623]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (622; 1451)	≤9 ->14 (range)	≤19	19	nd	1.5	0.8, 2.7		C
				20-39	169	nd	1.3	0.98, 1.6		
				40-59	229	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				60-79	138	nd	1.2	0.9, 1.5		
				≥80	67	nd	1.7	1.1, 2.4*		
Li 2007[60] PHS [17388667]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (492; 664)	11 (median)	Quartile 1[B]	nd	nd	1.01	0.71, 1.44	0.91	C
				Quartile 2	nd	nd	1.26	0.89, 1.80		
				Quartile 3	nd	nd	1.00	0.71, 1.41		
				Quartile 4	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
Gann 1996[66] PHS [8850273]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (232; 414)	6 (mean)	15.7-53.3	nd	nd	1.00	nd	0.82	C
				53.4-70.9	nd	nd	1.10	nd		
				71-93.5	nd	nd	1.16	nd		
				93.6-194	nd	nd	0.92	0.56, 1.50		
		Prostate cancer; age ≤61 y		15.7-53.3	nd	nd	1.00	nd	nd	
				53.4-70.9	nd	nd	1.19	nd		
				71-93.5	nd	nd	1.75	nd		
				93.6-194	nd	nd	1.48	0.73, 2.98		
		Prostate cancer; age >61 y		15.7-53.3	nd	nd	1.00	nd	nd	
				53.4-70.9	nd	nd	1.00	nd		
				71-93.5	nd	nd	0.82	nd		
				93.6-194	nd	nd	0.76	0.39, 1.47		

continued

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage (male), y	Outcome (no. of cases; no. of control)	Time to diagnosis, y	25(OH)D concentration, nmol/L	No. of cases	No. of control	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for trend	Study Quality
Corder 1993[58] [8220092]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (181; 181)	>5 (mode)	60.0 (case) vs. 50.5 (control) (est.)	181	181	-	-	-	C
		Mortality prostate cancer		nd	51	nd	-	-	-	
Ahonen 2000[55] Helsinki Heart [11075874]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (149; 566)	8-14 (mode)	< 30[C]	48	131	1.8	1.0, 3.2*	0.01	C
				31-40	41	143	1.4	0.8, 2.4		
				41-54	26	148	0.8	0.5, 1.5		
				> 55	34	144	**1**	**Reference**		
		Prostate cancer in those <52 years old at entry		≤40	nd	nd	3.5	1.7, 7.0*		
				>40	nd	nd	1			
		Prostate cancer in those >51 years old at entry		≤40	nd	nd	1.2	0.7, 2.1		
				>40	nd	nd	1			
Nomura 1998[62] Honolulu Heart [9794175]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (136; 136)	16 (mean)	<85[D]	38	34	**1**	**Reference**	0.68	C
				85-101	35	36	0.8	0.4, 1.8		
				102-119	30	32	0.8	0.4, 1.7		
				≥120	33	34	0.8	0.4, 1.8		
Tuohimaa 2007[65] Helsinki Heart [17301263]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (132; 456)	10.8 (mean)	<40	-	-	1.88	1.15, 3.08*		C
				40-59	-	-	**1**	**Reference**		
				≥60	-	-	1.25	0.64, 2.43		
Jacobs 2004[59] NPC [15225833]	51-70	Prostate cancer (83; 166)	5.1 (mean)	20-63.3	26	58	**1**	**Reference**	0.51	C
				63.4-81.9	33	49	1.71	0.68, 4.34		
				82-149	24	59	0.75	0.29, 1.91		
Braun 1995[57] WCC [7612803]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (61; 122)	14 (mean)	<60.1	7	24	**1**	**Reference**	0.60	C
				60.1-73.8	17	25	2.3	0.7, 7.8		
				73.9-88.5	16	24	2.3	0.7, 7.7		
				88.6-103	4	25	0.6	0.1, 2.5		
				>103	17	24	2.4[E]	0.8, 8.2		
Baron 2005[56] CPP [15767334][F]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (70 cases in a total of 672)[F]	<4 (34%)	<62.9	nd	NA	**1**	**Reference**	0.70	C
				62.9-84.9	nd	NA	1.22	0.66, 2.26		
				85	nd	NA	0.32	0.72, 2.43		

*Statistically significant (P<0.05)

[A] Cut points separated by analytical run; season, distributions among control (see Table 3 in original study)
[B] Cut points based on control standardized by season of collection
[C] Cut points based on total original cohort
[D] Cut points based on control frequency
[E] Unadjusted
[F] This is a cohort study, not a nested case-control study

Figure 7. Prostate cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration



Colorectal cancer.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews have evaluated the association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer mortality or incidence. One B quality RCT of elderly population reported no significant difference in colorectal cancer mortality or incidence between supplemental vitamin D_3 and no supplements. One B quality cohort study found an inverse association between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of colorectal cancer mortality (HR 0.28, highest compared to lowest tertile). Two B quality nested case-control studies of women found a trend between higher 25(OH)D serum concentrations and lower risk of colorectal cancer incidence (trend analysis). Another two B quality nested case-control studies of men, and one B quality and two C quality nested case-control studies of both sexes reported no significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of colorectal cancer or colon cancer.

Detailed presentation of supplemental vitamin D and colorectal caner (Tables 20 & 21).

An RCT compared supplemental vitamin D_3 (100,000 IU every 4 months) with placebo in 2686 elderly participants with a mean age of 75 years in the United Kingdom (latitude 52° N). [44] Colorectal cancer mortality and incidence were evaluated as two of multiple secondary endpoints. The primary endpoint was the prevention of fracture. At 5 years vitamin D_3 supplementation had no significant effect on the prevention of colorectal cancer mortality (P=0.33) or incidence (P=0.94). This trial was rated B because it did not report in sufficient detail the randomization method, and the outcome ascertainment was based on death certificates or self-reported data, not verified with another objective documents (e.g., medical records or pathology reports).

Findings per age and sex.

The same British trial reported no significant difference in colorectal cancer mortality or incidence between the vitamin D supplements group and the placebo at 5 years in men (P=0.96 and 0.59, respectively). In women, the trial also found no significant difference in colorectal cancer incidence between the two groups (P=0.32), whereas the risk of colorectal cancer mortality in the supplements group was significantly decreased compared to the placebo (0/326 deaths vs. 4/323 deaths; HR, not reported; P=0.04).

Findings per special populations.

No subgroup data were available regarding special populations (e.g., obese participants, smokers, ethnic groups, or users of contraceptives).

Table 20. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Trivedi 2003[44] Oxford, UK (52°N) [12609940]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	General population 75 (65-85) 76%	25(OH)D: 53.4 nmol/L Calcium intake= 742 mg/day (at 4 years, no difference by treatment allocation)	Vit D_3 100,000 IU vs placebo every 4 months	Participants taking ≥80% of study medication: 76%[A]	Previous CVD: 28%, previous cancer: 6%, steroids user: 5%, and HRT taker: 7%

CVD = cardiovascular disease; HRT = hormone replacement therapy.

[A] No difference between the vitamin D and the placebo arm.

Table 21. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex (Subgp)	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Trivedi 2003[44] [12609940]	65-85 y, Both sexes	CRC, mortality	2°	5 y	Vit D_3 100,000 IU every 4 mo	7	1345	Age adj HR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.62	0.24, 1.60	0.33	B
					Placebo	11	1341					
		CRC, incidence	2°		Vit D_3	28	1345	Age adj HR (Vit D/Placebo)	1.02	0.60, 1.74	0.94	
					Placebo	27	1341					
	65-85 y, Men	CRC, mortality	2°	5 y	Vit D_3	7	1019	Age adj HR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.97	0.34, 2.78	0.96	
					Placebo	7	1018					
		CRC, incidence	2°		Vit D_3	25	1019	Age adj HR (Vit D/Placebo)	1.18	0.65, 2.12	0.59	
					Placebo	21	1018					
	65-85 y, Women	CRC, mortality	2°	5 y	Vit D_3	0	326	Age adj HR (Vit D/Placebo)	NA	NA	0.04	
					Placebo	4	323					
		CRC, incidence	2°		Vit D_3	3	326	Age adj HR (Vit D/Placebo)	0.49	0.12, 1.98	0.32	
					Placebo	6	323					

Detailed presentation of 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer (Tables 22 & 23; Figures 8, 9, & 10).

A total of seven nested case-control studies evaluated the associations between 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of colorectal cancer[67-71] or colon cancer.[72,73] The number of pairs of cases and controls in these studies ranged from 101 to 588. Another cohort study comprising 16,818 adult community volunteers from the NHANES III[53] assessed the association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer mortality. The mean age of the subjects ranged from 44 to 66 years. Locations of the studies ranged from 20° N to 60° N. Baseline 25(OH)D concentrations ranged from 10 nmol/L to 227.5 nmol/L. No studies reported followup 25(OH)D concentrations. Time between blood drawn and the diagnosis of colorectal cancer incidence or mortality ranged from less than 1 year to 17 years. None of the studies reported power calculations. Methodological quality of five nested case-control studies[67-71] were rated B and two were rated C.[72,73] Common reasons for downgrading the quality ratings included exclusion of participants without available blood samples, no verification of cancer diagnosis, and lack of adequate statistical adjustments. The cohort study[53] was rated B because it was unclear whether cases were verified and there was no statistical adjustment for family history.

Findings per age and sex.

The NHANES III[53] analyzed data for both sexes combined. An adjusted analysis found an inverse association between 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of colorectal cancer mortality (HR: 0.28, highest [≥80 nmol/L] compared to lowest tertile [<50 nmol/L]; P for trend = 0.02). Two studies from WCC reported colon cancer incidence for both sexes combined.[72,73] One study reported a significantly lower 25(OH)D concentrations in colon cancer cases than controls (58.9 nmol/L vs. 86.6 nmol/L; P<0.001).[73] Both studies reported no significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colon cancer risk by trend analysis.

Three studies, from the Japan PHC, HPFS, and ATBC respectively, provided data on adult men.[67-69] None of the studies found an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer risk. Although all three studies provided data on colon cancer and rectal cancer as subgroup analysis, only HPFS reported a significant trend between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower risk of colon cancer (OR 0.46, highest [median 97.0 nmol/L] compared to lowest quartile [median 48.3 nmol/L]; P for trend = 0.005).[69] The HPFS also reported a subgroup analysis on men aged 65 years or older.[69] No significant association was reported between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer risk by trend analysis.

The Japan PHC and HPFS compared 25(OH)D concentrations between colorectal cancer cases and controls.[68,69] Neither reported a significant difference. One study explored subgroup analyses. Only the rectal cancer cases had significantly lower 25(OH)D concentrations compared to the controls (55 nmol/L for cases vs. 110 nmol/L for controls; P = 0.005).[68]

Two nested case-control studies from the NHS and Japan PHC provided data on adult women.[68,70] The NHS reported a trend between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower colorectal cancer risk (OR 0.53, highest [median 99.1 nmol/L] compared to lowest quintile [median 40.2 nmol/L]; P for trend = 0.02).[70] This trend remained significant in a subgroup analysis of women age 60 years or older (OR 0.35 between the highest quintiles [median 99.1 nmol/L] and lowest [median 40.2 nmol/L]; P for trend = 0.006) or in rectal cancer alone (OR 0.31, highest [median 92.4 nmol/L] compared to lowest tertile [median 44.4 nmol/L]; P for trend = 0.03).[70] The WHI focused on postmenopausal women.[71] A significant trend was reported

between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower colorectal cancer risk (OR 2.53, between highest [≥58.4 nmol/L] and lowest quintiles [<31.0 nmol/L]; P for Trend = 0.02).

The Japan PHC compared 25(OH)D concentrations between cases and controls; no significant difference was reported.[68]

Findings per special populations.

No subgroup data were available regarding the association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer risk in obese persons. One study exclusively included male smokers aged between 50 and 69 years,[67] and reported no significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer risk by trend analysis. Another study that exclusively included white population also found no association.[72] In addition, another study that focused on women who were taking hormone replacement therapy reported no significant association between 25(OH)D and colorectal cancer.[70]

Findings excluding early cases.

Three studies performed sensitivity analyses on the association between 25(OH)D concentrations and colorectal cancer risk by excluding cases diagnosed within the first 1 to 2 years after blood draw.[67,69,70] One study found a significant association between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower colon cancer risk (OR 0.3, between highest [>48.2 nmol/L] and lowest quartiles [≤ 24.5 nmol/L]; P for Trend = 0.04), which was not significant in main analysis.[67] Otherwise, the results were not materially different from the main analysis.

Findings on 1,25-Dihydroxyvitamin D.

A total of three studies evaluated the associations between $1,25(OH)_2D$ concentrations and colorectal cancer risk [67,70] or colon cancer.[73] None of the studies found a significant association by trend analysis. One study reported no significant association between $1,25(OH)_2D$ concentrations and rectal cancer risk.[67]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** The analysis of the NHANES III with a mean age of 44 years included participants mostly within this life stage. The study found an inverse association between 25(OH)D and colorectal cancer mortality.
- **51 – 70 y** The seven nested case-control studies included people with a mean age ranged from 55 to 66 years. A trend between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower colorectal cancer risk was found in two studies of women. Out of five studies that separately assessed the risk of colon cancer and rectal cancer, only one study of men and another study of women found trends between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower risks of colon cancer and rectal cancer, respectively. Otherwise, no association was found between 25(OH)D concentrations and cancer risk.
- **≥71 y** One RCT with a mean age of 75 included participants mostly within this life stage. The trial found no difference in colorectal cancer mortality or incidence between supplemental vitamin D and no supplements.

- **Postmenopause** One study and a subgroup analysis in another study focused on postmenopausal women. A trend between higher 25(OH)D concentrations and lower colorectal cancer risk was found in these two studies.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 22. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of observational studies[A]

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Cohort												
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III US (various) [16481636]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 44 (≥17) 45	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All	Colorectal cancer mortality stratified by prespecified baseline 25(OH)D cut points	X	X	X	X	X	X	White: 71%; Black: 14%; Hispanic: 6%; Others: 9%
Nested case-control												
Braun 1995[73] WCC Maryland, US (38°N) [329893]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 55 (nd) Nd	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Horris 1993) Fall	• 25(OH)D levels between cases and controls • Colon cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles		X			X		
Feskanich 2004[70] NHS US (various) [15342452]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 60 (43-70) 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Horris 1997) All	Colorectal cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	Aspirin user (>10 y): 10%; Hormone replacement therapy: 34%
Garland 1989[72] WCC Maryland, US (38°N) [2572900]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 63 (nd) 50	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	HPLA (Clemens 1982) Fall	• 25(OH)D levels between cases and controls • Colon cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles		X			X		White: 100%
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC Japan (various) [17622244]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any Men: 57 (40-69); Women: 56 (40-69)	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	CPBA (Haddad 1971) All	• 25(OH)D levels between cases and controls • Colorectal cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Tangrea 1997[67] ATBC Finland (~60°N) [9242478]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Smoker[B] 60 (50-69) 100	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Horris 1993) All	Colorectal cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles	X	X	X		X	X	
Wactawski-Wende 2006[71] WHI US (various) [16481636]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Post-menopausal women[C] Nd (50-79) 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All	Colorectal cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles		X	X	X		X	White: 83%; Black: 9%; Hispanic: 4% Others: 4%
Wu 2007[69] HPFS US (various) [17623801]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Smoker 5% 66 (nd) 100	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Horris 1997) All	• 25(OH)D levels between cases and controls • Colorectal cancer risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	Aspirin user in 1994: 40%; Current smoker: 5%

[A] This table is ordered alphabetically by study author.
[B] Participants of a lung cancer prevention 2 by 2 RCT of alpha-tocopherol and beta-carotene.
[C] Participants of a hip fracture prevention RCT of vitamin D3 and calcium

Table 23. Vitamin D and colorectal cancer: Results of observational studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	25(OH)D Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Cohort study										
Colorectal cancer mortality										
Women										
Freedman 2007[53] [17971526]	19-50[A] 51-70 ≥71	Colorectal Cancer Mortality (66/16818; 0.004)	nd	<50	28	~5606	**1**	**Reference**	0.02	B
				50-80	24	~5606	0.44	0.20, 0.95*		
				≥80	14	~5606	0.28	0.11, 0.68*		
Nested case-control study										
Colorectal cancer										
Men										
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC [17622244]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colorectal cancer (N=196 cases; 392 controls)	1-13	<57.2	43	74	**1**	**Reference**	0.39	B
				57.2-69.0	40	85	0.76	0.42, 1.4		
				69.0-80.2	36	85	0.76	0.39, 1.5		
				≥80.2	44	80	0.73	0.35, 1.5		
Wu 2007[69] HPFS [17623801]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Colorectal cancer (179 cases; 356 controls)	1-9	46, median	45	71	**1**	**Reference**	0.24[B]	B
				62.5	44	71	0.97	0.55, 1.70		
				72.8	30	68	0.66	0.35, 1.24		
				83.3	23	74	0.51	0.27, 0.97*		
				98.5	37	72	0.83	0.45, 1.52		
	19-50 51-70[A]	Colorectal cancer, age <65		48.2, median	25	34	**1**	**Reference**	0.13	
				66.8	15	28	1.03	0.36, 2.91		
				80.0	9	30	0.38	0.12, 1.26		
				97.0	14	36	0.45	0.15, 1.40		
	51-70[A] ≥71	Colorectal cancer, age ≥65		48.2, median	34	55	**1**	**Reference**	0.34	
				66.8	36	61	0.97	0.50, 1.87		
				80.0	19	58	0.56	0.27, 1.15		
				97.0	27	54	0.83	0.39, 1.75		
Tangrea 1997[67] ATBC [9242478]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colorectal cancer (146 cases; 292 controls)	1-8	≤24.5	46	72	**1**	**Reference**	0.13	B
				24.5-34.7	35	73	0.7	0.4, 1.3		
				34.7-48.2	36	73	0.8	0.4, 1.3		
				>48.2	29	72	0.6	0.3, 1.1		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	25(OH)D Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Women										
Wactawski-Wende 2006[71] WHI [16481636]	Post-menopausal women	Colorectal cancer (306 cases; 306 controls)	1-12	<31.0	88	67	2.53	1.49, 4.32	0.02	B
				31.0-42.3	80	73	1.96	1.18, 3.24*		
				42.4-58.3	78	73	1.95	1.18, 3.24*		
				≥58.4	60	93	**1**	**Reference**		
Feskanich 2004[70] NHS [15342452]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colorectal cancer (192 cases; 384 controls)	1-11	40.2, median	53	77	**1**	**Reference**	0.02[C]	B
				55.1	47	79	0.93	0.53, 1.63		
				66.7	35	75	0.79	0.44, 1.40		
				77.5	29	77	0.58	0.31, 1.07		
				99.1	29	75	0.53	0.27, 1.04		
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC [17622244]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colorectal cancer (179 cases; 358 controls)	1-13	<57.2	41	77	**1**	**Reference**	0.74	B
				57.2-69.0	34	73	1.0	0.55, 1.9		
				69.0-80.2	44	71	1.2	0.65, 2.3		
				≥80.2	41	76	1.1	0.50, 2.3		
Colon cancer										
Both sexes										
Braun 1995[73] WCC [329893]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Colon cancer (57 cases; 114 controls)	1-17	<43	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.57	C
				43.0-51.5	nd	nd	0.3	0.1, 1.0		
				51.5-61.8	nd	nd	0.5	0.2, 1.5		
				61.8-75.3	nd	nd	0.7	0.2, 2.0		
				≥75.3	nd	nd	0.4	0.1, 1.4		
Garland 1989[72] WCC [2572900]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Colon cancer (34 cases; 67 controls)	1-9	10 to <50	9	8	**1**	**Reference**	0.41	C
				50.0-67.5	7	13	0.48	0.13, 1.80		
				67.5-82.5	5	18	0.25	0.06, 0.98*		
				82.5-105	4	17	0.21	0.05, 0.89*		
				105-227.5	9	11	0.73	0.20, 2.66		
Men										
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC [17622244]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colon cancer (141 cases; 282 controls)	1-13	<57.2	25	54	**1**	**Reference**	0.70	B
				57.2-69.0	27	55	0.98	0.48, 2.0		
				69.0-80.2	29	66	1.0	0.48, 2.3		
				≥80.2	38	62	1.2	0.51, 2.7		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	25(OH)D Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Wu 2007[69] HPFS [17623801]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Colon cancer (139 cases; 276 controls)	1-9	48.3, median	49	66	**1**	**Reference**	0.005[D]	B
				66.8	44	68	0.74	0.42, 1.33		
				80.0	17	68	0.29	0.14, 0.59*		
				97.0	29	74	0.46	0.24, 0.89*		
Tangrea 1997[67] ATBC [9242478]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colon cancer (91 cases; 182 controls)	1-8	≤24.5	30	47	**1**	**Reference**	0.69[E]	B
				24.5-34.7	18	47	0.6	0.3, 1.2		
				34.7-48.2	22	45	0.8	0.4, 1.6		
				>48.2	21	42	0.8	0.4, 1.6		
Women										
Feskanich 2004[70] NHS [15342452]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colon cancer (148 cases; 296 controls)	1-11	41.2, median	41.2	75	**1**	**Reference**	0.17	B
				59.7	59.7	71	1.03	0.56, 1.89		
				73.3	73.3	77	0.54	0.28, 1.03		
				98.1	98.1	72	0.70	0.35, 1.38		
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC [17622244]	19-50 51-70[A]	Colon cancer (115 cases; 230 controls)	1-13	<57.2	21	53	**1**	**Reference**	0.12	B
				57.2-69.0	27	48	1.7	0.78, 3.6		
				69.0-80.2	27	41	2.1	0.90, 4.7		
				≥80.2	31	53	2.1	0.78, 5.6		
Rectal cancer										
Men										
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC [17622244]	19-50 51-70[A]	Rectal cancer (55 cases; 110 controls)	1-13	<57.2	18	20	**1**	**Reference**	0.06	B
				57.2-69.0	13	30	0.17	0.02, 1.2		
				69.0-80.2	7	19	0.25	0.05, 1.3		
				≥80.2	6	18	0.075	0.005, 0.99		
Tangrea 1997[67] ATBC [9242478]	19-50 51-70[A]	Rectal cancer (55 cases; 110 controls)	1-8	≤24.5	16	25	**1**	**Reference**	0.06[F]	B
				24.5-34.7	17	26	0.9	0.4, 2.4		
				34.7-48.2	14	28	0.8	0.3, 2.0		
				>48.2	8	30	0.4	0.1, 1.1		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	25(OH)D Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Wu 2007[69] HPFS [17623801]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Rectal cancer (40 cases; 80 controls)	1-9	53.0, median	11	30	**1**	**Reference**	0.08	B
				73.3	15	28	1.74	0.61, 5.00		
				93.5	14	22	3.32	0.87, 12.69		
Women										
Otani 2007[68] Japan PHC [17622244]	19-50 51-70[A]	Rectal cancer (64 cases; 128 controls)	1-13	<57.2	20	24	**1**	**Reference**	0.17	B
				57.2-69.0	7	25	0.26	0.07, 1.0		
				69.0-80.2	17	30	0.46	0.15, 14		
				≥80.2	10	23	0.33	0.08, 1.3		
Feskanich 2004[70] NHS [15342452]	19-50 51-70[A]	Rectal cancer (44 cases; 88 controls)	1-11	44.4, median	24	31	**1**	**Reference**	0.03	B
				66.2	10	26	0.52	0.14, 1.93		
				92.4	10	31	0.31	0.08, 1.31		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)

[A] Most representative life stage.
[B] P for trend = 0.31 when cases diagnosed within 2 years of blood collection were excluded.
[C] Results were not notably changed when cases diagnosed within the first year after blood collection were excluded (P for trend not reported). Subgroup analyses per age were also reported as follows: Age ≥ 60, OR = 0.35 (95% CI 0.14, 0.87) between the lowest and highest quintiles; P for trend = 0.006. Age < 60, OR = 1.36 (95% CI 0.48, 3.92) between the lowest and highest quintiles; P for trend = 0.70.
[D] P for trend = 0.008 when cases diagnosed within 2 years of blood collection were excluded.
[E] P for trend = 0.58 when cases diagnosed within 2 years of blood collection were excluded.
[F] P for trend = 0.04 when cases diagnosed within 2 years of blood collection were excluded.

Figure 8. Colorectal cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration



Figure 9. Colon cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration



Figure 10. Rectal cancer risk stratified by vitamin D concentration



Colorectal adenoma.

Synopsis.

No systematic reviews have evaluated the association between 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of colorectal adenoma. One B quality nested case-control study in women found no significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of colorectal adenoma.

Detailed presentation (Tables 24 & 25).

One nested case-control study within the NHS evaluated the relationship between 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of colorectal adenoma in women.[74] At 5 years, an adjusted analysis found no significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and the incidence of colorectal adenoma by trend analysis. Subgroup analyses also found no significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and the incidence of colon or rectal adenoma. No subgroup data were available regarding age or other special populations (e.g., obese, smokers, ethnic groups, or users of contraceptives). This study was rated B because it excluded more than 50 percent of participants of the original cohort because their blood samples were not available.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** A proportion of participants in the NHS was in this life stage. No unique conclusions are possible for this life stage separate from those for people 51 to 70 years.
- **51 – 70 y** The analysis of the NHS included female participants mostly within this life stage. The study found no association between 25(OH)D and the incidence of colorectal adenoma.
- **≥71 y** A proportion of participants in the NHS was in this life stage. No unique conclusions are possible for this life stage separate from those for people 51 to 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** The analysis of NHS partially included postmenopausal women. However, no unique conclusions are possible for this life stage separate from those for people 51 to 70 years.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 24. Vitamin D and colorectal adenoma: Characteristics of observational studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Nested case-control												
Platz 2000[74] NHS US (various) [11045788]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Any 59 (7) 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Horris 1993) All	• Colorectal adenoma risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	Aspirin user: 26%; Hormone replacement therapy: 36%

Table 25. Vitamin D and colorectal adenoma: Results of observational studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	25(OH)D Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Nested case-control study										
Colorectal adenoma										
Women										
Platz 2000[74] NHS [11045788]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Colorectal adenoma (326 cases; 326 controls)	5	16.3, median	103	82	**1**	**Reference**	1.0	B
				22.6	62	80	0.64	0.41, 1.00		
				28.3	61	82	0.58	0.36, 0.95		
				38.0	100	82	1.04	0.66, 1.66		
Colon adenoma										
Women										
Platz 2000[74] NHS [11045788]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Colon adenoma (261 cases; 261 controls)	5	16.3, median	79	64	**1**	**Reference**	1.0	B
				22.6	55	64	0.71	0.43, 1.18		
				28.3	51	69	0.60	0.35, 1.02		
				38.0	76	64	1.02	0.60, 1.73		
Rectal adenoma										
Women										
Platz 2000[74] NHS [11045788]	19-50 51-70[A] ≥71	Rectal adenoma (65 cases; 65 controls)	5	16.3, median	24	18	**1**	**Reference**	0.9	B
				22.6	7	16	0.38	0.12, 0.19		
				28.3	10	13	0.34	0.08, 1.42		
				38.0	24	18	1.59	0.50, 5.03		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)

[A] Most representative life stage

Breast cancer.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between vitamin D and calcium intake or serum 25(OH)D concentration and risk of breast cancer. One cohort study compared serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of breast cancer-specific mortality,[53] and two nested case-control studies compared 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of breast cancer.[75,76] The cohort study utilizing NHANES III data found significant decrease in breast cancer-specific mortality during 9 years of followup in those with serum concentration of 25(OH)D greater than 62 nmol/L. The Nurses' Health Study and Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial, however, found no significant relationship between serum concentration of 25(OH) D and risk of breast cancer diagnosis in either pre- or postmenopausal women during 7 to 12 years of followup.[75,76] All three studies were rated B quality.

Detailed presentation (Tables 26 & 27).

The NHANES III study followed 16,818 adults with a mean age of 44 years with a background calcium intake on average of about 812 mg/day (from diet and supplements). [53] The study included 71 percent non-Hispanic white, 14 percent non-Hispanic black, 6 percent Mexican American, and 9 percent from other races. During 9 years of followup, women with serum concentration of 25(OH) D greater than 62 nmol/L had a hazard ratio of 0.28 for breast cancer-specific mortality compared to those with 62 nmol/L or lower (95 percent CI 0.08-0.93). The breast cancer-specific mortality was one of many cancer-specific mortality outcomes reported in this study.

Two nested case-control studies of women with a mean age of 57 years and 67 years, respectively, found no relationship between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of breast cancer.[75,76] However, in the second study, when compared with the lowest quintile, quintiles 3 to 5 were associated with nonsignificantly elevated risks. In multivariable adjusted analyses, the risk associated with 25(OH)D levels below 15 ng/mL compared with higher levels was 0.81 (95 percent CI 0.59, 1.12).[76]

Findings by age and sex.

In the one nested case-control study (methodological quality B) including both premenopausal and postmenopausal women, no relationship was found between vitamin D levels and risk of breast cancer. However, in this study, there was a statistically significant trend towards decreased risk of breast cancer among women older than 60 years of age with serum concentration of 25(OH)D greater than 62 nmol/L.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** A followup study of NHANES III including women with a mean age of 44 years found a decreased mortality (hazard ratio 0.28) due to breast cancer among those with serum concentration of 25(OH)D greater than 62 nmol/L.

- **51 – 70 y** Two nested case-control studies of women with a mean age of 57 years and 67 years, respectively, found no relationship between vitamin D levels and risk of breast cancer. However, in one of these studies, there was a statistically significant trend towards decreased risk of breast cancer among women older than 60 years of age with serum concentration of 25(OH)D greater than 62 nmol/L.
- **≥71 y** Not reviewed
- **Postmenopause** Not reviewed
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 26. Vitamin D and breast cancer: Characteristics of observational studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Cohort												
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III US (38º N) [17971526]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	Non-institutionalized 44 (ND)	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA All year	Breast cancer risks: Quintile 1 vs. Quintile 2	X	X	X		X	X	
Nested Case-Control												
Bertone-Johnson 2005[75] NHS US (38º N) [16103450]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No Cancer 57 (7.0)	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA All year	Breast cancer risks: Quintile 1 vs. Quintile 2, 3, 4, 5	X	X	X	X		X	
Freedman 2008[76] PLCO Trial US (38º N) [18381472]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No Cancer 67 (ND)	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA Dec-Sep	Breast cancer risks: Quintile 1 vs. Quintile 2, 3, 4, 5	X	X	X	X		X	

Table 27. Vitamin D and breast cancer: Results of observational studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Cohort											
Freedman 2007[53] NHANES III [17971526]	All Adults	Breast cancer mortality (28/ND)[A]	105 mo	25(OH)D	<63	20	ND	**1**	**Reference**	NS	B
					≥63	8	ND	HR 0.28	0.08, 0.93*		
Nested Case-Control											
Bertone-Johnson 2005[75] NHS [16103450]	Pre- and Post-menopausal	Breast cancer (701/1425)	<1-82 mo	25(OH)D	≤50 (1st batch) ≤70 (2nd batch) ≤45 (3rd batch)	159	297	**1**	**Reference**	nd	B
					51 - 70 72 - 85 47 to 60	149	278	0.95	0.66, 1.36		
					72 - 82 87 - 97 62 - 72	125	266	0.74	0.51, 1.06		
					85 - 97 100 - 117 75 - 90	144	296	0.80	0.58, 1.11		
					≥100 ≥120 ≥92	124	265	0.73	0.49, 1.07		
		Breast cancer <60 y (701/1425)				97	191	**1**	**Reference**	NS	
						84	170	0.96	0.62, 1.49		
						77	164	0.80	0.51, 1.26		
						90	192	0.85	0.55, 1.32		
						70	146	0.92	0.57, 1.48		
		Breast cancer ≥60 y (701/1425)				62	109	**1**	**Reference**	**0.03**	
						65	114	1.07	0.60, 1.92		
						48	105	0.64	0.35, 1.16		
						54	99	0.68	0.38, 1.24		
						54	125	0.57	0.31, 1.04		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Freedman 2008[76] PLCO Cancer Screening Trial [18381472]	Pre- and Post-menopausal	Breast cancer (1005/2010)	12 y	25(OH)D	<46	172	2010	**1**	**Reference**	NS	B
					46-58	188	2010	1.02	0.75, 1.41		
					59-71	244	2010	1.36	0.99, 1.87		
					72-83	205	2010	1.13	0.82, 1.55		
					≥84	196	2010	1.04	0.75, 1.45		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)
[A] Total number of women not reported

Pancreatic cancer.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated associations between serum vitamin D concentrations and the incidence of pancreatic cancer. Two nested case-control studies, rated A in methodological quality, evaluated the association between serum 25(OH) concentration and the risk of developing pancreatic cancer in two different populations. One study found that older adult male smokers living in Finland with higher baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration had an increased risk of exocrine pancreatic cancer compared with those with lower concentration (>65.5 vs. <32 nmol/L; OR=2.92; P for trend=0.001). The other study found that baseline 25(OH)D concentrations were not associated with the risk of overall pancreatic cancer (>82.3 vs. <45.9 nmol/L; OR=1.45; P for trend=0.49) among older adults living in the United States. However, there was an increased risk of pancreatic cancer among the study participants with higher compared to lower 25(OH)D concentrations (>78.4 vs. <49.3 nmol/L; OR=4.03) only in those living in low residential UVB exposure areas but not among those living in moderate or high residential UVB exposure areas.

Detailed presentation (Tables 28 & 29).

51 - 74 years.

One nested case-control study based on the Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study (ATBC) in older adult male smokers aged 54 to 62 years in Finland identified 200 cases of incident exocrine pancreatic cancer.[77] These cases were matched to 400 controls. Baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration was stratified into quintiles. The odds ratio for exocrine pancreatic cancer was 2.92 (95 percent CI 1.56, 5.48) comparing 5th quintile (>65.5 nmol/L) to 1st quintile (<32 nmol/L). The result was adjusted for age, month of blood drawn, years smoked, number of cigarettes smoked per day, reporting to have quit smoking more than three consecutive visits (>1 y) during the trial (1985-1993), occupational physical activity, education, and serum retinol. The study authors excluded islet cell carcinomas from analysis because the etiology for their pathogenesis might be different from that of exocrine tumors.

Another nested case-control study based on the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Screening (PLCO) trial in older men and women aged 55 to 74 years in the United States identified 184 cases of incident pancreatic cancer.[78] These cases were matched to 368 controls. Baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration was stratified into quintiles. The odds ratio for exocrine pancreatic cancer was 1.45 (95 percent CI 0.66, 3.15) comparing 5th quintile (>82.3 nmol/L) to 1st quintile (<45.9 nmol/L). The result was adjusted for age, race, sex, date of blood draw based on 2-month blocks, BMI and smoking. The association was not significantly modified by season of blood collection (P for interaction > 0.14); but estimated residential annual solar UVB exposure significantly modified the 25(OH)D concentration and pancreatic cancer association (P for interaction = 0.015). In the joint effects models, among subjects with low estimated annual UVB residential exposure, higher compared with lower 25(OH)D concentrations were associated with increased risk of pancreatic cancer (compared with the lowest quartile, the ORs for each respective quartile were 2.52, 2.33, and 4.03; 95 percent CI 1.38, 11.79), whereas among subjects with moderate to high residential UVB exposure, 25(OH)D concentrations were not associated with pancreatic cancer. There was no significant interaction of 25(OH)D

concentration and pancreatic cancer by smoker status, sex, physical activity, or total vitamin A intake.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No study specifically targeted this age group.
- **51 – 70 y** One nested case-control study found that male smokers living in Finland with higher baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration had an increased risk of pancreatic cancer compared with those with lower concentration (5^{th} vs. 1^{st} quintile, >65.5 vs. <32 nmol/L: OR 2.92, 95 percent CI 1.56, 5.48, P for trend = 0.001). Another study found that baseline 25(OH)D concentrations were not associated with overall risk of pancreatic cancer among older adults living in the United States (5^{th} vs. 1^{st} quintile, >82.3 vs. <45.9 nmol/L: OR 1.45, 95 percent CI 0.66, 3.15; P for trend=0.49). However, there was an increased risk of pancreatic cancer among the study participants living in low residential UVB exposure areas (4^{th} vs. 1^{st} quartile >78.4 vs. <49.3 nmol/L: OR=4.03; 95 percent CI 1.38, 11.79).
- **≥71 y** No study specifically targeted this age group.
- **Postmenopause** not reviewed
- **Pregnant & lactating women** not reviewed

Table 28. Vitamin D and pancreatic cancer: Characteristics of observational studies

Author Year Trial/Cohort Country (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		25(OH)D		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	Comments
Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006[77] ATBC Finland (60°N) [17047087]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	All smokers 58 100	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) nd; but result adjusted for this variable	Exocrine pancreatic risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles	X	X			X	X	
Stolzenberg-Solomon 2009[78] PLCO US (various) [19208842]	Health status Mean age (range), y Male (%)	DM: 10.5% 66 (55-74) 65.2	Assay Season blood drawn	RIA (Heartland Assays lab) All seasons	Pancreatic risk stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quintiles Pancreatic risk stratified by residential sun exposure levels and baseline 25(OH)D quartiles		X	X		X	X	

Table 29. Vitamin D and pancreatic cancer: Results of observational studies

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage, y	Outcome (no. of cases; no. of control)	Time to diagnosis, y	25(OH)D concentration, nmol/L	No. of cases	No. of control	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for trend	Study Quality
Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006[77] ATBC Finland (60°N) [17047087]	51-70, male only	Exocrine pancreatic cancer (200; 400)	11.8 (median)	<32	27	80	**1**	**Reference**	0.001	A
				32-41.1	34	80	1.30	0.70, 2.40		
				41.1-51.1	47	80	2.12	1.15, 3.90*		
				51.1-65.5	35	81	1.50	0.81, 2.76		
				>65.5	57	79	2.92	1.56, 5.48*		
Stolzenberg-Solomon 2009[78] PLCO US (various) [19208842]	51-70, both sexes	Pancreatic cancer (184; 368)	5.4 (median), up to 11 y	≤45.9	44	74	**1**	**Reference**	0.49	A
				>45.9 to ≤60.3	40	74	0.97	0.47, 1.98		
				>60.3 to ≤69.5	27	73	0.86	0.40, 1.84		
				>69.5 to ≤82.3	31	74	0.84	0.39, 1.80		
				>82.3	42	73	1.45	0.66, 3.15		
		Pancreatic cancer: Low residential sun exposure area (91; 167)	nd	<49.3	22	44	**1**	**Reference**	P for interaction between low and moderate/high residential sun exposure = 0.015	
				>49.3 to <65.2	22	42	2.52	0.92, 6.90		
				>65.2 to <78.4	21	43	2.33	0.83, 6.48		
				>78.4	26	38	4.03	1.38, 11.79*		
		Pancreatic cancer: Moderate residential sun exposure area (91; 167)	nd	<49.3	33	48	1.97	0.80, 4.82		
				>49.3 to <65.2	15	50	0.66	0.22, 2.01		
				>65.2 to <78.4	18	49	0.91	0.31, 2.71		
				>78.4	24	54	1.45	0.53, 3.96		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)

Vitamin D and Immunologic Outcomes

We reviewed primary studies that evaluated relationships between vitamin D and any immune function related outcomes.

Synopsis.

Analyses using NHANES III data (general adult populations living in the US) showed no significant association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and infectious disease mortality.

One cohort study from UK suggested a relationship between maternal 25(OH)D concentration and the risk of eczema in their children, but the analysis did not control for important potential confounders, and the 25(OH)D concentrations in children were not measured.

Detailed presentation (Tables 30 & 31).

One study analyzed NHANES III data and showed no association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and infectious disease.[47] NHANES III cohort represents general adult populations living in the United States. This study was rated quality C.

One cohort study from UK analyzed the serum 25(OH)D concentration in 440 white women in late pregnancy (~33 wk) and found their infants' risk of eczema at age 9 months was higher in those mothers in the top quartile of the distribution of serum 25(OH)D (>50 nmol/L) compared with those at the bottom quartile (<30 nmol/L), although the results were not statistically significant.[42] However, this analysis did not control for important potential confounders, and the 25(OH)D concentrations in children were not measured. This study was rated quality C.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** NHANES III data include people in this life stage. Analyses using NHANES III data (general adult populations living in the US) showed no significant association between baseline 25(OH)D concentrations and infectious disease mortality.
- **51 – 70 y** NHANES III data also include people in this life stage.
- **≥71 y** NHANES III data also include people in this life stage
- **Postmenopause** No data
- **Pregnant & lactating women** One cohort study from UK analyzed the serum 25(OH)D concentration in white women in late pregnancy (~33 wk) and showed a relationship between maternal 25(OH)D concentration and the risk of eczema in their children. However, this analysis did not control for important confounders, and the 25(OH)D concentrations in children were not measured.

Table 30. Vitamin D (mother) and immunologic outcomes (offspring): Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	DM 7.4%, history of CVD 7.9%, HTN 25% 45 (≥20) 46	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (DiaSorin) All	Infectious disease mortality stratified by baseline 25(OH)D quartiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Gale 2008[42] PAHSG UK (50ºN) [17311057]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	singleton pregnancy <17 wk 26.3 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA nd	Length and weight in offspring stratified by mother's 25(OH)D		X			X		White only

Table 31. Vitamin D (mother) and immunologic outcomes (offspring): Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	Adults, both sexes	Infectious disease mortality (N=13,331)	Median 8.7 (IRQ 7.1-10.2) y	25(OH)D	<44	nd	13331 (Total)	0.84	0.38, 1.86	nd	C
					44-60	nd	nd	0.87	0.43, 1.74		
					61-80	nd	nd	1.01	0.53, 1.93		
					>80	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
Gale 2008[42] PAHSG UK (54°N) [17311057]	Pregnant women; infant at 9 mo	Atopic eczema at 9 mo (48/440; 0.11)	9 mo	Maternal 25(OH)D at late pregnancy	<30 (Quartile)	9	440 (total)	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
					30-50	10		1.11[A]	0.43, 2.84		
					50-75	15		1.75[A]	0.73, 4.17		
					>75	14		1.62[A]	0.67, 3.89		

[A] Crude OR

Vitamin D and Pregnancy-related Outcomes

Preeclampsia.

Synopsis.

A single nested case-control study found an association between low 25(OH)D concentration (<37.5 nmol/L) early in pregnancy and preeclampsia. The study was rated B for methodological quality.

Detailed presentation (Tables 32 & 33).

A nested case-control study evaluated the association between 25(OH)D concentration and risk of preeclampsia.[79] The study found an association between 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L (measured approximately 30 wk before outcome assessment) and increased risk of preeclampsia**.** The study was rated B for methodological quality.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** See pregnant and lactating women.
- **51 – 70 y** Not applicable
- **≥71 y** Not applicable
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** A single nested case-control study found an association between low 25(OH)D concentration (<37.5 nmol/L) early in pregnancy and preeclampsia.

Other outcomes.

Synopsis.

We did not identify any eligible studies on the relationship of vitamin D with or without calcium and high blood pressure, preterm birth, or small infant for gestational age.

Table 32. Vitamin D and preeclampsia: Characteristics of nested case-control studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted					
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle
Bodnar 2007[79] PEPPS[A] US (41°N) [17535985]	• Health status • Age range, y • Male (%)	Healthy 20-29 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	ELISA ND	Comparison of mean 25(OH)D levels in cases and controls		x	x			

[A] Pregnancy Exposures and Preeclampsia Prevention Study

Table 33. Vitamin D and preeclampsia: Results of nested case-control studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	Study Quality
Bodnar 2007[79A] PEPPS[B] US (41°N) [17535985]	Pregnancy	Preeclampsia (55/1198; 4%) [C]	ND	25(OH)D[D]	<37.5 (vs. >37.5)	49	265	5.0	1.7, 14.1	B

[A] This is a nested case-control study
[B] Pregnancy Exposures and Preeclampsia Prevention Study
[C] Incidence obtained from the "parent" cohort study in which this case control study is nested.
[D] Early in pregnancy, approximately 30 wk before outcome assessment

Vitamin D and Clinical Outcomes of Bone Health

For bone health outcomes (e.g., bone mineral density, fracture, fall or muscle strength), we relied on a recent comprehensive systematic review (Effectiveness and Safety of Vitamin D in Relation to Bone Health) performed by the Ottawa EPC (Table 28).[6] Because the Ottawa's EPC report did not report separate analyses for the effect of vitamin D supplementation alone, the results for the effect of vitamin D alone or in combination with calcium supplementation were presented in the "Combined Vitamin D and Calcium" section. The Ottawa EPC report also did not report separate analyses by study designs (i.e., RCTs, prospective cohorts, before and after study, and case-control studies), although the report primarily included RCTs.

The Ottawa EPC report was updated with literature published between January 2006 and September 2008, selected according to our eligibility criteria. Only RCTs qualified for inclusion.

Rickets.

Synopsis.

The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there is fair evidence for an association between low serum 25(OH)D concentrations and confirmed rickets, regardless of the types of assay measures of 25(OH)D concentrations (RIA, CPBA, HPLC). According to the report, there is inconsistent evidence to determine whether there is a threshold concentration of serum 25(OH)D above which rickets do not occur.

Our updated search did not identify new RCTs examining the effect of vitamin D supplementation on rickets.

Detailed presentation (Table 34).

Ottawa EPC Report: Rickets - infants (0 through 12 months) and young children (1 through 5 years).

Overall, there is fair evidence for an association between low serum 25(OH)D concentrations and confirmed rickets, regardless of the types of assay measures of 25(OH)D concentrations (RIA, CPBA, HPLC). There is inconsistent evidence to determine whether there is a threshold concentration of serum 25(OH)D above which rickets do not occur.

Six studies (one RCT, three before-after and two case-control studies) reported mean or median serum 25(OH)D concentrations < 30 nmol/L in children with rickets whereas the other studies reports the mean or median 25(OH)D concentrations were above 30 nmol/L (and up to 50 nmol/L). In seven of eight case-control studies, serum 25(OH)D concentrations were lower in the children with rickets compared with controls.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** The Ottawa EPC report included infants and young children and concluded that there is fair evidence for an association between low serum 25(OH)D concentrations and confirmed rickets, regardless of the types of assay measures of 25(OH)D concentrations (RIA, CPBA, HPLC). There were no new data since the Ottawa EPC report.
- **7 mo – 2 y** The Ottawa EPC report included infants and young children. There were no new data since the Ottawa EPC report.

- **3 – 8 y** The Ottawa EPC report included young children. There were no new data since the Ottawa EPC report.
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** Not reviewed
- **51 – 70 y** Not reviewed
- **≥71 y** Not reviewed
- **Postmenopause** Not reviewed
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 34. Summary of systematic review of the effect of vitamin D on bone health

Author Year [PMID]	Cranney 2007[6] [18088161]
Design	Systematic review of RCTs and observational studies
Population	• Include all ages • Exclude secondary causes of osteoporosis (e.g., glucocorticoid-induced, renal or liver disease) • Exclude studies on the treatment of vitamin D-dependent rickets (to minimize clinical heterogeneity as treatments is often nondietary sources of vitamin D)
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Intervention (Exposure): • Include vitamin D_2 or D_3 with or without calcium. • Exclude vitamin D preparations, calcitriol, α-calcidol (because they are not nutritional supplements, and have different safety profile) Comparator: • No vitamin D or lower doses/levels of vitamin D
Results	See text for summary results for the following outcomes in both vitamin D and combined vitamin D and calcium sections of the report: • Rickets • Fractures, falls, or performance measures • Bone mineral density or bone mineral contents • How does dietary intake of vitamin D from fortified foods and vitamin D supplementation affect serum 25(OH)D Concentrations • Adverse events
Comments	Case-control studies were included but always summarized separately from cohort studies and RCTs. Meta-analyses were performed to pool results from RCTs only.

AMSTAR			
A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes		

Fractures, falls, or performance measures.

Synopsis.

Overall, the Ottawa EPC report concluded that the associations between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of fractures, falls, and performance measures among postmenopausal women or elderly men are inconsistent.[6]

Findings from three additional RCTs (published after the Ottawa EPC report)[80-82] also did not show significant effects of either vitamin D_2 or D_3 supplementation (daily doses ranged from 400 IU to 822 IU) in reducing the risk of total fractures or falls in elderly populations (≥71 years old).

Detailed presentation (Tables 35 & 36).

Ottawa EPC Report: Fractures - Postmenopausal women or elderly men.

Overall, there is inconsistent evidence for an association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and the risk of fractures. Fifteen studies (three prospective cohorts and twelve case-controls) reported on the association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and fracture rates. One of three cohorts reported an inverse association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and fracture rates, and nine of twelve case-control studies found significantly lower 25(OH)D concentrations in cases versus controls. Differences in results may be attributed to whether all relevant confounders were controlled for and differences in baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations. Other factors may also contribute to the heterogeneity, such as diagnosis of fractures.

Ottawa EPC Report: Falls - Postmenopausal women or elderly men.

Overall, there is fair evidence of an association between lower serum 25(OH)D concentrations and an increased risk of falls in institutionalized elderly. One study suggested a serum 25(OH)D concentration below 39 nmol/L was associated with an increased risk of falls.

Five studies (one RCT, three cohorts and one case-control) evaluated the association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of falls. One RCT, two of the three cohorts and one case-control study reported an inverse association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and a risk of falls. In one cohort with a low percentage of vitamin D deficient participants, the association did not persist after adjustment for age and illness severity. In another cohort with an undetermined proportion of vitamin D deficient participants no significant association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of falls was observed. One case-control study reported no significant association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of falls after adjusting for serum PTH.

Ottawa EPC Report: Performance measures - Postmenopausal women or elderly men.

Overall, there is inconsistent evidence for an association of serum 25(OH)D concentrations with performance measures. In studies that reported an association, specific concentrations below which, declines in performance measures were increased, ranged from 50 to 87 nmol/L.

Seven studies (three RCTs and four cohorts) assessed the relation between 25(OH)D concentrations and performance related measures. Two of the three RCTs and two of the four cohorts reported an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and performance measures. The other studies did not find an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and performance measures.

Additional RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report.

We identified three additional RCTs (published after the Ottawa EPC report)[80-82] that examined the effect of either vitamin D_2 or D_3 supplementation on total fractures, falls, or performance in elderly populations (≥71 years old). All three RCTs were rated C. In two of the three RCTs[80,81] calcium supplementation (800 or 1200 mg/d) was given to all participants. Baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations were less than 40 nmol/L. The other RCT did not provide any information on background calcium intake or baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations.[82] All three RCTs reported no significant reduction in the risk of total fracture or falls in elderly populations at daily vitamin D doses ranging from 400 IU to 822 IU.[80-82] Only one of the three new RCTs among elderly reported data on performance measures. Vitamin D supplementation (400 IU/d) improved gait speed and body sway in healthy elderly subjects.[80]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No data
- **51 – 70 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that the associations between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of fractures, falls, and performance measures are inconsistent. There were no new data since the Ottawa report
- **≥71 y** Findings from three new RCTs did not show significant effects of either vitamin D_2 or D_3 supplementation (daily doses ranged from 400 IU to 822 IU) in reducing the risk of total fractures or falls among men and women in this life stage.
- **Postmenopause** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that the associations between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and risk of fractures, falls, and performance measures are inconsistent. There were no new data since the Ottawa report
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 35. Vitamin D and bone health: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]		Population	Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Lyons 2007[82] South Wales, UK (52°N) [17473911]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Living in care facilities including some elderly with mobility, cognitive, visual, hearing or communication impairments 84 (62-107) 23.7	nd	Vit D_2 100,000 IU 4-monthly vs. placebo	80% (percentage of occasions observed to take tablets)	
Burleigh 2007[81] Scotland (55° 57'N) [17656420]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Inpatient with high levels of comorbidity, mortality and polypharmacy 83 (7.6) 40	25(OH)D: 22.0 nmol/L	Vit D_3 800 IU/d + Ca carbonate 1200 mg/d vs. Ca carbonate 1200 mg	Ca group=87%, Vit D+Ca group=89% (total study drug taken/total study drug prescribed, as recorded in drug prescription charts)	
Bunout 2006[80] Chile (32°S) [16797903]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy 76 (4) 11.6	25(OH)D: ≤40 nmol/L	Ca 800 mg/d vs. Ca 800 mg/d + Vit D 400 IU/d (with and without exercise training)	92% (tablet counting)	

Table 36. Vitamin D and bone health: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Lyons 2007[82] [17473911]	≥71 both sexes	First fracture	1°	Median time to first fracture = 387 (IQR: 220–582) d in Vit D_2 group; 367 (IQR:139–618) d in placebo group	Vit D_2 ~822 IU[A]	205	1670	HR Vit D/placebo	0.95	0.79, 1.15	NS	C
					Placebo	218	1673					
Burleigh 2007[81] [17656420]	≥71 both sexes	Fall	1°	Median 1 (IQR 15–71 d)	Vit D_3 800 IU + Ca carbonate 1200 mg	36	100	RR (Vit D+Ca)/Ca	0.82	0.59, 1.16	NS	C
					Ca carbonate 1200 mg	45	103					
		Fracture	1°	Median 1 (IQR 15–71 d)	Vit D_3 800 IU + Ca carbonate 1200 mg	1	100	nd	nd		NS	
					Ca carbonate 1200 mg	3	103					
Bunout 2006[80] [16797903]	≥71 both sexes	Fall	2°	9 mo	Ca 800 mg	13[B]	24	Fall free survival curve	nd		NS	C
					Ca 800 mg + exercise training	6[B]	22					
					Vit D 400 IU + Ca 800 mg	9[B]	24					
					Vit D 400 IU + Ca 800 mg + Exercise training	8[B]	22					

[A] Daily dose was calculated from the intermittent doses that were used in the study (i.e., 100,000 IU tablets every 4 months)
[B] Estimated from figure

Vitamin D and all-cause Mortality

Synopsis.

This synopsis is based on our reanalysis of a systematic review of RCTs on vitamin D supplementation for mortality.[i] In addition, it summarizes four observational studies on the association of vitamin D and all-cause mortality.

Three RCTs from the previous systematic review and an additional C rated RCT were included in our reanalysis. Three used daily doses that ranged between 400 and 880 IU, and one used 100,000 IU every 3 months. Our meta-analysis of the 4 RCTs (13,833 participants) shows absence of significant effects of vitamin D supplementation on all-cause mortality (RR = 0.97, 95 percent CI: 0.92, 1.02; random effects model). There is little evidence for between-study heterogeneity in these analyses.

One cohort study (rated B for methodological quality) found a significant trend for lower odds for death with increasing 25(OH)D concentrations. Three other cohort studies did not find a significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and all-cause mortality. These three studies were rated C for their methodological quality.

The above are applicable to older (50-70 y) and elderly (≥71 y) men and women (mean age was >70 y in the included studies).

Detailed presentation (Tables 37, 38 & 39).

As mentioned in the Methods section, we updated and reanalyzed published meta-analyses of mortality outcomes. We drew our own conclusions based on our analyses. We also comment on the concordance of our conclusions with those of the published meta-analyses.

Relevant published systematic reviews of RCTs (with meta-analyses).

We identified two systematic reviews (with meta-analyses) of RCTs that summarized the effect of vitamin D supplementation with or without calcium on mortality.[83,84] One systematic review (Avenell 2008) examined only trials on fall prevention, and briefly described results on mortality.[84] The second meta-analysis (Autier 2007) focused specifically on mortality.[83] It included all RCTs identified in the first, as well as additional trials (which were not eligible for the primary analysis of the Avenell 2008 systematic review, namely prevention of falls).[83] Therefore, the Autier 2007 meta-analysis was used as the basis for our reanalysis.

Table 37 summarizes the findings of the Autier 2007 systematic review.

[i] Numerical data were extracted from previous systematic reviews –no additional studies were identified. For this reason, we did not appraise studies for their methodological quality.

Table 37. Summary of systematic review on vitamin D supplementation and all-cause mortality

Author Year [PMID]	Autier 2007[83] [17846391]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1992-2006)
Population	Community dwelling or institutionalized adults
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Supplementary vitamin D (at least 1000 mg/d) without calcium vs. placebo or no treatment
Results	18 trials of combined vitamin D and vitamin D + calcium RR: 0.93 (95% CI 0.87, 0.99); favoring vitamin D (± calcium) supplementation Statistically homogeneous In our reanalysis we and excluded 3 of 18 trials and separated studies with vitamin D only from those with vitamin D and calcium combination. For details and results of our reanalysis, see text.
Comments	See text in vitamin D and vitamin D + calcium sections for reanalyses of the separated trials. Study participants, vitamin D assays, and vitamin D status are not described in detail.

AMSTAR Criteria			
A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	No	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	The meta-analysis did not perform quality assessment (neither using individual quality items nor using quality scores)	

Additional identified RCTs (not included in published systematic reviews).

Lyons 2007 (n=3343, 24 percent males) used monthly supplementation with 100,000 IU of vitamin D_2, orally for 3 years.[82] The trial took place in South Wales (latitude ~52°N) and included older people (mean age 84 y) living in sheltered accommodation. The primary outcome was prevention of fractures. The Lyons 2007 RCT received grade "C" for the all-cause mortality outcome, because of inconsistencies in the reported data. This RCT is included in the reanalysis described below.

Reanalysis.

We excluded 5 of 18 trials in the Autier 2007 meta-analysis: One trial was on patients with congestive heart failure,[85] one was published only in abstract form,[86] in one trial the controls also received supplementation with vitamin D, albeit with a smaller dose,[87] and two trials used vitamin D injections.[88,89] One additional eligible RCT (Lyons 2007)[82] was identified and included in our meta-analysis.

Overall, four trials (13,899 patients) used only vitamin D supplementation without calcium. Among the four trials, sample sizes ranged from 2578 to 5292 participants. Followup periods ranged from 36 to 60 months. Vitamin D doses in most trials ranged between 400 and 830 IU per day.

Overall, there were no significant effects of vitamin D supplementation on mortality. The RR was 0.97 (95 percent CI 0.92, 1.02), with no evidence for between-study heterogeneity (P=0.39, I^2=0 percent).

Cohort studies.

We identified four prospective cohort studies described in 5 publications.[47,90-93] The characteristics of the four cohorts are shown in **Table 38**. One was rated "B" [90] for methodological quality and the remaining were rated "C".

Table 39 summarizes the findings of the four studies. Briefly, only Jia 2007[90] found a statistically significant trend between increasing 25(OH)D concentrations and lower odds for all-cause mortality (P=0.03). However, none of the odds ratios of the different 25(OH)D categories was significant, and if anything, they suggest an U shaped relationship between 25(OH)D and

mortality. All other cohorts did not find significant associations. Melamed 2008[47] performed analyses in subgroups of men and women, and <65 or ≥65 years of age, and found no significant associations (Table 33).

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** A subgroup analysis of people younger than 65 years in NHANES III (Melamed 2008) found no significant associations between 25(OH)D concentrations and all cause mortality.
- **51 – 70 y** Overall, there were no significant effects of vitamin D supplementation on mortality.
    - In a random effects model meta-analysis of five RCTs (n=13,899) the summary RR was 0.97 (95 percent CI 0.92, 1.02), with no evidence for between-study heterogeneity (p=0.39, I^2=0 percent). The mean participant age was more than 70 years in these RCTs.
    - Overall, data from four cohorts suggest no association between baseline 25(OH)D measurements and all-cause mortality (one cohort found a statistically significant trend for). A subgroup analysis of people aged 65 years or older in NHANES III (Melamed 2008) found no significant associations between 25(OH)D concentrations and all cause mortality.
- **≥71 y** The above (51–70 y) are applicable.
- **Postmenopause** No data
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Table 38. Vitamin D and all-cause mortality: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted					
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle
Jia 2007[90] UK (57°N) [17442130]	• Health status • Age range, y • Male (%)	Not terminally ill or demented >75 52	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA ND	Comparison of various 25(OH)D concentration categories		X		X	X	X
Shambrook 2004 & 2006[91,92] FREE[A] Australia (33°S) [15531500 & 16598375]	• Health status • Age range, y • Male (%)	Not bedridden >65 22	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Dia-sorin) ND	Association with log 25(OH)D		X		X		
Visser 2006[93] Longitudinal Aging Study Netherlands (52°N) [16960177]	• Health status • Age range, y • Male (%)	General population[B] >65 51	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	Competitive protein binding ND	Comparison of various 25(OH)D concentration categories		X	X			X
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	• Health status • Age mean (range), y • Male (%)	General population 45 (>=20) 46	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA (Dia-sorin) ND	Comparison of various 25(OH)D concentration categories	X	X	X	X	X	X

[A] Fracture Risk Epidemiology in the Elderly
[B] ~40% with CVD and ~60% arthritis

Table 39. Vitamin D and all-cause mortality: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Age range, sex	Outcome	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for trend	Study Quality
Jia 2007[90] UK (57°N) [17442130]	>75, both sexes	Mortality	69	25(OH)D	6.0-23.0 (M)/ 7.0-19.0 (F)	41	75	1.74	0.91, 3.34	0.03	B
					23.1-30.0 (M)/ 29.1-24.0 (F)	34	86	1.40	0.73, 2.70		
					30.1-37.0 (M)/ 24.1-30.2 (F)	21	80	0.90	0.45, 1.79		
					37.1-47.0 (M)/ 30.3-39.0 (F)	17	78	0.80	0.39, 1.62		
					47.1-82.0 (M)/ 39.1-82.0 (F)	16	79	**1.00**	**Reference**		
Shambrook 2004 & 2006[91,92] FREE[A] Australia (33°S) [15531500 & 16598375]	>65, both sexes	Mortality	27	25(OH)D	NA	559	1112	0.87[B]	0.75, 1.01	nd	C
Visser 2006[93] Longitudinal Aging Study Netherlands (52°N) [16960177]	>65, both sexes	Mortality	72	25(OH)D	<25	66	127	1.28	0.85, 1.92	0.19	C
					25-49.9	42	462	1.00	0.72, 1.40		
					50-74.9	30	440	0.91	0.65, 1.26		
					≥75	29	231	**1.00**	**Reference**		
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	>20, both sexes	Mortality	104	25(OH)D	<17.8	nd	nd	1.26	1.08, 1.46	nd	C
					17.8-24.3	nd	nd	1.06	0.89, 1.24		
					24.4-32.1	nd	nd	0.93	0.79, 1.10		
					>32.1	nd	nd	**1.00**	**Reference**		
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	>20, men only	Mortality	104	25(OH)D	<17.8	nd	nd	1.04	0.83, 1.30	nd	C
					17.8-24.3	nd	nd	0.94	0.75, 1.19		
					24.4-32.1	nd	nd	0.82	0.64, 1.05		
					>32.1	nd	nd	**1.00**	**Reference**		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Age range, sex	Outcome	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for trend	Study Quality
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	>20, women only	Mortality	104	25(OH)D	<17.8	nd	nd	1.55	1.15, 1.98	nd	C
					17.8-24.3	nd	nd	1.27	0.97, 1.66		
					24.4-32.1	nd	nd	1.16	0.87, 1.55		
					>32.1	nd	nd	**1.00**	**Reference**		
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	20-65, both sexes	Mortality	104	25(OH)D	<17.8	nd	nd	1.28	0.93, 1.76	nd	C
					17.8-24.3	nd	nd	1.13	0.81, 1.56		
					24.4-32.1	nd	nd	0.81	0.58, 1.14		
					>32.1	nd	nd	**1.00**	**Reference**		
Melamed 2008[47] NHANES III US (various) [18695076]	≥65, both sexes	Mortality	104	25(OH)D	<17.8	nd	nd	1.26	1.03, 1.54	nd	C
					17.8-24.3	nd	nd	0.99	0.82, 1.20		
					24.4-32.1	nd	nd	0.97	0.79, 0.82		
					>32.1	nd	nd	**1.00**	**Reference**		

[A] Fracture Risk Epidemiology in the Elderly
[B] Per unit change in the log-transformed concentration.

Vitamin D and Hypertension and Blood Pressure

We searched for systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated associations between vitamin D supplementation or serum concentrations and incidence of hypertension and change in blood pressure. For the outcome *incidence of hypertension*, we reviewed RCTs and other longitudinal studies. For the outcome *change in blood pressure*, we reviewed only RCTs. The EPC and the TEP agreed that due to the large volume of literature, the limited resources would not be expended on reviewing observational studies for the surrogate outcome blood pressure. We included only studies of adults. Studies of pregnancy-related hypertension and blood pressure control are included in the "Pregnancy-related outcomes" section.

Hypertension.

Synopsis.

No systematic reviews evaluated the association between vitamin D intake or serum 25(OH)D concentrations and incidence of hypertension. A combined analysis of a small subset of the Health Professionals Follow-up (HPFS) and Nurses Health Studies (NHS) evaluated the association with serum 25(OH)D concentrations. The analysis found higher incidence of hypertension at 4 and 8 years in men with baseline 25(OH)D concentration less than 37.5 nmol/L (OR~3-6). In women, serum 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L also had a significantly higher incidence of hypertension at 4 years (OR~3), but not at 8 years (OR~1.5).

Detailed presentation (Tables 40 & 41).

One analysis (methodological quality B) evaluated the incidence of hypertension in a combined set of 613 men from the HPFS and 1198 women from the NHS who had serum 25(OH)D concentrations measured.[94] The men were on average 65 years old and the women 57 years old. Among the men at 4 years, those with serum 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L were significantly more likely to have new onset hypertension than either men with 25(OH)D concentrations above 75 nmol/L (OR=6.1) or above 37.5 nmol/L (OR=5.7). The association remained significant at 8 years, although with a smaller effect size (OR=3.5 and 3.0, respectively). In women, a similar, though weaker, effect was seen at 4 years, such that those with 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L were significantly more likely to have new onset hypertension than either women with 25(OH)D concentrations above 75 nmol/L (OR=2.7) or above 37.5 nmol/L (OR=3.0). However, this effect was smaller and nonsignificant at 8 years (OR=1.7 and 1.4, respectively). The study was limited primarily by its inclusion of only a relatively small subset of participants and its reliance on self-reported hypertension without assessment of blood pressure measurements.

In the second analysis by the same investigators, the NHS 2 study was analyzed for the association between serum 25(OH)D concentration and hypertension as a nested case-control study.[95] These women were on average 43 years old. Cases and controls (per the 2005 biennial questionnaire) were chosen from among those women without hypertension, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, obesity, or cancer at baseline (blood samples drawn from 1997 to 1999). After approximately 7 years, a statistically significant trend was found such that women in the three quartiles with serum 25(OH)D concentrations of 80.5 nmol/L or less were about 50 to 60 percent more likely to develop hypertension than those women with higher serum concentrations of 25(OH)D (adjusted OR = 1.52 to 1.66, each of which was statistically significant compared to

the highest quartile). The study was graded methodological quality B for similar reasons as the analysis of the HPFS and NHS studies.

Findings per vitamin D concentration.

The HPFS and NHS studies were analyzed with 25(OH)D cutpoints of 37.5 and 75 nmol/L. Significant associations were found for those with serum concentrations below 37.5 nmol/L. The NHS 2 study was analyzed with 25(OH)D quartiles, such that significant associations were found for those with serum concentrations of 80.5 nmol/L or less.

Findings per age and sex.

See above *Detailed presentation* of the HPFS and NHS for the separate analyses by sex. No subgroup analyses were reported by life stage. The participants in the studies were approximately 40 to 80 years old.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** The NHS 2 included all women within the life stage. After approximately 7 years, those with serum 25(OH)D concentrations of 80.5 nmol/L or less were about 50 to 60 percent more likely to develop hypertension.
- **51 – 70 y** HPFS and NHS included participants mostly within this life stage. In men and women, the study found higher incidence of hypertension at 4 years followup in those with serum 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L; at 8 years, the association was significant only for men.
- **≥71 y** A minority of the men and few of the women appear to have been in this life stage. No unique conclusions are possible for this life stage separate from those for people 51 to 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** The majority of the women in NHS were postmenopausal. A significant association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations less than 37.5 nmol/L and increased hypertension was found at 4 years, but not 8 years followup.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 40. Vitamin D and hypertension: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Vitamin D Concentration		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Forman 2007[94] HPFS, NHS US (various) [17372031]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Any Men 65 (8) Women 57 (7) 34	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	RIA All	Hypertension incidence stratified by 25(OH)D categories (2 and 3 categories)		X	X			X	
Forman 2008[95] NHS 2 US (various) [18838623]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	No HTN, CVD, DM, obesity, cancer 43 (40-46) 0	• Assay method • Season blood drawn	EIA All	Hypertension incidence stratified by 25(OH)D categories (2 and 3 categories)	X	X	X		X		

Table 41. Vitamin D and hypertension: Results of cohort and nested case control studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Mean (SD) Age, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Vit D Measure	Concentration, nmol/L	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Men											
Forman 2007[94] HPFS [17372031]	65 (8), Men	Hypertension (61/613; 0.100)	4 y	25(OH)D	<37.5	6	33	6.13	1.00, 37.8*	nd	B
					37.5-75	33	247	1.12	0.51, 2.48		
					≥75	22	233	**1**	**Reference**		
					<37.5	6	33	5.68	1.01, 32.3*	<0.05	
					≥37.5	55	580	**1**	**Reference**		
		Hypertension (131/613; 0.214)	8 y	25(OH)D	<37.5	9	33	3.53	1.02, 12.3*	nd	
					37.5-75	nd	247	nd	nd		
					≥75	nd	233	**1**	**Reference**		
					<37.5	9	33	3.03	0.94, 9.76	NS	
					≥37.5	124	580	**1**	**Reference**		
Women											
Forman 2008[95] NHS 2 [18838623]	43 (40-46, range), Women	Hypertension (742 cases; 742 controls) Nested case control	~7 y	25(OH)D	41.75 (15.5-52.5)	208	371	1.66	1.11, 2.48	0.01	B
					59.5 (52.75-66.25)	188	370	1.55	1.07, 2.23		
					73.0 (66.5-80.5)	195	374	1.52	1.06, 2.18		
					94.75 (80.75-224)	151	369	**1**	**Reference**		
Forman 2007[94] NHS [17372031]	57 (7), Women	Hypertension (129/1198; 0.108)	4 y	25(OH)D	<37.5	11	nd[A]	2.67	1.05, 6.79*	nd	B
					37.5-75	60	nd	0.85	0.53, 1.34		
					≥75	58	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
					<37.5	11	nd	2.98	1.24, 7.20*	<0.05	
					≥37.5	118	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
		Hypertension (274/613; 0.229)	8 y	25(OH)D	<37.5	20	nd[A]	1.70	0.92, 3.16	nd	
					37.5-75	nd	nd	nd	nd		
					≥75	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
					<37.5	20	nd	1.42	0.79, 2.56	NS	
					≥37.5	254	nd	**1**	**Reference**		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)
[A] Due to formatting error in study table, no data on numbers of women in each category.

Vitamin D and blood pressure.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews have evaluated the association between vitamin D intake or serum 25(OH)D concentrations and changes in blood pressure. Three trials from Germany, UK, and India compared different doses of vitamin D (800 IU daily, a single dose of 100,000 IU, or 120,000 IU every 2 weeks) with placebo, with or without supplemental calcium in both groups. The study participants also varied: either older men, older men and women, or men mostly in their 40s. Both recruited older adults (over 63 or 70 years). All trials reported no significant effect on diastolic blood pressure. The A quality British study of a single dose of vitamin D 100,000 IU found no difference in systolic blood pressure after 5 weeks. The B quality German study found a significant net reduction of 7 mm Hg after 8 weeks in older women taking vitamin D 800 IU daily. The B quality Indian study of obese men mostly in their 40s, found a nearly significant net increase of 4 mm Hg after 6 weeks of vitamin D 120,000 IU every 2 weeks. No long term data were available.

Detailed presentation (Tables 42 & 43).

The A quality trial of single-dose vitamin D, performed in Cambridge, UK, recruited older adults (63 to 76 years, mean 70 years) who were not taking antihypertensive medications.[96] During the winter, they were given either a one-time dose of vitamin D_3 (100,000 IU [2.5 mg]) or placebo, and blood pressure was rechecked at 5 weeks. In both study arms, systolic and diastolic blood pressures fell by equal amounts, resulting in no net difference between vitamin D supplemented and placebo groups. No subgroup analyses were reported.

The German B quality trial of supplementation with combined vitamin D and calcium versus calcium alone recruited older women (70 to 86 years) without severe hypertension.[97] For 8 weeks, the women took either vitamin D_3 800 IU and calcium carbonate 1200 mg or calcium carbonate 1200 mg alone daily. Systolic blood pressure decreased by 13 mm Hg in those supplemented with vitamin D and calcium compared with a 6 mm Hg decrease in those taking calcium alone (P=0.02). Diastolic blood pressure declined by 7 mm Hg in both groups. No subgroup analyses were reported. The study was limited by inadequate reporting of its study methods and lack of blinding.

The Indian B quality study compared every other week vitamin D_3 supplementation 120,000 IU with placebo for 3 weeks in generally healthy but obese men without hypertension.[51] The men who received the vitamin D supplements had a net increase in systolic blood pressure of 4 mm Hg, which was close to statistically significant (P=0.06), but no significant difference in diastolic blood pressure. The study was limited by a high dropout rate (26 percent).

Findings per intake level.

No conclusions can be reached about an intake level threshold. In individual trials, a single dose of 100,000 IU of cholecalciferol had no significant effect on systolic and diastolic blood pressure after 5 weeks, a daily dose of vitamin D_3 800 IU together with calcium significantly lowered systolic blood pressure more than calcium alone, but every other week vitamin D_3 120,000 IU resulted in a nearly statistically significant increase in systolic blood pressure.

Findings per age and sex.

No conclusions can be reached about differences in effect based on age or sex. The study of older women found a significant decrease in systolic blood pressure with relatively low dose

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** A single study of men in this life stage found a near significant increase in systolic blood pressure with vitamin D and no effect on diastolic blood pressure.
- **51 – 70 y** One trial included people with an average age of 70 years, implying that about half were within this life stage. No significant effect on blood pressure was found of a single large dose of vitamin D.
- **≥71 y** Both trials included people within this life stage. The trial of people with an average age of 70 years found no significant effect of a single large dose of vitamin D. The single trial of women over age 70 years found a significant benefit for systolic blood pressure for vitamin D_3 800 IU and calcium carbonate 1200 mg compared with calcium carbonate 1200 mg alone.
- **Postmenopause** The women in both trials were postmenopausal. See the ≥71 y life stage.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 42. Vitamin D and blood pressure: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Scragg 1995[96] Cambridge, UK (52°N) [7498100]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No HTN 70 (63-76) 46%	25(OH)D: 34.5 nmol/L (treatment group), 32.25 nmol/L (control group)	Vit D_3 100,000 IU (2.5 mg) one-time dose vs. Placebo	nd	Complete trial performed in winter
Pfeifer 2001[97] Lower Saxony, Germany (52°N) [11297596]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy, low Vit D 75 (70-86) 0	25(OH)D < 50 nmol/L	Vit D_3 + Ca supplement vs. Ca supplement	95±12% for the Ca tablets and 96±10% for the Vit D_3 + Ca tablets (pill counting)	
Nagpal 2009[51] New Delhi, India (28.5°N) [19125756]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy, obese 44 (8) 100%	25(OH)D: 36.5 nmol/L (treatment group), 30.0 nmol/L (control group)	Vit D_3 120,000 IU every 2 weeks vs. Placebo	100% (implied); supervised home visits	Excluded subjects who refused subsequent blood draws

Table 43. Vitamin D and blood pressure: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE														
Scragg 1995[96] UK [7498100]	63-76 y, Both	SBP	1°	5 wk	Vit D_3 100,000 IU (2.5 mg), 1 dose	95	mm Hg	149	-5	-14.4, 4.4[A]	0	-4.2, 4.2[A]	0.81	A
					Placebo	94		147	-5	-17.9, 7.9[A]				
Pfeifer 2001[97] Germany [11297596]	70-86 y, Women	SBP	1°	8 wk	Vit D_3 800 IU +Ca carbonate 1200 mg	73	mm Hg	144.1	-13.1	nd	-7.4	-13.6, -1.2[A]	0.02	B
					Ca carbonate 1200 mg	72		140.6	-5.7	nd				
Nagpal 2009[51] New Delhi, India [19125756]	44 (8, SD) Men	SBP	2°	6 wk	Vit D_3 120,000 IU every 2 wk	35	mm Hg	124	+0.6	-2.7, 3.9	+4.0	-0.02, 8.0	0.06	B
					Placebo	36		124	-3.4	-5.8, -1.0				
DIASTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE														
Scragg 1995[96] UK [7498100]	63-76 y, Both	DBP	1°	5 wk	Vit D_3 100,000 IU (2.5 mg), 1 dose	95	mm Hg	82	-1	-6.8, 4.8[A]	0	-2.8, 2.8[A]	0.92	A
					Placebo	94		82	-1	-6.8, 4.8[A]				
Pfeifer 2001[97] Germany [11297596]	70-86 y, Women	SBP	1°	8 wk	Vit D_3 800 IU +Ca carbonate 1200 mg	73	mm Hg	84.7	-7.2	nd	-0.3	-0.7, -0.1[A]	0.10	B
					Ca carbonate 1200 mg	72		82.6	6.9	nd				
Nagpal 2009[51] New Delhi, India [19125756]	44 (8, SD) Men	SBP	2°	6 wk	Vit D_3 120,000 IU every 2 wk	35	mm Hg	78	+0.4	-2.1, 3.0	+1.7	-1.5, 4.9	0.31	B
					Placebo	36		77	-1.3	-3.2, 0.7				

[A] Estimated from available data

Vitamin D and Bone Mineral Density or Bone Mineral Content

For bone health outcomes (e.g., bone mineral density, fracture, fall or muscle strength), we relied on a recent comprehensive systematic review performed by the Ottawa EPC (Table 28).[6] Because the Ottawa's EPC report did not have separate analyses on the effect of vitamin D supplementation alone, the results for the effect of vitamin D alone or in combination with calcium supplementation are presented in "Combined vitamin D and Calcium" section.

The Ottawa EPC report was updated with literature published between January 2006 and September 2008, selected according to our eligibility criteria. For adults, we included only bone mineral density (BMD) indices. For children, we included only bone mineral content (BMC) indices. Only RCTs with duration more than 1 year qualified for inclusion.

Synopsis.

The Ottawa EPC report concluded that observational studies suggested a correlation between higher serum 25(OH)D concentrations and larger values of BMC indices for older children and adolescents (6 months through 18 years old). Furthermore, Based on results of the observational studies, there is fair evidence to support an association between serum 25(OH)D and BMD or changes in BMD at the femoral neck in postmenopausal women and elderly men. However, there was discordance between the results from RCTs and the majority of observational studies.[6] Three new RCTs identify from our updated search all showed no significant effects of vitamin D supplementation on BMC or BMD in children or adults, respectively.

Our updated search did not identify any new RCTs examining the effect of vitamin D on BMD and related outcomes in pregnant or lactating women.

Detailed presentation (Tables 44 & 45).

Ottawa EPC Report: Bone mineral content - Infants (0 through 12 months).

Overall, there is inconsistent evidence for an association between a specific serum 25(OH)D concentration and the bone health outcome BMC in infants. Of the two RCTs examining BMC, one demonstrated no significant benefit of higher serum 25(OH)D concentrations on radial bone mass while the other showed a transient increase of BMC compared to the unsupplemented group at 12 weeks but not 26 weeks. Of the three case-control studies, greater whole body BMC, was related to higher serum 25(OH)D concentrations.

Ottawa EPC Report: Bone mineral content or density - Older children (6 months through before puberty) and adolescents (the onset of puberty through 18 years).

Overall, there was fair evidence of an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and baseline BMD and change in BMD or BMC indices from the studies in older children and adolescents. However, the results from two RCTs of vitamin D supplementation have not confirmed a consistent benefit on BMD or BMC across sites and age groups.

There were seven studies in older children and adolescents (two RCTs, three cohorts, one case-control and one before-after study) that evaluated the relationship between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and BMC or BMD. In older children, there was one RCT, one prospective cohort and one before-after study. One RCT did not find an association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and distal radial BMC. Two of three studies found an association between lower baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations and lower BMC or BMD. The effect of bone size and muscle mass on these outcomes in relation to baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations was not reported. One RCT demonstrated a significant relation between baseline serum 25(OH)D

concentrations and baseline BMD of the lumbar spine, femoral neck and radius. However, only high dose supplementation with 14,000 IU/wk of vitamin D_3 increased BMC of the total hip.

Ottawa EPC Report: Bone mineral density – Postmenopausal women and elderly men.

Overall, there was discordance between the results from RCTs and the majority of observational studies that may be due to the limitations of observational studies to control for all relevant confounders. Five RCTs, and three cohort studies did not find an association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and BMD or bone loss. Four cohort studies found a significant association between 25(OH)D concentrations and bone loss, which was most evident at the hip sites but the evidence for an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and lumbar spine BMD was weak. Six case-control studies suggested an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and BMD and the association was most consistent at the femoral neck BMD.

Based on the results from the observational studies, there is fair evidence to support an association between serum 25(OH)D and BMD or changes in BMD at the femoral neck. Specific circulating concentrations of 25(OH)D below which bone loss at the hip was increased ranged from 30-80 nmol/L.

Ottawa EPC Report: Bone mineral density - pregnant or lactating women.

One cohort study did not find an association between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and change in BMD that occurred during lactation. Limitations in the study design and sources of bias highlight the need for additional research on vitamin D status in pregnancy and lactation, and the association with bone health outcomes.

Additional studies published after the Ottawa EPC report.

One A quality RCT compared the effect of vitamin D_2 supplementation on hip BMC in 256 elderly women between 70 and 90 years of age.[98] All elderly women in this trial had normal physical functioning. They were randomly assigned to receive either vitamin D_2 (1000 IU/d) plus calcium (1200 mg/d) supplement or calcium (1200 mg/d) supplement alone for one year. The mean baseline dietary calcium intake was 1097 mg/d and mean 25(OH)D concentration was 44.3 nmol/L. Total hip BMD increased significantly in both groups, with no difference between the vitamin D_2 plus calcium and calcium alone groups (hip BMD change: vitamin D, +0.5 percent; control, +0.2 percent).

One B quality RCT analyzed 89 and 83 healthy adult women and men separately.[99] The participants were Pakistani immigrants living in the Copenhagen area of Denmark (latitude 55 N°). Women and men were randomly assigned to receive either daily dose of 400 IU or 800 IU vitamin D_3, or placebo for one year. For women, the mean baseline dietary calcium intake was 495 mg/d and mean 25(OH)D concentration was 12 nmol/L. For men, the mean baseline dietary calcium intake was 548 mg/d and mean 25(OH)D concentration was 21 nmol/L. At the end of study, in both women and men, there were no significant differences in lumbar spine BMD changes between the two doses of vitamin D_3 (400 IU/d or 800 IU/d) and the placebo groups.

Two RCTs, both rated C, compared the effect of vitamin D supplementation on BMC in healthy girls, aged between 10 and 17 years old.[35,99] First RCT analyzed 26 healthy girls, who were Pakistani immigrants primarily living in the Copenhagen area Denmark (latitude 55 N°).[99] Girls were randomly assigned to receive either daily dose 400 IU or 800 IU vitamin D_3, or placebo for one year. The mean baseline dietary calcium intake was 510 mg/d and mean 25(OH)D concentration was 11 nmol/L. At the end of study, there were no significant differences in whole body BMC changes between the two doses of vitamin D_3 (400 IU/d or 800 IU/d) and the placebo groups. Second RCT analyzed 168 healthy girls, living in the Greater

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there is inconsistent evidence for an association between a specific serum 25(OH)D concentration and the bone health outcome BMC in infants. There were no new data since the Ottawa report.
- **7 mo – 2 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there was fair evidence of an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and baseline BMD and change in BMD or BMC indices from the studies in older children and adolescents. There were no new data since the Ottawa report.
- **3 – 8 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there was fair evidence of an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and baseline BMD and change in BMD or BMC indices from the studies in older children and adolescents. There were no new data since the Ottawa report.
- **9 – 18 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there was fair evidence of an association between 25(OH)D concentrations and baseline BMD and change in BMD or BMC indices from the studies in older children and adolescents. Two new RCTs enrolled only girls in this life stage. The results showed no significant differences in whole body BMC changes between either lower doses of vitamin D (200 or 400 IU/d) or higher dose of vitamin D (800 or 2000 IU/d) and the placebo groups.
- **19 – 50 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there was discordance between the results from RCTs and the majority of observational studies in postmenopausal women and elderly men. Based on results of the observational studies, there is fair evidence to support an association between serum 25(OH)D and BMD or changes in BMD at the femoral neck. One new RCT enrolled primarily men and women in this life stage. The results showed that there were no significant differences in lumbar spine BMD changes between the two doses of vitamin D_3 (400 IU/d or 800 IU/d) and the placebo groups.
- **51 – 70 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there was discordance between the results from RCTs and the majority of observational studies in postmenopausal women and elderly men. Based on results of the observational studies, there is fair evidence to support an association between serum 25(OH)D and BMD or changes in BMD at the femoral neck. One new RCT enrolled some men in this life stage. The results showed that there were no significant differences in lumbar spine BMD changes between the two doses of vitamin D_3 (400 IU/d or 800 IU/d) and the placebo groups.
- **≥71 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there was discordance between the results from RCTs and the majority of observational studies in postmenopausal women and elderly men. Based on results of the observational studies, there is fair evidence to

support an association between serum 25(OH)D and BMD or changes in BMD at the femoral neck. One new RCT enrolled only elderly women in this life stage. The results showed that vitamin D_2 supplementation (1000 IU/d) had no additional effect on hip BMD compared to calcium supplementation alone.

- **Postmenopause** There were no new data since the Ottawa report.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** There were no new data since the Ottawa report.

Table 44. Vitamin D and bone mineral density: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Zhu 2008[98] Perth, Australia (32 °S) [18410225]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	nd (based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, assume subjects were not very healthy but normal physical functioning) 77 (4.5) 0	25(OH)D: 44.3 nmol/L Ca: 1097 mg/d	Vit D_2 1000 IU/d + Ca citrate 1200 mg/d vs. Ca citrate 1200 mg/d	86.7% and 86.8% in the vitamin D and the control groups (tablet counting)	
Andersen 2008[99] Copenhagen, Denmark (55 N°) [18208636]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy Adolescent girls: 12.2 (10.1-14.7) Women: 36.2 (18.1-52.7) Men: 38.3 (17.9-63.5) 42	25(OH)D: Adolescent girls: 11 nmol/L Women: 12 nmol/L Men: 21 nmol/L Ca: Adolescent girls: 510 mg/d Women: 495 mg/d Men: 548 mg/d	Vit D3 400 IU/d, or Vit D3 800 IU/d vs. placebo	The median compliance was 85 (range 43-100), 92 (42-115) and 93 (33-105)% for girls, women, and men, respectively (pill counting)	Pakistani, living in Denmark. Compliance was lower for girls.
El-Hajj 2006[35] Beirut, Lebanon (33°53'N) [16278262]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy 13.2 (10-17) 0	25(OH)D: 34.9 nmol/L Ca: 677 mg/d	Weekly oral Vit D doses of 1400 IU (=Vit D 200 IU/d) or 14,000 IU (Vit D 2000 IU/d) vs. placebo	Placebo - 98%, Low dose group - 98%, High dose group - 97% (pill counting)	

Table 45. Vitamin D and bone mineral density or bone mineral contents: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, mo	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Zhu 2008[98] Perth, Australia (32 °S) [18410225]	71+. Women only	Hip BMD	1°	12	Vit D_2 1000 IU + Ca citrate 1200 mg	123	mg/cm^2	851	0.5%	-0.09, 1.09	0.3%	nd	NS	A
					Ca citrate 1200 mg	133		826	0.2%	-0.19, 0.59				
Andersen 2008[99] Copenhagen, Denmark (55 N°) [18208636]	18-53, Women only	Lumbar spine BMD	1°	12	Vit D_3 400	30/21[A]	mg/cm^2	1.06	0%	nd	-1%	nd	NS	B
					Vit D_3 800	30/21		0.98	1%	nd	0%	nd	NS	
					Placebo	29/18		0.99	1%	nd				
Andersen 2008[99] Copenhagen, Denmark (55 N°) [18208636]	18-64, Men only	Lumbar spine BMD	1°	12	Vit D_3 400	25/19[A]	mg/cm^2	1.03	2%	nd	0%	nd	NS	B
					Vit D_3 800	31/26		0.92	7%	nd	5%	nd	NS	
					Placebo	27/19		1.03	2%	nd				
Andersen 2008[99] Copenhagen, Denmark (55 N°) [18208636]	10-15 y girls	BMC	1°	12	Vit D_3 400	9/7[A]	kg	1.3	22%	nd	7%	nd	NS	C[B]
					Vit D_3 800	9/7		1.5	10%	nd	-5%	nd	NS	
					Placebo	8/7		1.7	15%	nd				
El-Hajj 2006[35] Beirut, Lebanon (33°N) [16278262]	10-17 y girls	BMC	1°	12	Vit D 2000 IU	55	kg	1.2	6.2%	4.7, 7.7	0.1%	-1.1, 2.0[C]	NS	C
					Vit D 200 IU	58		1.1	6.1%	4.6, 7.6	1.1%	-0.8, 3.2[C]	NS	
					Placebo	55		1.1	5.0%	3.8, 6.2				
	Subgroup–Premenarcheal girls, mean age 10 y	BMC	1°	12	Vit D 2000 IU	14	kg	0.8	11.6%	9.4, 13.8	4.2%	0.7, 7.7[C]	NS	
					Vit D 200 IU	12		0.7	11.4%	9.1, 13.7	4.0%	0.5, 7.5[C]	NS	
					Placebo	8		0.8	7.4%	4.7, 10.1				

[A] Baseline/final sample size
[B] Downgraded to C because very small sample size (insufficient power) and no adjustments for confounders
[C] Estimated from available data

Calcium and Health Outcomes

Calcium and Growth

We reviewed systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated relationships between calcium intake and growth parameters in infants and children.

Synopsis.

One systematic review and three primary studies evaluated supplemental intake of calcium and growth parameters in infants and children. The systematic review with a meta-analysis of 17 RCTs did not find an effect on weight and height gain attributable to calcium supplement in children ranging from 3 to 18 years of age. Three additional primary studies reported similar findings. Overall, the studies reviewed did not find a relationship between supplemental calcium intake and growth parameters.

Detailed presentation (Tables 46, 47 & 48).

0 - 6 months; 3 - 8 years; 9 - 18 years; pregnant women.

One systematic review of RCTs of supplemental calcium on bone related outcomes in children (age 3-18 y) also examined changes in height and weight at followup.[100] The systematic review (comprised of studies in Australia, China, Gambia, Israel, Switzerland, and US) conducted a meta-analysis of 17 RCTs with a total of 2088 subjects and found no significant difference in weight (weighted mean difference +0.14 kg (favors control)(95 percent CI -0.28, +0.57 kg)) and height gain (weighted mean difference +0.22 cm (favors control)(95 percent CI -0.30, +0.74 cm)) between those who were and those who were not supplemented. There was no significant statistical heterogeneity in the included studies. The calcium intake ranged from 300 to 1200 mg/d lasting from 0.7 to 4 years. The majority of the supplement used was calcium carbonate. This systematic review met seven of 11 AMSTAR[i] quality checklist items.

Two primary studies rated B in methodological quality and one primary study rated C provided additional information. One RCT from Denmark randomly assigned 110 girls (mean age 13 years) with either low (<713 mg/d) or medium (1000 to 1304 mg/d) habitual calcium intake to a supplement of calcium 500 mg/d (calcium carbonate) or placebo for 1 year.[101] There was no significant difference in height or weight gain among the groups at followup. One post hoc analysis of an RCT in Nebraska on bone mass analyzed 59 girls (mean age 9.5 years) who were randomly assigned to either a calcium enriched diet, supplying at least 1500 mg of calcium per day (~1656 mg/d), or usual diet (961 mg/d).[102] There was no significant difference in weight gain at 2 years followup. A cohort study in Washington DC analyzed dietary intake data from 322 pregnant African American women (mean age 21.6 years; 39 percent 16-19 years) and found that "none of the food energy and nutrient intakes [mean calcium intake 933 mg ± 52 (SE)] was significantly correlated with any of the pregnancy outcome measures". No specific quantitative relationship between calcium intake and infant birth weight or length was reported.[103]

[i] A measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** A cohort study of dietary intake in 322 pregnant African American women found that calcium intake was not significantly correlated with any pregnancy outcome measures, including infant birth weight or length.
- **7 mo – 2 y** No study covered this life stage.
- **3 – 8 y** One meta-analysis of 17 RCTs in children (age 3-18 y) found no significant difference in weight and height gain between those who were and those who were not supplemented at followup. The calcium intake ranged from 300 to 1200 mg/d lasting from 0.7 to 4 years.
- **9 – 18 y** In addition to the findings from the above meta-analysis, two primary studies provided additional information. One RCT of calcium 500 mg/d (calcium carbonate) versus placebo for 1 year found no significant difference in height or weight gain among the 110 girls (mean age 13 years) at followup. A post hoc analysis of an RCT of calcium enriched diet (~1656 mg/d) versus usual diet (~961 mg/d) on bone mass found no significant difference in weight gain at 2 years followup in 59 girls (mean age 9.5 years).
- **19 – 50 y** Not reviewed
- **51 – 70 y** Not reviewed
- **≥71 y** Not reviewed
- **Postmenopause** Not reviewed
- **Pregnant & lactating women** See 0 – 6 month results.

Table 46. Summary of systematic review of calcium on growth in children

Author Year [PMID]	Winzenberg 2007[100] [17636098]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2005)
Population	Children <18 y
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Supplemental and dietary calcium 300-1200 mg/d vs. placebo
Results	17 trials (2088 participants) Weighted mean difference: +0.14 (95% CI -0.28, +0.57) kg; favors control Weighted mean difference: +0.22 (95% CI -0.30, +0.74) cm; favors control No significant statistical heterogeneity
Comments	Post hoc analysis performed on trials identified for a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of calcium on bone outcomes

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Unclear if all languages included; study quality assessed but not factored into the M-A	

Table 47. Calcium and growth: Characteristics of primary studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
					Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Lorenzen 2006[101] Denmark (55ºN) [16400044]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	no specific health issue reported 13 0	88-item FFQ (no internal validation); dietary calcium: 957 mg/d; 25(OH)D: 34.5 nmol/L	Ca CO_3 (Ca 500 mg/d) X 1 y vs. placebo	x	x	x				RCT; Danish surnames only
Lappe 2004[102] Omaha, NE US (41ºN) [15354150]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	healthy 9.5 0	3-d food record (no internal validation); dietary intake calcium: 819 mg/d; dietary vit D 180 IU/d (4.5 µg/d)	Calcium rich diet (~1656 mg/d) vs. usual diet (~961 mg/d); wt & ht change at 2 y	x	x	x			x	Post hoc of RCT on bone mass; 95% white, 5% black
Johnson 1994[103] Washington DC, US (38ºN) [8201444]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	pregnant; no DM, sickle, thalassemia, HbC disease 22 (39% 16-19) 0	FFQ (no internal validation); calcium 933.4 mg/d	Relationship between maternal calcium intake and birth weight, height							Cohort study; all African American; Total Ca (from food)

Table 48. Calcium and growth: Results of primary studies

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, Y	Interventions, Ca daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
RCT														
Lorenzen 2006[101] (55ºN) [16400044]	9-18 female	wt in medium Ca intake group (1000-1304 mg/d)	1º	1	500 mg/d x 1 y	30	kg	51.8	5.1	1.7, 8.5[A]	0.2	-4.4, 4.9[A]	NS	B
					Placebo	30	kg	50.7	4.9	1.8, 8.0[A]				
		wt in low Ca intake group (<713 mg/d)	1º	1	500 mg/d x 1 y	30	kg	52.2	4.1	0.7, 7.5[A]	1.1	-3.6, 5.8[A]	NS	
					Placebo	30	kg	49.5	3.0	-0.2, 6.2[A]				
		ht in medium Ca intake group (1000-1304 mg/d)	1º	1	500 mg/d x 1 y	30	cm	162.5	3.7	1.6, 5.8[A]	-0.3	-3.3, 2.8[A]	NS	
					Placebo	30	cm	161.9	4.0	1.7, 6.3[A]				
		ht in low Ca intake group (<713 mg/d)	1º	1	500 mg/d x 1 y	30	cm	159.6	3.6	1.1, 6.1[A]	0.5	-3.3, 4.3[A]	NS	
					Placebo	30	cm	160.1	3.1	0.3, 5.9[A]				
Post hoc analysis of an RCT on bone outcomes														
Lappe 2004[102] (41ºN) [15354150]	9-18 female	wt	2º	2	Ca enriched diet (~1656 mg)	27	kg	32.2	10.7	8.2, 13.2[A]	-0.2	-4.1, 3.7[A]	NS	B
					Usual diet (~961 mg)	32	kg	33.2	10.9	7.9, 13.9[A]				
		ht	2º	2	Ca enriched diet (~1656 mg)	27	cm	137	14	11.5, 16.5[A]	1	-2, 4[A]	NS	
					Usual diet (~961 mg)	32	cm	138	13	11, 15[A]				
Cohort														
Johnson 1994[103] (38ºN) [8201444]	9-18 female; infant 0-6 mo	birth wt & length	1º	until delivery	322 African American women with a mean dietary calcium intake of 933 mg/d; "None of the food energy and nutrient intakes was significantly correlated with any of the pregnancy outcome measures". No specific quantitative relationship between calcium intake and infant birth weight or length was reported.									C

[A] Estimated from reported data

Calcium and Cardiovascular Disease

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between calcium intake and incidence of cardiovascular disease. No calcium intervention trials evaluated cardiovascular outcomes. Ten longitudinal cohort studies and one nested case-control study analyzed associations with various specific cardiovascular events. In all studies, baseline calcium intake, assessed by food frequency questionnaires, were analyzed as predictors of long-term cardiovascular outcomes. We point out where there were "suggestions" of associations in cases where P values were about 0.10 and/or there were consistent, though not statistically significant differences in risk compared to the lowest risk category of at least 20 percent.

Notably, the implied ranges of calcium intake within studied populations varied widely across studies. At one extreme, men and women in the Japan CC study had mean calcium intakes in the lowest quintile of 250 or 266 mg/day and in the highest quintile of 665 and 667 mg/day. The Japan PHC study and the Taiwanese CVD-FACTS study had similarly low calcium intake. The study with the highest calcium intake was the ATBC study of men in Finland. Median calcium intakes in the lowest and highest quintiles were 876 and 1916 mg/day, respectively; the overall median intake was 1379 mg/day.

Cardiovascular death was analyzed in two large studies analyzed, separately in men and women. Neither found a significant association between calcium intake and cardiovascular death after 9 or 28 years in either men or women.

Combined fatal and nonfatal cardiac events were analyzed in two large and one relatively small studies, in either both sexes together or just men. None found a significant association between calcium intake and cardiac events after 10 to 13 years.

Cardiac death was analyzed in three large and one relatively small studies, separately in men and women. Overall, no consistent significant association between calcium intake and cardiac death after 8, 9, 12, or 28 years of followup was found in the various studies, in either men or women. One study (the Iowa WHS) found a significant association between calcium intake of less than 696 mg/day and higher risk of ischemic heart disease death in white women aged 55 to 69 years.

Nonfatal myocardial infarction was analyzed by one large study of men. No significant association was found with calcium intake after 12 years of followup.

Total strokes were analyzed in five large and one relatively small studies, in both sexes combined, and separately for men and women. The studies had disparate findings. A Japanese and a Taiwanese study of men and women (40-59 y and ≥40 y, respectively) found progressively lower risks for stroke in people in higher quintiles of calcium intake after 13 and 11 years, respectively, in the setting of overall relatively low dietary calcium intake. A small Finnish study of both men and women (65-99 y) found no significant association after 10 years. The two studies of men (40 to 75 years old) found suggestions of associations (not statistically significant), though with trends in opposite directions; one suggested the highest risk for stroke in men with calcium intake below approximately 750 mg/day after 8 years; one suggested the highest risk for cerebral infarctions in men with calcium intake above about 1000 mg/day after 14 years. The study of women (32-57 y) found a nonsignificant trend after 14 years, but significantly higher stroke risk in those with calcium intake less than about 500 mg/day compared with women in the next two higher quintiles of calcium intake.

Fatal strokes were analyzed in one large cohort study and a nested case-control study, separately in men and women. None found a significant association between calcium intake and cardiac events after 10 to 13 years of followup.

Detailed presentation (Tables 49 & 50, Figures 11 & 12).

Cardiovascular death.

Two longitudinal cohort studies analyzed risk of cardiovascular death (death from cardiac or cerebrovascular events), separately in men and women, according to quintiles.

In the Japan Collaborative Cohort (Japan CC),[104] about 23,000 men aged 40 to 79 years without a history of cardiovascular disease were followed for 8.9 years; 3 percent died of a cardiovascular event. Men within the calcium quintiles had mean calcium intakes that ranged from 250 to 665 mg/day. No significant association was found between calcium quintile and cardiovascular death risk. In a study of Dutch civil servants (and spouses),[105] 1340 men aged 40 to 65 years (regardless of cardiovascular history) were followed for 28 years. About 27 percent (age-adjusted) had a cardiovascular death. The calcium intake quintiles ranged from less than 585 mg/day to more than 1245 mg/day. No significant associations were found between calcium intake and risk of cardiovascular death; however, men in the lowest quintile (≤585 mg/day) had an adjusted odds ratio of cardiovascular death of 1.3 (95 percent CI 0.8, 1.9) compared to those in the highest quintile. Both studies had methodological quality B. The Japanese study did not define cardiovascular mortality and the Dutch study did not report a complete analysis of the calcium intake quintiles.

In the Japan CC, about 35,600 women aged 40 to 79 years without a history of cardiovascular disease were followed for 8.9 years; 1.8 percent died of a cardiovascular event. Women within the calcium quintiles had mean calcium intakes that ranged from 266 to 667 mg/day. No significant trend across quintiles or associations among quintiles was found for risk of cardiovascular death. However, women in the lowest quintile had about 25 to 30 percent lower risks of cardiovascular death than women in the next two higher quintiles. In the Dutch civil servants study, 1265 women were followed for 28 years. About 14 percent had a cardiovascular death. The calcium intake quintiles ranged from less than 445 mg/day to more than 850 mg/day. No significant associations were found between calcium intake and risk of cardiovascular death.

Cardiac events, total.

Three longitudinal cohort studies analyzed combined fatal and nonfatal cardiac events, including coronary heart disease, acute myocardial infarction, and ischemic heart disease; two combined both sexes, one included only men.

In the Japan Public Health Center (Japan PHC) study (methodological quality A),[106] about 41,500 people aged 40 to 59 years, without cardiovascular disease, were followed for 13 years; 0.8 percent had cardiac events. People within the calcium intake quintiles had median calcium intakes that ranged from 233 to 753 mg/day. No association was found between calcium intake and risk of coronary heart disease events. In a small Finnish longitudinal study,[48] 755 people aged 65 to 99 years, regardless of cardiovascular history were followed for 10 years; 17 percent had a cardiac event. No significant association was found between tertiles of calcium intake and all acute myocardial infarctions. This methodological quality C study did not report relevant data including information on the calcium intake within the tertiles.

In the Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS),[107] about 39,000 men with a mean age of 54 years, without cardiovascular disease were followed for 12 years; 3.7 percent had an

ischemic heart disease event. The study was of methodological quality A. Men within the calcium quintiles had mean calcium intakes that ranged from 523 to 1377 mg/day. No significant association was found between calcium intake and risk of cardiac events.

Cardiac death.

Four longitudinal cohort studies analyzed death from cardiac events, separately in men (3 studies) and women (3 studies).

In the three studies of men, all found no significant association between calcium intake and cardiac death. All three studies are described above. In HPFS 1.1 percent of men died of a cardiac event during 12 years of followup.[107] In the Japan CC study 0.6 percent of men died of a cardiac event during 9 years of followup (methodological quality A for this outcome).[104] In the Dutch civil servants study about 15 percent (age-adjusted) died of a cardiac event during 28 years of followup.[105]

Three studies analyzed cardiac death in women. In two studies, both described above, there was no significant association between calcium intake and cardiac death. In the Japan CC study 0.3 percent of women died of a cardiac event during 9 years of followup.[104] In the Dutch civil servants study about 6 percent (age-adjusted) died of a cardiac event during 28 years of followup.[105] The Iowa Women's Health Study (Iowa WHS) analyzed about 34,500 white women, aged 55 to 69 years, without ischemic heart disease. During 8 years of followup, 1.1 percent died of a cardiac event. However, the study was of methodological quality B for this outcome because the outcome was not fully ascertained. The calcium intake quartiles ranged from less than 696 mg/day to more than 1425 mg/day. There was a suggestion of an association between lower calcium intake and higher risk of cardiac death, with a P value of 0.09 for the trend across quartiles and statistically significant adjusted relative risks of cardiac death for women with calcium intakes above 696 mg/day of 0.62 to 0.75 (compared to the lowest quartile).

Cardiac events, nonfatal.

Only the HPFS, described above, analyzed nonfatal cardiac events (methodological quality A).[107] During 12 years of followup 2.6 percent of almost 40,000 men had nonfatal myocardial infarctions. No significant association was found between calcium intake and nonfatal cardiac events.

Stroke, total.

Six longitudinal cohort studies analyzed combined fatal and nonfatal strokes, in either both sexes combined, or men and women separately.

In the Japan PHC study, described above (cardiac events, total), 3 percent of people suffered strokes during 13 years of followup (methodological quality A).[106] The study found a significant association between baseline calcium intake and risk of stroke. The risk of stroke was progressively lower in progressively higher quintiles of calcium intake. People with a median calcium intake of 439 mg/day (middle quintile) had a statistically significant adjusted hazard ratio (HR) of 0.79 compared to those with a median calcium intake of 233 mg/day. Those in higher quintiles had lower HRs; across quintiles, the trend had a P value of 0.02. As is evident from the median calcium intake levels within the quintiles, the middle-aged Japanese in this study had considerably lower average calcium intake than in most other studies (particularly those performed in the US). Compared to similar studies evaluated here, the calcium intake was approximately half of that in the HPFS or Iowa WHS. The CVD-FACTS study, performed in men and women at least 40 years old in Taiwan, evaluated ischemic strokes.[108] After a mean followup of 10.6 years, 7.4 percent of the cohort had an ischemic stroke. The B quality study

divided the cohort into tertiles. Similar to the Japanese study, the typical calcium intake was relatively low by Western standards (the average dietary calcium intake was approximately 520 mg/day). Those in the lower two tertiles had about a 50 percent increased risk of ischemic stroke than those in the highest tertile (>591 mg/day). While the adjusted OR for each tertile were not quite statistically significant (1.52 [95 percent CI 0.98-2.35] for lowest tertile; 1.49 [95 percent CI 0.99-2.24] for middle tertile; compared to highest tertile), the trend across tertiles had a P value of 0.03. The third study of combined men and women, of older Finns (described above under C*ardiac events, total*), found no significant association with stroke among 755 people followed for 10 years (stroke incidence 9.3 percent; methodological quality C).[48]

Both studies of men alone suggest trends across quintiles of calcium intake and stroke risk; however, the associations were in opposite directions. The HPFS, described above (cardiac events, total; methodological quality A) had a stroke incidence of 0.75 percent during 8 years of followup. Men in higher quintiles of calcium intake had generally lower adjusted relative risks (RR) of stroke compared to the lowest quintile (median calcium intake 500 mg/day); though none of the RRs was statistically significant and the P value for the trend across quintiles was 0.10. Notably, the RR of stroke for men in the middle quintile (median calcium intake 800 mg/day) was 0.72 (95 percent CI 0.50, 1.03); though the RRs for men in higher quintiles were closer to 1 with wider 95 percent confidence intervals. In the Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention (ATBC) Study, performed in southern Finland, about 26,500 men aged 50 to 69 years without a history of stroke were followed for almost 14 years; 10 percent suffered a stroke. The study was of methodological quality C because there was large misclassification of stroke outcomes in a sample of subjects (5-21 percent). Men in the lowest quintile of calcium intake (median 876 mg/day) had the lowest adjusted RR for cerebral infarction. Men in all higher quintiles (medians ranging from 1178 to 1916 mg/day) all had RR of about 1.10 that were near statistical significance (e.g., 95 percent CI for highest quartile was 0.98, 1.26). The P value of the trend of association across quintiles was 0.09.

One study evaluated total strokes in women alone. The Nurses Health Study (NHS) evaluated about 86,000 women aged 32 to 57 years with no history of cardiovascular disease. The study was rated methodological quality A. During 14 years of followup 0.8 percent of women suffered a stroke. The women in the four quintiles above the lowest quintile (who had a median calcium intake of 395 mg/day) all had similar adjusted RR of stroke (0.71-0.87); the RRs of those women in the second and third quintiles were statistically significant. However, the trend of associations across quintiles was not statistically significant.

Stroke death.

One longitudinal cohort study (with subanalyses in men and women separately) and one nested case-control study (in men) evaluated fatal strokes.

Both studies of men found no significant association between calcium intake and risk of stroke death. In the Japan CC study (described above, methodological quality A for this outcome) 1.4 percent of men died of stroke during 9 years of followup. The second study was a nested case-control study performed in China. In a prospective cohort of about 18,000 men aged 45 to 64 years, regardless of cardiovascular history, 245 died of stroke (1.3 percent) during 12 years of followup. These cases were matched with 1225 controls. The remaining 17,000 men were omitted from the analysis. The study also did not report data on the calcium intake within the tertiles. The methodological quality was C.

In the Japan CC study, 0.9 percent of women died of stroke. The study also found no consistent association between calcium intake and stroke death.

Findings per calcium intake level.

Among the outcomes for which studies had either statistically significant associations or suggestions of associations between calcium intake and cardiovascular events, the following findings of calcium intake level were reported.

Regarding the risk of overall cardiovascular mortality, one of two studies in women (Japan CC) found a suggestion that higher calcium intake may be associated with increased risk of cardiovascular death. The association can be seen for quintiles 2 to 4, where women in the lowest quintile had a median calcium intake of 266 mg/day and those in the second quintile had a median calcium intake of 379 mg/day.

Regarding the risk of cardiac mortality, one of three studies in women (Iowa WHS) found that women in the lowest quartile of calcium intake, below 696 mg/day, had the highest risk of cardiac mortality.

Regarding the risk of stroke, among studies of both sexes combined, two (Japan PHC and the Taiwanese CVD-FACTS) of three studies found a statistically significant association between lower calcium intake and higher risk of stroke. In Japan PHC, those in the third to fifth quintiles, with median calcium intakes of 439 mg/day or higher, had lower risks than those in the lowest quintile. Those in the second quintile had a median calcium intake of 344 mg/day and those in the lowest quintile 233 mg/day. In CVD-FACTS, those in the two tertiles with calcium intake below 591 mg/day had about a 50 percent increased risk of stroke compared to those with higher calcium intake. The two studies restricted to men had opposite findings. The HPFS found lower risks of stroke among men in the third to fifth quintiles of calcium intake (median 800 mg/day or higher) compared to the lowest quintile (median 500 mg/day). Those in the second quintile had a median calcium intake of 700 mg/day. In contrast, the ATBC study in Finland found somewhat higher risks of stroke (RR~1.1) in all quintiles above the lowest quintile. The median calcium intakes in the first and second quintiles were 876 and 1178 mg/day, respectively. The one study of women (NHS) had lower risks of stroke in all quintiles above the lowest quintile. The median calcium intakes in the first and second quintiles were 395 and 645 mg/day, respectively.

Findings per age and sex.

The majority of studies (and the large majority of individuals) included mostly people between the ages of about 40 and 70 years. The youngest individuals included were 32 year old women in the NHS. Apparently very few individuals were over the age of 70 years. Only a small Finnish study (Marniemi 2005[48]) restricted the study cohort to only older adults (65 years and older). This study found no significant associations between calcium intake and cardiovascular events. No study reported a subgroup analysis based on age. The reported data do not allow further conclusions based on age.

Almost all studies or analyses separately evaluated men and women. The findings that could be interpreted as an association between calcium intake and cardiovascular risk were mostly found in women (low calcium intake being associated with increased risk of cardiac death (in one of three studies) and stroke (in a single study), but with lowered risk of overall cardiovascular death (in one of two studies). The only potential associations between calcium intake and cardiovascular events in men were found for stroke; however, the two studies had opposite findings about the direction of the association.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed

- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** Overall, the studies included relatively few people in this life stage. All were at least 32 years old, and most were at least 40 to 45 years old. However, the one study of stroke in women was conducted in women who were mostly in this life stage. Those in the lowest quintile of the NHS appear to have had higher risks of stroke than those women with greater calcium intake.
- **51 – 70 y** The majority of evidence regards people in this life stage. Overall, the majority of analyses found no significant association between calcium intake and most cardiovascular events. Only for stroke did at least two studies find significant associations between calcium intake and the outcome. In two Asian studies, where the average dietary calcium intake was about half that in the US and which also included people in the younger life stage, stroke risk was progressively higher in lower quantiles (maximum quantiles were median of 753 mg/day and >591 mg/day). For studies of people within this life stage, other significant associations were found in one of three studies of cardiac death in women (calcium intake below 696 mg/day was associated with increased risk) and in one of two studies of cardiovascular death in women (calcium intake above about 300 mg/day may be associated with increased risk).
- **≥71 y** Few studies included people in this life stage. The one study of people in this life stage found no association between calcium intake and cardiac events or stroke in a relatively small, quality C study.
- **Postmenopause** Only the Iowa WHS included primarily postmenopausal women. In their analysis, calcium intake below 696 mg/day was associated with increased risk of ischemic heart disease death.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 49. Calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies[B]

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Specific CVD Outcomes
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Al-Delaimy 2003[107] HPFS US (various) [12663277]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	No CVD 54 (9) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Yes	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	IHD MI Cardiac death Total Ca (both)
Ascherio 1998[109] HPFS US (various) [9743511]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No CVD nd (40-75) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Yes	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Stroke Total Ca (both)
Bostick 1999[110] Iowa WHS Iowa (42°) [9921960]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No IHD 61 (55-69) 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Yes	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quartiles	X	X	X	X		X	Cardiac death Total Ca (both)
Iso 1999[111] NHS US (various) [10471422]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No CVD 46 (32-57) 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles		X				X	Stroke Total Ca (food)
Larsson 2008[112] ATBC SW Finland (~60°N) [18332289]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No stroke 57 (50-69) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Stroke (cerebral infarct) Total Ca (food)
Marniemi 2005[48] Turku Finland (60°N) [15955467]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 79 (65-99) 48%	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Interview No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake tertiles	X	X				X	MI Stroke Total Ca (both)

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Specific CVD Outcomes
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Ross 1997[113A] Shanghai China (31°N) [9236416]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Cases & controls nd (45-64) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ nd	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake tertiles		X	X	X		X	Fatal stroke Total Ca (food)
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC Japan (various) [16339476]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No CVD 56 (40-79) 39	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Cardiac death Stroke death CVD death Total Ca (food)
Umesawa 2008[106] Japan PHC Japan (various) [18635855]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No CVD 49 (40-59) 48	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Yes	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	CHD Stroke Total Ca (food)
van der Vijver 1992[105] Dutch civil servants Amsterdam Netherlands (52°) [1544755]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 52 (40-65) 51	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles		X	X			X	Cardiac death CVD death Total Ca (food)
Weng 2008[108] CVD—FACTS Taiwan (22°-25°) [18988909]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No stroke, cancer 57 (≥40) 44	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quartiles (top 2 quartiles combined)		X	X	X		X	Ischemic stroke Total Ca (both)

[A] Nested case-control study
[B] This table is ordered alphabetically by study author

Table 50. Calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name PMID	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
CVD Death										
Men										
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC [16339476]	40-79 y, Men	CVD death (685/23,117; 0.030)	8.9 y	250, mean	140	4623	**1**	**Reference**	0.95	B
				363	141	4624	0.98	0.75, 1.30		
				449	135	4623	0.93	0.67, 1.29		
				536	135	4624	0.92	0.64, 1.32		
				665	134	4623	0.97	0.64, 1.48		
van der Vijver 1992[105] Dutch civil servants [1544755]	40-65 y, Men	CVD death (nd/1340; ~0.27, age-adjusted)	28 y	≤585	31.9%, age-adjusted	271	1.3	0.8, 1.9	nd	B
				585-1245	26.7%	798	1.1	0.8, 1.5		
				>1245	24.9%	271	**1**	**Reference**		
Women										
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC [16339476]	40-79 y, Women	CVD death (644/35,609; 0.018)	8.9 y	266, mean	153	7121	**1**	**Reference**	0.14	B
				379	156	7122	1.29	0.99, 1.67		
				462	136	7122	1.24	0.90, 1.69		
				545	98	7122	0.92	0.64, 1.34		
				667	101	7122	1.14	0.74, 1.74		
van der Vijver 1992[105] Dutch civil servants [1544755]	40-65 y, Women	CVD death (nd/1265; ~0.14, age-adjusted)	28 y	≤445	14.6%, age-adjusted	258	1.1	0.6, 2.0	nd	B
				445-850	14.4%	750	1.1	0.7, 1.7		
				>850	12.6%	257	**1**	**Reference**		
Cardiac Events, Total										
Both Sexes										
Umesawa 2008[106] Japan PHC [18635855]	40-59 y, Both	CHD (322/41,526; 0.0078)	13 y	233, median	72	~8305	**1**	**Reference**	NS	A
				344	72	~8305	1.18	0.83, 1.68		
				439	56	~8305	0.91	0.60, 1.37		
				603	58	~8305	1.08	0.71, 1.65		
				753	64	~8305	0.93	0.58, 1.50		

continued

Author Year Study Name PMID	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Marniemi 2005[48] (Finland) [15955467]	65-99 y, Both	AMI (130/755; 0.172)	10 y	nd	nd	~252	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
				nd	nd	~252	0.87	0.57, 1.37		
				nd	nd	~252	1.14	0.70, 1.84		
Men										
Al-Delaimy 2003[107] HPFS [12663277]	Mean (SD) 54 (9) y, Men	IHD, total (1458/39,800; 0.037)	12 y	523, mean	300	7960	**1**	**Reference**	0.43	A
				670	296	7960	1.03	0.88, 1.22		
				803	267	7960	0.92	0.78, 1.09		
				995	299	7960	1.01	0.85, 1.19		
				1377	296	7960	0.94	0.79, 1.11		
Cardiac Death										
Men										
Al-Delaimy 2003[107] HPFS [12663277]	Mean (SD) 54 (9) y, Men	IHD death (428/39,800; 0.011)	12 y	523, mean	88	7960	**1**	**Reference**	0.72	A
				670	90	7960	1.17	0.87, 1.50		
				803	70	7960	0.93	0.67, 1.29		
				995	79	7960	1.06	0.77, 1.47		
				1377	101	7960	1.10	0.79, 1.51		
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC [16339476]	40-79 y, Men	CHD death (148/23,117; 0.0064)	8.9 y	250, mean	37	4623	**1**	**Reference**	0.43	A
				363	26	4624	0.84	0.47, 1.50		
				449	33	4623	1.20	0.62, 2.30		
				536	32	4624	1.27	0.60, 2.68		
				665	20	4623	0.92	0.37, 2.29		
van der Vijver 1992[105] Dutch civil servants 1544755	40-65 y, Men	CHD death (nd/1340; ~0.15, age-adjusted)	28 y	≤585	16.6%, age-adjusted	271	0.9	0.6, 1.6	nd	B
				585-1245	15.1%	798	1.0	0.6, 1.5		
				>1245	14.5%	271	**1**	**Reference**		
Women										
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC [16339476]	40-79 y, Women	CHD death (116/35,609; 0.0033)	8.9 y	266, mean	38	7121	**1**	**Reference**	0.50	A
				379	21	7122	0.88	0.48, 1.62		
				462	25	7122	1.28	0.62, 2.61		
				545	17	7122	0.84	0.35, 2.02		
				667	15	7122	0.87	0.31, 2.45		

continued

Author Year Study Name PMID	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Bostick 1999[110] Iowa WHS [9921960]	55-69 y, Women	IHD death (387/34,486; 0.011)	8 y	<696	127	~8621	**1**	**Reference**	0.09	B
				696-1051	84	~8621	0.62	0.45, 0.85*		
				1052-1425	94	~8621	0.75	0.55, 1.03		
				>1425	82	~8621	0.67	0.47, 0.94*		
van der Vijver 1992[105] Dutch civil servants [1544755]	40-65 y, Women	CHD death (nd/1265; ~0.06, age-adjusted)	28 y	≤445	6.2%, age-adjusted	258	1.1	0.5, 2.5	nd	B
				445-850	6.3%	750	1.2	0.6, 2.3		
				>850	4.4%	257	**1**	**Reference**		
Cardiac Event, Nonfatal										
Men										
Al-Delaimy 2003[107] HPFS [12663277]	Mean (SD) 54 (9) y, Men	Nonfatal MI (1030/39,800; 0.026)	12 y	523, mean	212	7960	**1**	**Reference**	0.43	A
				670	206	7960	1.01	0.83, 1.23		
				803	197	7960	0.96	0.78, 1.17		
				995	220	7960	1.04	0.85, 1.28		
				1377	195	7960	0.92	0.74, 1.14		
Stroke										
Both Sexes										
Umesawa 2008[106] Japan PHC [18635855]	40-59 y, Both	Stroke, Total (1321/41,526; 0.032)	13 y	233, median	314	~8305	**1**	**Reference**	0.02	A
				344	257	~8305	0.94	0.79, 1.13		
				439	252	~8305	0.79	0.65, 0.97*		
				603	247	~8305	0.78	0.63, 0.96*		
				753	251	~8305	0.71	0.56, 0.89*		
Weng 2008[108] CVD—FACTS [18988909]	≥40 y Both	Stroke, Ischemic (132/1772; 0.074)	10.6 y	<451	nd	443	1.52	0.98, 2.35	0.03	B
				451-591	nd	443	1.49	0.99, 2.24		
				>591	nd	886	**1**	**Reference**		
Marniemi 2005[48] (Finland) [15955467]	65-99 y, Both	Stroke, Total (70/755; 0.093)	10 y	nd	nd	~252	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
				nd	nd	~252	0.981	0.53, 1.81		
				nd	nd	~252	1.34	0.70, 2.55		
Men										

continued

Author Year Study Name PMID	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Ascherio 1998[109] HPFS [9743511]	40-75 y, Men	Stroke, Total (328/43,738; 0.0075)	8 y	500, median	75	~8748	**1**	**Reference**	0.10	A
				700	69	~8748	0.95	0.68, 1.32		
				800	51	~8748	0.72	0.50, 1.03		
				1000	63	~8748	0.84	0.60, 1.19		
				1400	70	~8748	0.88	0.63, 1.23		
Larsson 2008[112] ATBC [18332289]	50-69 y, Men	Cerebral infarction (2702/26,556; 0.102)	13.6 y	876, median	518	~5311	**1**	**Reference**	0.09	C
				1178	541	~5311	1.08	0.95, 1.22		
				1379	542	~5311	1.09	0.96, 1.23		
				1581	546	~5311	1.11	0.98, 1.26		
				1916	555	~5311	1.10	0.98, 1.26		
Women										
Iso 1999[111] NHS [10471422]	32-57 y, Women	Stroke, Total (690/85,764; 0.0080)	14 y	395, median	165	~17153	**1**	**Reference**	NS	A
				645	132	~17153	0.79	0.63, 1.00*		
				675	117	~17153	0.71	0.56, 0.90*		
				837	142	~17153	0.87	0.70, 1.09		
				1145	134	~17153	0.83	0.66, 1.04		
Stroke, Fatal										
Men										
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC [16339476]	40-79 y, Men	Stroke death (322/23,117; 0.014)	8.9 y	250, mean	61	4623	**1**	**Reference**	0.95	A
				363	76	4624	1.14	0.76, 1.70		
				449	69	4623	0.90	0.56, 1.45		
				536	59	4624	0.69	0.40, 1.18		
				665	57	4623	0.68	0.37, 1.26		
Ross 1997[113A] (China) [9236416]	45-64 y, Men	Stroke death (245/18,244;0.013) [245 cases vs. 1225 controls]	12 y	nd	103	460 controls	**1**	**Reference**	NS	C
				nd	68	369 controls	0.8	0.6, 1.6		
				nd	74	396 controls	1.0	0.8, 1.4		
Women										
Umesawa 2006[104] Japan CC [16339476]	40-79 y, Women	Stroke death (322/35,609; 0.0090)	8.9 y	266, mean	70	7121	**1**	**Reference**	0.50	A
				379	82	7122	1.38	0.95, 2.01		
				462	73	7122	1.24	0.79, 1.95		
				545	42	7122	0.69	0.40, 1.18		
				667	55	7122	0.94	0.51, 1.72		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)
[A] Case-control study from prospective, longitudinal cohort.

Figure 11. Cardiovascular outcomes risk stratified by calcium intake



Figure 12. Stroke risk stratified by calcium intake



Calcium and Body Weight

We searched for systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated associations between calcium intake or body stores and *incidence of overweight or obesity*; no such studies were found. For the outcome *weight change* (in kilograms or body mass index units), we included only randomized controlled trials. The EPC and the TEP agreed that the limited resources would not be expended on reviewing observational studies for the surrogate outcome body weight (where overweight or obesity are considered to be the clinical outcomes). We included only studies of adults. Studies of weight gain in children are included in the "Growth" section.

Synopsis.

No studies evaluated the association of calcium intake and incidence of overweight or obesity. We identified three systematic reviews that evaluated RCTs of calcium intake and changes in body weight. Eight additional trials not identified by these systematic reviews met eligibility criteria for this report and are summarized together with the systematic reviews. Altogether, 49 trials have been identified by the previous and current systematic reviews. Because the systematic reviews all used somewhat different eligibility criteria, they included overlapping groups of trials. No one or two systematic reviews captured most of the relevant trials; therefore, all systematic reviews are included here.

The three systematic reviews performed separate analyses for calcium supplementation and dairy product intake. Only one of the systematic reviews separately analyzed studies of people on isocaloric diets (where weight loss was not a goal) and studies of people on energy-restricted diets. Overall, 24 included trials investigated calcium supplementation and 15 investigated dairy product intake; 29 trials had isocaloric background diets and 13 evaluated calcium supplementation in the setting of an energy-restricted (weight loss) diets. Although there was not complete agreement among the systematic reviews, overall, the trials in the systematic review do not support an effect of calcium (or dairy) supplementation on body weight. No systematic review analyzed effects of calcium supplementation based on life stage or calcium dose.

Seven of the eight additional trials investigated calcium supplements in the setting of isocaloric diets; two of the trials investigated calcium supplements in overweight people on energy-restricted diets. All these trials found no significant effect of calcium supplementation on body weight.

Detailed presentation (Tables 51, 52, & 53).

The three systematic reviews explicitly or implicitly used generally different eligibility criteria, resulting in large overlaps in the trials included among the reports.[114-116]. Overall, the systematic reviews included 42 trials. All systematic reviews separately analyzed calcium supplementation and dairy product intake. The largest, most recent systematic review[114] included trials up to 2007, separated isocaloric from energy-restricted trials, but did not perform meta-analysis. The next largest systematic review[115] included trials through 2004. The last systematic review,[116] through 2001, also did not perform meta-analyses. All the dairy product trials in this review were also included in the most recent systematic review and are thus not discussed further here. Seven more recent calcium supplementation trials not included in any of the systematic reviews were found.[117-123]

Isocaloric trials.

The systematic review by Lanou et al. (2008)[114] evaluated 19 isocaloric trials of increased calcium intake in adults. Nine trials compared calcium supplements to placebo; 10 trials compared high calcium dairy intake to lower calcium nondairy intake. The systematic review did not provide details of every included trial, nor was meta-analysis performed. In summary, 16 trials (8 calcium supplement, 8 dairy product) of the 19 trials reported no significant effect of increased calcium intake on body weight, 1 calcium trial found significantly greater weight loss in those receiving calcium supplements, and 2 dairy trials found significantly greater weight *gain* in those in the dairy product group. This latter finding was theorized to be due to the extra calories from the dairy products.

Seven additional isocaloric trials were not included in the systematic reviews.[117-122,124] Four of these trials were conducted in postmenopausal women, two in young women (age early 20s), and one in men and women aged 30 to 34 years. The trials used a variety of calcium compounds with doses ranging from 800 to 2000 mg; one compared dairy (~1250 mg calcium) to nondairy (~375 mg calcium) intakes.[120] The studies ranged in duration from 1 month to almost 3 years. Among the studies, one was of methodological quality A, three B, and three C. Methodological limitations included inadequate reporting of methodology or outcomes, statistical issues, high dropout rates, and large difference in baseline weights between groups. The participants' weights were generally stable, on average changing less than 1 kg during 6 weeks to 3 years of followup. The net weight changes (calcium group minus control group) ranged from -0.8 to +0.5 kg. No trial found a significant effect of calcium.

Findings per calcium intake level.

Overall, there was no evidence of different effects related to calcium intake level. No study directly compared a range of calcium intake levels.

Findings per age and sex

The systematic review did not address the question of different effects based on age or sex. Among the additional trials reviewed here, no significant difference was found across trials of different populations. Most were conducted in postmenopausal women.

Energy-restricted diets.

The systematic review by Lanou et al. (2008)[114] evaluated 11 trials that compared dairy intake (6 trials) or calcium supplements (5 trials) in the setting of energy-restricted diets with the goal of weight loss. Of the six dairy product trials, three were conducted by the same investigators. These three trials all reported significantly more weight loss in participants with high dairy product intake than those with low or no dairy product intake (1137 vs. 430 mg Ca; 1100 vs. 500 mg; 3 vs. <1 servings). The systematic review authors note that due to incomplete reporting in the trials, it was impossible to determine whether the difference in weight loss may have been due to differences in calcium (or dairy) intake or differential compliance with the calorie restriction protocol. One of the five calcium supplement trials, which was part of one of the positive dairy trials by the same researchers, found greater weight loss with calcium supplementation; the others found no significant effect.

The two additional trials not included in the systematic reviews reported no significant effects of calcium supplementation on body weight loss.[119,123] Both trials were conducted in overweight women, one trial with a mean age of 49 years and one trial of postmenopausal women. One trial compared two different formulations of 500 mg calcium with placebo in the

setting of a low calcium intake (350 mg/day); the other compared higher (1200 mg) to lower (400 mg) doses of calcium citrate. Over 3 or 6 weeks, women in all trial groups lost between 3.3 and 4.3 kg, with no significant differences between those with higher than lower calcium intake.

Findings per calcium intake level.

Overall, there was no evidence of different effects related to calcium intake level. No study directly compared a range of calcium intake levels.

Findings per age and sex.

The systematic review did not address the question of different effects based on age or sex. The two additional trials did not add any information regarding age or sex subgroups.

Combined isocaloric and energy-restricted diets.

Two of the systematic reviews did not separately analyze studies based on background diet (regarding weight). The systematic review by Trowman et al. (2006)[115] performed meta-analyses of 13 trials, separately for calcium supplement and dairy product trials. This systematic review found a significant effect of calcium supplements (weighted mean difference = -1.79 [95 percent CI -3.04, -0.55]) suggesting greater weight loss (or smaller weight gain) in adults taking calcium supplements. However, the investigators noted that the difference in effect of calcium supplement trials may be due to significant differences (in aggregate) in the baseline weights of the two arms. Across studies, the calcium supplement group participants had significantly lower body weights at baseline. The meta-analysis of dairy trials found no significant effect of dairy products on body weight. The systematic review by Barr et al. (2003)[116] reviewed both calcium supplement and dairy trials; however, the dairy trials were all included in the later systematic review by Lanou et al. (2008)[114] and are thus not repeated here. Among the eight trials of calcium supplementation, all but one found no significant effect on body weight. Between the two systematic reviews, over two-thirds of the trials were conducted in post- or perimenopausal women; the mean age of participants (among trials with data reported in the systematic reviews) ranged from 36 to 72 years. Only four of the trials were conducted in men. The range of calcium supplement doses was 700 to 1600 mg/day, with most studies using 1000 mg. The range of calcium intake among the dairy trials was 610 to 2400 mg/day. In the Trowman et al. (2006) systematic review,[115] the range of followup durations of the trials was 12 weeks to 3 years. The Barr et al. (2003) systematic review[116] included longer duration trials, ranging from 6 months to 4 years.

Findings per calcium intake level.

The systematic reviews did not find evidence of differential effects based on calcium intake level (supplement dose or dairy calcium).

Findings per age and sex.

The large majority of trials reviewed in the systematic reviews were conducted in postmenopausal women. The systematic reviews did not find evidence of differential effects based on age or sex.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed

- **19 – 50 y** Many of the trials are applicable to people within this life stage; though relatively few trials included men. For both people on energy-restrictive diets and on isocaloric diets, overall, the evidence suggests no significant effect on body weight with increased calcium intake, either as supplements or from dairy product intake.
- **51 – 70 y** The majority of studies are applicable to women within this life stage; few trials included men. The conclusions are the same as for those in the 19-50 y life stage.
- **≥71 y** The evidence is scant for this life stage. Few of the studies appear to have included people over age 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** The majority of studies are applicable to postmenopausal women. The conclusions are the same as for those in the 19-50 y life stage.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 51. Systematic reviews of calcium supplementation and weight

Author Year [PMID]	Lanou 2008[114] [18454813]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2007)
Population	All, generally healthy (adults and children, only studies of adults included here)
Intervention and Comparator	Calcium supplements or dairy intake versus no supplement or low calcium intake
Results	29 trials[A] No energy restriction Calcium supplement: 8/9 trials no significant effect. 1 found significantly more weight loss on calcium supplement. Dairy supplementation: 8/10 trials no significant effect. 2 found significantly more weight gain among those on dairy Energy restriction Calcium supplement: 4/5 trials no significant effect. 1 found significantly more weight loss with calcium. Dairy supplementation: 3/6 trials significantly more weight loss on high calcium intake All 4 trials with significant differences were by same study investigators
Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	nd	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	None
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?		Only published trials. Excluded studies not enumerated or listed.	

Author Year [PMID]	Trowman 2006[115] [16768823]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1800[B]/2002-2004)
Population	Nonpregnant, nonlactating, ≥18 y
Intervention and Comparator	Calcium supplements or dairy intake versus no supplement or low calcium intake
Results	13 trials Calcium supplement WMD = -1.79 (-3.04, -0.55)[C], statistically homogeneous Dairy supplementation WMD = +0.85 (-4.39, +6.08), statistically heterogeneous ANCOVA, adjusting for baseline weight: Calcium Effect = -0.41 (-1.07, +0.25) kg Dairy Effect = +0.23 (-2.88, +3.34) kg
Comments	Apparent difference in effect of calcium supplement trials may be due to significant differences (in aggregate) in baseline weights of two arms across studies (intervention arm participants were significantly lighter at baseline).

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	nd	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Debatable
All publication types and languages included?	Yes (implied)	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Excluded studies not enumerated or listed. Used WMD instead of net difference, then needed to perform an ANCOVA to adjust for baseline differences.	

continued

Author Year [PMID]	Barr 2003[116] [12514301]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2001)
Population	All, generally healthy (adults and children, only studies of adults included here)
Intervention and Comparator	Calcium supplement or dietary calcium versus no supplement or usual calcium intake (see Comment)
Results	8 trials Calcium supplement 7/8 trials found no significant effect
Comments	6 dairy supplementation trials reviewed. Not included here. These represent a subset of the dairy trials reviewed by Lanou 2008[114]

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	nd	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	None
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Studies published in English only. Excluded studies not enumerated or listed.	

WMD, weighted mean difference

[A] The systematic review included the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) trial of vitamin D + calcium supplementation. This trial is omitted here and is discussed separately in the vitamin D + calcium and body weight section.

[B] Cochrane Library Database of Controlled Trials

[C] Numbers in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals

Table 52. Calcium and weight: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Yamamoto 1995[117] TOHP US (various) [7795837]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy 43 (30-54) 69	Ca 970 mg/d	Ca carbonate vs placebo	Eligibility for randomization required consumption of at least two-thirds of 6 wks of supplement placebo dosing. During the study, pill counts averaged 95% (with three-fourths taking at least 95% of their supplements).	
van Beresteyn 1986[118] Netherlands (52°N) [3788835]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy 21 (20-23) 0	nd	Ca carbonate vs placebo	nd	
Cifuentes 2004[119] New Brunswick, NJ (40°N) [15213038]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Overweight, post-menopause 61 (52-75) 0	nd	Ca supplement vs placebo	nd	Factorial design with weight loss and maintenance diets
Ghadirian 1995[120] Montreal, Canada (46°N) [7493659]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy, post-menopause ~80 (~≥50) 0	Ca 776 mg/d	Dairy vs dairy free intake	Non-compliant and those who provided incomplete data were excluded.	
Aloia 1995[121] Mineola, NY (41°N) [7892882]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy, post-menopause 53 (0.6) 0	nd	Ca supplement vs placebo (Vit D in both groups)	nd	
Thomsen 1987[122] Copenhagen, Denmark (55°N) [3307307]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy, post-menopause nd 0	nd	Combination Ca lactate-gluconate & Ca carbonate vs placebo	nd	
Bortolotti 2008[124] Lausanne, Switzerland (47°N) [18842771]	• Health status • Mean age (SE), y • Male (%)	Healthy 22 (1.2) 30	Ca 586 (137 SE) mg/d, all <800 mg/d	Ca phosphate vs placebo	Measured but not reported	Crossover study (5 wk with 10 wk washout), 1° outcomes were metabolic
Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008[123] Lausanne, Czech Rep (50°N) [17552880]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%) • Male (%)	Overweight, healthy 49 (12) 0 0	nd	Ca carbonate vs “lactoval” vs placebo	nd (a dietitian checked that subjects took tablets)	Energy restriction

Table 53. Calcium and weight: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Isocaloric														
Yamamoto 1995[117] TOHP [7795837]	30-54 y, Both	BMI	2°	6 mo	Ca carbonate 1000 mg	217	Kg/m^2	27.4	+0.07	-0.05, 0.19	-0.05[A]	-0.23, 0.13[B]	NS	A
					Placebo	218		27.0	+0.12	-0.02, 0.26				
van Beresteyn 1986[118] Netherlands [3788835]	20-23 y, Women	Weight	2°	6 wk	Ca carbonate 1500 mg	29	Kg	61.8	-0.3	-2.7, 2.1[B]	-0.8	-4.3, 2.7[B]	NS	B
					Placebo	29		62.5	+0.5	-2.0, 3.0[B]				
		BMI	2°		Ca	29	Kg/m^2	20.8	-0.1	-0.8, 0.6[B]	-0.2	-1.2, 0.8[B]	NS	
					Placebo	29		21.0	+0.1	-0.6, 0.8[B]				
Cifuentes 2004[119] New Jersey [15213038]	52-75 y, Women	Weight	1°	6 wk	Ca citrate 1200 mg	10	Kg	70.9	0	-3.3, 3.3[B]	-0.4[C]	-5.5, 4.7[B]	NS	B
					Ca citrate 400 mg	15		68.0	+0.4	-3.4, 4.2[B]				
Ghadirian 1995[120] Canada [7493659]	~>=50 y, Women	Weight	2°	1 mo	Dairy intake (1242 mg Ca)	81	Kg	59.84	+0.10	-2.4, 2.6[B]	+0.5	-3.7, 4.7[B]	NS	C
					Nondairy intake (377 mg)	77		59.65	-0.40	-3.8, 3.0[B]				
Aloia 1995[121] New York [7892882]	Mean (SD) 53 (0.6) y, Women	Weight	2°	2.9 y	Ca 1700 mg[D] + Vit D 400 IU	36	Kg/y	65.8	+0.1	nd	0	nd	NS	C
					Vit D 400 IU	28		65.6	+0.1	nd				
Thomsen 1987[122] Denmark [3307307]	Early post-menopause, Women	Weight	2°	1 y	Ca lactate-gluconate & carbonate 2000 mg	14	Kg	60.6	+0.4	-2.4, 3.2[B]	-0.2	-8.0, 7.6[B]	NS	C
					Placebo	14		66.4	+0.6	-6.7, 7.9[B]				
Bortolotti 2008[124] Switzerland [18842771]	Mean (SE) 22 (1.2) y, Both	Weight	2°	5 wk	Ca phosphate 800 mg	10[E]	Kg	78.1	Final 80.0		Diff Final +0.4	-5.7, +6.5	NS	B
					Placebo				79.6					
Energy Restricted														

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008[123] Czech Rep [17552880]	49 (SD) y, Women	Weight	2°	3 wk	Ca carbonate 500 mg + 350 mg Ca in diet (4.5 MJ/d)	21	Kg	85.37	-4.34	-4.9, -3.8	-0.47	-1.4, 0.4[B]	NS	B
					Lactoval (Ca phosphate, citrate, & lactate) 500 mg + 350 mg Ca in diet (4.5 MJ/d)	25		84.95	-3.34	-4.0, -2.6	+0.53	-0.5, 1.5[B]	NS	
					Placebo + 350 mg Ca in diet (4.5 MJ/d)	21		83.43	-3.87	-4.6, -3.2				
Cifuentes 2004[119] New Jersey [15213038]	52-75 y, Women	Weight	1°	6 wk	Ca citrate 1200 mg (>=2.5% wt loss goal)	16	Kg	71.5	-3.6	-6.4, -0.8[B]	-0.3[E]	-4.8, 4.2	NS	B
					Ca citrate 400 mg (>=2.5% wt loss goal)	16		74.5	-3.3	-6.8, 0.2[B]				

[A] Subgroup data available for black and white men and women (4 groups). No substantive differences among groups. All statistically nonsignificant.
[B] Estimated from reported data
[C] Adjusted for multiple factors, including baseline weight.
[D] No data on calcium type
[E] Crossover study
[F] Adjusted for multiple factors, including baseline weight

Calcium and Cancer

Cancer from all cause and total cancer mortality.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic review evaluated associations between calcium intake and incidence of all cancer and total cancer mortality. One RCT showed a borderline nonsignificant reduction of the risk of total cancer among healthy postmenopausal women (>55 years old) living in Nebraska (latitude 41°N) who received calcium supplementation (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d). However, one cohort study analyzed US AARP cohort (men and women 50-71 y) showed that that total calcium intake was not associated with the risk of total cancer incident.

There is insufficient data to draw a conclusion regarding association between dietary calcium intakes and total cancer mortality.

Detailed presentation (Tables 54, 55, 56 & 57).

A 4-year population-based RCT,[52] sampled from a 9-county, largely rural area in eastern Nebraska (latitude 41°N), aimed to compare the efficacy of vitamin D_3 (1000 IU/d) plus calcium (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d) or calcium alone (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d) to placebo in reducing fracture incidence. Incidence of cancer was a secondary outcome of this trial. A total of 743 postmenopausal women over 55 years old were analyzed for the effect of calcium supplementation alone. The mean serum 25(OH)D concentration at baseline was 72 nmol/L.

At the end of study the relative risk of developing cancer was 0.53 (95 percent CI 0.27, 1.03; P=0.06) comparing calcium supplementation (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d) to the placebo. This study was rated B.

A cohort study analyzed data from AARP (the American Association of Retired Persons) members, aged 50 to 71 years old, living in six specific states in the US.[125] During 3,383,377 person-years of followup (over 7 years), a total of 36,965 cancer cases in men and 16,605 cancer cases in women were identified. The results showed that that total calcium intake was not associated with the risk of total cancer after controlling for potential risk factors pertinent to individual cancers. Methodological quality of this study was rated B.

Findings by age, sex and/or ethnicity.

A cohort study analyzing a total of 1553 men and 1397 women, aged between 40 and 65 years, living in Amsterdam (52°N) showed that there was no significant association between dietary calcium from foods and total cancer mortality in either men or in women after 28 years of followup.[126] This study was rated C because the food frequency questionnaire was not internally validated and could not estimate usual intake through 1-week food frequency recall.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data

- **19 – 50 y** A cohort study in Amsterdam included some men and women in this life stage. However, this study provided insufficient data regarding association between dietary calcium intakes and total cancer mortality.
- **51 – 70 y** The cohort study in Amsterdam also included some men and women in this life stage. However, this study provided insufficient data regarding association between dietary calcium intakes and total cancer mortality. One study analyzed US AARP cohort with men and women in this life stage showed that that total calcium intake was not associated with the risk of total cancer incident
- **≥71 y** No data
- **Postmenopause** One RCT with healthy postmenopausal women showed a borderline nonsignificant reduction of risk of total cancer by calcium supplementation (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d).
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Table 54. Calcium and total cancer mortality: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Lappe 2007[52] Nebraska, US 41º N [17556697]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Mentally and physically fit 67 (7.3) 0	25(OH)D: 71.8 nmol/L	Vit D_3 1000 IU/d + Ca (citrate 1400 mg/d or carbonate 1500 mg/d) vs. Ca (citrate 1400 mg/d or carbonate 1500 mg/d) vs. placebo		

Table 55. Calcium and total cancer incidence or mortality: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Cohort												
Park 2009[125] NIH-AARP US 38º N [19237724]	• Health status • Mean age (range/), y • Male (%)	No cancer 50-71 60	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ (NCI-DHQ) USDA Nutrient Database y	Total cancer risk stratified by quintile of total calcium intake	X	X	X	X		X	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement
Slob 1993[126] Amsterdam 52° N [8478144]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	nd 53 (40-65) 51	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ no	Cancer mortality stratified by dietary calcium intake quintiles (from foods only)	X	X					

Table 56. Calcium and total cancer mortality: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Lappe 2007[52] nd [17556697]	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (all causes)	2°	4	Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	17	445	RR Ca/placebo	0.53	0.27, 1.03	0.06	B
					Placebo	20	288					
	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (restrict to subjects who were free of cancer at 1 y intervention)	2°	4	Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	15	416	RR Ca/placebo	0.59	0.29, 1.21	0.147	
					Placebo	18	266					

Table 57. Calcium and total cancer incidence or mortality: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Park 2009 NIH-AARP[125] [19237724]	**50-71, males**	Total cancer (36,965/3,383,377 person-years)	7 y	526	36,965 (total)	3,383,377 person-years (total, both males and females)	**1 (HR)**	**Reference**	0.74	B
				498			0.99	0.96, 1.03		
				857			0.99	0.96, 1.03		
				1073			0.95[A]	0.96, 1.03		
				1530			0.99	0.95, 1.03		
	50-71, females	Total cancer (16,605/3,383,377 person-years)	7 y	494	16,605 (total)	3,383,377 person-years (total, both males and females)	**1 (HR)**	**Reference**	0.23	
				717			0.98	0.93, 1.03		
				969			0.94	0.89, 0.99*		
				1296			0.93	0.88, 0.98*		
				1881			0.96	0.91, 1.02		
Slob 1993[126] nd [8478144]	40-65 y, males	Cancer mortality (232/1553; 0.15)	28 y	≤585	nd	nd	1.0	0.6, 1.6	nd	C
				585 to ≤725	nd	nd	1.0	0.6, 1.6		
				725 to ≤935	nd	nd	1.0	0.6, 1.5		
				935 to ≤1245	nd	nd	0.8	0.5, 1.3		
				>1245	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**		
	40-65 y, females	Cancer mortality (127/1397; 0.09)	28 y	≤445	nd	nd	1.1	0.6, 2.1	nd	
				445 to ≤540	nd	nd	0.8	0.4, 1.5		
				540 to ≤640	nd	nd	1.6	0.9, 2.8		
				640 to ≤850	nd	nd	1.4	0.7, 2.5		
				>850	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**		

[A] Not a reasonable number based on the reported confidence interval; probably a typographical error in the article.

Prostate cancer.

We reviewed primary studies that evaluated associations between calcium intake and incidence and mortality of prostate cancer.

Synopsis.

No trials of calcium interventions evaluated prostate cancer. Four cohort studies rated A in methodological quality reported on the association between total calcium intake and the risk of prostate cancer. Three studies found significant associations between higher calcium intake and increased risk of prostate cancer. One study found the risk was higher in the group that took more than 1500 mg/d of calcium compared to those that took less than 700 mg/d (adjusted RR 1.3). A second study found only the group that took more than 2000 mg/d of calcium had higher risk of prostate cancer compared to those that took 500 to 749 mg/d of calcium (adjusted RR 1.26). A third study also found that male smokers who took more than 2000 mg/d of calcium had higher risk compared to those who took less than 1000 mg/d (adjusted RR 1.63). The fourth study found no relation between calcium intake (<500 to ≥2000 mg/d) and the risk of prostate cancer in men aged 50-70 years.

Detailed presentation (Tables 58 & 59; Figure 13).

A total of 12 cohort studies in 13 publications reported on the association between calcium intake and the risk of prostate cancer.[56,127-138] One of the studies also provided a post hoc analysis of an RCT on calcium supplement.[56] The incidence of prostate cancer in these studies ranged from 0.008 to 0.10. Most of the studies were conducted in Europe or North America, one study was conducted in Japan. Mean age of the subjects ranged from 53 to 67 years. Total calcium intake ranged from less than 500 mg/d to at least 2000 mg/d. Time between dietary assessment and the diagnosis of prostate cancer varied from 1 to 17 years. Methodological quality of four studies was rated A, seven studies were rated B, and one study was rated C.

19-50 years.

No study specifically targeted men between 19 to 50 years old.

51-70 years.

Twelve studies reported data on subjects with a mean age ranged from 53 to 67 years. Seven studies did not find an association between calcium intake and the risk of prostate cancer.[56,130,131,133,134,136,137] Five studies found that the risk was higher in the groups that took more calcium compared to the groups that took lower amount (adjusted OR 1.2-2.2).[127,129,132,135,138] The higher amount ranged from 921 to at least 2000 mg/d of calcium; the lower amount ranged from 455 to 1000 mg/d. Three studies also reported on the association between calcium intake and mortality from prostate cancer. Two studies found no association[130,134] and one study found an increased risk comparing the group that took at least 2000 mg/d of calcium with the group that took 500 to 749 mg/d (adjusted RR 2.02, 95 percent CI 1.14, 3.58).[129] One study was a post hoc analysis of an RCT of high calcium supplement (1200 mg/d) to prevent colorectal adenoma.[56] This study did not find an increased risk of prostate cancer in those supplemented with calcium compared to those who were not (unadjusted RR 0.83, 95 percent CI 0.52, 1.32). This study did not adjust for factors potentially relevant to prostate cancer.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No study specifically targeted men 19 to 50 years old.
- **51 – 70 y** Seven studies did not find an association between calcium intake and the risk of prostate cancer. Five studies found that the risk was higher in the groups that took more calcium compared to the groups that took lower amount (adjusted OR 1.2-2.2). The higher amount ranged from 921 to at least 2000 mg/d; the lower amount ranged from 455 to 1000 mg/d.
- **≥71 y** No study specifically targeted men older than 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not applicable

Table 58. Calcium and prostate cancer: Characteristics of observational studies

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	Comments
Park 2007[134] NIH-AARP Diet & Health US (multiple latitudes) [18000020]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	12% current smoker 50-71(est.) 100	Dietary assessment method Internal validation? (y/n)	124-item FFQ y	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of calcium (dietary and supplement combined)	X	X	X	X		X	92% white; Total Ca (both)
Rodriguez 2003[135] CPS II Nutrition Cohort US (multiple latitudes) [12869397]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	9.5% current smoker 64 100	Dietary assessment method Internal validation? (y/n)	68-item FFQ (modified Block) y	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of calcium (dietary and supplement combined & dietary calcium alone)	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (both)
Giovannucci 2006[128] 2007[129] HPFS US (multiple latitudes) [16492906] [17450530]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	~10% current smoker 40-75 100	Dietary assessment method Internal validation? (y/n)	Semi-quantitative FFQ y	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of calcium (dietary and supplement combined)	X	X	X	X		X	>91% white; Total Ca (both)
Mitrou 2007[132] ATBC Finland (60°N) [17106437]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	all smokers 57 (est.) 100	Dietary assessment method Internal validation? (y/n)	276-item FFQ y	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of calcium (dietary and supplement combined)	X	X	X	X		X	100% white; Total Ca (food)
Park 2007[133] MCS, HI, CA US (multiple latitudes) [17925283]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	~17% current smoker 45-75 100	Dietary assessment method Internal validation? (y/n)	self-administered FFQ y	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of dietary calcium	X	X	X			X	~equal % of African Americans, native Hawaiians, Japanese Americans, Hispanics, whites; Total Ca (both)

continued

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	Comments
Chan 2001[127] PHS US (multiple latitudes) [11566656]	Health status	on ASA, β-carotene, placebo trial; ~11% current smoker	Dietary assessment method	short self-administered questionnaire	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of dietary calcium		X	X			X	Total Ca (dairy)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	53										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	n								
Koh 2006[130] HAH US (multiple latitudes) [17106437]	Health status	7.5% smoker	Dietary assessment method	23-item FFQ (Willett 1985, 1987)	Prostate cancer risk stratified by different intakes of dietary calcium	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (dairy)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	67										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	n								
Schurrman 1999[137] Netherlands Cohort (52°N) [10362125]	Health status	nd	Dietary assessment method	150-item semi-quantitative FFQ	Prostate cancer risk stratified by quintile of dietary calcium intakes	X	X					Total Ca (food)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	61										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	n								
Kurahashi 2008[131] Japan PHC (multiple latitudes) [18398033]	Health status	~44% current smoker	Dietary assessment method	FFQ	Prostate cancer risk stratified by quartiles of dietary calcium intakes	X	X				X	Total Ca (food)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	45-74										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	y								
Rohrmann 2007[136] WCC, MD US (39ºN) [17315319]	Health status	17% current smoker	Dietary assessment method	60-item FFQ (Block)	Prostate cancer risk stratified by tertiles of calcium intakes (dietary and supplement combined)	X	X	X				99% white; Total Ca (both)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	54										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	n								

continued

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	
Tseng 2005[138] NHEFS US (multiple latitudes) [15883441]	Health status	nd	Dietary assessment method	105-item FFQ	Prostate cancer risk stratified by tertiles of calcium intakes (dietary and supplement combined)	X	X			X	X	88% white; 11% black; Total Ca (both)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	58(14.6)										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	n								
Baron 2005[56] CPP US (multiple latitudes) [15767334]	Health status	had >1 colon adenoma removal	Dietary assessment method	FFQ (Block, 1986)	Prostate cancer risk stratified by tertiles of dietary calcium intakes	X	X					5% black; Total Ca (suppl)
	Mean age (range/SD), y	62 (8.7)										
	Male (%)	100	Internal validation? (y/n)	N								

Table 59. Calcium and prostate cancer: Results of observational studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage (male), y	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca intake in mg/d	No. of Cases	Total no. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Park 2007[134] NIH-AARP Diet & Health [18000020]	51-70	Prostate cancer (10,180/293,888; 0.035)	8 y	<500	767	nd	1.01	0.93, 1.10	0.41	A
				500-<750	2927	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				750-<1000	2808	nd	0.99	0.93, 1.04		
				1000-<1500	2572	nd	0.99	0.93, 1.05		
				1000-<1500	2572	nd	0.99	0.93, 1.05		
				≥2000	309	nd	0.97	0.85, 1.10		
		Mortality Prostate cancer		<500	11	nd	0.76	0.38, 1.53	0.99	
				500-<750	43	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				750-<1000	56	nd	1.50	0.97, 2.32		
				1000-<1500	50	nd	1.42	0.86, 2.35		
				1500-<2000	18	nd	1.05	0.54, 2.05		
				≥2000	0	nd	-	-		
Rodriguez 2003[135] CPS II [12869397]	51-70	Prostate cancer (3811/65,321; 0.058)	≤7 y	<700	1323	23,653	**1**	**Reference**	0.02	A
				700-999	1293	nd	1.0	0.9, 1.1		
				1000-1499	835	nd	1.0	0.9, 1.1		
				1500-1999	265	nd	1.3	1.1, 1.5*		
				≥2000	95	1330	1.2	1.0, 1.6*		
Giovannucci 2006[128] 2007[129] HPFS [16492906] [17450530]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (3544/47,750; 0.074)	≤16 y	<500	183	nd	0.98	0.84, 1.15	0.10	A
				750-999	1099	nd	1.07	0.98, 1.16		
				500-749	1072	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				1500-1999	207	nd	1.06	0.91, 1.23		
				1000-1499	898	nd	1.03	0.94, 1.14		
				≥2000	85	nd	1.28	1.02, 1.60*		
		Mortality Prostate cancer		<500	21	nd	1.05	0.65, 1.69	0.01	
				750-999	81	nd	0.95	0.70, 1.28		
				500-749	94	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				1500-1999	26	nd	1.56	1.0, 2.43*		
				1000-1499	76	nd	1.04	0.77, 1.42		
				≥2000	14	nd	2.02	1.14, 3.58*		

Continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage (male), y	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca intake in mg/d	No. of Cases	Total no. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Mitrou 2007[132] ATBC [17106437]	51-70	Prostate cancer (1267/27,028; 0.047)	≤17 y	<1000[A]	151	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				1000-1499	611	nd	1.28	1.07, 1.54*	<0.0001	A
				1500-1999	402	nd	1.38	1.14, 1.67*		
				≥2000	103	nd	1.63	1.27, 2.10*		
Park 2007[133] MCS [17925283]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (4404/82,483; 0.053)	8 y	<470	706	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				470-692	925	nd	1.03	0.93, 1.15	0.69	B
				692-935	949	nd	1.04	0.93, 1.17		
				935-1300	936	nd	1.05	0.93, 1.18		
				≥1301	888	nd	1.04	0.91, 1.20		
Chan 2001[127] PHS [11566656]	51-70	Prostate cancer (1012/20,885; 0.048)	≤11 y	0-150[A]	155	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				151-300	206	nd	1.21	0.96, 1.53	0.05	B
				301-600	377	nd	1.35	1.09, 1.66*		
				>600	274	nd	1.29	1.04, 1.62*		
Koh 2006[130] HAH [17106437]	51-70	Prostate cancer (815/10,011; 0.081)	≤10 y	0-199[A]	209	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				200-449	167	nd	0.81	0.64, 1.02	0.64	
				450-599	238	nd	0.91	0.73, 1.14		
				≥600	201	nd	0.91	0.70, 1.18		B
		Mortality Prostate cancer		0-199	30	nd	**1.00**	**Reference**		
				200-449	21	nd	0.57	0.27, 1.19	0.52	
				450-599	23	nd	0.60	0.29, 1.22		
				≥600	25	nd	0.81	0.38, 1.71		
Schuurman 1999[137] Netherlands Cohort [10362125]	51-70	Prostate cancer (704/58,279; 0.012)	≤6.3 y	602[A,B]	120	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				780	126	nd	1.10	0.80, 1.51	0.34	B
				911	127	nd	1.04	0.76, 1.42		
				1064	140	nd	1.21	0.89, 1.66		
				1329	129	nd	1.09	0.79, 1.50		
Kurahashi 2008[131] Japan PHC [18398033]	19-50 51-70	Prostate cancer (329/43,435; 0.008)	≤7.5 y	283[A,B]	56	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				404	68	nd	1.03	0.70, 1.51	0.16	B
				522	98	nd	1.32	0.92, 1.90		
				725	107	nd	1.24	0.85, 1.81		
Rohrmann 2007[136] WCC [17315319]	51-70	Prostate cancer (199/3892; 0.051)	≤15 y	<686	58	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				686-958	65	nd	0.98	0.72, 1.47	0.99	B
				>958	76	nd	0.99[C]	0.70, 1.41		

Continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage (male), y	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca intake in mg/d	No. of Cases	Total no. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Tseng 2005[138] NHEFS [15883441]	51-70	Prostate cancer (131/3779; 0.035)	7.7 y	455[B]	28	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.001	B
				642	37	nd	1.0	0.6, 1.7		
				921	66	nd	2.2	1.4, 3.5*		
Baron 2005[56] CPP [15767334]	51-70	Prostate cancer (70/672; 0.10)	≤12 y	<675[A,B]	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.51	C
				675-991	nd	nd	1.48	0.81, 2.70		
				>991	nd	nd	1.20	0.64, 2.23		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)
[A] Dietary calcium
[B] median of tertile, quartile or quintile
[C] Adjusted hazard ratio

Figure 13. Prostate cancer risk stratified by calcium intake



Colorectal cancer.

Synopsis.

This synopsis is based on one systematic review, 19 cohort studies in 20 publications, and one nested case-control study. The systematic review of two RCTs that evaluated high risk population found no difference in colorectal cancer incidence between those participants who received supplemental calcium and those who did not. Among five cohort studies and one nested case-control study with methodological quality B, two cohort studies showed a significant inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer. Among 14 cohort studies with methodological quality C, five studies showed a significant inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer, one found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colon cancer, and two showed an inverse association between calcium and rectal cancer. All the studies that found a significant association recruited men or women who were followed for a period that ranged between 1.4 and 11.3 years. None of these studies included participants younger than 45 years.

Detailed presentation (Tables 60, 61, 62 & 63; Figures 14, 15, 16, 17 & 18)

One systematic review of two RCTs of supplemental calcium on prevention of recurrent colorectal adenoma comprising 1346 adults (mean age 59 to 61 years) examined colorectal cancer incidence.[139] A fixed-effects model meta-analysis found no significant difference in colorectal cancer incidence between supplemental calcium and no supplements. This meta-analysis is considered inconclusive because only 5 colorectal cancer cases were diagnosed during the study period.

Nineteen cohort studies in 20 publications[125,140-158] and one nested case-control study[159] evaluated the association between calcium intake and colorectal, colon, or rectal cancer. Sample sizes ranged from 1954 to 492,810. Half of the studies were conducted in the US (latitude ranged from 21° N to 54° N),[125,140,142,144,145,147,150-152,154,155,158] one study was conducted in China (latitude 31° N),[149] and the rest were conducted in Europe including France (latitude 46° N),[141] the Netherlands (latitude 52° N),[159] the United Kingdom (latitude ranged between 54° N and 55° N),[156] and Scandinavia (latitude ranged between 59° N and 69° N).[143,146,148,153,157] For colorectal cancer, the incidence ranged from 0.003 to 0.025 for cohorts, while in the nested case-control study, the colorectal cancer incidence was 0.142; for colon cancer, the incidence ranged from 0.003 to 0.024; and for rectal cancer, the incidence ranged from 0.003 to 0.004. The participants' mean age ranged from 7.6 to 61.9 years. Average followup ranged from 1.4 to 19.6 years. Only one study reported that exposure assessors were blinded to outcome.[154] No studies mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded to exposure. None of the studies reported power calculations. The majority of the studies evaluated the potential effect of various factors besides calcium on colorectal cancer. All performed analyses adjusted at least for age. Except for four studies[151,156-158] that used dietary history, all other studies used a food frequency questionnaire to assess dietary intake. More than half of the studies did not confirm all or part of cancer cases with pathology reports. Six studies[125,140-143,159] were rated B, and 15 publications[144-158] were rated C for methodological quality.

Findings by age, sex and/or ethnicity.

One cohort study analyzed a total of 4374 children (IQR 4-11 years old) living in the United Kingdom. It found no significant association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer in these children after 65 years of followup.[156]

One cohort study analyzed a total of 127,749 adults aged between 50 and 74 years old living in US. It found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer.[145] However, another cohort study and one nested case-control study did not find such an association.[157,159] The only cohort study that analyzed subjects older than 15 years did not find a significant association between total calcium intake and colon cancer as well as rectal cancer in subgroup analyses.[157] Out of seven cohort studies[125,140,143-145,148,154] that analyzed male adults older than 40 years living in US, or Scandinavia, five[125,143-145,148] found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer. Out of eleven cohort studies[125,140-142,144-147,149,154,155] that analyzed women, four[125,144,146,147] found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer.

Out of four cohort studies[145,148,151,153] that analyzed men, one[145] found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colon cancer in a subgroup analysis. Out of four cohort studies[146,147,150,153] that analyzed women, none found an association between total calcium intake and colon cancer. For rectal cancer, one[148] of two[145,148] studies that analyzed men and one[152] of three[146,147,152] studies that analyzed women found an inverse association between total calcium intake and rectal cancer.[148,152]

One cohort study in the US found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer in a subgroup analysis of Japanese Americans aged 45 to 75 years, and a borderline inverse association in Caucasians of the same age range; however, the same cohort study did not find any significant association in subgroup analyses of African Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Latinos.[144] Another cohort study in the US that recruited only Japanese American men living in Hawaii did not find an association between total calcium intake and colon cancer.[151] One cohort study did not find any association in Chinese women (aged 40 to 70 years) living in Shanghai,[149]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** One study that followed up children with an interquartile range of age of 4 to 11 years for 65 years found no significant association between total calcium intake at baseline and the risk of colorectal cancer.
- **9 – 18 y** Three studies included some children and/or adolescents in this life stage, but no studies adequately evaluated this life stage.
- **19 – 50 y** Four studies included people with a mean or median age ranging from 39 to 50 years. No significant association was found between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer risk. Ten additional studies may have included participants in this life stage; however in these studies, no conclusions are possible for the subgroup in this life stage.
- **51 – 70 y** One inconclusive meta-analysis of 2 RCTs in adults with previous adenomatous polyps (mean age 59-61 years) found no significant difference in colorectal cancer incidence between those who were and those who were not supplemented at followup. Ten studies included people with a mean or median age ranged from 53 to 69

years. An association between higher total calcium intake and lower colorectal cancer risk was found in three studies in men and two studies in women. Another study of women found an association between higher total calcium intake and lower rectal cancer risk. Ten additional studies may also have included participants in this life stage An association between higher total calcium intake and lower colorectal cancer risk was found in two studies in men and two studies in women. However in these studies, the results are inconclusive for the subgroup in this life stage.

- **71+** One study that specifically included people in the retirement community found no association between total calcium intake and colorectal cancer risk. Nine additional studies may have also recruited participants in this life stage; however in these studies, no conclusions are possible for the subgroup in this life stage.
- **Postmenopause** One study focused on postmenopausal women. This study found an association between higher calcium intake and lower rectal cancer risk. However, it did not find any association for colon cancer risk.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Table 60. Systematic review of calcium supplementation and colorectal cancer incidence or adenoma recurrence

Author Year [PMID]	Weingarten, 2008[139] [18254022]
Design	Randomized controlled trials: Cochrane Library Issue 2, 2007, the Cochrane Colorectal Cancer Group (CCCG) specialized register, MEDLINE (1966 to July 2007), Cancerlit (1963 to April 2002), Embase (1980 to July 2007)
Population	Healthy adults and studies of adults at higher risk of colon cancer due to family history, previous adenomatous polyps, or inflammatory bowel disease
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Calcium (>1200 mg/d) vs. placebo
Results	Calcium vs. placebo Colorectal cancer incidence: OR 0.34, CI 0.05-2.15, P=0.20 (I^2=0%) Colorectal adenoma recurrence: OR 0.74; 95%CI 0.58, 0.95, P=0.02 (I^2=0%) At least one adverse event requiring discontinuation: OR 0.93; 95% CI 0.42, 2.05, P=0.80
Comments	Based only on two RCTs (1346 participants). Heterogeneity due to different dose of supplementation (one RCT supplemented with 1200 mg/d and the other RCT with 2000 mg/d). Analysis based on fixed effects model; however, considering there are only two studies, random effects model might have been more appropriate. The result of no significant difference in colorectal cancer incidence is inconclusive since there were only 5 colorectal cancer cases during the study period. Analysis on adverse events is based only on reported data of one out of the two RCTs (Barron 1999).[160] Only participants with high risk due to previous adenomas were recruited in these two RCTs; therefore, applicability of the results can only be considered for high risk population. Insufficient evidence to recommend the general use of calcium supplements to prevent colorectal adenoma or colorectal cancer

AMSTAR

A priori design?	X	**Study quality assessment performed?**	X
Two independent reviewers?	X	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	X
Comprehensive literature search?	X	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	X
All publication types and languages included?		**Publication bias assessed?**	
Included and excluded studies listed?	X	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	X
Study characteristics provided?	X		

Table 61. Calcium and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of observational studies

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	Seasons	Life styles	
Cohort												
Park, 2009[125] NIH-AARP Diet & Health (various) US [19237724]	• Health status • Mean age range, yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women 50-71 60	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Semi-quantitative FFQ (NCI-DHQ) y	CRC across 5 categories of total calcium intake	X	X	X	X		X	White Male ~92%; Female ~89%; Total Ca (both)
Wu, 2002[140] HPFS NHS (various) US [11904316]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	HPFS: generally healthy male health professionals NHS: generally healthy female nurses HPFS: 54.4 NHS: 46.6 HPFS: 100 NHS: 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	HPFS: 131-item semi-quantitative FFQ (by Willet) NHS: 61-item semi-quantitative FFQ (by Willet) y	For HPFS, NHS separately: CRC across 7 categories of cumulative average calcium intake	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
Kesse, 2005[141] Etude Epidémiologique auprès de femmes de l'Education Nationale France (46°N) [15880532]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy women 52.7 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ y	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
Lin, 2005[142] WHS US (various) [15800268]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy women nd 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	131-item FFQ y	CRC across total calcium intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)

continued

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	Seasons	Life styles	
Pietinen, 1999[143] ATBC Finland (~64°N) [10530608]	• Health status	Generally healthy men; smokers	• Dietary assessment method	276-item FFQ	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
	• Mean age (range/SD), yr	Median, cases: 60.1; non cases: 57.1										
	• Male (%)	100	• Internal validation? (y/n)	y								
Park, 2007[144] The Multiethnic Cohort Study US (various) [17215380]	• Health status	Generally healthy men and women	• Dietary assessment method	FFQ	CRC per gender across total calcium intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
	• Mean age (range/SD), yr	nd										
	• Male (%)	45	• Internal validation? (y/n)	y								
McCullough, 2003[145] CPS II US (various) [12708719]	• Health status	Generally healthy men and women	• Dietary assessment method	68-item semi-quantitative FFQ (modification of the brief Health Habits and History Questionnaire (HHHQ) by Block)	CRC across total calcium intake quintiles Subgroup analyses per gender For men, subgroup analyses per site (colon, rectal)	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
	• Mean age (range/SD), yr	nd										
	• Male (%)	48	• Internal validation? (y/n)	y								
Shin, 2006[149] Shanghai Women's Health Study China (31°N) [17019716]	• Health status	Generally healthy women	• Dietary assessment method	77-item FFQ used in Shanghai Women's Health Study	CRC across total calcium intake quintiles Subgroup analyses per site (colon, rectal)	X	X		X		X	Chinese; Total Ca (food)
	• Mean age (range/SD), yr	Cases: 59 (8.5); non-cases: 52 (9.1)										
	• Male (%)	0	• Internal validation? (y/n)	y								

continued

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	Seasons	Life styles	
Terry, 2002[146] Swedish Mammography Screening Cohort Sweden (59°N) [12467133]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy women nd 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Self-administered 67-item FFQ y	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles Subgroup analyses per site (colon, rectal) Subgroup analyses per age (< 55 vs. ≥ 55 years old) and site (colon, rectal)	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
Gaard,1996[153] nd Norway (60°-69°N) [9061275]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women 43 49	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	semi-quantitative FFQ (Oslo University) y	Colon cancer per gender across total calcium intake quartiles		X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
Flood, 2005[147] The Breast Cancer Detection Demonstration Project (BCDDP) US (various) [15668485]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy women 61.9 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	62-item semi-quantitative FFQ (by Block) y	CRC cancer across total calcium intake quintiles Subgroup analyses per site (colon, rectal)	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
Larsson, 2006[148] The Cohort of Swedish Men Sweden (59°N) [16522915]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men 60.3 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	96-item semi-quantitative FFQ y	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles Subgroup analyses per site (colon, rectal)	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
Bostick, 1993[150] Iowa Women's Health Study US (40°N) [8333412]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy post-menopausal women 61.5 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	127-item semi-quantitative FFQ (by Willet) y	Colon cancer across total calcium intake quintiles	X	X	X				Same cohort as Zheng 1998; Total Ca (both)

continued

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	Seasons	Life styles	
Zheng, 1998[152] Iowa Women's Health Study US (40°N) [9521437]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy post-menopausal women 61.5 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	127-item semi-quantitative FFQ (by Willet) y	Rectal cancer across total calcium intake tertiles	X	X	X	X		X	Same cohort as Bostick 1993; Total Ca (both)
Kato, 1997[155] New York University Women's Health Study US (various) [9343837]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy women nd 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	70-item semi-quantitative FFQ (slightly modified from Block's) y	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles	X	X					Total Ca (food)
Wu, 1987[154] US (21°N) [3620314]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women nd 33	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	56-item FFQ n	CRC per gender across total calcium intake tertiles		X					Total Ca (dairy)
Jarvinen, 2001[157] nd Finland (64°N) [11641750]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women 39.1 nd	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Diet history y	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles Subgroup analyses per site (colon, rectal)	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
Stemmerman n, 1990[151] Japan Hawaii Cancer Study US (21°N) [2311461]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men nd 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	24-hour diet recall interview y	Colon cancer across total calcium intake tertiles		X					Japanese; Total Ca (food)

continued

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	Seasons	Life styles	
van der Pols, 2007[156] The Boyd Orr Cohort UK (54°-55°N) [8333412]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy children 7.6 49.5	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	7-day household inventory method n	CRC between lowest and highest total calcium intake groups	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
Garland, 1985[158] Western Electric Health Study US (41°N) [2857364]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men 48.7 (4.4) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	28-day diet histories n	CRC across total calcium intake quartiles	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)
Nested case-control												
Kampman, 1994[159] The Netherlands Cohort Study Netherlands (52°N) [8205538]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), yr • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women nd nd	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	150-item semi-quantitative FFQ y	CRC across total calcium intake quintiles	X	X		X		X	Total Ca (food)

Table 62. Calcium and colorectal cancer: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Park, 2009[125] NIH-AARP Diet & Health US (various) [19237724]	Male adult (50-71 y)	CRC (nd)	**526**	nd	nd	84 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.001	B
		CRC (nd)	498	nd	nd	84 mo	0.89	0.80, 0.98*		
		CRC (nd)	857	nd	nd	84 mo	0.83	0.75, 0.93*		
		CRC (nd)	1073	nd	nd	84 mo	0.87	0.78, 0.97*		
		CRC (nd)	1530	nd	nd	84 mo	0.79	0.70, 0.89*		
	Female adult (50-71 y)	CRC (nd)	**494**	nd	nd	84 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.001	
		CRC (nd)	717	nd	nd	84 mo	0.87	0.75, 1.01		
		CRC (nd)	969	nd	nd	84 mo	0.83	0.71, 0.97*		
		CRC (nd)	1296	nd	nd	84 mo	0.71	0.60, 0.84*		
		CRC (nd)	1881	nd	nd	84 mo	0.72	0.61, 0.86*		
Wu 2002[140] HPFS: Health Professionals Follow-up Study NHS: Nurses' Health Study US (various) [11904316]	Male adult (40-75 y)	CRC (nd)	**≤ 500**	47	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.17	B
		CRC (nd)	501-600	48	nd	nd	0.69	0.46, 1.04		
		CRC (nd)	601-700	58	nd	nd	0.69	0.47, 1.01		
		CRC (nd)	701-800	51	nd	nd	0.60	0.40, 0.90*		
		CRC (nd)	801-1000	81	nd	nd	0.67	0.47, 0.97*		
		CRC (nd)	1001-1250	84	nd	nd	0.62	0.42, 0.92*		
		CRC (nd)	>1250	60	nd	nd	0.64	0.43, 0.95*		
	Female adult (30-55 y)	CRC (nd)	**≤ 500**	70	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.35	
		CRC (nd)	501-600	79	nd	nd	1.19	0.86, 1.64		
		CRC (nd)	601-700	83	nd	nd	1.07	0.77, 1.47		
		CRC (nd)	701-800	90	nd	nd	1.18	0.86, 1.63		
		CRC (nd)	801-1000	130	nd	nd	1.04	0.77, 1.40		
		CRC (nd)	1001-1250	106	nd	nd	1.05	0.77, 1.44		
		CRC (nd)	>1250	68	nd	nd	0.94	0.66, 1.33		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Kesse 2005[141] Etude Epidémiologique auprès de femmes de l'Education Nationale France (46°N) [15880532]	Female adult (40-65 y)	CRC (nd)	**<766.22**	163	nd	82.8 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.08	B
		CRC (nd)	766.22-962.63	154	nd	82.8 mo	0.94	0.63, 1.41		
		CRC (nd)	962.63-1201.81	150	nd	82.8 mo	0.78	0.51, 1.19		
		CRC (nd)	> 1201.81	131	nd	82.8 mo	0.72	0.47, 1.10		
Lin 2005[142] The Women's Health Study US (various) [15800268]	Female adult (≥ 45 y)	CRC (41/7691; 0.01)	**<614**	41	7691	120 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.21	B
		CRC (nd)	614-785	31	nd	120 mo	0.74	0.46, 1.18		
		CRC (0.01)	785-1016	52	7690	120 mo	1.19	0.78, 1.81		
		CRC (nd)	1016-1357	41	nd	120 mo	0.92	0.58, 1.44		
		CRC (58/7690; 0.01)	> 1357	58	7690	120 mo	1.20	0.79, 1.85		
Pietinen 1999[143] ATBC Finland (~64°N) [10530608]	Male adult (50-69 y)	CRC (nd)	**Median Q1, 856**	60	nd	96 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.04	B
		CRC (nd)	Median Q2, 1241	41	nd	96 mo	0.7	0.5, 1.0		
		CRC (nd)	Median Q3, 1484	45	nd	96 mo	0.7	0.5, 1.1		
		CRC (nd)	Median Q4, 1789	39	nd	96 mo	0.6	0.6, 0.9*		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Park 2007[144] The Multiethnic Cohort Study US (various) [17215380]	Male adult (45-75 y)	CRC (nd)	**< 288 /1000 kcal**	342	nd	87.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.006	C
		CRC (nd)	288-369 /1000 kcal	271	nd	87.6 mo	1.02	0.86, 1.22		
		CRC (nd)	369-457 /1000 kcal	258	nd	87.6 mo	1.08	0.89, 1.31		
		CRC (nd)	457-611 /1000 kcal	177	nd	87.6 mo	0.85	0.68, 1.07		
		CRC (nd)	≥ 611 /1000 kcal	90	nd	87.6 mo	0.70	0.52, 0.93*		
	Female adult (45-75 y)	CRC (nd)	**< 288 /1000 kcal**	172	nd	87.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.003	
		CRC (nd)	288-369 /1000 kcal	175	nd	87.6 mo	0.77	0.60, 0.97*		
		CRC (nd)	369-457 /1000 kcal	194	nd	87.6 mo	0.76	0.60, 0.97*		
		CRC (nd)	457-611 /1000 kcal	197	nd	87.6 mo	0.74	0.57, 0.94*		
		CRC (nd)	≥ 611 /1000 kcal	234	nd	87.6 mo	0.64	0.50, 0.83*		
McCullough 2003[145] CPS II US (various) [12708719]	Adult (50-74 y)	CRC (nd)	**<561**	156	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	C
		CRC (nd)	561-731	165	nd	nd	1.05	0.84, 1.31		
		CRC (nd)	732-925	137	nd	nd	0.88	0.70, 1.12		
		CRC (nd)	926-1255	108	nd	nd	0.72	0.56, 0.93*		
		CRC (nd)	>1255	117	nd	nd	0.87	0.67, 1.12		
	Male adult (50-74 y)	CRC (nd)	**<561**	89	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.04	
		CRC (nd)	561-731	106	nd	nd	1.01	0.76, 1.34		
		CRC (nd)	732-925	98	nd	nd	0.93	0.70, 1.25		
		CRC (nd)	926-1255	70	nd	nd	0.71	0.52, 0.98*		
		CRC (nd)	>1255	58	nd	nd	0.82	0.58, 1.16		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
		Colon cancer (nd)	**<561**	64	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	
		Colon cancer (nd)	561-731	82	nd	nd	1.08	0.77, 1.50*		
		Colon cancer (nd)	732-925	67	nd	nd	0.89	0.63, 1.27*		
		Colon cancer (nd)	926-1255	51	nd	nd	0.72	0.49, 1.05*		
		Colon cancer (nd)	>1255	38	nd	nd	0.74	0.49, 1.12*		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	**<561**	23	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.71	
		Rectal cancer (nd)	561-731	22	nd	nd	0.78	0.43, 1.41		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	732-925	29	nd	nd	1.02	0.58, 1.79		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	926-1255	16	nd	nd	0.60	0.31, 1.16		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	>1255	19	nd	nd	1.01	0.53, 1.93		
	Female adult (50-74 y)	CRC (nd)	**<561**	67	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.31	
		CRC (nd)	561-731	59	nd	nd	1.16	0.82, 1.66		
		CRC (nd)	732-925	39	nd	nd	0.80	0.54, 1.21		
		CRC (nd)	926-1255	38	nd	nd	0.78	0.51, 1.18		
		CRC (nd)	>1255	59	nd	nd	0.94	0.63, 1.39		
Shin 2006[149] Shanghai Women's Health Study China (31°N) [17019716]	Female adult (40-70)	CRC (nd)	**≤ 291.9**	nd	nd	Median, 68.9 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.48	C
		CRC (nd)	≤ 389.9	nd	nd	Median, 68.9 mo	1.0	0.7, 1.4		
		CRC (nd)	≤ 488.2	nd	nd	Median, 68.9 mo	1.0	0.7, 1.4		
		CRC (nd)	≤ 610.8	nd	nd	Median, 68.9 mo	0.9	0.6, 1.3		
		CRC (nd)	> 610.8	nd	nd	Median, 68.9 mo	0.9	0.6, 1.3		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Terry 2002[146] Swedish Mammography Screening Cohort Sweden (59°N) [12467133]	Female adult (≤ 76 y)	CRC (nd)	**Mean (SD) Q1, 486 (79)**	156	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	C
		CRC (nd)	Mean (SD) Q2, 631 (34)	149	nd	135.6 mo	0.97	0.77, 1.21		
		CRC (nd)	Mean (SD) Q3, 747 (37)	145	nd	135.6 mo	0.95	0.75, 1.20		
		CRC (nd)	Mean (SD) Q4, 914 (136)	122	nd	135.6 mo	0.72	0.56, 0.93*		
		Colon cancer (nd)	**Mean (SD) Q1, 486 (79)**	100	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.06	
		Colon cancer (nd)	Mean (SD) Q2, 631 (34)	97	nd	135.6 mo	0.97	0.74, 1.30		
		Colon cancer (nd)	Mean (SD) Q3, 747 (37)	92	nd	135.6 mo	0.93	0.70, 1.24		
		Colon cancer (nd)	Mean (SD) Q4, 914 (136)	82	nd	135.6 mo	0.74	0.54, 1.01		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	**Mean (SD) Q1, 486 (79)**	55	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.12	
		Rectal cancer (nd)	Mean (SD) Q2, 631 (34)	48	nd	135.6 mo	0.89	0.60, 1.32		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	Mean (SD) Q3, 747 (37)	49	nd	135.6 mo	0.94	0.63, 1.39		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	Mean (SD) Q4, 914 (136)	39	nd	135.6 mo	0.70	0.45, 1.09		
	Female adult (< 55 y)	CRC (nd)	**176-568**	nd	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.77	
		CRC (nd)	568-688	nd	nd	135.6 mo	1.06	0.68, 1.66		
		CRC (nd)	688-816	nd	nd	135.6 mo	1.11	0.71, 1.73		
		CRC (nd)	816-1300	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.91	0.56, 1.48		
	Female adult (≥ 55 y)	CRC (nd)	**176-568**	nd	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.008	
		CRC (nd)	568-688	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.93	0.71, 1.21		
		CRC (nd)	688-816	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.89	0.68, 1.17		
		CRC (nd)	816-1300	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.66	0.49, 0.89*		
	Female adult (< 55 y)	Colon cancer (nd)	**176-568**	nd	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.92	
		Colon cancer (nd)	568-688	nd	nd	135.6 mo	1.32	0.75 2.30		
		Colon cancer (nd)	688-816	nd	nd	135.6 mo	1.02	0.55, 1.85		
		Colon cancer (nd)	816-1300	nd	nd	135.6 mo	1.11	0.60, 2.05		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
	Female adult (≥ 55 y)	Colon cancer (nd)	**176-568**	nd	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	
		Colon cancer (nd)	568-688	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.89	0.64, 1.23		
		Colon cancer (nd)	688-816	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.91	0.65, 1.26		
		Colon cancer (nd)	816-1300	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.64	0.44, 0.92*		
	Female adult (< 55 y)	Rectal cancer (nd)	**176-568**	nd	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.75	
		Rectal cancer (nd)	568-688	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.33	0.34, 1.59		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	688-816	nd	nd	135.6 mo	1.30	0.66, 2.56		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	816-1300	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.70	0.31, 1.62		
	Female adult (≥ 55 y)	Rectal cancer (nd)	**176-568**	nd	nd	135.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.15	
		Rectal cancer (nd)	568-688	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.96	0.61, 1.52		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	688-816	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.79	0.48, 1.29		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	816-1300	nd	nd	135.6 mo	0.70	0.42, 1.19		
Gaard 1996[153] Norway (60°-69°N) [9061275]	Male adult (20-53 y)	Colon cancer (nd)	**<758**	22	nd	134.4 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.15	C
		Colon cancer (nd)	759-912	24	nd	134.4 mo	1.02	0.57, 1.83		
		Colon cancer (nd)	913-1066	24	nd	134.4 mo	1.04	0.58, 1.86		
		Colon cancer (nd)	>1067	13	nd	134.4 mo	0.57	0.29, 1.13		
	Female adult (20-53 y)	Colon cancer (nd)	**<527**	15	nd	134.4 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.94	
		Colon cancer (nd)	528-628	20	nd	134.4 mo	1.25	0.63, 2.46		
		Colon cancer (nd)	629-743	7	nd	134.4 mo	0.46	0.19, 1.12		
		Colon cancer (nd)	>744	18	nd	134.4 mo	1.20	0.60, 2.39		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Flood 2005[147] The Breast Cancer Detection Demonstration Project (BCDDP) US (various) [15668485]	Female adult (nd)	CRC (nd)	**<472**	102	nd	17 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	C
		CRC (nd)	472-635	110	nd	17 mo	1.03	0.79, 1.35		
		CRC (nd)	636-844	86	nd	17 mo	0.80	0.60, 1.06		
		CRC (nd)	845-1270	106	nd	17 mo	0.96	0.73, 1.26		
		CRC (nd)	>1270	80	nd	17 mo	0.74	0.55, 0.99*		
		Colon cancer (nd)	**<472**	nd	nd	17 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.10	
		Colon cancer (nd)	472-635	nd	nd	17 mo	0.84	0.59, 1.18		
		Colon cancer (nd)	636-844	nd	nd	17 mo	0.66	0.46, 0.96*		
		Colon cancer (nd)	845-1270	nd	nd	17 mo	0.78	0.55, 1.11		
		Colon cancer (nd)	>1270	nd	nd	17 mo	0.69	0.48, 0.99*		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	**<472**	nd	nd	17 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.30	
		Rectal cancer (nd)	472-635	nd	nd	17 mo	1.19	0.57, 2.48		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	636-844	nd	nd	17 mo	1.10	0.52, 2.32		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	845-1270	nd	nd	17 mo	1.23	0.60, 2.53		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	>1270	nd	nd	17 mo	0.93	0.43, 2.01		
Larsson 2006[148] The Cohort of Swedish Men Sweden (59°N) [16522915]	Male adult (45-79 y)	CRC (111/11,341; 0.011)	**<956**	127	11,348	80.4 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.01	C
		CRC (107/11295; 0.010)	956-1179	111	11,341	80.4 mo	0.80	0.61, 1.04		
		CRC (104/11,322; 0.009)	1180-1444	107	11,295	80.4 mo	0.73	0.56, 0.96*		
		CRC (67/11,322; 0.009)	>1445	104	11,322	80.4 mo	0.68	0.51, 0.91*		
		Colon cancer (77/11,348; 0.006)	**<956**	67	11,322	80.4 mo	0.72	0.50, 1.04	0.15	
		Colon cancer (70/11,295; 0.007)	956-1179	77	11,348	80.4 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
		Colon cancer (67/11,322; 0.006)	1180-1444	70	11,295	80.4 mo	0.80	0.57, 1.12		
		Colon cancer (50/11,348; 0.006)	>1445	67	11,322	80.4 mo	0.72	0.50, 1.04		
		Rectal cancer (49/11,341; 0.004)	**<956**	50	11,348	80.4 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	
		Rectal cancer (37/11,295; 0.004)	956-1179	49	11,341	80.4 mo	0.91	0.61, 1.37		
		Rectal cancer (37/11,322; 0.003)	1180-1444	37	11,295	80.4 mo	0.63	0.40, 0.98*		
		Rectal cancer (37/11,322; 0.003)	>1445	37	11,322	80.4 mo	0.61	0.38, 0.98*		
Bostick 1993[150] Iowa Women's Health Study US (40°N) [8333412]	Female adult (55-69 y)	Colon cancer (nd)	**<629**	54	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.22	
		Colon cancer (nd)	629-896	44	nd	nd	0.89	0.59, 1.33		
		Colon cancer (nd)	897-1188	42	nd	nd	0.88	0.58, 1.33		
		Colon cancer (nd)	1189-1547	44	nd	nd	0.97	0.63, 1.50		
		Colon cancer (nd)	>1548	28	nd	nd	0.68	0.41, 1.11		
Zheng 1998[152] Iowa Women's Health Study US (40°N) [9521437]	Female adult, (55-69 y)	Rectal cancer (nd)	**<800.8**	56	nd	108 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.02	C
		Rectal cancer (nd)	800.8-1278.7	52	nd	108 mo	0.90	0.61, 1.33		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	≥1278.7	36	nd	108 mo	0.59	0.37, 0.94*		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Kato 1997[155] New York University Women's Health Study US (various) [9343837]	Female adult (34-65 y)	CRC (nd)	**Lowest, Q1 (nd)**	nd	nd	85.2 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.18	C
		CRC (nd)	Q2 (nd)	nd	nd	85.2 mo	1.15	0.67, 1.95		
		CRC (nd)	Q3 (nd)	nd	nd	85.2 mo	0.90	0.52, 1.57		
		CRC (nd)	Highest Q4 (nd)	nd	nd	85.2 mo	0.71	0.39, 1.28		
Wu 1987[154] US (21°N) [3620314]	Male adult (nd)	CRC (nd)	**Low tertile (nd)**	nd	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	ns	C
		CRC (nd)	Medium tertile (nd)	nd	nd	nd	1.19	0.6, 2.2		
		CRC (nd)	High tertile (nd)	nd	nd	nd	0.86	0.4, 1.7		
	Female adult (nd)	CRC (nd)	**Low tertile (nd)**	nd	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	ns	
		CRC (nd)	Medium tertile (nd)	nd	nd	nd	0.9	0.5, 1.6		
		CRC (nd)	High tertile (nd)	nd	nd	nd	0.89	0.5, 1.6		
Jarvinen 2001[157] Finland (64°N) [11641750]	Adolescent and adult (> 15 y)	CRC (nd)	**Male: <1178.2 Female: <862.5**	20	nd	235.2 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.97	C
		CRC (nd)	Male: 1178.2-1557.1 Female: 862.5-1110.7	19	nd	235.2 mo	1.17	0.60, 2.27		
		CRC (nd)	Male: 1557.2-1953.2 Female: 1110.8-1416.6	18	nd	235.2 mo	1.37	0.67, 2.81		
		CRC (nd)	Male: > 1953.3 Female: > 1416.7	15	nd	235.2 mo	1.43	0.61, 3.39		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
		Colon cancer (nd)	**Male: <1178.2 Female: <862.5**	10	nd	235.2 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.17	
		Colon cancer (nd)	Male: 1178.2-1557.1 Female: 862.5-1110.7	14	nd	235.2 mo	1.44	0.61, 3.39		
		Colon cancer (nd)	Male: 1557.2-1953.2 Female: 1110.8-1416.6	9	nd	235.2 mo	1.04	0.38, 2.83		
		Colon cancer (nd)	Male: > 1953.3 Female: > 1416.7	5	nd	235.2 mo	0.63	0.17, 2.35		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	**Male: <1178.2 Female: <862.5**	10	nd	235.2 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.19	
		Rectal cancer (nd)	Male: 1178.2-1557.1 Female: 862.5-1110.7	5	nd	235.2 mo	0.77	0.25, 2.37		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	Male: 1557.2-1953.2 Female: 1110.8-1416.6	9	nd	235.2 mo	1.88	0.67, 5.30		
		Rectal cancer (nd)	Male: > 1953.3 Female: > 1416.7	10	nd	235.2 mo	3.01	0.93, 9.73		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Stemmermann 1990[151] Japan Hawaii Cancer Study US (21°N) [2311461]	Male adult (nd)	Colon cancer (74/2466; 0.02)	Low (nd)	74	2466	nd	1.3	0.9, 1.8	0.16	C
		Colon cancer (57/2456; 0.02)	Medium (nd)	57	2456	nd	1.0	0.7, 1.4		
		Colon cancer (58/2461; 0.03)	High (nd)	58	2461	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**		
van der Pols 2007[156] The Boyd Orr Cohort UK (54°-55°N) [8333412]	Children (IQR 4-11 y)	CRC (nd)	Lowest Q1, (nd)	nd	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.18	C
		CRC (nd)	Highest Q4, (nd)	nd	nd	nd	1.91	0.84, 4.32		
Garland 1985[158] Western Electric Health Study US (41°N) [2857364]	Male adult (40-55 y)	CRC (19/488; 0.04)	102-241 /1000 kcal	19	488	nd	nd	nd	nd	C
		CRC (12/489; 0.02)	242-306 /1000kcal	12	489	nd	nd	nd		
		CRC (12/489; 0.02)	307-383 /1000 kcal	12	489	nd	nd	nd		
		CRC (6/458; 0.01)	384-906 /1000 kcal	6	458	nd	nd	nd		

Table 63. Calcium and colorectal cancer: Results of nested case-control studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) PMID	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Kampman 1994[159] The Netherlands Cohort Study Netherlands (52°N) [8205538]	Adult (55-69 y)	CRC (443/3111, 0.14)	Median Q1, 596	98	623	39.6 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.89	B
			Median Q2, 768	89	619	39.6 mo	0.83	0.58, 1.22		
			Median Q3, 893	87	622	39.6 mo	0.96	0.67, 1.39		
			Median Q4, 1032	81	627	39.6 mo	0.93	0.64, 1.36		
			Median Q5, 1288	88	620	39.6 mo	0.92	0.64, 1.34		

Figure 14 Colorectal cancer risk in both sexes stratified by calcium intake



Figure 15 Colorectal cancer risk in men stratified by calcium intake



Figure 16 Colorectal cancer risk in women stratified by calcium intake



Figure 17 Colon cancer risk stratified by calcium intake



Figure 18. Rectal cancer risk stratified by calcium intake



Colorectal adenoma.

Synopsis.

This synopsis is based on one systematic review, two comparative trials (one post hoc followup study of an RCT and one nonrandomized trial), and four cohort studies. The systematic review that included two RCTs which evaluated high risk population for the prevention of colorectal adenoma recurrence showed a reduction in the risk of colorectal adenoma with calcium supplementation (OR 0.74, 95 percent CI 0.58, 0.95; P=0.02). The B quality long-term followup study of an RCT of calcium supplementation (1200 mg/d) versus placebo in healthy adults showed no significant difference in the risk of recurrence of colorectal adenoma. The nonrandomized comparative trial (methodological quality C) also found a significant reduction in adenoma recurrence risk among healthy adults who received calcium supplementation. Among four cohort studies (methodological quality B), two found an inverse association between total calcium intake and the risk of colorectal adenoma, while the others found no significant association.

Detailed presentation (Tables 64, 65, 66, 67 & 68; Figure 19).

One systematic review included two RCTs that recruited high risk population for colorectal adenoma due to previous adenomatous polyps.[139] A total of 1346 participants were analyzed for the effect of calcium supplementation (1200 to 2000 mg elemental calcium daily). The odds ratio of colorectal adenoma recurrence was 0.74 (95 percent CI 0.58, 0.95; P=0.02), comparing calcium supplementation to the placebo. A B quality post hoc followup analysis[161] of one of the two RCTs that were included in the meta-analysis examined the long-term effect of calcium supplementation to prevent colorectal adenoma recurrence. The trial recruited participants with previous colorectal adenoma, and compared the preventative efficacy of calcium supplementation (1200 mg/d) to placebo. Adenoma recurrence at 4 years was the original primary outcome. During the followup period after the trial treatment, about 50 percent of participants in both groups took some calcium supplements. In 347 participants who underwent colonoscopy during the first 5 years after the intervention period, the relative risk of adenoma recurrence was 0.63 (95 percent CI 0.46, 0.87; P=0.005) comparing calcium supplementation to placebo, whereas no difference was found in 424 participants who underwent colonoscopy in the subsequent 5 to 10 years after the trial treatment.

A nonrandomized comparative study[162] presented the percentage of adenoma recurrence in a group of men and women who underwent polypectomy, and received calcium supplementation (2000 mg/d) as chemoprevention. The same study also presented the percentage of adenoma recurrence in a group of men and women who underwent polypectomy but were not supplemented with calcium. The intervention group included 175 participants while the nonsupplemented group included nine patients. The two groups were followed for an average of 3.1 years. The trial was rated C for methodological quality. In this study,[162] the percentage of participants with adenoma recurrence was lower in the intervention group compared to the nonsupplemented participants (13 percent versus 55 percent); however, no further statistical analysis was provided.

Four cohort studies evaluated the association between calcium intake and colorectal adenoma.[141,163-165] Three studies were conducted in the US (latitude range between 33°N and 38°N), and one in France (latitude 46°N). Sample sizes ranged from 1304 to 48,115. Two studies recruited participants with a history of colorectal adenoma, and the other two recruited

healthy subjects without a history of adenoma. The incidence rate of colorectal adenomas ranged between 0.003 and 0.025. The participants' mean age ranged from 52.7 to 61.1 years. Average followup ranged from 36.8 to 44.4 months. Three of the four studies did not report information on assessor blinding.[141,164,165] All studies assessed dietary intake with food frequency questionnaires and confirmed cases with pathology reports. The quality of all four studies was rated B.

Findings by age and sex.

One cohort study[165] that analyzed men and women (aged 40-80 y) with a history of colorectal adenoma found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal adenoma recurrence after an average of 3.1 years of followup (RR 0.62, highest [>1279 mg/d] compared with lowest intake [<778 mg/d]; P for trend = 0.005). The study did not test statistically whether the strength of the association differed between men and women. Another study of both men and women with previous adenomatous polyps found no significant association between total calcium intake and colorectal adenoma recurrence.

One cohort study that analyzed exclusively women (aged 40-65 y) without a history of colorectal adenoma found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal adenoma (RR 0.80, highest [>1226 mg/d] compared with lowest intake [<786 mg/d]; P for trend = 0.04).[141] Another study of women without previous adenomatous polyps found no significant association.[163]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** One cohort study of women age 30 to 55 years found no association between total calcium intakes and colorectal adenoma. Three additional studies included some men or women in this life stage. Two of these studies reported a significant inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal adenoma. However, their results are inconclusive for adults in this life stage.
- **51 – 70 y** One meta-analysis of 2 RCTs in adults with previous adenomatous polyps (mean age 59 to 61 years) found a significant decrease in colorectal adenoma recurrence in supplemental calcium (1200 to 2000 mg elemental calcium daily) compared to no supplements (odds ratio, 0.74 [95 percent CI 0.58, 0.95]; P=0.02). A long-term followup study of one of the two trials found no difference in recurrence after 5 to 10 years after the intervention. One nonrandomized comparative trial also found a significant reduction in adenoma recurrence risk among healthy adults with a mean age 55 years who received calcium supplementation compared to no supplements (13 percent vs. 55 percent; P value not reported). Two cohort studies evaluated participants with a mean age 53 and 61 years respectively. One additional study recruited adults in this life stage. Two of the three studies, one including adults with a history of adenoma and another including women without adenoma history, found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal adenoma.
- **71+** No studies specifically focused on this life stage. Two studies also included some men and women with a history of adenoma corresponding to this life

stage. One found an inverse association between total calcium intake and colorectal adenoma, while the other did not find such an association.

- **Postmenopause** No data
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Table 64. Calcium and colorectal adenoma: Characteristics of interventional studies

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Vit D & Ca Background Diets	Interventions	Compliance	Comments
RCTs						
Grau, 2007[161] Calcium Polyp Prevention Study[A] US (34°-44°N) [17227996]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women with a recent colorectal adenoma 60.6 71.7	Calcium, mean: 876 mg/d[B]	Elemental calcium,1200 mg/d	nd	Duplicated with Wallace; results during the observational post-intervention phase (5-10 years)
Nonrandomized comparative study						
Duris, 1996[162] nd Slovakia (48°N) [8682453]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women; history of adenomatous polyps after polypectomy 54.7 62	nd	Calcium carbonicum (2 g/d)		No statistical comparison between groups

[A] A post-hoc followup study (Calcium Follow-up Study) of a RCT (Calcium Polyp Prevention Study).
[B] Two percent of the participants in the both groups took calcium supplements during the intervention period. Forty-seven percent in the placebo group and 49 percent in the supplement arm took any calcium supplements during the followup period after the intervention. The dosage was not reported (based on the self-reported data in the earlier report).[160]

Table 65. Calcium and colorectal adenoma: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author, Year Trial/Cohort Name Country (Latitude) [Pubmed ID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	Seasons	Life styles	
Cohort												
Oh, 2007[163] The Nurses Health Study US (38°N) [17379616]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Generally healthy women 30-55 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	61-item semi-quantitative FFQ (by Willet) y	Colorectal adenoma across total calcium intake quintiles	x	x	x	x		x	Total Ca (both)
Kesse, 2005[141] Etude Epidémiologique auprès de femmes de l'Education Nationale France (46°N) [15880532]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Generally healthy women 52.7 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ y	Colorectal adenomas across total calcium intake quartiles	x	x	x			x	Total Ca (both)
Hartman, 2005[164] The Polyp Prevention Trial US (38° N) [15671222]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women; history of at least one colorectal adenoma; 90% Caucasian 61.1 (9.9) 64	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ y	Adenoma recurrence across total calcium intake quintiles	x	x	x	x			Total Ca (both)
Martinez, 2002[165] Wheat Bran Fiber (WBF) trial US (33°N) [12020102]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Generally healthy men and women; history of colorectal adenoma(s) nd 57.1	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	113-item Arizona Food Frequency Questionnaire (AFFQ) y	Adenoma recurrence across total calcium intake quartiles Subgroup analyses per gender	x	x		x			Total Ca (food)

Table 66. Calcium and colorectal adenoma recurrence: Results of RCTs

Author Year Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, mo	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Grau 2007[161] Calcium Polyp Prevention Study US (various) [17227996]	Adult	All adenomas	1°	92.4	Calcium carbonate (1200 mg/d)	82	208	RR	1.09	0.85, 1.39	0.51	B
					Placebo	82	216					

Table 67. Calcium and colorectal adenoma recurrence: Results of nonrandomized comparative study

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, mo	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Duris 1996[162] Slovakia (48°N) [8682453]	Adult (30-75 y)	Adenoma recurrence	nd	37.2	Calcium carbonicum, 2g/d	12	175	RR	nd	nd	nd	C
					No chemoprevention	5	9					

Table 68. Calcium and colorectal adenoma: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Oh 2007[163] The Nurses Health Study US (38°N) [17379616]	Female adult (30-55 y)	Adenoma (nd)	**Median Q1, 584**	nd	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.06	B
		Adenoma (nd)	Median Q2, 779	nd	nd	nd	1.05	0.93, 1.20		
		Adenoma (nd)	Median Q3, 949	nd	nd	nd	0.96	0.84, 1.11		
		Adenoma (nd)	Median Q4, 1139	nd	nd	nd	0.96	0.82, 1.12		
		Adenoma (nd)	Median Q5, 1451	nd	nd	nd	0.88	0.74, 1.04		
Kesse 2005[141] Etude Epidémiologique auprès de femmes de l'Education Nationale France (46°N) [15880532]	Female adult (40-65 y)	Adenoma (nd)	**<785.62**	154	nd	44.4 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.04	B
		Adenoma (nd)	785.62-1226.16	150	nd	44.4 mo	0.97	0.76, 1.22		
		Adenoma (nd)	981.67-1226.16	131	nd	44.4 mo	0.83	0.65, 1.07		
		Adenoma (nd)	>1226.16	156	nd	44.4 mo	0.80	0.62, 1.03		
Hartman 2005[164] The Polyp Prevention Trial US (38° N) [15671222]	Adult (≥ 35 y)	Adenoma recurrence (nd)	**< 666**	156	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.20	B
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	666-814	163	nd	nd	1.12	0.83, 1.51		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	815-969	154	nd	nd	1.02	0.76, 1.38		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	970-1226	150	nd	nd	1.00	0.74, 1.36		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	>1226	131	nd	nd	0.86	0.62, 1.18		

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Follow up Duration (Time to Dx)	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Martinez 2002[165] Wheat Bran Fiber (WBF) trial US (38° N) [12020102]	Adult (40-80 y)	Adenoma recurrence (178/326; 0.55)	**< 778**	178	326	36.8 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	0.005	B
		Adenoma recurrence (175/326; 0.54)	778-996	175	326	36.8 mo	0.94	0.66, 1.32		
		Adenoma recurrence (148/326; 0.45)	997-1279	148	326	36.8 mo	0.68	0.48, 0.97*		
		Adenoma recurrence (138/326; 0.42)	>1279	138	326	36.8 mo	0.62	0.42, 0.90*		
	Male adult (40-80 y)	Adenoma recurrence (nd)	**< 778**	nd	nd	36.8 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	778-996	nd	nd	36.8 mo	1.01	0.68, 1.51		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	997-1279	nd	nd	36.8 mo	0.83	0.54, 1.26		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	>1279	nd	nd	36.8 mo	0.67	0.40, 1.10		
	Female adult (40-80 y)	Adenoma recurrence (nd)	**< 778**	nd	nd	36.8 mo	**1.0**	**Reference**	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	778-996	nd	nd	36.8 mo	0.81	0.40, 1.64		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	997-1279	nd	nd	36.8 mo	0.42	0.21, 1.87		
		Adenoma recurrence (nd)	>1279	nd	nd	36.8 mo	0.52	0.28, 0.98*		

Figure 19. Colorectal adenomatous polyp risk stratified by calcium intake



Breast cancer incidence.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between dietary and supplemental calcium intake and the risk of breast cancer. No RCTs were identified. Six cohort studies compared calcium intake and the risk of breast cancer. In four studies, premenopausal women with calcium intakes in the range of 780-1750 mg/d had a decreased risk of incident breast cancer.[125,166-170] Only one study reported decreased risk of breast cancer in both premenopausal and postmenopausal women for calcium intake ranged from 1250 to 1750 mg/d compared with the lowest quintile of intake of less than 500 mg/d.[168] In two of six studies, there was no association between calcium intake and breast cancer (both overall and by menopausal status).[125,170] Five studies were rated B and one study rated C.

Detailed presentation (Tables 69 & 70; Figure 20).

Six studies recruited a total of 452,398 (ranged from 3600 to 198,903) pre-and postmenopausal women and followed them for a period of 7 to 16 years. The participants had an average age ranged from 47 to 63 years. Four studies conducted in the US and one study conducted in Sweden used validated food frequency questionnaire to quantify calcium intake levels. One study conducted in France used computerized questionnaire to quantify calcium intake levels. The incidence of breast cancer in these studies ranged from 2.5 to 4.8 percent. In four of the six cohort studies, premenopausal women with calcium intakes in the range of 780 to 1750 mg/d had a decreased risk of incident breast cancer compared to those with lowest quintile intake levels in each study. There was no association between calcium intake and breast cancer in the two of six studies.[125,170]

Findings by age and sex.

In subgroup analysis of four cohort studies, premenopausal women had a consistently decreased risk of breast cancer. No association was found for postmenopausal women.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** A cohort study of Nurses' Health Study including women with an average age of 47 years had a decrease risk (RR 0.75, 95 percent CI 0.55, 0.99) in breast cancer among those with calcium intake levels of 1000-1250 mg/d compared to those with intake levels lesser than 500 mg/d.
- **51 – 70 y** Three of the five cohort studies of women with an average age between 51- 63 years, found a decreased risk of breast cancer among those with calcium intakes in the range of 780-1750 mg/d compared to those with lowest quintile intake levels in each study.
- **≥71 y** Not reviewed
- **Postmenopause** Cohort studies did not find an association between breast cancer risk and calcium intake levels among postmenopausal women.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 69. Calcium and breast cancer: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Cohort												
Park 2009 NIH-AARP US 38º N [19237724]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No cancer 50-71	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ (NCI-DHQ) USDA Nutrient Database y	Quintile 1 vs. Quintile 2, 3, 4, 5	x	x	x	x		x	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement
Shin 2002[169] NHS US 38° N [12208895]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No cancer 47 (ND)	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	61 item FFQ USDA Nutrient Database y	500 mg vs. 500-600, 600-700, 700-800, 800-1000, 1000-1250, >1250	x	x	x	x	x	x	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement
McCullough 2005[168] CPS II Nutrition Cohort US 38° N [16365007]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No cancer 63 (ND)	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Modified FFQ of Block et al. y	500 mg vs. 500-750, 750-1000, 1000-1250, 1250-1500, 1500-1750, >1750	x	x	x	x	x	x	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement
Larsson 2009[170] Swedish Mammography Cohort Sweden 62° N [19056569]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No cancer 53.7 (9.7)	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Swedish National Food Administration Database y	<727 vs. 727-862, 863-980, 980-1125, >1125	x	x	x		x	x	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement
Lin J 2007[167] WHS US 38º N [17533208]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No cancer or CVD 55 (55-56)	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Willet method USDA Nutrient Database y	Quintile 1 vs. Quintile 2, 3, 4, 5	x	x	x		x	x	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement

continued

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Kesse-Guyot 2007[166] SU.VI.MAX France 46° N [17536191]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No cancer 51 (6.3)	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	Computerized questionnaires ND	Quintile 1 vs. Quintile 2, 3, 4	x	x	x		x	x	Dietary calcium intake

Table 70. Calcium and breast cancer: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Park 2009[125] NIH-AARP [19237724]	Pre- and Post-menopausal women	Breast cancer (5856/198,903; 2.9%)	7 y	Q1	494	5856	**HR 1**	**Reference**	NS	B
				Q2	717	5856	0.96	0.88-1.04		
				Q3	969	5856	0.95	0.87-1.03		
				Q4	1296	5856	0.94	0.86-1.02		
				Q5	1881	5856	0.98	0.90-1.07		
Shin 2002[169] NHS [12208895]	Pre-menopausal women	Breast cancer (3172/88,381; 3.6%)	16 y	≤ 500	142	ND	**1**	**Reference**	0.05	B
				500-600	106	ND	0.88	0.68, 1.13		
				600-700	133	ND	0.97	0.76, 1.24		
				700-800	119	ND	0.95	0.74, 1.22		
				800-1000	161	ND	0.82	0.64, 1.05		
				1000-1250	104	ND	0.75	0.57, 0.99*		
				>1250	62	ND	0.80	0.58, 1.12		
	Post-menopausal women			≤ 500	240	ND	**1**	**Reference**	NS	
				500-600	216	ND	0.86	0.72, 1.04		
				600-700	293	ND	0.94	0.79, 1.12		
				700-800	292	ND	0.92	0.77, 1.10		
				800-1000	518	ND	0.93	0.79, 1.10		
				1000-1250	433	ND	0.90	0.76, 1.07		
				>1250	353	ND	0.93	0.77, 1.12		
McCullough 2005[168] CPS II Nutrition Cohort [16365007]	Pre- and Post-menopausal women	Breast cancer (2855/68,567; 4.1%)	8 y	≤500	457	10,620	**1**	**Reference**	0.07	B
				500-750	729	17,880	0.91	0.81, 1.02		
				750-1000	581	14,023	0.92	0.81, 1.04		
				1000-1250	407	9120	0.97	0.85, 1.11		
				1250-1500	248	6296	0.84	0.72, 0.98*		
				1500-1750	144	3983	0.76	0.63, 0.92*		
				1750	289	6645	0.91	0.79, 1.06		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Larsson 2009[170] Swedish Mammography Cohort [19056569]	Pre- and Post-menopausal women	Invasive Breast cancer (2952/61,433; 4.8%)	9 y	<727	595	2952	**1**	**Reference**	NS	B
				727-862	595	2952	0.97	0.87-1.09		
				863-980	592	2952	0.95	0.84-1.06		
				980-1125	571	2952	0.93	0.83-1.04		
				>1125	599	2952	0.97	0.87-1.09		
Lin J 2007[167] WHS [17533208]	Pre-menopausal women	Invasive breast cancer (878/31,487; 2.8%)	10 y	<617	70	10,578	**HR 1**	**Reference**	.04	B
				617-789	65	10,578	0.84	0.59, 1.19		
				789-1026	44	10,578	0.60	0.41, 0.88*		
				1026-1366	59	10,578	0.79	0.55, 1.14		
				≥1366	38	10,578	0.61	0.40, 0.92*		
	Post-menopausal women			<617	104	20,909	**HR 1**	**Reference**	NS	
				617-789	116	20,909	1.21	0.95, 1.54		
				789-1026	112	20,909	1.09	0.85, 1.40		
				1026-1366	119	20,909	1.21	0.95, 1.55		
				≥1366	151	20,909	1.17	0.92, 1.50		
Kesse-Guyot 2007[166] SU.VI.MAX trial [17536191]	Pre- and Post-menopausal	Breast cancer (92/3627; 2.5%)	8 y	<807	32	3627	**1**	**Reference**	0.04	C
				807-960	24	3627	0.73	0.42, 1.25		
				961-1144	20	3627	0.65	0.37, 1.14		
				>1144	16	3627	0.50	0.27, 0.91*		
	Post-menopausal			<807	14	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.64	
				807-960	13	nd	0.71	0.33, 1.54		
				961-1144	10	nd	0.67	0.30, 1.53		
				>1144	11	nd	0.76	0.34, 1.70		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
	Pre-menopausal			<807	18	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.01	
				807-960	11	nd	0.77	0.36, 1.66		
				961-1144	10	nd	0.63	0.29, 1.38		
				>1144	5	nd	0.26	0.10, 0.71*		

HR: hazard ratio
*Statistically significant (P<0.05)

Figure 20. Breast cancer risk stratified by calcium intake



Breast Mammographic Density.

Synopsis.

No systematic reviews evaluated the association between dietary and supplemental calcium intake and breast mammographic density. No RCTs of calcium intake evaluated breast mammography density. One prospective cohort study evaluated the association of calcium intake and breast mammographic density.[171] Both premenopausal and postmenopausal women with calcium intakes in the range of 523 mg/d to greater than 1021 mg/d were followed for almost 40 years, and there was no association between calcium intake and breast mammographic density. The methodological quality of this study was rated B.

Detailed presentation (Tables 71 & 72).

One prospective cohort study followed from birth of a British national representative sample of 2547 women and followed them for a period of 53 years.[171] Women had an average age of 51.5 years. Dietary calcium intake was evaluated using 5-day food records. The breast density in women was assessed through mammography at the ages 36, 43, and 53 years. Since the measurement at the age of 53 years was cross-sectional, this has been excluded from our analyses. There was no linear association between dietary calcium intakes in the range of 523 mg/d to greater than 1021 mg/d and breast mammographic density.

Findings by age and sex.

In subgroup analysis by age categories, there was no linear association between calcium intake and breast mammography density.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** There was no linear association between calcium intake in the range of 523 mg/d to greater than 1021 mg/d and breast mammographic density
- **51 – 70 y** No data
- **≥71 y** No data
- **Postmenopause** No data
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 71. Calcium and breast mammography density: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Cohort												
Mishra 2008[171] Medical MRC NSHD UK 54º N [18827811]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	No breast cancer 52	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	5-day food diaries McCance and Widdowson's food table ND	At age 36 y: <523, 524-648, 652-784, 785-940, >941 At age 43 y: <611, 612-735, 736-859, 860-1020, >1021	x	x	x	x		x	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement

Table 72. Calcium and breast cancer: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Mishra 2008[171] Medical MRC NSHD [18827811	Premenopausal women	Breast cancer density (nd; median 21.9%)	~32 y	≤523	133	766	β coefficient 1	Reference	NS	B
			~32 y	524 – 648	143	766	-0.11	-0.33, 0.10		
			~32 y	652 – 784	156	766	-0.05	-0.27, 0.17		
			~32 y	785 – 940	160	766	-0.04	-0.27, 0.19		
			~32 y	≥941	174	766	-0.08	-0.32, 0.17		
			~39 y	≤611	145	755	β coefficient 1	Reference	NS	
			~39 y	612-735	156	755	-0.13	-0.35, 0.09		
			~39 y	736-859	145	755	-0.06	-0.29, 0.17		
			~39 y	860-1020	156	755	-0.11	-0.34, 0.12		
			~39 y	≥1021	153	755	-0.16	-0.42, 0.09		

Pancreatic cancer.

We reviewed primary studies that evaluated associations between calcium intake and incidence of pancreatic cancer.

Synopsis.

Two studies analyzed three US cohorts and found that total daily calcium intake was not associated with the risk of pancreatic cancer in men and women. No RCTs of calcium intake or supplement have evaluated this outcome.

Detailed presentation (Tables 73 & 74).

One study analyzed data from Nurses' Health Study (NHS) and the Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS).[172] The study identified a total of 365 cases of pancreatic cancer (178/75,427 women aged 38 to 65 years from NHS; 178/46,771 men aged 40 to 75 years from HPFS). Comparing the group with at least 1000 mg/d of calcium intake to the group with less than 500 mg/d, there was no significant difference in the relative risk of pancreatic cancer (RR 0.94; 95 percent CI 0.62, 1.41 for overall; 0.75; 95 percent CI 0.43, 1.30 for NHS; 1.23; 95 percent CI 0.67, 2.25 for HPFS). The result was adjusted for age, categories of total vitamin D intake, smoking, diabetes, BMI, height, region of residence, use of multivitamin, and parity (for women). The pancreatic cancer was not stratified into endocrine versus exocrine tumors. Methodological quality of this study was rated A.

Another study analyzed data from AARP (the American Association of Retired Persons) members, aged 50 to 71 years old, living in six specific states in the US.[125] The study identified a total of 717 and 384 cases of pancreatic cancer in men and women over 7 years of followup period, respectively. Pancreatic cancer was one of many other cancer outcomes evaluated in this study. The results showed that that total calcium intake was not associated with the risk of pancreatic cancer after controlling for potential risk factors pertinent to individual cancers. The methodological quality of this study was rated B.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** One study analyzed two US cohorts (NHS [women 38 - 65 y] and HPFS [men 40 -75 y]) and found that total daily calcium intake was not associated with the risk of pancreatic cancer.
- **51 – 70 y** One study analyzed two US cohorts (NHS [women 38 - 65 y] and HPFS [men 40 -75 y]) and found that total daily calcium intake was not associated with the risk of pancreatic cancer. Another study analyzed US AARP cohort with men and women in this life stage found similar result.
- **≥71 y** One study that analyzed HPFS included males up to 75 years old and found that total daily calcium intake was not associated with the risk of pancreatic cancer.
- **Postmenopause** No data
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 73. Calcium and pancreatic cancer: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author, Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demographic	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Life styles	
Skinner 2006[172] NHS, HPFS US (multiple latitudes) [16985031]	Health status Mean age (range/SD), y Male (%)	DM: NHS 3%; HPFS 1% NHS 51; HPFS 55 NHS 0; HPFS 100	Dietary assessment method Internal validation? (y/n)	131-item FFQ (Willet, 1990) y	Pancreatic cancer risk stratified by different intakes of calcium (dietary and supplement combined)	X	X	X	X	X	X	current smoker ~23%
Park 2009[125] NIH-AARP US 38º N [19237724]	• Health status • Mean age (range/), y • Male (%)	No cancer 50-71 60	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ (NCI-DHQ) USDA Nutrient Database y	Pancreatic cancer risk stratified by quintile of total calcium intake	X	X	X	X		X	Total calcium intake from diet and supplement

Table 74. Calcium and pancreatic cancer: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage, y	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration, y	Total Ca intake in mg/d	No. of Cases	Total no. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Skinner 2006[172] NHS, HPFS US (multiple latitudes) [16985031]	19-50 51-70 ≥71	Pancreatic cancer (365/122,198; 0.003) overall	14.5	<500	41	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.29	A
				500-999	228	nd	1.17	0.83, 1.66		
				≥1000	96	nd	0.94	0.62, 1.41		
	19-50 51-70 women	Pancreatic cancer (178/75,427; 0.002) NHS	15.4	<500	24	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.09	
				500-999	109	nd	1.09	0.69, 1.73		
				≥1000	45	nd	0.75	0.43, 1.30		
	19-50 51-70	Pancreatic cancer (187/46,771; 0.004)	13.1	<500	17	nd	**1**	**Reference**	0.86	
				500-999	119	nd	1.28	0.76, 2.18		

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage, y	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration, y	Total Ca intake in mg/d	No. of Cases	Total no. in Category	Adjusted RR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
	≥71 men	HPFS		≥1000	51	nd	1.23	0.67, 2.25		
Park 2009 NIH-AARP[125] [19237724]	50-71, men	Pancreatic cancer (717/293,907; 0.002)	7	526	717 (total)	293,907 (total)	**1 (HR)**	**Reference**	0.39	B
				498			0.93	0.74, 1.16		
				857			0.9	0.72,1.14		
				1073			0.98	0.78, 1.23		
				1530			0.87	0.68, 1.11		
	50-71, women	Pancreatic cancer (384/198,903; 0.002)	7	526	384 (total)	198,903 (total)	**1 (HR)**	**Reference**	0.40	
				498			1.03	0.75, 1.40		
				857			0.93	0.67, 1.28		
				1073			0.97	0.71, 1.34		
				1530			0.88	0.63, 1.24		

Calcium and pregnancy-related outcomes

Preeclampsia.

Synopsis.

This summary is primarily based on a systematic review of 12 RCTs (n=15,528 women) of calcium supplementation (≥1000 mg/d) during pregnancy versus placebo for preventing preeclampsia. In addition, it includes findings from two cohort studies (one of which is a reanalysis of one of the 12 RCTs mentioned above).

Overall, the random effects meta-analysis of the 12 RCTs favored calcium supplementation (RR=0.48, 95 percent CI 0.33, 0.69), albeit with substantial between-study heterogeneity. More than 80 percent of the total number of randomized women (n=12,914) came from two large trials that found no significant effect of calcium supplementation for preventing preeclampsia (RR=0.95, 95 percent CI 0.89, 1.05). Based on their confidence interval, the two large studies excluded large effects of calcium for preeclampsia prevention. There is no obvious explanation for the observed between-study heterogeneity in the aforementioned meta-analysis. The heterogeneity stems from differences in the effects between smaller trials (claiming protective effects) and large trials (showing no effect).

The two cohort studies did not detect associations between calcium intake during the first or second trimester of pregnancy with preeclampsia. Both cohorts were rated B for methodological and reporting quality.

Based on the above, there is not a clear answer to whether calcium supplementation is effective for preeclampsia prevention.

Detailed presentation (Tables 75, 76 & 77).

Relevant published systematic reviews of RCTs (with meta-analyses).

We identified five systematic reviews[173-177] (with meta-analyses) of RCTs on calcium supplementation in the first or second trimester versus placebo for the prevention of preeclampsia (Appendix D). We selected a 2006 Cochrane review as eligible for this section.[176] All other systematic reviews were covered by the Cochrane review. We did not identify any RCTs published after the Cochrane review was conducted.

Eligible were RCTs comparing at least 1000 mg/d of calcium versus placebo in pregnant women. Studies were performed in several countries (both developed and developing). The review defined preeclampsia as high gestational blood pressure (diastolic blood pressure >90 mmHg, or increase more than 15 mm Hg in diastolic or more than 30 mm Hg in systolic blood pressure) with significant proteinuria (at least 300 mg/d or at least 500 mg).[i]

Table 75 summarizes the findings of the Cochrane review. A random effects meta-analysis of all studies suggests that calcium supplementation reduces the risk for preeclampsia (RR=0.48, 95 percent CI 0.33, 0.69). However, there is substantial heterogeneity among the included studies (P<0.001).

i Note that a strict definition of preeclampsia requires confirmation of no hypertension or proteinuria outside of pregnancy.

In subgroup analyses, the effects of calcium appear larger in women at high risk for hypertension versus women at low risk for hypertension. The same is observed when trials are grouped according to whether women had adequate average calcium intake versus low average calcium intake.

More than 80 percent of the total number of randomized women in this meta-analysis (n=12,914) came from two large trials that reported no significant effects of calcium supplementation for preeclampsia (RR=0.95, 95 percent CI 0.89, 1.05; by fixed effects synthesis). Based on their combined confidence interval, these two studies exclude modest and large effects of calcium for preeclampsia prevention. The remaining (smaller) trials show a protective effect. One of the large RCTs was performed in populations with low background calcium diets[178] and the other in populations with adequate background calcium diets.[179]

Allowing for the above, there is no clear explanation for the observed discrepant findings across the trials in the systematic review. The recurrent pattern is that large trials showed no effect for calcium supplementation, whereas smaller trials showed large effects. Calcium supplementation for preeclampsia prevention is a well known example where large trials and smaller trials show systematically different effects. Past methodological explorations (before the publication of the WHO trial[178]) have hypothesized that effects may be observed mostly among women with low calcium in their background diet.[180] However, as mentioned above, this is not supported by the subgroup analyses.

Table 75. Summary table of systematic review on calcium supplementation and preeclampsia, small for gestational age, preterm birth

Author Year [PMID]	Hofmeyr 2006[176] [16855957]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1988-2006)
Population	Pregnant women less than 35 weeks of gestation regardless of their risk of hypertensive of pregnancy or their previous calcium intake
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Calcium supplement (at least 1000 mg/d) vs. placebo
Results	12 trials (n=15,528)[A] *Preeclampsia (mother):* • All 12 trials (n=15,528): RR=0.48 (0.33, 0.69)[B]; statistically heterogeneous • Among 4 trials (n=5022) with adequate Ca in diet: RR=0.62 (0.32, 1.20); statistically heterogeneous • Among 7 trials (n=10,154) with low Ca in diet: RR=0.36 (0.18, 0.70); statistically heterogeneous • Among 5 trials (n=587) at high risk for hypertension: RR=0.22 (0.12, 0.42); statistically homogeneous • Among 6 trials (n=14,619) at low risk for hypertension: RR=0.68 (0.49, 0.94); statistically heterogeneous *High blood pressure with or without proteinuria (mother):* • Among 11 trials (n=14,946): RR= 0.70 (95% CI 0.57, 0.86); statistically heterogeneous • Among 4 trials (n=5022) with adequate Ca in diet: RR=0.90 (0.81, 0.99); statistically homogeneous • Among 6 trials (n=9684) with low Ca in diet: RR=0.47 (0.29, 0.76); statistically heterogeneous • Among 4 trials (n=327) at high risk for hypertension: RR=0.47 (0.22, 0.97); statistically heterogeneous • Among 7 trials (n=14,619) at low risk for hypertension: RR=0.78 (0.64, 0.95); statistically heterogeneous *Preterm birth:* • Among 10 trials (n=14,751): RR = 0.81 (0.64, 1.03); statistically heterogeneous • Among 4 trials (n=5033) with adequate Ca in diet: RR=0.59 (0.26, 1.33); statistically heterogeneous • Among 6 trials (n=9684) with low Ca in diet: RR=0.90 (0.80, 1.02); statistically homogeneous • Among 4 trials (n=478) at high risk for hypertension: RR=0.45 (0.24, 0.83); statistically homogeneous • Among 7 trials (n=14,183) at low risk for hypertension: RR=0.91 (0.74, 1.12); statistically heterogeneous *Small for gestational age (infant):* • Among 3 trials (n=13,091; fixed effects): RR = 1.10 (0.88, 1.37); statistically homogeneous
Comments	About 80% of participants are from two well designed and well conducted RCTs.[178,179] The two large RCTs show no effects for all four outcomes.

AMSTAR Criteria			
A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes		

[A] RR <1.0 favors calcium supplementation
[B] 95% confidence interval

Cohort studies.

We identified two eligible prospective cohort studies (Table 76).[181,182] Both were rated B for methodological and reporting quality. The first was a reanalysis of a large RCT and reported no associations of dietary calcium intakes during the first and second trimester with preeclampsia.[181] The second study was a prospective cohort that again reported no association between dietary calcium intake in the first trimester and risk of preeclampsia.[182] (See Table 77)

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** Not applicable
- **51 – 70 y** Not applicable
- **≥71 y** Not applicable
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Based on a Cochrane review that synthesized data from 12 RCTs on 15,528 pregnant women, calcium supplementation significantly lowered the risk for preeclampsia during pregnancy. However, this meta-analysis was heterogeneous; significant effects were observed only among small studies, and not in the two largest RCTs that comprised more than 80 percent of the women in the meta-analysis. In addition, two cohort studies found no association between calcium intake and preeclampsia. Overall, the effects of calcium supplementation on preeclampsia are unclear.

Table 76. Calcium and preeclampsia and other pregnancy outcomes: Characteristics of cohort studies[A,B]

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Outcomes and Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Morris 2007[181] CPEP reanalysis[C] US (various) [11262466]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy ND 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles		X	X			X	Total Ca (both)
Oken 2007[182] Project Viva US (42°N) [17521921]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy [most 30 to <40] 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome as a function of Ca intake		X	X				Total Ca (both)

[A] Both table entries are treated as cohort studies.
[B] In contrast with most other summary tables of study characteristics, this table is ordered alphabetically by study author.
[C] Reanalysis of the CPEP trial (calcium versus placebo) for preeclampsia prevention focusing on calcium content in diet (and including the intervention dose in the analyses)

Table 77. Calcium and preeclampsia and other pregnancy outcomes: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca Intake, mg/d	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Preeclampsia										
Morris 2007[181] CPEP reanalysis US (various) [11262466]	30-40 y, Women	Preeclampsia (326/4314; 7.6%)	ND	579	ND	ND	1.00 (ref)		ND	B
				580-845	ND	ND	0.90	0.61, 1.30		
				846-1131	ND	ND	0.95	0.65, 1.39		
				1132-1560	ND	ND	0.97	0.65, 1.45		
				1561	ND	ND	0.78	0.49, 1.24		
Oken 2007[182] Project Viva US (42°N) [17521921]		Preeclampsia (59/1599; 3.7%)[A]		~1300	59	1599	1.03[B]	0.84, 1.27	NS	B
High blood pressure with or without proteinuria										
Morris 2007[181] CPEP reanalysis US (various) [11262466]	30-40 y, Women	High blood pressure with or without proteinuria (747/4314; 17.3%)	ND	579	ND	ND	1.00 (ref)		ND	B
				580-845	ND	ND	1.09	0.84, 1.42		
				846-1131	ND	ND	1.10	0.83, 1.44		
				1132-1560	ND	ND	1.14	0.85, 1.53		
				1561	ND	ND	1.35	0.98, 1.86		
Oken 2007[182] Project Viva US (42°N) [17521921]		Pregnancy-induced hypertension (119/1659)[C]	ND	~1300	119	1659	0.99	0.85, 1.15	NS	B

[A] Excludes 119 women with pregnancy-induced hypertension – comparison versus normotensive women
[B] Per 300 mg of Ca intake (from supplement or diet)
[C] Excludes 59 women with preeclampsia – comparison versus normotensive women

High blood pressure with or without proteinuria during pregnancy.

Synopsis.

The synopsis of this outcome is based on the same systematic review described under preeclampsia. Overall, the meta-analysis of 11 RCTs favored calcium supplementation RR = 0.70 (95 percent CI 0.57, 0.86) for the treatment of hypertension during pregnancy, with or without proteinuria. However, there was substantial between-study heterogeneity. (Included in this meta-analysis are the two large trials mentioned in the preeclampsia section, which found no significant effect of calcium supplementation on blood pressure.) The systematic review did not offer a clear explanation for the observed heterogeneity.

Based on the above, there is no clear answer to whether calcium supplementation is effective for preventing high blood pressure (with or without proteinuria) in pregnancy.

Detailed presentation (Tables 75, 76 & 77).

Relevant published systematic reviews (with meta-analyses).

The Cochrane review that was selected for preeclampsia was applicable for hypertension during pregnancy[i] as well.[176] Table 75 summarizes the findings of the Cochrane review.

A meta-analysis of 11 trials (14,946 pregnant women) suggested that calcium supplementation reduces the risk for hypertension during pregnancy (RR=0.70, 95 percent CI 0.57, 0.86). However, there is substantial heterogeneity among the included studies ($p<0.001$). As described in Table 75, the heterogeneity was not explained by whether the trials included women with low versus adequate background dietary calcium intake.

In subgroup analyses, the effects of calcium appear larger in women at high risk for hypertension versus women at low risk for hypertension. The same is observed when trials are grouped according to whether women had adequate average dietary calcium intake versus low average calcium intake (see Table 75).

Cohort studies.

A single prospective cohort study[182] (Table 68) reported no association between calcium intake levels and risk for preeclampsia.[182] (See Table 69.)

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not applicable
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** Not applicable
- **51 – 70 y** Not applicable
- **≥71 y** Not applicable
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable

[i] The Cochrane review does not clarify whether the women were confirmed normotensive outside pregnancy. This is why we do not use the term pregnancy-induced hypertension for this outcome.

- **Pregnant & lactating women** Based on a Cochrane review that synthesized data from 11 RCTs on 14,946 pregnant women, calcium supplementation significantly lowered the risk for hypertension with or without proteinuria during pregnancy. However, this meta-analysis was very heterogeneous; significant effects were observed only among small studies, and not in the two largest RCTs that comprised more than 80 percent of the women in the meta-analysis. In addition, a cohort study found no association between calcium intake and hypertension during pregnancy. Therefore, the effects of calcium supplementation on hypertension with or without proteinuria during pregnancy are unclear.

Preterm birth.

Synopsis.

The synopsis of this outcome is based on the same systematic review described under preeclampsia. Among 10 RCTs (n=14,751), calcium supplementation has no significant effect on preterm births RR 0.81 (95 percent CI 0.64, 1.03). (Included in this meta-analysis are the two large trials mentioned in the preeclampsia section, which found no significant effects.)

Based on the above, there is no evidence for an effect of calcium supplementation on preterm births.

Detailed presentation (Table 75).

Relevant published systematic reviews (with meta-analyses).

The Cochrane review that was selected for preeclampsia was applicable for preterm birth as well.[176] Table 67 summarizes the findings of the Cochrane review.

A meta-analysis of 10 trials suggests that calcium supplementation had no significant effect on preterm births. There is evidence for between-study heterogeneity in this meta-analysis.

In subgroup analyses, the effects of calcium appear larger in women at high risk for hypertension versus women at low risk for hypertension. The same is observed when trials are grouped according to whether women had low average dietary calcium intake versus adequate average dietary calcium intake.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Based on a Cochrane review that synthesized data from ten RCTs on 14,751 pregnant women, calcium supplementation had no significant effect on whether infants were born prematurely or not.
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** Not applicable
- **51 – 70 y** Not applicable
- **≥71 y** Not applicable
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not applicable

Small for gestational age infant.

Synopsis.

The synopsis of this outcome is based on the same systematic review described under preeclampsia. The overall effects of calcium supplementation were not significant (among three RCTs in 13,091 randomized women RR = 1.10, 95 percent CI 0.88, 1.37). (Included in this meta-analysis are the two large trials mentioned in the preeclampsia section, which found no significant effects.)

Based on the above, there is no evidence for an effect of calcium supplementation on preterm births.

Detailed presentation (Table 75).

Relevant published systematic reviews (with meta-analyses).

The Cochrane review that was selected for preeclampsia was applicable for this outcome as well.[176] Table 75 shows that among three trials with pertinent information there was no significant effect of calcium supplementation on the proportion of infants who were small for gestational age.[178,179]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Based on a Cochrane review that synthesized data from three RCTs on 13,091 pregnant women, calcium supplementation has no significant effect on whether born infants were small for gestational age or not.
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** Not applicable
- **51 – 70 y** Not applicable
- **≥71 y** Not applicable
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not applicable

Calcium and all-cause Mortality

Synopsis.

One cohort study (rated B for methodological and reporting quality) reported no significant associations between calcium intakes and all-cause mortality in men or women aged between 40-65 years. No RCTs of calcium intake evaluated all-cause mortality.

Detailed presentation (Tables 78 & 79).

One cohort study from Amsterdam, Netherlands (52°N), reported in two publications[105,126] evaluated associations between calcium intake and all-cause mortality. The cohort was based on a general population health survey and enrolled civil servants or their spouses (aged 40-65 years). The reports received grade "B" for methodological and reporting quality (Table 70).

The publications reported no association between calcium intake and all-cause mortality among men or women. Table 71 shows the results of the various analyses conducted in the two publications.[105,126]

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** One cohort study found no associations between calcium intakes and all-cause mortality in men or women aged between 40-65 y.
- **51 – 70 y** The above (19-50 y) may be applicable here as well, based on the age range of cohort participants.
- **≥71 y** No data
- **Postmenopause** No data
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Table 78. Calcium intake and all-cause mortality: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Van der Vijver 1992[105] & Slob 1993[126] Netherlands (52°N) [1544755 & 8478144]	• Health status • Age range, y • Male (%)	General population 40-65y 51	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Outcome stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (food)

Table 79. Calcium intake and all-cause mortality: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N; Incidence)	Followup Duration	Total Ca Intake, mg/d	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Van der Vijver 1992[105] & Slob 1993[126] Netherlands (52°N) [1544755 & 8478144]	40-65 y, men	All cause mortality (nd)	336 mo (28 y)	≤585	nd	nd	1.1	0.7, 1.6	nd	B
				585 - 725	nd	nd	1.1	0.7, 1.6		
				725 - 935	nd	nd	0.8	0.5, 1.2		
				935 - 1245	nd	nd	0.9	0.6, 1.3		
				>1245	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**		
Van der Vijver 1992[105] & Slob 1993[126] Netherlands (52°N) [1544755 & 8478144]	40-65 y, women	All cause mortality (nd)	336 mo (28 y)	≤445	nd	nd	1.2	0.8, 1.9	nd	B
				445 - 540	nd	nd	1.1	0.7, 1.7		
				540 - 640	nd	nd	1.3	0.9, 2.0		
				640 - 850	nd	nd	1.1	0.7, 1.7		
				>850	nd	nd	**1.0**	**Reference**		

Calcium and Hypertension and Blood Pressure

We searched for systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated associations between calcium intake or body stores and incidence of hypertension and change in blood pressure. For the outcome *incidence of hypertension*, we reviewed randomized controlled trials and other longitudinal studies. For the outcome *change in blood pressure*, we reviewed only randomized controlled trials. The EPC and the TEP agreed that due to the large volume of literature, the limited resources would not be expended on reviewing observational studies for the surrogate outcome blood pressure. We included only studies of adults. Studies of pregnancy-related hypertension and blood pressure control are included in the pregnancy section.

Calcium and hypertension.

Synopsis.

No systematic reviews evaluated the association between calcium intake and incidence of hypertension. The association has been analyzed in five large studies (6 articles/analyses). No RCTs of calcium intake evaluated hypertension incidence. In analyses of men and women together and of men alone, there was no evidence of an association between calcium intake and risk of hypertension. In the Women's Health Study (WHS), a highly significant trend was found across quintiles of calcium intake and risk of hypertension, with significantly lower rates of hypertension found among women consuming at least 679 mg calcium per day compared to less than 558 mg calcium per day. The two articles that reported subgroup analyses based on age found associations between lower calcium intake and hypertension among younger adults (below 40 or 50 years of age), but no significant associations in older adults.

Detailed presentation (Tables 80 & 81 and Figure 21).

The six articles, reporting investigations of five studies, included two analyses of combined men and women in the NHANES I study and Navarra, Spain (both methodological quality C),[183,184] two analyses of men alone in the Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS) and NHANES I (of methodological quality B and C, respectively), [185,186] and three analyses of women alone in the WHS, the Nurses Health Study (NHS), and NHANES I (of methodological quality A, B, and C, respectively).[186-188] All studies included only people without hypertension at baseline. Only the A quality analysis, WHS, included elevated blood pressure in their outcome definition of hypertension; all other analyses used self-reported hypertension (generally based on a physician's diagnosis or treatment). The mean ages of the participants varied widely across studies (36-54 years) among those that reported mean data; the range of ages within studies varied from broad (20-90 years) to narrow (30-55 years) among those that reported ranges. All studies reported adjusted analyses; though each adjusted for different factors. Most of the studies were limited by such factors as reliance on self-reported hypertension (without assessment of blood pressure), exclusion of numerous participants due to lack of data, inadequate reporting of results data, and lack of reporting of definitions (ranges or averages of calcium quintiles).

Two studies reported analyses for combined men and women. These are discussed here. The remaining analyses of men or women separately are discussed below. In analyses of combined men and women (each with almost 7000 participants), neither study reported a significant association. No significant trend or individual analyses of quintiles was found in the short duration (2 years) Spanish cohort study. A poorly reported analysis from NHANES I concluded that there was progressively higher incidence of hypertension in lower quartiles of calcium

intake after 10 years, but no statistical analysis was performed and the definitions of the quartiles were not provided.

Findings per calcium intake level.

Among the studies that provided definitions of the compared categories of calcium intake, consistent significant associations were found for calcium intakes below 500 mg/day in men under age 50 years (compared to over 1100 mg/day) and below 558 mg/day in women (compared to over 678 mg/day).

Findings per age and sex.

Men alone were analyzed from the PHFS (about 31,000 men) and NHANES I (about 2000 men, split by race). Neither analysis found a significant trend or any significant differences among different calcium intake categories at 4 and 10 years, respectively for the two studies.

Women alone were analyzed from three studies. The studies had heterogeneous findings. The A quality analysis of the WHS (about 29,000 women) found a highly significant trend across quintiles ($P<0.0001$) at 10 years with a significantly higher rate of hypertension in women in the lowest calcium intake quintile (189-557 mg/day) compared to all quintiles with intakes above 679 mg/day. However, the B quality analysis of the NHS (about 41,500 women) found no significant association by calcium intake at 14 years and the C quality analysis of NHANES I (about 3500 women, split by race) found no consistent association at 10 years.

One C quality analysis of NHANES I assessed subgroups of combined men and women by age (divided at 40 years old). Among people under age 40 years, those in the lowest quartile of calcium intake had significantly higher rates of being treated for hypertension after 10 years; however, the article failed to define the calcium intake quartiles. No significant association was found among older participants. In the HPFS, in men under age 50 years, a higher rate of hypertension at 4 years was found in those with calcium intake less than 500 mg/d compared to over 1100 mg/d; but no association was found in older men.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** Five of the six studies included mostly people within this life stage.[183-186,188] Overall, there was no evidence of a significant association between calcium intake and risk of hypertension. However, as described in detail in the Findings per age and sex section above, in two subgroup analyses, significant associations were found between the lowest category of calcium intake and increased risk of hypertension in younger people (under age 40 – calcium intake range not reported, or age 50 years – less than 500 mg/d compared to over 1100 mg/d.
- **51 – 70 y** Four of the six studies included people largely within this life stage.[184,185,187,188] The studies mostly found no significant associations between calcium intake and risk of hypertension, including within the 2 subgroups of adults above 40 or 50 years of age. However, the WHS, which included women mostly within this life stage, found a highly significant trend across quintiles ($P<0.0001$) at 10 years with a significantly higher rate of hypertension in women in the lowest calcium intake quintile (189-557 mg/d) compared to all quintiles with intakes above 679 mg/d.

- **≥71 y** Few of the people in the studies appear to have been in this life stage. No unique conclusions are possible for this life stage separate from those for people 51 to 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** Only the WHS appeared to have included (or analyzed) primarily postmenopausal women. The study found a highly significant trend across quintiles ($P<0.0001$) at 10 years with a significantly higher rate of hypertension in women in the lowest calcium intake quintile (189-557 mg/d) compared to all quintiles with intakes above 679 mg/d.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 80. Calcium and hypertension incidence: Characteristics of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name Location [PMID]	Population		Dietary Calcium intake		Comparisons	Confounders/Effect Modifiers Adjusted						Comments
						Nutrients	Demograph	Anthrop	Medical	UV exposure	Lifestyle	
Alonso 2005[183] U Navarra Follow-up Navarra Spain (43°N) [16280427]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Normo-tensive 36 (20-90) 39	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Hypertension incidence stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
Dwyer 1996[184A] NHANES I US (various) [8890661]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Normo-tensive 46 (25-74) 63	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	24 hr recall nd	Hypertension incidence stratified by total Ca intake quartiles	X	X	X			X	Total Ca (both)
Ascherio 1992[185] HPFS US (various) [1330360]	• Health status • Median age (range), y • Male (%)	Normo-tensive 50 (40-75) 100	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Yes	Hypertension incidence stratified by total Ca intake categories		X	X			X	Total Ca (both)
Ford 1991[186B] NHANES I US (various) [1937662]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Normo-tensive nd (≥25) 35	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	nd nd	Hypertension incidence stratified by total Ca intake quartiles	X	X					Total Ca (both)
Wang 2008[187] WHS US (various) [18259007]	• Health status • Mean age (SD, range), y • Male (%)	Normo-tensive 54 (6.5; ≥45) 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ No	Hypertension incidence stratified by total Ca intake quintiles	X	X	X	X		X	Total Ca (both)
Ascherio 1996[188] NHS US (various) [8621198]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Normo-tensive nd (30-55) 0	• Dietary assessment method • Internal validation? (y/n)	FFQ Yes	Hypertension incidence stratified by total Ca intake categories		X	X			X	Total Ca (both)

[A] Overall and age subgroup analyses from NHANES I reported in this study. However, different samples selected; 63% male.
[B] Sex and race subgroup analyses from NHANES I reported in this study. However, different samples selected; 35% male.

Table 81. Calcium and hypertension incidence: Results of cohort studies

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Both Sexes										
Alonso 2005[183] U Navarra Follow-up [16280427]	20-90 y, Both	Hypertension (180/6686, 0.027)	2 y	Mean (SD) **900 (200)**	39	~1337	**1**	**Reference**	0.67	C
				1000 (200)	39	~1337	0.98	0.62, 1.54		
				1200 (200)	35	~1337	0.82	0.51, 1.30		
				1400 (300)	30	~1337	0.73	0.45, 1.19		
				1700 (400)	37	~1337	0.97	0.61, 1.54		
Dwyer 1996[184A] NHANES I [8890661]	25-74 y, Both	Hypertension, treated (1704/6634, 0.257)	10 y	nd	nd	~1658	29.8%		nd	C
				nd	nd	~1658	~27%			
				nd	nd	~1658	~25%			
				nd	nd	~1658	21.3%			
	≤40 y	Hypertension, treated (nd/nd)	10 y	**nd**	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				nd	nd	nd	0.70	0.54, 0.91[C]	nd	
				nd	nd	nd	0.79	0.66, 0.94[C]		
				nd	nd	nd	0.89	0.81, 0.97[C]		
	>40 y	Hypertension, treated (nd/nd)	10 y	**nd**	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
				nd	nd	nd	1.01	0.94, 1.08	nd	
				nd	nd	nd	1.02	0.89, 1.18		
				nd	nd	nd	1.04	0.84, 1.28		
Men										
Ascherio 1992[185] HPFS [1330360]	40-75 y, Men	Hypertension (1248/30,681, 0.041)	4 y	<500	85	1677	1.17	0.91, 1.50	0.53	B
				500-700	297	7504	0.91	0.77, 1.07		
				700-900	333	8576	0.89	0.76, 1.04		
				900-1100	195	5038	0.91	0.76, 1.09		
				≥1100	338	7890	**1**	**Reference**		
	≤50 y	Hypertension (nd/14,354)	4 y	<500	nd	nd	1.52	nd*	nd	
				500-1100	nd	nd	0.86	nd		
				≥1100	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		
	>50 y	Hypertension (nd/16,314)	4 y	<500	nd	nd	0.98	nd		
				500-1100	nd	nd	0.91	nd		
				≥1100	nd	nd	**1**	**Reference**		

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome (n/N, Incidence)	Followup Duration (Time to Dx)	Total Ca Intake, mg/day	No. of Cases	No. in Category	Adjusted OR	95% CI	P for Trend	Study Quality
Ford 1991[186B] NHANES I [937662]	≥25 y, Men (White)	Hypertension (360/1707, 0.211)	10 y	<344	47	~215	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
				344-591	78	~382	0.91	0.60, 1.38		
				591-954	104	~448	1.09	0.73, 1.63		
				>954	131	~662	0.96	0.64, 1.45		
	≥25 y, Men (Black)	Hypertension (64/183, 0.350)	10 y	<344	20	~34	**1**	**Reference**	nd	
				344-591	17	~45	0.68	0.28, 1.65		
				591-954	18	~56	0.54	0.22, 1.33		
				>954	9	~34	0.35	0.11, 1.13		
Women										
Wang 2008[187] WHS [8259007]	≥45 y, Women	Hypertension (8529/28,886, 0.295)	10 y	**189-557**	1860	5777	**1**	**Reference**	<0.0001	A
				558-678	1778	5777	0.96	0.90, 1.03		
				679-801	1626	5777	0.89	0.83, 0.95[C]		
				802-999	1634	5777	0.89	0.83, 0.95[C]		
				1000-2559	1631	5777	0.87	0.81, 0.93[C]		
Ascherio 1996[188] NHS [621198]	30-55 y, Women	Hypertension (2526/41,541, 0.061)	14 y	**<400**	87	5581 person-y	**1**	**Reference**	0.76	B
				400-600	608	36,605	1.07	0.85, 1.35		
				600-800	712	42,544	1.05	0.83, 1.31		
				800-1000	407	24,240	1.03	0.82, 1.31		
				≥1000	712	41,325	1.04	0.83, 1.31		
Ford 1991[186B] NHANES I [937662]	≥25 y, Women (White)	Hypertension (645/3065, 0.210)	10 y	<344	186	~865	**1**	**Reference**	nd	C
				344-591	183	~806	1.11	0.87, 1.43		
				591-954	172	~775	1.17	0.90, 1.51		
				>954	104	~619	1.01	0.74, 1.38		
	≥25 y, Women (Black)	Hypertension (171/456, 0.375)	10 y	<344	94	~225	**1**	**Reference**	nd	
				344-591	35	~120	0.61	0.37, 1.01		
				591-954	31	~74	1.11	0.62, 2.01		
				>954	11	~37	0.77	0.33, 1.81		

* Statistically significant (P<0.05)
[A] Overall and age subgroup analyses from NHANES I reported in this study. However, different samples selected; 63% male.
[B] Sex and race subgroup analyses from NHANES I reported in this study. However, different samples selected; 35% male.
[C] Estimated from available data

Figure 21. Hypertension risk stratified by calcium intake



Calcium and blood pressure.

Synopsis.

We identified six systematic reviews that evaluated RCTs of calcium intake and changes in blood pressure. Five additional trials not identified by these systematic reviews met eligibility criteria for this report and are summarized together with the systematic reviews. Altogether, 69 trials have been identified. The range of intervention calcium doses were approximately 400 to 2000 mg/d, with most studies using 1000 to 1500 mg/d. The systematic reviews followed the patterns of the primary studies in that they were divided among those that focused on studies of people without hypertension, people with hypertension, and general populations (with or without hypertension, without subgroup analyses). Because the systematic reviews all used somewhat different eligibility criteria, they included overlapping groups of trials. No one or two systematic reviews captured most of the relevant trials; therefore, all systematic reviews are included here.

Two overlapping systematic reviews evaluated trials of normotensive individuals. Both found no significant effect of calcium supplementation and blood pressure. The two additional, more recent primary studies of normotensive participants were consistent with this finding.

Four overlapping systematic reviews of the effect of calcium on blood pressure in hypertensive individuals mostly found significant effects on systolic blood pressure (ranging from about -2 to -4 mm Hg). An older, highly selective systematic review found no significant effect. The systematic review that found the largest effect of calcium on systolic blood pressure also found a significant effect on diastolic blood pressure (-1.5 mm Hg), but the other systematic reviews found no significant effect. None of the more recent primary studies were in people exclusively with hypertension.

Four of the systematic reviews performed meta-analyses of all people regardless of hypertension diagnosis. Except for the oldest, highly selective systematic review, they found significant effects on systolic blood pressure (ranging from -1.9 to –0.9 mm Hg). The summary estimates of the effect on diastolic blood pressure ranged from -1.0 to +0.03 mm Hg, which were mostly nonsignificant. The individual, recent primary studies of mixed populations (in terms of hypertension) found larger, though statistically nonsignificant, effects.

The systematic reviews that evaluated factors including age, sex, calcium dose, background dietary calcium, supplement versus dietary source, and other factors found no significant associations (or differences). The five additional primary studies did not provide further insights into these subgroup analyses.

Detailed presentation (Tables 82, 83, & 84).

The six systematic reviews explicitly or implicitly used generally different eligibility criteria, resulting in large overlaps in the trials included.[169,189-193]. The systematic reviews included a total of 64 trials. The largest systematic review[189] included trials up to 1997 and was an update of a previous review[191] that reported more analyses. The next largest systematic review[190] was one of the more recent systematic reviews (including trials through 2003). The most recent systematic review[169] was restricted to trials of people with hypertension. Five more recent trials, not included in any of the systematic reviews were found.[120,194-197] Two of the trials were restricted to normotensive individuals; none included only people with hypertension.

Normotensive individuals.

The systematic reviews by Bucher et al. (1996)[191] and Allender et al. (1996)[192] evaluated trials of normotensive individuals. The range of intervention calcium doses were approximately 400 to 2000 mg/d, with most studies using 1000 to 1500 mg/d. Both found no significant effect of calcium supplementation on blood pressure (net effect on systolic blood pressure of -0.27 and -0.53 mm Hg, respectively, and on diastolic blood pressure of -0.33 and -0.28 mm Hg, respectively). The two additional, more recent primary studies of normotensive participants were consistent with this finding. The TOHP trial compared calcium supplement to placebo in people without hypertension but high normal diastolic blood pressure (80-89 mm Hg) and found a nonsignificant net change in blood pressure of approximately -0.5/+0.35 mm Hg (systolic/diastolic) after 18 months.[195] Lijnen 1995 also compared calcium supplement to placebo, but in men who had been put on a low calcium run-in diet, and found a nonsignificant net change in blood pressure of approximately -2/-1 mm Hg after 4 months.[197] Both trials had methodological quality C due to inadequate reporting of this outcome or of the background calcium intakes of the participants. Bucher et al. (1996) reported a wide range of study quality; Allender et al. (1996) did not evaluate study quality.

Findings per calcium intake level.

Neither systematic review performed subgroup analyses of the normotensive individuals to evaluate a dose (calcium intake) effect. Qualitative examination of the data provided in the systematic review tables and the two additional trials did not indicate any dose effect.

Findings per age and sex.

Neither systematic review performed subgroup analyses of the normotensive individuals to evaluate age or sex. The trials in the Allender et al. (1996) systematic review and the two additional trials represented a wide range of ages, though apparently all participants were under age 70 years. Studies were of all men, all women, and both sexes. There were no apparent differences based on age or sex.

Hypertensive individuals.

Four systematic reviews evaluated trials of hypertensive individuals (Bucher et al. 1996[191], Allender et al. 1996[192], Cappuccio et al. 1989[193], and Dickinson 2006[198]). Dickinson et al. (2006) included only studies of people with hypertension. The range of supplemental calcium was approximately 400 to 2000 mg/d in most systematic reviews, with most studies using 1000 to 1500 mg/d. The systematic reviews generally found significant effects on systolic blood pressure of about -2 to -4 mm Hg, but no (or small) effects on diastolic blood pressure. The one systematic review that found no effect of calcium supplementation on systolic blood pressure (Cappuccio et al. 1989) was the oldest systematic review (including trials up to only 1988). In addition, the reviewers were highly selective in their eligibility criteria, having excluded trials that did not report various types of baseline data. The one systematic review that found a significant effect of calcium supplementation on diastolic blood pressure (Bucher et al. 1996) meta-analyzed only 6 trial subgroups of people with hypertension, compared to 10 to 16 trials in the other systematic reviews. None of the more recent trials provided analyses in only people with hypertension.

Findings per calcium intake level.

Only Dickinson et al. (2006), the systematic review of only trials of people with hypertension, evaluated calcium intake (or dose) as a predictor of effect. They found essentially the same overall effects on systolic and diastolic blood pressures in studies that used less than 1200 mg/d or 1200 to 2000 mg/d of calcium. Qualitative examination of the data provided in the tables of the remaining systematic reviews did not indicate any dose effect.

Findings per age and sex.

No systematic review evaluated the association between age or sex and treatment effect in trials of people with hypertension. Overall, the range of ages of participants was about 20 to 75 years. Studies were of all men, all women, and both sexes. There were no apparent differences based on age or sex.

All trials (combined normotensive and hypertensive individuals).

Five systematic reviews (including one which is an update of a second) combined trials of hypertensive, normotensive, or mixed groups of people (Griffith et al. 1999[189], van Mierlo et al. 2006[190], Bucher et al. 1996[191], Allender et al. 1996[192], and Cappuccio et al. 1989[193]). The range of calcium supplementation was approximately 400 to 2000 mg/d in most systematic reviews, with most studies using 1000 to 1500 mg/d. The systematic reviews generally found a significant effect of calcium supplementation on systolic blood pressure of -0.9 to -1.9 mm Hg (excluding the earliest, highly selective systematic review by Cappuccio et al. (1989)[193], as discussed above). The two systematic reviews that included the most studies (Griffith et al. 1999[189] and van Mierlo et al. 2006[190]) found a significant effect on diastolic blood pressure (-0.8 and -1.0 mm Hg, respectively). The smaller, older systematic reviews found no significant effect (Allender et al. 1996[192] and Cappuccio et al. 1989[193]). The reason for the difference in conclusions of the systematic reviews may relate to greater statistical power in the more recent meta-analyses or differences in study eligibility criteria. The systematic reviews that reported on study heterogeneity found significant heterogeneity. Three of the systematic reviews reported data on subgroup or regression analyses to explain the heterogeneity. The only factor that explained a significant amount of the heterogeneity was the difference in effect between studies of people with or without hypertension. (The age, sex, and calcium dose analyses are described below.)

Two recent randomized trials included postmenopausal women (over 50 or 55 years) regardless of their blood pressure;[120,194] a third trial enrolled pregnant women and evaluated long-term postpartum blood pressures.[196] The trials each compared different interventions: calcium citrate 1000 mg versus placebo; dairy product intake (with a mean of 1242 mg/d calcium) versus nondairy product intake (377 mg/d calcium); and calcium carbonate 2000 mg/d versus placebo in women all taking prenatal vitamins that included 400 IU/d vitamin D_2. The calcium citrate trial was of methodological quality B; the other two trials C. The recent trials found broadly similar conclusions to that of the systematic reviews, with women with greater calcium intake having lower systolic blood pressure (-2.2 to -5.4 mm Hg) and smaller decreases in diastolic blood pressure (-0.7 to -2.2 mm Hg); though none of the effects was statistically significant.

Findings per calcium intake.

Three systematic reviews[190-192] evaluated calcium dose (or intake) as a source of heterogeneity. None found a significant association. Specifically, van Mierlo et al. (2006) found similar (though smaller) effects in studies of over 1000 mg/d of calcium (SBP/DBP -1.75/-0.56) compared to studies of 1000 mg/d of calcium or less (-2.17/-1.41).

Findings per age and sex.

Age and sex were evaluated as potential explanations of heterogeneity in two systematic reviews.[190,192] Neither found that age or sex were significantly associated with the effect of calcium on blood pressure. However, these analyses are subject to ecological fallacy, as they used the mean ages and the percent of study participants who were male as proxies for the effects of calcium intake in people of a particular age or sex. Most studies included participants under age 70 years. Studies were of all men, all women, and both sexes.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** The majority of studies are applicable to people within this life stage; though people under approximately 40 years are less well represented. The evidence suggests no significant effect of calcium supplementation on blood pressure in normotensive individuals. In people with hypertension, the evidence suggests that calcium supplementation lowers systolic blood pressure by about -2 to -4 mm Hg, but does not change diastolic blood pressure. The effect appears to be consistent across calcium supplement doses (specifically above or below 1200 mg/d).
- **51 – 70 y** The majority of studies are applicable to people within this life stage. The conclusions are the same as for those in the 19-50 years life stage.
- **≥71 y** The evidence is scant for this life stage. Few of the studies appear to have included people over age 70 years.
- **Postmenopause** Our review of the evidence does not allow for a definitive conclusion for this life stage. None of the systematic reviews evaluated menopausal status as an explanatory variable for heterogeneity.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 82. Summary of systematic reviews of calcium and blood pressure

Author Year [PMID]	Griffith 1999[189] [10075392]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-1997)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 600-2000 mg (36% 1000 mg; 26% 1500-1600 mg; 12% 2000 mg)
Results	42 trials SBP: -1.44 (-2.20, -0.68)[A]; statistically heterogeneous DBP: -0.84 (-1.44, -0.24); statistically heterogeneous Subgroup analyses did not find that heterogeneity could be explained by age, sex, baseline calcium, dietary versus nondietary calcium, or quality. Subgroups with hypertensive versus normotensive people were significantly different (no further details). Conclusions similar to previous systematic review (Bucher 1996[191])
Comments	Update of Bucher 1996[191] (see below).

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Study quality not discussed in conclusions. Funding source reported, but not conflict of interest.	

Author Year [PMID]	van Mierlo 2006[190] [16673011]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2003)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 355-2000 mg (40% 1000 mg; 32% 1500-1600 mg; 6% 2000 mg)
Results	40 trials SBP: -1.86 (95% CI -2.91, -0.81); statistically heterogeneous DBP: -0.99 (95% CI -1.61, -0.37); statistically heterogeneous In multivariable analysis including age, sex, initial calcium intake, calcium dose, and initial blood pressure:

		SBP	DBP
Age	<45 y	-1.45 (-2.99, +0.09)	-1.26 (-2.20, -0.33)
	≥45 y	-2.33 (-3.69, -0.96)	-0.80 (-1.62, +0.02)
Male	≤50%	-2.20 (-3.68, -0.72)	-1.12 (-1.98, -0.26)
	>50%	-1.77 (-3.13, -0.42)	-0.84 (-1.65, -0.04)
Initial BP	<140/90 mm Hg	-2.04 (-3.40, -0.68)	-1.04 (-1.86, -0.22)
	≥140/90 mm Hg	-1.85 (-3.45, -0.32)	-0.89 (-1.79, +0.01)
Ca dose	≤1000 mg	-2.17 (-3.59, -0.75)	-1.41 (-2.24, -0.59)
	>1000 mg	-1.75 (-3.20, -0.31)	-0.56 (-1.40, +0.29)

Blood pressures not statistically significantly different between any strata.

Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Unclear	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	Partial	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	No data on inclusion of unpublished data. Excluded studies available from authors	

Table 82. continued

Author Year [PMID]	Bucher 1996[191] [8596234]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-1994)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation vs. placebo (no supplement) Dose range 406-2000 mg (41% 1000 mg; 31% 1500-1600 mg; 8% 2000 mg)
Results	33 trials [Overall summary results were updated in Griffith 1999[189], above] Studies with specified subgroups of hypertensive and normotensive participants (6 trials): Hypertensives SBP -4.30 (-6.47, -2.13) DBP -1.50 (-2.77, -0.23) Normotensives SBP -0.27 (-1.80, +1.27) DBP -0.33 (-1.56, +0.90) Regression analyses: BP (continuous scale) SBP OR = 0.99 (0.96, 1.01) DBP OR = 0.99 (0.96, 1.03) Dose of calcium, duration of supplementation, dietary vs. nondietary calcium supplementation, methodological quality did not demonstrate a relationship with the magnitude of treatment effect.
Comments	Updated in Griffith 1999[189] (see above)

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Funding source reported, but not conflict of interest.	

Author Year [PMID]	Allender 1996[192] [8610952]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1982-1993)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation vs. placebo (no supplement) Dose range 400-2160 mg (35% 1000 mg; 29% 1500-1600 mg; 10% 2000 mg)
Results	26 trials (22 trials included in meta-analyses) SBP: -0.89 (-1.74, -0.05) DBP: -0.18 (-0.75, +0.40) Hypertensives SBP -1.68 (-3.18, -0.18) DBP +0.02 (-0.96, +1.00) Normotensives SBP -0.53 (-1.56, +0.49) DBP -0.28 (-0.99, +0.42) By weighted linear regression analyses, age, sex, calcium dose, trial duration were not associated with treatment effect (P>0.10)
Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	No
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Excluded studies not enumerated or listed. Fixed effects models used.	

Author Year [PMID]	Cappuccio 1989[193] [2697729]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1983-1988)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) or low calcium intake Dose range 800-1600 mg (60% 1000 mg; 27% 1500-1600 mg)
Results	15 trials SBP (supine): -0.13 (-0.46, +0.19) DBP (supine): +0.03 (-0.17, +0.22) Hypertensives SBP +0.06 (-0.59, +0.72) DBP +0.03 (-0.21, +0.27)
Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	nd	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	No
All publication types and languages included?	nd	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Excluded studies not enumerated or listed. Fixed effects models used.	

Table 82. continued

Author Year [PMID]	Dickinson 2006[198] [16625609][B]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1982-2003/2005[C])
Population	Hypertensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 400-2000 mg (50% 1000 mg; 25% 1500-1600 mg; 6% 2000 mg)
Results	13 trials SBP: -2.53 (-4.45, -0.60); statistically heterogeneous DBP: -0.81 (-2.07, +0.44); statistically heterogeneous Ca dose <1200 mg SBP -2.67 (-5.15, -0.18) DBP -0.75 (-2.13, +0.63) Ca dose 1200-2000 mg SBP -2.69 (-5.86, +0.47) DBP -0.78 (-3.82, +2.25) Not statistically significantly different by calcium dose
Comments	

AMSTAR			
A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes		

[A] Numbers in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals
[B] A technical update, with no further studies added was published in the Cochrane database in 2008.
[C] Different dates for different databases.

Table 83. Calcium and blood pressure: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Whelton 1997[195] TOHP US (various) [9022561]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No HTN (DBP 80-89 mm Hg) 43 (30-54) 68	nd	Calcium supplement vs. Placebo	nd	
Lijnen 1995[197] Leuven, Belgium (51°N) [8557965]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Normotensive 24 (20-44) 100	"Low calcium diet" run-in	Calcium supplement vs. Placebo	nd	With low dairy intake
Reid 2005[194] Auckland, New Zealand (36.5°S) [15827103]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy 75 (≥55) 0	Ca 857 mg/day	Calcium supplement vs. Placebo	Calcium group: 55%, Placebo group: 58%	
Ghadirian 1995[120] Montreal, Canada (46°N) [7493659]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy ~80 (≥50) 0	Ca 776 mg/day	Dairy vs. Dairy-free intake	Non-compliant and those who provided incomplete data were excluded.	
Hatton 2003[196] CPEP Portland, Oregon (45.5°N) [14553957]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Pregnant during trial nd 0	nd	Calcium supplement vs. Placebo (both on prenatal vitamins including Vit D_2 400 IU)	nd (but all had to meet a compliance test prior to randomization)	Oregon site only. Post-pregnancy followup

Table 84. Calcium and blood pressure: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex; Population	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, unit	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE														
Normotensive														
Whelton 1997[195] TOHP [9022561]	30-54 y, Both; No HTN (DBP 80-89 mm Hg)	SBP	1°	18 mo	Ca carbonate 1000 mg	221	mm Hg	126.0	nd	nd	~-0.5[A]	~-2, -1	NS	C
					Placebo	224		125.4	nd	nd				
Lijnen 1995[197] Belgium [8557965]	20-44 y, Men No HTN	SBP, supine	2°	4 mo	Ca gluconate 2000 mg (low dairy intake)	16	mm Hg	114	~-4[A]	nd	~-2	nd	NS	C
					Placebo (low dairy intake)	16		114	~-2	nd				
All women														
Reid 2005[194] New Zealand [15827103]	≥55 y, Women; All BP	SBP	2°	30 mo	Ca citrate 1000 mg	732	mm Hg	134.9	0.0	-0.1, 0.1	-2.4	-0.8, 5.6	0.14	B
					Placebo	739		133.9	+2.4	2.3, 2.5				
Ghadirian 1995[120] Canada [7493659]	≥50 y, Women; All BP	SBP	2°	1 mo	Dairy intake (1242 mg Ca)	81	mm Hg	140.34	-2.69	-7.3, 2.0*	-5.4	-12.3, 1.4[C]	NS	C
					Dairy-free (377 mg Ca)	77		131.71	+2.75	-2.3, 7.8*				
Hatton 2003[196] CPEP [14553957]	Pregnant, Women[B]; All BP	SBP	2°	2 y post-partum	Ca carbonate 2000 mg (+Vit D_2 400 IU)	37	mm Hg	nd		Final 101.9	Difference -2.2	-7.8, 3.4[C]	NS	C
					Placebo (+Vit D_2 400 IU)	25		nd		104.1				
DIASTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE														
Normotensive														
Whelton 1997[195] TOHP [9022561]	30-54 y, Both; No HTN (DBP 80-89 mm Hg)	DBP	1°	18 mo	Ca carbonate 1000 mg	221	mm Hg	84.1	nd	nd	~+0.35[A]	~-1, 1	NS	C
					Placebo	224		83.9	nd	nd				
Lijnen 1995[197] Belgium [8557965]	20-44 y, Men No HTN	DBP, supine	2°	4 mo	Ca gluconate 2000 mg (low dairy intake)	16	mm Hg	74	~-1[A]	nd	~-1	nd	NS	C
					Placebo (low dairy intake)	16		72	~0	nd				
All women														
Reid 2005[194] New Zealand [15827103]	≥55 y, Women; All BP	DBP	2°	30 mo	Ca citrate 1000 mg	732	mm Hg	70.1	-0.2	-0.2, -0.2	-1.0	-2.3, 0.3	0.13	B
					Placebo	739		69.6	+0.8	0.8, 0.8				

continued

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex; Population	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, unit	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Ghadirian 1995[120] Canada [7493659]	≥50 y, Women; All BP	DBP	2°	1 mo	Dairy intake (1242 mg Ca)	81	mm Hg	81.17	-7.78	-10.0, -5.5*	-2.2	-5.4, 1.0[C]	NS	C
					Dairy-free (377 mg Ca)	77		79.09	-5.59	-7.9, -3.3*				
Hatton 2003[196] CPEP [14553957]	Pregnant, Women[B]; All BP	DBP	2°	2 y post-partum	Ca carbonate 2000 mg (+Vit D_2 400 IU)	37	mm Hg	nd		Final 67.1	Difference -0.7	-4.8, 3.4	NS	C
					Placebo (+Vit D_2 400 IU)	25		nd		67.8				

[A] From figure
[B] Blood pressure outcomes are 1 year post-partum
[C] Estimated from available data

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Health Outcomes

Women's Health Initiative (WHI) trial.

The WHI trial provided data for numerous health outcomes of interest. For this reason and because of some methodological issues unique to this trial, the study is discussed here. The trial compared combined vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 mg daily versus placebo in a 7 year trial in 36,282 postmenopausal women (age 50-79 y). The Tufts EPC, members of the Technical Expert Panel, and reviewers of the draft report debated about the quality of this trial. It was generally agreed that the overall methodological rigor and analyses were of good quality for most outcomes. However, there was not complete consensus on how to regard the fact that the women in both groups of this 7 year trial were allowed to take additional vitamin D supplements up to 600 IU and later 1000 IU per day and calcium supplements up to 1000 mg per day. At baseline, about one-third of women in both supplement and placebo groups were taking vitamin D supplements of at least 400 IU/d and 29 percent were taking at least 500 mg/d of supplemental calcium; by the end of the trial 69 percent of women were taking any additional supplemental calcium. During the 7 years, only about 60 percent of women (in any given year) were taking at least 80 percent of the study pills; at the end of the trial, only 76 percent were still taking any study medications. Regarding the overall quality of the study, arguments were put forward that this was a high quality effectiveness trial (in contrast with a more standardized efficacy trial) and thus had increased relevance to the actual use of supplements, that the crossover of interventions affects the applicability more than the methodological quality, and that the trial should not be downgraded because data reporting was more complete than for most trials. However, it was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

Combined Vitamin D Calcium and Growth

We reviewed primary studies that evaluated relationships between vitamin D and growth parameters in infants and children.

Synopsis.

One C-rated nonrandomized study compared combined vitamin D (1200 IU/d) and calcium (375 mg/d) to no supplementation in women in their third trimester of pregnancy. Infants of women who received supplementation were significantly heavier at birth.

Detailed presentation (Tables 4 & 6).

Infant 0 - 6 months; 7 months - 2 years; pregnant or lactating women.

We identified a study from India that included a nonrandomized comparison between combined vitamin D (1200 IU/d) and calcium (375 mg/d) for the expectant mothers versus no supplementation. The outcome was infant birth weight.[41] This study has already been described in the "Vitamin D and growth" section, as it also included a vitamin D only intervention arm. The study included expectant mothers with daily milk intake less than 500 mL and estimated daily vitamin D intake less than 30 IU. It was rated C for methodological quality, because of the lack of randomization and incomplete reporting of analyses. According to the reported analysis,

infants of women who received supplementation were significantly heavier at birth by 160 g on average (95 percent CI 0, 320).

Findings by life stage

- **0 – 6 mo** One C-rated nonrandomized study from India compared combined vitamin D (1200 IU/d) and calcium (375 mg/d) to no supplementation in women in their third trimester of pregnancy. Infants of women who received supplementation were significantly heavier at birth by 160 g on average (95 percent CI 0, 320). (See also the Pregnant & lactating women.)
- **7 mo – 2 y** No identified study covered this life stage.
- **3 – 8 y** No identified study covered this life stage.
- **9 – 18 y** No identified study covered this life stage.
- **19 – 50 y** Not reviewed
- **51 – 70 y** Not reviewed
- **≥71 y** Not reviewed
- **Postmenopause** Not reviewed
- **Pregnant & lactating women** One C-rated nonrandomized study from India compared combined vitamin D (1200 IU/d) and calcium (375 mg/d) to no supplementation in women in their third trimester of pregnancy. Infants of women who received supplementation were significantly heavier at birth by 160 g on average (95 percent CI 0, 320). (See also the 0 – 6 mo category.)

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Cardiovascular Disease

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between combined vitamin D and calcium, body stores, or serum concentrations, and cardiovascular events. A variety of cardiovascular events after 7 years were evaluated in the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) trial of combined daily vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 mg versus placebo in 50 to 79 year old women. No statistically significant effect was found with combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation on any cardiovascular outcome. However, near significant associations were found for three outcomes, suggesting increased risk with supplementation for a composite cardiac outcome that included invasive cardiac interventions, invasive cardiac interventions, and transient ischemic attacks. No significant associations were found for cardiovascular death, a composite cardiac outcome (myocardial infarction or cardiac death), coronary heart disease death, myocardial infarction, hospitalization for heart failure, angina, combined stroke or transient ischemic attack, stroke alone, or cerebrovascular death.

Detailed presentation (Tables 85 & 86).

In the WHI trial, discussed above, the evaluated cardiovascular outcomes were all prespecified secondary outcomes.[199,200] On average, the women had normal blood pressure. There were no significant effects of the supplementation on any of the outcomes, though three of the outcomes did approach statistical significance suggesting increased events with supplementation: composite cardiac events (HR = 1.08 [95 percent CI 0.99, 1.19]), coronary artery bypass grafting or percutaneous coronary interventions (HR=1.09 [95 percent CI 0.98, 1.22]), and transient ischemic attacks (HR=1.16 [95 percent CI 0.95, 1.42]). The authors, however, concluded that calcium and vitamin D supplementation neither increased nor decreased coronary or cerebrovascular risk in generally healthy postmenopausal women. The outcomes cardiac death and stroke were evaluated by age decade. No interaction was found with age (no significant difference across age groups). A similar analysis based on total calcium intake (dietary plus supplemental) also found no interaction.

Findings per intake level.

No conclusions are possible about a dose effect from this single study, especially since the women were allowed to take additional concurrent calcium and vitamin D supplements. However, no interaction was found with total reported calcium intake.

Findings by age and sex.

The study investigated postmenopausal women 50 to 79 years old. No interaction of effects with decade of age was found.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No data available

- **51 – 70 y** One large trial that included women mostly within this life stage (WHI) found no significant effect of combined vitamin D_3 (400 IU) and calcium carbonate (1000 mg) on cardiovascular outcomes after 7 years.
- **≥71 y** Inadequate available data.
- **Postmenopause** All women in the WHI trial were postmenopausal. See 51-71 y life stage.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 85. Combined vitamin D and calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Hsia 2007[199] LaCroix 2009[200] WHI US (various) [17309935 19221190]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 62 (50-79) 0	Ca: 1148 (654) mg/d in treatment group; 1154 (658) in placebo group Low Ca intake (<800 mg/day): 34%	Combined Vit D & Ca supplement vs. Placebo	See page 242	

Table 86. Combined vitamin D and calcium and cardiovascular outcomes: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Hsia 2007[199] LaCroix 2009[200] WHI [17309935 19221190]	50-79 y, Women	Cardiovascular death	2°	7	Vit D + Ca	226	18,176	HR (Suppl/Placebo)	0.92*	0.77, 1.10	NS	B
					Placebo	244	18,106					
		Cardiac composite (MI, CHD death, CABG, or PCI)	2°		Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	920	18,176	HR	1.08	0.99, 1.19	0.10	
					Placebo	841	18,106					
		Cardiac composite (MI or CHD death)	2°		Vit D + Ca	499	18,176	HR	1.04	0.92, 1.18	0.50	
					Placebo	475	18,106					
		CHD death	2°		Vit D + Ca	130	18,176	HR	1.01*	0.79, 1.29	0.92	
					Placebo	128	18,106					
		MI	2°		Vit D + Ca	411	18,176	HR	1.05	0.91, 1.20	0.52	
					Placebo	390	18,106					
		CABG or PCI	2°		Vit D + Ca	674	18,176	HR	1.09	0.98, 1.22	0.12	
					Placebo	607	18,106					
		Hospitalized for heart failure	2°		Vit D + Ca	394	18,176	HR	0.95	0.83, 1.10	0.50	
					Placebo	407	18,106					
		Angina	2°		Vit D + Ca	404	18,176	HR	1.08	0.94, 1.24	0.30	
					Placebo	377	18,106					
		Cerebrovascular composite (Stroke or TIA)	2°		Vit D + Ca	563	18,176	HR	1.02	0.91, 1.15	0.75	
					Placebo	547	18,106					
		Stroke	2°		Vit D + Ca	362	18,176	HR	0.95	0.82, 1.10	0.51	
					Placebo	377	18,106					
		TIA	2°		Vit D + Ca	213	18,176	HR	1.16	0.95, 1.42	0.13	
					Placebo	182	18,106					
		Cerebrovascular death	2°		Vit D + Ca	213	18,176	HR	0.89*	0.62, 1.29	NS	
					Placebo	182	18,106					

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Body Weight

We searched for systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated associations between combined vitamin D and calcium and *incidence of overweight or obesity*; no such studies were found. For the outcome *weight change* (in kilograms or body mass index units), we included only randomized controlled trials. The EPC and the TEP agreed that the limited resources would not be expended on reviewing observational studies for the surrogate outcome body weight (where overweight or obesity are considered to be the clinical outcomes). We included only studies of adults. Studies of weight gain in children are included in the "Growth" section.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between combined vitamin D and calcium, body stores, or serum concentrations, and body weight in adults. One RCT each tested the effect of combined vitamin D and calcium in the setting of either an isocaloric diet or an energy restricted diet. Both used vitamin D_2 400 IU/d and calcium carbonate (one 1000 mg/d, one 1200 mg/d) and were restricted to women. In the WHI trial of postmenopausal women on an isocaloric diet after 7 years, there was a statistically significant 0.1 kg smaller weight gain in those assigned to the supplement. The effect was statistically similar across age groups. In a Quebec study of 63 overweight premenopausal women, the apparent effect of supplementation in the setting of an energy restricted diet was greater than the WHI trial (net change -1.0 kg), but this was not a significant difference between the supplement and placebo groups.

Detailed presentation (Tables 87 & 88).

Isocaloric diet.

The WHI trial was analyzed for the effect of daily combined vitamin D_2 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 mg on weight.[201] The trial included about 36,000 postmenopausal women aged 50 to 79 years. The methodological quality of the study was B. At 7 year followup, the net change in body weight (supplemented minus control) was -0.13 kg (95 percent CI -0.21, -0.05; less weight gained in supplement group). This was of questionable clinical significance, but was statistically significant. The investigators performed numerous subgroup analyses including those based on age. There were no substantive or statistically significant differences among the evaluated age subgroups.

Energy restricted diet.

A trial performed in Quebec City analyzed 63 premenopausal overweight or obese women (mean age 43) comparing daily vitamin D_2 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1200 mg versus placebo.[202] Women in both study groups were placed on a weight-loss intervention which consisted of a 700 Kcal/day decrease in energy intake for 15 weeks; the women met biweekly with a nutritionist. The trial was rated methodological quality C due to a high drop out rate (25 percent) and poor description of the methodology. Women in both study groups on average lost weight, with those in the supplement group losing 1.0 kg more (4 vs. 3 kg). However, this effect was not statistically significant (P=0.19).

Findings per vitamin D and calcium dose.

No conclusion could be reached about a possible effect of vitamin D and calcium dose.

Findings per age and sex.

The trials included only women. The effect of supplementation on postmenopausal women not on an energy restricted diet was of questionable clinical significance after 7 years. The effect of supplementation for 15 weeks on overweight and obese premenopausal women (in an approximate age range of 32 to 54 years) on an energy restricted diet was relatively large (-4 vs. -3 kg), but this difference between the supplemented and control groups was not statistically significant.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** A single trial of women on an energy restricted diet found a nonsignificant difference in weight loss between that those assigned to vitamin D 300 IU and calcium 1200 mg supplementation for 15 weeks.
- **51 – 70 y** The WHI trial found no clinically significant effect on weight of vitamin D 300 IU and calcium 1000 mg after 7 years.
- **≥71 y** The subgroup of women in the WHI trial in this life stage had a similar net weight change as all the study participants as a whole, but the effect was not statistically significant.
- **Postmenopause** All the women in the WHI trial were postmenopausal.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 87. Combined vitamin D and calcium and weight: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Caan 2007[201] WHI US (various) [17502530]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	All, post-menopause 62 (50-79) 0	Ca: 1148 (654) mg/d in treatment group; 1154 (658) in placebo group	Vit D & Ca carbonate vs. Placebo	See page 242	Factorial design with HT vs. Placebo
Major 2007[202] Quebec City, Canada (47°N) [17209177]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y • Male (%)	Overweight, healthy, pre-menopause 43 (5.5) 0	Ca 704 mg/d	Vit D + Ca carbonate vs. Placebo	nd	Energy restriction

Table 88. Combined vitamin D and calcium and weight: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex (Subgp)	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Isocaloric Diet														
Caan 2007[201] WHI [17502530]	50-79 y, Women	Weight	2°	7 y	Vit D_2 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	18,129	kg	76.0	nd	nd	-0.13	-0.21, -0.05	.001[A]	B
					Placebo	18,055		75.9	nd	nd				
	(50-54 y)				Vit D_3 + Ca	2592	kg	nd	nd		-0.24	-0.45, -0.03	<0.05[B]	
					Placebo	2561		nd	nd					
	(55-59 y)				Vit D_3 + Ca	4134	kg	nd	nd		-0.08	-0.24, +0.09	NS	
					Placebo	4135		nd	nd					
	(60-69 y)				Vit D_3 + Ca	8276	kg	nd	nd		-0.15	-0.27, -0.03	<0.05	
					Placebo	8243		nd	nd					
	(70-79 y)				Vit D_3 + Ca	3174	kg	nd	nd		-0.10	-0.27, +0.09	NS	
					Placebo	2561		nd	nd					
	(White)				Vit D_3 + Ca	15,047	kg	nd	nd		-0.13	-0.22, -0.04	<0.05[C]	
					Placebo	15,106		nd	nd					
	(Black)				Vit D_3 + Ca	1682	kg	nd	nd		-0.32	-0.59, -0.06	<0.05	
					Placebo	1635		nd	nd					
	(Hispanic)				Vit D_3 + Ca	789	kg	nd	nd		-0.08	-0.48, +0.32	NS	
					Placebo	718		nd	nd					
	(Asian / Pacific Islander)				Vit D_3 + Ca	369	kg	nd	nd		+0.19	-0.37, +0.75	NS	
					Placebo	353		nd	nd					
Energy Restricted Diet														
Major 2007[202] Quebec City, Canada [17209177]	43 (SD)	Weight	2°	15 wk	Vit D_2 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1200 mg	30	kg	81.5	-4.0	+-9.0	-1.0	-2.31. +0.31	0.19	C
					Placebo	33		83.6	-3.0	+-11.7				

[A] In addition, subgroup analyses by baseline BMI and baseline dietary calcium intake are reported.
[B] No statistically significant interaction with age.
[C] No statistically significant interaction with ethnicity.

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Cancer

Cancer from all causes and total cancer mortality.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between combined vitamin D and calcium, body stores, or serum concentrations, and total cancer incidence or mortality. Two RCTs reported different effects of combined vitamin D_3 and calcium supplementation on the risk of total cancer. The WHI showed no effects,[71] while the trial conducted in Nebraska (latitude 41°N) reported significant reduction of risk of total cancer.[52] However, both vitamin D doses and baseline vitamin D status were substantially different between these two RCTs. Therefore, the effects from these two RCTs were not comparable.

Detailed presentation (Tables 89 & 90).

The 7-year WHI trial that enrolled 36,282 postmenopausal women across the US compared a daily supplement of vitamin D_3 (400 IU) and elemental calcium (1000 mg) with placebo and evaluated incidence of total cancer and total cancer mortality as part of multiple secondary analyses.[71] The median serum 25(OH)D level of the study population was 42 nmol/L. The trial did not find significant effect of combined vitamin D_3 and calcium supplementation on either the risk of total cancer (adjusted HR: 0.98, 95 percent CI 0.91, 1.05) or total cancer mortality (adjusted HR: 0.89, 95 percent CI 0.77, 1.03). The methodological quality of this study was rated B.

A 4-year population based RCT,[52] sampled from a 9-county, largely rural area in eastern Nebraska (latitude 41°N), aimed to determine the efficacy of vitamin D_3 (1000 IU/d) plus calcium (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d), or calcium alone (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d), compared to placebo in reducing the incidence of fracture. Incidence of cancer was a secondary outcome in this trial. A total of 734 postmenopausal women, aged more than 55 years old, were analyzed for the effect of vitamin D_3 (1000 IU/d) plus calcium (either calcium citrate 1400 mg/d or calcium carbonate 1500 mg/d). The mean 25(OH)D concentration at baseline was 72 nmol/L. Compared to the placebo group, the relative risk of developing cancer at the end of study was 0.40 (95 percent CI 0.20, 0.82; P=0.013) for the vitamin D_3 plus calcium group. On the hypothesis that cancers diagnosed early in the study would have been present, although unrecognized at entry, the analyses were restricted to women who were free of cancer at 1 year intervention. The relative risk of developing cancer at the end of study for the vitamin D_3 plus calcium group changed to 0.23 (95 percent CI 0.09, 0.60; P= 0.005). The methodological quality of this study was rated B.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** No data
- **51 – 70 y** No data
- **≥71 y** No data

- **Postmenopause** The WHI trial using vitamin D_3 400 IU/d plus calcium carbonate 1000 mg/d showed no effects, while the trial in Nebraska using vitamin D_3 1000 IU/d plus calcium citrate or carbonate 1500 mg/d showed significant reduction of risk of total cancer.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No Data

Table 89. Combined vitamin D and calcium and total cancer incidence: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Wactawski-Wende 2006[71] WHI US (various) [16481636]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	Post-menopausal women nd (50-79)	Ca intake (mg/d): <800, 34%; 800-200, 26%; ≥1200, 40% Median 25(OH)D: 42 nmol/L	Vit D_3 400 IU/d + Ca 1000 mg/d vs. Placebo	See page 242	
Lappe 2007[52] Nebraska, US (41º N) [17556697]	• Health status • Mean age (range/SD), y	Mentally and physically fit; post-menopause 67 (7.3)	25(OH)D: 71.8 nmol/L	Vit D_3 1000 IU/d + Ca (citrate 1400 mg/d or carbonate 1500 mg/d) vs. Ca (citrate 1400 mg/d or carbonate 1500 mg/d) vs. placebo	nd	

Table 90. Combined vitamin D and calcium and total cancer incidence: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Followup, year	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Wactawski-Wende 2006[71] WHI [16481636]	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (all causes)	2°	7	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	1634	18176	Adjusted HR (Vit D+Ca)/placebo	0.98	0.91, 1.05	0.53	B
					Placebo	1655	18106					
	Post-menopausal women	Total cancer mortality	2°	7	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	344	18176	Adjusted HR (Vit D+Ca)/placebo	0.89	0.77, 1.03	0.12	
					Placebo	382	18106					
Lappe 2007[52] [17556697]	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (all causes)	2°	4	Vit D_3 1000 IU + Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	13	446	RR (Vit D+Ca)/placebo	0.40	0.20, -0.82	0.01	B
					Placebo	20	288					
	Post-menopausal women	Incident cancer (restrict to subjects who were free of cancer at 1 y intervention)	2°	4	Vit D_3 1000 IU + Ca (citrate 1400 mg or carbonate 1500 mg)	8	403	RR (Vit D+Ca)/placebo	0.23	0.09, -0.60	<0.005	
					Placebo	20	288					

Colorectal cancer.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between combined vitamin D and calcium, body stores, or serum concentrations, and colorectal cancer mortality or incidence. One B quality RCT of postmenopausal women reported no significant association between supplemental vitamin D_3 and calcium and, colorectal cancer mortality or incidence.

Detailed presentation (Table 91 & 92).

The WHI compared daily supplemental vitamin D_3 (400 IU) and elemental calcium (1000 mg) with placebo in 36,282 postmenopausal women. Colorectal cancer was evaluated as a secondary endpoint.[71] The primary endpoint was the prevention of hip fracture. At 7 years vitamin D_3 and calcium supplementation had no significant effect on colorectal cancer mortality (P=0.39) or incidence (P=0.51). In a subgroup analysis, risks of colon cancer and rectal cancer were also not significantly different between the supplemented and unsupplemented groups (P=0.99 and P=0.11, respectively). This trial was rated B because it did not restrict the participants from taking calcium or vitamin D supplements; they had mean daily total calcium intake of 1151 mg and vitamin D intake of 367 IU at enrollment.

Findings per special populations.

The WHI performed 18 subgroup analyses based on baseline participant characteristics including ethnic groups, body mass index, smoking status, and geographic regions according to solar irradiance.[71] No significant interactions were found with these baseline characteristics. The same RCT with multifactorial design reported an interaction between estrogen alone or combined estrogen and progestin therapy, and combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation for colorectal cancer risk in a post hoc analysis.[203] Among women concurrently assigned to hormone replacement therapies, colorectal cancer incidence was increased in the combined supplemental vitamin D and calcium arm compared to placebo (HR 1.50, 95 percent CI 0.96, 2.33), whereas among those concurrently assigned to placebo in the estrogen trials, colorectal cancer risk was reduced in the vitamin D plus calcium arm compared to placebo (HR 0.71, 95 percent CI 0.46, 1.09) (P for interaction = 0.02).

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No data
- **51 – 70 y** One trial that included women mostly within this life stage (WHI) found no significant association between combined vitamin D_3 (400 IU) and calcium carbonate (1000 mg) and colorectal cancer mortality or incidence.
- **71+** The WHI included some people within this life stage, but no study adequately evaluated this life stage.

- **Postmenopause** The WHI exclusively focused on postmenopausal women. The study found no association between vitamin D and calcium intake and colorectal cancer mortality or incidence.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 91. Combined vitamin D with calcium and colorectal cancer: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Wactawski-Wende 2006[71] WHI US (various) [16481636]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Post-menopausal women nd (50-79) 0	Total Ca intake (mg/d) (Mean for both groups: 1151) Ca + Vit D arm: 1148 • <800: 34% • 800-<1200: 26% • ≥1200: 39% Placebo arm: 1154 • <800: 33% • 800-<1200: 26% • ≥1200: 40% Total Vit D intake (IU/d) (Mean for both groups: 367) Ca + Vit D arm: nd • <200: 38% • 200-<400: 19% • 400-<600: 23% • 600: 19% Placebo arm: nd • <200: 37% • 200-<400: 19% • 400-<600: 24% • 600: 19%	Ca 1000 mg/d + Vit D_3 400 IU/d vs. Placebo	See page 242	The outcomes were based on self-reported questionnaires. Only colorectal cancers were verified centrally. Colorectal cancer screening was not mandated in the protocol. Lost to followup: • Ca + Vit D arm: 0.8% • Placebo arm: 0.8% Withdrawn: • Ca + Vit D arm: 1.9% • Placebo arm: 1.8%

Table 92. Combined vitamin D with calcium and colorectal cancer: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Wactawski-Wende 2006[71] WHI [16481636]	Post-menopausal women	Colorectal cancer mortality	2°	7	Vit D3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	34	18,176	HR (Suppl/Placebo)	0.82	0.52, 1.29	0.39	B
					Placebo	41	18,106					
		Colorectal cancer	2°		Vit D + Ca	168	18,176	HR	1.08	0.86, 1.34	0.51	
					Placebo	154	18,106					
		Colon cancer	2°		Vit D + Ca	128	18,176	HR	1.00	0.78, 1.28	0.99	
					Placebo	126	18,106					
		Rectal cancer	2°		Vit D + Ca	44	18,176	HR	1.46	0.92, 2.32	0.11	
					Placebo	30	18,106					

Colorectal adenoma. Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between combined vitamin D and calcium, body stores, or serum concentrations, and incidence of intestinal adenoma. One B quality RCT of postmenopausal women found no significant effect of combined vitamin D_3 and calcium supplements on the incidence of colorectal adenoma. Another B quality post hoc subgroup analysis of a secondary prevention trial of adenomatous adenoma reported that calcium supplemented patients with higher baseline 25(OH)D concentrations had significantly lower risk of relapse compared to placebo (interaction P = 0.01 between subgroups). In contrast, no significant difference in relapse rates was found in calcium supplemented patients with lower baseline 25(OH)D concentrations compared to placebo.

Detailed presentation (Table 91 & 92).

The WHI compared a daily supplement of vitamin D_3 (400 IU) and elemental calcium (1000 mg) with placebo and evaluated incidence of self-reported colorectal adenoma as part of multiple secondary analyses.[71] At 7 years, the incidence of adenoma was not significantly different between the supplement and placebo groups (p=0.71). All the adenoma cases were based on self-reported data, not verified by medical record review or histopathology report.

A post hoc subgroup analysis of the CPP trial of secondary adenoma prevention on the basis of calcium supplementation (1200 mg of elemental calcium) evaluated the risk of colorectal adenoma stratified by baseline 25(OH)D concentrations.[204] The primary endpoint of the original trial was the risk of recurrent adenoma. After 4 years, in the subgroup with 25(OH)D concentrations greater than 72.6 nmol/L at baseline, subjects who received supplemental calcium had a significantly lower incidence of recurrent adenoma compared to placebo (HR=0.71 [95 percent CI 0.57,0.89] versus HR=1.05 [95 percent CI 0.85, 1.29]; interaction P=0.01). In the subgroup with 25(OH)D concentrations lower than 72.6 nmol/L, the risk of recurrence was not significantly different between supplemental calcium and placebo. No subgroup data were available regarding sex, separate life stages, or other special populations (e.g., obese, smokers, ethnic groups, or users of contraceptives).

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** The CPP included some people within this life stage, but no study adequately evaluated this life stage.
- **51 – 70 y** The analysis of the CPP with a mean age of 61 years included participants mostly within this life stage. The study found a significant association between supplemental calcium and reduced risk of colorectal adenoma in a subgroup with 25(OH)D concentrations higher than 72.6 nmol/L.
- **71+** The CPP included some people within this life stage, but no study adequately evaluated this life stage.
- **Postmenopause** The WHI found no association between combined vitamin D_3 and calcium supplements and the incidence of colorectal adenoma.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Breast cancer

Synopsis

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between vitamin D and calcium intake, body stores, or serum concentrations, and breast cancer. Breast cancer incidence and breast cancer related mortality after 7 years were evaluated in the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) trial of combined daily vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 mg versus placebo in 50 to 79 year old women without a prior history of breast cancer.[205] No statistically significant effect was found with combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation on incident breast cancer outcome. No significant associations were found for breast cancer related mortality.

Detailed presentation (Tables 93 & 94)

In the WHI trial, the evaluated breast cancer incidence and breast cancer related mortality outcomes were secondary outcomes.[205] There were no significant effects of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation on both outcomes. The authors concluded that invasive breast cancer incidence was similar in the two groups of healthy postmenopausal women: calcium and vitamin D supplementation and placebo groups. The relationship of 25(OH)D serum concentrations and the risk of breast cancer was examined in a nested case-control design. The study found no relationship between total vitamin D intake and 25(OH)D serum concentrations with the risk of breast cancer.

Findings per intake level

No conclusions are possible regarding a dose effect from this single study, especially since the women in the intervention and placebo groups were allowed to take additional concurrent calcium and vitamin D supplements.

Findings by age and sex

The study investigated postmenopausal women 50 to 79 years old.

Findings by life stage

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No data available
- **51 – 70 y** The WHI trial that included women mostly within this life stage found no significant effect of combined vitamin D_3 (400 IU) and calcium carbonate (1000 mg) on incident breast cancer and mortality from breast cancer after 7 years.
- **≥71 y** Inadequate available data.
- **Postmenopause** All women in the WHI trial were postmenopausal.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 93. Combined vitamin D and calcium and breast cancer outcomes: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Chebowski 2008[205] WHI US (various) [19001601]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No breast cancer 50-79 0	Baseline Ca supplementation: Vit D & Ca arm <800: 34.3% 800-<1200: 26.5% ≥1200: 39.3% Placebo arm <800: 33.8% 800-<1200: 26.2% ≥1200: 40.0% Baseline Vit D supplementation: Vit D & Ca arm Yes: 47.1% No: 52.9% Placebo arm Yes 47. 6% No 52.4%	Combined Vit D & Ca supplement vs. Placebo	See page 242	Intervention and placebo groups were allowed to take additional concurrent calcium and vitamin D supplements.

Table 94. Combined vitamin D and calcium and breast cancer outcomes: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Chebowski 2008[205] WHI [19001601]	50-79 y, Women	Breast cancer incidence	2°	7	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	668	18176	HR (Suppl/Placebo)	0.96	0.86, 1.07	NS	B
					Placebo	693	18106					
		Death from breast cancer	2°	7	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	23	18176	HR	0.99	0.55, 1.76	NS	
					Placebo	23	18106					
		Invasive breast cancer – subgroup >67.6 baseline 25(OH)D	2°	7	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	86	195	Adj OR	0.89	0.58, 1.36	NS	
					Placebo	76	185					
		Invasive breast cancer – subgroup 55.4-<67.6 baseline 25(OH)D	2°	7	Vit D_3 + Ca	95	171	Adj OR	1.25	0.83, 1.90	NS	
					Placebo	86	171					
		Invasive breast cancer – subgroup 43.9- <55.4 baseline 25(OH)D	2°	7	Vit D_3 + Ca	102	176	Adj OR	1.07	0.70, 1.62	NS	
					Placebo	92	195					
		Invasive breast cancer – subgroup 32.4-<43.9 baseline 25(OH)D	2°	7	Vit D_3 + Ca	71	185	Adj OR	0.69	0.45, 1.06	NS	
					Placebo	102	171					
		Invasive breast cancer – subgroup <32.4 baseline 25(OH)D	2°	7	Vit D_3 + Ca	94	171	Adj OR	0.91	0.60, 1.39	NS	
					Placebo	91	176					

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Pregnancy-related Outcomes

Preeclampsia.

Synopsis.

Based on data from a single RCT, there is no significant effect of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation on the prevention of preeclampsia.

Detailed presentation (Tables 95 & 96.)

One RCT from India used a combination of vitamin D (1200 IU/d) and calcium (375 mg/d) for the prevention of preeclampsia.[206] **Table 85** describes the characteristics of the trial. The trial found no significant difference between the compared arms (**Table 86**). Note that this RCT was excluded from the meta-analysis of trials for preeclampsia in the calcium section.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not applicable
- **3 – 8 y** Not applicable
- **9 – 18 y** Not applicable
- **19 – 50 y** [see pregnant and lactating women]
- **51 – 70 y** Not applicable
- **71+** Not applicable
- **Postmenopause** Not applicable
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Based on data from a single RCT, there is no significant effect of combined vitamin D (1200 IU/d) and calcium (375 mg/d) supplementation on the prevention of preeclampsia.

Other pregnancy-related outcomes.

Synopsis.

We did not identify any eligible studies on the relationship of vitamin D with or without calcium and high blood pressure, preterm birth, or small for gestational age infant.

Table 95. Combined vitamin D and calcium and preeclampsia: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Marya 1987[206] India (29°N) [3623260]	• Health status • Age range, y	Any 20-35	Ca: 500 mg/d in in diet; Vit D: ~40 IU/d (unclear how it was quantified)	Combined Vit D (1200 IU/d) & Ca (375 mg/d) supplement vs. no supplement	nd	

Table 96. Combined vitamin D and calcium and preeclampsia: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Compari-son)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Marya 1987[206] India (29°N) [3623260]	Pregnancy	Toxemia (preeclampsia)	1°	ND	Vit D (1200 IU) & calcium (375 mg)	12	200	RR (combined Vit D & Ca vs. nothing)	0.67	0.33, 1.35	0.26	C
					No supplement	18	200					

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Clinical Outcomes of Bone Health

Rickets, fractures, falls, or performance measures.

For bone health outcomes (e.g., bone mineral density, fracture, fall or muscle strength), we relied on a recent comprehensive systematic review performed by the Ottawa EPC (**Table 34)**.[6] Because the Ottawa's EPC report did not have separate analyses for the effect of vitamin D supplementation alone, the results for the effect of vitamin D alone or in combination with calcium supplementation are presented in this section.

The Ottawa EPC report was updated with literature published between January 2006 and April 2009, selected according to our eligibility criteria. Only RCTs qualified for inclusion.

Synopsis.

The Ottawa EPC report concluded that supplementation with vitamin D (most studies used D_3) plus calcium is effective in reducing fractures in institutionalized populations, but there is inconsistent evidence that supplemental vitamin D reduces falls in postmenopausal women and older men. Our update search did not identify new RCT examining the combined effect of vitamin D plus calcium supplementation on rickets, fractures, or falls in postmenopausal women and older men.

One study published after the Ottawa EPC report analyzed the performance measure outcomes in a small sample of postmenopausal women from WHI trial showed generally no differences in performance measures between vitamin D (400 IU/d) plus calcium (1000 mg/d) supplementation or placebo groups after 5 years of followup.[207] One RCT of premenopausal women, aged 17 to 35 years old, showed that 800 IU/d of vitamin D in combination with 2000 mg/d of calcium supplementation can reduce the risk of stress fracture from military training compared to placebo.[208]

Detailed presentation (Table 34, 97, 98 & 99).

One RCT of female Navy recruits, aged 17 to 35 years, aimed to determine whether supplementation with vitamin D (800 IU/d) plus calcium (2000 mg/d) can reduce the risk of stress fractures from military training near the Great Lakes (41°N).[208] The median dairy intake was <1 serving/day, which provided less than 300 mg of calcium. The combined supplementation significantly reduced the risk of stress fractures by 20 percent compared to placebo. The methodological quality of this study was rated B.

One study analyzed the performance measure outcomes in a sample of 2928 postmenopausal women from the WHI trial who had objective physical function measures.[207] The results showed that physical function, measured by grip strength, chair stands, and walking time, had generally declined in postmenopausal women who were assigned to either vitamin D (400 IU/d) plus calcium (1000 mg/d) supplementation or placebo group. However, women who had received vitamin D plus calcium supplementation showed less declines in walking time than those who had received placebo. The methodological quality of this study was rated C because only a small proportion of women from the WHI trial were in the analyses and their baseline characteristics were unclear.

From the Ottawa EPC Report: Fractures - Postmenopausal women and older men.

Fifteen RCTs examined the effect of either vitamin D_2 or D_3 alone or in combination with calcium on total, nonvertebral and hip fractures in postmenopausal women or older men. Few trials evaluated vertebral fractures. Most trials used vitamin D_3. There were no trials identified in premenopausal women.

Meta-analysis results from 13 RCTs of vitamin D_2 or D_3 with or without calcium showed a nonsignificant reduction in the risk of total fractures that persisted when only trials of higher quality were combined. Most trials used vitamin D_3. When combining seven RCTs of vitamin D_3 (400-800 IU) plus calcium, there was a reduction in the risk of total and hip fractures. However, in a subgroup analysis (800 IU vitamin D_3), this benefit was only evident in trials of institutionalized elderly subjects. One possible explanation for the discrepancy is that the mean serum 25(OH)D concentration achieved in trials of institutionalized participants was higher than in the trials on community dwellers. The combined estimate from trials with higher end-of-study serum 25(OH)D concentrations (>74 nmol/L) was consistent with a significant reduction in the risk of fractures.

In Ottawa EPC report: Falls - Postmenopausal women and older men.

Meta-analysis results from 12 RCTs demonstrated a small reduction in the risk of falls with supplemental vitamin D_2 or D_3 (oral or injectable) with or without calcium (OR 0.89, 95 percent CI 0.80, 0.99). The individual treatment effects ranged from OR 0.28 (95 percent CI 0.12, 0.67) to 1.16 (95 percent CI 0.70, 1.92). In the two cluster RCTs, one demonstrated a significant reduction in the risk of falls in postmenopausal women taking vitamin D_3 plus calcium (RR 0.88, 95 percent CI 0.79, 0.98), whereas the other trial did not show a significant reduction in the risk of falls in elderly individuals taking vitamin D_2 (RR 1.09, 95 percent CI 0.95, 1.25). Meta-analysis of eight RCTs of oral vitamin D_2/D_3 supplementation with calcium showed a reduction in the risk of falls, whereas four RCTs of oral vitamin D_3 alone did not. Subgroup analyses showed a significant reduction in the risk of falls when only trials of postmenopausal women were combined. Sensitivity analyses showed a significant reduction in the risk of falls when combining (1) RCTs that explicitly defined falls and the method of fall ascertainment and (2) those in which the allocation concealment was unclear. However, combining trials by degree of compliance and loss to followup did not.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** The Ottawa EPC report concluded that supplementation with vitamin D (most studies used D_3) plus calcium is effective in reducing the risk of fractures in institutionalized populations, but there is inconsistent evidence that supplemental vitamin D reduces the risk of falls in postmenopausal women and older men. One RCT of female Navy recruit, aged 17 to 35 years old, showed that vitamin D (800 IU/d) in combination of calcium (2000 mg/d) supplementation can reduce the risk of stress fractures from military training compared to placebo.
- **51 – 70 y** No new data since the Ottawa report
- **71+** No new data since the Ottawa report

- **Postmenopause** One study analyzed the performance measure outcomes in a small sample of postmenopausal women from the WHI trial showed generally no differences in performance measures between vitamin D (400 IU/d) plus calcium (1000 mg/d) supplementation and placebo groups after 5 years of followup.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Table 97. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone health: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Lappe 2008[208] Great Lakes, IL, US (41°N) [18433305]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Assumed healthy (Navy recruits) 19 (17-35) 0	Mean dairy servings/wk = 6 (ranged 1-26)	Vit D 800 IU/d + Ca 2000 mg/d vs. Placebo	Monitor pill taking: project staff observed the galley food lines, visited recruits in their quarters, and conducted an exit interview.	
Brunner 2008[207] WHI US (various) [18755319]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	nd (for the sub sample from WHI trial) 50-79 0	nd	Vit D 400 IU/d + Ca 1000 mg/d vs. Placebo	nd (however, adherence was assessed at least annually from the weight of remaining pills along with a structured interview in WHI trial)	A sub sample from WHI trial. Post hoc analyses of a RCT.

Table 98. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone health: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report (stress fracture)

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, mo	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Lappe 2008[208] [18433305]	17-35 y women	Stress fracture from Navy training (ITT)	1°	2	Vit D 800 IU + Ca 200 mg	139	2626	RR (Vit D+Ca)/placebo	0.8	0.64, 0.99	0.026	B
					Placebo	170	2575					
		Stress fracture from Navy training (per protocol)	1°	2	Vit D 800 IU + Ca 200 mg	126	1852	Adjusted OR (Vit D+Ca)/placebo	0.79	0.62, 1.01	0.059	
					Placebo	160	1848					

Table 99. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone health: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report (performance measures)

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, mo	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change SD	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Brunner 2008[207] [18755319]	Post-menopause	Grip strength	2°	60	Vit D 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	1185	kg	22.81	-2.49	5.81	0.15	0.24	0.52	C
					Placebo	1162		22.96	-2.64	5.69				
		Chair stands	2°	60	Vit D 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	1065	counts	6.52	-0.38	1.81	0.04	0.08	0.603	
					Placebo	1053		6.63	-0.43	1.81				
		Walking time	2°	60	Vit D 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	1160	seconds		+0.26	6.28	-0.54	0.26	0.030	
					Placebo	1141			+0.81	6.43				

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and all-cause Mortality

Synopsis.

This synopsis is based on a meta-analysis of RCTs of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation evaluating mortality. Numerical data were extracted from previous systematic reviews. Most trials used daily regimens; in these trials, vitamin D doses ranged between 300 and 880 IU per day. Most trials combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation; when used, calcium doses ranged between 500 and 1200 mg per day.

Our meta-analysis of 11 RCTs (44,688 participants) suggests no significant relationship between combined supplementation of vitamin D and calcium all-cause mortality (RR=0.93, 95 percent CI 0.86, 1.01; random effects model). There is little evidence for between-study heterogeneity in these analyses. Among 8 RCTs on 44,281 postmenopausal women, the summary random effects RR was 0.93 (95 percent CI 0.86, 1.00), again with little evidence for between-study heterogeneity.

Although the meta-analyses suggest decreased risk for all-cause mortality with combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation, the relationship is not statistically significant in the performed analyses.

Detailed presentation (Table 37; Figure 22).

As mentioned in the Methods section, we updated and reanalyzed published meta-analyses of mortality outcomes. We drew our own conclusions based on our analyses. We also comment on the concordance of our conclusions with those of the published meta-analyses.

Relevant published systematic reviews of RCTs (with meta-analyses).

As described in the vitamin D and all-cause mortality section, we identified two potentially eligible systematic reviews,[83,84] and selected one as the basis for our reanalysis (Autier 2007).[83] Table 37 in the "Vitamin D" section summarizes the findings of the Autier 2007 systematic review.

As detailed below, we identified one additional trial of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation reporting all-cause mortality.[209]

Eligible studies published after the systematic reviews.

The literature searches in Autier 2007 extended up to November 2006. We identified two additional RCT reports published after November 2006.[71,209] One publication[71] reported on the same trial as another publication[210] in the Autier 2007 meta-analysis, and was therefore excluded from our reanalysis. The other RCT (Bjorkman 2008[209]) was included in our meta-analysis.

One three-arm RCT (Bjorkman 2008[209], n=218) compared no supplementation versus daily supplementation with 400 IU and 1200 IU of vitamin D_3 and 500 mg of calcium. Mortality was assessed at 6 months. It included people older than 65 years, with chronically impaired mobility and stable general condition. The Bjorkman 2008 RCT was assigned grade "A" for overall reporting quality.

Reanalysis.

We excluded 5 of 18 trials in the Autier 2007 meta-analysis: One trial was on patients with congestive heart failure,[85] one was published only in abstract form,[86] and in the last trial the controls also received supplementation with vitamin D, albeit with a smaller dose,[87] and two used injections of vitamin D.[88,89] Altogether, 11 RCTs were included in the reanalysis of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation and all-cause mortality (i.e., 10 out of 18 in the Autier 2007 meta-analysis, and a subsequently published one[209]).

Among the 12 trials, sample sizes ranged from 55 to 36,282 participants, with 7 studies including more than 500 participants. Followup periods ranged from 6 to 84 months (median 24 months). Vitamin D doses in most trials ranged between 300 and 880 IU per day. One trial used 100,000 IU orally every 4 months. Calcium supplementation doses ranged between 500 to 1200 mg per day.

Overall, a meta-analysis of the 11 RCTs (44,688 participants; Figure 22) found no statistically significant relationship between vitamin D and all-cause mortality (RR=0.93, 95 percent CI 0.86, 1.01). There is little evidence for between-study heterogeneity in these analyses (P=0.58, I^2=0 percent). Among 8 RCTs on 44,281 postmenopausal women, the summary random effects RR was 0.93 (95 percent CI 0.86, 1.00), again with little evidence for between-study heterogeneity (P=0.46, I^2=0 percent). There are no RCTs with mean participant age below 50 years. It is unclear whether these findings are directly applicable to other life stages. In addition, in a subgroup analysis among 8 RCTs (n=8109) where the mean participant age was above 70 years, the summary random effects RR=0.98 (95 percent CI 0.84, 1.15), with little evidence for between study heterogeneity (P=0.33, I^2=13 percent).

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** No data
- **19 – 50 y** No data
- **51 – 70 y** Our meta-analysis of 12 RCTs (44,838 participants) suggests no significant relationship between combined supplementation of vitamin D and calcium all-cause mortality (RR=0.94, 95 percent CI 0.87, 1.01; random effects model). There is little evidence for between-study heterogeneity in these analyses.
- **71+** The above are likely applicable here. In addition, in a subgroup analysis among 8 RCTs (n=8109) where the mean participant age was above 70 years, the summary random effects RR=0.98 (95 percent CI 0.84, 1.15), with little evidence for between study heterogeneity.
- **Postmenopause** Among 8 RCTs on 44,281 postmenopausal women, the summary random effects RR was 0.93 (95 percent CI 0.86, 1.00), again with little evidence for between-study heterogeneity.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No data

Figure 22. Forest plot of trials of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation and effects on all-cause mortality.



Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Hypertension and Blood Pressure.

We reviewed systematic reviews and primary studies that evaluated associations between combined vitamin D and calcium intake and incidence of hypertension or change in blood pressure. For the outcome incidence of hypertension, we included RCTs and other longitudinal studies. For the outcome change in blood pressure, we included only RCTs. We included only studies of adults. Studies of pregnancy-related hypertension and blood pressure control are included in the "Pregnancy-related outcomes" section.

Combined vitamin D and calcium and hypertension.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between combined vitamin D and calcium intake, body stores, or serum concentrations and incidence of hypertension. The WHI trial reported an analysis of the risk of developing hypertension among the subset of women without hypertension at baseline. Over 7 years, combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation had no effect on the risk of hypertension.

Detailed presentation (Tables 100 & 101).

The WHI trial of a combined vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 mg supplement daily versus placebo had methodological quality B for the blood pressure outcome. The 36,282 women were postmenopausal (age 50-79 y) with a background calcium intake on average of about 1150 mg/day (from diet and supplements).[211] The women were allowed to take additional concurrent calcium and vitamin D supplements. The analysis of incident hypertension was reported briefly in a larger analysis of the blood pressure outcome (see *Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure*, below). Among 17,122 initially nonhypertensive women, 39 percent either were prescribed medication for hypertension or developed blood pressure above 140/90 mm Hg. The adjusted HR of developing hypertension over 7 years was 1.01 (95 percent CI 0.96, 1.06). Among 377 women with available data, there was a statistically significant trend across subgroups based on serum 25(OH)D concentration such that combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation *increased* the risk of developing hypertension more in those women with progressively *lower* baseline 25(OH)D ($P<0.01$ for trend). Other subgroup analyses based on age, race or ethnicity, weight, or baseline total calcium intake did not find any interactions with the effect of the supplement intervention.

Findings per intake level.

This single trial did not analyze different actual intake levels.

Findings by age and sex.

This trial found no difference in (lack of) effect by age among postmenopausal women.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** No data.

- **51 – 70 y** One large trial that included women mostly within this life stage found no significant effect of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation.
- **≥71 y** The WHI trial included some women within the life stage, but no study adequately evaluated this life stage.
- **Postmenopause** All women in the WHI trial were postmenopausal. See 51-71 y life stage.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 100. Combined vitamin D and calcium and incident hypertension: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Margolis 2008[211] WHI US (various) [18824662]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	No HTN 62 (50-79) 0	Ca: 1148 (654) mg/d in treatment group; 1154 (658) in placebo group 52% used Ca supplements 40% had intake ≥1200 mg/d (based on all subjects, including those with hypertension)	Combined Vit D + Ca supplement vs. Placebo	See page 242	Mean dose of open label supplemental Ca increased by <100 mg/d from 325 mg/d at enrollment; similar in both groups (based on all subjects, including those with hypertension)

Table 101. Combined vitamin D and calcium and incident hypertension: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Life Stage [Subgp]	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, y	Interventions, Daily Dose	n Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (Comparison)	Result	95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Margolis 2008[211] WHI [18824662]	50-79 y, Women	HTN	2°	7	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	3377	~8578	HR (Suppl/Placebo)	1.01	0.96, 1.06	0.69	B
					Placebo	3315	~8544					
	[25(OH)D <34.4 nmol/L]				Vit D + Ca	53			1.52	0.89, 2.59	NS	
					Placebo	38						
	[25(OH)D 34.4-47.6 nmol/L]				Vit D + Ca	39			1.48	0.89, 2.46	NS	
					Placebo	48						
	[25(OH)D 47.7-64.6 nmol/L]				Vit D + Ca	45			1.15	0.69, 1.92	NS	
					Placebo	45						
	[25(OH)D ≥64.7 nmol/L]				Vit D + Ca	48			0.79	0.51, 1.22	NS	
					Placebo	61						

Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure.

Synopsis.

No qualified systematic reviews evaluated the association between vitamin D and calcium intake, body stores, or serum concentrations, and changes in blood pressure. Two RCTs compared combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation with placebo. Both the small trial of a combined vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1200 mg supplement daily and the WHI trial found no significant effect of supplementation on blood pressure after 15 weeks or 6.1 years, respectively. The WHI trial analyzed blood pressure changes in a variety of subgroups, including by age, ethnicity, baseline total calcium intake, and baseline diagnosis of hypertension, but found no significant differences in effect across any subgroup.

Detailed presentation (Tables 102 & 103).

The WHI trial of a combined vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 mg supplement daily versus placebo had methodological quality B for the blood pressure outcome. The 36,282 women were postmenopausal (age 50-79 y) with a background calcium intake on average of about 1150 mg/day (from diet and supplements).[211] On average, the women had normal blood pressure and were allowed to take additional concurrent calcium and vitamin D supplements. At 74 months, the women's mean systolic blood pressure had risen and diastolic blood pressure had fallen in both trial arms (by less than about 2 mm Hg each at 2 years[199]). The absolute changes were not significantly different in the women assigned to the supplement than placebo (net difference 0.2 mm Hg systolic and 0.1 mm Hg diastolic). In subgroup analyses there was no differences in results by age, ethnicity, baseline total calcium intake, baseline diagnosis of hypertension, or a variety of other factors.

The C quality trial of combined vitamin D and calcium, performed in Quebec City, recruited premenopausal women (mean age 43 y) with low calcium intake (800 mg calcium per day) who did not have severe hypertension (blood pressure over 160/95 mm Hg).[202] The mean baseline calcium intake was 704 mg/day. On average, the 63 women had normal blood pressure. They were given either combined vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1200 mg daily or placebo. All women were on an energy restriction diet with a 700 kcal/day deficit. At 15 weeks, systolic and diastolic blood pressures were reduced in both study groups; systolic blood pressure was reduced by 2.5 mm Hg more in women on vitamin D and calcium than placebo, but this difference was not statistically significant. Diastolic blood pressure was reduced by the same amount in both groups. No subgroup analyses were reported. The study was limited by a 25 percent dropout rate due to lack of compliance with the diet and exercise portion of the trial, without performing an intention to treat analysis, an adequate description of the study methods, or a complete statistical analysis.

Findings per intake level.

Both trials used similar doses, vitamin D_3 400 IU and calcium carbonate 1000 or 1200 mg daily. The background calcium intake was lower in the study of premenopausal women (800 mg/day) than the WHI trial (1150 mg/day). The WHI trial found no significant difference in (lack of) effect in subgroups with different baseline total calcium intake.

Findings by age and sex.

Both the one small, short term, C quality trial of premenopausal women and the 6 year WHI trial of postmenopausal women found no effect. The WHI trial also found no difference in effect in subgroups of women based on age. No trials of men were found.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** Not reviewed
- **7 mo – 2 y** Not reviewed
- **3 – 8 y** Not reviewed
- **9 – 18 y** Not reviewed
- **19 – 50 y** One small trial that included women mostly within this life stage found no significant effect of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation.
- **51 – 70 y** One large trial that included women mostly within this life stage found no significant effect of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation.
- **≥71 y** The WHI trial included some women within the life stage, but no study adequately evaluated this life stage.
- **Postmenopause** All women in the WHI trial were postmenopausal. See 51-71 y life stage.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** Not reviewed

Table 102. Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure: Characteristics of RCTs

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Margolis 2008[211] WHI US (various) [18824662]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Any 62 (50-79) 0	Ca: 1148 (654) mg/d in treatment group; 1154 (658) in placebo group 52% used Ca supplements 40% had intake ≥1200 mg/d	Combined Vit D + Ca supplement vs. Placebo	See page 242	Mean dose of open label supplemental Ca increased by <100 mg/d from 325 mg/d at enrollment; similar in both groups
Major 2007[202] Quebec City, Canada (47°N) [17209177]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	Healthy, Overweight, low Ca intake 43 (5.5) 0	Ca: ~704 mg/d; all <800 mg/d	Combined Vit D + Ca supplement vs. Placebo	nd	

Table 103. Combined vitamin D and calcium and blood pressure: Results of RCTs

Author Year Study Name [PMID]	Age Range, Sex	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
SYSTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE														
Margolis 2008[211] WHI [18824662]	50-79, Women	SBP	2°	6.1 y	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	18,176	mm Hg	127[A]	+1.1%[A]	0.9, 1.3	+0.22	-0.05, +0.49	0.11	B
					Placebo	18,106		128[A]	+0.7%[A]	0.5, 0.9				
Major 2007[202] Quebec City [17209177]	43 (5.5), Women	SBP	2°	15 wk	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1200 mg (energy restriction diet)	30	mm Hg	112.4	-4.1	-6.5, -1.7	-2.5	-6.2, 1.2*	0.18	C
					Placebo (energy restriction diet)	33		109.5	-1.6	-4.2, 1.0				
DIASTOLIC BLOOD PRESSURE														
Margolis 2008[211] WHI [18824662]	50-79, Women	DBP	2°	6.1 y	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	18,176	mm Hg	76[A]	-0.2%[A]	-0.4, -0.02	+0.11	-0.04, +0.27	0.14	B
					Placebo	18,106		76[A]	-0.6%[A]	-0.8, -0.4				
Major 2007[202] Quebec City [17209177]	43 (5.5), Women	DBP	2°	15 wk	Vit D_3 400 IU + Ca carbonate 1200 mg (energy restriction diet)	30	mm Hg	74.9	-3.0	-4.8, -1.2	0	-2.7, 2.7*	1.0	C
					Placebo (energy restriction diet)	33		75.2	-3.0	-5.0, -1.0				

[A] Hsia 2007[199] [17309935]

Combined Vitamin D and Calcium and Bone Mineral Density or Bone Mineral Content.

For bone health outcomes (e.g., bone mineral density, fracture, fall or muscle strength), we relied on a recent comprehensive systematic review performed by the Ottawa EPC (**Table 34**).[6] Because the Ottawa's EPC report did not have separate analyses on the effect of vitamin D supplementation alone, the results for the effect of vitamin D alone or in combination with calcium supplementation were presented in this section.

The Ottawa EPC report was updated with literature published between January 2006 and April 2009, selected according to our eligibility criteria. For adults, we included only BMD indices. For children, we included only BMC indices. Only RCTs with duration more than 1 year qualified for inclusion.

Synopsis

One RCT found that, compared to placebo, there was no significant effect of supplementation with vitamin D_3 (200 IU/d) plus calcium (1000 mg/d) on BMC changes in healthy girls, between 10 and 12 years.

Overall, findings from the Ottawa EPC report showed that vitamin D_3 ($\leq$ 800 IU/d) plus calcium (~500 mg/d) supplementation resulted in small increases in BMD of the spine, total body, femoral neck and total hip in predominantly populations of late menopausal women.[6] Two of the three new RCTs showed consistent findings in postmenopausal women, comparing vitamin D_3 or D_2 (300 or 1000 IU/d, respectively) plus calcium (1200 mg/d) to placebo.

Detailed presentation (Table 34, 104 & 105).

One RCT compared the effect of vitamin D_3 (200 IU/d) plus calcium (1000 mg/d) supplementation to placebo on bone indices in healthy girls, aged 10 and 12 years.[212] The mean background dietary calcium intake was 670 mg/d. The intention-to-treat analyses showed that after 2 years of supplementation, there was no significant difference in the BMC changes between girls who received vitamin D plus calcium supplement or placebo. The methodological quality of this study was rated C, due to underpower and low compliance rate.

Three RCTs (two were rated B and one was rated C) examined the effect of vitamin D plus calcium supplementation on BMD changes. All three trials were conducted in postmenopausal women. However, the doses of vitamin D and calcium combinations varied. One RCT used daily dose of 400 IU vitamin D_3 plus 100 mg elemental calcium for 2 years [213] The second RCT used daily dose of 1000 IU vitamin D_2 plus 1200 mg calcium citrate for 5 years.[214] The third RCT used a daily dose of vitamin D_3 300 IU plus calcium citrate 1200 mg from calcium supplemented low-fat dairy products for 1 year.[215] The latter two RCTs resulted in a significant increase in hip or total BMD comparing vitamin D plus calcium supplementation to placebo.[214,215] The one RCT that did not show significant change in femoral neck BMD comparing vitamin D plus calcium supplementation to placebo used a substantially lower dose of calcium (100 mg/d) than the other two RCTs.

In Ottawa EPC report - Bone Mineral Density and women of reproductive age, postmenopausal women, and older men.

Overall, there is good evidence that vitamin D_3 plus calcium supplementation resulted in small increases in BMD of the spine, total body, femoral neck and total hip. Based on included

trials, it was less certain whether vitamin D_3 supplementation alone has a significant effect on BMD.

Seventeen RCTs evaluated the effect of supplemental vitamin D_2 or D_3 on BMD, predominantly in populations of late menopausal women. Only one small RCT included premenopausal women, and two trials included older men (> 60 years). Most trials were two to three years in duration and used vitamin D doses of ≤ 800 IU daily. Most trials used vitamin D_3 and also included calcium 500 mg as a cointervention.

Meta-analysis results of 17 RCTs of vitamin D_3 plus calcium versus placebo were consistent with a small effect on lumbar spine, femoral neck, and total body BMD. The WHI trial found a significant benefit of 400 IU vitamin D_3 plus 1000 mg calcium supplementation on total hip BMD. However, when the effect of vitamin D_3 plus calcium versus calcium alone supplementation is assessed, no significant increase in BMD was observed with either intervention, suggesting vitamin D_3 may be of less benefit in calcium replete postmenopausal women. Vitamin D_3 alone versus placebo did not result in a significant increase in BMD in postmenopausal women, except in one trial that noted an increase in femoral neck BMD. Only a few trials reported the impact of baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations on BMD and in all of these trials, baseline 25(OH)D concentration was not associated with increased BMD.

Findings by life stage.

- **0 – 6 mo** No data
- **7 mo – 2 y** No data
- **3 – 8 y** No data
- **9 – 18 y** One RCT showed that, compared to placebo, there was no significant effect of vitamin D_3 (200 IU/d) plus calcium (1000 mg/d) on BMC changes in healthy girls, aged between 10 and 12 years old.
- **19 – 50 y** No data
- **51 – 70 y** No new data since the Ottawa EPC report
- **≥71 y** No new data since the Ottawa EPC report
- **Postmenopause** Findings from the Ottawa EPC report showed that vitamin D_3 (≤ 800 IU/d) plus calcium (~500 mg/d) supplementation resulted in small increases in BMD of the spine, total body, femoral neck, and total hip in predominantly populations of late menopausal women. Two of the three new RCTs showed a significant increase in hip or total BMD in postmenopausal women, comparing D_3 or D_2 (300 or 1000 IU/d, respectively) plus calcium (1200 mg/d) to placebo.
- **Pregnant & lactating women** No new data since the Ottawa EPC report

Table 104. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone mineral density/content: Characteristics of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name Location (Latitude) [PMID]	Population		Background Calcium Intake & Vitamin D Data	Comparisons	Compliance	Comments
Cheng 2005[212] Jyvaskyla, Finland (62°24'N) [16280447]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy 11.2 (10-12) 0	Diet Vit D: 100 IU/d Ca: 670 mg/d	Vit D_3 200 IU/d + Ca carbonate 1000 mg/d vs. placebo	65% completed intervention with >50% compliance	
Bolton-Smith 2007[213] (UK 54ºN) [17243866]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Healthy (assumed postmenopausal) 68 (≥60) 0	25(OH)D: 59.4 nmol/L Ca: 1548 mg/d	Vit D_3 400 IU/d + Elemental Ca 100 mg/d vs. placebo	Good supplement adherence based on pill count (median, 99; IQE 97.3-99.8%).	Noncompliant women were excluded.
Zhu 2008[214] CIFOS Western Australia [18089701]	• Health status • Mean age (SD), y • Male (%)	nd (assumed postmenopausal) 74.8 (2.6) 0	25(OH)D: 68.0 nmol/L Ca: 1010 mg/d	Vit D_2 1000 IU/d + Ca citrate 1200 mg/d vs. placebo	No differences in adherence among groups (81-89% by tablet counting)	
Moschonis 2006[215] Greece (31ºN) [17181890]	• Health status • Mean age (range), y • Male (%)	Postmenopausal 61 (55-65) 0	Diet Vit D: 23.6 IU/d Ca 680 mg/d	Vit D_3 300 IU/d + Ca 1200 mg/d (from low fat dairy products) vs. control (usual diet)	Dairy group 93% (assessed via information obtained at the biweekly sessions	Control group had no intervention (or usual diet) so compliance issue not applicable

Table 105. Combined vitamin D and calcium and bone mineral density/content: Results of RCTs published after the Ottawa EPC report

Author Year Study Name PMID	Life Stage	Outcome	1°/2°	Mean Followup, mo	Interventions, Daily Dose	No. Analyzed	Unit	Baseline	Change	Change 95% CI	Net Diff	Net Diff 95% CI	P Btw	Study Quality
Cheng 2005[212] [16280447]	10-12 y girls	BMC	1°	24	Vit D 200 IU + Ca carbonate 1000 mg	46	kg	1.3	34.7%	34.3%, 35.1%	-0.3%	-0.8, 0.2[A]	NS	C
					Placebo	39		1.3	35.0%	34.6%, 35.4%				
Bolton-Smith 2007[213] [17243866]	Postmenopausal women	Femoral neck BMD	nd	24	Vit D_3 400 IU + Elemental Ca 100 mg	50	mg/cm^2	nd	+1.9	-6.5, 10.3	+1.2	-12.6, 15.0[A]	NS	B
					Placebo	56		nd	+0.7	-10.2, 11.6				
Zhu 2008[214] Australia CIFOS [18089701]	Postmenopausal women	Hip BMD	1°	60	Vit D_2 1000 IU + Ca citrate 1200 mg	39/33[B]	mg/cm^2	783	nd		+2.2%	1.9, 2.5	0.05	B
					Placebo	41/36[B]		828	nd					
Moschonis 2006[215] [17181890]	Postmenopausal women	Total body BMD	1°	12	Vit D_3 300 IU + Ca 1200 mg (from low fat dairy products)	39	mg/cm^2	1.13	1.5%	0.9%, 2.2%	+2.2%	1.3, 3.1[A]	<0.05	C
					Control (usual diet)	36		1.12	-0.7%	-1.4%, -0.1%				

[A] Estimated from reported data.
[B] Baseline/follow-up number of subjects analyzed

How does dietary intake of vitamin D from fortified foods and vitamin D supplementation affect serum 25(OH)D concentrations (arrow 4)?

The evidence for this question comes from studies identified in our literature search that crossed vitamin D terms with various outcomes terms. Studies that addressed this question but do not report any of the outcomes of interest would not have been identified in this manner. Because the availability of serum 25(OH)D concentration is unlikely to be adequately indexed in the Medline citation, it would be difficult to comprehensively search the literature for this question. To do so would require retrieving all vitamin D supplements full text articles (in excess of 10,000) to look for serum 25(OH)D concentration data. Given that there is no plausible reason for a systematic bias of studies of a specific outcome choosing to report serum 25(OH)D concentration, we believe that the evidence found, while not comprehensive, is a small but representative random sample. Only RCTs were included for this question. RCTs of different regimens but with the same dose of vitamin D supplementation were excluded (e.g., comparison of daily, weekly versus monthly dose).

This question was also addressed in the Ottawa EPC report.[6] When appropriate, we extracted relevant data from the Ottawa EPC report to be incorporated into our analyses.

RCTs on Dietary Intakes of Vitamin D From Fortified Foods and Serum 25(OH)D Concentrations.

Synopsis.

Our updated search did not identify new RCT evaluating the effect of food fortification on serum 25(OH)D concentrations since the Ottawa EPC report.[6] The Ottawa EPC report concluded that there is "good" evidence that dietary intake of vitamin D increases serum 25(OH)D concentrations among adults.

Detailed presentation.

Ottawa EPC report –Adults.

There were eleven RCTs (n=1281) of which seven (n=668) permitted a quantitative analysis. Ten of eleven trials found a significant effect of dietary intake from foods fortified with vitamin D on serum 25(OH)D concentrations. There was significant heterogeneity of the treatment effect. Potential sources of heterogeneity are the different 25(OH)D assays used (two studies each used HPLC, RIA or CPBA, and one study did not report the assay), the dietary vehicles used, and study populations. The increase in serum vitamin D concentration in the seven trials ranged from 15 (95 percent CI 11, 18) to 40 (95 percent CI 25, 55) nmol/L (fortification consisting of 100 - 1000 IU of vitamin D).

There can be a potential confounding of the data by the food source, the assay used to measure 25(OH)D and potential differences in the bioavailability and/or metabolism of vitamin D_2 versus vitamin D_3. Most studies in this review used dairy products as the

source of fortified food. It is important to note that there is potential for study contamination through altered intake of other nutrients such as calcium, phosphate and acid load that can affect the study outcomes.

RCTs on Vitamin D Supplementation and Serum 25(OH)D Concentrations.

Synopsis.

Because the availability of serum 25(OH)D concentration is unlikely to be adequately indexed in the Medline citation, it would be difficult to comprehensively search the literature for this question. We believe that studies summarized here is a small but representative random sample of all available data.

We plot the net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentration against the doses of vitamin D supplementation using data from 26 RCTs with 28 comparisons in adults. Only RCTs of daily vitamin D_3 supplementation (doses ranged from 200 to 5000 IU/d) alone or in combination with calcium supplementation (doses ranged from 500 to 1550 mg/d) that provided sufficient data for the calculations were included in the plot. It is important to note that the studies had varied compliance rates in the vitamin D intake; limited or no adjustment for skin pigmentations, calcium intake, or background sun exposure; different vitamin D assay methodologies and measurement (both intra- and interassay) variability. All these factors increase the heterogeneity and limit the usefulness of an overall summary estimate for an intake dose response in serum 25(OH)D concentration. Nonetheless, the relationship between increasing doses of vitamin D_3 with increasing net change in 25(OH)D concentration was evident in both adults and children (Figure 23). It was also apparent that the dose-response relationships differ depending on study participants' serum 25(OH)D status ($\leq$40 vs. >40 nmol/L) at baseline (Figure 24), and depending on duration of supplementation ($\leq$3 vs. >3 months) (Figure 25).

Vitamin D_2 supplementation was more commonly used in RCTs of infants and pregnant or lactating women, than vitamin D_3 supplementation. Results showed that supplementation of vitamin D_2 significantly increased 25(OH)D concentrations in infants, lactating mothers and in cord blood.

Detailed presentation (Table 106; Figures 23, 24 & 25).

The results from 26 RCTs with 28 comparisons in adults and two RCTs with three comparisons in children evaluating the effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation alone or in combination with calcium supplementation on serum 25(OH)D concentrations were shown in Table 106. Most of the data were extracted directly from the Ottawa EPC report. In adults, the doses of vitamin D_3 ranged from 200 to 5000 IU/d, and the doses of calcium supplementation ranged from 500 to 1550 mg/d across the 25 comparisons. In children, the doses of vitamin D_3 ranged from 200 to 2000 IU/d across the three comparisons. Duration of supplementation ranged from 0.5 to 60 months. Study populations and baseline vitamin D concentrations varied across these comparisons.

Ottawa EPC report – Infants.

Seven RCTs included infants and few trials used vitamin D_3 supplementation. One RCT concluded that 200 IU of vitamin D_2 may not be enough to prevent vitamin D deficiency in those infants residing at northern latitudes. A dose-response relationship

was noted in this trial (100, 200, 400 IU/day). Consistent responses to vitamin D supplementation were noted across the seven trials, and some trials suggested that infants who are vitamin D deficient may respond differently and require higher doses of vitamin D to achieve serum 25(OH)D concentrations within the normal range.

Ottawa EPC report - Pregnant or lactating women.

There were six small RCTs of vitamin D supplementation in pregnant or lactating women. No randomized trials studied the effect of 400 IU vitamin D_3/d. Three trials used 1000 IU vitamin D_2/d and one trial used 1000 IU/d of vitamin D_3. Supplementation of vitamin D_2 1000-3600 IU/d and vitamin D_3 1000 IU/d resulted in significant increases in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in lactating mothers and in cord blood. One trial found that supplementation of lactating mothers with 1000 IU vitamin D_2/d during winter months did not significantly increase serum 25(OH)D concentrations in the infants.

Ottawa EPC report - Children and adolescents.

There were four trials that examined the effect of vitamin D on serum 25(OH)D concentrations in children or adolescents with doses ranging from 200 to 2000 IU of vitamin D_3 per day and 400 IU of vitamin D_2. There were consistent increases in serum 25(OH)D concentrations ranging from 8 nmol/L (200 IU/d), 16.5 (with 600 IU D_3/d) to 60 nmol/L (2000 IU of vitamin D_3/d).

Ottawa EPC report - Premenopausal women and younger men.

Ten small trials included premenopausal women and younger males. Three trials compared vitamin D_2 to vitamin D_3 in healthy young adults. Two of the three trials used RIA, and one used HPLC to measure serum 25(OH)D concentrations The doses of vitamin D_3 ranged from 600 to 10,000 IU/day and vitamin D_2 (4000 IU/d or 50,000 to 100,000 for single dose).

Three trials found that supplementation with vitamin D_2 and D_3 in healthy adults may have different effects on serum 25(OH)D concentrations. One trial compared 100,000 IU vitamin D_2 given orally versus injection and found a greater variability in response with the intramuscular preparation. There appeared to be dose-response effect in those trials that used multiple doses of vitamin D_3, although there were insufficient data to perform a meta-analysis.

Ottawa EPC report - Postmenopausal women and older men.

Forty-four trials were conducted exclusively in postmenopausal women and older men, with 14 of these in elderly populations living in long-term care or nursing homes. One trial enrolled only women in early menopause (n=129). Doses of vitamin D_3 ranged from 100 to 4000 IU/day and vitamin D_2 was 9000 IU/day. One trial was conducted in African American women.

One trial found that wintertime declines in serum 25(OH)D concentrations were prevented with 500 IU vitamin D_3 per day. A dose response with increasing doses of vitamin D_3 was noted for serum 25(OH)D concentrations. There was variability in response to similar doses across trials that may have been due to differences in serum 25(OH)D assays or baseline 25(OH)D concentrations. Similarly, although some trials reported a greater response to vitamin D in populations that were vitamin D deficient at baseline compared to those who were not, there were insufficient data on which to base a definitive conclusion on this point.

Figure 23. Relationship between doses of Vitamin D3 supplementation and net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs



Legends: Each empty circle represents one study. The area of the circle is proportional to the inverse of the within-study variances. Typically, the larger the bubble, the larger the sample size and the smaller the standard error of the changes in 25(OH)D.

Figure 24. Relationship between doses of Vitamin D_3 supplementation and net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs by baseline vitamin D status among adults



Legends: Each empty circle represents one study. The area of the circle is proportional to the inverse of the within-study variances. Typically, the larger the bubble, the larger the sample size and the smaller the standard error of the changes in 25(OH)D.

Figure 25. Relationship between doses of Vitamin D_3 supplementation and net changes in serum 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs by duration of supplementation among adults



Legends: Each empty circle represents one study. The area of the circle is proportional to the inverse of the within-study variances. Typically, the larger the bubble, the larger the sample size and the smaller the standard error of the changes in 25(OH)D.

Table 106. The relationship between vitamin D_3 daily doses and changes in 25(OH)D concentrations in RCTs

Author	Year	Life stage	Base 25(OH)D, nmol/L	Vit D_3 dose (IU/d)	Ca dose (mg/d)	Duration (mo)	Vit D_3 ± Ca Group			Placebo or Ca Group		
							n	Mean change from baseline	SD	n	Mean change from baseline	SD
Bjorkman	2008[209]	71+	23	400	0	6	60	26.5	11.8	59	1.9	10.2
Bjorkman	2008[209]	71+	23	1200	0	6	63	49.1	19.5	59	1.9	10.2
Blum	2008[216]	71+	73	700	500[A]	12	132	48.5	35.3	125	9.3	21.5
Bunout	2006 [80]	71+	40	400	800[A]	9	46	33.4	14.3	46	3.5	10.0
Chapuy	1992 [217]	71+	36	800	1200	18	73	65.0	16.5	69	-4.5	13.5
Chel	2008[218]	71+	23	600	0	4	46	46.9	15.4	45	0.3	12.2
Deroisy	2002 [219]	71+	28	200	500[A]	3	50	14.7	10.0	50	4.5	10.0
Himmelstein	1990 [220]	71+	45	2000	0	1.5	15	39.7	15.7	15	-2.7	13.4
Kenny	2003 [221]	71+	62	1000	500[A]	6	29	22.3	10.1	31	-2.5	11.4
Krieg	1999 [222]	71+	29	880	500	24	34	36.5	14.0	38	-15.0	11.1
Pfeifer	2000 [223]	71+	25	880	1200[A]	2	74	40.5	27.0	74	18.3	20.9
Pfeifer	2001 [97]	71+	25	800	1200	2	73	39.2	22.4	72	19.7	23.8
Sorva	1991 [224]	71+	11	1000	1000	10	5	44.6	28.9	10	-1.4	2.3
Zhu	2008 [214]	71+	68	1000	1200[A]	60	29	36.2	27.5	34	-2.9	27.4
Barnes	2006 [225]	adults	52	600	1500[A]	2	12	38.6	15.1	15	-7.2	11.3
Bolton-Smith	2007 [213]	adults	60	400	100	24	50	12.0	15.1	56	-8.2	14.3
Dawson-Hughes	1997[226]	adults	74	700	500	36	145	35.2	32.6	167	-2.1	22.7
Harris	2002 [227]	adults	55	800	0	2	27	22.3	14.0	23	-4.6	6.3
Heaney	2003 [228]	adults	71	1000	0	5	16	12.0	16.0	16	-11.4	17.6
Heaney	2003 [228]	adults	71	5000	0	5	17	91.9	37.6	16	-11.4	17.6
Heikkinen	1998 [229]	adults	26	300	500[A]	12	18	9.4	10.9	18	-3.3	6.4
Honkanen	1990 [230]	adults	31	1800	1550	2.75	55	39.5	12.1	60	-13.1	9.2
Jensen	2002 [231]	adults	41	400	1450	36	33	34.6	23.2	33	16.5	28.2
Nelson	2009[232]	adults	62	800	0	12	55	35.3	23.2	31	10.9	16.9
Orwoll	1988 [233]	adults	58	1000	1000	12	46	25.0	19.1	46	3.0	19.1
Patel	2001 [234]	adults	72	800	0	12	35	8.4	13.1	35	-9.2	12.8
Riis	1984 [235]	adults	41	2000	500	12	8	87.5	14.1	7	-5.0	23.8

continued

Author	Year	Life stage	Base 25(OH)D, nmol/L	Vit D_3 dose (IU/d)	Ca dose (mg/d)	Duration (mo)	Vit D_3 ± Ca Group			Placebo or Ca Group		
							n	Mean change from baseline	SD	n	Mean change from baseline	SD
Trang	1998 [236]	adults	42	4000	0	0.5	24	23.3	17.5	24	3.0	19.8
Chan	1982 [237]	children	43	400	0	6	30	22.5	6.6	30	-2.5	6.6
El-Hajj (Fuleihan)	2006 [35]	children	35	200	0	12	58	7.5	19.8	55	5.0	18.8
El-Hajj (Fuleihan)	2006 [35]	children	35	2000	0	12	55	59.9	67.1	55	5.0	18.8

[A] Calcium supplement was given to all patients

The format of this table has been slightly modifies to fit each RCT in one line.

Outcomes for Tolerable Upper Intake Levels

We included only clinical outcomes of tolerable upper intake levels, such as all-cause mortality, cancer (incidence and mortality), soft tissue calcification, renal outcomes, and adverse events reported in RCTs.

Results of all-cause mortality and cancer have been described in previous sections. In brief, we did not find vitamin D and/or calcium associated with an increased risk of mortality. For cancer risk, there were some observational studies reporting high calcium intake may be associated with an increased risk of prostate cancer (see "Prostate cancer" in "Calcium and cancer" section). We did not identify any studies on soft tissue calcification and tolerable upper intake levels.

Renal Outcomes

The WHI trial on women aged 50 to 79 years, examined the effect of vitamin D_3 400 IU (the Recommended Dietary Allowance for women aged 50 to 70 years and below the 600 IU recommended intake for women > 70 years) in combination with 1000 mg calcium carbonate versus placebo and found an increase in the risk of renal stones (Hazard Ratio 1.17 95 percent CI 1.02, 1.34), corresponding to 5.7 events per 10,000 person years of exposure.[71] It should be noted that women in both groups were allowed to take additional vitamin D supplements up to 600 IU and later 1000 IU per day and calcium supplements up to 1000 mg per day. The baseline total calcium intakes (from foods and supplements) were high: 34 percent consumed less than 800 mg/d, 26 percent consumed 800 to 1200 mg/d, and 40 percent consumed more than 1200 mg/d. A prior publication from WHI trial provided the same data on the risk of renal stones was also included in the Ottawa EPC report.

No studies were identified that evaluated the effect of vitamin D, calcium, or combined vitamin D and calcium on other renal outcomes.

Adverse Events Reported in RCTs.

The reporting of adverse events in RCTs was generally inadequate, and most trials were not adequately powered to detect adverse events. Among the 63 RCTs included in this report, 47 did not report information on adverse events.

Five RCTs (in 6 publications) that enrolled a total of 444 subjects reported no adverse events during the trial periods.[35,51,227,238,239] Of these, one RCT administered combination of vitamin D_2 (1600 or 3600 IU/d) and vitamin D_3 (400 IU/d) supplements for 3 months, two RCTs administered vitamin D supplements (type of vitamin D not reported) with doses ranging from 200 to 2000 IU/d for 3 weeks or 1 year, one RCT used high-dose intermittent vitamin D_3 supplement (120,000 IU sachets given 3 times, every 2 weeks, for 6 weeks), and one RCT administered 1200 IU/d vitamin D_2 supplement for 5 years.

Eleven RCTs reported at least one adverse event (Table 107). Excessive gas, bloating, and gastrointestinal discomforts were reported to be associated with calcium supplementation (doses ranged from 600 to 1000 mg/d). Other RCTs of vitamin D (doses ranged from 400 to 5714 IU/d vitamin D_3 or ranged from 5000 to 10,000 vitamin D_2) and/or calcium supplementations (doses ranged from 200 to 1500 mg/d) reported few

cases of gastrointestinal disruption such as constipation, diarrhea, upset stomach, musculoskeletal soreness, primary hyperparathyroidism, hypercalcemia, renal calculi and craniotabes. One RCT reported some adverse events that required hospital admission, including retrosternal pain, a non-ST elevation myocardial infarction and a transient ischemic attack (all 3 cases in vitamin D 400 IU/d plus exercise training group) and one case of acute cholecystitis (in calcium, vitamin D plus exercise training group).[80] Another RCT reported that "there were no significant differences between the vitamin D and the control groups in the rate of incident cancer and vascular disease (ischemic heart disease and stroke)" (actual data not provided), and one participant died during the study.[98] However, these adverse events may or may not be associated with vitamin D and/or calcium supplementation in this study. Also described earlier in the "Renal outcomes" section, the WHI trial examined the effect of vitamin D_3 400 IU in combination with 1000 mg calcium carbonate versus placebo and found an increase in the risk of renal stones (Hazard Ratio 1.17 95 percent CI 1.02, 1.34), corresponding to 5.7 events per 10,000 person years of exposure.[71]

Ottawa EPC report:

A total of 22 trials reported data on toxicity-related outcomes, 21 of which used doses above 400 IU/d. Toxicity results from trials with intakes of vitamin D above current reference intakes varied and this may have been related to different doses, baseline characteristics of populations or exposure times. Most trials excluded subjects with renal insufficiency or hypercalcemia, were of small sample sizes and had short durations of exposure to vitamin D. Event rates were low across trials in both the treatment and placebo arms.

Table 107. Adverse events reported in RCTs

Author Year	N enrolled	Vit D dose (IU/d)	Ca dose (mg/d)	Duration	Adverse Event data (n=case#)
Yamamoto 1995 [117]	471	0	1000	6 mo	Comparing calcium group to the placebo group, excessive gas and bloating were more frequently reported by white women at 3 months and by whites, in general, at 6 months, and white men reported more loose stools at 6 months.
Moschonis 2006 [215]	112	300 D_3	600 or 1200	12 mo	Bloating, constipation and intestinal discomfort apparently related to the calcium supplement
Bunout 2006 [80]	96	400	800	9 mo	Adverse events that required hospital admission: Vit D plus exercise training group (n=3): retrosternal pain, a non-ST elevation myocardial infarction and a transient ischemic attack. Calcium, Vit D plus exercise training group (n=1): acute cholecystitis
Wactawski-Wende 2006 [71]	36282	400	1000	7 y	The WHI trial found an increase in the risk of renal stones (Hazard Ratio 1.17 95% CI 1.02, 1.34), corresponding to 5.7 events per 10,000 person years of exposure.
Burleigh 2007 [81]	205	800 D_3	1200	Median 1 mo	Hypercalcemia (n=2)
Lappe 2008 [208]	5201	800	200	8 wks	GI disruption such as constipation, diarrhea, upset stomach (4%), and musculoskeletal soreness (0.9%)
Brooke 1980 [34]	126	1000	0	3rd trimester only	Vit D group (craniotabes, n=2), placebo group (hypocalcemia, n=5; craniotabes, n=6)
Lappe 2007 [52]	1180	1000 D_3	1400-1500	4 y	Renal calculi in placebo (n=1), renal calculi in calcium only (n=3), renal calculi in calcium plus vit D (n=1)
Mastaglia 2006 [240]	65	5000 or 10,000 D_2	500	3 mo	Hypercalciuria (n=1) in control group
Zhu2008[98]	256	1000 D_2	1200	12 mo	There were no significant differences between the vitamin D and the control groups in the rate of incident cancer and vascular disease (ischemic heart disease and stroke). There were 8 and 5 adverse events in vitamin D and the control groups, respectively. One participant in the vitamin D group had mild asymptomatic hypercalcemia one occasion. No case of renal calculus was reported. 1 participant was deceased during the study.
Sneve 2008[50]	445	Group 1: 2 capsules of vitamin D_3 each 20,000 IU taken twice a week (Monday and Thursday): ~5714 IU/d Group 2: 1 capsules of vitamin D_3 each 20,000 IU taken twice a week (Monday and Thursday): ~2857 IU/d	500	12 mo	Primary hyperparathyroidism (n=2), increase in serum calcium to 2.62 mmol/L (n=1), transient increases in serum calcium > 2.59 mmol/L (n=4). 317 other adverse events were recorded, most of them related to GI discomfort. There were no significant differences between the treatment groups regarding adverse events.

Chapter 4. Discussion

This evidence report on vitamin D and calcium in relation to health outcomes was prepared for consideration by the Committee on Dietary Reference Intakes for Vitamin D and Calcium at the request of AHRQ on behalf of the various sponsors. This report does not make nor was it intended to make recommendations for DRI values concerning vitamin D or calcium. Responsibility for setting DRI values lies with the Committee. Evidence from systematic reviews is one of several types of information available to the Committee for use in its deliberations to establish DRI values. This is the first time that an independent systematic review is being commissioned to support the DRI process. Thus, it is important for users of this report to fully appreciate the nuances of the methodologies employed, as well as the strengths and limitations of this approach. In particular, it should be noted that total vitamin D exposure was not evaluated in this report because there is no valid method to quantify the contribution of endogenous vitamin D synthesis resulting from sun exposure and it is also the TEP's consensus that vitamin D intake, as estimated by current food frequency questionnaires, is too inaccurate to be of value.

For this report, we identified 165 primary articles that met the eligibility criteria established by the TEP. In addition, we included 11 published systematic reviews that incorporated over 200 additional primary articles. Despite the relatively large number of studies included, with the following few exceptions, it is difficult to make any substantive and concise statements on the basis of the available evidence concerning the association of serum 25(OH)D concentration, supplemental vitamin D, dietary calcium intake, or the combination of both nutrients with the various health outcomes. It proved challenging because many of the studies contained substantial heterogeneity and their findings were inconsistent for the health outcomes examined.

In general, among RCTs of hypertensive adults, calcium supplementation (400 to 2000 mg/d) lowered systolic, but not diastolic, blood pressure by a small but statistically significant amount (2 to 4 mm Hg).

For body weight, despite a wide range of calcium intakes (from supplements or from dairy and nondairy sources) across the calcium trials, the RCTs were fairly consistent in finding no significant effect of increased calcium intake on body weight.

For growth, a meta-analysis of 17 RCTs did not find a significant effect on weight and height gain attributable to calcium supplement in children ranged from 3 to 18 years of age.

For bone health, one well-conducted systematic review of RCTs found that vitamin D_3 (up to 800 IU/d) plus calcium (~500 mg/d) supplementation resulted in small increases in BMD of the spine, total body, femoral neck, and total hip in populations consisting predominantly of women in late menopause.

For breast cancer, subgroup analyses in four cohort studies consistently found that calcium intake in the range of 780 to 1750 mg/d in premenopausal women was associated with a decreased risk for breast cancer. However, no RCTs of calcium supplementation to prevent breast cancer in premenopausal women have been published. In contrast, cohort studies of postmenopausal women are consistent in showing no association of calcium intake with the risk of breast cancer.

For prostate cancer, three of four cohort studies found significant associations between higher calcium intake (>1500 or >2000 mg/day) and increased risk of prostate cancer, compared to men consuming lower amount of calcium (500-1000 mg/day).

For cardiovascular events, a cohort study and a nested case-control study found associations between lower serum 25(OH)D concentrations (less than either about 50 or 75 nmol/L) and

increased risk of total cardiovascular events; however an RCT found no effect of supplementation and studies of specific cardiovascular events were too sparse to reach conclusions. Taken together, six cohort studies of calcium intake suggest that in populations at relatively increased risk of stroke and with relatively low dietary calcium intake (i.e., in East Asia), lower levels of calcium intake under about 700 mg/day are associated with higher risk of stroke. This association, however, was not replicated in Europe or the US, and one Finnish study found a possible association of increased risk of stroke in men with calcium intakes above 1000 mg.

Studies on the association between either serum 25(OH)D concentration or calcium intake and other forms of cancer (colorectum, pancreas, prostate, all-cause); incidence of hypertension or specific cardiovascular disease events; immunologic disorders; and pregnancy-related outcomes including preeclampsia were either few in number or reported inconsistent findings. Too few studies of combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation have been conducted to allow adequate conclusions about its possible effects on health. The WHI trial was commonly the only evidence available for a given outcome.

Strengths of This Report

The strengths of this report lie in the wide range of topics covered, critical appraisal, detailed documentation, transparent methods to assess the scientific literature, and an unbiased selection of studies. A team of evidence-based methodologists not previously directly involved in research related to vitamin D and calcium worked with nutrient experts to refine the key questions (initially defined by AHRQ with input from various sponsors), analytic framework, and review criteria for the systematic review. After defining the questions and eligibility criteria with input from content experts and the sponsoring agencies, the Tufts EPC reviewed the published evidence on the topic. The intent was to perform a thorough and unbiased systematic review of the literature base on available evidence as defined by prespecified criteria. Once the review process began, input from experts in the field was sought to clarify technical questions during the literature review process. These individuals did not participate in study selection or detailed data extraction from the included studies nor were any members serving on the IOM committee on vitamin D and calcium involved in the review of this document. A quality rating as detailed in Chapter 2 (Methods section) was assigned for each primary study and systematic review, and incorporated into the data summaries section of the report. On the basis of this work, a sound foundation has been created which will facilitate rapid and efficient future updates as needed.

Details concerning the process of question formulation, selection of health outcomes of interest, justification for study selection criteria, methods used for critical appraisals of studies and quality rating, and summary of results are described fully in the Methods chapter. This approach is critical to the establishment of a transparent and reproducible process. Furthermore, important variables that affect vitamin D status such as life stages, latitude of the study locale, background diet and skin pigmentation are documented in this review.

This evidence report was carried out under the AHRQ EPC program, which has a 12-year history of producing over 175 evidence reports and numerous technology assessments for various users including many federal agencies. EPCs are staffed by experienced methodologists who continuously refine approaches to conducting systematic reviews and develop new methods on the basis of accumulated experience encompassing a wide range of topics. In addition, the Tufts EPC has conducted a number of nutrition-related evidence reports[19-22,241], as well as

conducted the mock exercise on vitamin A panel.[3] This report drew on these experiences, the expertise of the TEP, and the support of federal agencies.

DRI and the Literature on Vitamin D and Calcium

It should be emphasized that none of the studies reviewed were designed to address issues specifically relevant for establishing DRI values (i.e., to ascertain the optimal dose in a particular life stage to promote growth and tissue maintenance, and prevent chronic disease throughout the lifecycle). In general, the studies did not enroll subjects with ages that could be easily mapped to specific life stages as defined within the DRI framework (with the exception of postmenopausal women and pregnant or lactating women) and did not evaluate health outcomes on the basis of what doses will lower risk for a particular disease in prespecified life stages. Therefore, data will need to be extrapolated from these studies to craft a set of DRI values for vitamin D and calcium. This extrapolation may prove challenging.

Certain issues concerning the studies of vitamin D must be noted. As mentioned previously, it is difficult to evaluate nutritional adequacy because there are no methods currently available to quantify the contribution of endogenous vitamin D synthesis resulting from sun exposure on an individual or group level. In addition, it is generally accepted that estimating intake by dietary assessments is not a valid indicator of vitamin D status, because there are limitations in the completeness of nutrient databases for both food and dietary supplements vitamin D content and the rapidly changing landscape of vitamin D food fortification has not yet been captured in either instruments used to assess intake and the databases used to analyze the data. For example, vitamin D values are available for only about 600 out of 1400 foods in the USDA National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference (http://www.ars.usda.gov/nutrientdata) and notably missing are foods recently fortified with vitamin D.[25] Given the recent trend towards increased nutrient fortification of the North American food supply, the lag in updating food composition tables, and the inability to distinguish between fortified and unfortified foods when using most dietary assessment tools, it is difficult to accurately estimate dietary intakes of vitamin D, especially for a given year. Shifts in methodological approaches to measure serum 25(OH)D concentrations, the heterogeneous nature of the data available with respect to study locations (i.e., latitude) and times during the year (i.e., season) hamper our ability to succinctly summarize dose-response relationships. We did not perform a dose-response meta-analysis of the relationship between serum 25(OH)D concentrations and health outcomes because limited and inconsistent data would result in a meta-analysis that is difficult to interpret and results that may be misleading. Furthermore, many of the large cohorts analyzed for associations of vitamin D with health outcomes enrolled mostly white participants aged approximately 40 to 70 years old and much of the data on intake dose-response and serum 25(OH)D concentration were derived from studies designed to measure bone health in postmenopausal women. These factors limit the applicability of the findings to other life stages and other racial groups.

Unlike serum 25(OH)D concentrations for vitamin D, there is no equivalent serum biomarker to indicate calcium status. Relying on dietary assessment to gauge calcium intake is limited by the confounding effect of vitamin D status on the efficiency of calcium absorption and uncertainties in the calcium content of many foods due to the recent trend in nutrient fortification of food, limited ability of current dietary assessment tools to distinguish among fortified and unfortified foods and the lag in updating nutrient databases with current nutrient information.

Limitations of our Methodological Approach

The number of potentially relevant (English language articles on humans and not reviews) vitamin D studies indexed in MEDLINE is very large (~15,000) and the number of calcium studies is even larger (~110,000). Without unlimited time and resources, the systematic review conducted in this report had to focus on selected key questions predefined by our federal sponsors with input from the IOM, and capitalize on existing systematic reviews. Using previous systematic reviews risks propagating deficiencies and errors[242] introduced in those reviews (e.g., errors in data abstraction, flawed assumptions in quantitative synthesis). Although we have assessed the quality of these systematic reviews using AMSTAR[26] checklist, we cannot reliably know the validity of the reported summary data without knowing the details of the primary studies. It should also be stressed that a well-performed systematic review does not necessarily imply that the body of evidence for a particular outcome of interest is of high quality. While some systematic reviews assessed the quality of the individual studies, the methods used varied. Any systematic review is limited by the quality of the primary studies included in the review. Unless the methods used to assess the quality of the primary studies is transparent and the details made available for examination, it would be difficult to reliably determine the validity of the conclusions. Also, relying on existing systematic reviews alone could have potentially precluded us from identifying all relevant studies because those systematic reviews might have addressed somewhat different questions and had a different scope from this review. For example, for growth outcome in children, we principally relied on the findings from a meta-analysis of RCTs of calcium originally designed to evaluate bone density outcomes. If there were RCTs of calcium intake specifically designed to measure growth outcomes such as weight and height gain, but not bone density, then those studies would not have been identified. In addition, as per the task order from AHRQ, we relied on the Ottawa report for bone health outcomes and we did not examine specific studies included in that report. As a consequence, if those studies had reported other (than bone health) outcomes that were of interest, those studies would not have been included in this review.

As there is no consensus on how to assess the quality of the nutrition observational studies, we created a quality checklist based on a newly published reporting standard for observational studies[32] and nutrition reporting items that we believe should be considered in quality assessment. This checklist, however, has not been calibrated and the intra- and interrater variability have not been assessed. We should also remind the readers that impeccable study reporting does not equate study validity. However, transparent, comprehensive, and accurate reporting does help in evaluating a study's validity.

Also, studies on vitamin D and calcium were not specifically targeted at life stages (except for children, pregnant, and postmenopausal women) specified for the determination of DRI. We, therefore, were unable to structure our report strictly according to prespecified life stages. When a study enrolled populations that spanned across multiple life stages, we provided our best estimates as to which life stage(s) the study's findings would be of most relevance.

Comments on the Observational Studies

All the included observational studies were designed to generate hypotheses of potential associations of multiple factors with vitamin D or calcium. Therefore, a finding of a significant association in these studies, after exploratory analyses, should not be considered equivalent to

the result of studies that were designed to confirm this relationship. Many of the nested case-control studies typically excluded a substantial portion of participants (some as high as 60 to 70 percent) in the original cohorts because blood samples, or completed dietary questionnaires were not available. How this selection bias would affect the reported association is unclear. In addition, several of the studies might have suffered from outcome misclassification; for example, when cancer cases were identified from registries without histopathology verification. The effect of outcome misclassification is unpredictable. Furthermore, many of the studies did not report a power calculation. Even though many of the studies included cohorts with relatively large numbers of subjects (tens of thousands), it is plausible that, in fact, the included studies may have been underpowered to detect the true effect sizes. If that were the case, the significant effect reported may, in fact, be spurious. Furthermore, many of the reported effect sizes were small to moderate (with OR ranged from 1.03 to 2.0). When the effect size is small, the possibility of residual confounding by unmeasured variables must be considered.

Sources of Heterogeneity and Potential Biases

As have been mentioned previously, most of the findings reported in this review were inconsistent for each of the outcomes of interest. Many studies showed substantial heterogeneity. Some studies adjusted the serum 25(OH)D concentration by season of serum collection, some did not. While the majority of the studies used some forms of RIA to measure the serum 25(OH)D concentration, a minority used competitive protein-binding assay. Some studies reported a substantial proportion of the frozen serums were accidentally thawed and limited the analyses that could be performed. It is unclear how this would alter the overall results. Many studies suffered from potentially inadequate outcome ascertainment (e.g., reliance on self-reported calcium intake and hypertension diagnosis). Time between measurement of serum 25(OH)D concentration and the diagnosis of interest varied. For prostate and colorectal cancer, it ranged from 1 to more than 16 years. Factors potentially relevant to the outcomes of interest like family history (in colorectal cancer) were not consistently reported and accounted for in the studies. Also, the blinding of case assessors to the risk factor of interest (e.g., serum 25(OH)D concentrations) as well as that of investigators who measured the risk factor *per se* to outcomes were rarely reported.

For studies on calcium supplementation, intake compliance, information on the bioavailability of the calcium source, the role of background sun exposure, and associated vitamin D effects were not consistently available across all studies. Thus, it is difficult to interpret those findings on an absolute level and among studies.

Finally, all systematic reviews, including this report, may suffer from potential publication and reporting biases since currently there is no reliable way to detect and correct these biases. However, there is an underlying suspicion of publication bias against studies having either null or negative outcomes and reporting bias toward "significant" outcomes in the literature.[243,244] Thus, it is important to consider these biases when reviewing the overall findings of any systematic review.

Vitamin D Intake and Response in Serum 25(OH)D Concentration

The findings of this review on the association between vitamin D intake dose and change in serum 25(OH)D concentration was primarily derived from RCTs reviewed in a systematic review of bone health in postmenopausal women. This limits the applicability of the findings to

other life stages. Though, we did not find any reason to consider these trials to be biased, they are nonetheless an arbitrary sample of all studies that have reported the association between vitamin D intake dose and change in serum 25(OH)D concentration. We did not perform a quantitative synthesis (e.g., meta-regression) to examine the relationship between vitamin D intake dose and serum 25(OH)D concentration due to the heterogeneity across studies. Studies had varied compliance rates in the vitamin D intake; limited or no adjustment for skin pigmentations, calcium intake, or background sun exposure; different vitamin D assay methodologies and measurement (both intra- and interassay) variability. All these factors increase the heterogeneity and limit the usefulness of an overall summary estimate for an intake dose response in serum 25(OH)D concentration. Nonetheless, overall, there appeared to be a trend for higher vitamin D supplementation dose resulting in higher net change in serum 25(OH)D concentration.

Considerations for Future DRI Committees

Formulating the appropriate key questions is the most important aspect of conducting a systematic review to ensure the final product will meet the intended purpose. Ideally, this should be an iterative process involving the sponsors, EPC, TEP and targeted end-users. The questions should be reviewed and potentially refined once the "state" of the literature has been systematically appraised, with the understanding that any modifications to the key questions after the review process has started will likely extend the literature review and synthesis processes. In addition, developing relevant study selection criteria for the systematic review is critical to finding pertinent data to answer the key questions; the TEP should be engaged early in this process. Crafting a framework of the entire review process depicting the explicit roles of the sponsors, TEP, and targeted end-users could also be helpful for future reviews.

While the process of conducting the actual systematic review of a nutrient or group of nutrients on an agreed upon set of key questions concerning specific health outcomes is carefully laid out and could be replicated without undue difficulty, the process of selecting which health outcomes would be important for inclusion in a systematic review could not be easily replicated. The health outcomes selected were decided after much deliberation by the TEP with input from the various partners. As the nature of the deliberation hinged much on the expertise reflected by the particular composition of the TEP, it is conceivable that a different TEP composed of members with different expertise may have recommended a different set of health outcomes for inclusion. To minimize this variability, an a priori designed set of instructions to weigh each outcome (taking into account such factors like population attributable risk, morbidity, and others) for possible inclusion would be valuable.

Reference

(1) *Dietary reference intakes : the essential guide to nutrient requirements*. Institute of Medicine (IOM). The National Academy Press.; 2006.

(2) *The development of DRIs 1994-2004 : lessons learned and new challenges : workshop summary*. Institute of Medicine (IOM). The National Academies Press.; 2007.

(3) Russell R, Chung M, Balk EM et al. Opportunities and challenges in conducting systematic reviews to support the development of nutrient reference values: vitamin A as an example. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2009;89:728-733.

(4) Vitamin D and Health in the 21st Century: an Update. Proceedings of a conference held September 2007 in Bethesda, Maryland, USA. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:483S-592S.

(5) Yetley EA, Brule D, Cheney MC et al. Dietary Reference Intakes for vitamin D: justification for a review of the 1997 values. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2009;89:719-727.

(6) Cranney A, Horsley T, O'Donnell S et al. Effectiveness and safety of vitamin D in relation to bone health. *Evidence Report/Technology Assessment.* 2007;158:1-235.

(7) Holick MF. Vitamin D deficiency. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;357:266-281.

(8) DeLuca HF. Overview of general physiologic features and functions of vitamin D. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2004;80:1689S-1696S.

(9) Townsend K, Evans KN, Campbell MJ, Colston KW, Adams JS, Hewison M. Biological actions of extra-renal 25-hydroxyvitamin D-1alpha-hydroxylase and implications for chemoprevention and treatment. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol.* 2005;97:103-109.

(10) Norman AW. A vitamin D nutritional cornucopia: new insights concerning the serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D status of the US population. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:1455-1456.

(11) Bikle D. Nonclassic actions of vitamin D. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2009;94:26-34.

(12) White JH. Vitamin D signaling, infectious diseases, and regulation of innate immunity. *Infect Immun.* 2008;76:3837-3843.

(13) Mohr SB. A brief history of vitamin d and cancer prevention. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2009;19:79-83.

(14) Dawson-Hughes B. Serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D and functional outcomes in the elderly. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:537S-540S.

(15) Buell JS, wson-Hughes B. Vitamin D and neurocognitive dysfunction: preventing "D"ecline? *Mol Aspects Med.* 2008;29:415-422.

(16) Quarles LD. Endocrine functions of bone in mineral metabolism regulation. *J Clin Invest.* 2008;118:3820-3828.

(17) Hewison M. Vitamin D and innate immunity. *Curr Opin Investig Drugs.* 2008;9:485-490.

(18) Bucher HC, Guyatt GH, Cook DJ, Holbrook A, McAlister FA. Users' guides to the medical literature: XIX. Applying clinical trial results. A. How to use an article measuring the effect of an intervention on surrogate end points. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *JAMA.* 1999;282:771-778.

(19) Balk E, Chung M, Chew P, Ip S, Raman G, Kupelnick B, Tatsioni A, Sun Y, Wolk B, DeVine D, and Lau J. Effects of Soy on Health Outcomes. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 26 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ Publication No 05-E024-1. 2005. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
Ref Type: Report

(20) Balk, E, Chung, M, Raman, G, Tatsioni, A, Chew, P, Ip, S, DeVine, D, and Lau, J. B Vitamins and Berries and Age-Related Neurodegenerative Disorders. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 134 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ Publication No 05-E008. 2006. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
Ref Type: Report

(21) Balk E, Chung M, Lichtenstein A et al. *Effects of omega-3 fatty acids on cardiovascular risk factors and intermediate markers of cardiovascular disease. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 93 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ Publication No. 04-E010-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality*. 2004.

(22) Ip, S., Chung, M., Raman, G., Chew, P., Magula, N., DeVine, D., Trikalinos, T., and Lau, J. Breastfeeding and Maternal and Infant Health Outcomes in Developed Countries. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 153 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ Publication No 07-E007. 4-20-2007. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
Ref Type: Report

(23) Jordan H, Matthan N, Chung M et al. *Effects of omega-3 fatty acids on arrhythmogenic mechanisms in animal and isolated organ/cell culture studies. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 92 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ*

Publication No. 04-E011-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. 2004.

(24) Wang C, Chung M, Lichtenstein A et al. *Effects of omega-3 fatty acids on cardiovascular disease. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 94 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ Publication No. 04-E009-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality*. 2004.

(25) Holden JM, Lemar LE. Assessing vitamin D contents in foods and supplements: challenges and needs. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:551S-553S.

(26) Shea BJ, Grimshaw JM, Wells GA et al. Development of AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2007;7:10.

(27) Ballantyne JC, Carr DB, deFerranti S et al. The comparative effects of postoperative analgesic therapies on pulmonary outcome: cumulative meta-analyses of randomized, controlled trials. *Anesth Analg.* 1998;86:598-612.

(28) DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials.* 1986;7:177-188.

(29) Higgins JP, Whitehead A, Turner RM, Omar RZ, Thompson SG. Meta-analysis of continuous outcome data from individual patients. *Stat Med.* 2001;20:2219-2241.

(30) Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ.* 2003;327:557-560.

(31) Moher D, Schulz KF, Altman DG. The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomised trials. *Clin Oral Investig.* 2003;7:2-7.

(32) von EE, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet.* 2007;370:1453-1457.

(33) Chung M, Balk EM, Ip S et al. Reporting of systematic reviews of micronutrients and health: a critical appraisal. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2009;89:1099-1113.

(34) Brooke OG, Brown IR, Bone CD et al. Vitamin D supplements in pregnant Asian women: effects on calcium status and fetal growth. *BMJ.* 1980;280:751-754.

(35) El-Hajj FG, Nabulsi M, Tamim H et al. Effect of vitamin D replacement on musculoskeletal parameters in school children: a randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2006;91:405-412.

(36) Feliciano ES, Ho ML, Specker BL et al. Seasonal and geographical variations in the growth rate of infants in China receiving increasing dosages of vitamin D supplements. *J Trop Pediatr.* 1994;40:162-165.

(37) Marya RK, Rathee S, Dua V, Sangwan K. Effect of vitamin D supplementation during pregnancy on foetal growth. *Indian J Med Res.* 1988;88:488-492.

(38) Maxwell JD, Ang L, Brooke OG, Brown IR. Vitamin D supplements enhance weight gain and nutritional status in pregnant Asians. *BJOG.* 1981;88:987-991.

(39) Wagner CL, Hulsey TC, Fanning D, Ebeling M, Hollis BW. High-dose vitamin D3 supplementation in a cohort of breastfeeding mothers and their infants: a 6-month follow-up pilot study. *Breastfeed Med.* 2006;1:59-70.

(40) Mallet E, Gugi B, Brunelle P, Henocq A, Basuyau JP, Lemeur H. Vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy: a controlled trial of two methods. *Obstet Gynecol.* 1986;68:300-304.

(41) Marya RK, Rathee S, Lata V, Mudgil S. Effects of vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy. *Gynecol Obstet Invest.* 1981;12:155-161.

(42) Gale CR, Robinson SM, Harvey NC et al. Maternal vitamin D status during pregnancy and child outcomes. *Euro J Clin Nutr.* 2008;62:68-77.

(43) Morley R, Carlin JB, Pasco JA, Wark JD. Maternal 25-hydroxyvitamin D and parathyroid hormone concentrations and offspring birth size. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2006;91:906-912.

(44) Trivedi DP, Doll R, Khaw KT. Effect of four monthly oral vitamin D3 (cholecalciferol) supplementation on fractures and mortality in men and women living in the community: randomised double blind controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2003;326:469.

(45) Wang TJ, Pencina MJ, Booth SL et al. Vitamin D deficiency and risk of cardiovascular disease. *Circulation.* 2008;117:503-511.

(46) Giovannucci E, Liu Y, Hollis BW, Rimm EB. 25-hydroxyvitamin D and risk of myocardial infarction in men: a prospective study. *Arch Int Med.* 2008;168:1174-1180.

(47) Melamed ML, Michos ED, Post W, Astor B. 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels and the risk of mortality in the general population. *Arch Int Med.* 2008;168:1629-1637.

(48) Marniemi J, Alanen E, Impivaara O et al. Dietary and serum vitamins and minerals as predictors of myocardial infarction and stroke in elderly subjects. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis.* 2005;15:188-197.

(49) Heikkinen AM, Tuppurainen MT, Niskanen L, Komulainen M, Penttila I, Saarikoski S. Long-term vitamin D3 supplementation may have adverse effects on serum lipids

during postmenopausal hormone replacement therapy. *Eur J Endocrinol.* 1997;137:495-502.

(50) Sneve M, Figenschau Y, Jorde R. Supplementation with cholecalciferol does not result in weight reduction in overweight and obese subjects. *Euro J Endocrinol.* 2008;159:675-684.

(51) Nagpal J, Pande JN, Bhartia A. A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of the short-term effect of vitamin D3 supplementation on insulin sensitivity in apparently healthy, middle-aged, centrally obese men. *Diabet Med.* 2009;26:19-27.

(52) Lappe JM, Travers-Gustafson D, Davies KM, Recker RR, Heaney RP. Vitamin D and calcium supplementation reduces cancer risk: results of a randomized trial. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2007;85:1586-1591.

(53) Freedman DM, Looker AC, Chang SC, Graubard BI. Prospective study of serum vitamin D and cancer mortality in the United States. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2007;99:1594-1602.

(54) Ahn J, Peters U, Albanes D et al. Serum vitamin D concentration and prostate cancer risk: a nested case-control study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2008;100:796-804.

(55) Ahonen MH, Tenkanen L, Teppo L, Hakama M, Tuohimaa P. Prostate cancer risk and prediagnostic serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels (Finland). *Cancer Causes Control.* 2000;11:847-852.

(56) Baron JA, Beach M, Wallace K et al. Risk of prostate cancer in a randomized clinical trial of calcium supplementation. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2005;14:586-589.

(57) Braun MM, Helzlsouer KJ, Hollis BW, Comstock GW. Prostate cancer and prediagnostic levels of serum vitamin D metabolites (Maryland, United States). *Cancer Causes Control.* 1995;6:235-239.

(58) Corder EH, Guess HA, Hulka BS et al. Vitamin D and prostate cancer: a prediagnostic study with stored sera. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 1993;2:467-472.

(59) Jacobs ET, Giuliano AR, Martinez ME, Hollis BW, Reid ME, Marshall JR. Plasma levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D, 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D and the risk of prostate cancer. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol.* 2004;89-90:533-537.

(60) Li H, Stampfer MJ, Hollis JB et al. A prospective study of plasma vitamin D metabolites, vitamin D receptor polymorphisms, and prostate cancer. *PLoS Medicine / Public Library of Science.* 2007;4:e103.

(61) Mikhak B, Hunter DJ, Spiegelman D, Platz EA, Hollis BW, Giovannucci E. Vitamin D receptor (VDR) gene polymorphisms and haplotypes, interactions with plasma 25-

hydroxyvitamin D and 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D, and prostate cancer risk. *Prostate.* 2007;67:911-923.

(62) Nomura AM, Stemmermann GN, Lee J et al. Serum vitamin D metabolite levels and the subsequent development of prostate cancer (Hawaii, United States). *Cancer Causes Control.* 1998;9:425-432.

(63) Platz EA, Leitzmann MF, Hollis BW, Willett WC, Giovannucci E. Plasma 1,25-dihydroxy- and 25-hydroxyvitamin D and subsequent risk of prostate cancer. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2004;15:255-265.

(64) Tuohimaa P, Tenkanen L, Ahonen M et al. Both high and low levels of blood vitamin D are associated with a higher prostate cancer risk: a longitudinal, nested case-control study in the Nordic countries. *Int J Cancer.* 2004;108:104-108.

(65) Tuohimaa P, Tenkanen L, Syvala H et al. Interaction of factors related to the metabolic syndrome and vitamin D on risk of prostate cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2007;16:302-307.

(66) Gann PH, Ma J, Hennekens CH, Hollis BW, Haddad JG, Stampfer MJ. Circulating vitamin D metabolites in relation to subsequent development of prostate cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 1996;5:121-126.

(67) Tangrea J, Helzlsouer K, Pietinen P et al. Serum levels of vitamin D metabolites and the subsequent risk of colon and rectal cancer in Finnish men. *Cancer Causes Control.* 1997;8:615-625.

(68) Otani T, Iwasaki M, Sasazuki S, Inoue M, Tsugane S, Japan Public Health Center-Based Prospective Study Group. Plasma vitamin D and risk of colorectal cancer: the Japan Public Health Center-Based Prospective Study. *Br J Cancer.* 2007;97:446-451.

(69) Wu K, Feskanich D, Fuchs CS, Willett WC, Hollis BW, Giovannucci EL. A nested case control study of plasma 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations and risk of colorectal cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2007;99:1120-1129.

(70) Feskanich D, Ma J, Fuchs CS et al. Plasma vitamin D metabolites and risk of colorectal cancer in women. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2004;13:1502-1508.

(71) Wactawski-Wende J, Kotchen JM, Anderson GL et al. Calcium plus vitamin D supplementation and the risk of colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354:684-696.

(72) Garland CF, Comstock GW, Garland FC, Helsing KJ, Shaw EK, Gorham ED. Serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D and colon cancer: eight-year prospective study. *Lancet.* 1989;2:1176-1178.

(73) Braun MM, Helzlsouer KJ, Hollis BW, Comstock GW. Colon cancer and serum vitamin D metabolite levels 10-17 years prior to diagnosis. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1995;142:608-611.

(74) Platz EA, Hankinson SE, Hollis BW et al. Plasma 1,25-dihydroxy- and 25-hydroxyvitamin D and adenomatous polyps of the distal colorectum. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2000;9:1059-1065.

(75) Bertone-Johnson ER, Chen WY, Holick MF et al. Plasma 25-hydroxyvitamin D and 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D and risk of breast cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2005;14:1991-1997.

(76) Freedman DM, Chang SC, Falk RT et al. Serum levels of vitamin D metabolites and breast cancer risk in the prostate, lung, colorectal, and ovarian cancer screening trial. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2008;17:889-894.

(77) Stolzenberg-Solomon RZ, Vieth R, Azad A et al. A prospective nested case-control study of vitamin D status and pancreatic cancer risk in male smokers. *Cancer Res.* 2006;66:10213-10219.

(78) Stolzenberg-Solomon RZ, Hayes RB, Horst RL, Anderson KE, Hollis BW, Silverman DT. Serum vitamin D and risk of pancreatic cancer in the prostate, lung, colorectal, and ovarian screening trial. *Cancer Res.* 2009;69:1439-1447.

(79) Bodnar LM, Catov JM, Simhan HN, Holick MF, Powers RW, Roberts JM. Maternal vitamin D deficiency increases the risk of preeclampsia. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2007;92:3517-3522.

(80) Bunout D, Barrera G, Leiva L et al. Effects of vitamin D supplementation and exercise training on physical performance in Chilean vitamin D deficient elderly subjects. *Exp Gerontol.* 2006;41:746-752.

(81) Burleigh E, McColl J, Potter J. Does vitamin D stop inpatients falling? A randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing.* 2007;36:507-513.

(82) Lyons RA, Johansen A, Brophy S et al. Preventing fractures among older people living in institutional care: a pragmatic randomised double blind placebo controlled trial of vitamin D supplementation. *Osteoporos Int.* 2007;18:811-818.

(83) Autier P, Gandini S. Vitamin D supplementation and total mortality: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Intern Med.* 2007;167:1730-1737.

(84) Avenell A, Gillespie WJ, Gillespie LD, O'Connell DL. Vitamin D and vitamin D analogues for preventing fractures associated with involutional and post-menopausal osteoporosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008.

(85) Schleithoff SS, Zittermann A, Tenderich G, Berthold HK, Stehle P, Koerfer R. Vitamin D supplementation improves cytokine profiles in patients with congestive heart failure: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2006;83:754-759.

(86) Flicker L, MacInnis R, Stein M, et al. Should all older people in residential care receive Vitamin D to prevent falls? Results of a randomized trial. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2004;19:S99.

(87) Meyer HE, Smedshaug GB, Kvaavik E, Falch JA, Tverdal A, Pedersen JI. Can vitamin D supplementation reduce the risk of fracture in the elderly? A randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2002;17:709-715.

(88) Harwood RH, Sahota O, Gaynor K, Masud T, Hosking DJ. A randomised, controlled comparison of different calcium and vitamin D supplementation regimens in elderly women after hip fracture: The Nottingham Neck of Femur (NONOF) Study. *Age Ageing.* 2004;33:45-51.

(89) Latham NK, Anderson CS, Lee A, Bennett DA, Moseley A, Cameron ID. A randomized, controlled trial of quadriceps resistance exercise and vitamin D in frail older people: the Frailty Interventions Trial in Elderly Subjects (FITNESS). *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2003;51:291-299.

(90) Jia X, Aucott LS, McNeill G. Nutritional status and subsequent all-cause mortality in men and women aged 75 years or over living in the community. *Br J Nutr.* 2007;98:593-599.

(91) Sambrook PN, Chen JS, March LM et al. Serum parathyroid hormone is associated with increased mortality independent of 25-hydroxy vitamin d status, bone mass, and renal function in the frail and very old: a cohort study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2004;89:5477-5481.

(92) Sambrook PN, Chen CJ, March L et al. High bone turnover is an independent predictor of mortality in the frail elderly. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2006;21:549-555.

(93) Visser M, Deeg DJ, Puts MT, Seidell JC, Lips P. Low serum concentrations of 25-hydroxyvitamin D in older persons and the risk of nursing home admission. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2006;84:616-622.

(94) Forman JP, Giovannucci E, Holmes MD et al. Plasma 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels and risk of incident hypertension. *Hypertension.* 2007;49:1063-1069.

(95) Forman JP, Curhan GC, Taylor EN. Plasma 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels and risk of incident hypertension among young women. *Hypertension.* 2008;52:828-832.

(96) Scragg R, Khaw KT, Murphy S. Effect of winter oral vitamin D3 supplementation on cardiovascular risk factors in elderly adults. *Euro J Clin Nutr.* 1995;49:640-646.

(97) Pfeifer M, Begerow B, Minne HW, Nachtigall D, Hansen C. Effects of a short-term vitamin D(3) and calcium supplementation on blood pressure and parathyroid hormone levels in elderly women. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2001;86:1633-1637.

(98) Zhu K, Bruce D, Austin N, Devine A, Ebeling PR, Prince RL. Randomized controlled trial of the effects of calcium with or without vitamin D on bone structure and bone-related chemistry in elderly women with vitamin D insufficiency. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2008;23:1343-1348.

(99) Andersen R, Molgaard C, Skovgaard LT et al. Effect of vitamin D supplementation on bone and vitamin D status among Pakistani immigrants in Denmark: a randomised double-blinded placebo-controlled intervention study. *Br J Nutr.* 2008;100:197-207.

(100) Winzenberg T, Shaw K, Fryer J, Jones G. Calcium supplements in healthy children do not affect weight gain, height, or body composition. *Obesity.* 2007;15:1789-1798.

(101) Lorenzen JK, Molgaard C, Michaelsen KF, Astrup A. Calcium supplementation for 1 y does not reduce body weight or fat mass in young girls. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2006;83:18-23.

(102) Lappe JM, Rafferty KA, Davies KM, Lypaczewski G. Girls on a high-calcium diet gain weight at the same rate as girls on a normal diet: a pilot study. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2004;104:1361-1367.

(103) Johnson AA, Knight EM, Edwards CH et al. Dietary intakes, anthropometric measurements and pregnancy outcomes. *J Nutr.* 1994;124:936S-942S.

(104) Umesawa M, Iso H, Date C et al. Dietary intake of calcium in relation to mortality from cardiovascular disease: the JACC Study. *Stroke.* 2006;37:20-26.

(105) van der Vijver, van der Waal MA, Weterings KG, Dekker JM, Schouten EG, Kok FJ. Calcium intake and 28-year cardiovascular and coronary heart disease mortality in Dutch civil servants. *Int J Epidemiol.* 1992;21:36-39.

(106) Umesawa M, Iso H, Ishihara J et al. Dietary calcium intake and risks of stroke, its subtypes, and coronary heart disease in Japanese: the JPHC Study Cohort I. *Stroke.* 2008;39:2449-2456.

(107) Al-Delaimy WK, Rimm E, Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Hu FB. A prospective study of calcium intake from diet and supplements and risk of ischemic heart disease among men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2003;77:814-818.

(108) Weng LC, Yeh WT, Bai CH et al. Is ischemic stroke risk related to folate status or other nutrients correlated with folate intake? *Stroke.* 2008;39:3152-3158.

(109) Ascherio A, Rimm EB, Hernan MA et al. Intake of potassium, magnesium, calcium, and fiber and risk of stroke among US men. *Circulation.* 1998;98:1198-1204.

(110) Bostick RM, Kushi LH, Wu Y, Meyer KA, Sellers TA, Folsom AR. Relation of calcium, vitamin D, and dairy food intake to ischemic heart disease mortality among postmenopausal women. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1999;149:151-161.

(111) Iso H, Stampfer MJ, Manson JE et al. Prospective study of calcium, potassium, and magnesium intake and risk of stroke in women. *Stroke.* 1999;30:1772-1779.

(112) Larsson SC, Virtanen MJ, Mars M et al. Magnesium, calcium, potassium, and sodium intakes and risk of stroke in male smokers. *Arch Int Med.* 2008;168:459-465.

(113) Ross RK, Yuan JM, Henderson BE, Park J, Gao YT, Yu MC. Prospective evaluation of dietary and other predictors of fatal stroke in Shanghai, China. *Circulation.* 1997;96:50-55.

(114) Lanou AJ, Barnard ND. Dairy and weight loss hypothesis: an evaluation of the clinical trials. *Nutr Rev.* 2008;66:272-279.

(115) Trowman R, Dumville JC, Hahn S, Torgerson DJ. A systematic review of the effects of calcium supplementation on body weight. *Br J Nutr.* 2006;95:1033-1038.

(116) Barr SI. Increased dairy product or calcium intake: is body weight or composition affected in humans? *J Nutr.* 2003;133:245S-248S.

(117) Yamamoto ME, Applegate WB, Klag MJ et al. Lack of blood pressure effect with calcium and magnesium supplementation in adults with high-normal blood pressure. Results from Phase I of the Trials of Hypertension Prevention (TOHP). Trials of Hypertension Prevention (TOHP) Collaborative Research Group. *Ann Epidemiol.* 1995;5:96-107.

(118) van Beresteyn EC, Schaafsma G, de WH. Oral calcium and blood pressure: a controlled intervention trial. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1986;44:883-888.

(119) Cifuentes M, Riedt CS, Brolin RE, Field MP, Sherrell RM, Shapses SA. Weight loss and calcium intake influence calcium absorption in overweight postmenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2004;80:123-130.

(120) Ghadirian P, Shatenstein B, Verdy M, Hamet P. The influence of dairy products on plasma uric acid in women. *Euro J Epidemiol.* 1995;11:275-281.

(121) Aloia JF, Vaswani A, Russo L, Sheehan M, Flaster E. The influence of menopause and hormonal replacement therapy on body cell mass and body fat mass. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1995;172:896-900.

(122) Thomsen K, Nilas L, Christiansen C. Dietary calcium intake and blood pressure in normotensive subjects. *Acta Med Scand.* 1987;222:51-56.

(123) Kabrnova-Hlavata K, Hainer V, Gojova M et al. Calcium intake and the outcome of short-term weight management. *Physiol Res.* 2008;57:237-245.

(124) Bortolotti M, Rudelle S, Schneiter P et al. Dairy calcium supplementation in overweight or obese persons: its effect on markers of fat metabolism. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2008;88:877-885.

(125) Park Y, Leitzmann MF, Subar AF, Hollenbeck A, Schatzkin A. Dairy food, calcium, and risk of cancer in the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study. *Arch Int Med.* 2009;169:391-401.

(126) Slob IC, Lambregts JL, Schuit AJ, Kok FJ. Calcium intake and 28-year gastro-intestinal cancer mortality in Dutch civil servants. *Int J Cancer.* 1993;54:20-25.

(127) Chan JM, Stampfer MJ, Ma J, Gann PH, Gaziano JM, Giovannucci EL. Dairy products, calcium, and prostate cancer risk in the Physicians' Health Study. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2001;74:549-554.

(128) Giovannucci E, Liu Y, Stampfer MJ, Willett WC. A prospective study of calcium intake and incident and fatal prostate cancer. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2006;15:203-210.

(129) Giovannucci E, Liu Y, Platz EA, Stampfer MJ, Willett WC. Risk factors for prostate cancer incidence and progression in the health professionals follow-up study. *Int J Cancer.* 2007;121:1571-1578.

(130) Koh KA, Sesso HD, Paffenbarger RS, Jr., Lee IM. Dairy products, calcium and prostate cancer risk.[see comment]. *Br J Cancer.* 2006;95:1582-1585.

(131) Kurahashi N, Inoue M, Iwasaki M, Sasazuki S, Tsugane AS, Japan Public Health Center-Based Prospective Study Group. Dairy product, saturated fatty acid, and calcium intake and prostate cancer in a prospective cohort of Japanese men. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2008;17:930-937.

(132) Mitrou PN, Albanes D, Weinstein SJ et al. A prospective study of dietary calcium, dairy products and prostate cancer risk (Finland). *Int J Cancer.* 2007;120:2466-2473.

(133) Park SY, Murphy SP, Wilkens LR, Stram DO, Henderson BE, Kolonel LN. Calcium, vitamin D, and dairy product intake and prostate cancer risk: the Multiethnic Cohort Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007;166:1259-1269.

(134) Park Y, Mitrou PN, Kipnis V, Hollenbeck A, Schatzkin A, Leitzmann MF. Calcium, dairy foods, and risk of incident and fatal prostate cancer: the NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007;166:1270-1279.

(135) Rodriguez C, McCullough ML, Mondul AM et al. Calcium, dairy products, and risk of prostate cancer in a prospective cohort of United States men. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2003;12:597-603.

(136) Rohrmann S, Platz EA, Kavanaugh CJ, Thuita L, Hoffman SC, Helzlsouer KJ. Meat and dairy consumption and subsequent risk of prostate cancer in a US cohort study. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2007;18:41-50.

(137) Schuurman AG, van den Brandt PA, Dorant E, Goldbohm RA. Animal products, calcium and protein and prostate cancer risk in The Netherlands Cohort Study. *Br J Cancer.* 1999;80:1107-1113.

(138) Tseng M, Breslow RA, Graubard BI, Ziegler RG. Dairy, calcium, and vitamin D intakes and prostate cancer risk in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Epidemiologic Follow-up Study cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2005;81:1147-1154.

(139) Weingarten MA, Zalmanovici A, Yaphe J. Dietary calcium supplementation for preventing colorectal cancer and adenomatous polyps. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008;CD003548.

(140) Wu K, Willett WC, Fuchs CS, Colditz GA, Giovannucci EL. Calcium intake and risk of colon cancer in women and men. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2002;94:437-446.

(141) Kesse E, Boutron-Ruault MC, Norat T, Riboli E, Clavel-Chapelon F, Group N. Dietary calcium, phosphorus, vitamin D, dairy products and the risk of colorectal adenoma and cancer among French women of the E3N-EPIC prospective study. *Int J Cancer.* 2005;117:137-144.

(142) Lin J, Zhang SM, Cook NR, Manson JE, Lee IM, Buring JE. Intakes of calcium and vitamin D and risk of colorectal cancer in women. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2005;161:755-764.

(143) Pietinen P, Malila N, Virtanen M et al. Diet and risk of colorectal cancer in a cohort of Finnish men. *Cancer Causes Control.* 1999;10:387-396.

(144) Park SY, Murphy SP, Wilkens LR, Nomura AM, Henderson BE, Kolonel LN. Calcium and vitamin D intake and risk of colorectal cancer: the Multiethnic Cohort Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007;165:784-793.

(145) McCullough ML, Robertson AS, Rodriguez C et al. Calcium, vitamin D, dairy products, and risk of colorectal cancer in the Cancer Prevention Study II Nutrition Cohort (United States). *Cancer Causes Control.* 2003;14:1-12.

(146) Terry P, Baron JA, Bergkvist L, Holmberg L, Wolk A. Dietary calcium and vitamin D intake and risk of colorectal cancer: a prospective cohort study in women. *Nutr Cancer.* 2002;43:39-46.

(147) Flood A, Peters U, Chatterjee N, Lacey JV, Jr., Schairer C, Schatzkin A. Calcium from diet and supplements is associated with reduced risk of colorectal cancer in a prospective cohort of women. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2005;14:126-132.

(148) Larsson SC, Bergkvist L, Rutegard J, Giovannucci E, Wolk A. Calcium and dairy food intakes are inversely associated with colorectal cancer risk in the Cohort of Swedish Men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2006;83:667-673.

(149) Shin A, Li H, Shu XO, Yang G, Gao YT, Zheng W. Dietary intake of calcium, fiber and other micronutrients in relation to colorectal cancer risk: Results from the Shanghai Women's Health Study. *Int J Cancer.* 2006;119:2938-2942.

(150) Bostick RM, Potter JD, Sellers TA, McKenzie DR, Kushi LH, Folsom AR. Relation of calcium, vitamin D, and dairy food intake to incidence of colon cancer among older women. The Iowa Women's Health Study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1993;137:1302-1317.

(151) Stemmermann GN, Nomura A, Chyou PH. The influence of dairy and nondairy calcium on subsite large-bowel cancer risk. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 1990;33:190-194.

(152) Zheng W, Anderson KE, Kushi LH et al. A prospective cohort study of intake of calcium, vitamin D, and other micronutrients in relation to incidence of rectal cancer among postmenopausal women. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 1998;7:221-225.

(153) Gaard M, Tretli S, Loken EB. Dietary factors and risk of colon cancer: a prospective study of 50,535 young Norwegian men and women. *Eur J Cancer Prev.* 1996;5:445-454.

(154) Wu AH, Paganini-Hill A, Ross RK, Henderson BE. Alcohol, physical activity and other risk factors for colorectal cancer: a prospective study. *Br J Cancer.* 1987;55:687-694.

(155) Kato I, Akhmedkhanov A, Koenig K, Toniolo PG, Shore RE, Riboli E. Prospective study of diet and female colorectal cancer: the New York University Women's Health Study. *Nutr Cancer.* 1997;28:276-281.

(156) van der Pols JC, Bain C, Gunnell D, Smith GD, Frobisher C, Martin RM. Childhood dairy intake and adult cancer risk: 65-y follow-up of the Boyd Orr cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2007;86:1722-1729.

(157) Jarvinen R, Knekt P, Hakulinen T, Aromaa A. Prospective study on milk products, calcium and cancers of the colon and rectum. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2001;55:1000-1007.

(158) Garland C, Shekelle RB, Barrett-Connor E, Criqui MH, Rossof AH, Paul O. Dietary vitamin D and calcium and risk of colorectal cancer: a 19-year prospective study in men. *Lancet.* 1985;1:307-309.

(159) Kampman E, Goldbohm RA, van den Brandt PA, van ', V. Fermented dairy products, calcium, and colorectal cancer in The Netherlands Cohort Study. *Cancer Res.* 1994;54:3186-3190.

(160) Baron JA, Beach M, Mandel JS et al. Calcium supplements for the prevention of colorectal adenomas. Calcium Polyp Prevention Study Group. *N Engl J Med.* 1999;340:101-107.

(161) Grau MV, Baron JA, Sandler RS et al. Prolonged effect of calcium supplementation on risk of colorectal adenomas in a randomized trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2007;99:129-136.

(162) Duris I, Hruby D, Pekarkova B et al. Calcium chemoprevention in colorectal cancer. *Hepato-gastroenterology.* 1996;43:152-154.

(163) Oh K, Willett WC, Wu K, Fuchs CS, Giovannucci EL. Calcium and vitamin D intakes in relation to risk of distal colorectal adenoma in women. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2007;165:1178-1186.

(164) Hartman TJ, Albert PS, Snyder K et al. The association of calcium and vitamin D with risk of colorectal adenomas. *J Nutr.* 2005;135:252-259.

(165) Martinez ME, Marshall JR, Sampliner R, Wilkinson J, Alberts DS. Calcium, vitamin D, and risk of adenoma recurrence (United States). *Cancer Causes Control.* 2002;13:213-220.

(166) Kesse-Guyot E, Bertrais S, Duperray B et al. Dairy products, calcium and the risk of breast cancer: results of the French SU.VI.MAX prospective study. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2007;51:139-145.

(167) Lin J, Manson JE, Lee IM, Cook NR, Buring JE, Zhang SM. Intakes of calcium and vitamin D and breast cancer risk in women. *Arch Intern Med.* 2007;167:1050-1059.

(168) McCullough ML, Rodriguez C, Diver WR et al. Dairy, calcium, and vitamin D intake and postmenopausal breast cancer risk in the Cancer Prevention Study II Nutrition Cohort. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2005;14:2898-2904.

(169) Shin MH, Holmes MD, Hankinson SE, Wu K, Colditz GA, Willett WC. Intake of dairy products, calcium, and vitamin d and risk of breast cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2002;94:1301-0311.

(170) Larsson SC, Bergkvist L, Wolk A. Long-term dietary calcium intake and breast cancer risk in a prospective cohort of women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2009;89:277-282.

(171) Mishra G, McCormack V, Kuh D, Hardy R, Stephen A, dos SS, I. Dietary calcium and vitamin D intakes in childhood and throughout adulthood and mammographic density in a British birth cohort. *Br J Cancer.* 2008;99:1539-1543.

(172) Skinner HG, Michaud DS, Giovannucci E, Willett WC, Colditz GA, Fuchs CS. Vitamin D intake and the risk for pancreatic cancer in two cohort studies. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2006;15:1688-1695.

(173) Bucher HC, Guyatt GH, Cook RJ et al. Effect of calcium supplementation on pregnancy-induced hypertension and preeclampsia: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA.* 1996;275:1113-1117.

(174) Carroli G, Duley L, Belizan JM, Villar J. Calcium supplementation during pregnancy: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BJOG.* 1994;101:753-758.

(175) Hofmeyr GJ, Roodt A, Atallah AN, Duley L. Calcium supplementation to prevent pre-eclampsia--a systematic review. *S Afr Med J.* 2003;93:224-228.

(176) Hofmeyr GJ, Atallah AN, Duley L. Calcium supplementation during pregnancy for preventing hypertensive disorders and related problems. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2006;3:CD001059.

(177) Hofmeyr GJ, Duley L, Atallah A. Dietary calcium supplementation for prevention of pre-eclampsia and related problems: a systematic review and commentary. *BJOG.* 2007;114:933-943.

(178) Villar J, bdel-Aleem H, Merialdi M et al. World Health Organization randomized trial of calcium supplementation among low calcium intake pregnant women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2006;194:639-649.

(179) Levine RJ, Hauth JC, Curet LB et al. Trial of calcium to prevent preeclampsia. *N Engl J Med.* 1997;337:69-76.

(180) DerSimonian R, Levine RJ. Resolving discrepancies between a meta-analysis and a subsequent large controlled trial. *JAMA.* 1999;282:664-670.

(181) Morris CD, Jacobson SL, Anand R et al. Nutrient intake and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: Evidence from a large prospective cohort. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2001;184:643-651.

(182) Oken E, Ning Y, Rifas-Shiman SL, Rich-Edwards JW, Olsen SF, Gillman MW. Diet during pregnancy and risk of preeclampsia or gestational hypertension. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2007;17:663-668.

(183) Alonso A, Beunza JJ, gado-Rodriguez M, Martinez JA, Martinez-Gonzalez MA. Low-fat dairy consumption and reduced risk of hypertension: the Seguimiento Universidad de Navarra (SUN) cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2005;82:972-979.

(184) Dwyer JH, Li L, Dwyer KM, Curtin LR, Feinleib M. Dietary calcium, alcohol, and incidence of treated hypertension in the NHANES I epidemiologic follow-up study. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1996;144:828-838.

(185) Ascherio A, Rimm EB, Giovannucci EL et al. A prospective study of nutritional factors and hypertension among US men. *Circulation.* 1992;86:1475-1484.

(186) Ford ES, Cooper RS. Risk factors for hypertension in a national cohort study. *Hypertension.* 1991;18:598-606.

(187) Wang L, Manson JE, Buring JE, Lee IM, Sesso HD. Dietary intake of dairy products, calcium, and vitamin D and the risk of hypertension in middle-aged and older women. *Hypertension.* 2008;51:1073-1079.

(188) Ascherio A, Hennekens C, Willett WC et al. Prospective study of nutritional factors, blood pressure, and hypertension among US women. *Hypertension.* 1996;27:1065-1072.

(189) Griffith LE, Guyatt GH, Cook RJ, Bucher HC, Cook DJ. The influence of dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation on blood pressure: an updated metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials.[see comment]
1927. *Am J Hypertens.* 1999;12:84-92.

(190) van Mierlo LA, Arends LR, Streppel MT et al. Blood pressure response to calcium supplementation: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Hum Hypertens.* 2006;20:571-580.

(191) Bucher HC, Cook RJ, Guyatt GH et al. Effects of dietary calcium supplementation on blood pressure. A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA.* 1996;275:1016-1022.

(192) Allender PS, Cutler JA, Follmann D, Cappuccio FP, Pryer J, Elliott P. Dietary calcium and blood pressure: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 1996;124:825-831.

(193) Cappuccio FP, Siani A, Strazzullo P. Oral calcium supplementation and blood pressure: an overview of randomized controlled trials. *J Hypertens.* 1989;7:941-946.

(194) Reid IR, Horne A, Mason B, Ames R, Bava U, Gamble GD. Effects of calcium supplementation on body weight and blood pressure in normal older women: a randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2005;90:3824-3829.

(195) Whelton PK, Kumanyika SK, Cook NR et al. Efficacy of nonpharmacologic interventions in adults with high-normal blood pressure: results from phase 1 of the Trials of Hypertension Prevention. Trials of Hypertension Prevention Collaborative Research Group. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1997;65:652S-660S.

(196) Hatton DC, Harrison-Hohner J, Coste S, Reller M, McCarron D. Gestational calcium supplementation and blood pressure in the offspring. *Am J Hypertens.* 2003;16:801-805.

(197) Lijnen P, Petrov V. Dietary calcium, blood pressure and cell membrane cation transport systems in males. *J Hypertens.* 1995;13:875-882.

(198) Dickinson HO, Nicolson D, Cook JV et al. Calcium supplementation for the management of primary hypertension in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2006.

(199) Hsia J, Heiss G, Ren H et al. Calcium/vitamin D supplementation and cardiovascular events. *Circulation.* 2007;115:846-854.

(200) Lacroix AZ, Kotchen J, Anderson G et al. Calcium plus vitamin D supplementation and mortality in postmenopausal women: the Women's Health Initiative calcium-vitamin D randomized controlled trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2009;64:559-567.

(201) Caan B, Neuhouser M, Aragaki A et al. Calcium plus vitamin D supplementation and the risk of postmenopausal weight gain. *Arch Intern Med.* 2007;167:893-902.

(202) Major GC, Alarie F, Dore J, Phouttama S, Tremblay A. Supplementation with calcium + vitamin D enhances the beneficial effect of weight loss on plasma lipid and lipoprotein concentrations. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2007;85:54-59.

(203) Ding EL, Mehta S, Fawzi WW, Giovannucci EL. Interaction of estrogen therapy with calcium and vitamin D supplementation on colorectal cancer risk: reanalysis of Women's Health Initiative randomized trial. *Int J Cancer.* 2008;122:1690-1694.

(204) Grau MV, Baron JA, Sandler RS et al. Vitamin D, calcium supplementation, and colorectal adenomas: results of a randomized trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2003;95:1765-1771.

(205) Chlebowski RT, Johnson KC, Kooperberg C et al. Calcium plus vitamin D supplementation and the risk of breast cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2008;100:1581-1591.

(206) Marya RK, Rathee S, Manrow M. Effect of calcium and vitamin D supplementation on toxaemia of pregnancy. *Gynecol Obstet Invest.* 1987;24:38-42.

(207) Brunner RL, Cochrane B, Jackson RD et al. Calcium, vitamin D supplementation, and physical function in the Women's Health Initiative. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2008;108:1472-1479.

(208) Lappe J, Cullen D, Haynatzki G, Recker R, Ahlf R, Thompson K. Calcium and vitamin d supplementation decreases incidence of stress fractures in female navy recruits. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2008;23:741-749.

(209) Bjorkman M, Sorva A, Risteli J, Tilvis R. Vitamin D supplementation has minor effects on parathyroid hormone and bone turnover markers in vitamin D-deficient bedridden older patients. *Age Ageing.* 2008;37:25-31.

(210) Jackson RD, Lacroix AZ, Gass M et al. Calcium plus vitamin D supplementation and the risk of fractures. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354:669-683.

(211) Margolis KL, Ray RM, Van HL et al. Effect of calcium and vitamin D supplementation on blood pressure: the Women's Health Initiative Randomized Trial. *Hypertension.* 2008;52:847-855.

(212) Cheng S, Lyytikainen A, Kroger H et al. Effects of calcium, dairy product, and vitamin D supplementation on bone mass accrual and body composition in 10-12-y-old girls: a 2-y randomized trial. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2005;82:1115-1126.

(213) Bolton-Smith C, McMurdo ME, Paterson CR et al. Two-year randomized controlled trial of vitamin K1 (phylloquinone) and vitamin D3 plus calcium on the bone health of older women. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2007;22:509-519.

(214) Zhu K, Devine A, Dick IM, Wilson SG, Prince RL. Effects of calcium and vitamin D supplementation on hip bone mineral density and calcium-related analytes in elderly ambulatory Australian women: a five-year randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2008;93:743-749.

(215) Moschonis G, Manios Y. Skeletal site-dependent response of bone mineral density and quantitative ultrasound parameters following a 12-month dietary intervention using dairy products fortified with calcium and vitamin D: the Postmenopausal Health Study. *Br J Nutr.* 2006;96:1140-1148.

(216) Blum M, Dallal GE, wson-Hughes B. Body size and serum 25 hydroxy vitamin D response to oral supplements in healthy older adults. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 2008;27:274-279.

(217) Chapuy MC, Arlot ME, Duboeuf F et al. Vitamin D3 and calcium to prevent hip fractures in the elderly women. *N Engl J Med.* 1992;327:1637-1642.

(218) Chel V, Wijnhoven HA, Smit JH, Ooms M, Lips P. Efficacy of different doses and time intervals of oral vitamin D supplementation with or without calcium in elderly nursing home residents. *Osteoporos Int.* 2008;19:663-671.

(219) Deroisy R, Collette J, Albert A, Jupsin I, Reginster JY. Administration of a supplement containing both calcium and vitamin D is more effective than calcium alone to reduce secondary hyperparathyroidism in postmenopausal women with low 25(OH)vitamin D circulating levels. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2002;14:13-17.

(220) Himmelstein S, Clemens TL, Rubin A, Lindsay R. Vitamin D supplementation in elderly nursing home residents increases 25(OH)D but not 1,25(OH)2D. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1990;52:701-706.

(221) Kenny AM, Biskup B, Robbins B, Marcella G, Burleson JA. Effects of vitamin D supplementation on strength, physical function, and health perception in older, community-dwelling men. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2003;51:1762-1767.

(222) Krieg MA, Jacquet AF, Bremgartner M, Cuttelod S, Thiebaud D, Burckhardt P. Effect of supplementation with vitamin D3 and calcium on quantitative ultrasound of bone in elderly institutionalized women: a longitudinal study. *Osteoporos Int.* 1999;9:483-488.

(223) Pfeifer M, Begerow B, Minne HW, Abrams C, Nachtigall D, Hansen C. Effects of a short-term vitamin D and calcium supplementation on body sway and secondary hyperparathyroidism in elderly women. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2000;15:1113-1118.

(224) Sorva A, Risteli J, Risteli L, Valimaki M, Tilvis R. Effects of vitamin D and calcium on markers of bone metabolism in geriatric patients with low serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels. *Calcif Tissue Int.* 1991;49 Suppl:S88-S89.

(225) Barnes MS, Robson PJ, Bonham MP, Strain JJ, Wallace JM. Effect of vitamin D supplementation on vitamin D status and bone turnover markers in young adults. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2006;60:727-733.

(226) Dawson-Hughes B, Harris SS, Krall EA, Dallal GE. Effect of calcium and vitamin D supplementation on bone density in men and women 65 years of age or older. *N Engl J Med.* 1997;337:670-676.

(227) Harris SS, wson-Hughes B. Plasma vitamin D and 25OHD responses of young and old men to supplementation with vitamin D3. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 2002;21:357-362.

(228) Heaney RP, Davies KM, Chen TC, Holick MF, Barger-Lux MJ. Human serum 25-hydroxycholecalciferol response to extended oral dosing with cholecalciferol. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2003;77:204-210.

(229) Heikkinen A, Parviainen MT, Tuppurainen MT, Niskanen L, Komulainen MH, Saarikoski S. Effects of postmenopausal hormone replacement therapy with and without vitamin D3 on circulating levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D and 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D. *Calcif Tissue Int.* 1998;62:26-30.

(230) Honkanen R, Alhava E, Parviainen M, Talasniemi S, Monkkonen R. The necessity and safety of calcium and vitamin D in the elderly. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 1990;38:862-866.

(231) Jensen C, Holloway L, Block G et al. Long-term effects of nutrient intervention on markers of bone remodeling and calciotropic hormones in late-postmenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2002;75:1114-1120.

(232) Nelson ML, Blum JM, Hollis BW, Rosen C, Sullivan SS. Supplements of 20 microg/d cholecalciferol optimized serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations in 80% of premenopausal women in winter. *J Nutr.* 2009;139:540-546.

(233) Orwoll ES, Weigel RM, Oviatt SK, McClung MR, Deftos LJ. Calcium and cholecalciferol: effects of small supplements in normal men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1988;48:127-130.

(234) Patel R, Collins D, Bullock S, Swaminathan R, Blake GM, Fogelman I. The effect of season and vitamin D supplementation on bone mineral density in healthy women: a double-masked crossover study. *Osteoporos Int.* 2001;12:319-325.

(235) Riis B, Christiansen C, Rodbro P. The effect of different vitamin D treatments on serum vitamin D levels in early postmenopausal women. *Acta Vitaminol Enzymol.* 1984;6:77-82.

(236) Trang HM, Cole DE, Rubin LA, Pierratos A, Siu S, Vieth R. Evidence that vitamin D3 increases serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D more efficiently than does vitamin D2. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1998;68:854-858.

(237) Chan GM, Roberts CC, Folland D, Jackson R. Growth and bone mineralization of normal breast-fed infants and the effects of lactation on maternal bone mineral status. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1982;36:438-443.

(238) Basile LA, Taylor SN, Wagner CL, Horst RL, Hollis BW. The effect of high-dose vitamin D supplementation on serum vitamin D levels and milk calcium concentration in lactating women and their infants. *Breastfeed Med.* 2006;1:27-35.

(239) Hollis BW, Wagner CL. Vitamin D requirements during lactation: high-dose maternal supplementation as therapy to prevent hypovitaminosis D for both the mother and the nursing infant. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2004;80:1752S-1758S.

(240) Mastaglia SR, Mautalen CA, Parisi MS, Oliveri B. Vitamin D2 dose required to rapidly increase 25OHD levels in osteoporotic women. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2006;60:681-687.

(241) Bonis PA, Chung M, Tatsioni A et al. *Effects of omega-3 fatty acids on organ transplantation. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 115 (Prepared by Tufts-New England Medical Center Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 290-02-0022). AHRQ Publication No. 05-E012-2. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality*. 2005.

(242) Whitlock EP, Lin JS, Chou R, Shekelle P, Robinson KA. Using existing systematic reviews in complex systematic reviews. *Ann Int Med.* 2008;148:776-782.

(243) Dickersin K, Rennie D. Registering clinical trials. *JAMA.* 2003;290:516-523.

(244) Rising K, Bacchetti P, Bero L. Reporting bias in drug trials submitted to the Food and Drug Administration: review of publication and presentation. *PLoS Med.* 2008;5:e217.

Abbreviations

25(OH)D	25-hydroxyvitamin D
AHRQ	Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
AMSTAR	Assessment of multiple systematic reviews
Anthrop	Anthropometric measures
ASA	Acetyl-salicylic acid (aspirin)
ATBC	Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study
BCDDP	Breast Cancer Detection Demonstration Project
BMC	Bone mineral content
BMD	Bone mineral density
BMI	Body Mass Index
Ca	Calcium
CABG	Coronary artery bypass graft
CeVD	Cerebrovascular disease
CHD	Coronary heart disease
CHD	Coronary Heart Disease
CI	Confidence Interval
CIFOS	Calcium Intake Fracture Outcome Study
CONSORT	Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials
CPBA	Competitive protein binding assay
CPEP	Calcium for Prevention of Preeclampsia Trial
CPP	Calcium Polyp Prevention Study
CPS	Cancer Prevention Study
CRC	Colorectal cancer
CVD	Cardiovascular disease
DBP	Diastolic blood pressure
Demograph	Demographics
DM	Diabetes Mellitus
DRI	Dietary Reference Intake
Dx	Diagnosis
EAR	Estimated average requirement
EPC	Evidence-based Practice Center

FFQ	Food frequency questionnaire
FNB	Food and Nutrition Board
FOS	Framingham Offspring Study
FREE	Fracture Risk Epidemiology in the Elderly
HAH	Harvard Alumni Health Study
HbC	Hemoglobin C disease
HPFS	Health Professionals Follow-up Study
HPLC	High pressure liquid chromatography
HR	Hazard ratio
ht	Height
HT	Hormone (replacement) therapy
HTN	Hypertension
IHD	Ischemic heart disease
IOM	Institute of Medicine
Iowa WHS	Iowa Women's Health Study
IQR	Interquartile range
IU	International unit
Japan CC	Japan Collaborative Cohort
Japan PHC	Japan Public Health Center study
Kupio ORFPS	Kupio Osteoporosis Risk Factor and Prevention Study
MCS	Multiethnic Cohort Study, Hawaii, California
MI	Myocardial infarction
mil	Million
mo	Months(s)
N	Number of subjects
n	Number of subjects had event(s)
NA	Not applicable
nd	No data
NHANES	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
NHEFS	NHANES I Epidemiologic Follow-up Study
NHS	Nurses' Health Study

NIH	National Institutes of Health
NIH-AARP	National Institutes of Health – American Association of Retired Persons
NPC	Nutrition Prevention of Cancer trial
NS	Not significant
ODS	Office of Dietary Supplements
OR	Odds Ratio
PAHSG	Princess Anne Hospital Study Group, UK
PCI	Percutaneous coronary intervention
PHS	Physicians' Health Study
PI(E)CO	Population, Intervention (or Exposure), Comparison and Outcome
PLCO	Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial
PMID	PubMed (unique) identifier
PSA	Prostate specific antigen
PTH	Parathyroid hormone
RCT	Randomized-controlled trial
RDA	Recommended Dietary Allowance
RIA	Radioimmunoassay
RR	Relative risk
SBP	Systolic blood pressure
SD	Standard deviation
SE	Standard error
STROBE	STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology
Subgp	Subgroup
Suppl	Supplement(s)
TEP	Technical Expert Panel
TIA	Transient ischemic attach
TOHP	Trials of Hypertension Prevention
TOO	Task order officer
UK	United Kingdom
UL	Tolerable upper intake levels
US	United States
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture

UV	Ultraviolet rays
Vit	Vitamin
WCC	Washington County Cohort
WHI	Women's Health Initiative
WHS	Women’s Health Study
wk	week(s)
WMD	Weighted mean difference
wt	Weight
y	Year(s)

Latitudes of Selected Cities

Latitude	Western Hemisphere	Eastern Hemisphere
64° N	Reykjavik, Iceland Nome, Alaska	
60-61° N	Anchorage, Alaska	Oslo, Norway
56° N		Copenhagen, Denmark
52° N		Berlin, Germany Amsterdam, Netherlands
51° N	Calgary, Alberta	London, England
49° N	Vancouver, British Columbia	Paris, France
48° N	Seattle, Washington	Munich, Germany
47° N	Quebec City, Quebec Bismarck, North Dakota	Zurich, Switzerland
45° N	Ottawa, Ontario Minneapolis, Minnesota	Milan, Italy
44° N	Toronto, Ontario Portland, Maine	
42° N	Boston, Massachusetts Chicago, Illinois	Rome, Italy
41° N	New York, New York Salt Lake City, Utah	Barcelona, Spain
40° N	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Columbus, Ohio Washington, DC	Madrid, Spain Beijing, China
39° N	St Louis, Missouri Sacramento, California Louisville, Kentucky	
38° N	Wichita, Kansas San Francisco, California	Athens, Greece
36° N	Raleigh, North Carolina Las Vegas, Nevada	Tokyo, Japan
34° N	Columbia, South Carolina Los Angeles, California	Fez, Morocco
33° N	Dallas, Texas	
30° N	New Orleans, Louisiana	Cairo, Egypt
29° N	San Antonio, Texas	New Delhi, India
26° N	Miami, Florida	
22° N		Hong Kong, China
21° N	Honolulu, Hawaii	
19° N	Mexico City, Mexico	Mumbai (Bombay), India
15° N	Guatemala City, Guatemala	Manila, Philippines
10° N	Caracas, Venezuela	
4° N	Bogota, Columbia	
1° N		Singapore
12° S	Lima, Peru	
23° S	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	
26° S		Johannesburg, South Africa
34° S		Sydney, Australia Cape Town, South Africa
35° S	Buenos Aires, Argentina	
37° S		Auckland, New Zealand
38° S		Melbourne, Australia
41° S		Wellington, New Zealand

Appendix A. Search strategy for primary studies

a. Overall Search Strategy for Outcomes of Estimated Average Requirements

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R), CCTR (1969 to April 2009)

1. exp Vitamin D/
2. (25-hydroxy vit D or plasma vit D or 25OHD or 25-OHD).mp. [mp=title, original title, abstract, name of substance word, subject heading word]
3. (25OHD3 or "25(OH)D3" or 25-OHD3 or "25-(OH)D3").tw.
4. ("25(OH)D" or "25-(OH)D" or "25-OH-D").tw.
5. 25-hydroxycholecalciferol.tw.
6. 25-hydroxyergocalciferol.tw.
7. calcidiol.tw.
8. Calcifediol/
9. (vit adj (d or d2 or d3)).mp.
10. Ergocalciferols/
11. Ergocalciferol$.tw.
12. Cholecalciferol/
13. Cholecalciferol$.tw.
14. calciferol.tw.
15. or/1-14
16. exp Calcium/
17. exp Calcium Carbonate/ or exp Calcium Citrate/ or exp Calcium Phosphates/ or exp Calcium Malate/
18. exp Calcium, Dietary/
19. calcium.tw.
20. or/16-19
21. (ANIMALS not HUMAN).sh.
22. *Dialysis/ or *hemodialysis/ or *peritoneal dialysis/
23. 15 or 20
24. 23 not 21
25. 24 not 22
26. limit 25 to (addresses or bibliography or biography or comment or congresses or consensus development conference or consensus development conference, nih or dictionary or directory or duplicate publication or editorial or in vitro or interview or lectures or letter or news or newspaper article or "review")
27. 25 not 26
28. limit 27 to english language
29. randomized controlled trial.pt.

30. controlled clinical trial.pt.
31. randomized controlled trials/
32. Random Allocation/
33. Double-blind Method/
34. Single-Blind Method/
35. clinical trial.pt.
36. Clinical Trials.mp. or exp Clinical Trials/
37. (clinic$ adj25 trial$).tw.
38. ((singl$ or doubl$ or trebl$ or tripl$) adj (mask$ or blind$)).tw.
39. Placebos/
40. placebo$.tw.
41. random$.tw.
42. trial$.tw.
43. (latin adj square).tw.
44. Comparative Study.tw.
45. exp Evaluation studies/
46. Follow-Up Studies/
47. Prospective Studies/
48. (control$ or prospectiv$ or volunteer$).tw.
49. Cross-Over Studies/
50. or/29-49
51. 50 and 28
52. 28 not 51
53. limit 51 to yr="1969-2008"
54. limit 52 to yr="1969-2008"
55. 53 not ("200810$" or "200811$" or "200812$").ed.
56. 54 not ("200810$" or "200811$" or "200812$").ed.
57. 55 or 56
58. exp Vitamin D/
59. (25-hydroxy vit D or plasma vit D or 25OHD or 25-OHD).mp. [mp=title, original title, abstract, name of substance word, subject heading word]
60. (25OHD3 or "25(OH)D3" or 25-OHD3 or "25-(OH)D3").tw.
61. ("25(OH)D" or "25-(OH)D" or "25-OH-D").tw.
62. 25-hydroxycholecalciferol.tw.
63. 25-hydroxyergocalciferol.tw.
64. calcidiol.tw.
65. Calcifediol/
66. (vit adj (d or d2 or d3)).mp.

67. Ergocalciferols/
68. Ergocalciferol$.tw.
69. Cholecalciferol/
70. Cholecalciferol$.tw.
71. calciferol.tw.
72. or/58-71
73. exp Calcium/
74. exp Calcium Carbonate/ or exp Calcium Citrate/ or exp Calcium Phosphates/ or exp Calcium Malate/
75. exp Calcium, Dietary/
76. calcium.tw.
77. or/73-76
78. (ANIMALS not HUMAN).sh.
79. (ANIMALS not HUMAN).sh.
80. 72 or 77
81. 80 not 78
82. 81 not 79
83. limit 82 to (addresses or bibliography or biography or comment or congresses or consensus development conference or consensus development conference, nih or dictionary or directory or duplicate publication or editorial or in vitro or interview or lectures or letter or news or newspaper article or "review")
84. 82 not 83
85. limit 84 to english language
86. randomized controlled trial.pt.
87. controlled clinical trial.pt.
88. randomized controlled trials/
89. Random Allocation/
90. Double-blind Method/
91. Single-Blind Method/
92. clinical trial.pt.
93. Clinical Trials.mp. or exp Clinical Trials/
94. (clinic$ adj25 trial$).tw.
95. ((singl$ or doubl$ or trebl$ or tripl$) adj (mask$ or blind$)).tw.
96. Placebos/
97. placebo$.tw.
98. random$.tw.
99. trial$.tw.
100. (latin adj square).tw.
101. Comparative Study.tw.

102. exp Evaluation studies/
103. Follow-Up Studies/
104. Prospective Studies/
105. (control$ or prospectiv$ or volunteer$).tw.
106. Cross-Over Studies/
107. or/86-106
108. 107 and 85
109. 85 not 108
110. limit 108 to yr="1969-2008"
111. limit 109 to yr="1969-2008"
112. 110 not ("200810$" or "200811$" or "200812$").ed.
113. 111 not ("200810$" or "200811$" or "200812$").ed.
114. 112 or 113
115. verapamil.mp. or 52-53-9.rn.
116. nifedipine.mp. or 21829-25-4.rn.
117. diltiazem.mp. or 42399-41-7.rn.
118. Azelnidipine.mp. or 123524-52-7.rn.
119. nicardipine.mp. or 55985-32-5.rn.
120. felodipine.mp. or 72509-76-3.rn.
121. mepirodipine.mp. or 104713-75-9.rn.
122. Amlodipine.mp. or 88150-42-9.rn.
123. isradipine.mp. or 75695-93-1.rn.
124. bepridil.mp. or 64706-54-3.rn.
125. gallopamil.mp. or 16662-47-8.rn.
126. aranidipine.mp. or 86780-90-7.rn.
127. nitrendipine.mp. or 39562-70-4.rn.
128. Barnidipine.mp.
129. benidipine.mp. or 105979-17-7.rn.
130. Cilnidipine.mp. or 132203-70-4.rn.
131. clevidipine.mp.
132. efonidipine.mp. or 111011-53-1.rn.
133. Lacidipine.mp. or 103890-78-4.rn.
134. Lercanidipine.mp. or 100427-26-7.rn.
135. Manidipine.mp. or 89226-50-6.rn.
136. Nilvadipine.mp. or 75530-68-6.rn.
137. Nimodipine.mp. or 66085-59-4.rn.
138. Nisoldipine.mp. or 63675-72-9.rn.
139. Pranidipine.mp. or 99522-79-9.rn.

140. ((calcium or Ca) adj3 channel$).mp.

141. ((calcium or Ca) adj3 agonist$).mp.

142. (intracellular adj2 (calcium or Ca)).mp.

143. or/115-142

144. weight loss.mp. or exp Weight Loss/

145. body mass index.mp. or exp Body Mass Index/ or exp Body Mass/ or body mass.mp. or exp body weight/ or body weight.mp.

146. 144 or 145

147. obesity.mp. or exp OBESITY/pc, di, ep, et

148. or/144-147

149. limit 148 to ("all infant (birth to 23 months)" or "newborn infant (birth to 1 month)" or "infant (1 to 23 months)" or "preschool child (2 to 5 years)")

150. limit 149 to ("all adult (19 plus years)" or "child (6 to 12 years)" or "adolescent (13 to 18 years)" or "adult (19 to 44 years)" or "middle age (45 to 64 years)" or "middle aged (45 plus years)" or "all aged (65 and over)" or "aged (80 and over)")

151. 149 not 150

152. 148 not 151

153. exp Body Height/

154. exp body size/

155. growth velocity.af.

156. growth retardation.af.

157. growth delay.af.

158. growth restriction.af.

159. (height adj6 restrict$).af.

160. linear velocity.af.

161. (height adj6 delay).af.

162. length delay.af.

163. (length adj6 retardation).af.

164. or/153-163

165. limit 164 to ("all infant (birth to 23 months)" or "all child (0 to 18 years)" or "newborn infant (birth to 1 month)" or "infant (1 to 23 months)" or "preschool child (2 to 5 years)" or "child (6 to 12 years)" or "adolescent (13 to 18 years)")

166. 164 not 165

167. limit 166 to ("all adult (19 plus years)" or "adult (19 to 44 years)" or "middle age (45 to 64 years)" or "middle aged (45 plus years)" or "all aged (65 and over)" or "aged (80 and over)")

168. 164 not 167

169. Bone Density/

170. exp Osteoporosis/

171. ((bone$ or plate$) adj3 mineral$).tw.

172. (bone adj2 (loss or turnover or densi$)).tw.

173. (Skelet$ adj2 (mineral$ or development$)).tw.
174. mineralization defect$.tw.
175. Mineral$ content$.tw.
176. BMC.tw.
177. Osteoporo$.tw.
178. Osteomalac$.tw.
179. Osteopath$.tw.
180. Bone Development/
181. Osteogenesis/
182. fracture$.tw.
183. Accidental Falls/
184. falls.tw.
185. exp "Bone and Bones"/
186. or/169-185
187. Rickets/
188. rachitis.tw.
189. rickets.tw.
190. or/187-189
191. tooth loss.mp. or exp Tooth Loss/
192. 190 or 186 or 191
193. limit 192 to yr="2006-2008"
194. exp Cardiovascular Diseases/pc, di, ep, et
195. Cardi$.mp.
196. 195
197. Coronary.mp.
198. heart disease$.mp.
199. Myocardial infarct$.mp.
200. exp Cerebrovascular Accident/
201. stroke.tw.
202. Transient Ischemic Attack.tw.
203. exp Ischemia/
204. cardioprotect$.mp.
205. Pulmonary Embol$.tw.
206. Heart failure$.tw.
207. (embol$ or thromb$).tw.
208. exp Peripheral Vascular Diseases/ or peripheral artery disease.mp.
209. arterial occlusive diseases/
210. or/194-209

211. limit 210 to "all adult (19 plus years)"
212. exp hypertension/pc, di, ep, et
213. exp hypertension, renal/
214. hypertens$.af.
215. high blood pressure.af.
216. (eleva$ adj2 blood pressure).tw.
217. systolic blood pressure/
218. diastolic blood pressure/
219. mean arterial pressure/
220. or/212-219
221. limit 220 to "all adult (19 plus years)"
222. exp Neoplasms/dh, pc, et, di, ep [Diet Therapy, Prevention & Control, Etiology, Diagnosis, Epidemiology]
223. ("cancer risk" or "melanoma risk" or "lymphoma risk" or "leukemia risk" or "myeloma risk" or "sarcoma risk").tw.
224. (("risk of" or "occurrence of") and (cancer$ or neoplasm$ or malignan$ or adenocarcinom$ or carcinom$ or melanom$ or lymphom$ or leuk?emi$ or myelodysplas$ or myelom$ or sarcom$)).tw.
225. 222 or 224 or 223
226. colon polyps.mp. or exp adenomatous polyps/ or exp colonic polyps/
227. (colon$ or rectum or rectal or colorectum or colorectal).ti,ab.
228. (adenoma$ or polyps or polyp).ti,ab.
229. 228 and 227
230. 229 or 226
231. mammography.mp. or exp mammography/
232. mammog$.ti,ab.
233. 231 or 232
234. dens$.ti,ab.
235. 233 and 234
236. prostate specific antigen.mp. or exp prostate-specific antigen/
237. (aberrant crypt$ foc$ or ACF).ti,ab.
238. (prostat$ and (intraepitheli$ or intra-epitheli$ or intra epitheli$) and Neoplas$).ab,ti.
239. 236 or 238 or 235 or 237 or 230
240. type 1 diabetes mellitus.mp. or exp Diabetes Mellitus, Type 1/
241. psoriasis.mp. or exp Psoriasis/
242. rheumatoid arthritis.mp. or exp Arthritis, Rheumatoid/
243. multiple sclerosis.mp. or exp Multiple Sclerosis/
244. inflammatory bowel disease.mp. or exp Inflammatory Bowel Diseases/
245. ulcerative colitis.mp. or exp Colitis, Ulcerative/

246. Crohn's disease.mp. or exp Crohn Disease/
247. 240 or 241 or 242 or 243 or 244 or 245 or 246
248. tuberculosis.mp. or exp Tuberculosis/
249. influenza.mp. or exp Influenza, Human/
250. 248 or 249
251. exp "Activities of Daily Living"/
252. muscle strength.mp. or exp Muscle Strength/
253. exp Musculoskeletal Equilibrium/ or exp Walking/
254. ("balance test" or "timed walk" or "physical performance" or "hand-grip strength").tw.
255. exp Hand Strength/
256. exp Muscles/
257. ("walking time" or "muscle strength").tw.
258. or/251-257
259. limit 258 to ("all adult (19 plus years)" or "all aged (65 and over)" or "aged (80 and over)")
260. exp Pre-eclampsia/
261. (pre-eclampsia or preeclampsia).mp.
262. pregnancy complication$.mp. or exp Pregnancy Complications/
263. or/260-262
264. limit 263 to male
265. limit 263 to female
266. 264 not 265
267. 263 not 266
268. limit 267 to animal
269. limit 267 to human
270. 268 not 269
271. 267 not 270
272. limit 271 to english language
273. exp infant,low birth weight/
274. low birth weight.af.
275. exp infant, premature/
276. ("small for gestational age" or sga).af.
277. ((preterm or prematur$) adj6 (infant or newborn)).af.
278. or/273-277
279. exp Milk, Human/
280. human milk.mp.
281. (human adj2 milk).tw.
282. breast milk.mp.
283. breastmilk.mp.

284. breast feeding.mp.
285. breastfeed$.mp.
286. breast fed.mp.
287. breastfed.mp.
288. (breast adj2 fed).tw.
289. exp lactation/
290. (lactating or lactation).mp.
291. or/279-290
292. Mortality.mp. or exp Mortality/
293. Fatal Outcome.mp. or exp Fatal Outcome/
294. exp Death/ or exp "Cause of Death"/ or death.mp.
295. Survival Rate.mp. or exp Survival Rate/
296. 295 or 292 or 294 or 293
297. heterotopic ossification.mp. or exp Ossification, Heterotopic/
298. myositis ossificans.mp. or exp Myositis Ossificans/
299. calcinosis.mp. or exp Calcinosis/
300. extraosseous calcification.mp.
301. metaplastic calcification.mp.
302. myo-osteosis.mp.
303. neurogenic osteoma.mp.
304. osseous heteroplasia.mp.
305. ossifying fibromyopathy.mp.
306. para-articular calcification.mp.
307. heterotopic calcification.mp.
308. pathological bone.mp.
309. pathological calcification.mp.
310. periarticular calcification.mp.
311. synostosis.mp.
312. ectopic bone.mp.
313. heterotopic bone.mp.
314. dystrophic ossification.mp.
315. ectopic ossification.mp.
316. metaplastic ossification.mp.
317. para-articular ossification.mp.
318. periarticular ossification.mp.
319. pathological ossification.mp.
320. ectopic calcification.mp.
321. soft tissue calcification.mp.

322. (vascular adj3 calcification).mp.
323. (aort$ adj3 calcification).mp.
324. (valv$ adj3 calcification).mp.
325. or/297-324
326. limit 325 to animal
327. limit 325 to human
328. 326 not 327
329. 325 not 328
330. limit 329 to english language
331. exp kidney disease/
332. exp kidney/
333. kidney.mp.
334. renal.af.
335. nephro$.af.
336. exp renal replacement therapy/
337. exp kidney, artificial/
338. (hemodialy$ or haemodialy$ or dialy$).af.
339. exp Kidney Glomerulus/
340. exp Kidney Function Tests/
341. ur?emia.tw.
342. exp Kidney Calculi/
343. (kidney stone$ or renal stone$ or renal calcul$ or kidney calcul$ or nephrolith$).af.
344. 343 not 342
345. exp nephrolithiasis/
346. or/331-345
347. allerg$.mp. or exp Hypersensitivity/

b. Overall Search Strategy for Outcomes of Upper Limits

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R), CCTR (from 1966 to December 2008)

1. exp Vitamin D/
2. (25-hydroxy vit D or plasma vit D or 25OHD or 25-OHD).mp. [mp=title, original title, abstract, name of substance word, subject heading word]
3. (25OHD3 or "25(OH)D3" or 25-OHD3 or "25-(OH)D3").tw.
4. ("25(OH)D" or "25-(OH)D" or "25-OH-D").tw.
5. 25-hydroxycholecalciferol.tw.
6. 25-hydroxyergocalciferol.tw.
7. calcidiol.tw.
8. Calcifediol/

9. (vit adj (d or d2 or d3)).mp.
10. Ergocalciferols/
11. Ergocalciferol$.tw.
12. Cholecalciferol/
13. Cholecalciferol$.tw.
14. calciferol.tw.
15. exp Calcium Carbonate/ or exp Calcium Citrate/ or exp Calcium Phosphates/ or exp Calcium Malate/
16. or/1-15
17. supplement$.tw.
18. exp Dietary Supplements/to, ae, po, ut [Toxicity, Adverse Effects, Poisoning, Utilization]
19. No-Observed-Adverse-Effect Level/
20. upper limit$.tw.
21. UL.tw.
22. (excess$ or toxic$).tw.
23. vit d intox$.tw.
24. (noael or noel).tw.
25. (no observed adj2 effect$).tw.
26. or/17-25
27. 26 and 16
28. (ANIMALS not HUMAN).sh.
29. *Dialysis/ or *hemodialysis/ or *peritoneal dialysis/
30. 27 not 28
31. 30 not 29
32. limit 31 to (addresses or bibliography or biography or comment or dictionary or directory or duplicate publication or editorial or in vitro or interview or lectures or letter or news or "review")
33. 31 not 32
34. limit 33 to english language
35. exp kidney disease/
36. exp kidney, artificial/
37. exp Kidney Function Tests/
38. ur?emia.tw.
39. (kidney stone$ or renal stone$ or renal calcul$ or kidney calcul$ or nephrolith$).af.
40. exp nephrolithiasis/
41. heterotopic ossification.mp. or exp Ossification, Heterotopic/
42. myositis ossificans.mp. or exp Myositis Ossificans/
43. calcinosis.mp. or exp Calcinosis/
44. extraosseous calcification.mp.
45. metaplastic calcification.mp.

46. myo-osteosis.mp.
47. neurogenic osteoma.mp.
48. osseous heteroplasia.mp.
49. ossifying fibromyopathy.mp.
50. para-articular calcification.mp.
51. heterotopic calcification.mp.
52. pathological bone.mp.
53. pathological calcification.mp.
54. periarticular calcification.mp.
55. synostosis.mp.
56. ectopic bone.mp.
57. heterotopic bone.mp.
58. dystrophic ossification.mp.
59. ectopic ossification.mp.
60. metaplastic ossification.mp.
61. para-articular ossification.mp.
62. periarticular ossification.mp.
63. pathological ossification.mp.
64. ectopic calcification.mp.
65. soft tissue calcification.mp.
66. (vascular adj3 calcification).mp.
67. (aort$ adj3 calcification).mp.
68. (valv$ adj3 calcification).mp.
69. or/41-68
70. Calcification, Physiologic/de [Drug Effects]
71. Hypercalcemia/
72. Kidney Calculi/
73. Nephrocalcinosis/
74. Urinary Calculi/
75. Bladder Calculi/
76. Ureteral Calculi/
77. Calcinosis/
78. Hypercalcemi$.tw.
79. (Burnett$ adj2 syndrome$).tw.
80. Hypercalciuri$.tw.
81. or/70-80
82. psoriasis.mp. or exp Psoriasis/
83. 81 or 69 or 82

84. 34 and 83
85. limit 84 to case reports
86. 84 not 85

Appendix B. Search strategy for systematic reviews

Databases: MEDLINE(R), the Cochrane Database of Systemic Reviews, and the Health Technology Assessments (up to December 2008)

1. (meta-analys$ or metaanalys$).mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, keywords, caption text]
2. (systematic review$ or systematic literature or evidence-based or evidence review$).mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, keywords, caption text]
3. (EBM or EBR or EBRs).mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, keywords, caption text]
4. or/1-3
5. (vitamin D or cholecalciferol or ergocalciferol or hydroxy vitamin D or calcitriol).mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, keywords, caption text]
6. Calcium.mp. [mp=title, abstract, full text, keywords, caption text]
7. 5 or 6
8. 4 and 7

Appendix D. Evaluation of existing systematic reviews and evidence tables of the qualified systematic reviews

Evaluation of existing systematic reviews

Author Year Journal /Source	Intervention or exposure	Outcome	Study design included	Healthy population at baseline?*	Only included Ca +- Vit D interventions? ** Reported baseline dietary Ca intake with dietary assessment methods?***	Clear reporting of comparison and control group?	Clear reporting of outcome definitions?	Clear reporting of study designs (need separate reporting if two or more different designs are included)?	Comments* ** ***
Autier 2007 Arch Intern Med [17846391][1]	Vitamin D [+/- Calcium]	All cause mortality	RCTs	Yes[1]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	One additional study found
Avenell 2008 Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [16034849][2]	Vitamin D [+/- Calcium]	All cause mortality	RCTs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All relevant studies included in Autier 2007 – Conclusions are same as Autier 2007.
Allender 1996 Ann Intern Med	Ca supplement	Blood pressure	RCT	Yes (subgroup analysis)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	26 of 64 potential RCTs
Cappuccio 1995 AJE	Ca intake	Blood pressure	Observational, including cross-sectional	Unclear	No	NA (regressions)	Yes	No	REJECT Includes XS
Dickinson 2008 Cochrane	Ca supplement	Blood pressure	RCT	No All with HTN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Revision of 2006 SR 15/64 potential RCTs

[1] We excluded a study on patients with congestive heart failure in our reanalysis of data from this systematic review

Author Year Journal /Source	Intervention or exposure	Outcome	Study design included	Healthy population at baseline?*	Only included Ca +- Vit D interventions? ** Reported baseline dietary Ca intake with dietary assessment methods?***	Clear reporting of comparison and control group?	Clear reporting of outcome definitions?	Clear reporting of study designs (need separate reporting if two or more different designs are included)?	Comments****
Griffith 1999 AJH	Ca supplement	Blood pressure	RCT	Yes & No HTN & NTN combined See comment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Update of Bucher 1996 [2263] Subgp analysis HTN vs NTN in Bucher only 42/64 potential RCTs
van Mierlo 2006 J Hum Hypert	Ca supplement	Blood pressure	RCT	Yes Subgroup of HTN & NTN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	40/64 potential RCTs
Trumbo 2007 Nutr Rev	Ca supplement	Blood pressure, HTN, Pregnancy-induced HTN	All	Yes Subgroup of HTN & NTN	Yes (interv) No (observ)	No	No	No	REJECT Qualitative only Count of sig studies only Unclear if SR.
Bergsma-Kadijk 1996 Epidemiology	Ca intake	cancer and polyp	Cohort and Case-control	nd (probably healthy population)	nd on dietary assessment method	nd on Ca intake (only RR/OR between lowest and highest categories reported)	nd	nd on the definition of case-control study	Reject
Weigarten 2008 Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews	Ca supplement (>1200 mg/d)	cancer and polyp	RCT	yes (pts with prior adenoma)	yes	yes	yes	yes	Accept

Author Year Journal /Source	Intervention or exposure	Outcome	Study design included	Healthy population at baseline?*	Only included Ca +- Vit D interventions? ** Reported baseline dietary Ca intake with dietary assessment methods?***	Clear reporting of comparison and control group?	Clear reporting of outcome definitions?	Clear reporting of study designs (need separate reporting if two or more different designs are included)?	Comments* ** ***
Davies 2006 J Natl Cancer Inst	Nutritional RCTs, including Ca supplement	Cancer, recurrence of preinvasive lesions	RCT	No (both pts with cancer and preinvasive lesions)	nd	no	no	yes	Part of a larger SR of both diet and physical activity on outcome among patients with cancer or preinvasive lesions
Bergel 2007 BMC Pediatrics	maternal calcium intake	offspring BP	RCTs & cohort	y (RCT)	no yes	yes	yes	no	Data from 2 RCTs may be useful. Reject
Carroli 1994 Brit J Obstet Gynecol	Ca supplement	Preeclampsia	RCT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Covered by latest Cochrane SR
Hofmeyer 2003 S African J	Ca Supplement	Preeclampsia	RCT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Covered by latest Cochrane SR
Hofmeyer 2007 S African J	Ca Supplement	Preeclampsia (and summary of the outcomes mentioned above)	RCT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Covered by latest Cochrane SR

Author Year Journal /Source	Intervention or exposure	Outcome	Study design included	Healthy population at baseline?*	Only included Ca +- Vit D interventions? ** Reported baseline dietary Ca intake with dietary assessment methods?***	Clear reporting of comparison and control group?	Clear reporting of outcome definitions?	Clear reporting of study designs (need separate reporting if two or more different designs are included)?	Comments****
Hoffmeyr 2006 Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews	Ca supplement	Preeclampsia, pregnancy induced hypertension with and without proteinuria, maternal death or serious morbidity, other maternal outcomes, stillbirth, neonatal mortality or morbidity, preterm birth, small gestational age, and other outcomes for the child	RCT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Eligible review
Bucher 1996 JAMA	Ca supplement	Preeclampsia, pregnancy-induced hypertension	RCT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Covered by latest Cochrane SR
Gao 2005 NCI	calcium intake or dairy product	prostate cancer	prospective cohort	yes (assumed from study design)	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Shaukat 2005 Am J Gastroenterol	Ca supplement	recurrent polyp	RCT	yes (pts with prior adenoma)	no (1/3 included Ca+Vit A/C/E+selenium)	yes	yes? "recurrence of adenoma"	yes? "RCT"	Reject

Author Year Journal /Source	Intervention or exposure	Outcome	Study design included	Healthy population at baseline?*	Only included Ca +- Vit D interventions? ** Reported baseline dietary Ca intake with dietary assessment methods?***	Clear reporting of comparison and control group?	Clear reporting of outcome definitions?	Clear reporting of study designs (need separate reporting if two or more different designs are included)?	Comments****
Barr 2003 J Nutr	Increased dairy product or calcium intake (from supplements)	Weight	RCTs	Yes "healthy"	Yes (separate studies of increased dairy product and those of calcium supplements)	yes	yes	yes	No meta-analysis. Included children and adults
Trowman 2006 Br J Nutr	Calcium supplements or increased provision of dairy products	Weight	RCTs	Yes (excluded populations with severe co-morbidities, such as renal problems or cancer)	Yes (Separate meta-analyses for calcium supplement and increased provision of dairy products)	yes	yes	yes	May need to redo the meta-analyses to separate out energy restriction diet studies. This SR included adults only.
Winzenberg 2007 Obesity	calcium supplementation food or chemical	weight	RCTs	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	2º analysis of RCT of calcium on bone density outcome
Lanou 2008 Nutr Rev	Calcium or dairy supplementation with or without energy restriction	Weight, body fat	RCTs	nd	yes	no	yes	yes	Included both dairy and calcium supplementation RCTs. No individual study characteristics reported

*Either included only healthy population at baseline or SR had separate analyses for population with diseases and without diseases
**For SR of interventional studies
***For SR of observational studies
****Please comment on issues such as update of previous SRs or specific reasons for using or not using the SR, other than not fulfilling the screening criteria.

Evidence table of systematic review of the effect of vitamin D on bone health

Author Year [PMID]	Cranney 2007 [18088161]
Design	Systematic review of RCTs and observational studies
Population	• Include all ages • Exclude secondary causes of osteoporosis (e.g., glucocorticoid-induced, renal or liver disease) • Exclude studies on the treatment of vitamin D-dependent rickets (to minimize clinical heterogeneity as treatments is often non-dietary sources of vitamin D)
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Intervention (Exposure): • Include vitamin D_2 or D_3 with or without calcium. • Exclude vitamin D preparations, calcitriol, alphacalcidol (because they are not nutritional supplements, and have different safety profile) Comparator: • No vitamin D or lower doses/levels of vitamin D
Results	See text for summary results for the following outcomes in both vitamin D and combined vitamin D and calcium sections of the report: • Rickets • Fractures, falls, or performance measures • Bone mineral density or bone mineral contents • How does dietary intake of vitamin D from fortified foods and vitamin D supplementation affect serum 25(OH)D Concentrations • Adverse events
Comments	Case-control studies were included but always summarized separately from cohort studies and RCTs. Meta-analyses were performed to pool results from RCTs only.

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes		

Evidence table of systematic review on vitamin D supplementation and all-cause mortality

Author Year [PMID]	Autier 2007 [17846391]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1992-2006)
Population	Community dwelling or institutionalized adults
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Supplementary vitamin D (at least 1000 mg/d) without calcium vs. placebo or no treatment
Results	18 trials of combined vitamin D and vitamin D + calcium RR: 0.93 (95% CI 0.87, 0.99); favoring vitamin D (± calcium) supplementation Statistically homogeneous In our reanalysis we and excluded 3 of 18 trials and separated studies with vitamin D only from those with vitamin D and calcium combination. For details and results of our reanalysis, see text.
Comments	See text in vitamin D and vitamin D + calcium sections for reanalyses of the separated trials. Study participants, vitamin D assays, and vitamin D status are not described in detail.

AMSTAR Criteria

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	No	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	The meta-analysis did not perform quality assessment (neither using individual quality items nor using quality scores)	

Evidence table of systematic review of calcium on growth in children

Author Year [PMID]	Winzenberg 2007 [17636098]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2005)
Population	Children <18 y
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Supplemental and dietary calcium 300-1200 mg/d vs. placebo
Results	17 trials (2088 participants) Weighted mean difference: +0.14 (95% CI -0.28, +0.57) Kg; favors control Weighted mean difference: +0.22 (95% CI -0.30, +0.74) cm; favors control No significant statistical heterogeneity

Comments	Post hoc analysis performed on trials identified for a metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials of calcium on bone outcomes

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Unclear if all languages included; study quality assessed but not factored into the M-A	

Evidence table of systematic review s of calcium and blood pressure

Author Year [PMID]	Griffith 1999 [10075392]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-1997)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 600-2000 mg (36% 1000 mg; 26% 1500-1600 mg; 12% 2000 mg)
Results	42 trials SBP: -1.44 (-2.20, -0.68)[2]; statistically heterogeneous DBP: -0.84 (-1.44, -0.24); statistically heterogeneous Subgroup analyses did not find that heterogeneity could be explained by age, sex, baseline calcium, dietary versus nondietary calcium, or quality. Subgroups with hypertensive versus normotensive people were significantly different (no further details). Conclusions similar to previous systematic review (Bucher 1996{2263 /id})
Comments	Update of Bucher 1996{2263 /id} (see below).

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Study quality not discussed in conclusions. Funding source reported, but not conflict of interest.	

Author Year [PMID]	van Mierlo 2006 [16673011]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2003)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 355-2000 mg (40% 1000 mg; 32% 1500-1600 mg; 6% 2000 mg)
Results	40 trials SBP: -1.86 (95% CI -2.91, -0.81); statistically heterogeneous DBP: -0.99 (95% CI -1.61, -0.37); statistically heterogeneous In multivariable analysis including age, sex, initial calcium intake, calcium dose, and initial blood pressure:

		SBP	DBP
Age	<45 y	-1.45 (-2.99, +0.09)	-1.26 (-2.20, -0.33)
	≥45 y	-2.33 (-3.69, -0.96)	-0.80 (-1.62, +0.02)
Male	≤50%	-2.20 (-3.68, -0.72)	-1.12 (-1.98, -0.26)
	>50%	-1.77 (-3.13, -0.42)	-0.84 (-1.65, -0.04)
Initial BP	<140/90 mm Hg	-2.04 (-3.40, -0.68)	-1.04 (-1.86, -0.22)
	≥140/90 mm Hg	-1.85 (-3.45, -0.32)	-0.89 (-1.79, +0.01)
Ca dose	≤1000 mg	-2.17 (-3.59, -0.75)	-1.41 (-2.24, -0.59)
	>1000 mg	-1.75 (-3.20, -0.31)	-0.56 (-1.40, +0.29)

Blood pressures not statistically significantly different between any strata.

Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Unclear	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	Partial	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	No data on inclusion of unpublished data. Excluded studies available from authors	

[2] Numbers in parentheses are 95% confidence intervals

Evidence table of systematic review s of calcium and blood pressure. continued

Author Year [PMID]	Bucher 1996 [8596234]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-1994)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 406-2000 mg (41% 1000 mg; 31% 1500-1600 mg; 8% 2000 mg)
Results	33 trials [Overall summary results were updated in Griffith 1999{1927 /id}, above] Studies with specified subgroups of hypertensive and normotensive participants (6 trials): Hypertensives SBP -4.30 (-6.47, -2.13) DBP -1.50 (-2.77, -0.23) Normotensives SBP -0.27 (-1.80, +1.27) DBP -0.33 (-1.56, +0.90) Regression analyses: BP (continuous scale) SBP OR = 0.99 (0.96, 1.01) DBP OR = 0.99 (0.96, 1.03) Dose of calcium, duration of supplementation, dietary vs nondietary calcium supplementation, methodological quality did not demonstrate a relationship with the magnitude of treatment effect.
Comments	Updated in Griffith 1999{1927 /id} (see above)

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Funding source reported, but not conflict of interest.	

Author Year [PMID]	Allender 1996 [8610952]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1982-1993)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 400-2160 mg (35% 1000 mg; 29% 1500-1600 mg; 10% 2000 mg)
Results	26 trials (22 trials included in metaanalyses) SBP: -0.89 (-1.74, -0.05) DBP: -0.18 (-0.75, +0.40) Hypertensives SBP -1.68 (-3.18, -0.18) DBP +0.02 (-0.96, +1.00) Normotensives SBP -0.53 (-1.56, +0.49) DBP -0.28 (-0.99, +0.42) By weighted linear regression analyses, age, sex, calcium dose, trial duration were not associated with treatment effect (P>0.10)
Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	No
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Excluded studies not enumerated or listed. Fixed effects models used.	

Author Year [PMID]	Cappuccio 1989 [2697729]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1983-1988)
Population	Both hypertensive and normotensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) or low calcium intake Dose range 800-1600 mg (60% 1000 mg; 27% 1500-1600 mg)
Results	15 trials SBP (supine): -0.13 (-0.46, +0.19) DBP (supine): +0.03 (-0.17, +0.22) Hypertensives SBP +0.06 (-0.59, +0.72) DBP +0.03 (-0.21, +0.27)
Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	No
Two independent reviewers?	nd	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	NA
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	No
All publication types and languages included?	nd	**Publication bias assessed?**	No
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Excluded studies not enumerated or listed. Fixed effects models used.	

Evidence table of systematic review s of calcium and blood pressure. continued

Author Year [PMID]	Dickinson 2006 [16625609][3]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1982-2003/2005[4])
Population	Hypertensive participants
Intervention and Comparator	Dietary and nondietary calcium supplementation versus placebo (no supplement) Dose range 400-2000 mg (50% 1000 mg; 25% 1500-1600 mg; 6% 2000 mg)
Results	13 trials SBP: -2.53 (-4.45, -0.60); statistically heterogeneous DBP: -0.81 (-2.07, +0.44); statistically heterogeneous Ca dose <1200 mg SBP -2.67 (-5.15, -0.18) DBP -0.75 (-2.13, +0.63) Ca dose 1200-2000 mg SBP -2.69 (-5.86, +0.47) DBP -0.78 (-3.82, +2.25) Not statistically significantly different by calcium dose
Comments	

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	Yes
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	Yes	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	Yes	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	Yes
Study characteristics provided?	Yes		

Evidence table of systematic review of calcium on growth in children

Author Year [PMID]	Winzenberg 2007 [17636098]
Design (Search Years)	Randomized controlled trials (1966-2005)
Population	Children <18 y
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Supplemental and dietary calcium 300-1200 mg/d vs. placebo
Results	17 trials (2088 participants) Weighted mean difference: +0.14 (95% CI -0.28, +0.57) Kg; favors control Weighted mean difference: +0.22 (95% CI -0.30, +0.74) cm; favors control No significant statistical heterogeneity
Comments	Post hoc analysis performed on trials identified for a metaanalysis of randomized controlled trials of calcium on bone outcomes

AMSTAR

A priori design?	Yes	**Study quality assessment performed?**	Yes
Two independent reviewers?	Yes	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	No
Comprehensive literature search?	Yes	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	Yes
All publication types and languages included?	No	**Publication bias assessed?**	Yes
Included and excluded studies listed?	No	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	No
Study characteristics provided?	Yes	Unclear if all languages included; study quality assessed but not factored into the M-A	

[3] A technical update, with no further studies added was published in the Cochrane database in 2008.
[4] Different dates for different databases.

Evidence table of systematic review on calcium intake and adenoma recurrence

Author Year [UI]	Weingarten, 2008 [18254022]
Design	Randomized controlled trials: Cochrane Library Issue 2, 2007, the Cochrane Colorectal Cancer Group (CCCG) specialized register, MEDLINE (1966 to July 2007), Cancerlit (1963 to April 2002), Embase (1980 to July 2007)
Population	Healthy adults and studies of adults at higher risk of colon cancer due to family history, previous adenomatous polyps, or inflammatory bowel disease
Intervention (Exposure) and Comparator	Calcium (>1200 mg/d) vs. placebo
Results	Calcium vs. placebo colorectal adenoma recurrence: OR 0.74, CI 0.58-0.95, P=0.02 CRC: OR 0.34, CI 0.05-2.15, P=0.20 at least one adverse event requiring discontinuation: OR 0.93, CI 0.42-2.05, P=0.80
Comments	Based only on two RCTs (1346 participants). Heterogeneity due to different dose of supplementation (one RCT supplemented with 1200 mg/d and the other RCT with 2000 mg/d). Analysis based on fixed effects model; however, considering there are only two studies, random effects model might have been more appropriate. Analysis on adverse events is based only on reported data of one out of the two RCTs (Barron 1999). Only participants with high risk due to previous adenomas were recruited in these two RCTs; therefore, applicability of the results can only be considered for high risk population. Insufficient evidence to recommend the general use of calcium supplements to prevent colorectal adenoma or colorectal cancer

AMSTAR

A priori design?	X	**Study quality assessment performed?**	X
Two independent reviewers?	X	**Study quality appropriately used in analysis?**	X
Comprehensive literature search?	X	**Appropriate statistical synthesis?**	X
All publication types and languages included?		**Publication bias assessed?**	
Included and excluded studies listed?	X	**Conflicts of interest stated?**	X
Study characteristics provided?	X		

Appendix E. Blank Data Extraction Form and Quality Assessment Checklists

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
		RCT RCT-post hoc** Other intervention study Cohort study Case-cohort study						

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
		Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes/no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

Appendix F. Excluded Studies

Excluded Study	Reason
Aalberts JS, Weegels PL, van der HL et al. Calcium supplementation: effect on blood pressure and urinary mineral excretion in normotensive male lactoovovegetarians and omnivores. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 48 (1):131-8, 1988.	No outcomes of interest
Abbasi AA, Chemplavil JK, Farah S, Muller BF, Arnstein AR. Hypercalcemia in active pulmonary tuberculosis. Annals of Internal Medicine 90 (3):324-8, 1979.	No UL outcomes
Abrams SA, Griffin IJ, Hawthorne KM, Ellis KJ. Effect of prebiotic supplementation and calcium intake on body mass index. Journal of Pediatrics 2007; 151(3):293-298.	Not a calcium intervention trial
Adams JS, Lee G. Gains in bone mineral density with resolution of Vitamin D intoxication. Annals of Internal Medicine 127 (3):203-6, 1997.	Case report
Akcakus M, Koklu E, Budak N, Kula M, Kurtoglu S, Koklu S. The relationship between birthweight, 25-hydroxyVitamin D concentrations and bone mineral status in neonates. Annals of Tropical Paediatrics 2006; 26(4):267-275.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Ala-Houhala M, Koskinen T, Terho A, Koivula T, Visakorpi J. Maternal compared with infant Vitamin D supplementation. Archives of Disease in Childhood 61 (12):1159-63, 1986.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Ala-Houhala M. 25-HydroxyVitamin D levels during breast-feeding with or without maternal or infantile supplementation of Vitamin D. Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology & Nutrition 4(2):220-6, 1985.	In Ottawa EPC report
Almendingen K, Hofstad B, Vatn MH. Dietary habits and growth and recurrence of colorectal adenomas: results from a three-year endoscopic follow-up study. Nutrition & Cancer 49 (2):131-8, 2004.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Almendingen K, Hofstad B, Vatn MH. Lifestyle-related factors and colorectal polyps: preliminary results from a Norwegian follow-up and intervention study. European Journal of Cancer Prevention 11(2):153-8, 2002.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Almendingen K, Trygg K, Hofstad B, Veierod MB, Vatn MH. Results from two repeated 5 day dietary records with a 1 y interval among patients with colorectal polyps. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 55 (5):374-9, 2001.	No outcomes of interest
Al-oanzi ZH, Tuck SP, Raj N et al. Assessment of Vitamin D status in male osteoporosis. Clinical Chemistry 52 (2):248-54, 2006.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Aloia JF, Talwar SA, Pollack S, Feuerman M, Yeh JK. Optimal Vitamin D status and serum parathyroid hormone concentrations in African American women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 84 (3):602-9, 2006.	No outcomes of interest
Anonymous. Calcium supplementation during pregnancy reduces the risk of developing preeclampsia in nulliparous women. Canadian Family Physician 45:614, 618-20, 1999.	Editorial-like brief review

Excluded Study	Reason
Anonymous. Vitamin D supplementation for northern native communities. Indian and Inuit Health Committee, Canadian Paediatric Society. CMAJ Canadian Medical Association Journal 138 (3):229-30, 1988.	Review paper
Armitage NC, Rooney PS, Gifford KA, Clarke PA, Hardcastle JD. The effect of calcium supplements on rectal mucosal proliferation. British Journal of Cancer 71 (1):186-90, 1995.	No outcomes of interest
Armstrong AL, Oborne J, Coupland CA, Macpherson MB, Bassey EJ, Wallace WA. Effects of hormone replacement therapy on muscle performance and balance in post-menopausal women. Clinical Science 91 (6):685 -90, 1996.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Arunabh S, Pollack S, Yeh J, Aloia JF. Body fat content and 25-hydroxyVitamin D levels in healthy women. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 88 (1):157-61, 2003.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
August P, Helseth G, Cook EF, Sison C. A prediction model for superimposed preeclampsia in women with chronic hypertension during pregnancy. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology. 191(5):1666-72, 2004 Nov.	>=20% subjects with diseases
August P, Marcaccio B, Gertner JM, Druzin ML, Resnick LM, Laragh JH. Abnormal 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D metabolism in preeclampsia. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 166 (4):1295-9, 1992.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Back O, Blomquist HK, Hernell O, Stenberg B. Does vitamin D intake during infancy promote the development of atopic allergy? Acta Dermato -Venereologica 89 (1):28 -32 , 2009.	combination of vit D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Bailey BW, Sullivan DK, Kirk EP, Hall S, Donnelly JE. The influence of calcium consumption on weight and fat following 9 months of exercise in men and women. Journal of the American College of Nutrition 2007; 26(4):350-355.	No outcomes of interest
Bakker R, Rifas-Shiman SL, Kleinman KP, Lipshultz SE, Gillman MW. Maternal calcium intake during pregnancy and blood pressure in the offspring at age 3 years: a follow-up analysis of the Project Viva cohort. American Journal of Epidemiology 168 (12):1374 -80 , 2008.	age <18 (BP outcome)
Baron JA, Beach M, Mandel JS et al. Calcium supplements and colorectal adenomas. Polyp Prevention Study Group. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 889:138-45, 1999.	Duplicate publication (see Baron 1999 NEJM)
Baron JA, Beach M, Mandel JS et al. Calcium supplements for the prevention of colorectal adenomas. Calcium Polyp Prevention Study Group. . New England Journal of Medicine 340 (2):101-7, 1999.	In Weigarten 2008 systematic review
Baron JA, Tosteson TD, Wargovich MJ et al. Calcium supplementation and rectal mucosal proliferation: a randomized controlled trial. . Journal of the National Cancer Institute 87 (17):1303-7, 1995.	No outcomes of interest
Barr SI. Calcium and body fat in peripubertal girls: cross-sectional and longitudinal observations. Obesity 2007; 15(5):1302-1310.	Not RCT growth study
Barsoum GH, Hendrickse C, Winslet MC et al. Reduction of mucosal crypt cell proliferation in patients with colorectal adenomatous polyps by dietary calcium supplementation. British Journal of Surgery 79 (6):581-3, 1992.	No outcomes of interest

Excluded Study	Reason
Basile LA, Taylor SN, Wagner CL, Horst RL, Hollis BW. The effect of high-dose Vitamin D supplementation on serum Vitamin D levels and milk calcium concentration in lactating women and their infants. Breastfeeding Medicine: The Official Journal of the Academy of Breastfeeding Medicine 2006; 1(1):27-35.	In Ottawa EPC report
Belizan JM, Villar J, Bergel E et al. Long-term effect of calcium supplementation during pregnancy on the blood pressure of offspring: follow up of a randomised controlled trial.. BMJ 315 (7103):281-5, 1997.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Belizan JM, Villar J, Gonzalez L, Campodonico L, Bergel E. Calcium supplementation to prevent hypertensive disorders of pregnancy.. New England Journal of Medicine 325 (20):1399 -405, 1991.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Belizan JM, Villar J, Pineda O et al. Reduction of blood pressure with calcium supplementation in young adults. JAMA 249 (9):1161 -5, 1983.	In systematic review
Belizan JM, Villar J, Zalazar A, Rojas L, Chan D, Bryce GF. Preliminary evidence of the effect of calcium supplementation on blood pressure in normal pregnant women. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 146 (2):175 -80, 1983.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Bell NH, Epstein S, Greene A, Shary J, Oexmann MJ, Shaw S. Evidence for alteration of the Vitamin D-endocrine system in obese subjects. Journal of Clinical Investigation 76 (1):370-3, 1985.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Bell NH, Epstein S, Shary J, Greene V, Oexmann MJ, Shaw S. Evidence of a probable role for 25-hydroxyVitamin D in the regulation of human calcium metabolism. Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 3(5):489-95, 1988.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Bell NH, Godsen RN, Henry DP, Shary J, Epstein S. The effects of muscle-building exercise on Vitamin D and mineral metabolism. Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 3(4):369-73, 1988.	No outcomes of interest
Bell NH. Hypercalcemic and hypocalcemic disorders: diagnosis and treatment. Nephron 23(2-3):147-51, 1979.	Review paper
Berggren M, Stenvall M, Olofsson B, Gustafson Y. Evaluation of a fall-prevention program in older people after femoral neck fracture: a one-year follow-up. Osteoporosis International 1919;801-9.	100% patients with femoral neck fracture who admitted to the hospital
Berkey CS, Rockett HR, Willett WC, Colditz GA. Milk, dairy fat, dietary calcium, and weight gain: a longitudinal study of adolescents.. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine 159 (6):543 -50, 2005.	Not RCT growth study
Berube S, Diorio C, Masse B et al. Vitamin D and calcium intakes from food or supplements and mammographic breast density. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 14(7):1653-9, 2005.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Bierenbaum ML, Fleischman AI, Raichelson RI. Long term human studies on the lipid effects of oral calcium. Lipids 7 (3):202-6, 1972.	No outcomes of interest
Bierenbaum ML, Wolf E, Bisgeier G, Maginnis WP. Dietary calcium. A method of lowering blood pressure. American Journal of Hypertension 1(3 Pt 3):149S -152S, 1988.	In systematic review

Excluded Study	Reason
Bischoff HA, Stahelin HB, Dick W et al. Effects of Vitamin D and calcium supplementation on falls: a randomized controlled trial.. Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 18 (2):343-51, 2003.	In Ottawa EPC report
Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Conzelmann M, Stahelin HB et al. Is fall prevention by Vitamin D mediated by a change in postural or dynamic balance? Osteoporosis International 2006; 17(5):656-663.	Secondary analysis of an original RCT by Bischoff-Ferrari 2003, which is already in Ottawa's report
Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Orav EJ, wson-Hughes B. Effect of cholecalciferol plus calcium on falling in ambulatory older men and women: a 3-year randomized controlled trial. Archives of Internal Medicine 166 (4):424-30, 2006.	In Ottawa EPC report
Blum M, Kirsten M, Worth MH, Jr. Reversible hypertension. Caused by the hypercalcemia of hyperparathyroidism, Vitamin D toxicity, and calcium infusion. JAMA 237 (3):262 -3, 1977.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Boggess KA, Samuel L, Schmucker BC, Waters J, Easterling TR. A randomized controlled trial of the effect of third-trimester calcium supplementation on maternal hemodynamic function. Obstetrics & Gynecology 90 (2):157-61, 1997.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Bonithon-Kopp C, Kronborg O, Giacosa A, Rath U, Faivre J. Calcium and fibre supplementation in prevention of colorectal adenoma recurrence: a randomised intervention trial. European Cancer Prevention Organisation Study Group. . Lancet 356 (9238):1300-6, 2000.	In Weigarten 2008 systematic review
Bonithon-Kopp C, Piard F, Fenger C et al. Colorectal adenoma characteristics as predictors of recurrence. Diseases of the Colon & Rectum 47 (3):323-33, 2004.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Boon N, Koppes LL, Saris WH, Van MW. The relation between calcium intake and body composition in a Dutch population: The Amsterdam Growth and Health Longitudinal Study. American Journal of Epidemiology 162 (1):27-32, 2005.	No outcomes of interest
Bostick RM, Fosdick L, Grandits GA, Grambsch P, Gross M, Louis TA. Effect of calcium supplementation on serum cholesterol and blood pressure. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, clinical trial. Archives of Family Medicine 9(1):31-8 2000.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Bostick RM, Fosdick L, Wood JR et al. Calcium and colorectal epithelial cell proliferation in sporadic adenoma patients: a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial.. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 87 (17):1307-15, 1995.	No outcomes of interest
Bostick RM, Potter JD, Fosdick L et al. Calcium and colorectal epithelial cell proliferation: a preliminary randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial. Journal of the National Cancer Institute. 85(2):132-41, 1993 Jan 20.	No outcomes of interest
Boutron MC, Faivre J, Marteau P, Couillault C, Senesse P, Quipourt V. Calcium, phosphorus, Vitamin D, dairy products and colorectal carcinogenesis: a French case--control study.. British Journal of Cancer 74 (1):145-51, 1996.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis

Excluded Study	Reason
Bowen J, Noakes M, Clifton PM. Effect of calcium and dairy foods in high protein, energy-restricted diets on weight loss and metabolic parameters in overweight adults. International Journal of Obesity 29 (8):957-65, 2005.	In systematic review
Braverman AS. Evidence that high calcium and Vitamin D intake decrease the risk of breast cancer in premenopausal women: implications for breast cancer prevention and screening. Southern Medical Journal 100 (11):1061-2, 2007.	Review paper
Brekke HK, Ludvigsson J. Vitamin D supplementation and diabetes-related autoimmunity in the ABIS study. Pediatric Diabetes 2007; 8(1):11-14.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Broe KE, Chen TC, Weinberg J, Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Holick MF, Kiel DP. A higher dose of Vitamin d reduces the risk of falls in nursing home residents: a randomized, multiple-dose study. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 2007; 55(2):234-239.	In Ottawa EPC report
Brooke OG, Butters F, Wood C. Intrauterine Vitamin D nutrition and postnatal growth in Asian infants. British Medical Journal Clinical Research Ed 283 (6298):1024, 1981.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Brooke OG. Supplementary Vitamin D in infancy and childhood. Archives of Disease in Childhood 1983; 58(8):573-574.	Review paper
Brunvand L, Quigstad E, Urdal P, Haug E. Vitamin D deficiency and fetal growth. Early Human Development 45 (1-2):27-33, 1996.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Brunvand L, Shah SS, Bergstrom S, Haug E. Vitamin D deficiency in pregnancy is not associated with obstructed labor. A study among Pakistani women in Karachi. Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica 77 (3):303-6, 1998.	No outcomes of interest
Campbell CG, Chew BP, Luedecke LO, Shultz TD. Yogurt consumption does not enhance immune function in healthy premenopausal women. Nutrition & Cancer 37 (1):27-35, 2000.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Cancela L, Le BN, Miravet L. Relationship between the Vitamin D content of maternal milk and the Vitamin D status of nursing women and breast-fed infants. Journal of Endocrinology 110 (1):43-50, 1986.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Canto-Costa MH, Kunii I, Hauache OM. Body fat and cholecalciferol supplementation in elderly homebound individuals. Brazilian Journal of Medical & Biological Research 39 (1):91-8, 2006.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Caplan RH, Miller CD, Silva PD. Severe hypercalcemia in a lactating woman in association with moderate calcium carbonate supplementation: a case report. Journal of Reproductive Medicine 49 (3):214-7, 2004.	Case report
Cappuccio FP, Elliott P, Allender PS, Pryer J, Follman DA, Cutler JA. Epidemiologic association between dietary calcium intake and blood pressure: a meta-analysis of published data. . American Journal of Epidemiology 142 (9):935-45, 1995.	Meta-analysis
Carlon GC, Howland WS, Goldiner PL, Kahn RC, Bertoni G, Turnbull AD. Adverse effects of calcium administration. Report of two cases. Archives of Surgery 113 (7):882-5, 1978.	Case report

Excluded Study	Reason
Carlson LA, Derblom H, Lanner A. Effect of different doses of Vitamin D on serum cholesterol and triglyceride levels in healthy men. Atherosclerosis 12 (2):313-7, 1970.	Multiple antioxidant trials analyses
Caruso JB, Patel RM, Julka K, Parish DC. Health-behavior induced disease: return of the milk-alkali syndrome. Journal of General Internal Medicine 2007; 22(7):1053-1055.	Case report
Cats A, Kleibeuker JH, van der MR et al. Randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled intervention study with supplemental calcium in families with hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 87 (8):598-603, 1995.	No outcomes of interest
Cervellin G, Bonino P, Palummeri E, Passeri M. Calcium phosphate and blood pressure: their relationships in a geriatric population. American Journal of Nephrology 6 Suppl 1:16-8, 1986.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Chan GM, Roberts CC, Folland D, Jackson R. Growth and bone mineralization of normal breast-fed infants and the effects of lactation on maternal bone mineral status. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 36 (3):438-43, 1982.	In Ottawa EPC report
Chan GM. Growth and bone mineral status of discharged very low birth weight infants fed different formulas or human milk. Journal of Pediatrics 123 (3):439-43, 1993.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Chan JM, Pietinen P, Virtanen M et al. Diet and prostate cancer risk in a cohort of smokers, with a specific focus on calcium and phosphorus (Finland). Cancer Causes & Control 11(9):859-67, 2000.	Superseded by Mitrou 2007
Chen W, Dawsey SM, Qiao YL et al. Prospective study of serum 25(OH)-Vitamin D concentration and risk of oesophageal and gastric cancers. British Journal of Cancer 2007; 97(1):123-128.	No outcomes of interest
Chyou PH, Nomura AM, Stemmermann GN. Diet, alcohol, smoking and cancer of the upper aerodigestive tract: a prospective study among Hawaii Japanese men. International Journal of Cancer 60 (5):616-21, 1995.	No outcomes of interest
Cleghorn GJ, Tudehope DI. Neonatal intestinal obstruction associated with oral calcium supplementation. Australian Paediatric Journal 17(4):298-9, 1981.	Case report
Cockburn F, Belton NR, Purvis RJ et al. Maternal Vitamin D intake and mineral metabolism in mothers and their newborn infants. British Medical Journal 281 (6232):11-4, 1980.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Cohen GR, Curet LB, Levine RJ et al. Ethnicity, nutrition, and birth outcomes in nulliparous women. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 2001; 185(3):660-667.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Colditz GA, Manson JE, Stampfer MJ, Rosner B, Willett WC, Speizer FE. Diet and risk of clinical diabetes in women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 55 (5):1018 -23, 1992.	No outcomes of interest
Combs GF, Jr., Hassan N, Dellagana N et al. Apparent efficacy of food-based calcium supplementation in preventing rickets in Bangladesh. Biological Trace Element Research 121 (3):193 -204, 2008.	>=20% subjects with diseases

Excluded Study	Reason
Cong K, Chi S, Liu G. Calcium supplementation during pregnancy for reducing pregnancy induced hypertension. Chinese Medical Journal 108 (1):57-9, 1995.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Corless D, Dawson E, Fraser F et al. Do Vitamin D supplements improve the physical capabilities of elderly hospital patients? Age & Ageing 14(2):76-84, 1985.	In Ottawa EPC report
Cosman F, Nieves J, Shen V, Lindsay R. Oral 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D administration in osteoporotic women: effects of estrogen therapy. Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 10(4):594-600, 1995.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Costenbader KH, Feskanich D, Holmes M, Karlson EW, ito-Garcia E. Vitamin D intake and risks of systemic lupus erythematosus and rheumatoid arthritis in women. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases 67 (4):530-5, 2008.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses
Crowther CA, Hiller JE, Pridmore B et al. Calcium supplementation in nulliparous women for the prevention of pregnancy-induced hypertension, preeclampsia and preterm birth: an Australian randomized trial. FRACOG and the ACT Study Group. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology 39 (1):12-8, 1999.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Dahifar H, Faraji A, Yassobi S, Ghorbani A. Asymptomatic rickets in adolescent girls. Indian Journal of Pediatrics 2007; 74(6):571-575.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Dattani JT, Exton-Smith AN, Stephen JM. Vitamin D status of the elderly in relation to age and exposure to sunlight. Human Nutrition - Clinical Nutrition 38 (2):131-7, 1984.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Dauchet L, Kesse-Guyot E, Czernichow S et al. Dietary patterns and blood pressure change over 5-y follow-up in the SU.VI.MAX cohort. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2007; 85(6):1650-1656.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Davie MW, Abraham RR, Hewins B, Wynn V. Changes in bone and muscle constituents during dieting for obesity. Clinical Science 70 (3):285-93, 1986.	No outcomes of interest
Davies KM, Heaney RP, Recker RR et al. Calcium intake and body weight. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 85 (12):4635-8, 2000.	Meta-analysis; five clinical studies
Deheeger M, Bellisle F, Rolland-Cachera MF. The French longitudinal study of growth and nutrition: data in adolescent males and females. Journal of Human Nutrition & Dietetics 15 (6):429-38, 2002.	Analysis did not relate exposure to outcome
DeJongh ED, Binkley TL, Specker BL. Fat mass gain is lower in calcium-supplemented than in unsupplemented preschool children with low dietary calcium intakes. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 84 (5):1123-7, 2006.	<9y (a study on BMI)
Dent CE, Gupta MM. Plasma 25-hydroxyVitamin-D-levels during pregnancy in Caucasians and in vegetarian and non-vegetarian Asians. Lancet 2(7944):1057-60, 1975.	No outcomes of interest
DeSantiago S, Alonso L, Halhali A, Larrea F, Isoard F, Bourges H. Negative calcium balance during lactation in rural Mexican women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 76 (4):845-51, 2002.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis

Excluded Study	Reason
Devereux G, Litonjua AA, Turner SW et al. Maternal Vitamin D intake during pregnancy and early childhood wheezing. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2007; 85(3):853-859.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Dewey KG, Lonnerdal B. Milk and nutrient intake of breast-fed infants from 1 to 6 months: relation to growth and fatness. Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology & Nutrition 2(3):497 -506, 1983.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Dhesi JK, Bearne LM, Moniz C et al. Neuromuscular and psychomotor function in elderly subjects who fall and the relationship with Vitamin D status. Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 17(5):891-7, 2002.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Dhesi JK, Jackson SH, Bearne LM et al. Vitamin D supplementation improves neuromuscular function in older people who fall. Age & Ageing 33 (6):589-95, 2004.	Intramuscular injection of high dose ergocalciferol
Dijkstra SH, van BA, Janssen JW, de Vleeschouwer LH, Huysman WA, van den Akker EL. High prevalence of Vitamin D deficiency in newborn infants of high-risk mothers.[erratum appears in Arch Dis Child. 2007 Nov;92(11):1049]. Archives of Disease in Childhood 2007; 92(9):750-753.	Relationship betweem mother's 25(OH)D and infant's 25(OH)D levels
Dixon LB, Pellizzon MA, Jawad AF, Tershakovec AM. Calcium and dairy intake and measures of obesity in hyper- and normocholesterolemic children. Obesity Research 13(10):1727-38, 2005.	Outcome is BW but participants age is from 4 to 10y (mostly <9y)
Dobnig H, Pilz S, Scharnagl H et al. Independent association of low serum 25-hydroxyvitamin d and 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin d levels with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. Archives of Internal Medicine 168 (12):1340 -9 , 2008.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Doege C, Bauer J. Effect of high volume intake of mother's milk with an individualized supplementation of minerals and protein on early growth of preterm infants <28 weeks of gestation. Clinical Nutrition 26 (5):581-8, 2007.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Domrongkitchaiporn S, Ongphiphadhanakul B, Stitchantrakul W et al. Risk of calcium oxalate nephrolithiasis after calcium or combined calcium and calcitriol supplementation in postmenopausal women. Osteoporosis International 11(6):486-92, 2000.	No outcomes of interest, no UL outcomes
Drinka PJ, Nolten WE. Hazards of treating osteoporosis and hypertension concurrently with calcium, Vitamin D, and distal diuretics. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 32 (5):405-7, 1984.	Case report
Drouillet P, Balkau B, Charles MA et al. Calcium consumption and insulin resistance syndrome parameters. Data from the Epidemiological Study on the Insulin Resistance Syndrome (DESIR). Nutrition Metabolism & Cardiovascular Diseases 2007; 17(7):486-492.	No outcomes of interest
Ehrenberg A. Non-medical prevention of pre-eclampsia. Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica - Supplement 164:108-10, 1997.	Review paper
Epstein S, Bell NH, Shary J, Shaw S, Greene A, Oexmann MJ. Evidence that obesity does not influence the Vitamin D-endocrine system in blacks. Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 1(2):181-4, 1986.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis

Excluded Study	Reason
Epstein S, Stern PH, Bell NH, Dowdeswell I, Turner RT. Evidence for abnormal regulation of circulating 1 alpha, 25-dihydroxyVitamin D in patients with pulmonary tuberculosis and normal calcium metabolism. Calcified Tissue International 36 (5):541-4, 1984.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Ertbeg P, Norgaard P, Bang L, Nyholm H, Rudnicki M. Ionized magnesium in gestational diabetes. Magnesium Research 17(1):35-8, 2004.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Faivre J, Couillault C, Kronborg O et al. Chemoprevention of metachronous adenomas of the large bowel: design and interim results of a randomized trial of calcium and fibre. ECP Colon Group. European Journal of Cancer Prevention 6(2):132-8, 1997.	Design and interim results article
Farrerons J, Barnadas M, Rodriguez J et al. Clinically prescribed sunscreen (sun protection factor 15) does not decrease serum Vitamin D concentration sufficiently either to induce changes in parathyroid function or in metabolic markers. British Journal of Dermatology 139 (3):422-7, 1998.	No outcomes of interest
Faulkner KA, Cauley JA, Zmuda JM et al. Higher 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D3 concentrations associated with lower fall rates in older community-dwelling women. Osteoporosis International 2006; 17(9):1318-1328.	In Ottawa EPC report
Feeley RM, Eitenmiller RR, Jones JB, Jr., Barnhart H. Calcium, phosphorus, and magnesium contents of human milk during early lactation. Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology & Nutrition 2(2):262-7, 1983.	No outcomes of interest
Felson DT, Niu J, Clancy M et al. Low levels of Vitamin D and worsening of knee osteoarthritis: results of two longitudinal studies. Arthritis & Rheumatism 2007; 56(1):129-136.	No outcomes of interest
Fleischman AR, Rosen JF, Cole J, Smith CM, DeLuca HF. Maternal and fetal serum 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D levels at term. Journal of Pediatrics 1980; 97(4):640-642.	No outcomes of interest
Fleischman AR, Rosen JF, Nathenson G. 25-hydroxyVitamin D. Serum levels and oral administration of calcifediol in neonates. Archives of Internal Medicine 138 Spec No: 869-73, 1978.	Premature infants
Forman JP, Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Curhan GC. Vitamin D intake and risk of incident hypertension: results from three large prospective cohort studies. Hypertension 46 (4):676-82, 2005.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Franco A, Sikalidis AK, Solis Herruzo JA. Colorectal cancer: influence of diet and lifestyle factors. Revista Espanola de Enfermedades Digestivas 97 (6):432-48, 2005.	Review paper
Freedman DM, Tangrea JA, Virtamo J, Albanes D. The effect of beta-carotene supplementation on serum Vitamin D metabolite concentrations. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 8 (12):1115-6, 1999.	No outcomes of interest
Fronczak CM, Baron AE, Chase HP et al. In utero dietary exposures and risk of islet autoimmunity in children. Diabetes Care 26 (12):3237 -42 , 2003.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses

Excluded Study	Reason
Galloe AM, Graudal N, Moller J, Bro H, Jorgensen M, Christensen HR. Effect of oral calcium supplementation on blood pressure in patients with previously untreated hypertension: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover study. Journal of Human Hypertension 7 (1):43-5, 1993.	In systematic review
Gambacciani M, Ciaponi M, Cappagli B et al. Body weight, body fat distribution, and hormonal replacement therapy in early postmenopausal women.[erratum appears in J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1997 Dec;82(12):4074]. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 82 (2):414-7, 1997.	No outcomes of interest
Garland CF, Garland FC. Do sunlight and Vitamin D reduce the likelihood of colon cancer? [reprint in Int J Epidemiol. 2006 Apr;35(2):217-20; PMID: 16303809]. International Journal of Epidemiology 9 (3):227-31, 1980.	Ecological study
Garland CF, Mohr SB, Gorham ED, Grant WB, Garland FC. Role of ultraviolet B irradiance and Vitamin D in prevention of ovarian cancer. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 2006; 31(6):512-514.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Genkinger JM, Hunter DJ, Spiegelman D et al. Dairy products and ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 12 cohort studies. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 15 (2):364-72, 2006.	Pooled analysis
Gertner JM, Domenech M. 25-HydroxyVitamin D levels in patients treated with high-dosage ergo- and cholecalciferol. Journal of Clinical Pathology 30(2):144-50, 1977.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Gillies DR, Hay A, Sheltawy MJ, Congdon PJ. Effect of phototherapy on plasma 25(OH)-Vitamin D in neonates. Biology of the Neonate 1984; 45(5):225-227.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Gillman MW, Oliveria SA, Moore LL, Ellison RC. Inverse association of dietary calcium with systolic blood pressure in young children. JAMA 267 (17):2340-3, 1992.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Gillman MW, Rifas-Shiman SL, Kleinman KP, Rich-Edwards JW, Lipshultz SE. Maternal calcium intake and offspring blood pressure. Circulation 110 (14):1990-5, 2004.	Relationship between maternal intake and offspring blood pressure
Giovannucci E, Liu Y, Rimm EB et al. Prospective study of predictors of Vitamin D status and cancer incidence and mortality in men.. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 98 (7):451-9, 2006.	Superseded by Giovannucci 2007
Giovannucci E, Rimm EB, Wolk A et al. Calcium and fructose intake in relation to risk of prostate cancer. Cancer Research 58 (3):442-7, 1998.	Predictive model was used to predict 25(OH)D levels of whole cohort
Giovannucci E, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA et al. MultiVitamin use, folate, and colon cancer in women in the Nurses' Health Study.. Annals of Internal Medicine 129 (7):517 -24, 1998.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Gonzalez AJ, White E, Kristal A, Littman AJ. Calcium intake and 10-year weight change in middle-aged adults. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 106 (7):1066-73 2006.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis

Excluded Study	Reason
Goswami R, Gupta N, Ray D, Singh N, Tomar N. Pattern of 25-hydroxy vitamin D response at short (2 month) and long (1 year) interval after 8 weeks of oral supplementation with cholecalciferol in Asian Indians with chronic hypovitaminosis D. British Journal of Nutrition 100 (3):526 -9 , 2008.	not RCT curve 4 study
Grady D, Halloran B, Cummings S et al. 1,25-DihydroxyVitamin D3 and muscle strength in the elderly: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 73 (5):1111-7, 1991.	1,25(OH)2D supplement
Grant WB. The likely role of Vitamin D from solar ultraviolet-B irradiance in increasing cancer survival. Anticancer Research 26 (4A):2605-14, 2006.	Ecological study
Grau MV, Baron JA, Barry EL et al. Interaction of calcium supplementation and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and the risk of colorectal adenomas. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 14(10):2353-8, 2005.	In Weigarten 2008 systematic review
Greene MF. Trial of calcium to prevent preeclampsia. Journal of Women's Health 6(4):485-6, 1997.	Commentary
Greer FR, Ho M, Dodson D, Tsang RC. Lack of 25-hydroxyVitamin D and 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D in human milk. Journal of Pediatrics 99 (2):233-5, 1981.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Greer FR, Hollis BW, Cripps DJ, Tsang RC. Effects of maternal ultraviolet B irradiation on Vitamin D content of human milk. Journal of Pediatrics 105 (3):431-3, 1984.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Greer FR, Marshall S. Bone mineral content, serum Vitamin D metabolite concentrations, and ultraviolet B light exposure in infants fed human milk with and without Vitamin D2 supplements. Journal of Pediatrics 114 (2):204-12, 1989.	In Ottawa EPC report
Greer FR, Searcy JE, Levin RS, Steichen JJ, Asch PS, Tsang RC. Bone mineral content and serum 25-hydroxyVitamin D concentration in breast-fed infants with and without supplemental Vitamin D. Journal of Pediatrics 98 (5):696-701, 1981.	In Ottawa EPC report
Gruson M, Cancela L, Denne MA, Miravet L. Relationship between bone GLA-protein (BGP) and calcidiol (25-hydroxycalciferol) in serum of breast-fed infants. Endocrinologia Experimentalis. 20(2-3):329-34, 1986 Aug.	25(OH)D supplement
Gunther CW, Legowski PA, Lyle RM et al. Dairy products do not lead to alterations in body weight or fat mass in young women in a 1-y intervention. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 81 (4):751-6, 2005.	In systematic review
Gunther CW, Legowski PA, Lyle RM et al. Parathyroid hormone is associated with decreased fat mass in young healthy women. International Journal of Obesity 30 (1):94-9, 2006.	Ca intake and BW measured but not assessed ==> no relevant results reported
Haddad JG, Jr., Rojanasathit S. Acute administration of 25-hydroxycholecalciferol in man. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 42 (2):284 -90, 1976.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Hakala P, Karvetti RL. Weight reduction on lactovegetarian and mixed diets. Changes in weight, nutrient intake, skinfold thicknesses and blood pressure. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 43 (6):421-30, 1989.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect

Excluded Study	Reason
Halhali A, Villa AR, Madrazo E et al. Longitudinal changes in maternal serum 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D and insulin like growth factor I levels in pregnant women who developed preeclampsia: comparison with normotensive pregnant women. Journal of Steroid Biochemistry & Molecular Biology 89 -90 (1-5):553-6, 2004.	No outcomes of interest
Hamet P, Mongeau E, Lambert J et al. Interactions among calcium, sodium, and alcohol intake as determinants of blood pressure. Hypertension 17(1 Suppl):I150-4, 1991.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Hamid Z, Riggs A, Spencer T, Redman C, Bodenner D. Vitamin D deficiency in residents of academic long-term care facilities despite having been prescribed Vitamin D.. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association 2007; 8(2):71-75.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Hansen KE, Jones AN, Lindstrom MJ, Davis LA, Engelke JA, Shafer MM. Vitamin D insufficiency: disease or no disease? Journal of Bone & Mineral Research 23(7):1052-60, 2008.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Haub MD, Simons TR, Cook CM, Remig VM, Al-Tamimi EK, Holcomb CA. Calcium-fortified beverage supplementation on body composition in postmenopausal women. Nutrition Journal 4:21, 2005.	In systematic review
Heilbrun LK, Hankin JH, Nomura AM, Stemmermann GN. Colon cancer and dietary fat, phosphorus, and calcium in Hawaiian-Japanese men. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 43 (2):306-9, 1986.	Letter to the editor
Heilbrun LK, Nomura A, Hankin JH, Stemmermann GN. Dietary Vitamin D and calcium and risk of colorectal cancer. Lancet 1985; 1(8434):925.	Superceded by Stemmermann, 1990 RefID 1691
Herrera JA, revalo-Herrera M, Herrera S. Prevention of preeclampsia by linoleic acid and calcium supplementation: a randomized controlled trial. Obstetrics & Gynecology 91 (4):585 -90, 1998.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Herrmann U, Schwille PO, Schmiedl A, Fan J, Manoharan M. Acute effects of calcium sodium citrate supplementation of a test meal on mineral homeostasis, oxalate, and calcium oxalate crystallization in the urine of healthy humans--preliminary results in patients with idiopathic calcium urolithiasis. Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy 53 (5-6):264-73, 1999.	No UL outcomes: CaOx crystallization; saturation of CaOx
Hill KM, Braun M, Kern M et al. Predictors of calcium retention in adolescent boys. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 93 (12):4743 -8 , 2008.	no outcomes of interest
Hiller JE, Crowther CA, Moore VA, Willson K, Robinson JS. Calcium supplementation in pregnancy and its impact on blood pressure in children and women: follow up of a randomised controlled trial. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology 2007; 47(2):115-121.	No outcomes of interest
Hillman LS, Haddad JG. Perinatal Vitamin D metabolism. II. Serial 25-hydroxyVitamin D concentrations in sera of term and premature infants. Journal of Pediatrics 1975; 86(6):928-935.	No clear Vitamin D dose for term infants

Excluded Study	Reason
Hillman LS, Johnson LS, Lee DZ, Vieira NE, Yergey AL. Measurement of true absorption, endogenous fecal excretion, urinary excretion, and retention of calcium in term infants by using a dual-tracer, stable-isotope method. Journal of Pediatrics 1993; 123(3):444-456.	All neonates included weighed < 1500 gm
Hintzpeter B, Mensink GB, Thierfelder W, Muller MJ, Scheidt-Nave C. Vitamin D status and health correlates among German adults. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 62 (9):1079 -89 , 2008.	cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Hofmeyr GJ, Mlokoti Z, Nikodem VC et al. Calcium supplementation during pregnancy for preventing hypertensive disorders is not associated with changes in platelet count, urate, and urinary protein: a randomized control trial. Hypertension in Pregnancy 27 (3):299 -304 , 2008.	ancillary study (small sample) of WHO trial. The preeclampsia data of WHO trial was already included in the previous SR (Hofmeyer2007).
Hofstad B, Almendingen K, Vatn M et al. Growth and recurrence of colorectal polyps: a double-blind 3-year intervention with calcium and antioxidants. Digestion 59 (2):148-56, 1998.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Hofstad B, Vatn MH, Andersen SN, Owen RW, Larsen S, Osnes M. The relationship between faecal bile acid profile with or without supplementation with calcium and antioxidants on recurrence and growth of colorectal polyps. European Journal of Cancer Prevention 7 (4):287-94, 1998.	No independent Ca effect
Hollis BW, Wagner CL. Vitamin D requirements during lactation: high-dose maternal supplementation as therapy to prevent hypoVitaminosis D for both the mother and the nursing infant. Am J Clin Nutr 2004; 80(6 Suppl):1752S-1758S.	In Ottawa EPC report
Hollis JH, Mattes RD. Effect of increased dairy consumption on appetitive ratings and food intake. [erratum appears in Obesity (Silver Spring). 2007 Oct;15(10):2520]. Obesity 2007; 15(6):1520-1526.	No outcomes of interest
Holt PR, Atillasoy EO, Gilman J et al. Modulation of abnormal colonic epithelial cell proliferation and differentiation by low-fat dairy foods: a randomized controlled trial. . JAMA 280 (12):1074-9, 1998.	No outcomes of interest
Holt PR, Bresalier RS, Ma CK et al. Calcium plus Vitamin D alters preneoplastic features of colorectal adenomas and rectal mucosa. Cancer 106 (2):287-96, 2006.	No outcomes of interest
Holt PR, Wolper C, Moss SF, Yang K, Lipkin M. Comparison of calcium supplementation or low-fat dairy foods on epithelial cell proliferation and differentiation. Nutrition & Cancer 41 (1-2):150-5, 2001.	No outcomes of interest
Hunt CD, Johnson LK. Calcium requirements: new estimations for men and women by cross-sectional statistical analyses of calcium balance data from metabolic studies. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2007; 86(4):1054-1063.	Arrow 4: calcium balance
Hvarfner A, Ljunghall S, Morlin C, Wide L. Calcium metabolism and arterial blood pressure in a healthy population sample and in hypertensive men. American Journal of Nephrology 6 Suppl 1:14-5, 1986.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Hyman J, Baron JA, Dain BJ et al. Dietary and supplemental calcium and the recurrence of colorectal adenomas. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 7 (4):291-5, 1998.	Multiple antioxidant trials analyses

Excluded Study	Reason
Hypponen E, Hartikainen AL, Sovio U, Jarvelin MR, Pouta A. Does Vitamin D supplementation in infancy reduce the risk of pre-eclampsia? European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2007; 61(9):1136-1139.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses
Hypponen E, Laara E, Reunanen A, Jarvelin MR, Virtanen SM. Intake of Vitamin D and risk of type 1 diabetes: a birth-cohort study.. Lancet 358 (9292):1500-3, 2001.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses
Hypponen E, Sovio U, Wjst M et al. Infant Vitamin d supplementation and allergic conditions in adulthood: northern Finland birth cohort 1966. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 1037:84-95, 2004.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses
Ilich-Ernst JZ, McKenna AA, Badenhop NE et al. Iron status, menarche, and calcium supplementation in adolescent girls.[erratum appears in Am J Clin Nutr 1999 Mar;69(3):577]. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 68 (4):880-7, 1998.	Ca intake, BMI, LBM and BW measured, but the analyses on the relationship among these were not performed.
Ish-Shalom S, Segal E, Salganik T, Raz B, Bromberg IL, Vieth R. Comparison of daily, weekly, and monthly vitamin D3 in ethanol dosing protocols for two months in elderly hip fracture patients. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 93 (9):3430 -5, 2008.	arrow 4 RCT but daily doses were the same in the comparison groups (comparison of daily, weekly versus monthly dose)
Ito M, Koyama H, Ohshige A, Maeda T, Yoshimura T, Okamura H. Prevention of preeclampsia with calcium supplementation and Vitamin D3 in an antenatal protocol. International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics 47 (2):115 -20, 1994.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Jackson RD, Donepudi S, Mysiw WJ. Epidemiology of fracture risk in the Women's Health Initiative. Current Osteoporosis Reports 6 (4):155 -61 , 2008.	review paper
Jackson RD, Lacroix AZ, Cauley JA, McGowan J. The Women's Health Initiative calcium-Vitamin D trial: overview and baseline characteristics of participants. Annals of Epidemiology 13(9 Suppl):S98-106, 2003.	Overview of trial participants
Jackson RD, Lacroix AZ, Gass M et al. Calcium plus Vitamin D supplementation and the risk of fractures.[erratum appears in N Engl J Med. 2006 Mar 9;354(10):1102]. New England Journal of Medicine 354 (7):669-83, 2006.	Same as Wactawski-Wende 2006 RefID 1967 in which longer f/up data reported
Jacobs D. Calcium and myocardial infarction. South African Medical Journal Suid -Afrikaanse Tydskrif Vir Geneeskunde 48 (13):523-7, 1974.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Jacobs ET, Alberts DS, Benuzillo J, Hollis BW, Thompson PA, Martinez ME. Serum 25(OH)D levels, dietary intake of Vitamin D, and colorectal adenoma recurrence. Journal of Steroid Biochemistry & Molecular Biology 2007; 103(3-5):752-756.	Analyses include 25(OH)D measurements taken after outcome (colorectal polyps) occurred.
Jacques PF, Felson DT, Tucker KL et al. Plasma 25-hydroxyVitamin D and its determinants in an elderly population sample. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 66 (4):929-36, 1997.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Joffe GM, Esterlitz JR, Levine RJ et al. The relationship between abnormal glucose tolerance and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy in healthy nulliparous women. Calcium for Preeclampsia Prevention (CPEP) Study Group.. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 179 (4):1032-7, 1998.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca

Excluded Study	Reason
John EM, Dreon DM, Koo J, Schwartz GG. Residential sunlight exposure is associated with a decreased risk of prostate cancer. . Journal of Steroid Biochemistry & Molecular Biology 89 -90 (1-5):549 -52, 2004.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
John WG, Noonan K, Mannan N, Boucher BJ. HypoVitaminosis D is associated with reductions in serum apolipoprotein A-I but not with fasting lipids in British Bangladeshis. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 82 (3):517-22, 2005.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Johnson MA, Fischer JG, Park S. Vitamin D deficiency and insufficiency in the Georgia Older Americans Nutrition Program. Journal of Nutrition for the Elderly 27 (1-2):29 -46 , 2008.	combination of vit D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Johnson NE, Smith EL, Freudenheim JL. Effects on blood pressure of calcium supplementation of women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 42 (1):12-7, 1985.	In systematic review
Jones G, Scott F. Low bone mass in premenopausal parous women: identification and the effect of an information and bone density feedback program. . Journal of Clinical Densitometry 2(2):109-15, 1999.	No outcomes of interest
Jorde R, Bonaa KH. Calcium from dairy products, Vitamin D intake, and blood pressure: the Tromso Study.. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 71 (6):1530-5, 2000.	No outcomes of interest
Kampman E, Giovannucci E, van ', V et al. Calcium, Vitamin D, dairy foods, and the occurrence of colorectal adenomas among men and women in two prospective studies. Am J Epidemiol 1994; 139(1):16-29.	Same cohorts as Wu 2002 RefID 529 (HPFS & NHS) and same exposure-outcome relationship but shorter follow-up
Karanja N, Morris CD, Illingworth DR, McCarron DA. Plasma lipids and hypertension: response to calcium supplementation. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 45 (1):60-5, 1987.	No outcomes of interest
Karanja N, Morris CD, Rufolo P, Snyder G, Illingworth DR, McCarron DA. Impact of increasing calcium in the diet on nutrient consumption, plasma lipids, and lipoproteins in humans. . American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 59 (4):900-7, 1994.	No outcomes of interest
Kawano Y. Role of blood pressure monitoring in non-pharmacological management of hypertension. Blood Pressure Monitoring 7 (1):51-4, 2002.	Review paper
Kearney J, Giovannucci E, Rimm EB et al. Calcium, Vitamin D, and dairy foods and the occurrence of colon cancer in men. American Journal of Epidemiology 143 (9):907-17, 1996.	Longer followup data were published in Wu 2002
Kemi VE, Karkkainen MU, Karp HJ, Laitinen KA, Lamberg-Allardt CJ. Increased calcium intake does not completely counteract the effects of increased phosphorus intake on bone: an acute dose-response study in healthy females. British Journal of Nutrition 99 (4):832-9, 2008.	No outcomes of interest
Kenny AM, Bellantonio S, Gruman CA, Acosta RD, Prestwood KM. Effects of transdermal testosterone on cognitive function and health perception in older men with low bioavailable testosterone levels. Journals of Gerontology Series A-Biological Sciences & Medical Sciences 57 (5):M321-5, 2002.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca

Excluded Study	Reason
Kenny AM, Biskup B, Robbins B, Marcella G, Burleson JA. Effects of Vitamin D supplementation on strength, physical function, and health perception in older, community-dwelling men. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 51 (12):1762-7, 2003.	In Ottawa EPC report
Kesteloot H, Geboers J. Calcium and blood pressure. Lancet 1(8276):813 -5, 1982.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Khaw KT, Barrett-Connor E. Dietary potassium and stroke-associated mortality. A 12-year prospective population study. New England Journal of Medicine 316 (5):235-40, 1987.	Continuous Ca intake analysis only
Kigutha HN, van Staveren WA, Wijnhoven TM, Hautvast JG. Maternal nutritional status may be stressed by seasonal fluctuations in food availability: evidence from rural women in Kenya. International Journal of Food Sciences & Nutrition 46 (3):247-55, 1995.	Ca intake, BMI and BW measured, but analysis did not relate Ca intake to BMI/BW.
Knekt P, Laaksonen M, Mattila C et al. Serum Vitamin D and subsequent occurrence of type 2 diabetes. Epidemiology. 19(5):666-71, 2008 Sep.	No outcomes of interest
Knight KB, Keith RE. Calcium supplementation on normotensive and hypertensive pregnant women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 55 (4):891-5, 1992.	No outcomes of interest
Knox EG. Ischaemic-heart-disease mortality and dietary intake of calcium. Lancet 1(7818):1465-7, 1973.	Analysis @ region level, not individual level
Kobayashi E, Okubo Y, Suwazono Y et al. Association between urinary calcium excretion level and mortality in inhabitants of the Jinzu River basin area of Japan. Biological Trace Element Research 89(2):145-53, 2002.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Koh-Banerjee PK, Ferreira MP, Greenwood M et al. Effects of calcium pyruvate supplementation during training on body composition, exercise capacity, and metabolic responses to exercise. Nutrition 21(3):312-9, 2005.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Kokot F, Pietrek J, Srokowska S et al. 25-hydroxyVitamin D in patients with essential hypertension. Clinical Nephrology 16 (4):188-92, 1981.	On drug Rx for hypertension
Koralek DO, Bertone-Johnson ER, Leitzmann MF et al. Relationship between calcium, lactose, Vitamin D, and dairy products and ovarian cancer. Nutrition & Cancer 2006; 56(1):22-30.	No outcomes of interest
Kristal AR, Chi C, Tangen CM, Goodman PJ, Etzioni R, Thompson IM. Associations of demographic and lifestyle characteristics with prostate-specific antigen (PSA) concentration and rate of PSA increase. Cancer 106 (2):320-8, 2006.	No outcomes of interest
Kromhout D, Bosschieter EB, Coulander CD. Potassium, calcium, alcohol intake and blood pressure: the Zutphen Study. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 41 (6):1299-304, 1985.	No outcomes of interest
Kulier R, de OM, Gulmezoglu AM, Villar J. Nutritional interventions for the prevention of maternal morbidity. International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics 63 (3):231-46, 1998.	SR of prevention of maternal morbidity

Excluded Study	Reason
Kumar R, Cohen WR, Silva P, Epstein FH. Elevated 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D plasma levels in normal human pregnancy and lactation. Journal of Clinical Investigation 63 (2):342-4, 1979.	No outcomes of interest
Kuroda T, Shiraki M, Tanaka S, Ohta H. Contributions of 25-hydroxyvitamin D, co-morbidities and bone mass to mortality in Japanese postmenopausal women. Bone 44 (1):168 -72 , 2009.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Kynast-Gales SA, Massey LK. Effects of dietary calcium from dairy products on ambulatory blood pressure in hypertensive men.. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 92 (12):1497-501, 1992.	In systematic review
Laaksi I, Ruohola JP, Tuohimaa P et al. An association of serum Vitamin D concentrations < 40 nmol/L with acute respiratory tract infection in young Finnish men. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 86 (3):714-7, 2007.	No outcomes of interest
Lakdawala DR, Widdowson EM. Vitamin-D in human milk. Lancet 1(8004):167-8, 1977.	No outcomes of interest
Lamberg-Allardt C, Larjosto M, Schultz E. 25-HydroxyVitamin D concentrations in maternal and cord blood at delivery and in maternal blood during lactation in Finland. Human Nutrition - Clinical Nutrition 38 (4):261-8, 1984.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Lancia B, Tedesco M, Sergio G, Tenna M. Anthropometric and nutritional assessment in Italian elderly subjects. Journal of Nutrition, Health & Aging 1(3):174-80, 1997.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Lappe JM, Davies KM, Travers-Gustafson D, Heaney RP. Vitamin D status in a rural postmenopausal female population. Journal of the American College of Nutrition 2006; 25(5):395-402.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Laraia BA, Bodnar LM, Siega-Riz AM. Pregravid body mass index is negatively associated with diet quality during pregnancy. Public Health Nutrition 2007; 10(9):920-926.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Lasco A, Gaudio A, Morini E et al. Effect of long-term treatment with raloxifene on mammary density in postmenopausal women. Menopause 2006; 13(5):787-792.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Latham NK, Anderson CS, Lee A et al. A randomized, controlled trial of quadriceps resistance exercise and Vitamin D in frail older people: the Frailty Interventions Trial in Elderly Subjects (FITNESS). . Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 51 (3):291-9, 2003.	In Ottawa EPC report
Le BN, Cancela L, Miravet L. Calcidiol in human milk. The effect of prohormone on Vitamin D status of breast fed unsupplemented infants. Endocrinologia Experimentalis. 20(2-3):325-8, 1986.	Correlation b/tw breastmilk 25(OH)D with infant's serum 25(OH)D
Lee DC, Lee GY. The use of pamidronate for hypercalcemia secondary to acute Vitamin D intoxication. Journal of Toxicology - Clinical Toxicology 36 (7):719-21, 1998.	Case report
Lee WT, Leung SS, Wang SH et al. Double-blind, controlled calcium supplementation and bone mineral accretion in children accustomed to a low-calcium diet.. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 60 (5):744 -50, 1994.	In Winzenberg 2007 systematic review, no outcomes of interest

Excluded Study	Reason
Levine AJ, Harper JM, Ervin CM et al. Serum 25-hydroxyVitamin D, dietary calcium intake, and distal colorectal adenoma risk. Nutrition & Cancer 2001; 39(1):35-41.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Levine RJ, Esterlitz JR, Raymond EG et al. Trial of Calcium for Preeclampsia Prevention (CPEP): rationale, design, and methods. Controlled Clinical Trials 17(5):442-69, 1996.	Methods for trial
Levine RJ, Hauth JC, Curet LB et al. Trial of calcium to prevent preeclampsia.. New England Journal of Medicine 337 (2):69-76, 1997.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Lewandowski S, Rodgers AL. Renal response to lithogenic and anti-lithogenic supplement challenges in a stone-free population group. Journal of Renal Nutrition 14(3):170-9, 2004.	No UL outcomes: saturation of CaOx
Liebman M, Chopin LF, Carter E et al. Factors related to blood pressure in a biracial adolescent female population. Hypertension 8(10):843-50, 1986.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Lin PH, Appel LJ, Funk K et al. The PREMIER intervention helps participants follow the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension dietary pattern and the current Dietary Reference Intakes recommendations. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 2007; 107(9):1541-1551.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Lin YC, Lyle RM, McCabe LD, McCabe GP, Weaver CM, Teegarden D. Dairy calcium is related to changes in body composition during a two-year exercise intervention in young women. Journal of the American College of Nutrition. 19(6):754-60, 2000 Nov-Dec.	No outcomes of interest
Lind L, Lithell H, Skarfors E, Wide L, Ljunghall S. Reduction of blood pressure by treatment with alphacalcidol. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study in subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. Acta Medica Scandinavica 223 (3):211-7, 1988.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Lipkin M, Friedman E, Winawer SJ, Newmark H. Colonic epithelial cell proliferation in responders and nonresponders to supplemental dietary calcium. Cancer Research 49 (1):248 -54, 1989.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Lipkin M, Newmark H. Effect of added dietary calcium on colonic epithelial-cell proliferation in subjects at high risk for familial colonic cancer. New England Journal of Medicine 313 (22):1381-4, 1985.	No outcomes of interest
Liu LS. Epidemiology of hypertension and cardiovascular disease--China experience. Clinical & Experimental Hypertension - Part A, Theory & Practice 12 (5):831-44, 1990.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Liu S, Choi HK, Ford E et al. A prospective study of dairy intake and the risk of type 2 diabetes in women. Diabetes Care 29 (7):1579-84, 2006.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Ljunghall S, Lind L, Lithell H et al. Treatment with one-alpha-hydroxycholecalciferol in middle-aged men with impaired glucose tolerance--a prospective randomized double-blind study. Acta Medica Scandinavica 222 (4):361-7, 1987.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Lonzer MD, Imrie R, Rogers D, Worley D, Licata A, Secic M. Effects of heredity, age, weight, puberty, actiVitaminy, and calcium intake on bone mineral density in children. Clinical Pediatrics 35 (4):185-9, 1996.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis

Excluded Study	Reason
Lopez-Jaramillo P, Delgado F, Jacome P, Teran E, Ruano C, Rivera J. Calcium supplementation and the risk of preeclampsia in Ecuadorian pregnant teenagers. Obstetrics & Gynecology 90 (2):162-7, 1997.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Lopez-Jaramillo P, Narvaez M, Weigel RM, Yepez R. Calcium supplementation reduces the risk of pregnancy-induced hypertension in an Andes population. British Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology 96 (6):648 -55, 1989.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Luft FC, Aronoff GR, Sloan RS, Fineberg NS, Weinberger MH. Short-term augmented calcium intake has no effect on sodium homeostasis. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics 39 (4):414-9, 1986.	No outcomes of interest
Lutter CK, Rodriguez A, Fuenmayor G, Avila L, Sempertegui F, Escobar J. Growth and micronutrient status in children receiving a fortified complementary food. Journal of Nutrition 138 (2):379-88, 2008.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Lyle RM. Does baseline serum total calcium level influence the blood pressure response to calcium supplementation? A double-blind study. Netherlands Journal of Medicine 41 (1-2):48-55, 1992.	In systematic review
Lynch MF, Griffin IJ, Hawthorne KM, Chen Z, Hamzo M, Abrams SA. Calcium balance in 1-4-y-old children. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2007; 85(3):750-754.	Arrow 4: calcium balance
Ma J, Stampfer MJ, Gann PH et al. Vitamin D receptor polymorphisms, circulating Vitamin D metabolites, and risk of prostate cancer in United States physicians. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 7 (5):385-90, 1998.	Main results had been previous published (Gann 1996, RefID 3783), and no additional usable data
Macdonald HM, New SA, Campbell MK, Reid DM. Longitudinal changes in weight in perimenopausal and early postmenopausal women: effects of dietary energy intake, energy expenditure, dietary calcium intake and hormone replacement therapy. International Journal of Obesity & Related Metabolic Disorders: Journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity 27 (6):669-76, 2003.	No outcomes of interest
Madore F, Stampfer MJ, Rimm EB, Curhan GC. Nephrolithiasis and risk of hypertension. American Journal of Hypertension 11(1 Pt 1):46-53, 1998.	No outcomes of interest
Malila N, Virtanen M, Pietinen P et al. A comparison of prospective and retrospective assessments of diet in a study of colorectal cancer. Nutrition & Cancer 32 (3):146 -53, 1998.	Superseded by Pietinen 1999
Mandic-Puljek M, Mandic ML, Perl A, Kenjeric D. Calcium intake, food sources and seasonal variations in eastern Croatia. Collegium Antropologicum 29 (2):503-7, 2005.	No outcomes of interest
Manios Y, Moschonis G, Grammatikaki E, Katsaroli I, Kanelou P, Tanagra S. Nutrition education in postmenopausal women: changes in dietary and cardiovascular indices. Maturitas 2006; 55(4):338-347.	Nutrition education intervention study
Marangella M, Vitaminale C, Petrarulo M, Rovera L, Dutto F. Effects of mineral composition of drinking water on risk for stone formation and bone metabolism in idiopathic calcium nephrolithiasis. Clinical Science 91 (3):313-8, 1996.	No UL outcomes: saturation of CaOx

Excluded Study	Reason
Markestad T, Kolmannskog S, Arntzen E, Toftegaard L, Haneberg B, Aksnes L. Serum concentrations of Vitamin D metabolites in exclusively breast-fed infants at 70 degrees north. Acta Paediatrica Scandinavica 73 (1):29-32, 1984.	No relation with 25(OH)D to growth outcome
Markestad T. Effect of season and Vitamin D supplementation on plasma concentrations of 25-hydroxyVitamin D in Norwegian infants. Acta Paediatrica Scandinavica 72 (6):817-21, 1983.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Markestad T. Plasma concentrations of Vitamin D metabolites in unsupplemented breast-fed infants. European Journal of Pediatrics 141 (2):77-80, 1983.	No outcomes of interest
Marniemi J, Jarvisalo J, Toikka T, Raiha I, Ahotupa M, Sourander L. Blood Vitamins, mineral elements and inflammation markers as risk factors of vascular and non-vascular disease mortality in an elderly population. International Journal of Epidemiology 27 (5):799-807, 1998.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Martinez ME, Giovannucci EL, Colditz GA et al. Calcium, Vitamin D, and the occurrence of colorectal cancer among women. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 88 (19):1375-82, 1996.	Longer followup data were published in Wu 2002
Marx SJ, Swart EG, Jr., Hamstra AJ, DeLuca HF. Normal intrauterine development of the fetus of a woman receiving extraordinarily high doses of 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D3. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 51 (5):1138 -42, 1980.	Case report
Masse PG, Tranchant CC, Jougleux JL, Coburn SP, Cole DE. Cardiovascular disease-risk factors in middle-aged osteopaenic women treated with calcium alone or combined to three nutrients essential to artery and bone collagen. Journal of Human Nutrition & Dietetics 21(2):117-28, 2008.	No outcomes of interest
Matheson NA. Letter: Multiple sclerosis and diet. Lancet 2 (7884):831, 1974.	Letter to the editor
Matsumoto T, Kubodera N. ED-71, a new active Vitamin D3, increases bone mineral density regardless of serum 25(OH)D levels in osteoporotic subjects. Journal of Steroid Biochemistry & Molecular Biology 2007; 103(3-5):584-586.	Vitamin D analog
Mawer EB, Berry JL, Sommer-Tsilenis E, Beykirch W, Kuhlwein A, Rohde BT. Ultraviolet irradiation increases serum 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D in Vitamin-D-replete adults. Mineral & Electrolyte Metabolism 10(2):117-21, 1984.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Mazess RB, Peppler WW, Chesnut CH, III, Nelp WB, Cohn SH, Zanzi I. Total body bone mineral and lean body mass by dual-photon absorptiometry. II. Comparison with total body calcium by neutron activation analysis. Calcified Tissue International 33 (4):361-3, 1981.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Mazess RB, Peppler WW, Harrison JE, McNeill KG. Total body bone mineral and lean body mass by dual-photon absorptiometry. III. Comparison with trunk calcium by neutron activation analysis. Calcified Tissue International 33 (4):365-8, 1981.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca

Excluded Study	Reason
McCarron DA, Morris CD. Blood pressure response to oral calcium in persons with mild to moderate hypertension. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover trial. Annals of Internal Medicine 103 (6 (Pt 1)):825 -31, 1985.	In systematic review
Merlino LA, Curtis J, Mikuls TR et al. Vitamin D intake is inversely associated with rheumatoid arthritis: results from the Iowa Women's Health Study.. Arthritis & Rheumatism 50(1):72-7, 2004.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses
Methy N, Binquet C, Boutron-Ruault MC, Paillot B, Faivre J, Bonithon-Kopp C. Dietary fatty acids and recurrence of colorectal adenomas in a European intervention trial. Nutrition & Cancer 60 (5):560 -7 , 2008.	no 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Michaud DS, Spiegelman D, Clinton SK, Rimm EB, Willett WC, Giovannucci E. Prospective study of dietary supplements, macronutrients, micronutrients, and risk of bladder cancer in US men. American Journal of Epidemiology 152 (12):1145-53, 2000.	No outcomes of interest
Misselwitz J, Hesse V, Markestad T. Nephrocalcinosis, hypercalciuria and elevated serum levels of 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D in children. Possible link to Vitamin D toxicity. Acta Paediatrica Scandinavica 79 (6-7):637-43, 1990.	Case report
Moerman CJ, Smeets FW, Kromhout D. Dietary risk factors for clinically diagnosed gallstones in middle-aged men. A 25-year follow-up study (the Zutphen Study). Annals of Epidemiology 4(3):248-54, 1994.	No outcomes of interest
Mohr SB, Garland CF, Gorham ED, Garland FC. The association between ultraviolet B irradiance, vitamin D status and incidence rates of type 1 diabetes in 51 regions worldwide. Diabetologia 51 (8):1391 -8 , 2008.	ecological study
Moller UK, Ramlau-Hansen CH, Rejnmark L, Heickendorff L, Henriksen TB, Mosekilde L. Postpartum Vitamin D insufficiency and secondary hyperparathyroidism in healthy Danish women. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2006; 60(10):1214-1221.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Morley R, Carlin JB, Dwyer T. Maternal calcium supplementation and cardiovascular risk factors in twin offspring.. International Journal of Epidemiology 33 (6):1304-9, 2004.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Morosetti M, Jankovic L, Palombo G et al. High-dose calcitriol therapy and progression of cardiac vascular calcifications. Journal of Nephrology 21(4):603 -8 , 2008;-Aug.	i.v. calcitriol
Morris CD, McCarron DA. Effect of calcium supplementation in an older population with mildly increased blood pressure. American Journal of Hypertension 5(4 Pt 1):230-7, 1992.	No outcomes of interest
Munger KL, Levin LI, Hollis BW, Howard NS, Ascherio A. Serum 25-hydroxyVitamin D levels and risk of multiple sclerosis. JAMA. 296(23):2832-8, 2006 Dec 20.	No outcomes of interest
Muray S, Marco MP, Craver L, Rue M, Valdivielso JM, Fernandez E. Influence of mineral metabolism parameters on pulse pressure in healthy subjects.. Clinical Nephrology 2006; 66(6):411-417.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca

Excluded Study	Reason
Nakamura K, Nishiwaki T, Ueno K, Yamamoto M. Age-related decrease in serum 25-hydroxyVitamin D concentrations in the frail elderly: a longitudinal study. Journal of Bone & Mineral Metabolism 2007; 25(4):232-236.	Effect of aging on 25(OH) D
Nakamura R, Saruta T. Effect of calcium supplementation on blood pressure in essential hypertensive subjects. Japanese Journal of Medicine 26 (2):203-6, 1987.	No outcomes of interest
Nako Y, Fukushima N, Tomomasa T, Nagashima K, Kuroume T. HyperVitaminosis D after prolonged feeding with a premature formula. Pediatrics 1993; 92(6):862-864.	Case report
Narang NK, Gupta RC, Jain MK. Role of Vitamin D in pulmonary tuberculosis. Journal of the Association of Physicians of India 32 (2):185-8, 1984.	No outcomes of interest
Nayir A, Kadioglu A, Sirin A, Emre S, Tonguc E, Bilge I. Causes of increased renal medullary echogenicity in Turkish children. Pediatric Nephrology 9 (6):729 -33, 1995.	Case report
Need AG, O'Loughlin PD, Horowitz M, Nordin BE. Relationship between fasting serum glucose, age, body mass index and serum 25 hydroxyVitamin D in postmenopausal women. Clinical Endocrinology 62 (6):738-41, 2005.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Nieves JW, Barrett-Connor E, Siris ES, Zion M, Barlas S, Chen YT. Calcium and vitamin D intake influence bone mass, but not short-term fracture risk, in Caucasian postmenopausal women from the National Osteoporosis Risk Assessment (NORA) study. Osteoporosis International 1919;673-9.	not RCT bone study (postmenepausal women)
Nilas L, Christiansen C. Treatment with Vitamin D or its analogues does not change body weight or blood glucose level in postmenopausal women. International Journal of Obesity 8(5):407-11, 1984.	Review paper
Niromanesh S, Laghaii S, Mosavi-Jarrahi A. Supplementary calcium in prevention of pre-eclampsia. International Journal of Gynaecology & Obstetrics 74 (1):17-21, 2001.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Nishimura K, Shima M, Tsugawa N et al. Long-term hospitalization during pregnancy is a risk factor for Vitamin D deficiency in neonates.[erratum appears in J Bone Miner Metab. 2003;21(4):253]. Journal of Bone & Mineral Metabolism 21(2):103-8, 2003.	No outcomes of interest
Nishiyama T. Effects of calcium on muscular training. Journal of Nutritional Science & Vitaminology 31 Suppl: S45-7, 1985.	Calcium only and bone/muscle outcomes
Nowak A, Pachocka L, Targosz U, Klosiewicz-Latoszek L. Dietary calcium and obesity in men. Roczniki Panstwowego Zakladu Higieny 58 (1):301-5, 2007.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Nowson C, Morgan T. Effect of calcium carbonate on blood pressure in normotensive and hypertensive people. Hypertension 13(6 Pt 1):630-9, 1989.	In systematic review
Obarzanek E, Hunsberger SA, Van HL et al. Safety of a fat-reduced diet: the Dietary Intervention Study in Children (DISC). Pediatrics 100 (1):51-9, 1997.	No outcomes of interest

Excluded Study	Reason
Ochner CN, Lowe MR. Self-reported changes in dietary calcium and energy intake predict weight regain following a weight loss diet in obese women. Journal of Nutrition 2007; 137(10):2324-2328.	No outcomes of interest
Olafsdottir AS, Wagner KH, Thorsdottir I, Elmadfa I. Fat-soluble Vitamins in the maternal diet, influence of cod liver oil supplementation and impact of the maternal diet on human milk composition. Annals of Nutrition & Metabolism 45 (6):265-72, 2001.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Paganus A, Juntunen-Backman K, Savilahti E. Follow-up of nutritional status and dietary survey in children with cow's milk allergy. Acta Paediatrica 81 (6-7):518 -21, 1992.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Palacios C, Benedetti P, Fonseca S. Impact of calcium intake on body mass index in Venezuelan adolescents. Puerto Rico Health Sciences Journal 26 (3):199-204, 2007.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Park SB, Suh DH, Youn JI. A pilot study to assess the safety and efficacy of topical calcipotriol treatment in childhood psoriasis. Pediatric Dermatology 16 (4):321-5, 1999.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Pasch A, Frey FJ, Eisenberger U, Mohaupt MG, Bonny O. PTH and 1.25 vitamin D response to a low-calcium diet is associated with bone mineral density in renal stone formers. Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation 23(8):2563 -70 , 2008.	no outcomes of interest
Pehlivan I, Hatun S, Aydogan M, Babaoglu K, Gokalp AS. Maternal Vitamin D deficiency and Vitamin D supplementation in healthy infants. Turkish Journal of Pediatrics 45 (4):315-20, 2003;-Dec.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Peters U, Hayes RB, Chatterjee N et al. Circulating Vitamin D metabolites, polymorphism in Vitamin D receptor, and colorectal adenoma risk. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 2004; 13(4):546-552.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Peters U, McGlynn KA, Chatterjee N et al. Vitamin D, calcium, and Vitamin D receptor polymorphism in colorectal adenomas. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 2001; 10(12):1267-1274.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Pettifor JM, Bikle DD, Cavaleros M, Zachen D, Kamdar MC, Ross FP. Serum levels of free 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D in Vitamin D toxicity. Annals of Internal Medicine 122 (7):511-3, 1995.	Case report
Phillips SM, Bandini LG, Cyr H, Colclough-Douglas S, Naumova E, Must A. Dairy food consumption and body weight and fatness studied longitudinally over the adolescent period. . International Journal of Obesity & Related Metabolic Disorders: Journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity 27 (9):1106-13, 2003.	Not RCT growth study
Pilz S, Dobnig H, Fischer JE et al. Low Vitamin d levels predict stroke in patients referred to coronary angiography. Stroke 39 (9):2611-3, 2008.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Pilz S, Dobnig H, Winklhofer-Roob B et al. Low serum levels of 25-hydroxyVitamin D predict fatal cancer in patients referred to coronary angiography. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 17(5):1228-33, 2008.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Pittard WB, III, Geddes KM, Hulsey TC, Hollis BW. How much Vitamin D for neonates? American Journal of Diseases of Children 145 (10):1147-9, 1991.	Not RCT arrow 4 study

Excluded Study	Reason
Pittard WB, III, Geddes KM, Sutherland SE, Miller MC, Hollis BW. Longitudinal changes in the bone mineral content of term and premature infants. . American Journal of Diseases of Children 1990; 144(1):36-40.	Changes in 25(OH)D status of term and premature infants
Pittas AG, Harris SS, Stark PC, wson-Hughes B. The effects of calcium and Vitamin D supplementation on blood glucose and markers of inflammation in nondiabetic adults.. Diabetes Care 2007; 30(4):980-986.	No outcomes of interest
Porojnicu AC, Robsahm TE, Dahlback A et al. Seasonal and geographical variations in lung cancer prognosis in Norway. Does Vitamin D from the sun play a role? Lung Cancer 2007; 55(3):263-270.	Ecological study
Prentice A, Ginty F, Stear SJ, Jones SC, Laskey MA, Cole TJ. Calcium supplementation increases stature and bone mineral mass of 16- to 18-year-old boys. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 90 (6):3153-61, 2005.	In Winzenberg 2007 systematic review
Prineas RJ, Folsom AR, Zhang ZM, Sellers TA, Potter J. Nutrition and other risk factors for renal cell carcinoma in postmenopausal women. Epidemiology 8 (1):31-6, 1997.	No outcomes of interest
Purwar M, Kulkarni H, Motghare V, Dhole S. Calcium supplementation and prevention of pregnancy induced hypertension. Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology Research 22 (5):425-30, 1996.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Rajalakshmi R, Sail SS, Shah DG, Ambady SK. The effects of supplements varying in carotene and calcium content on the physical, biochemical and skeletal status of preschool children. British Journal of Nutrition 30 (1):77-86, 1973.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Rajpathak SN, Rimm EB, Rosner B, Willett WC, Hu FB. Calcium and dairy intakes in relation to long-term weight gain in US men. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 83 (3):559-66, 2006.	No outcomes of interest
Rees GA, Doyle W, Srivastava A, Brooke ZM, Crawford MA, Costeloe KL. The nutrient intakes of mothers of low birth weight babies - a comparison of ethnic groups in East London, UK. Maternal & Child Nutrition 1(2):91-9, 2005.	No outcomes of interest
Repke JT, Villar J, Anderson C, Pareja G, Dubin N, Belizan JM. Biochemical changes associated with blood pressure reduction induced by calcium supplementation during pregnancy. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 160 (3):684-90, 1989.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Repke JT, Villar J. Pregnancy-induced hypertension and low birth weight: the role of calcium. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 1991; 54(1:Suppl): Suppl-241S.	Review paper
Resnick LM, Oparil S, Chait A et al. Factors affecting blood pressure responses to diet: the Vanguard study. American Journal of Hypertension 13(9):956-65, 2000.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Reunanen A, Knekt P, Marniemi J, Maki J, Maatela J, Aromaa A. Serum calcium, magnesium, copper and zinc and risk of cardiovascular death. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 50 (7):431-7, 1996.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Rich GM, McCullough M, Olmedo A, Malarick C, Moore TJ. Blood pressure and renal blood flow responses to dietary calcium and sodium intake in humans. American Journal of Hypertension 4(11):642S-645S, 1991.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect

Excluded Study	Reason
Roberts CC, Chan GM, Folland D, Rayburn C, Jackson R. Adequate bone mineralization in breast-fed infants. Journal of Pediatrics 99 (2):192-6, 1981.	In Ottawa EPC report
Robien K, Cutler GJ, Lazovich D. Vitamin D intake and breast cancer risk in postmenopausal women: the Iowa Women's Health Study. Cancer Causes & Control 2007; 18(7):775-782.	Observational study estimated Vitamin D supplement doses
Rogers MS, Fung HY, Hung CY. Calcium and low-dose aspirin prophylaxis in women at high risk of pregnancy-induced hypertension. Hypertension in Pregnancy 18 (2):165-72, 1999.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Roongpisuthipong C, Kantawan R, Roongpisuthipong W. Reduction of adipose tissue and body weight: effect of water soluble calcium hydroxycitrate in Garcinia atroviridis on the short term treatment of obese women in Thailand. Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2007; 16(1):25-29.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Rosell M, Hakansson NN, Wolk A. Association between dairy food consumption and weight change over 9 y in 19,352 perimenopausal women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 2006; 84(6):1481-1488.	Ca intake and BW measured but not assessed ==> no relevant results reported
Rothberg AD, Pettifor JM, Cohen DF, Sonnendecker EW, Ross FP. Maternal-infant Vitamin D relationships during breast-feeding. Journal of Pediatrics 101 (4):500-3, 1982.	In Ottawa EPC report
Rourke KM, Brehm BJ, Cassell C, Sethuraman G. Effect of weight change on bone mass in female adolescents. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 103 (3):369-72, 2003.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Rozen P, Fireman Z, Fine N, Wax Y, Ron E. Oral calcium suppresses increased rectal epithelial proliferation of persons at risk of colorectal cancer. Gut 30(5):650-5, 1989.	No outcomes of interest
Rozen P, Lubin F, Papo N et al. Calcium supplements interact significantly with long-term diet while suppressing rectal epithelial proliferation of adenoma patients. Cancer 91 (4):833-40, 2001.	No outcomes of interest
Rumiris D, Purwosunu Y, Wibowo N, Farina A, Sekizawa A. Lower rate of preeclampsia after antioxidant supplementation in pregnant women with low antioxidant status. Hypertension in Pregnancy 2006; 25(3):241-253.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Rush D, Sloan NL, Leighton J et al. The National WIC Evaluation: evaluation of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children. V. Longitudinal study of pregnant women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 48 (2 Suppl):439-83, 1988.	No exposure of interest
Saadi HF, Dawodu A, Afandi B et al. Effect of combined maternal and infant vitamin D supplementation on vitamin D status of exclusively breastfed infants. Maternal & Child Nutrition 5(1):25 -32 , 2009.	arrow 4 RCT but daily doses were the same in the comparison groups (comparison of daily vs. monthly doses)
Sacks FM, Brown LE, Appel L, Borhani NO, Evans D, Whelton P. Combinations of potassium, calcium, and magnesium supplements in hypertension. Hypertension 26 (6 Pt 1):950-6, 1995.	Combinations of minerals
Sacks FM, Obarzanek E, Windhauser MM et al. Rationale and design of the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension trial (DASH). A multicenter controlled-feeding study of dietary patterns to lower blood pressure. Annals of Epidemiology 5(2):108-18, 1995.	No outcomes of interest

Excluded Study	Reason
Sacks FM, Willett WC, Smith A, Brown LE, Rosner B, Moore TJ. Effect on blood pressure of potassium, calcium, and magnesium in women with low habitual intake. Hypertension 31 (1):131-8, 1998.	In systematic review
Saito K, Sano H, Kawahara J, Yokoyama M. Calcium supplementation attenuates an enhanced platelet function in salt-loaded mildly hypertensive patients. Hypertension 26 (1):156-63, 1995.	Data too incomplete
Sakhaee K, Baker S, Zerwekh J, Poindexter J, Garcia-Hernandez PA, Pak CY. Limited risk of kidney stone formation during long-term calcium citrate supplementation in nonstone forming subjects. Journal of Urology 152 (2 Pt 1):324-7, 1994.	No UL outcomes
Sakhaee K, Poindexter JR, Griffith CS, Pak CY. Stone forming risk of calcium citrate supplementation in healthy postmenopausal women. Journal of Urology 172 (3):958-61, 2004.	No UL outcomes: saturation of CaOx
Salazar-Martinez E, Lazcano-Ponce E, Sanchez-Zamorano LM, Gonzalez-Lira G, Escudero-DE Los RP, Hernandez-Avila M. Dietary factors and endometrial cancer risk. Results of a case-control study in Mexico. International Journal of Gynecological Cancer 15 (5):938-45 , 2005.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Sampath V, Havel PJ, King JC. Calcium supplementation does not alter lipid oxidation or lipolysis in overweight/obese women. Obesity 16 (11):2400 -4, 2008.	not RCT wt study
Sanchez-Ramos L, Adair CD, Kaunitz AM, Briones DK, Del Valle GO, Delke I. Calcium supplementation in mild preeclampsia remote from term: a randomized double-blind clinical trial. Obstetrics & Gynecology 85 (6):915-8, 1995.	100% patients with already diagnosed "mild" preeclampsia
Sanchez-Ramos L, Briones DK, Kaunitz AM, Delvalle GO, Gaudier FL, Walker CD. Prevention of pregnancy-induced hypertension by calcium supplementation in angiotensin II-sensitive patients. Obstetrics & Gynecology 84 (3):349-53, 1994.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Sanders TA, Purves R. An anthropometric and dietary assessment of the nutritional status of vegan preschool children. Journal of Human Nutrition 35 (5):349-57, 1981.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Sato K, Emoto N, Toraya S et al. Progressively increased serum 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D2 concentration in a hypoparathyroid patient with protracted hypercalcemia due to Vitamin D2 intoxication. Endocrine Journal 41 (4):329-37, 1994.	Case report
Satterfield S, Cutler JA, Langford HG et al. Trials of hypertension prevention. Phase I design. Annals of Epidemiology 1(5):455-71, 1991.	Shows research design, but no result
Schleithoff SS, Zittermann A, Tenderich G, Berthold HK, Stehle P, Koerfer R. Vitamin D supplementation improves cytokine profiles in patients with congestive heart failure: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial.[see comment]. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 83 (4):754 -9 , 2006.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Schumann SA, Ewigman B. Double-dose Vitamin D lowers cancer risk in women over 55. Journal of Family Practice 2007; 56(11):907-910.	Editorial-like brief review

Excluded Study	Reason
Sellers TA, Bazyk AE, Bostick RM et al. Diet and risk of colon cancer in a large prospective study of older women: an analysis stratified on family history (Iowa, United States). Cancer Causes & Control 9(4):357-67, 1998.	Same cohort as Zheng 1998 (RefID 2924) only difference is that taking into consideration the family history of colon cancer in the analysis
Shahar DR, Abel R, Elhayany A, Vardi H, Fraser D. Does dairy calcium intake enhance weight loss among overweight diabetic patients? Diabetes Care 2007; 30(3):485-489.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Shapses SA, Heshka S, Heymsfield SB. Effect of calcium supplementation on weight and fat loss in women. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 89 (2):632-7, 2004.	In systematic review
Sharkey JR, Giuliani C, Haines PS, Branch LG, Busby-Whitehead J, Zohoori N. Summary measure of dietary musculoskeletal nutrient (calcium, Vitamin D, magnesium, and phosphorus) intakes is associated with lower-extremity physical performance in homebound elderly men and women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 77 (4):847-56, 2003.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Shaunak S, Ang L, Colston K, Patel S, Bland M, Maxwell JD. Muscle strength in healthy white and Asian subjects: the relationship of quadriceps maximum voluntary contraction to age, sex, body build and Vitamin D. Clinical Science 73 (5):541-6, 1987.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Sibai BM, Ewell M, Levine RJ et al. Risk factors associated with preeclampsia in healthy nulliparous women. The Calcium for Preeclampsia Prevention (CPEP) Study Group. . American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 177 (5):1003-10, 1997.	No Ca dose
Sieg J, Sieg A, Dreyhaupt J, Schmidt-Gayk H. Insufficient Vitamin D supply as a possible co-factor in colorectal carcinogenesis. Anticancer Research 26 (4A):2729 -33, 2006.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Silverman SL, Delmas PD, Kulkarni PM, Stock JL, Wong M, Plouffe L, Jr. Comparison of fracture, cardiovascular event, and breast cancer rates at 3 years in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 52 (9):1543-8, 2004.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Sita-Lumsden A, Lapthorn G, Swaminathan R, Milburn HJ. Reactivation of tuberculosis and Vitamin D deficiency: the contribution of diet and exposure to sunlight. Thorax 62 (11):1003-7, 2007.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Siwek RA, Burkinshaw L, Oxby CB, Robinson PA. Multi-element analysis of the obese subject by in vivo neutron activation analysis. Physics in Medicine & Biology 29 (6):687-701, 1984.	Not relevant
Skinner JD, Bounds W, Carruth BR, Ziegler P. Longitudinal calcium intake is negatively related to children's body fat indexes.. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 103 (12):1626-31, 2003.	Not RCT growth study
Slemenda CW, Reister TK, Hui SL, Miller JZ, Christian JC, Johnston CC, Jr. Influences on skeletal mineralization in children and adolescents: evidence for varying effects of sexual maturation and physical actiVitaminy. Journal of Pediatrics 125 (2):201-7, 1994.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Specker BL, Beck A, Kalkwarf H, Ho M. Randomized trial of varying mineral intake on total body bone mineral accretion during the first year of life. Pediatrics 99(6): E12, 1997.	No independent Ca effect

Excluded Study	Reason
Specker BL, Tsang RC, Ho M, Miller D. Effect of vegetarian diet on serum 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D concentrations during lactation. Obstetrics & Gynecology 70 (6):870-4, 1987.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Specker BL, Valanis B, Hertzberg V, Edwards N, Tsang RC. Sunshine exposure and serum 25-hydroxyVitamin D concentrations in exclusively breast-fed infants. Journal of Pediatrics 107 (3):372-6, 1985.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Stamler J, Liu K, Ruth KJ, Pryer J, Greenland P. Eight-year blood pressure change in middle-aged men: relationship to multiple nutrients. Hypertension 39 (5):1000-6, 2002.	No outcomes of interest
Stern HS, Gregoire RC, Kashtan H, Stadler J, Bruce RW. Long-term effects of dietary calcium on risk markers for colon cancer in patients with familial polyposis. Surgery 108 (3):528-33, 1990.	No outcomes of interest
Sugden JA, Davies JI, Witham MD, Morris AD, Struthers AD. Vitamin D improves endothelial function in patients with Type 2 diabetes mellitus and low vitamin D levels. Diabetic Medicine 2008;25:320-5.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Swanenburg J, de Bruin ED, Stauffacher M, Mulder T, Uebelhart D. Effects of exercise and nutrition on postural balance and risk of falling in elderly people with decreased bone mineral density: randomized controlled trial pilot study. Clinical Rehabilitation 2007; 21(6):523-534.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Takeuchi A, Okano T, Tsugawa N et al. Effects of ergocalciferol supplementation on the concentration of Vitamin D and its metabolites in human milk. Journal of Nutrition 119 (11):1639-46, 1989.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Tanji JL, Lew EY, Wong GY, Treguboff C, Ward JA, Amsterdam EA. Dietary calcium supplementation as a treatment for mild hypertension.. Journal of the American Board of Family Practice 4(3):145-50, 1991.	In systematic review
Taylor EN, Stampfer MJ, Curhan GC. Dietary factors and the risk of incident kidney stones in men: new insights after 14 years of follow-up. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology 15 (12):3225-32, 2004.	No outcomes of interest
Teegarden D, White KM, Lyle RM et al. Calcium and dairy product modulation of lipid utilization and energy expenditure. Obesity 16 (7):1566-72, 2008.	No outcomes of interest
Thompson IM, Coltman CA, Jr., Crowley J. Chemoprevention of prostate cancer: the Prostate Cancer Prevention Trial. Prostate 33 (3):217-21, 1997.	Commentary
Thompson WG, Rostad HN, Janzow DJ, Slezak JM, Morris KL, Zemel MB. Effect of energy-reduced diets high in dairy products and fiber on weight loss in obese adults. . Obesity Research 13(8):1344-53, 2005.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Thomson K, Morley R, Grover SR, Zacharin MR. Postnatal evaluation of Vitamin D and bone health in women who were Vitamin D-deficient in pregnancy, and in their infants.[erratum appears in Med J Aust. 2005 Jan 3;182(1):48 Note: Thompson, Katherine [corrected to Thomson, Katherine]]. Medical Journal of Australia 181 (9):486-8, 2004.	No analysis of association between 25(OH)D and outcomes
Tomoda S, Kitanaka T, Ogita S, Hidaka A. Prevention of pregnancy-induced hypertension by calcium dietary supplement: a preliminary report. Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology 21(3):281-8, 1995.	No outcomes of interest

Excluded Study	Reason
Tretli S, Hernes E, Berg JP, Hestvik UE, Robsahm TE. Association between serum 25(OH)D and death from prostate cancer. British Journal of Cancer 100 (3):450 -4, 2009.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Tsang RC, Gigger M, Oh W, Brown DR. Studies in calcium metabolism in infants with intrauterine growth retardation. Journal of Pediatrics 86 (6):936-41, 1975.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Tworoger SS, Lee IM, Buring JE, Rosner B, Hollis BW, Hankinson SE. Plasma 25-hydroxyVitamin D and 1,25-dihydroxyVitamin D and risk of incident ovarian cancer. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 2007; 16(4):783-788.	No outcomes of interest
van Beresteijn EC, Riedstra M, van der WA, Schouten EG, Burema J, Kok FJ. Habitual dietary calcium intake and blood pressure change around the menopause: a longitudinal study. International Journal of Epidemiology 21(4):683-9, 1992.	No outcomes of interest
van Buul BJ, Steegers EA, Jongsma HW et al. Dietary sodium restriction in the prophylaxis of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: effects on the intake of other nutrients. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 62 (1):49-57, 1995.	Ca intake and BM (mothers and neonates) measured but not assessed ==> no relevant results reported
Vatanparast H, Baxter-Jones A, Faulkner RA, Bailey DA, Whiting SJ. Positive effects of vegetable and fruit consumption and calcium intake on bone mineral accrual in boys during growth from childhood to adolescence: the University of Saskatchewan Pediatric Bone Mineral Accrual Study. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 82 (3):700-6, 2005.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Vergnaud AC, Peneau S, Chat-Yung S et al. Dairy consumption and 6-y changes in body weight and waist circumference in middle-aged French adults. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 88 (5):1248 -55 , 2008.	not RCT (weight outcome)
Verhaar HJ, Samson MM, Jansen PA, de Vreede PL, Manten JW, Duursma SA. Muscle strength, functional mobility and Vitamin D in older women.. Aging-Clinical & Experimental Research 12 (6):455-60, 2000.	In Ottawa EPC report
Verreault R, Semba RD, Volpato S, Ferrucci L, Fried LP, Guralnik JM. Low serum Vitamin d does not predict new disability or loss of muscle strength in older women. . Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 50 (5):912-7, 2002.	In Ottawa EPC report
Verreault R, Semba RD, Volpato S, Ferrucci L, Fried LP, Guralnik JM. Low serum Vitamin d does not predict new disability or loss of muscle strength in older women. . Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 50(5):912-7, 2002.	In Ottawa EPC report
Villar J, bdel-Aleem H, Merialdi M et al. World Health Organization randomized trial of calcium supplementation among low calcium intake pregnant women. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology. 194(3):639-49, 2006 Mar.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review, systematic review
Villar J, Gulmezoglu AM, de OM. Nutritional and antimicrobial interventions to prevent preterm birth: an overview of randomized controlled trials. Obstetrical & Gynecological Survey 53 (9):575-85 , 1998 Sep.	Not relevant systematic review

Excluded Study	Reason
Villar J, Repke JT. Calcium supplementation during pregnancy may reduce preterm delivery in high-risk populations. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 163 (4 Pt 1):1124 -31, 1990.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Visser M, Deeg DJ, Lips P, Longitudinal Aging SA. Low Vitamin D and high parathyroid hormone levels as determinants of loss of muscle strength and muscle mass (sarcopenia): the Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 88 (12):5766-72, 2003.	In Ottawa EPC report
von Hurst PR, Stonehouse W, Matthys C, Conlon C, Kruger MC, Coad J. Study protocol--metabolic syndrome, vitamin D and bone status in South Asian women living in Auckland, New Zealand: a randomised, placebo-controlled, double-blind vitamin D intervention. BMC Public Health 8 :267 , 2008.	RCT protocol only
Wallace K, Baron JA, Cole BF et al. Effect of calcium supplementation on the risk of large bowel polyps.[see comment]. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 96 (12):921 -5, 2004.	In Weigarten 2008 SR
Wallace K, Baron JA, Karagas MR et al. The association of physical actiVitaminy and body mass index with the risk of large bowel polyps. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 14(9):2082-6, 2005.	No outcomes of interest
Waltman NL, Twiss JJ, Ott CD et al. Testing an intervention for preventing osteoporosis in postmenopausal breast cancer survivors. Journal of Nursing Scholarship 35 (4):333-8, 2003.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Wanchu M, Malhotra S, Khullar M. Calcium supplementation in pre-eclampsia. Journal of the Association of Physicians of India 49:795-8, 2001.	In Hofmeyer 2007 systematic review
Wang LD, Qiu SL, Yang GR, Lipkin M, Newmark HL, Yang CS. A randomized double-blind intervention study on the effect of calcium supplementation on esophageal precancerous lesions in a high-risk population in China. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention 2(1):71-8, 1993.	>=20% subjects with diseases
Wargovich MJ, Isbell G, Shabot M et al. Calcium supplementation decreases rectal epithelial cell proliferation in subjects with sporadic adenoma. . Gastroenterology 103 (1):92-7, 1992.	No outcomes of interest
Webb AR, Pilbeam C, Hanafin N, Holick MF. An evaluation of the relative contributions of exposure to sunlight and of diet to the circulating concentrations of 25-hydroxyVitamin D in an elderly nursing home population in Boston. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 51 (6):1075-81, 1990.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Webber CE, Blake JM, Chambers LF, Roberts JG. Effects of 2 years of hormone replacement upon bone mass, serum lipids and lipoproteins. Maturitas. 19(1):13-23, 1994 May.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Wei EK, Giovannucci E, Fuchs CS, Willett WC, Mantzoros CS. Low plasma adiponectin levels and risk of colorectal cancer in men: a prospective study. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 97 (22):1688-94, 2005.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca

Excluded Study	Reason
Weinberger MH, Wagner UL, Fineberg NS. The blood pressure effects of calcium supplementation in humans of known sodium responsiveness. American Journal of Hypertension 6 (9):799-805, 1993.	In systematic review
Weisgerber UM, Boeing H, Owen RW, Waldherr R, Raedsch R, Wahrendorf J. Effect of longterm placebo controlled calcium supplementation on sigmoidal cell proliferation in patients with sporadic adenomatous polyps. Gut 38 (3):396-402, 1996.	No outcomes of interest
Weisman Y, Bawnik JC, Eisenberg Z, Spirer Z. Vitamin D metabolites in human milk. Journal of Pediatrics 100 (5):745-8, 1982.	Cross-sectional or retrospective assessment of diet after disease diagnosis
Weston TL, Aronson KJ, Siemiatycki J, Howe GR, Nadon L. Cancer mortality among males in relation to exposures assessed through a job-exposure matrix. International Journal of Occupational & Environmental Health 6(3):194-202, 2000.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Widga AC, Lewis NM. Defined, in-home, prenatal nutrition intervention for low-income women. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 99(9):1058-62, 1999.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA, Rosner BA, Speizer FE. Relation of meat, fat, and fiber intake to the risk of colon cancer in a prospective study among women. N Engl J Med 1990; 323(24):1664-1672.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Williams CP, Child DF, Hudson PR et al. Why oral calcium supplements may reduce renal stone disease: report of a clinical pilot study. Journal of Clinical Pathology 54 (1):54-62, 2001.	No UL outcomes
Wimalawansa SJ. Antihypertensive effects of oral calcium supplementation may be mediated through the potent vasodilator CGRP. American Journal of Hypertension 6 (12):996-1002, 1993.	n=8, Ca to Rx HTN
Witteman JC, Willett WC, Stampfer MJ et al. A prospective study of nutritional factors and hypertension among US women. Circulation 80 (5):1320-7, 1989.	Superceded by Ascherio (4022)
Wortsman J, Matsuoka LY, Chen TC, Lu Z, Holick MF. Decreased bioavailability of Vitamin D in obesity. [erratum appears in Am J Clin Nutr. 2003 May;77(5):1342]. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 72 (3):690-3, 2000.	Not RCT arrow 4 study
Wosje KS, Kalkwarf HJ. Lactation, weaning, and calcium supplementation: effects on body composition in postpartum women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 80 (2):423-9, 2004.	No outcomes of interest
Wyatt HR, Jortberg BT, Babbel C et al. Weight loss in a community initiative that promotes decreased energy intake and increased physical actiVitaminy and dairy consumption: Calcium Weighs-In. Journal of Physical ActiVitaminy & Health 5(1):28-44, 2008.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Yang YX, Han JH, Shao XP et al. Effect of micronutrient supplementation on the growth of preschool children in China. Biomedical & Environmental Sciences 15 (3):196-202, 2002.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect

Excluded Study	Reason
Yesudian PD, Berry JL, Wiles S et al. The effect of ultraviolet B-induced Vitamin D levels on host resistance to Mycobacterium tuberculosis: a pilot study in immigrant Asian adults living in the United Kingdom. Photodermatology, Photoimmunology & Photomedicine 24 (2):97-8, 2008.	No outcomes of interest
Zemel MB, Richards J, Milstead A, Campbell P. Effects of calcium and dairy on body composition and weight loss in African-American adults. Obesity Research 13(7):1218 -25, 2005.	In systematic review
Zemel MB, Thompson W, Milstead A, Morris K, Campbell P. Calcium and dairy acceleration of weight and fat loss during energy restriction in obese adults. . Obesity Research 12 (4):582-90, 2004.	In systematic review
Zhang Y, Kiel DP, Ellison RC et al. Bone mass and the risk of prostate cancer: the Framingham Study. American Journal of Medicine 113 (9):734 -9, 2002.	No 25(OH)D or dietary Ca
Zhou C, Fan S, Zhou L, Ni Y, Huang T, Shi Y. Clinical observation of treatment of hypertension with calcium. American Journal of Hypertension 7 (4 Pt 1):363-7, 1994.	In systematic review
Zofkova I, Hill M. Long-term 1,25(OH)2 Vitamin D therapy increases bone mineral density in osteopenic women. Comparison with the effect of plain Vitamin D. Aging-Clinical & Experimental Research. 19(6):472-7, 2007 Dec.	Combination of Vitamin D/Ca and other treatment w/o analysis of independent effect
Zorbas YG, Petrov KL, Kakurin VJ et al. Calcium supplementation effect on calcium balance in endurance-trained athletes during prolonged hypokinesia and ambulatory conditions. Biological Trace Element Research 73 (3):231-50, 2000.	Arrow 4: calcium balance

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18505967	Ahn 2008	Case-cohort study	Non-Hispanic white males, at least one prostate cancer screen before end of follow-up. All eligible patients with aggressive cancer selected, and a randomly selected subset of those with non-aggressive prostate cancer.	No prior history of prostate cancer before first year of follow-up.	1993-2001	Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial (PLCO)	NIH: National Cancer Institute, Intramural Research Program	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18505967	Ahn 2008	Case-cohort study	United States (various): Birmingham, AL; Denver, CO; Detroit, MI; Honolulu, HI; Marshfield, WI; Minneapolis, MN; Pittsburgh, PA; Salt Lake City, UT; St. Louis, MO; Washington DC	1530 749 cases; 781 controls	1530	Case: 67.8 (5.3); Control: 67.6 (5.3)	nd	100%	Non-Hispanic white	BMI case 27.3 (3.6); BMI control 27.5 (3.9)	No prior history of cancer before randomization	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18505967	Ahn 2008	25(OH)D				25(OH)D determined by radioimmunoassay (Heartland Assays)	y, coefficient of variation in subset of 80 patients was 5.9%	nd	nd	nd
18505967	Ahn 2008	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	US Department of Agriculture	n	nd	n			nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18505967	Ahn 2008	secondary	Prostate cancer	nd
18505967	Ahn 2008	secondary	Aggressive prostate cancer	Gleason sum >=7 or clinical stage III or IV)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18505967	Ahn 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Total calcium intake	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?		
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	History of diabetes	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Vigorous physical activity
		Other	study center	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS A RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE AN APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST.

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model.)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tirtiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases*	No. of Non-cases	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
18505967	Ahn 2008	prostate cancer	quintiles based on season of collection (standardized) Quintile 1 (12.8-42.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	119	157	Adjusted for age at cohort entry; time since screening; calendar year;	OR	1.00	(Referent)		0.04
			Quintile 2 (42.5-51.3 nmol/L)	nd	nd	125	156			1.12	0.79-1.57		

			Quintile 3 (51.4-60.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	190	157			1.61	1.16-2.22		
			Quintile 4 (60.6-71.7 nmol/L)	nd	nd	167	156			1.42	1.02-1.96		
			Quintile 5 (71.8-129.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	148	155			1.32	0.94-1.84		
18505967	Ahn 2008	prostate cancer	quintiles based on season of collection (standardized) Quintile 1 (12.8-42.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	119	157	Adjusted for age at cohort entry; time since screening; calendar year; study center; DM; BMI; physical activity; Ca intake	OR	1.00	(Referent)		0.20
			Quintile 2 (42.5-51.3 nmol/L)	nd	nd	125	156			1.10	0.78-1.56		
			Quintile 3 (51.4-60.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	190	157			1.53	1.10-2.13		
			Quintile 4 (60.6-71.7 nmol/L)	nd	nd	167	156			1.33	0.95-1.86		
			Quintile 5 (71.8-129.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	148	155			1.18	0.83-1.68		
18505967	Ahn 2008	Aggressive prostate cancer (Gleason sum >=7 or clinical stage III or IV)	Serum 25(OH)D-Quintile 1 (12.8-42.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	68	157	Adjusted for age at cohort entry; time since screening; calendar year; study center; DM	OR	1.00	(Referent)	nd	0.05
			Quintile 2 (42.5-51.3 nmol/L)	nd	nd	73	156			1.20	0.80-1.81	nd	
			Quintile 3 (51.4-60.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	130	157			1.96	1.34-2.87	nd	
			Quintile 4 (60.6-71.7 nmol/L)	nd	nd	105	156			1.61	1.09-2.38	nd	
			Quintile 5 (71.8-129.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	90	155			1.37	0.92-2.05	nd	

		Aggressive prostate cancer (Gleason sum >=7 or clinical stage III or IV)	Serum 25(OH)D-Quintile 1 (12.8-42.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	68	157	Adjusted for age at cohort entry; time since screening; calendar year; study center; DM; BMI; physical activity; Ca intake	OR	1.00	(Referent)		0.09
			Quintile 2 (42.5-51.3 nmol/L)	nd	nd	73	156			1.18	0.78-1.79		
			Quintile 3 (51.4-60.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	130	157			1.92	1.31-2.82		
			Quintile 4 (60.6-71.7 nmol/L)	nd	nd	105	156			1.56	1.05-2.31		
			Quintile 5 (71.8-129.5 nmol/L)	nd	nd	90	155			1.34	0.87-1.98		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
18505967	Ahn 2008	Prostate cancer cases:	2-8 years	crude	749	59.0	19.1	nd	nd	25(OH)D: 0.18
18505967	Ahn 2008	Prostate cancer controls:	2-8 years	crude	781	57.6	18.9	nd	nd	

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18505967	Ahn 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	While all cases of aggressive cancers were selected; only a randomly picked subset of nonaggressive cancers were selected.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11075874	Ahonen 2000	Case-cohort study	Employees in two Finnish governmental agencies and five industrial companies	Previously clinically detected prostate cancer	1981-1982	Helsinki Heart Study	Finnish Cancer Foundation, Yrjo Jahnsson Foundation, Medical Research Fund of Tampere University Hospital, Tampere University	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11075874	Ahonen 2000	Case-cohort study	Finland 62° (various cities)	715 cases: 149 control: 566	715	nd	40-57	100%	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
11075874	Ahonen 2000	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Radioimmunoassay (Incstar Corporation)	Intra-assay coefficient of variation = 8.5%, Inter-assay coefficient of variation = 16%	Same day	Jan-Feb; March-May; September	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd			nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11075874	Ahonen 2000	Nd	Prostate cancer	nd

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11075874	Ahonen 2000	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (matched), residence (matched)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Systolic blood pressure, HDL	
		Medication	Treatment with gemfibrozil	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	time of sample retrieval
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Smoking
		Other	Time of sample retrieval (matched)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tirtiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases*	No. of Non-cases	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11075874	Ahonen 2000	Prostate cancer	Quartile cut off based on total original cohort; Quartile 4: 25(OH)D > 55 nmol/L	nd	nd	34	144	crude	OR	1			0.01
			Quartile 3: 25(OH)D = 41-54 nmol/L	nd	nd	26	148	crude	OR	0.8	0.4-1.4		
			Quartile 2: 25(OH)D = 31-40 nmol/L	nd	nd	41	143	crude	OR	1.3	0.8-2.3		

			Quartile 1: 25(OH)D = < 30 nmol/L	nd	nd	48	131	crude	OR	1.7	1.0-3.0		
11075874	Ahonen 2000	Prostate cancer	Quartile cut off based on total original cohort; Quartile 4: 25(OH)D > 55 nmol/L	nd	nd	34	144	adjusted for HDL; SBP; BMI	OR	1			0.01
			Quartile 3: 25(OH)D = 41-54 nmol/L	nd	nd	26	148	Adjusted	OR	0.8	0.5-1.5	nd	
			Quartile 2: 25(OH)D = 31-40 nmol/L	nd	nd	41	143	Adjusted	OR	1.4	0.8-2.4	Nd	
			Quartile 1: 25(OH)D = < 30 nmol/L	nd	nd	48	131	Adjusted	OR	1.8	1.0-3.2	nd	
		Prostate cancer in those <52 years old at entry	Group 1: 25(OH)D >40	nd	nd	nd	nd	adjusted HDL; SBP; BMI	OR	1			
			Group 2: 25(OH)D ≤40	nd	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	OR	3.5	1.7-7.0	Group 2 vs. 1 = 0.0006	
		Prostate cancer in those >51 years old at entry	Group 1: 25(OH)D >40	nd	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1			
			Group 2: 25(OH)D ≤40	nd	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.2	0.7-2.1	Group 2 vs. 1 = NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11075874	Ahonen 2000	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	na	a) One of the prespecified methods was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	n	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	NA	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	na	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	n					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	na	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	na					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	details of prostate cancer diagnosis not reported; 39% of the stored samples were thawed; no adjustment for additional factors relevant to prostate cancer

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	Cohort Study	Men, 40-75 y, health professional	Kcal intake outside 800-4200 kcal/day, ≥70 items omitted on FFQ Nonmelanoma cancer before IHD, CVD at baseline.	1986	Health Professionals Follow-up Study	Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	Cohort Study	US, various	39,800	39,800 (415,965 person years)	~54 (~9)	40-75	100%	White close to 100%	~25.5 ± ~3.4	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	USDA, release 10, 1995 + other sources	Yes Random sample of 127 men in Boston. FFQ compared to diet record. Correlation coefficient = 0.64					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	1°	Fatal ischemic heart disease	Including sudden death. Death various sources, confirmed by medical records, autopsy, death certificate.
		1°	Nonfatal MI	Self-reporting with medical record confirmation (WHO criteria)
		2°	Total ischemic heart disease	Implied combination of fatal IHD and nonfatal MI

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM, Hypercholesterolemia
		Medication	Yes	Aspirin, Vitamin E
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, EtOH, Physical activity
		Other	Yes	Family Hx of MI

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	IHD (fatal + nonfatal)	Total calcium Quintile 1		523	300	7960	12 years	Adjusted ("multivariate")	RR	1.0	--		0.43
			Quintile 2		670	296	7960				1.03	0.88, 1.22		
			Quintile 3		803	267	7960				0.92	0.78, 1.09		
			Quintile 4		995	299	7960				1.01	0.85, 1.19		
			Quintile 5		1377	296	7960				0.94	0.79, 1.11		
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	Nonfatal MI	Total calcium Quintile 1		523	212	7960	12 years	Adjusted ("multivariate")	RR	1.0	--		0.43
			Quintile 2		670	206	7960				1.01	0.83, 1.23		
			Quintile 3		803	197	7960				0.96	0.78, 1.17		
			Quintile 4		995	220	7960				1.04	0.85, 1.28		
			Quintile 5		1377	195	7960				0.92	0.74, 1.14		
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	Fatal IHD	Total calcium Quintile 1		523	88	7960	12 years	Adjusted ("multivariate")	RR	1.0	--		0.72
			Quintile 2		670	90	7960				1.17	0.87, 1.50		
			Quintile 3		803	70	7960				0.93	0.67, 1.29		
			Quintile 4		995	79	7960				1.06	0.77, 1.47		
			Quintile 5		1377	101	7960				1.10	0.79, 1.51		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
12663277	Al-Delaimy 2003	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No flaws. Well analyzed.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
7892882	Aloia 1995	RCT	Healthy white women between 6 months and 6 years after a natural menopause.	Nd	nd	nd	NIH	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
7892882	Aloia 1995	RCT	Mineola, NY, USA, 40°	118	64 (+30 in HRT arm)	-Calcium group: 52(0.6) yrs -Placebo group: 53.4(0.6) yrs	nd	0%	White 100%	-Weight: calcium group 65.8 (1.5) kg; placebo group 65.6 (1.8) kg -BMI: calcium group 24.6(0.5); placebo group 24.7(0.6)	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
7892882	Aloia 1995	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Nd
		Dietary calcium intake	Nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
7892882	Aloia 1995	Calcium supplement	nd about type	1700 mg Ca	2.9 +/- 1.1 yrs.	nd
		Calcium placebo				Nd
Co-intervention(s) *:			400 IU vitamin D in all groups			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
7892882	Aloia 1995	2°	Body weight	Change in kg/yr

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
7892882	Aloia 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7892882	Aloia 1995	Body weight	kg	Calcium	2.9 yrs	36	65.8	SD = 1.5	Delta = +0.1	Nd	0.0	ND	Not significant
				placebo	2.9 yrs	28	65.6	SD = 1.8	Delta = +0.1	nd			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
7892882	Aloia 1995	RCT-parallel	Y	ND	nd	No	nd	nd	y	n	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	High dropout rate. Inadequate reporting of outcomes of interest.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16280427	Alonso 2005	Cohort Study	University graduates or registered nurses	History of CVD, cancer, DM, prevalent HTN, extreme total energy intakes (<400 or >3500 women; <600 or >4200 men), missing data	12/99-1/2002	U Navarra Follow-up Study	Govt, University	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16280427	Alonso 2005	Cohort Study	Navarra, Spain 42° 40'	~7470 (incl missing data)	6686	36 (~11)	20-90	39%	nd (educated Spaniards)	BMI 23.1	No HTN	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
16280427	Alonso 2005	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Spanish food composition tables (referenced)	(Previously validated in Spain)	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16280427	Alonso 2005	1°	HTN, incident	Physician diagnosis (self-reported)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
16280427	Alonso 2005	In a validation study of 127 participants, with a HTN threshold of 160/95, negative predictive value of self-reported = 98%; with threshold of 140/90, NPV = 85% and PPV=82%

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16280427	Alonso 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Na consumption, total energy consumption
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, Sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	Hypercholesterolemia
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Physical activity, EtOH, smoking
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Follow-up	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Person Years (N)	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) /	Mean Follow-up	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Person Years (N)	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR,	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****

			Intervention Groups						RR, HR, %)				
16280427	Alonso 2005	HTN	Quintile 1	2 y	nd (mean 0.9±0.2)[1]	39 (14.3/1000 p-yr)	2734 p-yr (~1337)	Adjusted	HR	1	--		0.67
			Quintile 2		nd (mean 1.0±0.2)[2]	39 (14.3/1000 p-y	2726 p-yr (~1337)			0.98	0.62, 1.54	NS	
			Quintile 3		nd (mean 1.2±0.2)[3]	35 (12.9/1000 p-y	2706 p-yr (~1337)			0.82	0.51, 1.30	NS	
			Quintile 4		nd (mean 1.4±0.3)[4]	30 (11.2/1000 p-y	2668 p-yr (~1337)			0.73	0.45, 1.19	NS	
			Quintile 5		nd (mean 1.7±0.4)[5]	37 (13.7/1000 p-y	2692 p-yr (~1337)			0.97	0.61, 1.54	NS	

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
		Quintiles are for total dairy consumption, not calcium.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

[1] Mean±SD calcium intake within quintile of total dairy consumption
[2] Mean±SD calcium intake within quintile of total dairy consumption
[3] Mean±SD calcium intake within quintile of total dairy consumption
[4] Mean±SD calcium intake within quintile of total dairy consumption
[5] Mean±SD calcium intake within quintile of total dairy consumption

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16280427	Alonso 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Yes	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Yes	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Yes
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Yes	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Yes
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	No	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Yes	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	No

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No data on range of Ca intake within quintiles

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18208636	Andersen, 2008	RCT	General Pakistani immigrants primarily living in the Copenhagen area Denmark (latitude 55 N°), recruited through various information meetings, radio and television, and posters.	Medications known to affect bone metabolism or serum 25(OH)D concentrations, serious illness, pregnancy, planning pregnancy within 1 yr, breastfeeding, and serum ionized Ca concentrations >1.5 mmol/L. Subjects with Incomplete data in one or more of the explanatory variables were excluded from the analyses.	Jan 2002 to Nov 2002	nd	nd	Mc

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18208636	Andersen, 2008	RCT	Copenhagen area, Denmark (55 N°)	199	147	Median age - Adolescent girls: 12.2 Women: 36.2 Men: 38.3	Range – Adolescent girls: 10.1-14.7 Women: 18.1-52.7 Men: 17.9-63.5	42	Pakistani	Median BMI - Adolescent girls: 19.5 Women: 27 Men: 26.7	Generally healthy	No hypercalcimia

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18208636	Andersen, 2008	25(OH)D				HPLC using a diode array detector	Yes Interassay CV=6.3% and intraassy CV=4.3%	nd	All seasons (blood were drawn three time, baseline, 6 mo and 1 yr)	See baseline variables
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	General Intake Estimation System described elsewhere	no	no				Median Ca intake (mg/d) - Adolescent girls: 510 Women: 495 Men: 548

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18208636	Andersen, 2008	Vitamin D3	Scanphrm A/S (Birkerod, Denmark)	10 ug/d	1 yr	Daily
		Vitamin D3		20 ug/d	1 yr	Daily
		placebo	Cellulosum microcristallium	0	1 yr	Daily
Co-intervention(s) *:			none			
Compliance/Adherence:			Tablet counting. The median compliance was 85 (range 43-100), 92 (42-115) and 93 (33-105)% for girls, women, and men, respectively			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18208636	Andersen, 2008	primary	25(OH)D	
		primary	BMD, BMC	DXA, whole body, or lumbar spine

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18208636	Andersen, 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed****	Baseline	Baseline IQR*	Final **	Final IQR*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
18208636	Andersen, 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/L	Girls - Placebo	crude	12	8 / 7	7.3	5.3, 23.6	5.75	4.88, 16.0	nd	nd	Ref
				Girls - Vit D3 10 ug/d			9 / 7	16.9	12.1, 21.1	47.0	28.7, 61.5			0.03
				Girls - Vit D3 20 ug/d			9 / 7	8.8	5.2, 17.1	29.3	28.5, 64.0			NS
18208636	Andersen, 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/L	Women - Placebo	crude	12	29 / 19	11.7	7.5, 19.4	10.1	8.38, 16.1	nd	nd	Ref
				Women - Vit D3 10 ug/d			30 / 21	9.95	6.9, 14.3	40.9	37.4, 47.7			<0.0001
				Women - Vit D3 20 ug/d			30 / 22	14.0	8.3, 17.5	46.2	38.6, 53.2			<0.0001
18208636	Andersen, 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/L	Men - Placebo	crude	12	27 / 20	20	15, 25.2	19.1	13.1, 22.6	nd	nd	Ref
				Men - Vit D3 10 ug/d			26 / 19	22.9	12.6, 28.2	39.4	31, 48.2			<0.0001
				Men - Vit D3 20 ug/d			31 / 26	18.9	13.6, 29.2	54.7	45.2, 65.1			<0.0001
18208636	Andersen, 2008	BMC – whole body	G	Girls - Placebo	crude	12	8 / 7	1666	1399, 1767	1923	1730, 2145	nd	nd	Ref
				Girls - Vit D3 10 ug/d			9 / 7	1308	1104, 1726	1595	1302, 1953			NS
				Girls - Vit D3 20 ug/d			9 / 7	1473	1209, 1887	1625	1380, 21440			NS
18208636	Andersen, 2008	BMD – lumbar spine	g/cm2	Women - Placebo	crude	12	29 / 18	0.99	0.91, 1.12	1.00	0.89, 1.16	nd	nd	Ref
				Women - Vit D3 10 ug/d			30 / 21	1.06	0.99, 1.06	1.06	1.01, 1.11			NS
				Women - Vit D3 20 ug/d			30 / 21	0.98	0.93, 1.05	0.99	0.93, 1.06			NS
18208636	Andersen, 2008	BMD – lumbar spine	g/cm2	Men - Placebo	crude	12	27 / 19	1.03	0.96, 1.14	1.06	0.90, 1.14	nd	nd	Ref
				Men - Vit D3 10 ug/d			25 / 19	1.03	0.94, 1.07	1.05	0.97, 1.11			NS
				Men - Vit D3 20 ug/d			31 / 26	0.92	0.89, 1.08	1.00	0.88, 1.12			NS

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****Baseline / follow-up n

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18208636	Andersen, 2008	RCT	nd	nd	NA	no	nd	yes	yes	no	yes	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Very small size for girls (therefore downgraded to C). Dropout rates were different between treatment groups. Compliance was lower for girls. Blinding was not described.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	RCT	• Newly diagnosed adenomatous polyps > 4mm • Age 30-75 y • Biopsy for cell proliferation after the intervention	Conditions predisposing to colorectal cancer other than sporadic adenomas Contraindication to calcium supplement Contraindication to biopsy Severe restriction of general health Drug use that may interfere with the study More specifically: • FAP • IBD • Chronic alcohol abuse • Intestinal malabsorption syndromes • Cancers other than non-melanoma skin cancer • Renal insufficiency • Gastrectomy, Ileostomy, colectomy • Vegetarian diet • Consumption of > 1 L milk/day > 600 g dairy products/day (milk-alkali syndrome) • Renal stones, hematuria • Sarcoidosism, hyperparathyroidism, hypercalcemia, abnormal serum calcium/Cr • Tx with cholestyramine, calcium and/or Vit D supplement, anticoagulation	nd	nd	Europe Against Cancer, Sandoz AG, Nurnberg	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	RCT	Heidelberg and surrounding areas, Germany	44[#]	30	62 (nd)	46-75	53[##]	nd	nd	nd (other than previously resected colorectal adenomatous polyps)	Total: 2638 (kcal/d) Fiber: 33 (g/d) Calcium: 928 (mg/d) Vit D: 4 (microg/d)

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.
48 patients included but 4 were excluded due to non-compliance during run-in phase before randomization. The other 14 exclusions after randomization were: 1 (death), 6 (non-compliance during the intervention phase), 3 (good compliance but poor absorption assessed by a fecal study), and 4 (did not undergo biopsy).
Distribution of sex (men) unbalanced (33% in placebo vs. 73% in calcium supplement)

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Vit D: 4 (microg/d)
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					Calcium: 928 (mg/d) by FFQ
			FFQ (baseline)	Federal Food Code of Germany	N					
			24HR (during supplementation)	Federal Food Code of Germany	n					

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Calcium	supplement	2000 mg/d	9 mon	A 1000mg tablet was take with breakfast and evening meal
		Placebo	-	-		

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Unlcear	PI	Change in PI% of all examined crypts before and after calcium treatment
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Unlcear	PI	Change in curve of PI% (function of percentile distance from the base of the crypt column) of all examined crypts before and after calcium treatment
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Unlcear	PI	Change in PI% of each of 5 compartments of equal size into which each crypt column was divided before and after calcium treatment
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Unlcear	Calcium balance	Total fecal calcium and urinary calcium

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"
PI: proliferation index

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
		Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes/no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SE	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta SE	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	PI (total)	% change	Calcium	9	15	13.5	1.5	11.4	1.2	nd	nd	0.7 (MW)##
				Placebo		15	13.7	0.9	10.7	1.1			
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	PI (highest compartment)#	% change	Calcium	9	15	28.2	2.8	23.1	2.4	nd	nd	0.4 (MW)##
				Placebo		15	27.3	2.6	21.5	1.8			
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	PI (lowest compartment)#	% change	Calcium	9	15	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.2	nd	nd	0.8 (MW)##
				Placebo		15	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.3			
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	PI (curve)	% change	Calcium	9	15	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	NS (unclear)
				Placebo		15	nd	nd	nd	nd			
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Total fecal calcium	% change	Calcium	6	15	1021	170	2828	316	+1807	357	<0.001##
				Placebo		15	914	141	723	78	-192	112	
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Water soluble fecal calcium	% change	Calcium	6	15	130	28	337	158	+206	37	<0.01##
				Placebo		15	114	23	100	16	-40	18	
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	Total urine calcium	% change	Calcium	6	15	100	24	109	12	+10	24	0.6##
				Placebo		15	68	9	74	11	+5	9	

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
As many as 5 compartments were separately evaluated without any biologically plausible explanations. Thus, only compartments with highest and lowest baseline PI were selected.
only final values were analyzed, not net difference.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author	Comments for Results

	Year	
		Two participants

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
8675093	Weisgerber 1996	RCT	Y	nd	Y	Y (38%)	Y	N	Y (as baseline estimate is similar between groups)	N	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	As high as 38% of originally randomized patients were excluded due to several reasons.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15531486	Armas 2004	RCT	men in good health; <16 oz milk qd; <10 h sun exposure per wk	granulomatous conditions; liver, kidney disease; DM; on anticonvulsants, barbiturates or steroids	2003	-	academic	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15531486	Armas 2004	RCT	Omaha, NE (41.2º)	30	30	33 (11.5)	20-61	100	nd	BMi 27.1	good health	4 subjects took multivitamin averaging 1 time per wk before enrollment

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15531486	Armas 2004	25(OH)D				RIA (IDS & DiaSorin)	n	nd	July	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
15531486	Armas 2004	vit D2	Sidmark Lab., NC	50000 IU	1 time only	one tablet
		vit D3	Tishcon Corp., NC	50000 IU	1 time	10 tablets of 5000 IU each
		no supplement, seasonal effect only				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			100%			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15531486	Armas 2004	primary	change in 25(OH)D	sum of 25(OH)D2 and 25(OH)D3
			(AUC) for 25 (OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15531486	Armas 2004	4 subjects took multivitamin averaging 1 time per wk, stopped 1 wk before and throughout the study; control 25 (OH)D level used to adjust for sunlight exposure in the active intervention subjects

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15531486	Armas 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	yes	sunlight exposure
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Delta**or Final	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
15531486	Armas 2004	change in 25(OH)D	nmol/L	vit D2	7d	10	0***		8***				
				vit D3	7d	10	0***		15***				
				vit D2	14d	10	0***		2***				
				vit D3	14d	10	0***		17***				
				vit D2	28d	10	0***		-5***				
				vit D3	28d	10	0***		12***				
		Area under the curve (AUC) for 25 (OH)D	nmol.d/L	vit D2	28d	10			150.5	58.5			<0.002
				vit D3	28d	10			511.8	80.9			

***adjusted for seasonal risk in 25(OH)D; all values estimated from Figure 2 in paper

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
15531486	Armas 2004	RCT	nd	nd	nd	y	n	n	n	n	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	unclear how the subjects were chosen; relatively small number of subjects; incomplete reporting of analysis; did not adjust for all potentially relevant variables

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
1330360	Ascherio 1992	Cohort study	Male health professionals, 40-75 y	Caloric intake <800 or >4200 kcal/d, incomplete FFQ, nonmelanoma cancer, CVD, diabetes, kidney failure, high cholesterol, digoxin, nitrates, antihypertensive medications	1986	Health Professionals Follow-up Study	NIH	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
1330360	Ascherio 1992	Cohort study	US, various	30,681	30,681	Median ~50	40-75	100	White close to 100%	nd	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
1330360	Ascherio 1992	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	Yes Ca correlation 0.53	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
1330360	Ascherio 1992	1°	Incident HTN	self-reported diagnosis (collected BP data, but apparently didn't use) Validated

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
1330360	Ascherio 1992	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	EtOH
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
1330360	Ascherio 1992	Incident HTN	Ca intake Categories		<500	85	1677	4 y	Adjusted	RR	1.17	0.91, 1.50	NS	0.53
					500-699	297	7504				0.91	0.77, 1.07	NS	
					700-899	333	8576				0.89	0.76, 1.04	NS	
					900-1099	195	5038				0.91	0.76, 1.09	NS	
					≥1100	338	7890				1.00	--	--	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups		Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
1330360	Ascherio 1992	Incident HTN	Ca intake Categories	Age≤50	<500	nd	14354	4 y	Adjusted	RR	1.52	nd	<.05	nd
					500-1099	nd					0.86	nd	NS	
					≥1100	nd					1.00	--	--	
				Age>50	<500	nd	16314				0.98	nd	NS	nd
					500-1099	nd					0.91	nd	NS	
					≥1100	nd					1.00	--	--	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
1330360	Ascherio 1992	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Yes	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Yes	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Yes	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Yes	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Probably	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Yes
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Yes	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	No	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Yes	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Yes
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Yes					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	No	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Yes	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	No

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Definition of HTN not clear (self reported, probably didn't use BP threshold, probably should have if not)

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8621198	Ascherio 1996	Cohort study	Female nurses, 30-55 y, completed FFQ	HTN, CVD, DM, nonmelanoma cancer, antihypertensive drug, on special diet, recent pregnancy prior to FFQ	1976	Nurses' Health Study	NIH	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8621198	Ascherio 1996	Cohort study	US, various	59,670	41,541	nd	30-55	0	White 98%	nd	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
8621198	Ascherio 1996	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	USDA + other sources	Yes correlation Ca 0.62	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8621198	Ascherio 1996	1°	Incident HTN	Self-reported; apparently did not use BP threshold Validated

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8621198	Ascherio 1996	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	EtOH
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Person years	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
8621198	Ascherio 1996	Hypertension	Ca intake category 1		<400	87	5,581	14 y	Adjusted	RR	1.0	--	--	0.76
			category 2		400-599	608	36,605				1.07	0.85, 1.35	NS	
			category 3		600-799	712	42,544				1.05	0.83, 1.31	NS	
			category 4		800-1000	407	24,240				1.03	0.82, 1.31	NS	
			category 5		≥1000	712	41,325				1.04	0.83, 1.31	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8621198	Ascherio 1996	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Yes	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Yes	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Yes	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Yes	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Yes	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Yes
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Yes	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Yes	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Probably	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Yes					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Yes	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Yes	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	No

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Probably incomplete definition of incident HTN (BP not used)

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9743511	Ascherio 1998	Cohort study	Male health professionals, 40-75 y	Calorie intake <800 or >4200/day, incomplete FFQ, CVD, DM	1986	Health Professionals Follow-up Study	Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9743511	Ascherio 1998	Cohort study	US, various	43,738	43,738 (implied)	nd	40-75	100	mostly White	nd	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
9743511	Ascherio 1998	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	Yes Correlation Ca 0.53	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9743511	Ascherio 1998	1°	Incident stroke	Fatal or nonfatal stroke by report, confirmed by medical records with standard definitions, excluding infection or neoplasia caused strokes
			specific stroke types	not extracted

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9743511	Ascherio 1998	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	HTN, hypercholesterolemia
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, EtOH, physical activity
		Other		Parental early MI, profession

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N (person years)	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
9743511	Ascherio 1998	Stroke	Calcium intake Quintile 1		500	75	~8748 (64,728)	8 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	0.10
			Quintile 2		700	69	~8748 (65,534)				0.95	0.68, 1.32	NS	
			Quintile 3		800	51	~8748 (64,596)				0.72	0.50, 1.03	NS	
			Quintile 4		1000	63	~8748 (64,425)				0.84	0.60, 1.19	NS	
			Quintile 5		1400	70	~8748 (64,112)				0.88	0.63, 1.23	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		
9743511	Ascherio 1998	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	implied	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Only median	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospe collecti data? (
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	No (in other papers though)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Probably	b) Anal was pla when c was fo (y/n)
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justific of sam size (in sample calcula (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15767334	Baron 2005	RCT-post hoc (Ca suppl) Cohort study (Vit D; Dietary Ca)	Men Details were referred to original RCT (See Baron NEJM 1999 paper)	nd	1988 (mentioned) – 1992 (inferred)	From Baron NEJM 1999 paper: Calcium Polyp Prevention Study	NCI and GlaxoSmithKlein	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15767334	Baron 2005	RCT-post hoc (Ca suppl) Cohort study (Vit D; Dietary Ca)	Cleveland Clinic Dartmouth–Hitchcock University of Iowa University of Minnesota University of North Carolina University of Southern California	672	672 542 w/ full PSA data (58% of 930)	61.8 (8.7)	nd	100	African American: 5.4%	nd	From Baron NEJM 1999 paper: Had >1 histologically confirmed large-bowel adenoma removed within 3 months of enrollment but subsequently examined and judged free of polyps. In good heath.	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15767334	Baron 2005	25(OH)D, $1,25(OH)_2D$				Competitive protein-binding assay (Quest Diagnostics).	Interbatch Pearson r for 25(OH)D = 0.95 Interbatch Pearson r for $1,25(OH)_2D$ = 0.58	nd	Nd	nd
15767334	Baron 2005	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (Block, 1986)	nd (need to refer to NEJM 1999 paper)	no	nd	nd			910 mg

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
15767334	Baron 2005	Ca	nd	CaCO3 3g (= elemental Ca 1200 mg)	Mean 44 mo (Compliance >/= 50%: 38%)	nd
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			Nd			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15767334	Baron 2005	Secondary	Prostate cancer risk	Incident cases were sought through the periodic follow-up questionnaires. All reports of prostate cancer (by questionnaire or death certificate) were verified by review of hospital records.
15767334	Baron 2005	Secondary	Total serum PSA	Prostate-specific antigen measurements were determined using a solid-phase, two-site chemoluminescent immunometric assay (IMMULITE PSA, Diagnostic Products Co., Los Angeles, CA)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15767334	Baron 2005	PSA measurements only available among 544 men (81%)

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
		Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Log-calories	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Season of blood draw	For 25(OH)D analysis only
		Smoking and other life styles variables	no*	
		Other	Treatment (calcium supplement or placebo)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
15767334	Baron 2005	Prostate cancer risk	Calcium carbonate supplement	122.3	33	327	RR Ca/Placebo	0.83	0.52-1.32				
			Placebo	123.8	37	345							
15767334	Baron 2005	Prostate cancer risk	Calcium carbonate supplement	48	9	327	RR Ca/Placebo	0.56	0.25-1.29				
			Placebo	48	15	345							
15767334	Baron 2005	PSA>4 ng	Calcium carbonate supplement	48	14	279	RR Ca/Placebo	0.63	0.33-1.21				
			Placebo	48	21	263							
15767334	Baron 2005	PSA>6 ng	Calcium carbonate supplement	48	10	279	RR Ca/Placebo	0.73	0.32-1.63				
			Placebo	48	13	263							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
15767334	Baron 2005	PSA change	ng/mL	Calcium carbonate supplement	48	263	1.72	2.93	+0.28	0.19	-0.25	nd	0.34
				Placebo	48	279	1.88	2.52	+0.53	0.18			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases*	No. of Non-cases	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

15767334	Baron 2005	Prostate cancer risk	Baseline dietary calcium intake – tertile 1		<675.2	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0 (Ref)		nd	0.51
			Baseline dietary calcium intake – tertile 2		675.2-990.8	nd	nd			1.48	0.81-2.70		
			Baseline dietary calcium intake – tertile 3		>990.8	nd	nd			1.20	0.64-2.23		
15767334	Baron 2005	Prostate cancer risk	Baseline 25(OH)D – tertile 1		<25.2 ng/mL	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0 (Ref)		nd	0.70
			Baseline 25(OH)D – tertile 2		25.2-34 ng/mL	nd	nd			1.22	0.66-2.26		
			Baseline 25(OH)D – tertile 3		>34.0 ng/mL	nd	nd			1.32	0.72-2.43		
15767334	Baron 2005	Prostate cancer risk	Baseline $1,25(OH)_2D$ – tertile 1		<36.4 pg/mL	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0 (Ref)		nd	0.92
			Baseline $1,25(OH)_2D$ – tertile 2		36.4-47.08 pg/mL	nd	nd			1.10	0.55-1.83		
			Baseline $1,25(OH)_2D$ – tertile 3		>47.08 pg/mL	nd	nd			1.02	0.57-1.82		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
15767334	Baron 2005	Male subgroup of RCT	nd	nd	nd	Y (42/672=6%)	nd	Y	N	Y (but only some)	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Inadequate adjustment for confounding; no data on number of cases per exposure category

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15767334	Baron 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods was used? (y/n)	n	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	This is a subgroup analysis from a RCT. Prostate cancer outcome was not planned outcome in the original RCT. No adjustment for other factors relevant to prostate cancer (like FH).

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Case-cohort study	43 to 69 years old female registered nurses in the US who participated in the Nurses' health cohort study and those who did not have cancer and had provided blood samples.	Those who had cancer before start of the study	Original cohort 1976 Study cohort 1989-1990	Nurses' health study	Gov	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Case-cohort study	U.S.	1459 735 with breast cancer 724 controls	1425 (701 breast cancer and 724 controls)	57 (7.0)	nd	0%	ND	BMI at age 18=21.1 BMI at blood collection=25	Post menopausal 68% Ever smokers 56% Family h/o breast cancer 17% Parity = 3	Plasma 25 (OH) D at 1989-1990 31.5 ng/mL Plasma 1,25 OH2D = 33.5 ng/mL

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Background exposure data
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	N	~3-10 y	ND

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Primary	Breast cancer risk	Risk of developing or newly diagnosed breast cancer
		Secondary	Breast cancer risk by age <60y and ≥60y	Risk of developing or newly diagnosed breast cancer stratified by age groups

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Blood were withdrawn in 3 batches and analyzed by 3 different methods; 25(OH)D has different cut-offs for these 3 batches

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Yes; plasma alpha-carotene level, intakes of alcohol Yes (matched by age, menopausal status) Yes BMI at age 18 Family of breast cancer; benign breast disease Use of post menopausal hormones ND Yes (intakes of alcohol) Parity; age at first birth	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level /	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases **	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 1	≤20 ng/mL(1st batch) ≤28 (2nd batch) ≤18 (3rd batch)	Nd	159	138	Adjusted (both analyses available)	RR	1.0			.04 (only data available for unadjusted analyses)
16103450	Bertone-Johnson	Breast cancer	25(OH)D quintile 2	21 to 28 29 to 34		149	129	Adjusted	RR	0.95	0.66-1.36	nd	

	2005	risk		19 to 24									
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 3	29 to 33 35 to 39 25 to 29	Nd	125	141	Adjusted	RR	0.74	0.51-1.06	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 4	34 to 39 40 to 47 30 to 36		144	152	Adjusted	RR	0.80	0.58-1.11	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 5	≥40 ng/mL ≥48 ng/mL ≥37 ng/mL		124	141	Adjusted	RR	0.73	0.49-1.07	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2 D quintile 1	≤28.5 ng/mL		138	127	Adjusted	RR	1.0		nd	0.39
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 2	28.6 to 31.5 ng/mL		111	121	Adjusted	RR	0.68	0.46-1.02	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 3	31.6 to 34.3		117	122	Adjusted	RR	0.73	0.50-1.07	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 4	34.4 to 38.1		123	122	Adjusted	RR	0.78	0.53-1.14	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 5	≥38.2		129	126	Adjusted	RR	0.76	0.52-1.11	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level /	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases **	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 1 Stratified by <60y age at blood collection	≤20 ng/mL(1st batch) ≤28 (2nd batch) ≤18 (3rd batch)	Nd	97	94	Adjusted (both analyses available)	RR	1.0			0.20
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 2 Stratified by <60y age at blood collection	21 to 28 29 to 34 19 to 24		84	86	Adjusted	RR	0.96	0.62-1.49	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 3 Stratified by age <60y at blood	29 to 33 35 to 39 25 to 29	Nd	77	87	Adjusted	RR	0.80	0.51-1.26	nd	

			collection										
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 4 Stratified by age <60y at blood collection	34 to 39 40 to 47 30 to 36		90	102	Adjusted	RR	0.85	0.55-1.32	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 5 Stratified by age <60y at blood collection	≥40 ng/mL ≥48 ng/mL ≥37 ng/mL		70	76	Adjusted	RR	0.92	0.57-1.48	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 1 Stratified by ≥60y age at blood collection	≤20 ng/mL(1st batch) ≤28 (2nd batch) ≤18 (3rd batch)		62	47	Adjusted	RR	1.0			0.03
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 2 Stratified by ≥60y age at blood collection	21 to 28 29 to 34 19 to 24		65	49	Adjusted	RR	1.07	0.60-1.92		
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 3 Stratified by age ≥60y at blood collection	29 to 33 35 to 39 25 to 29		48	57	Adjusted	RR	0.64	0.35-1.16		
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 4 Stratified by age ≥60y at blood collection	34 to 39 40 to 47 30 to 36		54	55	Adjusted	RR	0.68	0.38-1.24		
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)D quintile 5 Stratified by age ≥60y at blood collection	≥40 ng/mL ≥48 ng/mL ≥37 ng/mL		54	71	Adjusted	RR	0.57	0.31-1.04		
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2 D quintile 1 Stratified by ≥60y age at blood collection	≤28.5 ng/mL		60	49	Adjusted	RR	1.0		nd	0.23
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 2 Stratified by ≥60y age at blood collection	28.6 to 31.5 ng/mL		55	53	Adjusted	RR	0.76	0.42-1.38	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 3 Stratified by ≥60y age at	31.6 to 34.3		50	38	Adjusted	RR	1.0	0.53-1.88	nd	

			blood collection										
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 4 Stratified by ≥60y age at blood collection	34.4 to 38.1		39	47	Adjusted	RR	0.61	0.32-1.15	nd	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	Breast cancer risk	25(OH)2D quintile 5 Stratified by ≥60y age at blood collection	≥38.2		53	51	Adjusted	RR	0.72	0.40-1.32	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16103450	Bertone-Johnson 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	na	a) Method reported? (y/n)	na	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	na	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	na	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	na	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	na					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	na

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	**B**
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	**3 different cut-off thresholds for vitamin D levels. Some of those with cancers were not analyzed, no explanation provided**

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	RCT	Age ≥65 years, chronically impaired mobility, stable general condition, and no known present disease (except osteoporosis) or medication (vitamin D supplements, glucocorticoids, antiepileptics, etc.) affecting calcium or bone metabolism.	Markedly elevated creatinine levels (>125 umol/l), hypercalcemia (ionized calcium >1.32 mmol/l), hypothyroidism (thyrotopin >5.3 mU/l) or hyperthyroidism (thyrotropin<0.2 mU/L)	September to December 2005	nd	A special governmental subsidy	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	RCT	Helsinki, Finland 60° 10' North	218	218	84.5	65-104.3	18.4	nd	nd	All required assistance of >2 persons in almost all activities of daily living. Mean GFR = 64.3, ranged from 17 to 163. 67% had dementia; 43% had cerebrovascular disease; 14% had hip fracture	Frail and chronically bedridden

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	25(OH)D				HPLC	Within assay CV=5.6% at 21.6 nmol/l (n=14); 3.7% at 138 nmol/l (n=15). The total CV=7.3% at 16.4 nmol/l (n=12) 5.7% at 167 nmol/l (n=15)	nd	nd	23 (ranged 9-60) nmol/l
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	no	nd				500 mg/day

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	Cholecalciferol 400 IU/day	Cholecalciferol (Vigantol, Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany 20,000 IU in Migliol oil). 26 drops=~0.84 mL oil was diluted 3-fold with Migliol oil	Vitamin D 400 IU/day (group II)	6 months	Nd
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	Cholecalciferol 1200 IU/day	Cholecalciferol (Vigantol, Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany 20,000 IU in Migliol oil)	Vitamin D 1200 IU/day (group III)	6 months	nd
		Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			Before the start of intervention, the use of dairy products was roughly evaluated to be insufficient among 40 patients (18%), who received a daily calcium carbonate substitution of 500 mg during the intervention.			
Compliance/Adherence:			The oil was swallowed entirely in the presence of the nurse and given with a small amount of food or drink.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	Primary	25(OH)D level	Changes from baseline to 6-month after vitamin D supplementation
		secondary	mortality	All cause

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Event*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	All cause mortality	Placebo	0		9	68	Crude	nd			0.262	
			Cholecalciferol	400 IU/day		17	77						
			Cholecalciferol	1200 IU/day		10	73						

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/l	Placebo	Crude	6	59			+1.9	10.2			<0.0001
				Cholecalciferol 400 IU/d			60			+26.5	11.8			
				Cholecalciferol 1200 IU/d			63			+49.1	19.5			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	Most common causes of death in each group were pneumonia, Alzheimer's disease and vascular dementia.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17965037	Bjorkman 2008	RCT - Parallel	nd	yes	NA	yes	nd	yes	yes	no	yes	A/B

Adverse Event(s): **	Nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	B for mortality outcome due to underpowered study and secondary outcome; A for changes in 25(OH)D outcome

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18689559	Blum 2008	2º/subgroup analysis of an RCT(?)	healthy ≥65 y; subgroup from a larger trial: those who did not travel to a latitude ≤35º N 3 mo prior to initial study visit and 3 mo prior to visit at year one.	conditions/medications related to bone; BMD >2SD below the reference mean; dietary Ca >1500 mg/d	nd	nd	NIH	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18689559	Blum 2008	2º/subgroup analysis of an RCT(?)	Boston, US, 42º N	389 (original trial)	257 (for this study)	70 (4.9)	65-86	47	97% white	45% BMI 25-30	healthy	Mean Vit D 189 IU/d; Ca 721 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18689559	Blum 2008	25(OH)D				CPBA	n	n	subjects grouped by season of enrollment	Mean Vit D 189 IU/d
		Dietary calcium intake								Ca 721 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18689559	Blum 2008	vit D + Ca	nd	vit D3 700 IU + Ca 500 mg/d	3 y	nd
		Placebo		Placebo	3 y	nd
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:		nd				

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18689559	Blum 2008	Primary	25(OH)D at 1 y	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18689559	Blum 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age, sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	season of visit
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta **	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
18689559	Blum 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/L	vit D + Ca	1 y	132	74.7	33.8	+48.5	35.3	39.2		<0.01
				placebo	1 y	125	71.2	29.8	+9.3	21.5			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18689559	Blum 2008	subgroup analysis of an RCT	nd	nd	NA	nd	nd	n	y	y	n	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Unclear if there were subjects who met the inclusion criteria but were not selected in this study

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17535985	Bodnar 2007	Nested case-control study	nulliparity; no preexisting medical conditions; bank serum <22 wk gestation		1997-2001	Pregnancy Exposures & Preeclampsia Prevention Study	NIH	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17535985	Bodnar 2007	Case-cohort study	Pittsburgh, PA	1198 in the eligible cohort; 55 cases; 220 controls (not-matched)	49 cases; 216 controls	24 (est.)	20-29 (est.)	0	78% white (in cases); 68% white (in control)	prepregnancy BMI ≥25 = 58% of cases; 41% of controls	no preexisting medical conditions	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17535985	Bodnar 2007	25(OH)D				ELISA	y; interassay CV 10.3%	5-9 years	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17535985	Bodnar 2007	primary	preeclampsia	gestational HTN & proteinuria and return of all abnormalities by 12 wk postpartum

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17535985	Bodnar 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	race, education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	prepregnancy BMI
		Medical conditions		sample gestational age
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	season
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
17535985	Bodnar 2007	Cases:	30 wk (est.)	adj	49	45.4	38.6-53.4			0.01
		Control:	30 wk (est.)		216	53.1	47.4-59.9			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17535985	Bodnar 2007		early pregnancy 25(OH)-D <37.5 nmol/L was associated with an increased risk of preeclampsia (adj OR 5.0, 95%CI 1.7-14.1), independent of race, season, sample gestational age, prepregnancy BMI and education.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17535985	Bodnar 2007	used specialized methods to control for unmeasured confounding (like calcium intake); ELISA could only detect 5-300 nmol/L of 25 (OH)D, sample measures outside of this range were excluded (3 samples).

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17535985	Bodnar 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	n	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	did not adjust for some potential confounders

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18198394	Bolland 2008	RCT	Postmenopausal >5 yr, age ≥55 y, life expectancy >5 y, LS density within normal limits	Osteoporosis treatment, Ca supplementation, major organ disease, 25(OD)D<25 nmol/L	~2000	Same as Reid 2005	Govt (suppl supplied by industry)	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18198394	Bolland 2008	RCT	Auckland, New Zealand 36°	1471	1471	74 (~4.2)	≥55 y	0	nd	BMI 26.4	healthy	25(OD)D≥25 nmol/L

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
18198394	Bolland 2008	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	No		nd	Dietary calcium 857 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18198394	Bolland 2008	Ca supplement	Calcium citrate (Citracal)	1 g (elemental)	5 years	2 x 200 mg before breakfast; 3 x 200 mg evening
		Identical placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Calcium: 396 (54%) alive, continuing followup, continuing intervention at 5 years. Overall compliance 55% Placebo: 443 (60%) alive, continuing followup, continuing intervention at 5 years. Overall compliance 58%			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18198394	Bolland 2008	1° (this analysis; 2° for original RCT)	Death	Family, hospital, and national records
		1° (this analysis; 2° for original RCT)	Sudden death	Standard criteria adjudicated by blinded cardiologist "Adjudicated" analysis used
		1° (this analysis; 2° for original RCT)	MI	Standard criteria adjudicated by blinded cardiologist "Adjudicated" analysis used
		1° (this analysis; 2° for original RCT)	Stroke	Standard criteria adjudicated by blinded neurologist "Adjudicated" analysis used
		1° (this analysis; 2° for original RCT)	CVD Composite (MI, Stroke, Sudden death)	composite "Adjudicated" analysis used

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

Did not data extract angina TIA or composite outcomes including these outcomes (reported by participants or family member; adjudicated data not reported by authors),

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18198394	Bolland 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	But all ≥55 yo
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	Yes	h/o outcomes
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	No	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
18198394	Bolland 2008	MI	Calcium	5 yr	31	732	RR Ca/placebo	1.49	0.86, 2.57	NS			
			Placebo	5 yr	21	739							
		MI	Calcium	5 yr	11.1	nd	Ratio of rates per 1000 person years	1.67	0.98, 2.87	.06			
			Placebo	5 yr	6.6	nd							
		Stroke	Calcium	5 yr	34	732	RR Ca/placebo	1.37	0.83, 2.28	NS			
			Placebo	5 yr	25	739							
		Stroke	Calcium	5 yr	11.4	nd	Ratio of rates per 1000 person years	1.45	0.88, 2.49	NS			
			Placebo	5 yr	7.8	nd							
		Sudden death	Calcium	5 yr	3	732	RR Ca/placebo	0.51	0.13, 2.01	NS			
			Placebo	5 yr	6	739							
		Sudden death	Calcium	5 yr	0.9	nd	Ratio of rates per 1000 person years	0.51	0.10, 2.04	NS			
			Placebo	5 yr	1.8	nd							
		Composite	Calcium	5 yr	60	732	RR Ca/placebo	1.21	0.84, 29.2	NS			
			Placebo	5 yr	50	739							
		Composite	Calcium	5 yr	23.3	nd	Ratio of rates per 1000 person years	1.43	1.01, 2.04	.04			
			Placebo	5 yr	16.3	nd							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

NOTE: RR analysis: No. of patients with events (not # of events) used.

NOTE: Ratio of rates analysis: rates per 1000 patient years extracted.

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g.,	Mean Vit D	Mean Ca	No. of Cases	No. of Non-	Crude or Adjusted	Outcome Metric (e.g.	Outcome effect size	CI / SE /	P between groups***	P for trend****

			Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	level / dose	level / dose	(Event)*	cases / Total N**	analysis?	OR, RR, HR, %)		SD **		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
18198394	Bolland 2008	**RR analysis: No. of patients with events (not # of events) used. Ratio of rates analysis: rates per 1000 patient years extracted.**

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18198394	Bolland 2008	RCT	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Mostly	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Since these are 2° outcomes (from original study perspective), fully adjusted analyses should have been performed. In addition, multiple methods for assessing outcomes (Tables 2, 3, 4) is confusing, making it unclear which outcome is most meaningful. Their approach or logic was not adequately described in Methods.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	RCT	Healthy women ≥60 years of age were recruited to provide about equal numbers in the age groups 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, and ≥75 years	Clinical osteoporosis or chronic disease (e.g., DM, CVD, cancer, fat malabsorption syndromes), routine medication that interferes with vit K, vit D or bone metabolism (notably warfarin and steroids), and consumption of nutrient supplements that provided >30 ug vit K, 10 ug (400 IU) vit D, or 500 mg calcium daily.	nd	nd	UK Food Standards Agency	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	RCT	UK	123	106	Vit D+Ca: 69.4 (6.4) Placebo: 67.8 (6.0)	≥60	0	nd	Mean BMI: 26	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	25(OH)D				Radioimmunoassay (RIA kit, DiaSorin, Wokingham, UK)	no	nd	Winter (baseline measure only); nd for follow-up measures	Vit D+Ca: 25.0 ug/L Placebo: 22.8 ug/L
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ, designed for studies of osteoporosis in Scottish women	nd	nd	Nd				Vit D+Ca: 1078 mg/day Placebo: 1068 mg/day

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	100 mg of elemental calcium + 10 ug of vitamin D_3	A chewable tablet form contains calcium carbonate and vitamin vitamin D_3 (provided by Hoffmann-La Roche, Basel, Switzerland)	100 mg of elemental calcium + 10 ug of vitamin D_3	2 years	2 tablets per day with breakfast
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Good supplement adherence based on pill count (median, 99; IQE 97.3-99.8%). It should be noted that noncompliant women were excluded.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	nd	Femoral neck BMD	DEXA of the femur was carried out every 6 months using the same Lunar machine.
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	nd	25(OH)D	Measured at baseline and yearly intervals. Assay performance was monitored against external quality assurance.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	Original RCT had 4 groups: placebo, vit K supplement, vit D+Ca supplement, and vit K+vit D+Ca supplement. For the purpose of our review, only placebo and vitD+Ca groups were extracted.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	total energy intake, calcium and other nutrient intakes, serum markers of vitamin D and vitamin K status	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes* (physical activity)	
		Other	bone area; markers of bone turnovers	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta CI *	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	Femoral neck BMD	mg/cm^2	Vit D+Ca	24	50	Nd	Nd	+1.9	-6.5, 10.3	+1.2	nd	NS
				Placebo	24	56	nd	nd	+0.7	-10.2, 11.6			
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	25(OH)D	ug/L	Vit D+Ca	24	50	25.0	6.2	Final: 29.8	SD: 6.0	nd	nd	<0.001
				Placebo	24	56	22.8	6.1	19.5	5.3			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	Data presented in the result table were unadjusted but the author stated that the adjusted results were similar to unadjusted results. For 25(OH)D outcome, it is unclear if seasonal variation was controlled for (by collecting blood samples during the same season at follow up)

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17243866	Bolton-Smith 2007	RCT-Parallel	yes	yes	NA	yes	nd	no	yes	yes	yes	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Reasons for withdrawal included noncompliance or other violations of the inclusion criteria, low BMD necessitating further medical intervention, and dislike the tablets. Dropout rate=14%

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	RCT	BMI > 27, Ca intakes < 800 mg/d	BMI < 27, high intake of Ca	nd	nd	Nestec SA, Switzerland (subsidiary of Nestle SA)	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SEM) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc) (SEM)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	RCT	Lausanne, Switzerland (latitude = 46 N)	10	10	22.2 (1.2)	nd	30%	nd	Weight(kg) = 78.1 (9.1) Height(m) = 1.65 (0.06) BMI(kg/m^2) = 28.5 (1.4)	Overweight/obese	Ca intakes < 800 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	25(OH)D and/or 1,25$(OH)_2$D				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	Ca balance	n		nd	Ca intake mg/d (SEM) = 586 (137)

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	Ca	Dairy Ca supplement – Arla Foods, Viby, Denmark. Natural milk mineral concentrate: 6% protein, 13% lactose, 74% ash, 6% moisture, and 24% Ca, present almost entirely as calcium phosphate.	800 mg/d	5 wks	Sachets were taken 2 times a day
		placebo	Made of maltodextrin and filler. Made by Roquette, Lestrem, France	-	5 wks	Sachets were taken 2 times a day
Co-intervention(s) *:			Subjects consumed their habitual low-Ca diet			
Compliance/Adherence:			Authors state that compliance was assessed by counting the number of returned empty sachets. No specifics regarding compliance were provided.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	2°	weight	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	Study was a RCT crossover design in which 5 subjects received placebo and 5 received Ca for 5 wks. This was followed by a 10-week washout period before the 2nd intervention period. Total study length was therefore 20 weeks. After 4 weeks of each intervention period, either 500 mg lactose or 300 mg slow-release caffeine was administered. After the 5th week, the lactose or caffeine, whichever was not administered a week prior, was administered. This was done to explore possible synergistic effects between Ca and caffeine as far as energy expenditure and lipid oxidation.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	no	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions	no	
		Medication	no	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	no	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other	no	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SEM*	Final**	Final SEM*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	weight	kg	Ca	1.25	10	78.1	9.1	80.0	3.2	+0.4		NS
				placebo	1.25	10	78.1	9.1	79.6	3.0			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18842771	Bortolotti 2008	RCT-crossover	nd/NA	nd	Y	Y	nd	nd	Y	NA	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Weight loss was not 1° outcome and lactose/caffeine was administered during the study as an acute intervention. No information on allocation concealment or blinded outcome assessment.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8333412	Bostick 1993	Cohort study	• Women aged 55-69 • Resided in Iowa verified by driver's license • Responded to the baseline questionnaire (n=41837)	•Hx of cancer (excl. skin cancer) (n=3519) •>30 items on the FFQ blank (n=2299) •Implausibly high (>5000) or low (<600) energy intake (kcal/d) (n=291)	1986	Iowa Women's Health Study	NCI	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8333412	Bostick 1993	Cohort study	Iowa, US (40°23′ - 40°30′ N)	41837	35216	61.5 (nd)	nd	0%	nd	BMI=27.0 kg/m2 Height=64.1 inches Waist/hip=0.837	nd	Total energy intake=1801.5 kcal/d Total Ca=1118.3 mg/d Total Vit D=411.7 IU/d Dietary fiber=20.4 g/d Total fat=68.7 g/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
8333412	Bostick 1993	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (Harvard FFQ by Willet)	USDA Nutrient Database	Yes: reported in Munger et al. AJEpi 1992	NA	NA		nd	Total Ca=1118.3 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8333412	Bostick 1993	Not explicitly described but the only outcome reported	Colon cancer	State Health registry of Iowa/SEER

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
rectal cancer cases were excluded.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8333412	Bostick 1993	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (total energy intake, total Vit E intake, low fat meat variable)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age, parity)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (height)	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

Simultaneous inclusion of vit D, (calcium,) milk product in the models yielded no material difference

considered but omitted because of not reaching <0.1 statistically significant level: education, BMI, Waist/hip, physical activity, any type of Vit/mineral supplement, fat, fiber, vegetables, fruits, red meat, alcohol, and phosphorus.

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Ca dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Total person-year**	Mean follow up, months	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
8333412	Bostick 1993	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1		<629	54	33473	nd	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.01
			Q2		629-896	44	33477	nd			0.82	0.55-1.22	Nd	
			Q3		897-1188	42	33465	nd			0.78	0.52-1.16	Nd	

			Q4		1189-1547	44	33565	nd			0.82	0.55-1.23	nd	
			Q5		1548-	28	33466	nd			0.52	0.33-0.82	nd	
8333412	Bostick 1993	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1		<629	54	33473	nd	Adj (full multivariate model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.22
			Q2		629-896	44	33477	nd			0.89	0.59-1.33	Nd	
			Q3		897-1188	42	33465	nd			0.88	0.58-1.33	Nd	
			Q4		1189-1547	44	33565	nd			0.97	0.63-1.50	nd	
			Q5		1548-	28	33466	nd			0.68	0.41-1.11	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
full multivariate model listed in the confounders table.
data on dietary calcium, supplemental calcium, total Vit D, dietary Vit D, supplemental Vit D, total dairy intake, and fat containing dairy intake were also presented but not extracted.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								

		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
8333412	Bostick 1993	Follow up: over 5 years

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8333412	Bostick 1993	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N/nd	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	n	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n/nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y <1%	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	nd	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Study designed for cancer incidence and mortality; not specifically for colon cancer; power calculation for colon cancer not stated; blinding for assessors not reported; confirmation of cancer cases by histology not reported; post-hoc analysis using an existing database.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9921960	Bostick 1999	Cohort study	Women 55-69 y, post-menstrual	Ischemic heart disease, incomplete FFQ, implausible energy intake (<600 or >5000 kcal/d)	1986	Iowa Women's Health Study	NCI	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9921960	Bostick 1999	Cohort study	Iowa ~42°	34,486	34,486	61	55-69	0	White ~100%	~27	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
9921960	Bostick 1999	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	Yes Reliability coefficients 0.57-0.82 Validity coefficients 0.67 & 0.51	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9921960	Bostick 1999	1°	Ischemic heart disease mortality	Health registry, death certificates, ICD-9 codes. Not validated

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9921960	Bostick 1999	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total energy intake, dietary vitamin E, saturated fat intake (total Ca intake for supplemental Vit D analysis)
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI, waist:hip ratio
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM
		Medication	Yes	Estrogen
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, EtOH, physical activity
		Other	Yes	Education, marital status

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Vit D dose	Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	N (person years)	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
9921960	Bostick 1999	IHD death	Total Ca intake Quartile 1		<696	127	~8621.5 (74,224)	8 y	Adjusted	RR	1.00	--	--	.09
			Quartile 2		696-1051	84	~8621.5 (74,497)				0.62	0.45, 0.85	<.05	
			Quartile 3		1052-1425	94	~8621.5 (74,588)				0.75	0.55, 1.03	>.05	
			Quartile 4		>1425	82	~8621.5 (74,570)				0.67	0.47, 0.94	<.05	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.36
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9921960	Bostick 1999	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	FFQ	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No ascertainment of outcome “other studies have indicated that the validity of the IHD on death certificates is relatively high.”

***Check “NA” and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
329893	Braun 1995	Case-cohort study	Cohort: a population-based registry of the residents in Washington county (Maryland) in 1974 with blood sample donation and filling in a short questionnaire Cases: histologically confirmed colon cancer diagnosed between 1984 and 1991 identified through the cancer registry in the county Controls: 2 matching participants without colon cancer (by the date of diagnosis of the case) per case from the same cohort		1974	Washington County Cohort	nd	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
329893	Braun 1995	Case-cohort study	Washington, Maryland, USA 39 N	Cohort: 20,305 Cases: 61 Controls: 122	Cases: 61 Controls: 122	55 (median)	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
329893	Braun 1995	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA (25-D) Radioreceptor assay (1,25-D)	Coefficients of variation: Interset, 14.1% (25-D) and 8.7% (1,25-D) Intraset, 8.9% (25-D) and 12.4% (1,25-D)	Nd (~18 y inferred, mean 14 y between sampling and diagnosis reported)	(Late) August though November	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd			nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
329893	Braun 1995	nd	Colon cancer	Washington county cancer registry with histological confirmation (unclear when)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
329893	Braun 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	matching: age, race, sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	matching: date of blood sampling
		Smoking and other life styles variables	No	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis
No adjusted analysis reported except for matching.

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean follow-up time	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
329893	Braun 1995	Colon cancer	Q1	<17.2	10-17 y (cases)	61	122	crude	OR	1 (ref)	-	nd	0.57
			Q2	17.2-20.6						0.3	0.1-1.0		
			Q3	20.7-24.6						0.5	0.2-1.5		
			Q4	24.7-30.1						0.7	0.2-2.0		
			Q5	>30.1						0.4	0.1-1.4		

329893	Braun 1995	Colon cancer [25(OH)D (ng/ml)]	Q1	<26.6	10-17 y (cases)	61	122	crude	OR	1 (ref)	-	nd	0.88
			Q2	26.6-32.5						1.6	0.6-4.4		
			Q3	32.6-36.0						1.1	0.4-3.3		
			Q4	36.1-41.3						1.1	0.4-3.3		
			Q5	>41.3						1.1	0.4-3.2		
329893	Braun 1995	Colon cancer [1,25(OH)D (pg/ml)]	Q1	<17.2	10-17 y (cases)	61	122	crude	OR	1 (ref)	-	nd	0.57
			Q2	17.2-20.6						0.3	0.1-1.0		
			Q3	20.7-24.6						0.5	0.2-1.5		
			Q4	24.7-30.1						0.7	0.2-2.0		
			Q5	>30.1						0.4	0.1-1.4		
329893	Braun 1995	Colon cancer [25(OH)D (ng/ml)]	Q1	<26.6	10-17 y (cases)	61	122	crude	OR	1 (ref)	-	nd	0.88
			Q2	26.6-						1.6	0.6-4.5		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
329893	Braun 1995	Cases:	~18-20 y	crude	61	23.6	9.2	nd	nd	nd
	[25(OH)D]	Control:			122	34.7	7.9			
329893	Braun 1995	Cases:	~18-20 y	crude	61	23.2	7.8	nd	nd	nd
	[1,25(OH)D]	Control:			122	34.6	10.0			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
329893	Braun 1995	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	NA	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No clear inclusion (and selection) process of participants, probably post-hoc analysis of already available database. No reports on verification of cancer diagnosis or adjustments of family history. How often participants were excluded due to unavailability of blood samples is also unclear.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
7612803	Braun 1995	Case-cohort study	Resident of Washington County, MD. Serum sample stored.	None (implied)	1974	(Washington County)	nd Corresponding/lead author is NCI employee	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
7612803	Braun 1995	Case-cohort study	Washington County, MD 39.7° (39° 42')	183 (61 cases, 122 controls)	183	Mode 55-64 (51%)	<45 – 75+	100%	White 100%	nd	No prostate cancer at baseline (pre-1980)	<5% with baseline 25(OH)D <15 ng/mL

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
7612803	Braun 1995	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25D: RIA (^{125}I) (Hollis 1993) 1,25D: Radioreceptor assay (Hollis 1986)	25D: CV 11.1% interset; 22.0% intraset 1,25D: CV 14.3% interset; 21.3% intraset	~18-20 yr	(Late) August through November	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
7612803	Braun 1995	Primary (in post hoc analysis, maybe not for primary analysis)	Prostate cancer	Diagnosed 1980-1992, 6-18 y after blood sample Cancer registry
			Prostate cancer severity of disease	Method of diagnosis: Less severe: incidental finding on TURP More severe: other cases

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
7612803	Braun 1995	Blood samples drawn only from August-November

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
7612803	Braun 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	None	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (matched & subgroup analysis) (all male, White)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Month commented on	Unclear if used in any analysis
		Smoking and other life styles variables	No	
		Other		"Severity of disease"

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases (controls)**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
7612803	Braun 1995	Prostate cancer [25(OH)D]	Q1	<24.1	nd	7	24	crude	OR	1.0 (ref)	-	nd	0.60
			Q2	24.1-29.5		17	25			2.3	0.7-7.8		
			Q3	29.6-35.4		16	24			2.3	0.7-7.7		
			Q4	35.5-41.3		4	25			0.6	0.1-2.5		
			Q5	>41.3		17	24			2.4	0.8-8.2		

7612803	Braun 1995	Prostate caner [25(OH)D]	Q1	<24.1	nd	7	24	crude	OR	1.0 (ref)	-	nd	NS
			Q2	>24.1		54	98			1.9	0.7-5.5		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
7612803	Braun 1995	Cases:	18 y	Crude	61	34.3	9.9			NS
		Control:			122	33.2	10.8			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
7612803	Braun 1995	Prostate cancer, adjusted for “method of diagnosis” and age above or below median	“Did not differ significantly between cases and controls”

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
7612803	Braun 1995	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	No (1°)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y†	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	+/-					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Small, underpowered. 1° analysis was not controlled for relevant factors. Other analysis poorly described. Limited applicability for prostate cancer assessment (no blacks).

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

† Cases and controls chosen prior to Vit D level assessment

6793058; 6989438 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
6793058 6989438	Maxwell 1981; Brooke 1980	RCT	pregnant Asians		nd		government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
6793058	Maxwell 1981	RCT	London, UK	126	126	nd	nd	0	Asians	weight at 3rd trimester: 63.7 Kg	nd	25(OH)D level at 28-32 wk: 20.1 nmol/L; ~25% vegetarians

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
6793058	Maxwell 1981	25(OH)D				nd	nd		nd	25(OH)D level at 28-32 wk: 20.1 nmol/L
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
6793058	Maxwell 1981	calciferol		1000 IU/d	3rd trimester only	
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
6793058	Maxwell 1981	primary	weight gain 3rd trimester	
		secondary	birth weight	
6989438	Brooke 1980		25(OH)D in cord blood & maternal blood at term	
			infant symptomatic hypocalcemia	<1.8 mmol/L

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
6793058	Maxwell 1981	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
6793058	Maxwell 1981	infants with birth weight <2500 g	calciferol		7	59				NS			
			control		15	67							
6989438	Brooke 1980	infant with symptomatic hypocalcemia	calciferol		0	59		chi2=4.6		<0.01			
			control		5	67							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final	Final SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
6793058	Maxwell 1981	maternal weight gain 3rd trimester	g/d	calciferol		59			63.3	20.7			<0.001
				control		67			46.4	29.5			
6793058	Maxwell 1981	infant birth weight	g	calciferol		59			3157	469			NS
				control		67			3034	524			
6989438	Brooke 1980	infant birth length	cm	calciferol		59			49.7	0.3			NS
				control		67			49.5	0.4			
	Brooke 1980	maternal term 25 (OH)D level	nmol/L	calciferol		59	20.2		168	12.5			nd
				control		67	20.0		16.2	2.7			
	Brooke 1980	cord 25 (OH)D level	nmol/L	calciferol		59			137.9	10.8			nd
				control		67			10.2	2.0			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
6793058	Maxwell 1981	Unclear how weight gain differences between groups were determined not due to edema.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
6793058; 6989438	Maxwell 1981; Brooke 1980	RCT	nd	nd	NA	y	y	y	n	n	n	B

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	study methodology not completely reported; small sample size

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18755319	Brunner 2008	RCT-post hoc**	Postmenopausal women (50 to 79 yrs old)	nd	1993-1998	WHI	NIH, National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18755319	Brunner 2008	RCT-post hoc	US 40 centers	36,282 joined at the initial stage of the Ca/vitD trial, 33,067 joined at the first annual visit	2928 had objective physical function measures	nd	50-79 yr	0	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18755319	Brunner 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
18755319	Brunner 2008	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18755319	Brunner 2008	Ca+VitD	500mg calcium carbonate + 200IU vitD3 (by Glaxo SmithKline, Bensalem, PA)	1000mg calcium carbonate + 400IU vitD3	Average 7.1 yrs	two times a day
		Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			Hormone therapy, dietary modification			
Compliance/Adherence:			No information on adherence rate (however, adherence was assessed at least annually from the weight of remaining pills along with a structured interview.)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18755319	Brunner 2008	Secondary	Grip strength	Two measurements were made in the dominant hand with staff coaching for maximal performance (Jamar hand dynamometer; Lafayette Instruments)
18755319	Brunner 2008	Secondary	Chair stands	Conducted if the subject was able to stand at least once without using hands/arms from a straight-backed, nonpadded, flat-seated, armless chair. Two 15-second trials of repeated chair stands were performed with arms folded across the chest with a 1- to 2-minute rest in between trials. Counted as the participant arose, and counts for both trials recorded.
18755319	Brunner 2008	Secondary	Timed walk	The timed walk utilized a course marked on the floor with end lines 6m apart and “X” marked just beyond each end line. Participants used ambulatory aids as needed, walking at usual speed to one X with a second trial performed to the other X. The result was recorded as number of seconds from start to when a foot completely crossed the end line.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18755319	Brunner 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total Ca intake <600mg**
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	Age (continuous), age 70 years or older**, Asian or white ethnicity**
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	Weight <127 lb**
		Medical conditions		History of two or more falls in past year; relative who broke bone before age 40; history of any fracture**
		Medication		Never used hormones**
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes*	Current smoker**
		Other		Treatment arm in the hormone therapy and dietary modification trials

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis
** Fracture risk score

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference SE*	P between
18755319	Brunner 2008	Grip strength (year 2)	Kg	CaD	24 months	1334			-1.20	5.63	0.06	0.21	0.790
				Placebo	24 months	1265			-1.27	5.30			
18755319	Brunner 2008	Grip strength (year 5)	Kg	CaD	60 months	1185	22.81	5.78	-2.49	5.81	0.15	0.24	0.524
				Placebo	60 months	1162	22.96	5.75	-2.64	5.69			
18755319	Brunner 2008	Chair stands (year 2)	Counts	CaD	24 months	1250			-0.09	1.55	0.03	0.06	0.623
				Placebo	24 months	1188			-0.12	1.60			
18755319	Brunner 2008	Chair stands (year 5)	Counts	CaD	60 months	1065	6.52	1.87	-0.38	1.81	0.04	0.08	0.603
				Placebo	60 months	1053	6.63	1.82	-0.43	1.81			
18755319	Brunner 2008	Timed walk (year 2)	seconds	CaD	24 months	1298			+0.11	7.08	-0.12	0.27	0.580
				Placebo	24 months	1238			+0.23	6.38			
18755319	Brunner 2008	Timed walk (year 5)	seconds	CaD	60 months	1160	6.5	5.51	+0.26	6.28	-0.54	0.26	0.030
				Placebo	60 months	1141	6.19	4.64	+0.81	6.43			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
18755319	Brunner 2008	Only those women who were at least 80% adherent to study pills were examined in a subgroup analysis (data not shown). No substantial differences in physical functioning related to treatment assignment were found.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18755319	Brunner 2008	RCT-Parallel	nd	nd	n	nd	nd	y	y	y	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	Nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Different number of participants who had objective physical function measures. Only small fraction of women had such data from WHI. No information on blinded outcome assessment. Referred to original design paper for RCT methodology.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17656420	Burleigh 2007	RCT	Patients were aged 65 years or over	Subjects with hypercalcemica, urolithiasis or renal dialysis therapy, patients who were terminal orbed-bound with a reduced Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), those already prescribed calcium and vitamin D supplements, and those who were deemed 'nil by mouth' at time of admission.	nd	nd	Nd	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17656420	Burleigh 2007	RCT	Scotland (55° 57' N)	205	199	83.0 (7.6)	nd	40%	nd	Under weight 40% Normal weight 50% Overweight 10%	Inpatient with high levels of comorbidity, mortality and polypharmacy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17656420	Burleigh 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Using the Nicholas Advantage Analyser (Nicholas Institute Diagnostics, San Juan Capitrano, California, USA)	n	nd	nd	25(OH)D 22.0 nmol/L
17656420	Burleigh 2007	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17656420	Burleigh 2007	VitD+Ca	cholecalciferol +calcium carbonate	800iu cholecalciferol +1200mg calcium carbonate	The intervention was continued until time of patient discharge or death. Median length of hospital inpatient stay=30days	Once daily
17656420	Burleigh 2007	Ca	calcium carbonate	1200mg calcium carbonate	Continued until time of patient discharge or death. Median length of hospital inpatient stay=30days	Once daily
Co-intervention(s) *:			nd			
Compliance/Adherence:			Control group=87%, Intervention group=89%, compliance method – a percentage (total study drug taken/total study drug prescribed, as recorded in drug prescription charts)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17656420	Burleigh 2007	primary	Fall	Defined as the patient unintentionally coming to rest on the ground, or other lower level, other than as a consequence of sustaining violence or an epileptic seizure, documented by ward nursing staff in an official accident
17656420	Burleigh 2007	primary	fracture	Any fracture incurred during the inpatient stay was verified in medical and nursing note

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17656420	Burleigh 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		No statistical analysis of baseline characteristics between control and intervention group.
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17656420	Burleigh 2007	Fall	VitD+Ca	Median 30 days (IQR 14.75–71.00)	36	100	RR VitD+Ca / Ca	0.82	0.59-1.16	0.263			
			Ca	Median 30 days (IQR 14.75–71.00)	45	103							
17656420	Burleigh 2007	Fracture	VitD+Ca	Median 30 days (IQR 14.75–71.00)	1	100	nd			NS			
			Ca	Median 30 days (IQR 14.75–71.00)	3	103							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17656420	Burleigh 2007	VitD levels	VitD levels(nmol/l) increased in the treatment group, but not in the control group, but this did not reach statistical significance (median change in vitD in control group; 0.00 vs. intervention group; 2.00, Mann-Whitney U test P=0.113)

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17656420	Burleigh 2007	RCT-parallel	y	y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	Two individuals developed hypercalcaemia.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No statistical analysis of baseline characteristics between control and intervention group, Intervention duration varied, Serum vit D analysis was performed in only 1 in 4 patients.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):									
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):									

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17502530	Caan 2007	RCT	Women 50-79 y, postmenopausal	none	1994-1999	WHI	Govt	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17502530	Caan 2007	RCT	US	36282	36282	nd	50-79	0	White 83% Black 9% Hispanic 4% AmInd 0.4% As/PacIs 2%	BMI <25 28% 25 to <30 35% 30 to <35 22% >35 14%	Healthy, post-menopausal	Total Ca intake <600 mg/d 20% 600 to <1200 41% ≥1200 39%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
17502530	Caan 2007	Dietary calcium intake	WHI adaptation of Block FFQ	(see other article)	Yes (not reported here)					See previous table Total Ca 1150 mg/d Total cholecalciferol 9 µg/day

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17502530	Caan 2007	Ca + Vit D	Ca carbonate Cholecalciferol	1000 mg 400 IU	7 years	500 mg/200 IU 2x/day
		Placebo			7 years	2x/day
Co-intervention(s) *:			Factorial design overlaid on HT vs placebo. Allowed to take calcium (up to 1000 mg/d) and cholecalciferol (up to 600 IU/d, then 1000 IU/d after 1999)			
Compliance/Adherence:			Proportion consuming ≥80% of study medications at year 1 60%; through year 7 56-63% annually. At least 66% took 50% or more through year 7.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17502530	Caan 2007	2° (1° for this article)	Weight	Kg

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17502530	Caan 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total Ca intake Total cholecalciferol intake Energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, race, education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI, waist circumference
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM
		Medication	Yes	hormone replacement
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, exercise
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
17502530	Caan 2007	Weight	Kg	Ca+D	7 yr	18129	76.0	16.9	nd		-0.13	(-0.21, -0.05)	0.001
				Placebo		18055	75.9	17.1	nd				

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI	P between
17502530	Caan 2007	Weight	Kg	Ca+D	7 yr	50-54 y 2592	nd		nd		-0.24	-0.45, -0.03	<0.05
				Placebo		2561	nd		nd				
						55-59 y 4134	nd		nd		-0.08	-0.24, +0.09	NS
						4135	nd		nd				
						60-69 y 8276	nd		nd		-0.15	-0.27, -0.03	<0.05
						8243	nd		nd				
						70-79 y 3174	nd		nd		-0.10	-0.27, +0.09	NS
						3167	nd		nd				
											Overall (interaction), **AGE**		NS
17502530	Caan 2007	Weight	Kg	Ca+D	7 yr	White 15047	nd		nd		-0.13	-0.22, -0.04	<0.05
				Placebo		15106	nd		nd				
						Black 1682	nd		nd		-0.32	-0.59, -0.06	<0.05
						1635	nd		nd				
						Hispanic 789	nd		nd		-0.08	-0.48, +0.32	NS
						718	nd		nd				
						Asian/PacIs 369	nd		nd		+0.19	-0.37, +0.75	NS
						353	nd		nd				
											Overall (interaction), **ETHNICITY**		NS
17502530	Caan 2007	Weight	Kg	Ca+D	7 yr	BMI<25 4974	nd		nd		-0.08	-0.23, +0.06	NS
				Placebo		5117	nd		nd				
						BMI 25-30 6409	nd		nd		-0.09	-0.22, +0.04	NS
						6327	nd		nd				
						BMI 30-35 4037	nd		nd		-0.23	-0.40, -0.06	<0.05
						3992	nd		nd				

						BMI ≥35 2621	nd		nd		-0.17	-0.38, +0.04	NS
						2539	nd		nd				
											Overall (interaction), **BMI**		0.04
17502530	Caan 2007	Weight	Kg	Ca+D	7 yr	Base Ca <1200/d 10819	nd		nd		-0.19	-0.29, -0.09	<0.05
				Placebo		10658	nd		nd				
						Base Ca ≥1200 7002	nd		nd		-0.05	-0.17, +0.08	NS
						7095	nd		nd				
											Overall (interaction), **BASE CA INTAKE**		0.09

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17502530	Caan 2007	RCT	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	B

Adverse Event(s): **	Women with intolerable GI symptoms were treated by reducing the number of times per day or days per week that study medication was taken w/o unblinding participant or study staff. No other data on AEs provided.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	It was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):									
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):									

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11566656	Chan 2001	Cohort	Male physicians, subjects who returned the dietary questionnaires, did not have a diagnosis of cancer at baseline, and provided information on body mass index	nd	1995	Physician's Health Study	The CaP Cure Young Investigator Award (JMC) and National Institutes of Health	JHL/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11566656	Chan 2001	Cohort	US	22071	20885	53.3	nd	100	nd	BMI=24.9	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
11566656	Chan 2001	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Nd
11566656	Chan 2001	Dietary calcium intake	Short self-administered questionnaire	Database from the prospective Health Professional Follow-up Study	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11566656	Chan 2001	Secondary	Prostate cancer	Requested permission to obtain hospital records and pathology reports for review by the study investigators. Information on tumor grade and stage at diagnosis was extracted, and the diagnosis of prostate cancer was confirmed by medical chart review in 99% of cases.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11566656	Chan 2001	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes* - Age	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes* - BMI	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes* - Smoking, exercise	
		Other	Randomized treatment in the original trial (aspirin, β-carotene, or placebo), food score	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11566656	Chan 2001	Prostate cancer	Dairy calcium intake Group 1		0-150	155		132	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.05
			Group 2		151-300	206		132	Adjusted	RR	1.21	0.96-1.53		
			Group 3		301-600	377		132	Adjusted	RR	1.35	1.09-1.66		
			Group 4		> 600	274		132	Adjusted	RR	1.29	1.04-1.62		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11566656	Chan 2001	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Post-hoc analysis of RCT (but, we categorized this as a cohort study because the treatment in the original trial was not Ca), Dietary assessment method was not validated.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19001601	Chebowski 2008	RCT Case-cohort study	Post menopausal enrolled in WHI trial of hormonal therapy and dietary modification. Aged 50-79 y and life expectancy of >3y, no prior breast cancer, and no other cancers within 10 y	Women with h/o hypercalcemia, kidney stones, corticosteroid or calcitriol use	Until March 2005	WHI	Gov	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19001601	Chebowski 2008	RCT Case-cohort study	US 38 N	68.132	36,282	ND	50-79	0	CaD: White 82.8% Black 9.3% Hispanic 4.3% American Indian 0.4% Asian pacific Islander 2.0% Unknown 1.2% Placebo: White 83.4% Black 9% Hispanic 4% American Indian 0.4% Asian pacific Islander 2.0% Unknown 1.2%	CaD <25 26.2% 25-<30 35.8% ≥ 30 38% Placebo <25 26.8% 25-<30 36.0% ≥ 30 37.2%	CaD : Alcohol use in Non drinker 10.3% Past drinker 17.7% Current drinker 72% Smoking: Never smoked 52% Past smoker 40.3% Current smoker 7.8%	Baseline vitD supplementation: CaD arm Yes: 47.1% No: 52.9% Placebo arm Yes 47. 6% No 52.4% Baseline Ca supplementation: CaD arm <800: 34.3% 800-<1200: 26.5% ≥1200: 39.3% Placebo arm <800: 33.8% 800-<1200: 26.2% ≥1200: 40.0%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19001601	Chebowski 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				DiaSorin Liason Chemiluminescent immunoassay	Y 11.8%	ND	ND	Equal % of subjects in both arms were taking vitamin D
19001601	Chebowski 2008	Dietary calcium intake	Modified block FFQ	ND	N	NA	NA		ND	the % of subjects in the placebo arm who were getting Ca were higher for the highest level ≥1200

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
19001601	Chebowski 2008	Calcium carbonate Vit D3	GlaxoSmith Kline	400 IU vit D 1000 mg Ca	7 years	200 IU vit D x twice daily 500 mg Ca x twice daily
Co-intervention(s) *:			Hormone use was similar in both arms. CaD arm: Tamoxifen use 0.08%; raloxifene use 0.10% Placebo arm: Tamoxifen use 0.06%; raloxifene use 0.11%			
Compliance/Adherence:			60%-63% during first 3 years of follow-up			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19001601	Chebowski 2008	Not clear. Most likely secondary outcome	Incident invasive breast cancer	Confirmed by both local and central medical record and pathology report review by trained adjudicators. Tumor characteristics were coded by SEER program guidelines.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
19001601	Chebowski 2008	The trial is unable to discern the independent effects of Ca and Vit D, since the use of supplementation is the same in both arms.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

This sections is only applicable for the nested case-control study of Vitamin D biomarker section

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19001601	Chebowski 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Both arms liberally used Ca D supplements	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication	Hormonal therapy, estrogen alone or combined with progestin	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Latitude of the clinical center	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death) (This is from RCT part of the study)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
19001601	Chebowski 2008	Total breast cancer	Calcium carbonate 400 IU Vit D3 1000 mg	7 y	668	18176	HR	0.96	0.86 to 1.07	NS			
			Placebo		693	18106							
		Death from breast cancer	Calcium carbonate 400 IU Vit D3 1000 mg	7 y	23	18176	HR	0.99	0.55 to 1.76	NS			
			Placebo		23	18106							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death) (This section is from the nested case-control study that examined pre-randomization levels were associated with breast cancer)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
19001601	Chebowski 2008	Invasive breast cancer	≥67.6 Q1 Baseline 25(OH)D	81.9 (13.2)		CaD 86 Pl 76	195	7 y	Adj	OR	0.89	0.58 to 1.36		0.2 (main effect)
			55.4≤67.6 Q2 Baseline 25(OH)D	60.9 (3.5)		CaD 95 Pl 86	185	7 y	Adj	OR	1.25	0.83 to 1.90		
			43.9≤55.4 Q3 Baseline 25(OH)D	49.2 (3.3)		CaD 102 Pl 92	171	7 y	Adj	OR	1.07	0.70 to 1.62		
			32.4≤43.9 Q4 Baseline 25(OH)D	38.5 (3.3)		CaD 71 Pl 102	171	7 y	Adj	OR	0.69	0.45 to 1.06		
			<32.4 Q5 Baseline 25(OH)D	23.6 (5.9)		CaD 94 Pl 91	176	7 y	Adj	OR	0.91	0.60 to 1.39		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
19001601	Chebowski 2008	RCT-Parallel	y	y	n	y	nd	y	y	y	y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	ND (patients were excluded if they had kidney stones, etc.)
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	It was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
19001601	Chebowski 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	n					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	na

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Time from sample collection to analysis not reported, unclear how the effect of VitD was delineated when both arms had vitD intake at baseline.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

[1]ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17874029	Chel 2008	RCT	Nursing home residents	outside sunshine >1/wk; vit D or Ca supplement; >1 vit D-fortified food or drink; completely immobilized; poor life expectancy	nd	nd	Solvay Pharm. provided meds; ZonMw (the Netherlands Org for Health Research & Development	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17874029	Chel 2008	RCT	The Netherlands, 52º N	338	338	84 (6)	nd	22	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17874029	Chel 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA (Diasorin)	y; interassay CV 10% at 30 nmol/L	nd	nd	100 IU/d vit D from food
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17874029	Chel 2008	vit D3 600 IU/d vs. placebo	Solvay		4.5 mo	1 tab
		vit D3 4200 IU/wk vs. placebo	Solvay		4.5 mo	7 tabs once a wk
		vit D3 18,000 IU/mo vs. placebo	Solvay		4.5 mo	one powder once a month
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			276/338 completed the 4 mo study; compliance with meds ~80% in a random sample of 96/338 participants			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17874029	Chel 2008	primary	25(OH)D concentration	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17874029	Chel 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions	no	
		Medication	no	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI	P between
17874029	Chel 2008	increase in 25(Oh)D	nmol/L	Any vit D supplement	4 mo	139					38.5	35.7-41.3	0.000
				Placebo	4 mo								
				600 IU daily	4 mo	46	23.0	8.3	69.9	17.8	47.2	42.3-52.1	0.000
				Placebo daily	4 mo	45	25.2	12.1	25.5	12.0			
				4200 IU 1x/wk	4 mo	48					40.7	35.8-45.6	0.000
				Placebo weekly	4 mo	44							
				18,000 IU 1x/mo	4 mo	45					27.6	22.8-32.5	0.000
				Placebo monthly	4 mo	48							
				600 IU daily	4 mo	46					6.6	1.7-11.4	0.009
				4200 IU 1x/wk	4 mo	48							
				4200 IU 1x/wk	4 mo	48					11.2	6.3-16.1	0.000
				18,000 IU 1x/mo	4 mo	45							
				18,000 IU 1x/mo	4 mo	45					-17.8	-22.7- -12.8	0.000
				600 IU daily	4 mo	46							

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17874029	Chel 2008	Figure 2 in paper does not seem to agree with results in Table 2.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17874029	Chel 2008	RCT	y	n	NA	y	nd	n	y	y	y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Compliance assessed in a random sample of 96/338 participants; baseline medical conditions not reported; 12% of participants died during study period (number not stratified between placebo and active intervention)

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

Reference List

(1) Chel V, Wijnhoven HA, Smit JH, Ooms M, Lips P. Efficacy of different doses and time intervals of oral vitamin D supplementation with or without calcium in elderly nursing home residents.[see comment]. *Osteoporosis International.* 2008;663-671.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16280447	Cheng 2005	RCT	10-12 y old girls; Tanner 1 to 2; dietary calcium <900 mg/d	serious medical conditions; medications that affect bone metabolism;	nd	nd	government and industry	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16280447	Cheng 2005	RCT	Jyvaskyla, Finland 62°24'N	195	165	11.2	10-12	0	nd	BMI: 18.2	no serious medical conditions	dietary calcium: 670 mg/d; vit D 2.5 µg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16280447	Cheng 2005	25(OH)D				enzyme immunoassay (Immunodiagnostic Systems Ltd, UK)	y; intra and interassay CV: 4.2%, 6.1%	nd	baseline: Dec to Feb	vit D 2.5 µg/d
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ x 3 d	nd	n	NA	NA			dietary calcium: 670 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
16280447	Cheng 2005	Calcium and vit D	Tums or Kalcipos (calcium); Deetipat (vit D3)	1000 mg calcium carbonate + 200 IU (5 µg) vit D3/d	24 mo	one tab in am; one tab in pm; drops in am
		Calcium and placebo	Tums or Kalcipos (calcium)	1000 mg calcium carbonate + vit D placebo		one tab in am; one tab in pm; drops in am
		dairy product		1000 mg calcium equivalent		
		placebo		calcium placebo + vit D placebo		one tab in am; one tab in pm; drops in am
Co-intervention(s) *:			none			
Compliance/Adherence:			126 completed intervention with >50% compliance			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16280447	Cheng 2005	primary	bone indexes	by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16280447	Cheng 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI; Tanner stage
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes*	physical activity
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
16280447	Cheng 2005	change in BMC (ITT analysis)	g	Calcium and vit D3	adj	24 mo	46	1328	292	34.7%	1.3%			NS
				Calcium and placebo			41	1431	274	35%	1.4%			
				dairy product			39	1343	235	38.1%	1.4%			
				placebo			39	1383	257	35%	1.4%			
		areal BMD	g/cm2	Calcium and vit D3	adj	24 mo	46	0.934	0.1	9.8%	0.5%			aBMD increased more in the dairy group with compliance>50% than in placebo (P=0.044)
				Calcium and placebo			41	0.945	0.1	9.7%	0.5%			
				dairy product			39	0.935	0.1	10.4%	0.5%			
				placebo			39	0.939	0.1	8.9%	0.5%			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
16280447	Cheng 2005		With the use of hierarchical linear model to control for growth velocity; differences in BMD between dairy and placebo disappeared.
16280447	Cheng 2005	other bone indices	see Table 3 in paper for other bone indices

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
16280447	Cheng 2005	RCT	y	nd	NA	y	y	y	y	y	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	small sample size in each group. Underpowered and compliance was low.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	RCT	Weight-stable, overweight, post-menopausal women	Women with disease states, including osteoporosis, and those using medication known to influence calcium or bone metabolism.	2000-2003	Nd	NIH	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	RCT	New Brunswick, NJ, USA 40.486°	73	57	61(5)	52-75	0%	Nd	BMI: 26.9(1.9)	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	25(OH)D and $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	N	Nd	April and October	25(OH)D Nl Ca/Wt maint: 84.1 nmol/L Nl Ca/Wt loss: 73.3 High Ca/Wt maint: 68.9 High Ca/Wt loss: 61.6 Sig difference among groups
		Dietary calcium intake	3 day diet record (at baseline and after 6 weeks)	Nd	N	Nd	Nd		Nd	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	Calcium	Supplement of calcium citrate, Mission Pharmacal, San Antonio, TX	1.2 g/d in high calcium group	6 weeks	2 Ca tablets in the morning, 3 in the evening
		Placebo	Supplement of calcium citrate, Mission Pharmacal, San Antonio, TX	0.4 g/d in normal calcium group	6 weeks	2 tablets in the morning, 3 in the evening (4 placebo tablets and 1 calcium tablet)
Co-intervention(s) *:			Weight loss group (targeted loss of ≥2.5% of bodyweight), weight maintenance group. Each group was split into high calcium and normal calcium groups.			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	Primary	Weight change	Change in weight in kg
		Secondary	Curve 4- Ca→25(OH)D	Change in 25(OH)D after 6 weeks of calcium intervention vs placebo

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
		NS but substantial differences (in small number of participants) in baseline weight

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	Baseline body weight
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Season of blood sample collection	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	Year of recruitment, estrone, sNTx	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final	Final	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	Body weight	Kg	Calcium, both weight maintenance (WM) and weight loss (WL) groups	6 weeks	10 16	70.9 71.5	5.1 5.8	70.9 67.9	5.5 5.7	0.9	nd	0.3227
				Placebo, both weight maintenance (WM) and weight loss (WL) groups	6 weeks	15 16	68.0 74.5	7.7 7.3	68.4 71.2	7.5 7.1			
		25(OH)D	nmol/L	Calcium, both weight maintenance (WM) and weight loss (WL) groups	6 weeks	10 16	81.4 74.1	14.6 22.0	80.1 76.9	16.2 18.2	1.5	Nd	0.1639
				Placebo, both weight maintenance (WM) and weight loss (WL) groups	6 weeks	15 16	96.6 85.8	19.9 21.9	98.4 94.6	26.0 27.7			
		1,25(OH)D	pmol/L	Calcium, both weight maintenance (WM) and weight loss (WL) groups	6 weeks	10 16	117.0 102.3	34.0 32.4	116.9 113.8	29.8 36.2	11.4	nd	0.9663

				Placebo, both weight maintenance (WM) and weight loss (WL) groups	6 weeks	15 16	92.9 135.8	42.9 41.4	99.4 145.2	35.0 41.3			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
15213038	Cifuentes 2004	RCT-parallel	Y	nd	Y	N	Y	nd	Mostly	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No mention of intention-to-treat or compliance rate, high dropout rate. Questionable statistics.
Comment	Really 2 separate trials. Combining wt maintenance and wt loss in statistical test is of questionable value. However, they did control for various factors, including the substantial differences in baseline weights. However, the very small number of subjects may have precluded meaningful adjustment (of 6 variables)

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

Colditz 1992ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
13151203	Colditz 1992	Cohort study	-participant of Nurses' Health Study -female	- ≥10 food items blank on 1980 dietary questionnaire - Implausibly high or low score for total food intake on 1980 dietary questionnaire -hx of DM, CHD, or cancer before the return of the 1980 questionnaire	1976-1986	Nurses' Health Study	NIH	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
13151203	Colditz 1992	Cohort study	various	98464	84360	nd	nd (NHS participants 30-55 yrs)	0%	Predominantly white	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
13151203	Colditz 1992	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
		Dietary calcium intake	SFFQ	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
13151203	Colditz 1992	nd	NIDDM	Report of one of the following: 1. at least one classical symptom (wt loss, hunger, thirst, polyuria, or pruritis) plus a plasma fasting glucose concentration ≥ 7.77 mmol/L or a random plasma glucose ≥ 11.10 mmol/L, or 2.at least two elevated plasma glucose concentrations ≥ 11.10 mmol/L in the absence of symptoms.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
13151203	Colditz 1992	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Controlled for age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	Controlled for BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Controlled for EtOH consumption
		Other		Also adjusted for family hx of DM, prior wt change, and time period.

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
13151203	Colditz 1992	NIDDM in BMI < 29 participants	Quintile 1					Adjusted	RR	1.0			
			Quintile 2					Adjusted	RR	1.16			
			Quintile 3					Adjusted	RR	0.67			
			Quintile 4					Adjusted	RR	0.69			
			Quintile 5					Adjusted	RR	0.70	0.47-1.04	P>0.05 (Q1 vs. Q5)	0.005

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
13151203	Colditz 1992	NIDDM in BMI ≥ 29 participants	Quintile 1					Adjusted	RR	1.0			
			Quintile 2					Adjusted	RR	0.95			
			Quintile 3					Adjusted	RR	0.92			
			Quintile 4					Adjusted	RR	0.91			
			Quintile 5					Adjusted	RR	0.84	0.59-1.18	P>0.05 (Q1 vs. Q5)	0.26

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
13151203	Colditz 1992	NIDDM in BMI < 29 participants	Quintile 1					Adjusted for same as above in addition to Mg and K	RR	1.0			
			Quintile 2						RR	1.19			
			Quintile 3						RR	0.71			
			Quintile 4						RR	0.77			
			Quintile 5						RR	0.85	0.53-1.37	P>0.05 (Q1 vs. Q5)	

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

**Adverse Event(s): ** **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
13151203	Colditz 1992	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No Ca ranges given for quintiles. Food composition database that was used was not reported.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8220092	Corder 1993	Case-cohort study	Ambulatory, generally healthy in 1964-1971. Sera stored. Stayed as a Kaiser member. Cases: Diagnosed with prostate cancer before 1988. Blacks oversampled (for power). Controls: Alive without prostate cancer at time of (matched) case diagnosis. Matched for race, age±3 yr, initial screening±3 day of year (to account for possible seasonal variation)	"Orientals" excluded (for power). Prostate cancer not confirmed. Missing sera.	Vit D screening 1964-71 Cancer diagnosis <1988	(Kaiser Permanente)	NCI National MS Society	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8220092	Corder 1993	Case-cohort study	San Francisco Bay area, US 37° 46'	200 cases 200 controls	181 cases 181 controls	57 (nd)	38-81	100	Black 91 pairs White 90 pairs	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Background exposure data
8220092	Corder 1993	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Competitive protein binding (Haddad 1971) 25-D Do not distinguish between D2 and D3	no	Mean 11.5 years to diagnosis (range 1-23 yr)	25(OH)D: 15-80 ng/ml $1,25(OH)_2D$: 19-50 pg/ml
		Dietary calcium intake							

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8220092	Corder 1993	Primary	Prostate cancer diagnosis	Invasive adenocarcinoma by histopathology
8220092	Corder 1993	Secondary	Prostate cancer stage	Gleason grade
8220092	Corder 1993	Secondary	Prostate cancer death	Death record

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
8220092	Corder 1993	"To avoid exclusion of all 19 controls [matched to 19 excluded cases] and 6 cases paired to excluded cases and controls, 6 case-control pairs were salvaged from their respective pair members by forming the best age and race matches."

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8220092	Corder 1993	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Race (matched), age (matched)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	Day of year (matched)
		Smoking and other life styles variables	No	
		Other	No	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
8220092	Corder 1993	Prostate cancer	"A separate model for men less than 57 years of age was not predictive of risk."
			"In a conditional logistic model, the measured values of 25-D, 1,25-D, and their interaction were jointly predictive of the risk of prostate cancer (P=.02)"
			"Risk in relation to vitamin D metabolite levels depended on age at serum storage (P=.002) and age at case diagnosis (P=.05)."
			"Pattern of risk was similar in black and white men (P=0.51)."
		Palpable tumor (n=56) & Gleason Grade 7-10 (n=44)	Detailed OR data for these 2 outcomes for men ≥57 years: Higher quartiles of both 25-D and 1,25-D were protective.
		Prostate cancer death (n=51)	Vitamin D metabolite levels unrelated to risk of prostate cancer death overall and in subgroups by age.

The odds [ratio] of prostate cancer for eqch quartile of 25-D and 1,25-D compared to their lowest quartiles. All men. N=181 pairs (Unadjusted for other variables, implied)

	Quartile of 1,25-D (pg/mL)			
Quartile of 25-D (ng/mL)	1 (5-26)	2 (27-32)	3 (33-39)	4 (40-81)
1 (3-18)	1.00	0.53 P<.05	0.28 P<.05	0.15 P<.05
2 (19-23)	0.96	0.58	0.35	0.21
3 (24-28)	0.93	0.63	0.43	0.29
4 (29-52)	0.90	0.69	0.53	0.41

The odds [ratio] of prostate cancer for eqch quartile of 25-D and 1,25-D compared to their lowest quartiles. Men ≥57 years old at baseline. N=91 pairs (57 is median age; 30 black, 61 white) (Unadjusted for other variables, implied)

	Quartile of 1,25-D (pg/mL)			
Quartile of 25-D (ng/mL)	1 (5-26)	2 (27-32)	3 (33-39)	4 (40-81)
1 (3-18)	1.00	0.22 P<.05	0.05 P<.05	0.01 P<.05
2 (19-23)	0.79	0.23	0.07 P<.05	0.02 P<.05
3 (24-28)	0.62	0.24	0.09	0.03 P<.05
4 (29-52)	0.48	0.24	0.12	0.06

P=.0001 by (unadjusted) logistic regression (P=.98 for men<57 at serum storage).

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8220092	Corder 1993	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	No	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Vit D measured with competitive protein binding and calf thymus receptor assays. Inadequate adjustment.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8682453	Duris 1996	Other intervention study	Patients with adenomatous polyps after polypectomy receiving calcium chemoprevention (n=175) and patients with adenomatous polyps after polypectomy who did not receive calcium chemoprevention (n=9) Patients with colorectal cancer after surgery receiving calcium chemoprevention and patients with colorectal cancer after surgery who did not receive calcium chemoprevention	nd	Group with polyps: nd Patients with colorectal cancer after surgery receiving calcium chemoprevention (Group C): 1992 Patients with colorectal cancer after surgery who did not receive calcium chemoprevention (Group A): 1984; Group B): 1985	nd	nd	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8682453	Duris 1996	Other intervention study	Bratislava, Slovak Republic (48° 40' 0" N)	Patients with polyps and calcium, n=175 Patients with polyps without calcium, n=9 Patients with CRC and calcium, n=50 Patients with CRC without calcium (Group A, 1984 year), n=46 Patients with CRC without calcium (Group B, 1985 year), n=47	Patients with polyps and calcium, n=175 Patients with polyps without calcium, n=9 Patients with CRC and calcium, n=50 Patients with CRC without calcium (Group A, 1984 year), n=46 Patients with CRC without calcium (Group B, 1985 year), n=47	Patients with polyps and calcium: 55 yr Patients with polyps without calcium: 48.7 yr For CRC group: nd	Patients with polyps and calcium, range: 38-75 Patients with polyps without calcium, range: 30-69 For CRC group: nd	Patients with polyps and calcium: 61.7% Patients with polyps without calcium: 66.7% For CRC group: nd	nd	nd	Patients with history of polyps, n=184 Patients with history of CRC, n=143	nd

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
8682453	Duris 1996	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
8682453	Duris 1996	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
8682453	Duris 1996	Caclium (patients with polyps)	Calcium carbonicum	2 g	Mean: 3.1 yr range 1-6 yr (based on follow up period)	nd
8682453	Duris 1996	Caclium (patients with CRC)	Calcium carbonicum (implied)	nd	~50 mo (based on Kaplan Meier figure for survival)	nd
Co-intervention(s) *: nd						
Compliance/Adherence: nd						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8682453	Duris 1996	nd	Adenomas recurrence	nd (only for patients with history of polyps)
8682453	Duris 1996	nd	Survival	nd (only for patients with CRC history)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
8682453	Duris 1996	This publication includes two separate groups of patients who were analyzed separately; therefore, it could be considered as two different studies reported in the same publication (first study on patients with adenomatous polyps after polypectomy; second study on patients with CRC after surgery) Although the %patients with adenomatous recurrence is based on the initial number of patients, the article reports that 5 patients died and 6 additional patients did not attend examination visits

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8682453	Duris 1996	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	no	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions	no	
		Medication	no	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	no	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
8682453	Duris 1996	Adenomas recurrence	Calcium carbonicum, 2g/day	37.2	12	175	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
			No chemoprevention	36	5	9							
		Survival	Calcium carbonicum (implied)	nd	nd	50	nd	nd	nd	0.048	nd	nd	nd
			No chemoprevention (Group B: patients from 1985)	nd	nd	47							
		Survival	Calcium carbonicum (implied)	nd	nd	50	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
			No chemoprevention (Group C: patients form 1984)	nd	nd	46							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
8682453	Duris 1996	Case series	NA	NA	NA	y	nd	y	n	n	n	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Study design has no validity to test the hypothesis implied. Authors seem to have two case series (one with polyps and another one with CRC) and they use calcium chemoprevention to two subgroups (one subgroup with polyps and another with CRC). The comparison between those who received calcium with those patients without calcium does not turn this case series study to a case control or case cohort study. A lot of information on the concept, the research questions, population recruited, and the results are not reported.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8890661	Dwyer 1996	Cohort Study	NHANES I 25-74 yo White or black. Sufficient data	HTN at baseline	1971-75	NHANES I	nd	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8890661	Dwyer 1996	Cohort Study	US, various	6634	6634	46 (~14)	25-74	63%	White 86% Black 14%	BMI 25.4	No HTN	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
8890661	Dwyer 1996	Dietary calcium intake	24 hour recall	nd	nd	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8890661	Dwyer 1996	1°	Incident HTN	HTN medication prescribed
		2°	Incident HTN	SBP≥160 or DBP≥95 or medication prescribed

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8890661	Dwyer 1996	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Calories
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, Sex, Race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	EtOH
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
8890661	Dwyer 1996	HTN (Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	1704	6634	OR (increase in Ca intake)				0.90	0.77, 1.04	NS
		HTN (BP or Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	1222	5527	OR (increase in Ca intake)				0.99	0.85, 1.172	NS

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Follow-up	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
8890661	Dwyer 1996	HTN (Rx)	Quartile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~1658	Adjusted (age)	%	29.8%			nd
			Quartile 2		nd	nd	~1658	Unadjusted	%	~27% (figure)			
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	~1658	Unadjusted	%	~25% (figure)			
			Quartile 4		nd	nd	~1658	Adjusted (age)	%	21.3%			
		HTN (Rx), Age ≤40 y	Quartile 2	10 y	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.89	0.81, 0.97	<.05	<.05 younger vs older
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	nd			0.79	0.66, 0.94	<.05	
			Quartile 4		nd	nd	nd			0.70	0.54, 0.91	<.05	
		HTN (Rx), Age >40 y	Quartile 2	10 y	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.01	0.94, 1.08	NS	
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	nd			1.02	0.89, 1.18	NS	
			Quartile 4		nd	nd	nd			1.04	0.84, 1.28	NS	
		HTN (Rx), Male	Quartile 2	10 y	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.98	0.89, 1.08	NS	NS male vs female
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	nd			0.96	0.79, 1.17	NS	
			Quartile 4		nd	nd	nd			0.95	0.70, 1.28	NS	
		HTN (Rx), Female	Quartile 2	10 y	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.96	0.89, 1.03	NS	
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	nd			0.92	0.80, 1.07	NS	
			Quartile 4		nd	nd	nd			0.87	0.71, 1.11	NS	
		HTN (Rx), Black	Quartile 2	10 y	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.94	0.82, 1.09	NS	NS black vs white
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	nd			0.86	0.67, 1.19	NS	
			Quartile 4		nd	nd	nd			0.84	0.55, 1.29	NS	
		HTN (Rx), White	Quartile 2	10 y	nd	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.97	0.91, 1.04	NS	
			Quartile 3		nd	nd	nd			0.94	0.83, 1.08	NS	

			Quartile 4		nd	nd	nd			0.92	0.75, 1.12	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Age

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
8890661	Dwyer 1996	HTN (Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	nd	nd	OR (increase in Ca intake) Age ≤40 y				0.75	nd	.004
					nd	nd	Age >40 y				1.00	nd	
		HTN (BP or Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	nd	nd	OR (increase in Ca intake) Age ≤40 y				0.83	nd	.004
					nd	nd	Age >40 y				1.14	nd	

Sex

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
8890661	Dwyer 1996	HTN (Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	nd	nd	OR (increase in Ca intake) Male				0.94	nd	NS
					nd	nd	Female				0.85	nd	
		HTN (BP or Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	nd	nd	OR (increase in Ca intake) Male				1.10	nd	NS
					nd	nd	Female				0.82	nd	

Race

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
8890661	Dwyer 1996	HTN (Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	nd	nd	OR (increase in Ca intake) Black				0.82	nd	NS
							White				0.91	nd	
		HTN (BP or Rx)	Calcium intake, per 1 g/day increase	10 year	nd	nd	OR (increase in Ca intake) Black				0.80	nd	NS
					nd	nd	White				1.01	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8890661	Dwyer 1996	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	nd	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	nd					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Thorough analyses. Incomplete data available from database. Methods not fully described. Numbers in subgroups and incident rates not fully enumerated.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17189552	Eagan 2006	RCT-post hoc**	Calcium intakes <800mg/d and energy intakes <2200kcal/d	> 20% overweight or 15% underweight according to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Tables	nd	nd	Dairy Management, Inc. (Rosemont, IL)	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17189552	Eagan 2006	RCT-post hoc**	Indiana 40°N	154	51	19.4±1.6	nd	0	nd	BMI: 22.31 Weight: 62.4kg	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17189552	Eagan 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Immunosorbent assay (Dia-Sorin, Inc., Stillwater, MN)	n	nd	nd	25(OH)D 24.5 ng/mL
17189552	Eagan 2006	Dietary calcium intake	3-day food records	Food and Nutrient Database 28 (Minneapolis, MN)	n	nd	nd		nd	Total Ca 723.5 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17189552	Eagan 2006	High dairy	Foods from dairy	1300-1400mg Ca/day from dairy	1y	
17189552	Eagan 2006	Medium dairy	Foods from dairy	1000-1100mg Ca/day from dairy	1y	
17189552	Eagan 2006	Control		Maintain current dietary consumption	1y	
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17189552	Eagan 2006	nd	Weight	To the nearest 0.5 pound (1.1 kg), was measured using a standard physician's balance beam scale
17189552	Eagan 2006	nd	BMI	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17189552	Eagan 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes – energy intake	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes* - BMI	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	25(OH)D	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)****	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference SD*	P between groups***
17189552	Eagan 2006	Weight	Kg	High dairy	Adjusted	18 months	19	61.2	7.6	61.5	7.4	0.3	3.0	NS
17189552	Eagan 2006	Weight	Kg	Medium dairy	Adjusted	18 months	14	66.1	13.7	66.3	14.8	0.1	6.7	NS
17189552	Eagan 2006	Weight	Kg	Control	Adjusted	18 months	18	60.8	11.6	61.2	10.9	0.4	1.7	NS
17189552	Eagan 2006	BMI	Kg/m^2	High dairy	Adjusted	18 months	19	21.9	2.6	22.1	2.5	0.2	1.3	NS
17189552	Eagan 2006	BMI	Kg/m^2	Medium dairy	Adjusted	18 months	14	23.4	4.7	23.6	5.1	0.1	1.3	NS
17189552	Eagan 2006	BMI	Kg/m^2	Control	Adjusted	18 months	18	21.9	3.4	22.0	3.0	0.1	0.6	NS

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****Assessed the impact of the 1-year dairy intervention 6 months after completion of the intervention.

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17189552	Eagan 2006	RCT-parallel	nd	n	NA	y	nd	y	y	y	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	Nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Small number of subjects for the follow-up study (original study N=154, 135 completed one-year intervention, 51 subjects included in this study)

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	RCT	10-17yr girls in four schools from the greater Beirut area to ensure balanced representation geographically and socioeconomically	nd	2001-2002	nd	nd	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	RCT	Greater Beirut area, Lebanon (33°53'N)	179	168	13.2 (no sd)	10-17y	0%	nd	Height 152.7cm Weight 47.3 kg % fat mass 28.3%	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D - Competitive protein biding assay	Y, intra- and interassay CVs less than 13%	nd	nd	25(OH)D - 14.0 ng/ml
						1,25(OH)D - RIA	Y, intra- and interassay CVs less than 10%			1,25(OH)D - 82.3 ng/ml
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Dietary calcium intake	Food Frequency Questionnaire	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	677.3mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Low vitD	Diluted Vigantol oil, Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany	200IU/d	1y	Weekly, usually taken on the weekends
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	High vitD	Vigantol oil, Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany	2000IU/d	1y	Weekly, usually taken on the weekends
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Placebo	Oily solution	nd	1y	Weekly, usually taken on the weekends
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Placebo - 98%, Low dose group - 98%, High dose group - 97% Method - the % of the dose taken was calculated as (total volume-returned volume)/total volume*100.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Primary	% change in BMC at the lumber spine	
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Primary	% change in total hip BMC	
16278262	El-Hajj 2006		25(OH)D	
16278262	El-Hajj 2006		Height	
16278262	El-Hajj 2006		Weight	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		Dietary calcium intake was comparable across treatment groups and was not controlled for.
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final or Delta**	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	25(OH)D	ng/ml	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	55	14	7	16	8			• Placebo vs. Low vitD=NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	58	14	9	17	6			• Placebo vs. High=p<0.001
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	55	14	8	38	31			• Low vitD vs. High vitD=p<0.001
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	1,25(OH)D	ng/ml	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	55	86	30	76	30			• Placebo vs. Low vitD=NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	58	78	29	78	30			• Placebo vs. High=p<0.001
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	55	83	27	105	33			• Low vitD vs. High vitD=p<0.001
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Total body BMC	Kg	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	55	1.2	0.3	Delta = 5.0 %	4.7			• Placebo vs. Low vitD=NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	58	1.1	0.3	6.1 %	5.7			• Placebo vs. High=NS
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	55	1.1	0.3	6.2 %	5.8			• Low vitD vs. High vitD=NS
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Height	cm	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	55	154	10	Delta =2.0%	1.8			• Placebo vs. Low vitD=NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	58	152	9	2.7%	2.3			• Placebo vs. High=NS
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	55	152	10	2.8%	2.4			• Low vitD vs. High vitD=NS
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Weight	kg	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	55	48	11	Delta =8.6%	7.8			• Placebo vs. Low vitD=NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	58	47	11	8.8%	8.3			• Placebo vs. High=NS
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	55	47	13	9.7%	8.5			• Low vitD vs. High vitD=NS

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Premenarcheal girls (mean age = 10)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	25(OH)D	ng/ml	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	8	13	7	11	6			Overall: <0.001 Placebo vs. Low=NS, Placebo vs. High=<0.001, Low vs. High=<0.001
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	12	15	6	16	5			
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	14	14	5	28	9			

16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Total body BMC	kg	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	8	0.8	0.2	Delta= 7.4 %	3.9			Overall: 0.06 Each pair comparison= NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	12	0.7	0.2	11.4 %	4.0			
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	14	0.8	0.2	11.6 %	4.2			
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Height	cm	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	8	142	8	Delta=3.8%	1.5			Overall: 0.07 Each pair comparison= NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	12	141	9	5.0%	1.4			
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	14	140	7	5.6%	1.3			
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	Weight	kg	Placebo	Adjusted	1y	8	37	11	Delta=14.9%	5.2			Overall: 0.25 Each pair comparison= NS
				Low vitD	Adjusted	1y	12	35	8	15.3%	4.7			
				High vitD	Adjusted	1y	14	36	8	18.4%	6.2			

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
16278262	El-Hajj 2006	RCT-parallel	y	y	n	y	nd	y	y	y	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	None
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	BMC - No adjustment for height, bone area, lean mass, pubertal stage, and bone age; rated C for ht and wt outcome because of small sample size (≤34)

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8078115	Feliciano 1994	RCT	≥37 wk gestation	gastrointestinal disease; congenital anomalies	Fall 1986; Spring 1987	-	non-profit	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8078115	Feliciano 1994	RCT	Beijing (40 ºN); Jiamusi (47 ºN); Nanin (22ºN); Wuhan (30ºN) China	255	255	newborn		nd	Asians	6 mo weight: 7.8 Kg; length; 67 cm		

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
8078115	Feliciano 1994	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd			86% infant breastfed until 5-6 mo; other foods: powdered cow milk; rice porridge
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
8078115	Feliciano 1994		Kremers-Urban Co., Milwaukee, WI	100 IU	6 mo	nd
				200 IU		
				400 IU		
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8078115	Feliciano 1994	primary	weight	
		primary	length	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8078115	Feliciano 1994	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
8078115	Feliciano 1994	weight gain in North, born in spring	g	100 IU		6 mo	17			4208	1695			NS
		weight gain in North, born in spring		200 IU			13			5296	1064			
		weight gain in North, born in spring		400 IU			12			3745	2000			
		weight gain in North, born in fall	g	100 IU		6 mo	15			5190	927			NS
		weight gain in North, born in fall		200 IU			13			5046	862			
		weight gain in North, born in fall		400 IU			13			4846	763			
		weight gain in South, born in spring	g	100 IU		6 mo	15			4810	873			NS
		weight gain in south, born in spring		200 IU			20			4536	706			

		weight gain in south, born in spring		400 IU			20			4609	1005			
		weight gain in South, born in fall	g	100 IU			21			4563	958			NS
		weight gain in south, born in fall		200 IU			19			4342	585			
		weight gain in south, born in fall		400 IU			23			4572	671			
		Length gain in North, born in spring	cm	100 IU			15			19.3	3.6			NS
		Length gain in North, born in spring		200 IU			13			19	1.7			
		Length gain in North, born in spring		400 IU			12			18.8	2.4			
		Length gain in North, born in fall	cm	100 IU			18			17.9	3.0			NS
		Length gain in North, born in fall		200 IU			15			17.5	1.9			
		Length gain in North, born in fall		400 IU			16			18.7	3.5			

		Length gain in South, born in spring	cm	100 IU			15			16.6	1.7			NS
		Length gain in South, born in spring		200 IU			20			16.6	2.1			
		Length gain in South, born in spring		400 IU			20			16.7	1.8			
		Length gain in South, born in fall	cm	100 IU			22			15.6	1.8			NS
		Length gain in South, born in fall		200 IU			10			16.5	3.4			
		Length gain in South, born in fall		400 IU			23			17.1	3.7			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
8078115	Feliciano 1994	unclear if it is randomized within each city or randomized in the overall study

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
8078115	Feliciano 1994	RCT	nd	n	NA	y	n	n	y	n	n	C

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	incomplete reporting of study methodology; small number of subjects in each group

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Case-cohort study	• Ongoing cohort study with participants who were ages 30-55y at study initiation (N=121,700) • Subjects provided blood samples aged 43-70 y between 06/89-(12/)90 (N=32,826) • Cases: confirmed invasive adenocarcinoma (inferred) diagnosed between 1989-06/2000 • Controls: 1:2 matching cases (year of birth [=age], month of blood draw)	• Previous non-cutaneous cancer (in cases and controls) • Non-adenocarcinoma (SCC, CIS, metastatic) (in cases) (n=32) • Non-confirmed cases (in cases) (n=26)	1976	Nurses' Health Study	nd	JHL/TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Case-cohort study	US (various latitudes)	Original cohort (N=121,700), Subjects provided blood samples (N=32,826), cases (N=193) and controls (N=383)	576	60 (no SD)	43-70 (inclusion)	0%	nd	BMI 25.1	Aspirin user (>10y): 10% HRT user: 34%	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15342452	Feskanich 2004	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Intraset coefficient of variation (CV) based on 21 masked samples from cases and controls: 25(OH)D=11.8% 1,25(OH)2D=10.1%	~10 y or 13 y	nd	Total Vit D intake: 9.3 µg/d, 25(OH)D 24.1ng/mL
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	nd	nd	nd			Total Ca intake: 1049.2 mg/day

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15342452	Feskanich 2004	nd	Colorectal cancer	• Reported by a participant on a NHS questionnaire • Invasive adenocarcinoma (inferred) confirmed by medical records (96%) or by the participants by letter or telephone incase medical records were unavailable • Identified cases from death record information
15342452	Feskanich 2004	nd	Colon cancer	nd
15342452	Feskanich 2004	nd	Rectal cancer	nd
15342452	Feskanich 2004	nd	Proximal and distal colon cancer	nd

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Intakes of calcium, folate, methionine, retinol, red meat Yes – matched on age Yes - BMI Use of HRT, duration of aspirin use Physical activity Yes - pack years of smoking, alcohol Family history of colorectal cancer, menopausal status	Matching factors: year of birth, month of blood draw # sensitivity analysis: cases diagnosed within the first year after blood draw excluded and average UV light at zip code of residence added to the full model (results not materially changed [data not shown]).

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose*****(ng/mL)		Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases **	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	25(OH)D – quintile 1	Lab1 14.9	Lab2 17.4		53	77	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.02
			25(OH)D – quintile 2	19.6	24.8		47	79	Adjusted		0.93	0.53-1.63		
			25(OH)D – quintile 3	24.1	29.6		35	75	Adjusted		0.79	0.44-1.40		
			25(OH)D – quintile 4	27.9	34.5		29	77	Adjusted		0.58	0.31-1.07		

			25(OH)D – quintile 5	35.3	44.5		29	75	Adjusted		0.53	0.27-1.04		
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	1,25(OH)2D – quintile 1	24.6	18.7		34	77	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.51
			1,25(OH)2D – quintile 2	29.4	24.2		42	78	Adjusted		1.45	0.78-2.69		
			1,25(OH)2D – quintile 3	33.2	29.8		33	76	Adjusted		0.93	0.48-1.78		
			1,25(OH)2D – quintile 4	36.8	33.8		38	76	Adjusted		1.21	0.64-2.26		
			1,25(OH)2D – quintile 5	43.7	42.3		46	75	Adjusted		1.77	0.93-3.36		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****median from lab 1 and lab 2, lab 1 values are from blood samples assayed in 2000. lab2 values are from blood samples assayed 2003.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Cases:	11y	Adjusted**	193			1004mg		
		Control:	11y	Adjusted**	383			1072mg		

Duplicate one table per outcome
**Adjusted by age

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colon cancer	25(OH)D (values for each quartile not provided) exhibited an inverse linear association, but was not significant (p=0.17).
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Rectal cancer	25(OH)D (values for each tertile not provided) exhibited a strong inverse linear association (p=0.03).
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Cancer at the distal colon and rectum	A significant inverse dose-response association with 25(OH)D (p=0.02).
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	Sensitivity analysis: cases diagnosed within the first year after blood draw excluded and average UV light at zip code of residence added to the full model (results not materially changed [data not shown]).
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	Some post-hoc subgroup analyses: • Vit D intake high (≥7.5 μg/d) and low (<7.5 μg/d) "association remained inverse" • UV light high lesion➔ OR between Q1 & Q5: 0.25 [0.10-0.69] vs. low lesion➔ OR: 1.24 [0.42-3.64] (Interaction between group P=0.16) • Ca intake high (≥900 mg/d) [Trend P=0.08] vs. low (<900 mg/d) [Trend P=0.14] "no evidence of attribution"
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	Subgroup Women Age ≥ 60: OR between Q1 & Q5 = 0.35 (0.14-0.87); Trend P=0.006
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	Subgroup Women Age < 60: OR between Q1 & Q5 = 1.36 (0.48-3.92); Trend P=0.70
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	Postmenoposal HRT user: OR between Q1 & Q5 = 0.61 (0.16-2.41); Trend P not reported
15342452	Feskanich 2004	Colorectal cancer	Postmenoposal non HRT user: OR between Q1 & Q5 = 0.41 (0.15-1.12); Trend P not reported

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15342452	Feskanich 2004	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)		c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B****
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some unclear/no reporting, no internal calibration of FFQ

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

**** **C** (Grade for subgroup analysis - No information on range of plasma 25(OH)D for quartiles or tertiles)

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15668485	Flood 2005	Cohort study	•Women found to or not to have breast disease participated in the BCDDP from 1973-1980 (n=64182) •Completed baseline questionnaire from 1979-1981 (n=61431)	• Failed to complete dietary assessment questionnaire from 1987-1989 (n=9738) • Already with colorectal cancer at the dietary assessment or earlier (n=479) • Reported an incorrect order of entry date and exit date (n=6) • Skipped >30 items of the dietary assessment or reported >3800 or <400 kcal/d total energy intake (n=5647) • Reported implausibly high Ca intake >3000 mg/d (n=207)#	1973-1980	The Breast Cancer Detection Demonstration Project (BCDDP)	NCI and American Cancer Society	TTE

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT
 # Although not provided, this exclusion seems to have been used in sensitivity analysis, which did not materially alter the results.

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15668485	Flood 2005	Cohort	27 cities across the US (25° 46'-54° 40')	61431	45354 (details on the reasons for exclusions spelled out above)	61.9 (nd)	nd	0%	nd	BMI=24.7 kg/m2 Ht=64.0 (inches)	Some with previous breast cancer (details not reported)	Total energy intake ~1273 kcal/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15668485	Flood 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Nd
15668485	Flood 2005	Dietary calcium intake	62-item National Cancer Institute/ Block FFQ	USDA	Y (cited two original Block papers and a NCI paper)	nd	nd		nd	Nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15668485	Flood 2005	Nd	Colorectal cancer	Self reports, statewide cancer registry, national death index. Only self reports were validated by obtaining the pathology reports (94% confirmed). Cases without the pathology confirm were excluded in sensitivity analysis, which did not materially alter the results. Non-confirmed cases by the pathology reports not appearing in the registry were considered non-cases
		nd	Colon cancer vs. rectal cancer	Same as above
			Proximal vs. distal colon cancer	Same as above (not data extracted)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15668485	Flood 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	folate, vitamin D, fiber, meat, fat, fruits, vegetables, grains, energy Age, education (through high school/more than high school) body mass index (kg/m2), height history of menopausal or hormone replacement therapy (yes/no) Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory (NSAID) drug use (yes/no) No smoking (ever/never), alcohol, weekday physical activity index expressed in units of Metabolic Equivalent Time	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

1. After performing all of these tests, none of the factors listed above generated any material changes in either the dietary calcium model, the total calcium model, or the supplemental calcium model (data not shown), and the authors did not include them in any of the final calcium models.
2. Adjusting for reported colorectal cancer-screening or restricting the cohort to only those subjects who had no prior history of breast disease resulted in no qualitative differences in risk estimates
3. Simultaneous inclusion of all these potential confounders in the proportional hazards regression models also did not produce any material changes in the results from those obtained in the age- and energy-adjusted models.

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up time, mo	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
15668485	Flood 2005	Colorectal cancer (Total calcium [mg])	Q1	17	<472	102	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.02
			Q2	17	472-635	110	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.03	0.79-1.35	Nd	
			Q3	17	636-844	86	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.80	0.60-1.06	Nd	

			Q4	17	845-1270	106	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.96	0.73-1.26	Nd	
			Q5	17	>1270	80	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.74	0.55-0.99	Nd	
15668485	Flood 2005	Rectal cancer (Total calcium [mg])	Q1	17	<472	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.30
			Q2	17	472-635	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.19	0.57-2.48	Nd	
			Q3	17	636-844	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.10	0.52-2.32	Nd	
			Q4	17	845-1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.23	0.60-2.53	Nd	
			Q5	17	>1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.93	0.43-2.01	Nd	
15668485	Flood 2005	Colon cancer (Total calcium [mg])	Q1	17	<472	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.68	0.42-1.08	Nd	0.10
			Q2	17	472-635	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.83	0.53-1.29	Nd	
			Q3	17	636-844	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.54	0.33-0.90	Nd	
			Q4	17	845-1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.89	0.57-1.38	Nd	
			Q5	17	>1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	
15668485	Flood 2005	Proximal colon cancer (Total calcium [mg])	Q1	17	<472	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.71	0.40-1.26	Nd	0.24
			Q2	17	472-635	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.71	0.40-1.26	Nd	
			Q3	17	636-844	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.86	0.49-1.49	Nd	

			Q4	17	845-1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.76	0.43-1.34	Nd	
			Q5	17	>1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	
15668485	Flood 2005	Distal colon cancer (Total calcium [mg])	Q1	17	<472	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.26
			Q2	17	472-635	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.84	0.59-1.18	Nd	
			Q3	17	636-844	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.66	0.46-0.96	Nd	
			Q4	17	845-1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.78	0.55-1.11	Nd	
			Q5	17	>1270	nd	nd	Age and energy only	RR (HR)	0.69	0.48-0.99	Nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
15668485	Flood 2005	**Some data on Vit D reported** Correlation between dietary Ca and supplemental Ca was low (r=0.01) Correlation between dietary Ca and dietary Vit D was high (r=0.87) Correlation between dietary Ca and total Vit D was low (r=0.33) Correlation between supplemental Ca and total Vit D was low (r=0.10) **Explanation of the use of only age and energy adjusted model** Simultaneous inclusion of all the potential confounders in the proportional hazards regression models did not produce any material changes in the results from those obtained in the age- and energy-adjusted models.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15668485	Flood 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y but not used eventually	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y "all"	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y (90.3 %)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y "not materially altered"	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Post-hoc analysis of an already available database. Otherwise, the reporting is good except for the blinding of the assessors of exposure and outcomes; not all cases confirmed by histology; participants per calcium quintile not reported; power calculation not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
1937662	Ford 1991	Cohort study	25-74 yo Traced between 1982-84 Detailed exam/interview Serum Ca available	HTN at baseline	1971-75	NHANES I	nd	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
1937662	Ford 1991	Cohort study	US, various	6913	5411	nd	25-44: ~59% 45-64: ~28% ≥65: ~13%	35%	White: 88% Black: 12%	"Normal": BMI<27.8 men / <27.3 women: ~78% "Obese": BMI 27.8-<31.1 men / 27.3-<32.3 women: ~16% "Severe obesity": BMI ≥31.1 men / ≥32.3 women ~7%	normotensive	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
1937662	Ford 1991	Dietary calcium intake	nd, not referenced	nd, not referenced	nd, not referenced	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
1937662	Ford 1991	1°	Hypertension	SBP≥160 mm Hg or DBP≥95 mm Hg or taking antihypertensive

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
1937662	Ford 1991	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Caloric intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (subanalyses by race, sex)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Follow-up	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
1937662	Ford 1991	Incident HTN, white men	Quartile 1	10 y	<343.75 mg/day	47 (22%)	~215	Adjusted	OR	1.0	--		
			Quartile 2		343.76-591.11	78 (20%)	~382			0.91	0.60, 1.38	NS	
			Quartile 3		591.12-953.77	104 (23%)	~448			1.09	0.73, 1.63	NS	
			Quartile 4		>953.77	131 (20%)	~662			0.96	0.64, 1.45	NS	
		Incident HTN, white women	Quartile 1	10 y	<343.75 mg/day	186 (22%)	~865	Adjusted	OR	1.0	--		
			Quartile 2		343.76-591.11	183 (23%)	~806			1.11	0.87, 1.43	NS	
			Quartile 3		591.12-953.77	172 (22%)	~775			1.17	0.90, 1.51	NS	
			Quartile 4		>953.77	104 (17%)	~619			1.01	0.74, 1.38	NS	
		Incident HTN, black men	Quartile 1	10 y	<343.75 mg/day	20 (42%)	~48	Adjusted	OR	1.0	--		
			Quartile 2		343.76-591.11	17 (38%)	~45			0.68	0.28, 1.65	NS	
			Quartile 3		591.12-953.77	18 (32%)	~56			0.54	0.22, 1.33	NS	
			Quartile 4		>953.77	9 (27%)	~34			0.35	0.11, 1.13	.08	
		Incident HTN, black women	Quartile 1	10 y	<343.75 mg/day	94 (42%)	~225	Adjusted	OR	1.0	--		
			Quartile 2		343.76-591.11	35 (29%)	~120			0.61	0.37, 1.01	.053	
			Quartile 3		591.12-953.77	31 (42%)	~74			1.11	0.62, 2.01	NS	
			Quartile 4		>953.77	11 (30%)	~37			0.77	0.33, 1.81	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
1937662	Ford 1991	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	No	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	No	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Yes	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Yes	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Yes	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Yes
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Yes	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	No	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	No	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Unclear
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	No					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	No	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Yes	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	No

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Very unclear reporting, particularly of numbers of subjects analyzed. Different methods used in different analyses without justification. Inadequate adjustment in primary model. >20% without sufficient data to include in analyses. Outdated definition of HTN.

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17372031	Forman 2007	Cohort study	-participant of HPFS or NHS who submitted blood samples and had 25(OH)D measured	-Cases from case-control studies derived from HPFS and NHS except from the nested case-control study of colon polyps in the NHS, from which both cases and controls were included. -prevalent HTN at the time of blood collection	NHS: 1990 – 1998 HPFS: 1994 - 2002	Health Professionals' Follow-up Study (HPFS) and Nurses' Health Study (NHS)	AHA	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17372031	Forman 2007	Cohort study	various	1811 (613 men, 1198 women)	1811	Men: 65 ± 8 years Women: 57 ± 7 years	nd	34%	- 95% of men and 85% of women were white	BMI ~ 25 ± 4	nd	Low vit D intake in part of cohort

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17372031	Forman 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D measured in several batches using RIA	Yes – coeff of variation ranged from 5.4% to 8.7%	nd	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17372031	Forman 2007	1º (for this post hoc analysis)	Incident HTN	Subject reporting that their physician made a dx of HTN since preceding questionnaire (biennial questionnaires administered in both NHS and HPFS)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17372031	Forman 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age and race were included in all models
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI was included in all models
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Physical activity was included in all models
		Other		Family hx of HTN, smoking status, menopausal status, season of blood draw, and intakes of vit D, EtOH, folate, Na, K, Ca, and Mg were tested individually and kept in model only if their inclusion changed the RR for 25(OH)D level by > 10%. Only menopausal status altered the effect estimate for < 15 ng/mL by > 10% and was maintained in final multivariable models.

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories	Mean Vit D level		No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
17372031	Forman 2007	Incident HTN	25(OH)D ≥ 30 ng/mL (♂)	≥ 30 ng/mL		22	233	Adjusted	4-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D between 15 and 29 ng/mL (♂)	15 and 29		33	347	Adjusted	4-year RR	1.12	0.51-2.48	NS	
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♂)	< 15		6	33	Adjusted	4-year RR	6.13	1.00-37.8	.05	
			25(OH)D ≥ 15 ng/mL (♂)*	≥ 15 ng/mL		55	580	Adjusted	4-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♂)*	< 15		6	33	Adjusted	4-year RR	5.68	1.01–32.3	<.05	
			25(OH)D ≥ 30 ng/mL (♂)	≥ 30 ng/mL		nd	233	Adjusted	8-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♂)	< 15		9	33	Adjusted	8-year RR	3.53	1.02-12.3	< .05	
			25(OH)D ≥ 15 ng/mL (♂)*	≥ 15 ng/mL		124	580	Adjusted	8-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♂)*	< 15		9	33	Adjusted	8-year RR	3.03	0.94-9.76	NS	
			25(OH)D ≥ 30 ng/mL (♀)	≥ 30 ng/mL		58	nd	Adjusted	4-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D between 15 and 29 ng/mL (♀)	15 and 29		60	nd	Adjusted	4-year RR	0.85	0.53-1.34	NS	
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♀)	< 15		11	nd	Adjusted	4-year RR	2.67	1.05-6.79	< .05	
			25(OH)D ≥ 15 ng/mL (♀)*	≥ 15 ng/mL		118	nd	Adjusted	4-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♀)*	< 15		11	nd	Adjusted	4-year RR	2.98	1.24-7.20	<.05	
			25(OH)D ≥ 30 ng/mL (♀)	≥ 30 ng/mL		nd	nd	Adjusted	8-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♀)	< 15		20	nd	Adjusted	8-year RR	1.70	0.92-3.16	NS	
			25(OH)D ≥ 15 ng/mL (♀)*	≥ 15 ng/mL		254	nd	Adjusted	8-year RR	1.0 (reference)			
			25(OH)D < 15 ng/mL (♀)*	< 15		20	nd	Adjusted	8-year RR	1.42	0.79-2.56	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

* Versus ≥15 ng/mL. Separate analysis from tertiles analysis

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17372031	Forman 2007	Incident HTN	HPFS and NHS data were combined to compute a pooled result using random-effects model. Those with vit D levels < 15 ng/mL compared to those with levels ≥ 30 ng/mL had a 4-year RR of 3.18 (95% CI: 1.39 – 7.29), p<.05

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17372031	Forman 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	N	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A): Time from sample collection to analysis not reported, no clear definition of outcome, food composition database not reported, no sample size calculations.	Data incomplete (formatting error in the table); potentially incomplete definition of outcome (no BP measurement). Small subset of all potentially available participants. Outcome did not include BP measurements.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18838623	Forman 2008	Case-cohort study	Fasting for ≥ 8 hours; no diagnosis of hypertension; no use of antihypertensive medications; no diagnosis of cancer (except nonmelanoma skin cancer); no diagnosis of either coronary heart disease or diabetes; and BMI < 30 kg/m^2	nd	1989	Nurses' Health Study 2	American Heart Association & National Institutes of Health	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18838623	Forman 2008	Case-cohort study	US	116,671 Female registered nurses joined the prospective cohort study in 1989, 29616 subjects contributed blood samples 1997-1999, 750 cases and 750 controls selected.	742 cases and 742 controls	43 (nd)	40-46	0	nd	BMI 24.1	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18838623	Forman 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Enzyme immunoassay	Y, coefficient variation=3.2%	nd	nd	26.6 ng/mL
18838623	Forman 2008	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18838623	Forman 2008	Primary	Hypertension	Self-reported by the health professionals on biennial questionnaires (obtained medical records from a subset of randomly selected NHS 2 participants to validate hypertension, sensitivity 94%, specificity 85%)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18838623	Forman 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Ca, phosphorus, uric acid
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	Age**, race**
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	Family history of hypertension
		Medication	Yes	Oral contraceptive use, creatinine
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes*	Physical activity
		Other	Yes	Date of blood sample collection**, day of menstrual cycle**, time of day of the blood collection**, PTH

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis
**Matching factors

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
18838623	Forman 2008	Hypertension	< 30.0		520	975	OR	1.64	1.29, 2.10	nd	1.47	1.10, 1.97	nd
			≥ 30.0		222	509							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18838623	Forman 2008	Hypertension	Quartile 1	ng/mL 37.9*****		151	369		Adjusted	OR	1.0			0.01
			Quartile 2	29.2		195	374		Adjusted		1.52	1.06, 2.18		
			Quartile 3	23.8		188	370		Adjusted		1.55	1.07, 2.23		
			Quartile 4	16.7		208	371		Adjusted		1.66	1.11,		

												2.48		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****median vitD level

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18838623	Forman 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	n	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	n	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	n					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	n	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Relied on self-reported hypertension, insufficient power to examine the association between plasma 25(OH)D levels and incident hypertension

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cohort study	• Noninstitutionalized US population, age 17 y or older who completed physical examination (n=17,705)	• No 25(OH)D measurement (n=875) • Unknown mortality status (n=11) • Missing birthdate (n=1)	1988-1994	NHANES III	NIH/NCI, USPHS/DHHS	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cohort study	US Mean latitude=38.3N	16818	16818	44.0 (nd)	nd	45.4	• Non-Hispanic white: 71.2 • Non-Hispanic black: 14.1 • Mexican American: 5.8 • Other: 8.9	BMI=26.7 kg/m^2 %body fat=23.4	nd	Vit D: 4.7 mcg/d Ca: 811.8 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Background exposure data
17971526	Freedman 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA kit	The mean coefficient of variation: • 17.6% (range 10–25%) for lower 25(OH)D values (20–62.5 nmol/L) • 15% (range12–18%) for higher values (85–147.5 nmol/L)	Nd (~7 to ~13 y) (follow-up of the entire cohort 146578 person-years)	Vit D intake: 4.7 mcg/d
17971526	Freedman 2007	Dietary calcium intake	24HR	USDA food composition database	nd	nd	nd		Ca intake: 811.8 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17971526	Freedman 2007	Primary	Cancer mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Lung cancer mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Digestive cancer mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Breast cancer mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Prostate cancer mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma/leukemia mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Colorectal cancer mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#
17971526	Freedman 2007	Secondary	Other cancers mortality	Based on ICD-10 codes#

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

Reported ICD-10 codes include: C33 – C34 (lung, trachea, and bronchus); C18 – C21 (colon, rectum, and anus); C15, C16, C22, C25 (other digestive system, i.e., esophagus, stomach, liver, pancreatic cancer); C50 (breast); C61 (prostate); C82 – C85, C91 – C95 (non-Hodgkin lymphoma/leukemia); and C00 – C14, C17, C23 – C24, C26 – C32, C37 – C41, C43 – C49, C51 – C52, C54 – C60, C62 – C65, C67 – C80, C88, C90, C97 (other cancers, including buccal, larynx, melanoma, gynecological sites, kidney, bladder, brain, multiple myeloma).

Note: these are based on a death registry or a cancer database. Cases were not verified with medical records or pathology reports.

**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17971526	Freedman 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (calcium intake and serum retinol level)	Final model includes: sex, race/ethnicity, and smoking pattern
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (sex, race/ethnicity, and education)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (BMI and total body fat)	
		Medical conditions	Yes (disease history)	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes (season and location/latitude)	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes (smoking pattern)	Never, former, current (<20pack-y), current (20 or more pack-y), current (unknown pack-y)
		Other	Levels of physical activity	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

Final model includes: sex, race/ethnicity, and smoking pattern

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level (nmol/L)	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean follow-up period, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?		Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality	6-Q1	<50	nd	175	5744	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.65
			6-Q2	50 to <62.5		103	3143					1.22	0.91-1.64		
			6-Q3	62.5 to <80		117	3713					1.02	0.69-1.50		
			6-Q4	80 to <100		80	4218					1.00	0.71-1.40		
			6-Q5	100 to <120		41						0.92	0.58-1.46		
			6-Q6	120 or over		20						1.49	0.85-2.64		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Lung Cancer Mortality	4-Q1	<50	nd	57	5744	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.41
			4-Q2	50 to <80		51	6856					0.78	0.50-1.22		
			4-Q3	80 to <100		23	4218					0.65	0.36-1.18		
			4-Q4	100 or over		22						1.14	0.60-2.18		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Digestive Cancer Mortality	2-Q1	<62.5	nd	34	Nd	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.18
			2-Q2	62.5 or over		37						1.42	0.73-1.76		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Breast Cancer Mortality	2-Q1	<62.5	nd	20	Nd	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.76
			2-Q2	62.5 or over		8						0.28	0.08-0.93		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Prostate Cancer Mortality	2-Q1	<62.5	nd	22	nd	105	Adjusted		RR	reference	-	nd	0.95
			2-Q2	≥62.5		25						0.91	0.39-2.14		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma or leukemia Mortality	2-Q1	<62.5	nd	16	nd	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.96
			2-Q2	62.5 or over		24						1.34	0.62-2.91		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Colorectal Cancer Mortality	3-Q1	<50	nd	28	nd	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.02
			3-Q2	50 to <80		24						0.44	0.20-0.95		
			3-Q3	80 or over		14						0.28	0.11-0.68		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Other Cancers	3-Q1	<50	nd	38	nd	105	Adjusted		HR	reference	-	nd	0.84
			3-Q2	50 to		60						1.83	0.93-		

		Mortality		<80									3.61		
			3-Q3	80 or over		32						1.86	0.75-4.63		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level (nmol/L)	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Winter/lower latitude)	5-Q1	<50	nd	74	nd	Adjusted	HR	reference	-	Interaction (between winter/lower vs. summer/higher subgroups) P=0.36	0.65
			5-Q2	50 to <62.5		37				1.02	0.59-1.76		
			5-Q3	62.5 to <80		42				1.16	0.52-2.56		
			5-Q4	80 to <100		30				0.95	0.51-1.79		
			5-Q5	100 or over		23				1.08	0.54-2.16		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Summer/higher latitude)	5-Q1	<50	nd	101	Nd	Adjusted	HR	reference	-		0.95
			5-Q2	50 to <62.5		66				1.29	0.90-1.85		
			5-Q3	62.5 to <80		75				0.96	0.65-1.41		
			5-Q4	80 to <100		50				1.00	0.65-1.54		
			5-Q5	100 or over		38				1.09	0.66-1.81		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Males)	5-Q1	<50	nd	88	1993	Adjusted	HR	reference	-	Interaction (between winter/lower vs. summer/higher subgroups) P=0.70	0.08
			5-Q2	50 to <62.5		57	1461			1.03	0.73-1.44		
			5-Q3	62.5 to <80		71	1845			0.99	0.57-1.74		
			5-Q4	80 to <100		58	2333			1.21	0.83-1.78		
			5-Q5	100 or over		44				1.35	0.78-2.31		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Females)	5-Q1	<50	nd	87	3751	Adjusted	HR	reference	-	Interaction (between winter/lower vs. summer/higher subgroups) P=0.26	0.12
			5-Q2	50 to <62.5		46	1682			1.40	0.94-2.08		
			5-Q3	62.5 to <80		46	1868			1.02	0.62-1.67		
			5-Q4	80 to <100		22	1885			0.72	0.40-1.26		
			5-Q5	100 or over		17				0.78	0.40-1.53		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Non-Hispanic white)	4-Q1	<50	nd	61	2964	Adjusted	HR	reference	-	Interaction (between winter/lower vs. summer/higher	0.80
			4-Q2	50 to <80		135	5206			1.12	0.78-1.60		
			4-Q3	80 to <100		57	3813			1.02	0.66-1.56		

			4-Q4	100 or over		45				1.10	0.70-1.74	subgroups) P=NS	
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Non-Hispanic black)	3-Q1	<50	nd	80	1666	Adjusted	HR	reference	-	Interaction (between winter/lower vs. summer/higher subgroups) P=NS	0.14
			3-Q2	50 to <80		42	609			0.84	0.53-1.33		
			3-Q3	80 or over		22	101			1.41	0.80-2.48		
17971526	Freedman 2007	Cancer Mortality (Mexican American)	3-Q1	<50	Nd	33	414	Adjusted	HR	reference	-	Interaction (between winter/lower vs. summer/higher subgroups) P=NS	0.37
			3-Q2	50 to <80		39	433			0.89	0.42-1.87		
			3-Q3	80 or over		15	122			0.66	0.28-1.55		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17971526	Freedman 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	Nd

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No details on enrollment and blinding assessment, some may have been excluded due to unavailability of data (e.g., blood sample), leading to the possibility of selection bias. NO adjustments on family history. How the diagnosis of cancer was verified was unclear.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18381472	Freedman 2008	Case-cohort study	Cases: All participants of Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial who provided baseline blood samples and background questionnaires, no history of breast cancer at baseline, but were diagnosed with an incident breast cancer between the date of the baseline blood collection (1993-2001) and June 30, 2005. Noncases: All participants of Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial who provided baseline blood samples and background questionnaires but had not reported a breast cancer as of June 30, 2005.	History of one of the four PLCO cancers, a recent history of screening procedures for one of the cancers, or were undergoing treatment for any cancer (other than nonmelanoma skin cancer).	November 1993 and July 2001	Prostate, Lung, Colorectal, and Ovarian (PLCO) Cancer Screening Trial	NIH	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18381472	Freedman 2008	Case-cohort study	10 US centers 38 00 N	1,005 cases and 1,005 noncases	2010	66.5	nd	0	~90% Caucasian	~21	Ever smoker ~ 37-47% History of benign breast disease 16% - 31% HRT use 63% – 78% Nulliparous 7% to 11%	Total calcium intake 1.1 to 1.7 g/d Supplement with vitD use 25% to 60%

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Background exposure data
18381472	Freedman 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Coeff variation 8.2% for 25(OH)D 12.8% for 1,25(OH)2D	~5y	FFQ for Ca and vit D
		Dietary calcium intake							

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18381472	Freedman 2008	Primary outcome	Breast cancer risk	Incident breast cancer classified according to their behavior and histological patterns

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
18381472	Freedman 2008	Used quintiles to assess sensitivity of their findings to different analytical approaches. Data available for incident breast cancer risk after excluding first 2y of followup

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18381472	Freedman 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes, age at first birth, race	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes - BMI	
		Medical conditions	Menopausal status, age at menarche, benign fibrocystic disease, family h/o breast cancer	
		Medication	Hormonal replacement	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes smoking status, alcohol intake	
		Other	Months of the blood draw, mammography, parity	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level	Followup	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 1 <18.3 ng/mL	25(OH)D	12 y	172	2010	Y	RR	1.0			0.81
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 2 18.3-<23.5 ng/mL	25(OH)D	12 y	188	2010	Y	RR	1.02	0.75-1.41		
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 3 23.5-<28.3 ng/mL	25(OH)D	12 y	244	2010	Y	RR	1.36	0.99-1.87		

18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 4 28.3-<33.7 ng/mL	25(OH)D	12 y	205	2010	Y	RR	1.13	0.82-1.55		
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 5 ≥33.7 ng/mL	25(OH)D	12 y	196	2010	Y	RR	1.04	0.75-1.45		
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 1 <28.2 pg/mL	25(OH)2D	12 y	166	2010	Y	RR	1.0	1.0		0.14
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 2 28.2-<33.5 pg/mL	25(OH)2D	12 y	186	2010	Y	RR	1.22	1.22		
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 3 33.5-<39 pg/mL	25(OH)2D	12 y	206	2010	Y	RR	1.28	1.28		
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 4 39-<46.3 pg/mL	25(OH)2D	12 y	234	2010	Y	RR	1.47	1.47		
18381472	Freedman 2008	Incident breast cancer	Quintiles 5 ≥46.3 pg/mL	25(OH)2D	12 y	212	2010	Y	RR	1.23	1.23		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups

		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18381472	Freedman 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	na	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)		a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)		c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	**B**
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A	lacks data on exposure and dietary assessment

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9061275	Gaard 1996	Cohort study	• Attended NHSS health screening (n=62998) • Returned dietary assessment questionnaire (n=51982) • Answered 20 or more questions and had total energy intake of >501.9 kcal/d (n=51152)	Previous cancer (n=617)	1977-1983	NHSS	nd	TTE

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9061275	Gaard 1996	Cohort study	Norway (Finnmark [69° 44'N], Sogn og Fjordane [61° 04'N], Oppland [60° 47'N])	50535	50535	43 (nd)	20-53(invited)	49% (male and female were separately analyzed)	nd	nd	nd	Male • Total energy: 2033.7 kcal/d • Ca intake: 907 mg/d • Total fat: 87.2 g/d Female • Total energy: 1343.5 kcal/d • Ca intake: 637 mg/d • Total fat: 55.4 g/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
9061275	Gaard 1996	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	The Norwegian Food Composition table (Blaker et al. 1991)	Yes "acceptable" (reported separately in Loken et al 1987 in Finish)	na	na		nd	907 mg/d (M); 637 mg/d (F)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9061275	Gaard 1996	Primary (only reported outcome)	Colon cancer	Norwegian cancer registry (compulsory reporting of cancer cases by histopathology departments)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
9061275	Gaard 1996	Rectal cancer not reported in this article

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9061275	Gaard 1996	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Energy	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age [20-44/45-49/55-], attained age [-50/51-54/55-])	Men and women were separately analyzed
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (BMI, height)	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (smoking [current/ex-/never])	
		Other	Nd	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up time, mo	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Person-years**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
Men													
9061275	Gaard 1996	Colon cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	134.4	-758	22	73785	adjusted	RR (OR?)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.15

			Q2	134.4	759-912	24	72101	adjusted	RR (OR?)	1.02	0.57-1.83	Nd	
			Q3	134.4	913-1066	24	71950	adjusted	RR (OR?)	1.04	0.58-1.86	Nd	
			Q4	134.4	1067-	13	70992	adjusted	RR (OR?)	0.57	0.29-1.13	nd	
Women				134.4									
9061275	Gaard 1996	Colon cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	134.4	-527	15	71563	adjusted	RR (OR?)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.94
			Q2	134.4	528-628	20	70540	Adjusted	RR (OR?)	1.25	0.63-2.46	Nd	
			Q3	134.4	629-743	7	69896	Adjusted	RR (OR?)	0.46	0.19-1.12	Nd	
			Q4	134.4	744-	18	69926	adjusted	RR (OR?)	1.20	0.60-2.39	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9061275	Gaard 1996	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Post-hoc analysis of an existing cohort. Some limited reporting. Cases not confirmed by histology; a series of potential correlations are reported as outcomes; power calculation not reported; analyses of the whole sample is not provided (only per gender); consecutive sampling only for part of the population while random sampling for another part; blinding not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17311057	Gale 2008	Cohort study	Caucasian women ≥16 y; singleton pregnancy <17 wk gestation		1991-92	-	non-profit	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17311057	Gale 2008	Cohort study	Southampton, UK	466	440	26.3 (est.)		0	Caucasians	prepregnancy wt: 59 Kg (est.)		vit D intake (food & supplements): 2.9 µg in late pregnancy

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17311057	Gale 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	y; intra and interassay CV <10%)	5 y	not explicitly reported	UV-B exposure from 2974 (bottom quartile of 25 (OH)D) to 32017 (top quartile of 25 (OH)D) Wh/m2
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17311057	Gale 2008	primary	birth length	
			birth weight	
			9 mo length	
			9 mo weight	
			atopic eczema at 9 mo	modified UK Working Party Diagnostic Criteria, 1994

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
17311057	Gale 2008	Data from a longitudinal cohort of UK children whose mothers had taken part in a nutritional survey during pregnancy

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17311057	Gale 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions	no	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	UVB exposure
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases *	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17311057	Gale 2008	atopic eczema at 9 mo	Quartile 1:<30 nmol/L			9	440	crude	OR	1.0			
			Quartile 2: 30-50			10	440			1.11	0.43-2.84		
			Quartile 3: >50-75			15	440			1.75	0.73-4.17		
			Quartile 4: >75			14	440			1.62	0.67-3.89		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.

*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
17311057	Gale 2008	birth weight	Kg	Quartile 1:<30 nmol/L	crude					3.38	0.46			0.247
				Quartile 2: 30-50						3.40	0.56			
				Quartile 3: >50-75						3.49	1.57			
				Quartile 4: >75						3.43	0.51			
		birth length	cm	Quartile 1:<30 nmol/L	crude					50	1.83			0.150
				Quartile 2: 30-50						50	2.29			
				Quartile 3: >50-75						50.5	2.25			
				Quartile 4: >75						50.1	2.09			
17311057	Gale 2008	9 mo weight	Kg	Quartile 1:<30 nmol/L	crude					9.10	1.07			0.873
				Quartile 2: 30-50						9.03	1.14			
				Quartile 3: >50-75						9.24	1.34			
				Quartile 4: >75						9.07	1.06			
		9 mo length	cm	Quartile 1:<30 nmol/L	crude					71.2	2.85			0.861
				Quartile 2: 30-50						71.4	2.60			
				Quartile 3: >50-75						71.7	2.89			
				Quartile 4: >75						71.1	2.67			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17311057	Gale 2008	no adjustment for potential confounders like FH of atopy

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17311057	Gale 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	n	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	n	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	no adjustment for potential confounders

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8850273	Gann 1996	Case-cohort study	US male physicians	Prior history of MI, stroke, TIA, unstable angina, cancer except for nonmelanoma skin cancer, current renal or liver disease, peptic ulcer or gout, contraindication to aspirin use, current use of aspirin, other platelet-active agents, or vitamin A supplements.	nd	Physicians' Health Study (PHS)	NIH	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8850273	Gann 1996	Case-cohort study	United States (multiple locations)	22,071 in original cohort, 520 cases matched 1:2 with controls, 646 total with adequate exposure data	232 cases and 414 controls	62 yrs	40-84 yrs at baseline	100%	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
8850273	Gann 1996	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA for 25-D, radioreceptor assay using calf thymus receptor for 1,25-D	Y; CV = 8.1% for 25-D, 7.9% for 1,25-D	nd	66.4% collected in fall	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8850273	Gann 1996	Nd	Prostate cancer	Medical records and pathology reports

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8850273	Gann 1996	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (match)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Season of blood collection (for 25-D)	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking (match)
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
8850273	Gann 1996	Total prostate cancer	Quartile 1: 25-D 6.3-21.3 ng/mL	Nd	nd	Nd	Nd	adjusted	OR	1.00	nd	Nd	0.82
			Quartile 2: 25-D 21.4-28.4	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.10	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 3: 25-D 28.5-37.4	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.16	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 4: 25-D 37.5-77.8	nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.92	0.56-1.50	nd	

		Total prostate cancer	Quartile 1: 1,25-D 13.8-28.5 pg/mL	Nd	nd	Nd	Nd	adjusted	OR	1.00	nd	Nd	0.50
			Quartile 2: 1,25-D 28.6-33.8	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.13	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 3: 1,25-D 33.9-40.1	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.85	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 4: 1,25-D 40.2-129.1	nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.88	0.53-1.45	nd	

Note: ORs are controlled for age and smoking by matching, 25-D is additionally adjusted for season of blood collection

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Median 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
8850273	Gann 1996	Cases:	nd	crude	232	29.3				0.80
		Control:			414	28.5				

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

8850273	Gann 1996	Total prostate cancer	Models adjusting for BMI, exercise, smoking, and alcohol produced nearly identical results, although they were not specifically listed.
		Prostate cancer by age	Quartiles of 25-D and 1,25-D did not list ranges, CI for comparison of Quartile 4 to quartile one was given and was not significant for either ages >61 yrs or ≤61 yrs.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
8850273	Gann 1996	Total prostate cancer; age ≤61 y	Quartile 1: 25-D 6.3-21.3 ng/mL	Nd	nd	Nd	Nd	adjusted	OR	1.00	nd	Nd	nd
			Quartile 2: 25-D 21.4-28.4	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.19	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 3: 25-D 28.5-37.4	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.75	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 4: 25-D 37.5-77.8	nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.48	0.73-2.98	nd	
		Total prostate cancer; age >61 y	Quartile 1: 25-D 6.3-21.3 ng/mL	Nd	nd	Nd	Nd	adjusted	OR	1.00	nd	Nd	nd
			Quartile 2: 25-D 21.4-28.4	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.00	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 3: 25-D 28.5-37.4	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.82	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 4: 25-D 37.5-77.8	nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.76	0.39-1.47	nd	
		Total prostate cancer; age ≤61 y	Quartile 1: 1,25-D 13.8-28.5 pg/mL	Nd	nd	Nd	Nd	adjusted	OR	1.00	nd	nd	nd
			Quartile 2: 1,25-D 28.6-33.8	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.61	nd	nd	

			Quartile 3: 1,25-D 33.9-40.1	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.10	nd	nd	
			Quartile 4: 1,25-D 40.2-129.1	nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.93	0.44-1.95	nd	
		Total prostate cancer; age >61 y	Quartile 1: 1,25-D 13.8-28.5 pg/mL	Nd	nd	Nd	Nd	adjusted	OR	1.00	nd	Nd	nd
			Quartile 2: 1,25-D 28.6-33.8	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.81	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 3: 1,25-D 33.9-40.1	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.65	Nd	Nd	
			Quartile 4: 1,25-D 40.2-129.1	nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.82	0.39-1.47	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8850273	Gann 1996	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	na	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	na	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	na	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	n					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	na					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Less than half of physicians who were cases provided samples adequate for analysis. Results were not provided for fully adjusted model.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
2857364	Garland 1985	Cohort study	Randomly selected from the population of men aged 40-55 years who had been employed for at least 2 years at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works in Chicago	Age at first examination less than 40 y, vital status unknown at the twentieth anniversary, malignancy diagnosed before second examination, death before second examination, termination of employment with the company or transfer to another plant, withdrawal from the study, lack of information from the second examination with respect to diet or cigarette smoking	1957-1958	Western Electric Health Study	American heart association	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
2857364	Garland 1985	Cohort study	Chicago, US 41° N	2107	1954	48.7 (4.4)		100	65% Americans of Germen, Polish, or Bohemian ancestry, most of others from the British Isles	BMI 25.5	nd	Nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
2857364	Garland 1985	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
2857364	Garland 1985	Dietary calcium intake	28-day diet histories	Food composition table (Ref 2)	nd	nd	nd		nd	mg/1000kcal Cancer: 316.7 No cancer: 326.7

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
2857364	Garland 1985	nd	Colorectal cancer	Medical and hospital records

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
2857364	Garland 1985	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (Dietary intake) Yes* - age Yes* - BMI Yes (Cigarette consumption, ethanol consumption)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
2857364	Garland 1985	Colorectal cancer	Ca (mg/1000kcal) – quartile 1		102-241	19	488	Adjusted for age	HR	nd	nd		nd
			Ca (mg/1000kcal) - quartile 2		242-306	12	489		HR	nd	nd		
			Ca (mg/1000kcal) -		307-	12	489		HR	nd	nd		

			quartile e 3		383								
			Ca (mg/1000kcal) - quartile 4		384-906	6	458		HR	nd	nd		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:	19 yr		49			289.9 /1000kcal	nd	≤ 0.05
		Control:	19 yr		1905			nd	nd	

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

2857364	Garland 1985	Results on the model with multiple factor adjustment are not shown; it is reported that these results were similar to the models (univariate and age adjustred) shown in the article Based on coefficient and SE, HR (95% CI) can be calculated: 1 (1-0.99) both for univariate and for age adjusted models (for calcium); however, p-values given are one-tailed, which may no longer be statistically significant if converted to two-tailed p-values (same applies for one way analysis)

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
2857364	Garland 1985	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	N	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	N	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Validity of 28-day dietary histories was not examined; exposure assessor blinding not reported; power calculation not reported; use of one-tailed test for significance in Cox regression and in one way analysis (exact p-value not given); results poorly reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
2572900	Garland 1989	Case-cohort study	• Community volunteer cohort participants • Cases: colon caner cases (ICD-8 153.0-153.8) diagnosed between 1/1/75 & 12/31/83 • Controls: 1:2 matching controls (by race, sex, age, month of blood draw, census registry status)	Cases: • Non-white cases • Previous cancer (excl. non-melanoma skin cancer)	1974 (Sep-Nov)	nd	NCI, The Dairy Bureau of Canada, National Heart Lung and Blood Institute	JHL/TTE

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
2572900	Garland 1989	Case-cohort study	Washington county, Maryland (38° 42')	Original Cohort (n=25620) Cases (N=34) Controls (N=67)	101	62.8 (no SD)	nd	49.5%	White: 100%	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
2572900	Garland 1989	25(OH)D				HPLC and UV absorbance detection	Inter-assay coefficient of variation (CV) =7.6%	At least ~9 y (assuming last dx) max ~15 y	Aug-Nov	nd
2572900	Garland 1989	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd			nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
2572900	Garland 1989	nd	Colon cancer	ICD-8 153.0-153.8 (probably registry data, unclear about confirmation by medical records/pathological reports or by other means)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
2572900	Garland 1989	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		Matching factors: race, sex, age, month blood was taken

		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Yes No Month blood was taken No	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
2572900	Garland	Colon	25(OH)D – quintile 1	4-19		9	8	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			

			25(OH)D – quintile 2	20-26		7	13			0.48	Nd		
			25(OH)D – quintile 3	27-32		5	18			0.25	Nd	≤0.05 (vs. Q1)	
			25(OH)D – quintile 4	33-41		4	17			0.21	Nd	≤0.05 (vs. Q1)	
			25(OH)D – quintile 5	42-91		9	11			0.73	Nd		
	Garland 1989	Colon cancer	25(OH)D – group 1	0-29			42*****	Adjusted (matching)	OR	1.0 (ref)			
			25(OH)D – group 2	≥ 30			57*****			0.5	Nd	0.13	
	Garland 1989	Colon cancer	25(OH)D – group 1	0-19			17*****	Adjusted (matching)	OR	1.0 (ref)			
			25(OH)D – group 2	≥20			82*****			0.3	Nd	0.05 (1-sided)	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****Total N

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
2572900	Garland 1989	Cases:	11 mo to ~9 y	Adjusted (matching)	34	30.5 ng/ml	Nd			P=0.05
		Control:			67	33.3 ng/ml	Nd			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
2572900	Garland 1989	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	ND	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	N	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	ND	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting, post-hoc analysis of a prospective cohort study, no controlling for family history of colon cancer

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	RCT	Post-menopausal nuns ≥50 y	Acute illness, medical treatments that may affect blood pressure, lipids and other parameters, memory lapses, therapeutic diets, high anxiety	≤1994	none	Dairy Bureau	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	RCT	Montreal, Canada 45.7°	265	158	Maybe ~80	50-69: 25% ≥70: 75%	0%	Probably almost all white	59.7 Kg	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ & 24 hr recall	Canadian Nutrient File	no	NA	NA		nd	776 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	Dairy diet	Regular food	Achieved 1242 mg/d (30 g dairy protein)	4 wk	3 meals
		Dairy free diet		Achieved 377 mg/day		
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			Non-compliant and those who provided incomplete data were excluded.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	2°	Weight	Kg
		2°	SBP/DBP	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No (NA for weight analysis)	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final	Final SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	Weight	Kg	Dairy diet	1	81	59.84	11.33	59.94	11.37	+0.5		NS (implied)
				Dairy free diet		77	59.65	15.34	59.25	14.80			
		SBP	mm Hg	Dairy diet	1	81	140.34	20.55	137.65	22.14	-5.44		NS (implied)
				Dairy free diet		77	131.71	23.91	134.46	21.31			
		DBP	mm Hg	Dairy diet	1	81	81.17	9.87	73.39	10.67	-2.19		NS (implied)
				Dairy free diet		77	79.09	9.89	73.50	10.42			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
7493659	Ghadirian 1995	RCT	nd	nd	NA	No	No	No	No	No	No	C

**Adverse Event(s): ** **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poorly reported, poorly analyzed. Very high dropout rate.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16492906 and 17450530	Giovannucci 2006 and Giovannucci 2007***	Cohort study	Male health professionals	-Cancer (except nonmelanoma skin cancer) -men who did not adequately complete SFFQ	1986 - 2002	Health Professionals Follow-up Study	NCI, NIH, NHLBI	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others

**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

***note: data in this document is derived from Giovannucci 2006. Giovannucci 2007 contained no extra information, but slightly different numbers because of different included confounders.

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16492906	Giovannucci 2006	Cohort study	United States (various)	51,529 in original cohort	47,750	nd	40-75 yrs at baseline	100%	>91% Caucasian	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16492906	Giovannucci 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D and 1,25(OH)D by RIA	Intrapair CV ranged from 5%-7%	nd	All samples drawn in 1993 to 1994	NA
		Dietary calcium intake	SFFQ	USDA	Yes: used a sample of 127 cohort members from Boston area. Total energy-adjusted Ca was 815±280 mg/d based on diet records and 839±346 mg/d based on SFFQ. Their correlation was 0.61	None	NA		NA	Nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16492906	Giovannucci 2006	nd	Prostate cancer	Cases derived from self report, pathology reports, hospital records. T1a cancers excluded.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16492906	Giovannucci 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Total calories, red meat, fish, α-linolenic acid, zinc supplements, tomato sauce	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI at age 21, height
		Medical conditions	Family history of prostate cancer, history of diabetes	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Cigarette pack years, vigorous physical activity level
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
16492906	Giovannucci 2006	Total prostate cancer	Total calcium <500 mg/d	nd	nd	183	Nd	adjusted	RR	0.98	0.84-1.15		0.10
			Total calcium = 500-749 mg/d	nd	nd	1072	Nd			1	Reference		
			Total calcium = 750-999 mg/d	nd	nd	1099	Nd			1.07	0.98-1.16		
			Total calcium = 1,000-1,499 mg/d	nd	nd	898	Nd			1.03	0.94-1.14		

			Total calcium = 1,500-1,999 mg/d	nd	nd	207	Nd			1.06	0.91-1.23		
			Total calcium = ≥2,000 mg/d	nd	nd	85	nd			1.28	1.02-1.60		
		Fatal prostate cancer	Total calcium <500 mg/d	nd	nd	21	Nd	adjusted	RR	1.05	0.65-1.69		0.01
			Total calcium = 500-749 mg/d	nd	nd	94	Nd			1	Reference		
			Total calcium = 750-999 mg/d	nd	nd	81	Nd			0.95	0.70-1.28		
			Total calcium = 1,000-1,499 mg/d	nd	nd	76	Nd			1.04	0.77-1.42		
			Total calcium = 1,500-1,999 mg/d	nd	nd	26	Nd			1.56	1.00-2.43		
			Total calcium = ≥2,000 mg/d	nd	nd	14	Nd			2.02	1.14-3.58		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								

		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16492906	Giovannucci 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	NA	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Case-cohort study	US male health care professionals Provided blood sample Age 40-75 in 1986	History of CVD pre-1994. Participant reported MI not confirmed by medical records. Non-CVD death	Blood sample drawn 1/1993-12/1995 CVD assessed through 1/31/2004	Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS)	Gov't (NIH)	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Case-cohort study	US-wide (~25-45)	18225	1354: 454 cases 900 controls	63.8 (8.6) (implied at time of blood draw)	40-75	100%	White 94% AA 0% Asian 0.7% Other 5%	BMI Cases: 26.1 (3.3) Controls 25.6 (3.4) P=.01 difference	No CVD (baseline) Current smoker 9.3% FHx MI<60 16% DM 9.3% HTN 37%	Total fat intake 31% of Kcal Saturated fat 10% Marine O3 0.12% Multivitamin use 47% (of cases)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Background exposure data
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	25(OH)D				RIA (Hollis 1993)	Yes CV=11.5%	Unclear (but frozen)	Mean (SD) Cases 23.0 (7.6) Controls 24.5 (8.3) % in 4 categories, controls only: ≤15 ng/mL 9.7% 15.1-22.5 34% 22.6-29.9 33% ≥30 23%
		Dietary calcium intake							

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Primary (for post hoc analysis)	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD	By questionnaire: "professionally diagnosed" Medical record review (confirmed) by study MDs: MI – WHO criteria Deaths identified from state and national records, next of kin, or postal system. Fatal CHD: confirmed by hospital records, autopsy, or cause of death on death certificate if evidence of previous CHD was available. Nonfatal MI 352 participants; Fatal CHD 102 participants.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Marine O3 intake (adjusted)
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (matched) Gender (all male) Ethnicity, white vs other (adjusted)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI (adjusted)
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM (adjusted) HTN (adjusted)
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	Physical activity (adjusted) US region (northeast, mid-Atlantic, Midwest, south) (adjusted) Month and year of blood draw (matched)
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Smoking status (matched) Alcohol intake (adjusted)
		Other	Yes	Family history of MI<60 y (adjusted) Baseline LDL-c (adjusted) Baseline HDL-c (adjusted) Triglycerides (adjusted)

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	F/up	N Event	N Total	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD	25(OH)D Level 1	≤15.0 ng/mL	10 y	63	150	Adjusted	RR	2.09	1.24, 3.54	<.05	
			Level 2	15.1-22.5		156	463			1.43	0.96, 2.13	NS	
			Level 3	22.6-29.9		165	464			1.60	1.10, 2.32	<.05	
			Level 4	≥30.0		70	277			1.00	--	--	.02
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD	All	All	10 y	454	1354	Adjusted	OR (per 1 ng/mL)	0.98	0.96, 0.998		.05
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD	All	All	10 y	454	1354	Adjusted	Risk reduction per 1 ng/mL		-2.1%	-0.2%, -4.0%	<.05
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Nonfatal MI or fatal CHD	25(OH)D Level 1	≤15.0 ng/mL	10 y	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR No cholesterol lowering drugs at baseline	2.30	1.33, 3.97	<.05	
			Level 4	≥30.0 ng/mL						1.0	--	--	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD			P between groups
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	Cases:	10 y	Crude	454	23.0	7.6			.002
		Control:			900	24.5	8.3			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	The most adjusted model was chosen. Similar results (somewhat "stronger") if only accounted for matching variables. Very similar results if omitted lipid-adjustment.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

No statistical evidence of interaction by age (range approximately 48-83).

Interaction data also reported for HTN, BMI, aspirin use, physical activity, alcohol use, LDL-c, Tg, HDL-c.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18541825	Giovannucci 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	+/-	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Appropriate matching, adjustment, and statistical analysis. No clear flaws.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
14652238	Grau 2003	Post hoc analysis of an existing RCT	Subjects had at least one histologically confirmed large-bowel adenoma removed within 3 months before recruitment, with the entire large-bowel mucosa visualized endoscopically and judged to be free of remaining polyps.	nd	1988	Calcium Polyp Prevention Study	nd	JHL/TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
14652238	Grau 2003	Post hoc analysis of an existing RCT	Six clinical centers: the Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, the University of Southern California—Southern California Permanente Medical group, the University of Iowa, the University of Minnesota, and the University of North Carolina	930	803	60.9 (nd)	nd	72.5%	White - 84.4% Black - 8.3% Hispanic - 7.2%	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
14652238	Grau 2003	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Radioimmunoassay kit from Nicholas Institute Diagnostics (Capistrano, CA)	Y, inter-batch Pearson correlation coefficient 25(OH)VitD=.95 1,25(OH)2VitD=.58	11-15y (1988-1992 to ~2003)	nd	nd
14652238	Grau 2003	Dietary calcium intake	SFFQ	nd	nd	nd	nd			nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
14652238	Grau 2003	Ca	Ca supplementation (no brand name)	3g of calcium carbonate or 1200mg of elemental calcium	4 y	nd
		placebo	nd	N/A	4 y	nd
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
14652238	Grau 2003	1°	Recurrence of colorectal adenomas	nd
14652238	Grau 2003	2°	Occurrence of "advanced" colorectal adenomas (i.e., advanced lesions only)	Defined by the study pathologists as advanced lesions: tubulovillous adenomas (25-74% villous component), villous adenomas (75% or more villous), this containing advanced dysplasia or invasive cancer, or those larger than 1cm in diameter (as assessed by the endoscopist)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
14652238	Grau 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes - age, gender	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes - month of blood draw	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes - alcohol intake, smoking status	
		Other	Center, VDR genotypes	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
14652238	Grau 2003	Recurrent adenoma [25(OH)D≤29.1ng/mL]	Placebo	4 y	95	203	RR				1.05	0.85-1.29	Interaction P=0.012
			Calcium		99	200							
14652238	Grau 2003	Recurrent adenoma [25(OH)D>29.1ng/mL]	Placebo	4 y	107	200	RR				0.71	0.57-0.89	
			Calcium		75	195							
14652238	Grau 2003	Recurrent "advanced" adenoma [25(OH)D≤29.1ng/mL]	Placebo	4 y	30	203	RR				1.02	0.63-1.64	Interaction P=0.106
			Calcium		28	200							
14652238	Grau 2003	Recurrent "advanced" adenoma [25(OH)D>29.1ng/mL]	Placebo	4 y	39	200	RR				0.58	0.36-0.93	
			Calcium		23	195							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo
Similar findings were observed when V-D levels were considered in tertiles or quartiles.

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases *	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
14652238	Grau 2003	Recurrent adenoma vs. a unit (12 ng/mL) change in 25(OH)D	Overall					adj	RR	0.99	0.91-1.07	Interaction (calcium vs. placebo) P=0.006	
			Calcium					adj	RR	0.88	0.77-0.99		
			placebo					adj	RR	1.09	0.97-1.22		
14652238	Grau 2003	Recurrent "advanced" adenoma vs. a unit (12 ng/mL) change in 25(OH)D	Overall					adj	RR	0.95	0.79-1.15	Interaction (calcium vs. placebo) P=0.48	
			Calcium					adj	RR	0.78	0.58-1.05		
			placebo					adj	RR	1.10	0.86-1.40		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
14652238	Grau 2003	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Post-hoc “subgroup” analyses of a RCT. Consecutiveness not fully preserved. No controlling for family history of colorectal cancer

***Check “NA” and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17227996	Grau 2007	RCT	Subjects had at least one histologically confirmed adenoma within 3 months before enrollment, with the large bowel mucosa entirely examined and judged free of remaining polyps.	Subjects diet during Calcium trial, died after Calcium Trial and before Calcium follow-up, refused to participate, or unable to be contacted	1988-1992	Calcium Polyp Prevention Study	National Institute of Health	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17227996	Grau 2007	RCT	US The Cleveland Clinic Foundation (41.51° N), Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center (43.71° N), The University of South California-Southern California Kaiser Permanente Medical Group (34.02° N), the University of Iowa (41.39° N), the University of Minnesota (44.98° N), and the University of North Carolina (35.94° N)	930	822	60.6 (no sd)	nd	Male 71.7% Female 28.3%	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17227996	Grau 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
17227996	Grau 2007	Dietary calcium intake	Semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	876mg

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17227996	Grau 2007	Ca	Ca supplementation	1200mg of elemental calcium (3g of calcium carbonate)	4y	1 time/day
17227996	Grau 2007	placebo	nd			
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			50% (no information on measurement)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17227996	Grau 2007	Primary	All adenomas	For each colonoscopy a participant reported, copies of the endoscopy report and relevant pathology reports were obtained. Slides of each lesion removed from the bowel were sent to a study pathologist for uniform review regarding diagnosis and, for neo-plastic lesions, the degree of dysplasia. If the local and study pathologists disagreed, we accepted the study pathologist's diagnosis.
17227996	Grau 2007	nd	Advance adenomas	Advanced lesions were defined as adenomas with at least 25% villous component, those containing advanced dysplasia or invasive cancer, or those with an estimated diameter of at least 1 cm (as assessed by the endoscopist)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17227996	Grau 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		For analysis of subjects who did not take calcium supplements before the first colonoscopy in the follow-up period, RR were adjusted fir age, sex, center, follow-up time and number of colonoscopies from the end of the active trial up to the last colonoscopy in the follow-up period under consideration.
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes* - Age, gender	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other	Center, follow-up time, number of colonoscopies from the end of the active trial up to the last colonoscopy in the follow-up period under consideration, and calcium supplement use before the first colonoscopy in the follow-up period under consideration.	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17227996	Grau 2007	All adenomas	Calcium group	5 years	51	162	RR				0.63	0.46-0.87	nd
			Placebo group	5 years	80	185							
17227996	Grau 2007	All adenomas	Calcium group	5-10 years	82	208	RR				1.09	0.85-1.39	nd
			Placebo group	5-10 years	82	216							
17227996	Grau 2007	Advanced adenomas	Calcium group	5 years	21	162	RR				0.85	0.43-1.69	nd
			Placebo group	5 years	23	185							
17227996	Grau 2007	Advanced adenomas	Calcium group	5-10 years	26	208	RR				1.10	0.65-1.88	nd
			Placebo group	5-10 years	26	216							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.
2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

Subjects who did not take calcium supplements before the first colonoscopy in the follow-up period

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17227996	Grau 2007	All adenomas	Calcium group	5 years	28	102	RR				0.59	0.40-0.90	nd
			Placebo group	5 years	48	114							
17227996	Grau 2007	All adenomas	Calcium group	5-10 years	53	121	RR				1.05	0.77-1.43	nd
			Placebo group	5-10 years	50	123							
17227996	Grau 2007	Advanced Adenomas	Calcium group	5 years	10	102	RR				0.62	0.29-1.33	nd
			Placebo group	5 years	14	114							
17227996	Grau 2007	Advanced Adenomas	Calcium group	5-10 years	18	121	RR				1.18	0.57-2.43	nd
			Placebo group	5-10 years	15	123							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17227996	Grau 2007	RCT-Parallel	nd	nd	NA	n	y	y	y	y	y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Only 597 subjects in the Calcium Follow-up Study (74%) underwent at least one colonoscopy, no uniform interval between the end of the active trial and the first post-treatment colonoscopy. No details about the frequency of use and dose of elemental calcium in the supplements taken during the observational post-intervention phase

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
10511329	Harris 1999	RCT	men 20-35 y or 60-75 y	travel to southern areas in last month; vit D supplement in last 6 mo; outdoor occupation; calcium >600 mg/d; calcium supplement in last 6 mo; meds that affect vit D metabolism; >3 alcohol drinks/d; kidney stone last 5 y; liver, kidney, gastrointestinal diseases	nd	-	USDA	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
10511329	Harris 1999	RCT	Boston, MA	20	18	Young: 26 Old: 69	nd	100	nd	BMI Young: 26.6 Old: 31	nd	vit D intake Young: 51 IU/d Old: 90 IU/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
10511329	Harris 1999	25(OH)D				HPLC	inter- and intraassay CV: 10%, 8% (external validity)	3 wks	February	vit D intake Young: 51 IU/d Old: 90 IU/d
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
10511329	Harris 1999	vit D2	Drisdol (Sanofi Winthrop, NY)	1800 IU/d	3 wk	qAM
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
10511329	Harris 1999	secondary	25(OH)D total	sum of D2 and D3
		primary	25(OH)D2	
		primary	25(OH)D3	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
10511329	Harris 1999	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	blood drawn in February in Boston
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
10511329	Harris 1999	change in 25(OH)D2 in young	nmol/L	vit D2 supplment	3 wk	6	0	0	37	9.4			nd
				placebo		3	7.5	13	-7.5	13			
		change in 25(OH)D2 in old	nmol/L	vit D2 supplment	3 wk	5	0	0	19.5	12.8			nd
				placebo		4	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0			
		change in 25(OH)D3 in young	nmol/L	vit D2 supplment	3 wk	6	32.4	10.7	-6.7	6.8			nd
				placebo		3	34.9	0.0	-1.7	6.3			
		change in 25(OH)D3 in old	nmol/L	vit D2 supplment	3 wk	5	39.9	9.3	-12.0	5.7			nd
				placebo		4	34.9	6.1	-3.7	6.3			
		change in total 25(OH)D in young	nmol/L	vit D2 supplment	3 wk	6	32.4	10.7	30.4	9.5			nd
				placebo		3	42.4	13	-9.2	15			
		change in total 25(OH)D in old	nmol/L	vit D2 supplment	3 wk	5	39.9	9.3	7.5	13			nd
				placebo		4	39.9	6.1	-3.7	6.3			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
10511329	Harris 1999		ANOVA of the 3-wk change in 25(OH)D2 showed a significant interaction between age and supplementation group (P=0.02)

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
10511329	Harris 1999	RCT	nd	nd	NA	y	n	n	n	y	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	None
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	small sample size; compliance not reported; did not report all relevant statistical analyses

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15671222	Hartman 2005	Cohort study Participants are included in an RCT	Subjects ≥ 35 yr with 1 or more histologically confirmed colorectal adenomas identified by complete colonoscopy	Subjects must not have had resected adenomatous polyps previously, nor could have been diagnosed with cololectal cancer, inflammatory bowel disease, or polyposis syndrome, ≤ 150% of their recommended weight and could not be currently using lipid-lowering medications.	1991-1994	The Polyp Prevention Trial	nd	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15671222	Hartman 2005	Cohort study Participants are included in an RCT	US 38° N, 8 clinical centers	2079	1905	61.1(9.9)	nd	64	Caucasian 90%	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15671222	Hartman 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	VitD 4.4±2.4 µg/d
15671222	Hartman 2005	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	USDA	Y (4 day food records from a subset)	nd	nd		nd	981± 435 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15671222	Hartman 2005	nd	Recurrent adenomas	Ascertained by complete colonoscopy at baseline and after 1 and 4y
15671222	Hartman 2005	nd	Advanced adenomas	Subjects had maximal diameter ≥ 1 cm or had at least 25% villous elements or displayed evidence of high-grade dysplasia.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15671222	Hartman 2005	This original study (The Polyp Prevention Trial) was a multicenter randomized clinical trial designed to determine the effects of a high-fiber, high-fruit and vegetable, low fat diet on the recurrent of adenomatous polyps in the large bowel. For this study, the association of calcium with risk of colorectal adenomas was examined.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15671222	Hartman 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Energy intake Yes/no* - age, gender Yes/no* Use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs Yes/no* Intervention assignment, gender*intervention group	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15671222	Hartman 2005	Recurrent adenomas	Ca quintile 1		< 666 mg/d	156	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0			0.20
			Ca quintile 2		666-814	163	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.12	0.83-1.51		
			Ca quintile 3		815-969	154	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.02	0.76-1.38		
			Ca quintile 4		970-1226	150	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.00	0.74-1.36		
			Ca quintile 5		>1226	131	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.86	0.62-		

											1.18		
15671222	Hartman 2005	Advanced adenomas	Ca quintile 1		< 666 mg/d	23	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0			0.98
			Ca quintile 2		666-814	26	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.19	0.66-2.16		
			Ca quintile 3		815-969	22	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.00	0.54-1.85		
			Ca quintile 4		970-1226	23	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.56	0.88-2.77		
			Ca quintile 5		>1226	21	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.93	0.49-1.79		
15671222	Hartman 2005	Multiple recurrent adenomas	Ca quintile 1		< 666 mg/d	58	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0			0.36
			Ca quintile 2		666-814	73	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.33	0.90-1.96		
			Ca quintile 3		815-969	71	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.29	0.87-1.92		
			Ca quintile 4		970-1226	69	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.30	0.87-1.93		
			Ca quintile 5		>1226	47	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.88	0.56-1.36		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15671222	Hartman 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Power calculation not performed; study not initially designed for assessing the relation between calcium intake and adenomas; blinding not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	RCT	Age 18 to 60 years, BMI between 25 and 34.9, current calcium consumption ≤500 mg/d, current dairy product consumption < 1 serving/d, no medical problems that would contraindicate calorie restriction, non-smokers, agreement to follow study diet as prescribed	History of major medical or psychiatric problems including metabolic disease (i.e. hepatic, endocrine, or renal disease), diabetes requiring oral agents or insulin, lactose intolerance, planned a pregnancy within next 12 months, unable to participate in exercise program, unwilling to stop taking dietary supplements, taking medications that would influence metabolism or weight change.	Nd	Nd	National Dairy Council, Northeast Dairy Foods Research Center, University of Vermont, Cabot Cheese	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	RCT	Vermont, USA 44°N	54	44	45.2(6.7)	18-60	7%	Nd	BMI = 30(2.5), weight = 81(9), Body fat % = 44(4.8)%	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Dietary calcium intake	7-day food record	Other (Food Processor, version 7.9, ESHA, Salem, OR)	N	NA	NA		NA	NA

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank

**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	Dairy (high Ca)	3-4 dairy servings/d (milk, yogurt, cheese)	Goal of 1200 to 1400 mg/d Ca	12 months	Nd
		Control (low Ca)	One dairy serving/d	Goal of 400-500 mg/d Ca	12 months	nd
Co-intervention(s) *:			Calorie restriction in both groups with behavioral weight loss program, aiming for 500 kcal/d restriction from baseline levels			
Compliance/Adherence:			7 dropped out from not being able to follow menus			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	Primary	Body weight	Change in bodyweight in kg

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	Body weight	Kg	High dairy	12 mo.	23	82.7	SD = 10.0	Delta = -10.8	SD = 5.9	-1.2	Nd	0.56
				Low dairy	12 mo.	21	80.9	SD = 8.7	Delta = -9.6	SD = 6.5			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
16286519	Harvey-Berino 2005	RCT-parallel	nd	Nd	Nd	Y	Nd	N	Y	N	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	Nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Not much explanation of methodology with respect to randomization, blinding

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
14553957	Hatton 2003	RCT	Completed CPEP trial protocol; in Oregon Delivered an infant without serious health problems Previously nulliparous Read English	CKD, calciuria, hematuria, urolithiasis, frequent Ca supplements or antacids	≤1996	Calcium for Prevention of Preeclampsia Trial (CPEP) [Oregon center only]	GSK NIH	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
14553957	Hatton 2003	RCT	Portland, OR 45.5°	497	62	nd	nd	0	nd	nd	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
14553957	Hatton 2003	Dietary calcium intake	none	NA	NA	none	NA		nd	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
14553957	Hatton 2003	Ca supplement	Ca carbonate	2 g	~20-30 weeks (during pregnancy until delivery)	2x500 mg capsules 2x/day with meals
		Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			All received prenatal vitamin (Ca 50 mg, Fe 30 mg, vit D_2 400 IU, other vitamins)			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd (but all had to meet a compliance test prior to randomization)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
14553957	Hatton 2003	2°	BP (post-partum)	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
14553957	Hatton 2003	RCT was conducted during pregnancy. The calcium was discontinued upon delivery. The researchers then contacted women again and measured BP in children (primary focus) and mothers.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
14553957	Hatton 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final	Final SD	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
14553957	Hatton 2003	SBP	mm Hg	Ca supplement (prenatal)	2 y	37	nd	nd	101.9	12.9			NS
				Placebo		25	nd	nd	104.1	9.6			
		DBP	mm Hg	Ca supplement (prenatal)	2 y	37	nd	nd	67.1	7.7			NS
				Placebo		25	nd	nd	67.8	8.2			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
14553957	Hatton 2003	RCT	nd	nd	NA	No	nd	No	Unclear	No	No	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Outcome of convenience in post hoc analysis of small subgroup. Incomplete data presented. No adjustment

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12499343	Heaney 2003	RCT	men in good general health, ≤1 serving milk qD; planning winter vacation to areas with significant solar radiation	vitamin supplement	nd	-	Health Future Foundation	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12499343	Heaney 2003	RCT	Omaha, NE 41.2ºN	67	67	38.7 (11.2)	nd	100	nd	BMI 26.2 (2.4)	good general health	est. <5 µg/d intake of vit D

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12499343	Heaney 2003	25(OH)D3				Nichols method (Nichols Institute Diagnostics); similar to IDS	nd	nd	October to March, 2 successive years	est. <5 µg/d intake of vit D
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
12499343	Heaney 2003	zero dose		zero dose	~20 wk	
		1000 IU	Douglas Laboratory, Pittsburgh	25 µg (1000 IU)	~20 wk	1 tab
		5000 IU	Tishcon, NY	125 µg (5000 IU)	~20 wk	1 tab
		10000 IU	Tishcon, NY	250 µg (10,000 IU)	~20 wk	2 tabs
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12499343	Heaney 2003	primary	slope	Δ25(OH)D/ Δ vitD dose

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12499343	Heaney 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age, sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	body weight, % body fat
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	UV exposure, location
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
12499343	Heaney 2003	Regression on actual dose	Δ25(OH)D3 (nmol/L)= -0.038 + **0.700** vitD dose (µg/d)

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
12499343	Heaney 2003	RCT	nd	nd	NA	nd	nd	nd	y	y	n	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	unclear how many subjects in each group; not all relevant data reported

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	RCT	47-56 yo women, Last menstrual period within 6.24 months prior to study	Contraindications for HRT	>=1989	Kuopio Osteoporosis Risk Factor and Prevention Study	Schering, Professional Organization	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SEM) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	RCT	Kuopio Province, Eastern Finland (63°**N)**	464	320	52.9(0.29)	47-56	0%	Nd	26.4(0.47)	Nd	Nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Dietary calcium intake	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	Vit D3 plus Ca	D-Calsor, Orion Corporation, Espoo, Finland	300 IU Vit D3/day, 500 mg/day calcium lactate	30 mo	Nd
		Ca	D-Calsor, Orion Corporation, Espoo, Finland	500 mg/day calcium lactate	30 mo	nd
Co-intervention(s) *:			Hormone replacement therapy (a third group was HRT+ Vit D, and a fourth was HRT alone)			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	secondary	Body weight	Change in kg over 30 months

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	Body weight	kg	Vit D3 plus Ca	30	83	71.5	SD = 1.24	Final = 72.8	Final SD = 1.3	0.9	Nd	Not significant
				Ca	30	95	67.6	SD = 1.07	Final = 69.8	Final SD = 1.26			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.

*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
9405029	Heikkinen 1997	RCT-parallel	Yes	ND	NA	No	Nd	Nd	Yes	No	No	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Baseline weights are not evenly distributed between intervention groups. High dropout rate. Unclear if 3 year or 30 month data. No discussion of washout, blinding, intention to treat

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	RCT	Lactating mothers, within 1 month after birth, were recruited for inclusion in the study if they planned to fully breastfeed for the next 3 months	Preexisting type 1 or 2 diabetes, HTN, parathyroid disease, and uncontrolled thyroid disease.	nd	nd	NIH, Medical University of South Carolina	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15585800	Hollis 2006	RCT	Nd	64	18	2000 IU grp: 29 (6) 4000 IU grp: 30.8 (5.2)	nd	0	White: 72%; African American: 28%	Mothers: nd Mean birth weight=3448 g	Mothers: healthy Infants: GA 36-41 weeks	Nd
17661558	Basile 2006	RCT	nd	64	25	2000 IU grp: 30.6 (4.6) 4000 IU grp: 29.6 (4.9)	nd	0	White: 64%; African American: 36%	Mothers: nd Mean birth weight=3460 g (ranged 2315-4165)	Mothers: healthy Infants: mean GA 38 weeks	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	25(OH)D				HPLC and radioimmunoassay	nd	nd	nd	Subjects were instructed to limit sun exposure (for mother and infant). See results for baseline 25(OH)D levels
		Dietary calcium intake	nd			nd				nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	Group 1: vitamin D2 + multivitamin	Nd	1600 IU vitamin D2 + 400 IU vitamin D3	3 months	Nd
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	Group 2: vitamin D2 + multivitamin	nd	3600 IU vitamin D2 + 400 IU vitamin D3	3 months	nd
Co-intervention(s) *:			nd			
Compliance/Adherence:			Compliance with vitamin d supplement (%): Group 1: returned month 1 = 10.3%, month 2 =12.1%; month 3=10.2% Group 2: returned month 1 = 8.4%, month 2 =10.4%; month 3=7.6%			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	Primary	Maternal circulating total 25(OH)D	Maternal serum total vitamin D2, total vitamin D3, 25(OH)D2, and 25(OH)D3
		primary	Infant circulating total 25(OH)D	Infant serum total vitamin D2, total vitamin D3, 25(OH)D2, and 25(OH)D3

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	Also have separate results for changes in 25(OH)D2 and 25(OH)D3

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
17661558	Basile 2006	Maternal circulating total 25(OH)D	mg/dL	2000 IU/d	3	12	22.4	8.8	33.9	6.5	nd	nd	0.03
				4000 IU/d	3	13	28.5	8.6	43.0	11.6			
17661558	Basile 2006	infant circulating total 25(OH)D	mg/dL	2000 IU/d	3	12	7.8	1.1	27.8	3.9	nd	nd	0.01
				4000 IU/d	3	13	13.4	3.3	30.8	5.0			
15585800	Hollis 2006	Maternal circulating total 25(OH)D	Ng/mL	2000 IU/d	3	9	27.6	3.3	36.1	2.3	nd	Nd	nd
				4000 IU/d	3	9	32.9	2.4	44.5	3.9			
15585800	Hollis 2006	infant circulating total 25(OH)D	Ng/mL	2000 IU/d	3	9	7.9	1.1	27.8	3.9	nd	nd	nd
				4000 IU/d	3	9	13.4	3.3	30.8	5.0			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
15585800; 17661558	Hollis 2004; Basile 2006	RCT - parallel	nd	nd	NA	no	nd	no	no	no	no	C

Adverse Event(s): **	No episodes of hypercalciuria or hypercalcemia
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	It is very likely Basile and Hollis are the same study but the number of mother-infant pairs were different. Basile 2004 claimed that Hollis is the pilot study but the number of enrolled mothers (N=64) were the same and only a small fraction of mothers were included in the analyses. Although reported as a RCT, the analyses were done to compare within group changes only. Poor reporting of interventions and compliance.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17309935	Hsia 2007	RCT-post hoc	-Participant of WHI hormone therapy and/or dietary modification trial -Women, 50-79 yrs of age	-Menopausal	1995-2005	Women's Health Initiative fracture trial	NHLBI	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17309935	Hsia 2007	RCT-post hoc	Various (40 clinical sites)	36,282	36,282	62 (7)	50-79	0%	83% white 9% black 4% Hispanic	BMI = 29 ± 6 Waist circumference = 89 ± 14 cm	"generally healthy" postmenopausal women	See background exposure data

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17309935	Hsia 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	
		Dietary calcium intake								At baseline, mean Ca intake (diet + supplements) was 1148 ± 654 mg/d in the active tx group and 1154 ± 658 mg/d in the placebo group.

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17309935	Hsia 2007	Vit D/Ca	25-hydroxy vit D3 / calcium carbonate	400 IU / 1000 mg	Mean = 7.0 ± 1.4 yrs	200 IU / 500 mg 2x daily
		Placebo	nd	-	Mean = 7.0 ± 1.4 yrs	Twice daily
Co-intervention(s) *:			Concurrent Ca supplementation was permitted, as was vit D, up to 400 IU daily.			
Compliance/Adherence:			60% of study participants took at least 80% of their study medication through year 6.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17309935	Hsia 2007	2º	Weight	nd
		2º	SBP	nd
		2º	DBP	nd
		2º	MI	Algorithm that included symptoms, ECG findings, and cardiac enzymes
		2º	CHD death	Centrally adjudicated
		2º	CABG or PCI	Hospital record review
		2º	Angina	Required hospitalization w/ confirmatory stress test or obstructive coronary disease by angiography
		2º	Hospitalized heart failure	Hospital record review
		2º	Stroke	Rapid onset of a persistent neurological deficit not due to trauma, tumor, infection, or other cause
		2º	TIA	nd
				For all outcomes, centrally trained physician-adjudicators classified outcomes on the basis of medical record review.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17309935	Hsia 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Ca and vit D intake	Groups matched on total Ca intake and total vit D intake (supplements + diet)
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Groups matched on age and race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	Groups matched on BMI
		Medical conditions	DM, high cholesterol requiring pills, CVD, CHD	Groups matched on these medical conditions
		Medication	statin use, aspirin use, NSAID use, use of postmenopausal hormone therapy	Groups matched on use of these medications
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Groups matched on smoking
		Other		Baseline characteristics were balanced between groups except for HTN (P = 0.03)

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17309935	Hsia 2007	MI	Ca/D	7 yr	411	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.05	0.91, 1.20	0.52			
			Placebo		390	18106							
		CHD death	Ca/D	7 yr	130	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.01	0.79, 1.29	0.92			
			Placebo		128	18106							
		MI or CHD death	Ca/D	7 yr	499	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.04	0.92, 1.18	0.50			
			Placebo		475	18106							
		CABG or PCI	Ca/D	7 yr	674	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.09	0.98, 1.22	0.12			
			Placebo		607	18106							
		MI/CHD death/CABG/PCI	Ca/D	7 yr	920	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.08	0.99, 1.19	0.10			
			Placebo		841	18106							
		Angina	Ca/D	7 yr	404	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.08	0.94, 1.24	0.30			
			Placebo		377	18106							
		Hospitalized heart failure	Ca/D	7 yr	394	18176	Hazard Ratio	0.95	0.83, 1.10	0.50			
			Placebo		407	18106							
		Stroke	Ca/D	7 yr	362	18176	Hazard Ratio	0.95	0.82, 1.10	0.51			
			Placebo		377	18106							
		TIA	Ca/D	7 yr	213	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.16	0.95, 1.42	0.13			
			Placebo		182	18106							
		Stroke/TIA	Ca/D	7 yr	563	18176	Hazard Ratio	1.02	0.91, 1.15	0.75			
			Placebo		547	18106							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
17309935	Hsia 2007	Weight		Ca/D	2 yr	18176	BMI=29.1	5.9	+1.4%	10.5	-0.3%		0.03
				placebo		18106	BMI=29.0	5.9	+1.7%	12.0			
		SBP		Ca/D	2 yr	18176	127	17	+1.1%	12.4	+0.4%		0.01
				placebo		18106	128	17	+0.7%	12.4			
		DBP		Ca/D	2 yr	18176	76	9	-0.2%	12.4	+0.4%		0.007
				placebo		18106	76	9	-0.6%	12.4			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Age	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
									Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17309935	Hsia 2007	CHD (MI or CHD death)	50-59	Ca/D	7 yr	84		Hazard Ratio	0.94	0.70-1.27	> .05			
				placebo		87								
			60-69	Ca/D	7 yr	239		Hazard Ratio	1.08	0.90-1.30	> .05			
				placebo		220								
			70-79	Ca/D	7 yr	176		Hazard Ratio	1.05	0.85-1.30	> .05			
				placebo		168								

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Age	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
									Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17309935	Hsia 2007	Stroke	50-59	Ca/D	7 yr	51		Hazard Ratio	0.90	0.62-1.32	> .05			
				placebo		56								
			60-69	Ca/D	7 yr	164		Hazard Ratio	0.97	0.78-1.20	> .05			
				placebo		170								
			70-79	Ca/D	7 yr	147		Hazard Ratio	0.96	0.76-1.20	> .05			
				placebo		151								

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Total Ca intake, mg	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
									Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17309935	Hsia 2007	CHD (MI or CHD death)	<800	Ca/D	7 yr	210		Hazard Ratio	1.12		> .05			
				placebo		181								
			800 - <1200	Ca/D	7 yr	128		Hazard Ratio	1.01		> .05			
				placebo		125								
			≥1200	Ca/D	7 yr	143		Hazard Ratio	0.93		> .05			
				placebo		158								

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Total Ca intake, mg	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
									Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17309935	Hsia 2007	Stroke	<800	Ca/D	7 yr	139		Hazard Ratio	1.07		> .05			
				placebo		127								
			800 - <1200	Ca/D	7 yr	92		Hazard Ratio	1.04		> .05			
				placebo		87								
			≥1200	Ca/D	7 yr	121		Hazard Ratio	0.80		> .05			
				placebo		152								

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17309935	Hsia 2007	Other subgroups evaluated: BMI, waist circumference, diabetes, smoking, HTN, high cholesterol requiring medication, CHD risk factors, CHD at baseline, CVD at baseline, statin use at baseline, aspirin use at baseline, dietary Ca intake, total vit D intake, EtOH use, HRT arm, dietary modification arm. CHD risk with active vit D/Ca was inversely related to BMI. Stroke risk with active vit D/Ca was lower among women with high cholesterol and those taking statins at baseline. Stroke risk was with active vit D/Ca was also inversely related to the number of CHD risk factors. All other demographic/clinical characteristics were not statistically significant.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17309935	Hsia 2007	RCT-post hoc	Nd#	Nd#	NA	Y	Y	nd	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	It was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**
These items were explicitly described in Wactawski-Wenda et al. N Engl J Med 2006, which met the "y" criteria.

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
10471422	Iso 1999	Cohort study	Female nurses	Inadequate FFQ, implausible food intake, nonmelanoma cancer, CVD	1980	Nurses' Health Study	NIH	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
10471422	Iso 1999	Cohort study	US, various	86,368	85,764	~46	(Probably 32-57)	0	White 98%	~14% BMI ≥29	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
10471422	Iso 1999	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd here	done elsewhere	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
10471422	Iso 1999	1°	All stroke	Self-report, medical record review, death index etc, death certificates (standard definitions)
			also data for stroke types	not extracted

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
10471422	Iso 1999	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
10471422	Iso 1999	Stroke	Calcium intake quintile 1		395	165	~17153	14 y	Adjusted	RR	1.0	--	--	NS
			quintile 2		645	132	~17153				0.79	0.63, 1.00	.05	
			quintile 3		675	117	~17153				0.71	0.56, 0.90	<.05	
			quintile 4		837	142	~17153				0.87	0.70, 1.09	NS	
			quintile 5		1145	134	~17153				0.83	0.66, 1.04	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
10471422	Iso 1999	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	implied	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Median only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	else-where					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
10471422	Iso 1999	Cohort study	Female nurses	Inadequate FFQ, implausible food intake, nonmelanoma cancer, CVD	1980	Nurses' Health Study	NIH	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
10471422	Iso 1999	Cohort study	US, various	86,368	85,764	~46	(Probably 32-57)	0	White 98%	~14% BMI ≥29	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
10471422	Iso 1999	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd here	done elsewhere	NA	NA		NA	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
10471422	Iso 1999	1°	All stroke	Self-report, medical record review, death index etc, death certificates (standard definitions)
			also data for stroke types	not extracted

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
10471422	Iso 1999	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
10471422	Iso 1999	Stroke	Calcium intake quintile 1		395	165	~17153	14 y	Adjusted	RR	1.0	--	--	NS
			quintile 2		645	132	~17153				0.79	0.63, 1.00	0.05	
			quintile 3		675	117	~17153				0.71	0.56, 0.90	<0.05	
			quintile 4		837	142	~17153				0.87	0.70, 1.09	NS	
			quintile 5		1145	134	~17153				0.83	0.66, 1.04	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
10471422	Iso 1999	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	implied	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Median only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	else-where					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15225833	Jacobs 2004	Case-cohort study	Caucasian, male	nd	1983, 1989	Nutritional Prevention of Cancer (NPC)	National Cancer Institute	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15225833	Jacobs 2004	Case-cohort study	Eastern United States (25º46'N to 41º41'N)	1312 in original cohort, 249 with exposure and outcome data; 83 cases; 166 controls	249	68	nd	100	white	26	some subjects were on Se to prevent recurrence of non-melanoma skin cancer	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15225833	Jacobs 2004	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Y, coefficient of variation for 1,25(OH) D = 11.5% and 25(OH)D = 12.9%	nd	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15225833	Jacobs 2004	secondary	Prostate cancer	nd

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15225833	Jacobs 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication	Original treatment group (selenium or placebo)	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Clinic site	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Cigarette smoking- pack years
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15225833	Jacobs 2004	Prostate cancer	Tertile 1: 25(OH)D = 8.1-25.3 ng/ml	Nd	Nd	26	58	adjusted	OR	1.00	reference		0.51
			Tertile 2: 25(OH)D = 25.4-32.7 ng/ml	Nd	Nd	33	49			1.71	0.68-4.34		
			Tertile 3: 25(OH)D = 32.8-59.7 ng/ml	Nd	Nd	24	59			0.75	0.29-1.91		
		Prostate cancer	Tertile 1: 1,25(OH)D = 13.7-27.5 ng/ml	Nd	Nd	27	56	adjusted	OR	1.00	reference		0.90

			Tertile 2: 1,25(OH)D = 27.6-32.9 ng/ml	Nd	Nd	29	54			1.44	0.59-3.52		
			Tertile 3: 1,25(OH)D = 33.0-64.4 ng/ml	Nd	Nd	27	56			1.06	0.42-2.66		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15225833	Jacobs 2004	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	n	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	n	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N/A	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	n					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Quite a few specifics left out, such as explanation of how cases were ascertained.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Cohort study	• Participant of a large-scale health examination survey • Being interviewed to assess dietary intake (about 20%, unclear if consecutive) • Dietary data available and no previous cancer at baseline	nd	1966-1972	nd	nd	TTE

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Cohort study	Finland (64 00 N)	9959	9959	39.1 (nd)	15-	nd	nd	BMI=24.8 kg/m2	nd	Total energy=2602.6Kcal

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Dietary calcium intake	Diet history Dietary survey (interview guided by questionnaire	Finnish food composition table (Rastas et al. 1989)	Y (interclass correlation coefficients 4-7 y apart) Dietary Ca: 0.53-0.55 Dietary Vit D: 0.42	NA	NA		nd	1414 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Not explicitly described	Colorectal cancer	Finish cancer registry (ICD153-154 [WHO 1955]); unclear about confirmation by other sources
		Not explicitly described	Colon cancer	Finish cancer registry (no clear definition)
		Not explicitly described	Rectal cancer	Finish cancer registry (no clear definition)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (Dietary energy intake)	Folic acid, fiber taken into account in sensitivity analysis but the results not reported.
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (Age, sex)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (BMI)	
		Medical conditions	no	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes (geographical region)	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (smoking, occupation)	
		Other		Cancer during the first-year f/u excluded in sensitivity analysis but the results not reported.

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up time	Mean Ca dose (mg)	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Colorectal cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	19.6 y	M: <1178.2 F: <862.5	20	Nd	Adjusted	RR (HR)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.97
			Q2		M: 1178.2-1557.1 F: 862.5-	19	nd			1.17	0.60-2.27	nd	

					1110.7								
			Q3		M: 1557.2-1953.2 F: 1110.8-1416.6	18	Nd			1.37	0.67-2.81	nd	
			Q4		M: 1953.3- F: 1416.7-	15	nd			1.43	0.61-3.39	nd	
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Colon cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	19.6 y	M: <1178.2 F: <862.5	10	Nd	Adjusted	RR (HR)	1.00	Ref	Nd	0.17
			Q2		M: 1178.2-1557.1 F: 862.5-1110.7	14	nd			1.44	0.61-3.39	nd	
			Q3		M: 1557.2-1953.2 F: 1110.8-1416.6	9	Nd			1.04	0.38-2.83	nd	
			Q4		M: 1953.3- F: 1416.7-	5	nd			0.63	0.17-2.35	nd	
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Rectal cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	19.6 y	M: <1178.2 F: <862.5	10	Nd	Adjusted	RR (HR)	1.00	ref	Nd	0.19
			Q2		M: 1178.2-1557.1 F: 862.5-1110.7	5	nd			0.77	0.25-2.37	nd	
			Q3		M: 1557.2-1953.2 F: 1110.8-1416.6	9	Nd			1.88	0.67-5.30	nd	
			Q4		M: 1953.3- F:	10	nd			3.01	0.93-9.73	nd	

					1416.7-								

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	Cases: colorectal cancer	19.6 y	Adjusted (age and sex)	72	Nd	Nd	1335	Nd	0.24
		Control:			9887	nd	nd	1415	Nd	

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11641750	Jarvinen 2001	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y		NA			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Unclear consecutiveness, some poor reporting, post-hoc analysis of an existing database; power calculation not reported; diet history instead of FFQ used for calcium assessment; case confirmation by histology not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17442130	Jia 2007	Cohort study	75 y or older	Terminal illness Severe dementia	1999-2000	nd	nd	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17442130	Jia 2007	Cohort study	Aberdeen, UK	405	398	80#	Range 75-96	52	nd	BMI: median 25.4 kg/m^2, range (23.4-27.7)	• 58% heart disease (self report) • 6% DM (self report) • 85% fair to very good health status (self-perception) • 44% no physical activity	27% took Vit D supplement 74% had 2 or more portions of fruits or vegetables

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
median

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17442130	Jia 2007	25(OH)D				"RIA"	n	Nd (~6 to ~7 y) (Median f/u of the entire cohort: 69.2 mon [range, 1.0-79.9])	April 1999 and March 2000#	nd
17442130	Jia 2007	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd			nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

Excerpts from the paper on original cohort study (McNeill Br J Nutr 2002) "For the subjects seen in summer (June–September), repeat samples were taken in winter (February–March) to estimate seasonal change in vitamin D status." In this report, it is unclear if such data are available or not.

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17442130	Jia 2007	primary	mortality	Mortality from any causes

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17442130	Jia 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Medical conditions	Yes	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Medication	Yes	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	See the hierarchy of the planned model below
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

Model 1: age, sex
Model 2: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication
Model 3: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes
Model 4: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes, sunlight exposure
Model 5: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes, Vit D supplement
Model 6: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes, sunlight exposure, Vit D supplement

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level (nmol/L)	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality	Q1	6.0-23.0 (M)/7.0-19.0 (F)	nd	41	75	Adjusted (Model 1)	HR	2.89	1.61-5.18	nd	<0.001
			Q2	23.1-30.0 (M)/29.1-24.0 (F)		34	86			2.07	1.14-3.76		
			Q3	30.1-37.0 (M)/24.1-30.2 (F)		21	80			1.16	0.60-2.24		

			Q4	37.1-47.0 (M)/30.3-39.0 (F)		17	78			1.0	0.50-1.97		
			Q5	47.1-82.0 (M)/39.1-82.0 (F)		16	79			reference	-		
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality	Q1	6.0-23.0 (M)/7.0-19.0 (F)	nd	41	75	Adjusted (Model 2)	HR	2.22	1.21-4.07	nd	0.003
			Q2	23.1-30.0 (M)/29.1-24.0 (F)		34	86			1.71	0.93-3.14		
			Q3	30.1-37.0 (M)/24.1-30.2 (F)		21	80			1.03	0.53-2.02		
			Q4	37.1-47.0 (M)/30.3-39.0 (F)		17	78			0.96	0.48-1.92		
			Q5	47.1-82.0 (M)/39.1-82.0 (F)		16	79			reference	-		
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality	Q1	6.0-23.0 (M)/7.0-19.0 (F)	nd	41	75	Adjusted (Model 3)	HR	2.22	1.22-4.06	nd	0.001
			Q2	23.1-30.0 (M)/29.1-24.0 (F)		34	86			1.75	0.95-3.22		
			Q3	30.1-37.0 (M)/24.1-30.2 (F)		21	80			1.03	0.53-2.00		
			Q4	37.1-47.0 (M)/30.3-39.0 (F)		17	78			0.92	0.46-1.84		
			Q5	47.1-82.0 (M)/39.1-82.0 (F)		16	79			reference	-		
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality	Q1	6.0-23.0 (M)/7.0-19.0 (F)	nd	41	75	Adjusted (Model 4)	HR	2.02	1.10-3.72	nd	0.008
			Q2	23.1-30.0 (M)/29.1-24.0 (F)		34	86			1.64	0.89-3.02		
			Q3	30.1-37.0 (M)/24.1-30.2 (F)		21	80			1.01	0.52-1.96		
			Q4	37.1-47.0 (M)/30.3-39.0 (F)		17	78			0.87	0.43-1.75		
			Q5	47.1-82.0		16	79			reference	-		

				(M)/39.1-82.0 (F)									
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality	Q1	6.0-23.0 (M)/7.0-19.0 (F)	nd	41	75	Adjusted (Model 5)	HR	1.97	1.03-3.75	nd	0.01
			Q2	23.1-30.0 (M)/29.1-24.0 (F)		34	86			1.54	0.80-2.97		
			Q3	30.1-37.0 (M)/24.1-30.2 (F)		21	80			0.95	0.48-1.88		
			Q4	37.1-47.0 (M)/30.3-39.0 (F)		17	78			0.86	0.43-1.74		
			Q5	47.1-82.0 (M)/39.1-82.0 (F)		16	79			reference	-		
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality	Q1	6.0-23.0 (M)/7.0-19.0 (F)	nd	41	75	Adjusted (Model 6)	HR	1.74	0.91-3.34	nd	0.03
			Q2	23.1-30.0 (M)/29.1-24.0 (F)		34	86			1.40	0.73-2.70		
			Q3	30.1-37.0 (M)/24.1-30.2 (F)		21	80			0.90	0.45-1.79		
			Q4	37.1-47.0 (M)/30.3-39.0 (F)		17	78			0.80	0.39-1.62		
			Q5	47.1-82.0 (M)/39.1-82.0 (F)		16	79			reference	-		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
Model 1: age, sex
Model 2: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication
Model 3: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes
Model 4: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes, sunlight exposure
Model 5: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes, Vit D supplement
Model 6: age, sex, (self-perceived) health status, taking 5 or more kinds of medication, (self-reported) heart disease, (self-reported) diabetes, sunlight exposure, Vit D supplement

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
17442130	Jia 2007	Cases:	Nd (~6 to ~7 y) (Median f/u: 69.2 mon [range, 1.0-79.9])	Crude	129	26.0#	6.0-63.0#	Nd	nd	<0.001 (Mann-Whitney)
		Control:			269	33.0#	9.0-82.0#	nd	Nd	

Duplicate one table per outcome
Median with range. Convert this into mean by using the method by Hozo (Hozo et al. 2008)

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level (nmol/L)	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality (Men only)	Q1	6.0-23.0	nd	21	38	Adjusted (Model 3)	HR	2.02	0.88-4.65	nd	0.02
			Q2	23.1-30.0		21	49			1.89	0.84-4.27		
			Q3	30.1-37.0		11	39			0.99	0.40-2.50		
			Q4	37.1-47.0		9	39			0.91	0.35-2.36		
			Q5	47.1-82.0		9	42			reference	-		
17442130	Jia 2007	Mortality (Women only)	Q1	7.0-19.0	nd	20	37	Adjusted (Model 3)	HR	2.71	1.12-6.58	nd	0.02
			Q2	29.1-24.0		13	37			1.60	0.63-4.06		
			Q3	24.1-30.2		10	41			1.08	0.41-2.89		
			Q4	30.3-39.0		8	39			0.97	0.35-2.69		
			Q5	39.1-82.0		7	37			reference	-		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17442130	Jia 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	n/NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n/NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	y

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No details on enrollment and blinding assessment, some may have been excluded due to unavailability of data (e.g., blood sample), leading to the possibility of selection bias

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8201444	Johnson 1994	Cohort study	African American women; 16-35 y; pregnant; nulliparity	DM, sickle cell, thalassemia, Hb C	nd		NICHD	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8201444	Johnson 1994	Cohort study	Washington DC	322	322	21.6	16->31 (est.)	0	African American	42% 90-110% of ideal prepregnancy body weight; 28% >120% of ideal prepregnancy body weight	nd	Calcium 933.4 ± 51.8 (SE) mg/d intake

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
8201444	Johnson 1994	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	USDA	n					Calcium 933.4 ± 51.8 (SE) mg/d intake

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8201444	Johnson 1994	primary	birth weight	
			birth length	
			gestational age	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8201444	Johnson 1994	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
8201444	Johnson 1994	birth weight; birth length	"None of the food energy and nutrient intakes was significantly correlated with any of the pregnancy outcome measures". No specific quantitative relationship was provided for calcium.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8201444	Johnson 1994	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	n	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	nd	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	nd	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	incomplete presentation of analysis

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	Other intervention study	-overweight or obese -female	-diabetes -uncompensated thyroid dysfunction -drugs affecting water balance	nd	none	Supported by grants IGA NR/7800-4 and S-QF 3166	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	Other intervention study	Prague, Czech Republic. 50 N	67	67	49.1±12.1	nd	0%	nd	BMI=32.2±4.1 Weight=84.5±13 %body fat=41.5±5.5	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	placebo	Food/tablets	350 mg/d from food	3 wks	Placebo tablets were taken 3x/day
		Ca	Calcium carbonate + food	500 mg/d tablet / 350 mg/d from food	3 wks	Tablets were taken 3x/day
		Ca	Lactoval (70% Ca phosphate, 20% Ca citrate, 10% Ca lactate)	500 mg/d tablet / 350 mg/d from food	3 wks	Tablets were taken 3x/day
Co-intervention(s) *:			Only those subjects who exhibited a stable weight during 1 week on 7 MJ/d diet entered the trial and received a 4.5 MJ/day diet for the next 3 weeks (diet supplied 350 mg/d Ca) plus tablets.			
Compliance/Adherence:			All subjects were advised to eat all the meals served in four daily portions in the spa dining room. A dietician checked that subjects took tablets.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	nd	weight	Analyzed by a bipedal-bimanual Body Composition Analyzer Tanita BC-418MA
		nd	BMI	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	All three groups on 7 MJ/day diet
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	All three groups matched on age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	Groups matched on BMI and % body fat
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	"The studied women were predominantly perimenopausal. The number of women in menopause was comparable in the groups."	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	Weight	kg	placebo	Adjusted	3 wks	21	85.37	14.83	-4.34	1.37			NS
				Ca carbonate	Adjusted	3 wks	25	84.95	11.75	-3.34	1.79			NS
				Lactoval	Adjusted	3 wks	21	83.43	11.65	-3.87	1.62			NS
		BMI	Kg/m^2	placebo	Adjusted	3 wks	21	32.36	4.86	-1.64	0.49			NS
				Ca carbonate	Adjusted	3 wks	25	32.39	4.35	-1.29	0.69			NS
				Lactoval	Adjusted	3 wks	21	32.42	4.22	-1.51	0.65			NS

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17552880	Kabrnova-Hlavata 2008	Non-randomized controlled trial	NA	NA	NA	N	nd	nd	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Nd on how subjects were divided into groups

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.** **QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES**

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8205538	Kampman 1994	Cohort study	• Age 55 to 69 participant of Netherlands Cohort Study on diet and cancer (n=120852) • Subpopulation randomly selected from the main cohort (n=3500)	• History of cancer (excluding skin cancer) (n=154) • Incomplete/inconsistent dietary data (n=235) • Events (cancer only?) within the first year of follow-up (n=28)	1986	Netherlands Cohort Study on diet and cancer	Netherlands Digestive Diseases Foundation, Dutch Cancer Society	TTE

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8205538	Kampman 1994	Cohort study	Netherlands (nd) (52 30 N)	3500 (see above)	3111	~61 (nd)#	55-69 (per inclusion criteria)	~49%#	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.
approximated based on the data on the highest and lowest quintile of Ca intake.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
8205538	Kampman 1994	Dietary calcium intake	150 item-FFQ	nd	N					Ca=1286 mg/d (energy-adjusted median)

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8205538	Kampman 1994	nd	Colorectal cancer	Record linkage to cancer registries and a nationwide pathology registry

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
****Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"**

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8205538	Kampman 1994	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (any vitamin suppl. use, energy, energy-adjusted intake of fat and dietary fiber) Yes (age, gender, level of education) No Yes (Hx of gallbladder surgery) No No Yes (smoking) Family history of colorectal cancer	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

After excluding first year of follow up

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up time, mo	Median Ca dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
8205538	Kampman 1994	Colorectal cancer (Total Ca [mg])	Q1	39.6	596	98	623	Adjusted (age, gender, energy)	RR	1.00	Ref		0.87
			Q2	39.6	768	89	619		RR	0.83	nd		
			Q3	39.6	893	87	622		RR	0.96	nd		
			Q4	39.6	1032	81	627		RR	0.92	nd		
			Q5	39.6	1288	88	620		RR	0.92	nd		
8205538	**Kampman 1994**	**Colorectal cancer (Total Ca [mg])**	Q1	39.6	596	98	623	**Adjusted (full multivariate model)**	RR	1.00	Ref		0.89
			Q2	39.6	768	89	619		RR	0.83	0.58, 1.22		
			Q3	39.6	893	87	622		RR	0.96	0.67, 1.39		
			Q4	39.6	1032	81	627		RR	0.93	0.64, 1.36		
			Q5	39.6	1288	88	620		RR	0.92	0.64, 1.34		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
8205538	Kampman 1994	Ca intake from non-dairy products, fermented dairy products, unfermented dairy products were presented as subgroup analysis but only brief results (energy adjusted analyses) Ca from non-dairy products only: age-gender adjusted RR trend (Q1 vs. Q5) P=0.18; full multivariate adjusted RR (Q1 vs. Q5) trend P=0.01 Ca from fermented dairy products only: age-gender adjusted RR trend (Q1 vs. Q5) P=0.52; full multivariate adjusted RR trend (Q1 vs. Q5) P=0.32 Ca from non-fermented dairy products only: age-gender adjusted RR trend (Q1 vs. Q5) P=0.10; full multivariate adjusted RR trend (Q1 vs. Q5) P=0.11 Data on other exposures (fermented milk, hard cheese, unfermented milk) presented but not extracted.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8205538	Kampman 1994	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Dietary calcium intake only was evaluated. Possibility of post-hoc analysis. Power calculation not reported; assessor blinding not reported; results without excluding 1st year of follow up are not given; power calculation not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9343837	Kato 1997	Cohort study	•Women breast exam participants aged 34-65 •No hormonal medications or pregnancy for 6 mo prior to the enrollment •30 ml blood donation and answering a baseline questionnaire	• Prior colorectal cancer (n=58) • 8 or more blanks in the questionnaire (n=1000)	1985-1991	New York Univ. Women's Health Study	NCI	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9343837	Kato 1997	Cohort study	New York City, NY (40° 47') or Lauderhill, FL (26° 8')	14727	14727	nd	nd	0%	[Based on only 11573 participants] Caucasian: 82% Black: 10% Hispanic: 5% Others: 3%	nd	[based on only 14724 participants] Aspirin use (last 4 wks): 25%	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
9343837	Kato 1997	Dietary calcium intake	70-item FFQ slightly modified from Block's	nd	Only n=267 assessed; Short term (2-3 mo): correlation coefficient=0.56, Long-term (2-5 y): "somewhat lower"					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9343837	Kato 1997	Not explicitly stated but the only outcome reported	Colorectal Cancer	Self reports (in the questionnaires sent until the end of 1994) confirmed by medical records pathology reports, supplemented by the state cancer registries and the National Death Index

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9343837	Kato 1997	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (total energy intake)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age, education)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes (place of enrollment [i.e., NY vs. FL])	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
9343837	Kato 1997	Colorectal cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	nd	nd	nd	nd	85.2	adjusted	HR	1.0	Ref	nd	0.178
			Q2	nd	nd	nd	nd	85.2			1.15	0.67-1.95	nd	
			Q3	nd	nd	nd	nd	85.2			0.90	0.52-1.57	nd	
			Q4	nd	nd	nd	nd	85.2			0.71	0.39-1.28	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

**Adverse Event(s): ** **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9343837	Kato 1997	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	nd	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Study not designed initially for assessing calcium intake and CRC; power calculation not reported. Poor reporting throughout the paper precluded detailed assessments. Post-hoc analysis. Calcium intake per category not reported; blinding not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8610704	Kearney 1996	Cohort study	• Male health professionals • Age 40-75 in 1986 • Responded baseline questionnaire (n=51529)	Implausibly high (4200-)/low (-800) total energy intake (kcal/d) or failed to fill in the dietary assessment (n=49999) Precious cancer (excl. nonmelanoma skin cancer), ulcerative colitis, familial polyposis syndrome (n=47935)	1986	The Health Professionals Follow-up Study	American Cancer Society, NIH, National Dairy Council	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8610704	Kearney 1996	Cohort study	US (25 46"-54 40"N)	47935	47239	nd	40-75	100%	nd	BMI=25kg/m2	Family history=8.4% Previous polyps=3.6% Current activity=19.6 MET Current smoker=10.0%	Total energy intake=1958.7 kcal/d Fiber=23.0 g/d Saturated fat=25.2 g/d Ca=947.0 mg/d Vit D=400.9IU/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
8610704	Kearney 1996	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (Rim et al. 1992)	USDA and others (Rim et al. 1992)	Correlation of coefficient (energy adjusted): 0.53 (before week-to-week variability adjusted) 0.60 (with supple) and 0.61 (without supple) (after week-to-week variability adjusted)					Ca=947.0 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8610704	Kearney 1996	nd	Colon caner	Response to the biennial questionnaires confirmed by the hospital/pathology reports or the National Death Index. During the 6-year follow-up.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8610704	Kearney 1996	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (red meat, saturated fat, fiber, vitamin E)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (BMI)	
		Medical conditions	Yes (family history of colon cancer, previous polyps, prior screening)	
		Medication	Yes (aspirin)	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (smoking, alcohol, physical activity)	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Ca dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Person-years**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
8610704	Kearney 1996	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	"6 y"	<631	59	51343	Adjusted (age, energy intake)	OR	1.0	Ref	nd	0.01
			Q2		631-765	32	51501			0.57	0.36-0.85	nd	
			Q3		766-921	36	51127			0.60	0.39-0.90	nd	

			Q4		922-1212	37	52047			0.61	0.40-0.89	nd	
			Q5		1213-	39	51620			0.58	0.39-0.87	nd	
8610704	Kearney 1996	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	"6 y"	<631	59	51343	Adjusted (full multivariate model)	RR (OR)	1.0	Ref	nd	0.22
			Q2		631-765	32	51501			0.64	0.42-1.01	nd	
			Q3		766-921	36	51127			0.73	0.47-1.12	nd	
			Q4		922-1212	37	52047			0.74	0.48-1.15	nd	
			Q5		1213-	39	51620			0.75	0.48-1.15	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
8610704	Kearney 1996	1. Ca intake from food (dietary Ca), dairy products, and non-dairy products were presented as subgroup analysis but only brief results: Dietary Ca: age-gender adjusted RR trend P=0.02; full multivariate adjusted RR trend P=0.62 Ca from dairy products only: age-energy adjusted RR trend P=0.001; full multivariate adjusted RR trend P=0.28 Ca from non-dairy products only: age-energy adjusted RR trend P=0.06; full multivariate adjusted RR trend P=0.30 2. Data on Vit D intake without blood Vit D level presented but not extracted (ineligible).

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8610704	Kearney 1996	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some unclear reporting (eligibility, blinding), post-hoc analysis, some important confounders (e.g., Vit D) not fully taken into account.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15880532	Kesse 2005	Cohort study	Women living in France, aged 40 to 65 years at baseline and insured with the Mutuelle Générale de l'Education Nationale, a national health insurance scheme for teachers.	Subjects who had reported a cancer diagnosis before the start of follow-up, non-histologically confirmed colorectal cancer, a familial polyposis syndrome, an inflammatory bowl disease, lost to follow-up after dietary assessment	1990	Etude Epidémiologique auprès de femmes de l'Education Nationale.	French League against Cancer, European Community, 3M Company, Mutuelle Générale de l'Education Nationale, Institut Gustave Roussy, Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale, Association pour la Recherche sur le Cancer, Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15880532	Kesse 2005	Cohort study	France 46° N	100,000	Adenoma study: 5320 CRC: 67484	52.7 (nd)	nd	0%	nd	BMI 23.0kg/m^2	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15880532	Kesse 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Vit D (µg) 2.61±1.28*****
15880532	Kesse 2005	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Conversion of foods into nutrients was carried out using a French food composition table compiled ad hoc and derived from a major French table the McCance and Widdowson's food composition table (Ref)	Y, correlation coefficient for dairy products 0.67, for calcium intake 0.38					Calcium (mg) 1014.15±359.55*****

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance
*****Cancer-free subjects only

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15880532	Kesse 2005	nd	adenoma	Complete colonoscopy was performed mostly for investigating anemia or bowel symptoms, as well as some times for screening first-degree relatives of subjects with colorectal neoplasia.
15880532	Kesse 2005	nd	Colorectal cancer	Mostly diagnosed when symptomatic

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15880532	Kesse 2005	High risk of adenomas was also included as outcome.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15880532	Kesse 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Energy and alcohol intake	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes - education	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes - BMI	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes - smoking, physical activity level	
		Other	Family hx of colon cancer	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose*****	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Follow up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15880532	Kesse 2005	Colorectal cancer	Ca quartile 1		<766.22	49	nd	Median, 82.8	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.08
			Ca quartile 2		766.22-962.63	47	nd	Median, 82.8	Adjusted	RR	0.94	0.63-1.41		
			Ca quartile 3		962.63-1201.81	39	nd	Median, 82.8	Adjusted	RR	0.78	0.51-1.19		
			Ca quartile 4		> 1201.81	37	nd	Median, 82.8	Adjusted	RR	0.72	0.47-1.10		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****Quartiles was calculated on the distribution of cancer-free subjects (n=67312)

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose*****	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Follow up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15880532	Kesse 2005	All adenomas	Ca quartile 1		<785.62	140	nd	44.4	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.04
			Ca quartile 2		785.62-1226.16	141	nd	44.4	Adjusted	RR	0.97	0.76-1.22		
			Ca quartile 3		981.67-1226.16	121	nd	44.4	Adjusted	RR	0.83	0.65-1.07		
			Ca quartile 4		>1226.16	114	nd	44.4	Adjusted	RR	0.80	0.62-1.03		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****Quartiles was calculated on the distribution of polyp-free subjects (n=4804)

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15880532	Kesse 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No information on exposure assessor blinded to outcome info and outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement; power calculation not reported; multiple risk factors examined

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17536191	Kesse-Guyot 2007	RCT-post hoc (cohort follow-up of RCT)	12741 subjects enrolled in the SU.VI.MAX trial from 1994-1995 and had a follow-up of 8 years. Of these 3836 women had at least 5 24-hourdietary records over the first 18 months	Subjects with a recent cancer event, except for basal cell skin cancers and in situ tumors, during the 5 years preceding the follow-up, subjects with cancers other than breast cancer	1994-1995	SU.VI.MAX trial	Gov	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17536191	Kesse-Guyot 2007	RCT-post hoc (cohort follow-up of RCT)	France 46° N	3836	3627	51 (6.3)	nd	0%	nd	BMI: <18.5 = 4.4% 18.5-25 = 75.8% 25.1 – 30.0 = 11.0% >30.0 = 7.7%	Post-menopausal status 52% cases; 41% non-cases 41% Family h/o breast cancer 18.5% cases and controls 9%	Energy adjusted calcium intake 935 mg/d in cases; 994 mg/d in controls

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
17536191	Kesse-Guyot 2007	Dietary calcium intake	Computerized questionnaires	nd	nd					Evaluated were calcium, dairy calcium, and non dairy calcium

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17536191	Kesse-Guyot 2007	nd	Incident breast cancer	Self reported and identified through medical record data

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must be explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17536191	Kesse-Guyot 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Supplement use, saturated fatty acid consumption, vegetable consumption, meat consumption Yes (education level, marital status and parity) Yes (BMI) HRT use Physical activity Yes (total alcohol intake, smoking) Family hx of breast cancer	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up	Mean Ca level	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17536191	Kesse-Guyot 2007	Breast cancer	Q1	7.7 y	<807 mg	32	3627	yes	RR	1			0.04
			Q2	7.7 y	807-960 mg	24	3627	yes	RR	0.73	(0.42-1.25)		
			Q3	7.7 y	961-1144 mg	20	3627	yes	RR	0.65	(0.37-1.14)		

			Q4	7.7 y	>1144 mg	16	3627	yes	RR	0.50	(0.27-0.91)		
		Breast cancer in post menopausal women	Q1	7.7 y	<807 mg	14	nd	yes	RR	1			0.64
			Q2	7.7 y	807-960 mg	13	nd	yes	RR	0.71	(0.33-1.54)		
			Q3	7.7 y	961-1144 mg	10	nd	yes	RR	0.67	(0.30-1.53)		
			Q4	7.7 y	>1144 mg	11	nd	yes	RR	0.76	(0.34-1.70)		
		Breast cancer in pre-menopausal women	Q1	7.7 y	<807 mg	18	nd	yes	RR	1			0.01
			Q2	7.7 y	807-960 mg	11	nd	yes	RR	0.77	(0.36-1.66)		
			Q3	7.7 y	961-1144 mg	10	nd	yes	RR	0.63	(0.29-1.38)		
			Q4	7.7 y	>1144 mg	5	nd	yes	RR	0.26	(0.10-0.71)		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17536191	Kesse-Guyot	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting of critical elements

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17106437	Koh 2006	Cohort study	Harvard male undergraduates (1916-1950) who filled out diet questionnaires	baseline cancer or no data on dairy intake	1960's	Harvard Alumni Health Study	government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17106437	Koh 2006	Cohort study	nd	11014	10011	67	nd	100	nd	43% with BMI>25	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
17106437	Koh 2006	Dietary calcium intake	23 items FFQ (Willett 1985, 1987)	USDA	n					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17106437	Koh 2006	primary	prostate cancer	self-reported of physician-diagnosed cancer or death certificates (through 1998)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17106437	Koh 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	red meat intake, vegetable intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	smoking, alcohol, physical activity
		Other		paternal hx of prostate cancer

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Event*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17106437	Koh 2006	prostate cancer	dairy calcium		0-199 mg/d	209	10011	adj	RR	1.00 (ref)			0.64
					200-449	167	10011			0.81	0.64-1.02		
					450-599	238	10011			0.91	0.73-1.14		
					≥600	201	10011			0.91	0.70-1.18		
17106437	Koh 2006	fatal prostate cancer	dairy calcium		0-199 mg/d	30	10011	adj	RR	1.00 (ref)			0.52
					200-449	21	10011			0.57	0.27-1.19		
					450-599	23	10011			0.60	0.29-1.22		
					≥600	25	10011			0.81	0.38-1.71		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17106437	Koh 2006	prostate cancer risk	Calcium supplement was not related to risk of prostate cancer (multivariate RR = 1.05 (0.84-1.31). Only 8% of men used supplement (classified as users vs. non-users). Dose not specified.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17106437	Koh 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)		a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	N
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)		b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	no internal validation of FFQ; retrospective

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	Cohort study	Male Japanese residents age 40-69 at baseline	History of prostate cancer, extreme total energy intake reported	Cohort I launched in 1990, Cohort II launched in 1993	Japan Public Health Center-Based Prospective Study	Japanese Ministry of Health	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	Cohort study	Japan 36°N	65,801 men in initial cohort	46,036	nd	45-74	100%	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Standard Tables of Food Composition in Japan, 5th edition	Yes, correlation coefficient for calcium, comparing FFQ to 14 or 28 day diet records, was 0.43 for cohort I and 0.65 for cohort II					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	nd	Prostate cancer	Active patient notification from major local hospitals in the study area, linkage with cancer registries, death certificates

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Intake of green tea and genistein	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking status, drinking frequency
		Other	Area, marital status	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	Prostate cancer	Quartile 1: calcium median = 282.8 mg/d	nd	nd	56	nd	Adjusted	RR	1.00	Reference		0.16
			Quartile 2: calcium median = 403.6 mg/d	nd	nd	68	nd			1.03	0.70-1.51		
			Quartile 3: calcium median = 521.9 mg/d	nd	nd	98	nd			1.32	0.92-1.90		
			Quartile 4: calcium median = 725.1 mg/d	nd	nd	107	nd			1.24	0.85-1.81		

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18398033	Kurahashi 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	NA	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Quartiles give medians, not means or ranges; no adjustment for FH of prostate cancer

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	RCT-post hoc** Case-cohort study	Postmenopausal women aged 50-79 years old.	A predicted survival of less than 3 years; a history of renal calculi or hypercalcemia; or current use of oral corticosteroids or calcitriol, or daily use of 600 IU or more of supplemental vitamin D	1993-1998	WHI	National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	RCT-post hoc** Case-cohort study	40 US clinical centers	For RCT, 36,282 women; 18,176 (intervention), 18,106 (control)	For case-cohort study, 323 (cases) and 1962 (controls)	62.4 (nd)	50-79 years	0%	White 83.1% Black 9.1% Hispanic 4.2% American Indian/Native American 0.4% Asian/Pacific Islander 2.0% Unknown 1.2%	BMI 29.1 (5.9)	nd	Low Ca intakes (<800mg/d) 34%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				DiaSorin Liaison chemiluminescent immunoassay	nd	nd	nd	nd
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	Daily total calcium, mg CaD arm 1148.4 (654.2) Placebo arm 1154.3 (658.0)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Ca+VitD	500mg calcium carbonate + 200IU vitD3 (by Glaxo SmithKline, Pittsburgh, PA)	1000mg calcium carbonate + 400IU vitD3	Average 7 years	2 times a day
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			Hormone therapy and dietary modification was similar in both arms			
Compliance/Adherence:			At trial closure, 76% of women enrolled were still taking study medications and 59% were taking at least 80% of study pills. Adherence was assessed by weighing returned pill bottles.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	nd	Mortality	Causes of death were determined based on available medical records, autopsy reports, and the death certificate in a blinded fashion by local and central physician adjudicators.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	Age, race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	Latitude of clinical center, season of blood draw
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No*	
		Other		CaD treatment assignment

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Total mortality (same as Wactawski-Wende 2006 [16481636])	CaD	84 mo	744		HR				0.91	0.83-1.01	
			Placebo	84 mo	807								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	CVD death	CaD	84 mo	226		HR				0.92	0.77-1.10	
			Placebo	84 mo	244								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	CHD death (same as Hsia 2007 [17309935]	CaD	84 mo	130		HR				1.01	0.79-1.29	
			Placebo	84 mo	128								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Cerebrovascular death	CaD	84 mo	54		HR				0.89	0.62-1.29	
			Placebo	84 mo	60								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Cancer death (same as Wactawski-Wende 2006 [16481636])	CaD	84 mo	344		HR				0.89	0.77-1.03	
			Placebo	84 mo	382								

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Total mortality	Tertiles of serum 25(OH)D, nmol/L	≥52.5				84 mo	Adjusted	OR	1.00			
				35.4-52.4				84 mo			1.42	1.06-1.91		
				<35.4				84 mo			1.46	1.07-1.99		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Mortality	(Nested case-control study) Compared with women in the highest tertile of serum 25(OH)vitD, there was a significantly increased risk for death for women in the middle and low tertiles. The odds ratio for serum 25(OH)D level was analyzed as a continuous variable was 0.80 (95% CI, 0.67-0.95) for a difference of 29.9 nmol/L (the interquartile range).

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
Participants younger than 70 years													
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Total mortality	CaD	85.2 mo	466		HR				0.89	0.79-1.01	
			Placebo	85.2 mo	517								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	CVD death	CaD	85.2 mo	115		HR				0.85	0.66-1.08	
			Placebo	85.2 mo	135								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	CHD death	CaD	85.2 mo	70		HR				0.99	0.71-1.38	
			Placebo	85.2 mo	70								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Cerebrovascular death	CaD	85.2 mo	21		HR				0.62	0.36-1.08	
			Placebo	85.2 mo	33								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Cancer death	CaD	85.2 mo	245		HR				0.91	0.76-1.08	
			Placebo	85.2 mo	268								
Participants 70 or older													
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Total mortality	CaD	80.4 mo	278		HR				0.95	0.80-1.12	
			Placebo	80.4 mo	290								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	CVD death	CaD	80.4 mo	111		HR				1.01	0.78-1.32	
			Placebo	80.4 mo	109								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	CHD death	CaD	80.4 mo	60		HR				1.02	0.71-1.47	
			Placebo	80.4 mo	58								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Cerebrovascular death	CaD	80.4 mo	33		HR				1.20	0.72-2.01	
			Placebo	80.4 mo	27								
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	Cancer death	CaD	80.4 mo	99		HR				0.86	0.65-1.12	
			Placebo	80.4 mo	114								

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	RCT-Parallel	y	y	n	y	nd	y	y	y	y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	Nd (Study pills were discontinued if women reported kidney stones, hypercalcemia, dialysis, or the use of calcitriol or daily supplements of more than 1,000 IU of vitamin D during semiannual contacts.)
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	It was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
19221190	LaCroix, 2009	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	n	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	n	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	n	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	nd	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	n					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	nd					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):							C										
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):							Reporting quality was poor overall. Comparative categories were not clear in the results section. Matching factors were not reported in case and control groups.										

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15354150	Lappe 2004	RCT-post hoc	girl scouts	significant health problems (see list in paper); usual dietary calcium intake >1100 mg; BMI ≥85%tile for age and sex; participants in organized team sports ≥3x/wk	nd	-	Natl Institute of Nursing	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15354150	Lappe 2004	RCT-post hoc	Omaha, NE 41° N	63	59	9.5	nd	0	95% white 5% black	BMI 17	nd	dietary intake calcium: 819 mg/d; vit D 4.5 µg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15354150	Lappe 2004	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								dietary vit D 4.5 µg/d
		Dietary calcium intake	3-d food records	nd	n					dietary intake calcium: 819 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
15354150	Lappe	calcium enriched diet	foods, calcium-fortified foods (but no calcium supplement)	≥1500 mg/d	24 mo	nd
		usual diet				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15354150	Lappe	secondary	change in BMI	
			change in wt	
			change in ht	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15354150	Lappe	study funded the calcium enriched foods

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15354150	Lappe	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	baseline wt, energy and protein intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	wt; ht
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	physical activity
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
15354150	Lappe	BMI	kg/m2	calcium enriched	24 mo	27	17	2.0	19	2.8			NS
				usual		32	17	3.0	19	3.3			
		wt	kg	calcium enriched	24 mo	27	32.2	4.6	42.9	7.5			NS
				usual		32	33.2	6.7	44.1	9.9			
		ht	cm	calcium enriched	24 mo	27	137	6.3	151	7.0			NS
				usual		32	138	4.6	151	6.0			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
15354150	Lappe	ANCOVA with tertile of calcium intake (lowest (731±105 mg/d) vs. highest (1366±193 mg/d); baseline wt; mean energy and protein intake in 24 mo) on change in body wt	calcium was not a significant predictor
		ANCOVA with tertile of calcium intake (lowest (731±105 mg/d) vs. highest (1366±193 mg/d); baseline wt; mean energy and protein intake in 24 mo) on change in ht	calcium was not a significant predictor

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
15354150	Lappe	RCT post-hoc	nd	nd	NA	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	did not account for all relevant variables like Tanner stage, menstrual history

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17556697	Lappe 2007	RCT	>55 y women; no cancer; mentally and physically fit to permit 4 y participation. More detailed inclusion criteria were published in a previous publication (Lappe 2006): women needed to be at least four years past last menses, in generally good health, living independently in the community, and weighing less than 300 pounds	More detailed inclusion criteria were published in a previous publication (Lappe 2006): 1) a medical diagnosis of any CKD, 2) Paget's or other metabolic bone disease, and 3) history of cancer except for a) superficial basal or squamous cell carcinoma of the skin and b) other malignancies treated curatively more than 10 years prior to entry into study.	nd	none	nd	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17556697	Lappe 2007	RCT	Nebraska, 41.4º N	1180	1179	67 (7.3)	nd	0	white	BMI 29	mentally and physically fit to permit 4 y participation	baseline 25(OH)-D 71.8 ± 20.3 nmol/L

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17556697	Lappe 2007	25(OH)D				RIA	n	nd	nd	baseline 25(OH)D 71.8 ± 20.3 nmol/L
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17556697	Lappe 2007	placebo		placebo	4 y(?)	nd
		calcium only		calcium citrate (1400 mg Ca/d) or calcium carbonate (1500 mg Ca/d) plus a vit D placebo	4 y(?)	nd
		calcium plus vit D		calcium citrate (1400 mg Ca/d) or calcium carbonate (1500 mg Ca/d) plus 1000 IU (25µg) cholecalciferol (vit D3)	4 y(?)	nd
Co-intervention(s) *:			nd			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17556697	Lappe 2007	secondary	incident cancer	from medical record (including breast, colon, lung, lymph, uterus and others)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17556697	Lappe 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Event*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17556697	Lappe 2007	incident cancer (years 1-4)	placebo			20	288		%	6.9%		chi2=7.3 with df 2; P<0.03 comparing placebo with the other 2 groups	
			calcium only			17	445			3.8%			
			calcium plus vit D			13	446			2.9%			
		incident	placebo			16	266			6.8%			

		cancer (years 2-4)											
			calcium only			15	416			3.6%			
			calcium plus vit D			6	403			2.0%			
		incident cancer (years 1-4)	placebo			20	288		RR	1.0			
			calcium only			17	445			0.532	0.27-1.03	0.063	
			calcium plus vit D			13	446			0.402	0.20-0.82	0.013	
		incident cancer (years 2-4)	placebo			18	266			1.0			
			calcium only			15	416			0.587	0.29-1.21	0.147	
			calcium plus vit D			8	403			0.232	0.09-0.60	<0.005	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final or Delta**	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference SD*	P between groups***
17556697	Lappe 2007	change in 25 OH(D) level at 12 mo		placebo		12 mo	nd	72.1	20.7	71.1	19.8	-0.23	14.7	nd
				calcium only				71.6	20.5	71	20.3	-0.74	13.0	
				calcium plus vit D				71.8	20.0	96.0	21.4	23.9	17.8	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups

		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17556697	Lappe 2007	cancer risk	Logistic regression showed treatment assignment and either baseline or 12 mo 25()H)-D levels were significant independent predictors (P<0.002, P<0.03) respectively.
			RR of cancer per unit concentration of 25(OH)D was 0.983 (CI 0.968 to 0.997); P<0.01
		renal calculi in placebo	1/288
		renal calculi in calcium only	3/445
		renal calculi in calcium plus vit D	1/446

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17556697	Lappe 2007	unclear reporting, discrepancy between Table 1 and text

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17556697	Lappe 2007	RCT - parallel	Y	N	NA	Y	N	Y	N	NA	N	B

Adverse Event(s): **	renal calculi (see above), no significant difference between groups
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	unclear reporting, discrepancy between Table 1 and text

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18433305	Lappe 2008	RCT	Women entered basic training at the US Navy	nd	May 2001 to march 2006	nd	Department of Defense Bone Health and Military Readiness Grant	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18433305	Lappe 2008	RCT	Great Lakes, IL, USA 41° North	5201	3700	Median: 19	17-35	0	American Indian: 3%, Asian: 4%, non-Hispanic black: 18%, Hispanic: 13%, non-Hispanic white: 54%, other: 4%	Mean BMI = 24 (ranged 15-43)	Assumed healthy (Navy recruits)	Mean dairy servings/wk = 6 (ranged 1-26)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18433305	Lappe 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				Very little cutaneous conversion of vitamin D takes place between the months of September and March due to the latitude.
18433305	Lappe 2008	Dietary calcium intake	Risk factor questionnaire (no further information)	nd	n					Mean dairy servings/wk = 6 (ranged 1-26)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18433305	Lappe 2008	Calcium + vitamin D	nd	200 mg calcium and 800 IU vitamin D/day	8 weeks	4 supplement pills per day made available in galley line at breakfast and dinner
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			none			
Compliance/Adherence:			To monitor pill taking, project staff observed the galley food lines, visited recruits in their quarters, and conducted an exit interview.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18433305	Lappe 2008	primary	stress fractures	Stress fractures were ascertained when recruits reported to the Great lakes clinic with symptoms. All stress fractures were confirmed with radiography or technetium scan according to the usual Navy protocol.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18433305	Lappe 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age group (<25 vs. >=25 yr)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication	Use of depomedroxyprogesterone	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	exercise sessions/wk (high vs. low), smoking, run time per 1.5 mi at entry of basic training
		Other	Menses during training	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
18433305	Lappe 2008	Stress fracture (ITT analysis)	Calcium + vitamin D	2	5.3%	2626	RR ca+vitD / placebo	0.8	0.64-0.99	0.026			
			Placebo	2	6.6%	2575							
18433305	Lappe 2008	Stress fracture (per protocol analysis)	Calcium + vitamin D	2	6.8%	1852	OR ca+vitD / placebo	nd		0.02	0.789	0.616-1.01	0.0589
			Placebo	2	8.6%	1848							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18433305	Lappe 2008	RCT - parallel	Y	nd	NA	N	nd	Y	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	GI disruption such as constipation, diarrhea, upset stomach (4%), and musculoskeletal soreness (0.9%)
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Dropout rate = 29% (majority withdrew because the participants changed their mind, forgot, it was too difficult, or for no reported reason). Participants who developed adverse events also withdrew from the study. A little bit more people allocated to treatment group withdrew than the placebo group (n=774 vs. 727 respectively). There was ITT analysis but multivariate model only for per protocol analysis.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16522915	Larsson 2006	Cohort study	• Men aged 45-79 • Resides in Vastmanland & Orebro counties (n=100303) • Completed the questionnaire (n=48850)	• Missing/erroneous registration # • Implausibly high energy intake • Previous cancer (excl. nonmelanoma skin cancer) at baseline	1997 (Autumn)	The Cohort of Swedish Men	the Swedish Cancer Foundation, the Swedish Research Council-Longitudinal Studies, the Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education (STINT), Vastmanland County Research Fund against Cancer, Orebro County Council Research Committee, And Orebro Medical Center Research Foundation	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16522915	Larsson 2006	Cohort study	Sweden (Vastmanland [59° 37'N] & Orebro counties [59.23 N])	48850	45306	60.3 (nd)		100%	nd	BMI=25.8kg/m2	Hx of DM=6.1% Aspirin use=36.4%	Vit D=6.4 μg/d Saturated fat 33.5 g/d Ca=809-1665 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
16522915	Larsson 2006	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Swedish Food Administration Database (Bergstrom 1991)	Yes: by 24HR and correlation coefficient=0.77 (total and dietary calcium intake)	NA	NA		nd	Ca=809-1665 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16522915	Larsson 2006	Not explicitly described	Colorectal caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma.
16522915	Larsson 2006	Not explicitly described	Colon caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma.
16522915	Larsson 2006	Not explicitly described	Rectal caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma. (Rectal cancers included tumors in the rectosigmoid junction and rectum.)
16522915	Larsson 2006	Not explicitly described	Proximal colon caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma. (proximal colon cancers defined as tumors occurring from the cecum to the splenic flexure)
16522915	Larsson 2006	Not explicitly described	Distal colon caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma. (distal colon cancers defined as tumors occurring in the splenic flexure, descending colon, and sigmoid colon)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16522915	Larsson 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (multivitamin, total energy, saturated fat, read meat, fruit, vegetables) Yes (age, education) Yes (BMI) Yes (family Hx, Hx of DM) Yes (Aspirin) No Yes (exercise, smoking, alcohol nd	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up, mo	Mean Ca dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of total subjects**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colorectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	127	11348	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.03
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	111	11341			0.81	0.63-1.04	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	107	11295			0.77	0.59-0.99	Nd	

			Q4	80.4	1445-	104	11322			0.73	0.51-0.91	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colorectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	127	11348	Adj (full multivariate model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.01
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	111	11341			0.80	0.61-1.04	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	107	11295			0.73	0.56-0.96	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	104	11322			0.68	0.51-0.91	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	77	11348	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.24
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	62	11341			0.74	0.53-1.04	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	70	11295			0.84	0.60-1.16	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	67	11322			0.78	0.56-1.08	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	77	11348	Adj (full multivariate model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.15
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	62	11341			0.72	0.51-1.01	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	70	11295			0.80	0.57-1.12	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	67	11322			0.72	0.50-1.04	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Rectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	50	11348	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.05
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	49	11341			0.91	0.61-1.36	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	37	11295			0.67	0.44-1.02	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	37	11322			0.69	0.45-1.06	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Rectal cancer	Q1	80.4	<956	50	11348	Adj (full multivariate	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.02

		(total Ca intake [mg])						model)					
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	49	11341			0.91	0.61-1.37	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	37	11295			0.63	0.40-0.98	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	37	11322			0.61	0.38-0.98	Nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
16522915	Larsson 2006	Results also on proximal and distal colon cancer subsites # Multivariate RRs were adjusted for age (in mo), education (less than high school, high school graduate, or more than high school), family history of colorectal cancer (yes or no), BMI (in kg/m2; <23.0, 23.0– 24.9, 25.0 –29.9, or >30.0), exercise (h/wk; 3 categories), history of diabetes (yes or no), cigarette smoking (never, past, or current), aspirin use (no, <10 y, or >10 y), multivitamin supplement use (no, occasional use, or regular use), total energy intake (continuous), and quartiles of saturated fat, total vitamin D, alcohol, fruit, vegetable, and red meat intakes. ## Sensitivity analysis of colorectal cancer #1 (excluding the participants with Ca intake >2500 mg/d): multivariate Trend P=0.006 ### Sensitivity analysis of colorectal cancer #2 (excluding the cases developed cancer within the first two years of follow-up): multivariate Trend P=0.005 #### Data on similar outcomes on dietary calcium only not analyzed because only 2.1% of participants were supplemental user, precluding meaningful analyses. ##### Data on similar outcomes on dairy foods presented but not extracted.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16522915	Larsson 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	n/nd	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N (~50%)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y/nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some limited reporting (inclusion and blinding), post-hoc analysis of a database; cases not confirmed by pathology results

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16522915	Larsson 2006	Cohort study	• Men aged 45-79 • Resides in Vastmanland & Orebro counties (n=100303) • Completed the questionnaire (n=48850)	• Missing/erroneous registration # • Implausibly high energy intake • Previous cancer (excl. nonmelanoma skin cancer) at baseline	1997 (Autumn)	The Cohort of Swedish Men	the Swedish Cancer Foundation, the Swedish Research Council-Longitudinal Studies, the Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education (STINT), Vastmanland County Research Fund against Cancer, Orebro County Council Research Committee, And Orebro Medical Center Research Foundation	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16522915	Larsson 2006	Cohort study	Sweden (Vastmanland [59° 37'N] & Orebro counties [59.23 N])	48850	45306	60.3 (nd)	nd	100%	nd	BMI=25.8kg/m2	Hx of DM=6.1% Aspirin use=36.4%	Vit D=6.4 μg/d Saturated fat 33.5 g/d Ca=809-1665 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
16522915	Larsson 2006	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Swedish Food Administration Database (Bergstrom 1991)	Yes: by 24HR and correlation coefficient=0.77 (total and dietary calcium intake)					Ca=809-1665 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16522915	Larsson 2006	nd	Colorectal caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma.
		nd	Colon caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma.
		nd	Rectal caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma. (Rectal cancers included tumors in the rectosigmoid junction and rectum.)
		nd	Proximal colon caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma. (proximal colon cancers defined as tumors occurring from the cecum to the splenic flexure)
		nd	Distal colon caner	National Swedish Cancer Register (-12/31/2003) and Regional Cancer Register covering the study area (from 1/1/2004-12/31/2004), only adenocarcinoma. (distal colon cancers defined as tumors occurring in the splenic flexure, descending colon, and sigmoid colon)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16522915	Larsson 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (multivitamin, total energy, saturated fat, read meat, fruit, vegetables) Yes (age, education) Yes (BMI) Yes (family Hx, Hx of DM) Yes (Aspirin) No Yes (exercise, smoking, alcohol	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean follow-up, mo	Mean Ca dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of total subjects**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colorectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	127	11348	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.03
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	111	11341			0.81	0.63-1.04	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	107	11295			0.77	0.59-0.99	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	104	11322			0.73	0.51-0.91	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colorectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	127	11348	Adj (full multivariate model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.01
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	111	11341			0.80	0.61-1.04	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	107	11295			0.73	0.56-0.96	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	104	11322			0.68	0.51-0.91	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	77	11348	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.24
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	62	11341			0.74	0.53-1.04	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	70	11295			0.84	0.60-1.16	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	67	11322			0.78	0.56-1.08	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Colon cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	77	11348	Adj (full multivariate model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.15
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	62	11341			0.72	0.51-1.01	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-	70	11295			0.80	0.57-	Nd	

					1444						1.12		
			Q4	80.4	1445-	67	11322			0.72	0.50-1.04	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Rectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	50	11348	Adj (age)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.05
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	49	11341			0.91	0.61-1.36	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	37	11295			0.67	0.44-1.02	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	37	11322			0.69	0.45-1.06	Nd	
16522915	Larsson 2006	Rectal cancer (total Ca intake [mg])	Q1	80.4	<956	50	11348	Adj (full multivariate model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	Nd	0.02
			Q2	80.4	956-1179	49	11341			0.91	0.61-1.37	Nd	
			Q3	80.4	1180-1444	37	11295			0.63	0.40-0.98	Nd	
			Q4	80.4	1445-	37	11322			0.61	0.38-0.98	Nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
16522915	Larsson 2006	Results also on proximal and distal colon cancer subsites - Multivariate RRs were adjusted for age (in mo), education (less than high school, high school graduate, or more than high school), family history of colorectal cancer (yes or no), BMI (in kg/m2; <23.0, 23.0– 24.9, 25.0 –29.9, or >30.0), exercise (h/wk; 3 categories), history of diabetes (yes or no), cigarette smoking (never, past, or current), aspirin use (no, <10 y, or >10 y), multivitamin supplement use (no, occasional use, or regular use), total energy intake (continuous), and quartiles of saturated fat, total vitamin D, alcohol, fruit, vegetable, and red meat intakes. - Sensitivity analysis of colorectal cancer #1 (excluding the participants with Ca intake >2500 mg/d): multivariate Trend P=0.006 - Sensitivity analysis of colorectal cancer #2 (excluding the cases developed cancer within the first two years of follow-up): multivariate Trend P=0.005 - Data on similar outcomes on dietary calcium only not analyzed because only 2.1% of participants were supplemental user, precluding meaningful analyses. - Data on similar outcomes on dairy foods presented but not extracted.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16522915	Larsson 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	nd	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some limited reporting (inclusion and blinding), post-hoc analysis of a database; cases not confirmed by pathology results

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18332289	Larsson 2008	Cohort Study	Male smokers, 50-69 y	Nonmelanoma cancer, other serious disease, anticoagulant therapy, excessive doses of vitamin E, vitamin A, beta carotene, incomplete dietary data, self-reported history of stroke	1985-1988	ATBC study	Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18332289	Larsson 2008	Cohort Study	Southwestern Finland ~60°	26556	26556	~57 (nd)	50-69	100	Mostly white (implied)	~26.5	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
18332289	Larsson 2008	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	"evaluated previously"					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18332289	Larsson 2008	1°	First stroke (and subtypes)	Hospital discharge and death registries, by ICD codes. Subtypes confirmed in a sample, correct between 79 & 95% of time.
			Cerebral infarction included here	
			Also separate analysis for much smaller numbers of cases of intracerebral hemorrhage and subarachnoid hemorrhage. Not extracted here.	
			No analysis of total stroke.	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18332289	Larsson 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM, CHD
		Medication	Yes	Alpha tocopherol and beta carotene
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	# cigarettes, physical activity, EtOH
		Other	Yes	BP, total cholesterol, HDL

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
18332289	Larsson 2008	Cerebral infarction	Total Ca intake Quintile 1		876	518	~5311	13.6 years	Adjusted ("multivariate")	RR	1.00	--	--	0.09
			Quintile 2		1178	541	~5311				1.08	0.95, 1.22	NS	
			Quintile 3		1379	542	~5311				1.09	0.96, 1.23	NS	
			Quintile 4		1581	546	~5311				1.11	0.98, 1.26	NS	
			Quintile 5		1916	555	~5311				1.10	0.98, 1.26	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								

		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18332289	Larsson 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Outcome ascertainment questionable; did not confirm diagnosis in most. In sample, large percentage with misclassification of stroke (correct in 79-90%) and stroke death (correct in 91-95%).

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19056569	Larsson 2009	Cohort study	-Women born between 1917 and 1948 in Vastmanland County, Sweden -Women born between 1914 and 1948 in Uppsala County, Sweden	-erroneous or missing national registration number -questionnaires that lacked a date, the date the subject moved out of study area, or date of death -implausible values for energy intake -cancer diagnosis except non-melanoma skin cancer	1987-1990	Swedish Mammography Cohort	Swedish Cancer Foundation, Swedish Research Council for Infrastructure	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19056569	Larsson 2009	Cohort study	Sweden 62ºN	61,433	36,664	53.7(9.7)	Nd	0	Swedish	BMI 24.8(3.9)	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19056569	Larsson 2009	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Swedish National Food Administration Database	Y- Pearson correlation coefficient between FFQ and dietary records was 0.5 for dietary calcium, Spearman correlation coefficient between FFQ and fourteen 24-h recalls over 1 y was 0.77 for dietary and total calcium intake	nd	nd		nd	nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19056569	Larsson 2009	Primary	Invasive breast cancer	Linkage with national and regional Swedish Cancer registers

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19056569	Larsson 2009	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Total energy intake, fiber	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI, height
		Medical conditions	History of benign breast disease	
		Medication	Use of oral contraceptives, use of postmenopausal hormones	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	alcohol
		Other	Age at first birth, age at menarche, age at menopause, family history of breast cancer	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
19056569	Larsson 2009	Invasive breast cancer	Quintile 1: <727 mg/d calcium	nd	nd	595	nd	9.4 yrs	Adjusted	RR	1.00	Reference	nd	0.49
			Quintile 2: 727-862 mg/d calcium	nd	nd	595	nd	9.4 yrs			0.97	0.87-1.09	nd	
			Quintile 3: 863-	nd	nd	592	nd	9.4 yrs			0.95	0.84-1.06	nd	

			980 mg/d calcium											
			Quintile 4: 980-1124 mg/d calcium	nd	nd	571	nd	9.4 yrs			0.93	0.83-1.04	nd	
			Quintile 5: ≥1125 mg/d calcium	nd	nd	599	nd	9.4 yrs			0.97	0.87-1.09	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
19056569	Larsson 2009	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	n	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No data on blinding, almost half of original cohort didn't answer second questionnaire for various reasons

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17388667	Li 2007	Case-cohort study	Male physicians	Hx of MI, stroke, hx of TIA, unstable angina, cancer (except nonmelanoma skin cancer), current renal or liver disease, peptic ulcer, gout, current use of platelet-active agents, vit A or beta-carotene supplements	1982 - 2000	Physicians' Health Study	NIH, US Army Medical Research	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17388667	Li 2007	Case-cohort study	United States-multiple locations	2684	1156 492 cases 664 control	58.9±8.3 at study onset. 69.3±7.3 at diagnosis	nd	100%	6% not of European descent	Age at study onset: cases = 58.9(8.3), controls = 59.0(8.0)	nd	-Vit D deficiency (<20 ng/ml) in summer/fall: 10.8% in cases and 12.7% in controls -Vit D deficiency in spring/winter: 27.9% in cases and 36.4% in controls

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17388667	Li 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Yes: mean intra-pair coefficients of variation for blinded duplicate quality control samples were 7.9% to 8.1% for 25(OH)D and 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Spring or winter: 24.1% of cases and 26.0% of controls	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	Nd	Nd	Nd					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank

**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17388667	Li 2007	secondary	Prostate cancer	Tumor Gleason score, grade, stage determined by reviewing medical and pathological reports

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must be explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
		Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (matched), race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Smoking status (matched), exercise
		Other	Follow-up period (matched)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases*	No. of Non-cases	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI /	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases*	No. of Non-cases	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
17388667	Li 2007	Total prostate cancer	Quartile 1: lowest 25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.01	0.71-1.44	nd	0.91
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.26	0.89-1.80		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.00	0.71-1.41		
			Quartile 4: highest 25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Aggressive prostate cancer	Quartile 1: lowest 25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.27	0.76-2.13	nd	0.74
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.33	0.80-2.20		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.97	0.58-1.60		
			Quartile 4: highest 25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Total prostate cancer age >= 65 y	Quartile 1: lowest 25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.03	0.67-1.60	nd	0.95
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.32	0.86-2.03		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.02	0.68-1.54		
			Quartile 4: highest 25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Aggressive prostate cancer age >= 65 y	Quartile 1: lowest 25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.34	0.71-2.53	nd	0.68
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.41	0.75-2.62		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.91	0.49-1.70		
			Quartile 4: highest 25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Total prostate cancer	Quartile 1: lowest 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	0.91	0.63-1.33	nd	0.74
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.35	0.95-1.92		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			0.94	0.66-1.36		
			Quartile 4: highest 1,25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		

		Aggressive prostate cancer	Quartile 1: lowest 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.37	0.81-2.33	nd	0.07
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.90	1.14-3.16		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.19	0.69-2.05		
			Quartile 4: highest 1,25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Total prostate cancer age >= 65 y	Quartile 1: lowest 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.19	0.75-1.89	nd	0.26
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.53	0.98-2.39		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.17	0.73-1.89		
			Quartile 4: highest 1,25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Aggressive prostate cancer age >= 65 y	Quartile 1: lowest 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.93	0.99-3.75	nd	0.03
			Quartile 2	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			2.17	1.15-4.10		
			Quartile 3	Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd			1.55	0.76-3.16		
			Quartile 4: highest 1,25(OH)D	nd	Nd	nd	Nd			Reference	Reference		
		Total prostate cancer	Low 25(OH)D, Low 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	1.33	0.94-1.88	nd	0.85 (p-value for interaction)
			Low 25(OH)D, High 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd			1.16	0.82-1.64		
			High 25(OH)D, Low 1,25(OH)D								0.85-1.70		
			High 25(OH)D, High 1,25(OH)D							Reference	Reference		
		Aggressive prostate cancer	Low 25(OH)D, Low 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd	adjusted	OR	2.06	1.24-3.43	nd	0.23 (p-value for interaction)
			Low 25(OH)D, High 1,25(OH)D	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd			1.08	0.66-1.77		
			High 25(OH)D, Low 1,25(OH)D							1.24	0.75-2.04		
			High 25(OH)D, High 1,25(OH)D							Reference	Reference		

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17388667	Li 2007	Cutoff points for quartiles were only listed for controls (presumably for total prostate cancer in all age groups); not for cases or for age or aggressive disease subgroups. Cutoffs for controls were 18.3, 24.4, and 31.1 ng/ml for winter/spring-collected samples and 24.4, 32.0, and 39.5 ng/ml for summer/fall-collected samples.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17388667	Li 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Thorough explanations of methodology, however group comparison data was not clearly documented with regards to group cutoffs. Only 492/1066 (46%) cases had vit D analysis because of limited funding.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8557965	Lijnen 1995	RCT	Male, "Normal" Normotensive (not defined)	none	<1994	None	nd Supplements provided by industry	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8557965	Lijnen 1995	RCT	Leuven, Belgium 51°	32	32	24±1	20-44 y	100	nd	Weight 75.9±1.3 Kg	Healthy	1 month low Ca diet run-in

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
8557965	Lijnen 1995	Dietary calcium intake	None	NA	NA					"Low Ca diet" run-in

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
8557965	Lijnen 1995	Ca supplement	Ca gluconate	2 g	16 wk	1 g 2x/day
		Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			Low dairy diet			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8557965	Lijnen 1995	2°	SBP/DBP	Standing and supine
		2°	25(OH)D	Competitive protein binding assay (Medgenix and/or Inestar Corp)
			1,25(OH)D	Radioreceptor assay (Medgenix and/or Inestar Corp)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8557965	Lijnen 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SEM	Delta / ~Final	Delta Range / ~SEM	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
8557965	Lijnen 1995	SBP (standing)	mm Hg	Ca suppl	4	16	~124 (figure)	~2 (figure)	-7.8	-16, +4	-5.7		0.01
				Placebo		16	~122	~2	-2.1	-15, +7			
		DBP (standing)	mm Hg	Ca suppl	4	16	~78	~2	-2.6	-14, +6	-3.5		0.06
				Placebo		16	~76	~2	+0.9	-4, +16			
		SBP (supine)	mm Hg	Ca suppl	4	16	114	2	~110	~2	~-2		NS
				Placebo		16	114	2	~112	~2			
		DBP (supine)	mm Hg	Ca suppl	4	16	74	2	~73	~1	~-1		NS
				Placebo		16	72	2	~72	~1			
		25(OH)D	ng/mL	Ca suppl	4	16	~24	~4	~20	~2	~+5		NS
				Placebo		16	~29	~3	~21	~2			
		1,25(OH)D	pg/mL	Ca suppl	4	16	~30	~3	~21	~3	~-9		<0.05
				Placebo		16	~31	~2	~31	~2			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
8557965	Lijnen 1995	RCT	nd	nd	Y	Y	nd	Y	Y	N	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Incomplete data reporting. No data on background diet, even though diet was manipulated

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15800268	Lin 2005	Cohort study Participants are included in an RCT	US female professionals aged 45 or older Free of cancer and CVD	Excluded (n=2900) • did not provide sufficient dietary information at baseline • had an implausible total energy intake (<600 or >3,500 kcal/day) • failed to provide information on potential risk factors at baseline	1993 (RCT)	The Women's Health Study (a 2x2 factorial RCT evaluating low-dose ASA and Vit E for the primary prevention of cancer and CVD.	NCI and National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15800268	Lin 2005	Cohort study Participants are included in an RCT	US (25° 46'-54° 40')	36976	36976	Nd (~54 y)	45 or over (enrollment of the RCT)	0%	nd	BMI=~26	FH of colorectal cancer=~10% Previous colorectal polyps=~3% Current use of hormone replacement=~40% Physical activity=~ 1300kcal/d	Total energy intake=~1700 kcal/d Total fat intake=~55 g/d Total fiber intake=~20 g/d Total Ca=882 mg/d (median) Total Vit D=205 IU/d (median)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
15800268	Lin 2005	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	USDA + data from manufacturers	Correlation coefficients (FFQ and 4 1-week records): 0.56 (total Ca) and 0.51 (dietary Ca)					882 mg/d (median)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15800268	Lin 2005	nd	Colorectal cancer	Follow-up questionnaire (q6mo for the 1st y and annually thereafter) confirmed by medical records and pathology reports during a follow-up of 9 y.
		nd	Proximal colon cancer	Not fully defined (data not extracted)
		nd	Distal colon cancer	Not fully defined (data not extracted)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15800268	Lin 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (multivitamin, saturated fat, red meat, total energy intake) Yes (age) Yes (BMI) Yes (family history, polyps) Yes (hormone replacement therapy) No Yes (physical activity, smoking, alcohol) Yes (RCT arms [aspirin/no, Vit E/not])	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis
first model used only age and RCT assignments (aspirin & Vit E)
second model used the full multivariate model
performed a sensitivity analysis by excluding cases developed colorectal cancer during the first year of follow-up and added symptomatic examination, and regular screening test of colorectal cancer [colono- or sigmoidoscopy] to the second model.

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
15800268	Lin 2005	Colorectal cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	Nd	<614	41	7691	10 y (120 mo)	Adj (first model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	nd	0.17
			Q2	Nd	614-<785	31	Nd				0.74	0.46-1.18	Nd	
			Q3	Nd	785-<1016	52	7690				1.22	0.81-1.84	Nd	
			Q4	Nd	1016-	41	Nd				0.93	0.60-	nd	

					<1357							1.43		
			Q5	Nd	1357-	58	7690				1.22	0.81-1.82	Nd	
15800268	Lin 2005	Colorectal cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	Nd	<614	41	7691	10 y (120 mo)	Adj (second model)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	nd	0.21
			Q2	Nd	614-<785	31	Nd				0.74	0.46-1.18	Nd	
			Q3	Nd	785-<1016	52	7690				1.19	0.78-1.81	Nd	
			Q4	Nd	1016-<1357	41	Nd				0.92	0.58-1.44	nd	
			Q5	Nd	1357-	58	7690				1.20	0.79-1.85	Nd	
15800268	Lin 2005	Colorectal cancer (total Ca [mg])	Q1	Nd	<614	41	Nd	10 y (120 mo)	Adj (sensitivity analysis#)	RR (HR)	1.0	Ref	nd	0.11
			Q2	Nd	614-<785	31	Nd				0.74	0.45-1.21	Nd	
			Q3	Nd	785-<1016	52	Nd				1.21	0.78-1.88	Nd	
			Q4	Nd	1016-<1357	41	Nd				0.96	0.60-1.54	nd	
			Q5	Nd	1357-	58	nd				1.29	0.83-2.02	Nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
15800268	Lin 2005	- first model used only age and RCT assignments (aspirin & Vit E) - second model used the full multivariate model - performed a sensitivity analysis by excluding cases developed colorectal cancer during the first year of follow-up and added symptomatic examination, and regular screening test of colorectal cancer [colono- or sigmoidoscopy] to the second model. - subgroup analyses (total fat intake [high vs. low], phosphorus intake [high vs. low], total fiber intake [high vs. low], total vitamin intake [high vs. low]) performed: all but high fat intake group (RR between Q1 and Q5 = 1.61 [0.87-2.98]; P for trend = 0.04) and low fiber intake (RR between Q1 and Q5 = 1.80 [1.50-3.23]; P=0.02) were NS (P for trend). - “proximal” colon cancer and “distal” colon cancer were reported as clinical outcome (P for trend=NS); not fully extracted.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15800268	Lin 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting on inclusion/exclusion and actual selections, post-hoc analysis of an RCT of "cancer prevention" interventions: although adjusted; may have still been affected by these interventions; blinding not reported; power calculation not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17533208	Lin J 2007	Cohort study of subjects enrolled in randomized trial	39 876 women 45 years or older who were free of cancer and cardiovascular disease were enrolled in the WHS trial and completed a self-administered questionnaire at baseline about their medical history and lifestyle factors. During an average 10 years of follow-up, 276 premenopausal and 743 postmenopausal women had a confirmed diagnosis of incident invasive breast cancer and were included in the cohort.	8389 who provided insufficient dietary information or had biologically uncertain or unknown menopause status.	During 1993 and 1995	Women's Health Study	Gov't	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17533208	Lin J 2007	Cohort study of subjects enrolled in randomized trial	US 26° - 61°	31487	31487	55 y	55-56	0%	nd	BMI = 26	Current smokers = 8% to 20% Current users of postmenopausal hormone 56% to 72%	Current users of multivitamins, 15% to 76% Calcium supplement users, 6% to 90%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17533208	Lin J 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	No, Only correlation between vit D intake and plasma 25 OHD are available	nd	nd	Calculated from diet and multivitamin supplement
17533208	Lin J 2007	Dietary calcium intake	Willet method	USDA Nutrient Database	Yes, as references to Nurses' Health Study					Calcium dietary intake: Dairy products 53% pizza (4%), English muffin (3%), orange juice (2%), and bread (2%); other sources of vitamin D included dark fish (9%), tuna mix (5%), cereal (4%), and margarine (4%)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17533208	Lin J 2007	Primary	Breast cancer	Incident cases of invasive breast cancer

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must be explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
17533208	Lin J 2007	Vit D sources estimated from dietary questionnaire, no biomarker available. Thus excluded from the outcomes. Also available are subgroup analyses of relationships of calcium from dietary sources, supplements and breast cancer

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17533208	Lin J 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	multivitamin use and total energy intake in premenopausal and postmenopausal
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age at menopause and postmenopausal hormone therapy in postmenopausal women
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	Yes	hormone therapy in postmenopausal women
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	physical activity
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	smoking status, alcohol consumption
		Other	Yes	family history of breast cancer in a first-degree relative, history of benign breast disease, age at menarche, parity, age at first birth

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca intake level	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17533208	Lin J 2007	Invasive breast cancer-Premenopausal	Total calcium intake Q1	nd	<617	70	? unclear what was used in analyses Total followed up for 10 y = 10578	Age, randomized treatment, BMI, family h/o breast cancer, h/o benign breast disease, etc	HR	1 (Ref)			0.14

			Total calcium intake Q2		617 to <789	65	? 10578		HR	0.78	0.52 – 1.17		
			Total calcium intake Q3		789 to <1026	44	? 10578		HR	0.60	0.38 – 0.94		
			Total calcium intake Q4		1026 to <1366	59	? 10578		HR	0.78	0.51 – 1.19		
			Total calcium intake Q5		≥1366	38	? 10578		HR	0.64	0.40 – 1.03		
		Invasive breast cancer-Postmenopausal	Total calcium intake Q1		<617	104	?20909		HR	1.0 (Ref)			0.17
			Total calcium intake Q2		617 to <789	116	?20909		HR	1.12	0.85 – 1.47		
			Total calcium intake Q3		789 to <1026	112	?20909		HR	1.10	0.83 – 1.44		
			Total calcium intake Q4		1026 to <1366	119	?20909		HR	1.10	0.84 – 1.45		
			Total calcium intake Q5		≥1366	151	?20909		HR	1.23	0.94 – 1.61		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17533208	Lin J 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	NA

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Lack of biomarker, reliance on dietary assessment alone, unclear about total N

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	RCT	12y ±6 mo old girls with Danish names; calcium intake either 1000-1304 mg/d or <713 mg/d	nd	nd	-	academic and industry	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	RCT	Frederiksberg, Copenhagen, Denmark 56°	113	110	13.2	nd	0	white	wt 51 Kg	nd	dietary calcium: 957 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	25(OH)D				RIA	n	nd	nd	25(OH)D: 34.5 mmol/L
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (88 questions)	nd	n					dietary calcium: 957 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	calcium	calcium carbonate	500 mg	1 y	two 250 mg chewables with evening meal q day
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			80% in calcium; 82% in placebo			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	primary	body weight	
			height	
		secondary	25(OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	enrolled subject stratified by two groups depending on calcium intake: 1000-1304 mg/d or <713 mg/d

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	calcium intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	weight, height, body fat
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	no	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline / SE*	Final **	Final SE*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	weight Δ in medium (1000-1304 mg/d) calcium intake group	Kg	calcium	1 y	30	51.8	1.7	56.9	1.8			NS
				placebo	1 y	30	50.7	1.6	55.6	1.6			
		weight Δ in low (<713 mg/d) calcium intake group	Kg	calcium	1 y	24	52.2	1.7	56.3	1.8			NS
				placebo	1 y	26	49.5	1.7	52.5	1.6			
		height Δ in medium (1000-1304 mg/d) calcium intake group	cm	calcium	1 y	30	162.5	1.1	166.2	1.0			NS
				placebo	1 y	30	161.9	1.2	165.9	1.1			
		height Δ in low (<713 mg/d) calcium intake group	cm	calcium	1 y	24	159.6	1.3	163.2	1.3			NS
				placebo	1 y	26	160.1	1.5	163.2	1.4			
		25(OH)D Δ in medium (1000-1304 mg/d) calcium intake group	mmol/L	calcium	1 y	29	37.5	2	35.1	3			NS
				placebo	1 y	29	39.2	3	32.2	2			
		25(OH)D Δ in low (<713 mg/d) calcium intake group	mmol/L	calcium	1 y	24	30.8	2	25.7	3			NS
				placebo	1 y	24	29.2	2	28.5	3			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
16400044	Lorenzen 2006	RCT	nd	nd	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	B

**Adverse Event(s): ** **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	relatively small sample size in each group; details of methods not completely reported; did not adjust for all potentially relevant confounders

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17473911	Lyons 2007	RCT	All residents living in care homes across South Wales, including those with mobility, cognitive, visual, hearing or communication impairments	People already receiving ≥ 400 IU of vit D/d and those already have contradictions to vit D supplementation (not specified)	December 2000 and January 2003	nd	The Wales Office of Research and Development for Health and Social Care	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17473911	Lyons 2007	RCT	South Wales (51.96° N)	3440	3343	84 (7.5)	62-107	23.7%	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17473911	Lyons 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D – DiaSorin radioimmunoassay	n	nd	nd	nd
17473911	Lyons 2007	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17473911	Lyons 2007	Vit D	Supplementation – ergo-calciferol	822IU/d	3 years	Every 4 months (Two 1.25 mg vit D tablets - 100,000 IU)
17473911	Lyons 2007	placebo	nd	nd	3 years	Every 4 months
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			80% (percentage of occasions observed to take tablets)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17473911	Lyons 2007	Primary	First fracture	Confirmed by matching every participant with computerized health records and searching through emergency department and in-patient records
17473911	Lyons 2007	Secondary	Fractures (hip/wrist/forearm/vertebrae)	Confirmed by matching every participant with computerized health records and searching through emergency department and in-patient records
17473911	Lyons 2007	Secondary	Mortality	nd

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17473911	Lyons 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes -age, gender	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other	Residential home, nursing or dual-registered home, sheltered accommodation	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17473911	Lyons 2007	First fracture (all sites)	Vit D2	median time to first fracture = 387 days (IQR: 220–582)	205	1670	HR vit d2/placebo	0.95	0.79-1.15	NS			
			Placebo	367 days (IQR: 139–618) in the control group	218	1673							
17473911	Lyons 2007	mortality	Vit D2	3 yr	947	1670	HR vit d2/placebo	1.0	0.9-1.0	NS			
			Placebo	3 yr	953	1673							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome

**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17473911	Lyons 2007	Fracture at the hip, wrist, forearm, and spine	HR, intervention to control – 1.00 (95% CI; 0.8-1.3)
17473911	Lyons 2007	Fracture at the hip	HR, intervention to control – 1.1 (95% CI; 0.8-1.1)

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17473911	Lyons 2007	RCT-parallel	Y	Y	NA	Y	nd	Y	Y	Y	Y	B/C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting on the result section, no information on background diet. **Quality rating C** for mortality data due to inconsistent reporting between figure and table.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17209177	Major 2007	RCT	Women with low Ca intake (800 mg Ca/d), premenopausal, stable weight, overweight or obese (BMI 27-40), limited exercise (<3 periods of 20 min per week), general good health, BP<160/95	Ca supplementation Menopause Smoking Cholesterol level requiring treatment Abnormal thyroid function Medication that could affect weight Consumption of >5 cups coffee/day Pregnant or breastfeeding	nd	none	Wyeth, professional organization (CVD, DM), Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17209177	Major 2007	RCT	Quebec City, QC, Canada 47°	84	63	43 (~5.5)	nd (premenopausal)	0	nd	BMI – 31.9 (~3)	Healthy, overweight/ obese	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				None				
17209177	Major 2007	Dietary calcium intake	3 d dietary record (Tremblay 1983)	Canadian Nutrient File	No					Ca+D: 708.0 (119) mg/d Placebo: 700.5 (99) mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17209177	Major 2007	Vit D + Ca	Supplements (Caltrate 600+D)	Ca: 1200 mg (Ca carbonate per website) Vit D 400 IU (cholecalciferol per website)	15 wk	1 capsule 2x/d
		Placebo	nd			
Co-intervention(s) *:			Energy restriction diet: -700 Kcal/d, maintaining "diet quality"			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17209177	Major 2007	2°	Weight	Kg
		2°	BMI	
		2°	SBP	
		2°	DBP	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17209177	Major 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final or Change	Final or Change SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
17209177	Major 2007	Weight	Kg	Ca + D	15 wk	30	81.5	8.3	77.5	9.0	-1.0		0.19
				Placebo		33	83.6	11.1	80.6	11.7			
		BMI	Kg/m^2	Ca + D	15 wk	30	31.4	2.5	29.8	2.8	-0.4		0.23
				Placebo		33	32.3	3.54	31.1	3.7			
		SBP	mmHg	Ca + D	15 wk	30	112.4	10.8	-4.1	6.8	-2.5		0.18
				Placebo		33	109.5	8.5	-1.6	7.6			
		DBP	mmHg	Ca + D	15 wk	30	74.9	8.9	-3.0	4.9	0		1.0
				Placebo		33	75.2	7.0	-3.0	5.9			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17209177	Major 2007	RCT	nd	nd	NA	N	Y	N	Technically OK, but poor choice (ANOVA)	N	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Design methods poorly described. High dropout due to problems with diet/exercise compliance etc. These people were fully dropped. Questionable choice of statistical analysis.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
3755517	Mallet 1986	RCT	term pregnancy, white, lived in same town	nd	nd	nd	nd	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
3755517	Mallet 1986	RCT	NW France, 48º N	77	77	25	18-36	0	white	nd	nd	Ca intake 550 to 1000 mg/d in 55% of the subjects

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
3755517	Mallet 1986	25(OH)D				Competitive protein binding assay	y; reproducibility at 20 nmol/L 6%	nd	winter, Feb/Mar	45% were outside <1 h/d
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
3755517	Mallet 1986	unsupplemented				
		vit D 1000 IU/d		1000 IU	daily for last 3 mo pregnancy	nd
		vit D 200,000 IU 1x			!x at 7 mo pregnancy	
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:		nd				

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
3755517	Mallet 1986	primary	maternal 25(OH)D at term	
			cord blood 25(OH)D at term	
		primary	maternal 1,25 (OH)2D at term	
			cord blood 1,25 (OH02D at term	
		secondary	birth weight	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
3755517	Mallet 1986	unsupplemented group was not randomized

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
3755517	Mallet 1986	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age, race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	yes	spent time outside
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
3755517	Mallet 1986	maternal 25(OH)D at term	nmol/L	unsupplemented	crude	3 mo	29	nd	nd	9.4	4.9			
				1000 IU/d			21	nd	nd	25.3	7.7			
				200,000 IU			27	nd	nd	26	6.4			
		cord 25(OH)D	nmol/L	unsupplemented	crude	3 mo	29	nd	nd	5.3	2.5			
				1000 IU/d			21	nd	nd	15.7	5.1			
				200,000 IU			27	nd	nd	18.2	5.2			
		birth weight	g	unsupplemented	crude		nd	nd	nd	3460	70			NS
				1000 IU/d			nd	nd	nd	3370	80			
				200,000 IU			nd	nd	nd	3210	90			
		maternal 1,25(OH)2D at term	pmol/L	unsupplemented	crude	3 mo	29	nd	nd	66.1	14			
				1000 IU/d			21	nd	nd	49.9	16			
				200,000 IU			27	nd	nd	69	22			
		cord 1,25(OH)2D at term	pmol/L	unsupplemented	crude	3 mo	29	nd	nd	47	16			
				1000 IU/d			21	nd	nd	42.6	12			
				200,000 IU			27	nd	nd	46.1	15			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
3755517	Mallet 1986	curve4 data rejected due to nonRCT design when comparing to the unsupplemented group

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
3755517	Mallet 1986	RCT	n	n	NA	nd	nd	nd	y	n	n	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	small sample size; incomplete data on infants

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18824662	Margolis 2008	RCT	Women aged 50 to 79 years	Women with < 3years of predicted survival, a history of kidney stone or hypercalcemia, current oral corticosteroid use or current calcitriol use	1993-1998	WHI	NIH	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18824662	Margolis 2008	RCT	US	36282	36282	62 (7)	50-79	0%	83% White, 9% Black, 4% Hispanic, <1% American Indian, 2% Asian/Pacific Islander	BMI <25 28.0% BMI 25 to <30 35.4% BMI ≥30 36.6%	healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18824662	Margolis 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Diasorin Liaison chemiluminescent immunoassay	nd	nd	nd	25(OH)D nmol/L <34.4 25.0%, 34.4-47.6 25.2%, 47.7-64.6 24.9%, ≥ 64.7 24.8%
18824662	Margolis 2008	Dietary calcium intake	Food frequency questionnaire	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	Total Ca intake mg/d <600 19.7%, 600-799 14.4%, 800-1199 26.3%, ≥1200 39.6%

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18824662	Margolis 2008	Ca+VitD	Ca-Tablet as calcium carbonate VitD-provided by GlaxoSmithKline	Ca 1000mg VitD3 400IU	7y	2 times/d
18824662	Margolis 2008	Placebo	nd			
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			60% (proportion taking ≥ study medication, adherence assessed by weighing returned bottles)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18824662	Margolis 2008	primary	Hypertension	Self-report of medication prescribed for hypertension or any BP ≥ 140/90 mm Hg

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18824662	Margolis 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		Ca intake, VitD intake, sodium intake,
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	Age, race, education,
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI
		Medical conditions		Blood pressure, hypertensive status
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes*	Physical activity, smoking, alcohol intake,
		Other		25(OH)vitD

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
18824662	Margolis 2008	Hypertension	CaD	74 mo	3377	8597	HR				1.01	0.96, to 1.06	0.69
			Placebo	74 mo	3315	8525							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
18824662	Margolis 2008	Systolic BP	mmHg	CaD	74 mo						+0.22	-0.05 to 0.49	0.11
				Placebo	74 mo								
18824662	Margolis 2008	Diastolic BP	mmHg	CaD	74 mo						+0.11	-0.04 to 0.27	0.14
				Placebo	74 mo								

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
18824662	Margolis 2008	In the subsample of subjects with measured 25(OH)vitD, those with lower levels had a higher risk of incident hypertension. Test if interaction between Ca/vitD treatment assignment and 25(OH)vitD on hypertension risk (p-value <.01)

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18824662	Margolis 2008	RCT-parallel	nd	nd	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Open-label use of Ca and vitD supplements as long as non-study use of vitD did not exceed 600IU daily. UL was raised to 1000IU after IOM report release, outcome measure - Self-report of medication prescribed for hypertension

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15955467	Marniemi 2005	Cohort study	65-99 in 1986-87. Around Turku, Finland.	Men<75 in NH Women<70 in NH Missing lab data Obvious inaccuracies in dietary data	1986-87	(Turku, Finland)	nd	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15955467	Marniemi 2005	Cohort study	Turku, Finland 60°	769	755	79 (nd)	65-99	48%	White 100% (probably)	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15955467	Marniemi 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA (Incstar)	No	Frozen. Unclear. ≤10 y	nd	nd
15955467	Marniemi 2005	Dietary calcium intake	Interview (nd)	Nutrica database at the Social Insurance Institution (Knuts 1987; Hakala 1996)	No					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15955467	Marniemi 2005	1°	AMI	ICD 9 codes from national death registry and national hospital discharge registry
			Stroke	Same

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15955467	Marniemi 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (Ca analyses)	Weight adjusted intake of total energy (Ca analyses)
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Smoking
		Other	Yes	"Functional capacity" (Vit D analyses) TC, HDL, SBP

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Followup, mean	Mean Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15955467	Marniemi 2005	AMI	Calcium intake, Tertile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~252	Adjusted	RR	1	Ref		nd
			Tertile 2		nd	nd	~252			0.866	0.57, 1.37		
			Tertile 3		nd	nd	~252			1.14	0.70, 1.84		
		AMI	25(OH)D level, Tertile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~252	Adjusted	RR	1	Ref		nd
			Tertile 2		nd	nd	~252			0.987	0.64, 1.53		
			Tertile 3		nd	nd	~252			0.769	0.47, 1.27		
		AMI	1.25$(OH)_2$D level, Tertile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~252	Adjusted	RR	1	Ref		nd
			Tertile 2		nd	nd	~252			1.05	0.68, 1.62		
			Tertile 3		nd	nd	~252			0.821	0.52, 1.30		
		Stroke	Calcium intake, Tertile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~252	Adjusted	RR	1	Ref		nd
			Tertile 2		nd	nd	~252			0.981	0.53, 1.81		
			Tertile 3		nd	nd	~252			1.34	0.70, 2.55		
		Stroke	25(OH)D level, Tertile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~252	Adjusted	RR	1	Ref		nd
			Tertile 2		nd	nd	~252			1.13	0.62, 2.05		
			Tertile 3		nd	nd	~252			0.999	0.51, 1.94		
		Stroke	1.25$(OH)_2$D level, Tertile 1	10 y	nd	nd	~252	Adjusted	RR	1	Ref		nd
			Tertile 2		nd	nd	~252			0.631	0.37, 1.09		
			Tertile 3		nd	nd	~252			0.406	0.22, 0.77	0.005	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome

**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Measure	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
15955467	Marniemi 2005	No data on ranges, medians, etc. of intake or level tertiles.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15955467	Marniemi 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C (or NA)
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No intake values or level values provided for tertiles. Data not reported.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12020102	Martinez 2002	Cohort study Participants are included in an RCT	Men and women 40-80 years of age who had undergone removal of one or more colorectal adenoma(s) 3 mm or larger at colonoscopy within three months prior to study entry were recruited from the Phoenix, Arizona, metropolitan area	Individuals with a personal history of inflammatory bowel disease or hereditary colon cancer syndromes.	nd	Wheat Bran Fiber (WBF) trial	NCI	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others

**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12020102	Martinez 2002	Cohort study	Phoenix, Arizona, metropolitan area (33°29′ N)	1429	1304	According to calcium intake, 1st quartile:64.3 (9.3); 2nd quartile: 66.4 (8.5); 3rd quartile: 66.5 (8.9); 4th quartile:66.2 (8.4)	nd	57.1	nd	nd	Regular aspirin use in the past 10 years: 28.2% Previous polyps: 39.2% Family CRC history: 16.9% Current smoking: 13.7% According to calcium intake, Alcohol (g), 1st quartile: 10.9 (22.4); 2nd quartile: 7.5 (13.2); 3rd quartile: 6.5 (11); 4th quartile: 3.9 (8.2)	According to calcium intake Energy (kcal), 1st quartile:1809 (655); 2nd quartile: 2038 (683); 3rd quartile: 1986 (689); 4th quartile:1866 (742) Total fat (g), 1st quartile: 70.9 (13.7); 2nd quartile: 69.9 (12); 3rd quartile: 68.4 (13.1); 4th quartile: 66.7 (13.5)

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12020102	Martinez 2002	Cohort study	Phoenix, Arizona, metropolitan area	1429	1304	According to calcium intake, 1st quartile:64.3 (9.3); 2nd quartile: 66.4 (8.5); 3rd quartile: 66.5 (8.9); 4th quartile:66.2 (8.4)	nd	57.1	nd	nd	Regular aspirin use in the past 10 years: 28.2% Previous polyps: 39.2 Family CRC history: 16.9 Current smoking: 13.7 According to calcium intake, Alcohol (g), 1st quartile: 10.9 (22.4); 2nd quartile: 7.5 (13.2); 3rd quartile: 6.5 (11); 4th quartile: 3.9 (8.2)	According to calcium intake Dietary fiber (g), 1st quartile: 20 (5.9); 2nd quartile: 22.2 (6.8); 3rd quartile: 22.8 (7.5); 4th quartile: 23.4 (7.1) Red meat (g), 1st quartile: 72.5 (56.9); 2nd quartile: 65.8 (47.7); 3rd quartile: 61.1 (46.9); 4th quartile: 50.6 (40.2)

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12020102	Martinez 2002	Cohort study	Phoenix, Arizona, metropolitan area (33°29′ N)	1429	1304	According to calcium intake, 1st quartile: 64.3 (9.3); 2nd quartile: 66.4 (8.5); 3rd quartile: 66.5 (8.9); 4th quartile:66.2 (8.4)	nd	57.1	nd	nd	Regular aspirin use in the past 10 years: 28.2% Previous polyps: 39.2 Family CRC history: 16.9 Current smoking: 13.7 According to calcium intake, Alcohol (g), 1st quartile: 10.9 (22.4); 2nd quartile: 7.5 (13.2); 3rd quartile: 6.5 (11); 4th quartile: 3.9 (8.2)	According to calcium intake Supplemental calcium (mg), 1st quartile: 11.6 (35.6); 2nd quartile: 34.6 (72.1); 3rd quartile: 92.2 (170.7); 4th quartile: 582.8 (516) Supplemental vitamin D (IU), 1st quartile: 65.4 (151.8); 2nd quartile: 115.7 (189.3); 3rd quartile: 163.7 (256.2); 4th quartile: 227.5 (248.2) Median total calcium intake (mg/day), 1st quartile: 629; 2nd quartile: 874; 3rd quartile: 1107; 4th quartile: 1638

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12020102	Martinez 2002	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
12020102	Martinez 2002	Dietary calcium intake	113-item Arizona Food Frequency Questionnaire (AFFQ)	United States Department of Agriculture's Continuing Survey of Food Intake of Individuals, 1996 and the United States Department of Agriculture's Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Version 13	y assessment of its validity and reliability [recurrence. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 8: 941-946] have been previously reported					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12020102	Martinez 2002	primary	Adenoma recurrence	One or more adenomas or colorectal cancer detected by colonoscopy any time after randomization

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12020102	Martinez 2002	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Dietary fiber; total vitamin D; energy intake	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age; gender)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	Self reported history of polyps prior to baseline; adenoma number (≥ 3 vs. < 3); adenoma location (any proximal vs. non-proximal)	
		Medication	Regular use of aspirin in the previous 10 years	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	Number of colonoscopies after baseline	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

Covariates: age, gender

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12020102	Martinez 2002	Adenoma recurrence	1st total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		< 778	178	148	36.8	adjusted	OR	1.00			
		Adenoma recurrence	2nd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		778-996	175	151	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.90	0.66-1.23	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	3rd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		997-1279	148	178	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.64	0.47-0.88	nd	0.002
		Adenoma recurrence	4th total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		>1279	138	188	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.65	0.47-0.90	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

Covariates: age, gender, number of colonoscopies, history of polyps prior to baseline, aspirin use, dietary fiber, and total vitamin D intake

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12020102	Martinez 2002	Adenoma recurrence	1st total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		< 778	178	148	36.8	adjusted	OR	1.00			
		Adenoma recurrence	2nd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		778-996	175	151	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.92	0.65, 1.29	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	3rd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		997-1279	148	178	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.66	0.47, 0.94	nd	0.004
		Adenoma recurrence	4th total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		>1279	138	188	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.62	0.42, 0.90	nd	

Covariates: age, gender, number of colonoscopies, history of polyps prior to baseline, aspirin use, dietary fiber, and total vitamin D intake, location and number of polyps at baseline

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12020102	Martinez 2002	Adenoma recurrence	1st total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		< 778	178	148	36.8	adjusted	OR	1.00			
		Adenoma recurrence	2nd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		778-996	175	151	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.94	0.66, 1.32	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	3rd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		997-1279	148	178	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.68	0.48, 0.97	nd	0.005
		Adenoma recurrence	4th total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		>1279	138	188	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.62	0.42, 0.90	nd	

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Covariates: age, gender, number of colonoscopies, history of polyps prior to baseline, aspirin use, dietary fiber, and total vitamin D intake, location and number of polyps at baseline / stratified by gender

Male patients

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12020102	Martinez 2002	Adenoma recurrence	1st total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		< 778	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	1.00			nd
		Adenoma recurrence	2nd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		778-996	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	1.01	0.68-1.51	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	3rd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		997-1279	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.83	0.54-1.26	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	4th total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		>1279	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.67	0.40-1.10	nd	

Female patients

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12020102	Martinez 2002	Adenoma recurrence	1st total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		< 778	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	1.00			nd
		Adenoma recurrence	2nd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		778-996	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.81	0.40-1.64	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	3rd total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		997-1279	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.42	0.21-1.87	nd	
		Adenoma recurrence	4th total calcium intake quartile (mg/day)		>1279	nd	nd	36.8	adjusted	OR	0.52	0.28-0.98	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
12020102	Martinez 2002	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Study was not design to evaluate calcium intake and adenoma recurrence; assessor blinding not reported; power calculation not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
7239350	Marya 1981	Other intervention study	pregnancy	preeclampsia, antepartum hemorrhage, twins	nd	-	nd	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
7239350	Marya 1981	Other intervention study	Rohtak, India 28° 54' N	70	70	nd	nd	0	Indian	nd	nd	daily milk <500 mL; vit D (diet) <30 IU/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
7239350	Marya 1981	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								vit D (diet) <30 IU/d
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specified)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., bran name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
7239350	Marya 1981			1200 IU vit D + 375 mg Calcium	qd through 3rd trimester	
				600,000 U vit D2 once in 7th and 8th month pregnancy		
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
7239350	Marya 1981	secondary	birth weight	-

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments
7239350	Marya 1981	two supplement groups were randomly selected; control group was not

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
7239350	Marya 1981	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIEATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHONOMIC OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7239350	Marya 1981	birth weight		1200 IU/d vit D + calcium (3rd trimester)		25			2.89	0.32			0.05
				control		75			2.73	0.36			
				1.2 mil IU vit D total		20			3.14	0.45			0.001
				control		75			2.73	0.36			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHONOMIC OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARING BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
7239350	Marya 1981	quasi-RCT	nd	N	NA	Y	N	N	N	N	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	no information provided
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	small sample size, no comparative data between the two supplemented groups; study methodology not completely reported

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
3623260	Marya 1987	RCT	pregnancy	nd	nd	-	nd	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
3623260	Marya 1987	RCT	Rohtak, India 28° 54' N	400	400	nd	20-35	0	Indian	nd	nd	diet: calcium 500 mg/d and vit D 40 IU/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				diet: vit D 40 IU/d
3623260	Marya 1987	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	n					diet: calcium 500 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
3623260	Marya 1987	vit D and Ca	nd	calcium 375 mg and Vit D 1200 IU from 20-24 wk onwards	≤16-20 wk	nd
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
3623260	Marya 1987	primary	toxemia	nd

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
3623260	Marya 1987	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
3623260	Marya 1987	toxemia	ca+ vit D suppl	pregnancy	12	200		6% vs. 9%		>0.05 per chi2			
			no suppl	pregnancy	18	200							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
3623260	Marya 1987	RCT	nd	N	NA	Y	N	N	N	N	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	study methodology not completely reported

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
3243609	Marya 1988	RCT	pregnancy	preeclampsia, antepartum hemorrhage, preterm delivery, twin pregnancies	nd	-	nd	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
3243609	Marya 1988	RCT	Rohtak, India 28° 54' N	200	200	24	22-35	0	Indian	weight 54 Kg	nd	Vit D 35 IU/d; calcium 429 mg/d (diet?)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
3243609	Marya 1988	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				vit D 35 IU/d (diet?)
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						calcium 429 mg/d (diet?)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
3243609	Marya 1988	vit D	unclear if this is oral or parenteral supplementation	600,000 IU once each in 7th and 8th month pregnancy		
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
3243609	Marya 1988	primary	newborn birth weight	
		secondary	crown-heel length	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
3243609	Marya 1988	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	yes	weight gain in 3rd trimester
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
3243609	Marya 1988	birth weight <2.5 Kg	1.2 million IU vit D					4% vs. 19%					
			no supplement										

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
3243609	Marya 1988	newborn birth weight	Kg	1.2 million IU vit D		100			2.99	0.36			<0.05
				no supplement		100			2.80	0.37			
		gestational age	wk	1.2 million IU vit D		100			38.65	1.77			>0.05
				no supplement		100			38.86	1.69			
		crown-heel length	cm	1.2 million IU vit D		100			50.06	1.79			<0.001
				no supplement		100			48.45	2.04			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Subgroup in women with similar weight gain 3rd trimester

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
3243609	Marya 1988	newborn birth weight in women with similar weight gain (50-55 g/d) in 3rd trimester		1.2 million IU vit D		33 women			2.95	0.17			<0.01
				no supplement		25 women			2.76	0.25			

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
3243609	Marya 1988	RCT	nd	N	NA	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	no information provided
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	study methodology not completely reported

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	RCT	50-70 y women; menopause ≥1 y; BMD T-score < -1	vit D or meds that affect mineral metabolism within past 12 mo; kidney stone, tumors, liver or kidney disease; hypercalciuria	winter, spring 2002	-	non-profit and industry	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	RCT	Buenos Aires, Argentina (34ºS)	45	45	65 (median, est.)	54.5-77 (IQR, est.)	0	nd	BMI 27.4 (median, est.)	BMD T-score < -1	25(OH)D level 42 nmol/L (median, est.)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	25(OH)D				RIA (DIASORIN)	y; interassay and intraassay CV 19%, 17.6%	nd	winter, spring	25(OH)D level 42 nmol/L (median, est.)
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	calcium 500 mg/d + No vit D	calcium carbonate	calcium 500 mg/d + No vit D	3 mo	1 tablet qd
		calcium 500 mg/d + vit D 125 µg/d	calcium carbonate + vit D2 (Spedrog-Caillon, Argentina)	calcium 500 mg/d + 5000 IU/d vit D2	3 mo	2 drop qd of vit D2 + 1 tablet of calcium qd
		calcium 500 mg/d + vit D 250 µg/d	calcium carbonate + vit D2 (Spedrog-Caillon, Argentina)	calcium 500 mg/d + 10000 IU/d vit D2	3 mo	4 drop qd of vit D2 + 1 tablet of calcium qd
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			89%			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	primary	25(OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	season
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline (median)	Baseline IQR	Final (median)	Final (IQR)	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	25(OH)D at 2 mo	nmol/L	calcium only	crude	2 mo	13	45	31.2-61.2	47.5	38.7-66.2			
				calcium + 5000 D2			13	42	23.7-45	67.5	57.5-91.2			NS (btw 5000 & 10000)
				calcium + 10000 D2			12	32.5	27.5-37.5	97.7	79.1-111.8			
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	25(OH)D at 3 mo	nmol/L	calcium only	crude	3 mo	13	45	31.2-61.2	55	72.5-68			
				calcium + 5000 D2			13	42	23.7-45	77.5	66.2-156.2			NS (btw 5000 & 10000)
				calcium + 10000 D2			12	32.5	27.5-37.5	97.7	79.3-123.1			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
16391587	Mastaglia 2006	RCT	nd	nd	NA	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	Hypercalciuria (n=1) in control group
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	small number of subjects in each group; methodology not fully explained

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

6793058ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
6793058	Maxwell 1981	RCT	pregnant Asians	nd	nd	-	government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
6793058	Maxwell 1981	RCT	London, UK 51° N	126	126	nd	nd	0	Asians	weight at 3rd trimester: 63.7 Kg	nd	25(OH)D level at 28-32 wk: 20.1 nmol/L

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
6793058	Maxwell 1981	25(OH)D				nd				25(OH)D level at 28-32 wk: 20.1 nmol/L
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
6793058	Maxwell 1981	calciferol	nd	1000 IU/d	3rd trimester only	
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
6793058	Maxwell 1981	primary	weight gain 3rd trimester	
		secondary	birth weight	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
6793058	Maxwell 1981	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
6793058	Maxwell 1981	infants with birth weight <2500 g	calciferol		7	59				NS			
			control		15	67							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final	Final SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
6793058	Maxwell 1981	maternal weight gain 3rd trimester	g/d	calciferol		59			63.3	20.7			<0.001
				control		67			46.4	29.5			
6793058	Maxwell 1981	infant birth weight	g	calciferol		59			3157	469			NS
				control		67			3034	524			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
6793058	Maxwell 1981	Unclear how weight gain differences between groups were determined not due to edema.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
6793058	Maxwell 1981	RCT	nd	nd	NA	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	no information provided
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	study methodology not completely reported; small sample size

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12708719	McCullough 2003	Cohort study	Members of CPS II who resided in 21 states with population based cancer registries and were 50-74 years old at enrollment (when they completed a 10-page confidential, self-administered mailed questionnaire including questions on demographic, medical, behavioral, environmental, occupational, and dietary factors). A follow up questionnaire (beginning in 1997) was sent to cohort members to update exposure information and to ascertain newly diagnosed cancers.	Men and women lost to follow (until August 31, 1997); participants who reported any prevalent cancer (except non-melanoma skin cancer) at baseline; with extreme daily energy intake, for women <550 or >3500 kcal; for men <650 or >4000 kcal; those who left ≥ 10 of the 68 questionnaire items (15%) blank; respondents who left ≥ 4 of the seven dairy food questions blank; and those with uninterpretable responses to calcium or multivitamin questions; also, patients whose self-report of CRC could not be verified	1992-1993	Cancer Prevention Study (CPS) II Nutrition Cohort	nd	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others

**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12708719	McCullough 2003	Cohort study	US (21 states)	127749	127749	According to calcium intake per quintile For men, Q1: 62.9 (nd); Q3: 63.9 (nd); Q5: 65.1 (nd) For women, Q1: 61.3 (nd); Q3: 61.9 (nd); Q5: 62.6 (nd)	nd	48	nd	According to calcium intake per quintile %BMI>30 For men, Q1: 16.1; Q3: 13.6; Q5: 11.4 For women, Q1: 18.6; Q3: 16.5; Q5: 10.7	According to calcium intake per quintile Median exercise MET score For men, Q1: 11.2; Q3: 13.4; Q5: 14.4 For women, Q1: 10.1; Q3: 12; Q5: 13.5 %long-term multivitamin use For men, Q1: 4.1; Q3: 12.1; Q5: 23.2 For women, Q1: 4.4; Q3: 15; Q5: 31 %family CRC history For men, Q1: 12.6; Q3: 12.3; Q5: 12.4 For women, Q1: 14.1; Q3: 14.4; Q5: 14.5 Median alcohol intake (g/day) For men, Q1: 17.3; Q3: 9.3; Q5: 6.4 For women, Q1: 6.1; Q3: 4.1; Q5: 3.7	According to calcium intake per quintile Median total vitamin D (IU/day) For men, Q1: 94; Q3: 208; Q5: 488 For women, Q1: 92; Q3: 215; Q5: 485 According to vitamin D intake per quintile Median total calcium (mg/day) For men, Q1: 509; Q3: 872; Q5: 1122 For women, Q1: 496; Q3: 876; Q5: 1334

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12708719	McCullough 2003	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
12708719	McCullough 2003	Dietary calcium intake	68-item semi-quantitative FFQ (modification of the brief Health Habits and History Questionnaire (HHHQ) by Block et al.	USDA	y Validated using 4 random 24h recalls collected over a 1-year period. Energy adjusted correlation that controlled for day-to-day variation in 24h recalls was r=0.68 for dietary calcium					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12708719	McCullough 2003	primary	Colorectal cancer	Confirmed incident cases of fatal or non-fatal colon cancer or rectal cancer that occurred between enrollment (1992-93) and August 31, 1997. Most cases were initially identified by self-report on the follow up questionnaires and verified by medical records, or from linkage with state cancer registries. Also, a few cases were initially identified through linkage with state cancer registries to confirm other reported cancers. CRC deaths were identified if recorded as the underlying or the contributory cause of death on a death certificate through August 31, 1997 among cohort members. Ascertainment of all deaths is accomplished through linkage with the National Death Index.
			Proximal colon cancer	Cancer at cecum to splenic flexure
			Distal colon cancer	Cancer at descending to sigmoid colon
			Rectal cancer	Cancer at rectum and rectosigmoid junction

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
12708719	McCullough 2003	Data on total energy intake are not given

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12708719	McCullough 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (total energy, %saturated fat intake, fruit intake, vegetable intake, long-term multivitamin use) Yes (age; gender; education) Yes (BMI) Yes (family CRC history) Yes (for women only: HRT use) No Yes (smoking; exercise METs)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

Age adjusted in five-year categories

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
12708719	McCullough 2003	CRC	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	156	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	165	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.18	nd	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	137	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.96	nd	nd	<0.06
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	108	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.75	nd	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	117	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.87	nd	nd	

Adjusted for age, smoking, BMI, education, exercise METs, family CRC history, total energy, %saturated fat intake, fruit intake, vegetable intake, long-term multivitamin use, and gender

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
12708719	McCullough 2003	CRC	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	156	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	165	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.05	0.84-1.31	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	137	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.88	0.70-1.12	nd	0.02
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	108	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.72	0.56-0.93	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	117	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.87	0.67-1.12	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
12708719	McCullough 2003	For women, results on subsite analyses for CRC were imprecise due to small number of cases; therefore, only results on subsite analyses for men are presented. Results for total calcium intake and CRC were unchanged when the first year of follow up was excluded from the analysis.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

For men: age adjusted in five-year categories

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
12708719	McCullough 2003	CRC	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	89	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	106	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.95	nd	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	98	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.85	nd	nd	0.002
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	70	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.63	nd	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	58	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.71	nd	nd	

For women: age adjusted in five-year categories

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
12708719	McCullough 2003	CRC	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	67	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	59	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.07	nd	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	39	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.71	nd	nd	0.007
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	38	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.64	nd	nd	

			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	59	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.72	nd	nd	

For men: adjusted for age, smoking, BMI, education, exercise METs, family CRC history, total energy, %saturated fat intake, fruit intake, vegetable intake, long-term multivitamin use

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
12708719	McCullough 2003	CRC	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	89	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	106	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.01	0.76-1.34	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	98	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.93	0.70-1.25	nd	0.04
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	70	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.71	0.52-0.98	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	58	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.82	0.58-1.16	nd	
		Proximal colon cancer	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	26	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	0.04
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	36	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.13	0.68-1.88	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	26	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.81	0.47-1.42	nd	
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	23	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.77	0.43-1.47	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	13	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.57	0.28-1.13	nd	
		Distal colon cancer	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	17	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.55

			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	26	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.25	0.67-2.31	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	31	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.51	0.83-2.77	nd	
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	15	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.77	0.38-1.57	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	13	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00	0.47-2.13	nd	
		Total colon cancer	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	64	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.02
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	82	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.08	0.77-1.50	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	67	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.89	0.63-1.27	nd	
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	51	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.72	0.49-1.05	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	38	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.74	0.49-1.12	nd	
		Rectal cancer	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	23	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	0.71
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	22	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.78	0.43-1.41	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	29	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.02	0.58-1.79	nd	
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	16	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.60	0.31-1.16	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	19	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.01	0.53-1.93	nd	

For women: adjusted for age, smoking, BMI, education, exercise METs, family CRC history, total energy, %saturated fat intake, fruit intake, vegetable intake, long-term multivitamin use, and HRT use

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) /	Mean Vit D level	Mean Ca level /	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR,	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****

			Intervention Groups	**/ dose**	**dose**		**cases / Total N****			**RR, HR, %)**				
12708719	McCullough 2003	CRC	1st quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		<561	67	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		561-731	59	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.16	0.82-1.66	nd	
			3rd quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		732-925	39	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.80	0.54-1.21	nd	0.31
			4th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		926-1255	38	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.78	0.51-1.18	nd	
			5th quintile of total calcium intake (mg/day)		>1255	59	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.94	0.63-1.39	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
12708719	McCullough 2003	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	na	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only		a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	na					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Initial cohort was assembled to evaluate cancer mortality; assessor blinding not reported; power calculation not reported; results are not given sufficiently (age adjusted model without CI; number of non-cases per calcium quintile not provided); confirmation of cases by histology not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16365007	McCullough 2005	Cohort study	Women from the CPS II Nutrition Cohort, a prospective study of cancer mortality established in 1982.	Women who were lost to follow-up between enrollment in 1992/1993 and August 31, 2001 (n = 3,514), or, who, at baseline, reported a history of breast cancer (n = 6,220) or other cancer (except nonmelanoma skin cancer; n = 5,805). Women who were premenopausal or perimenopausal at baseline (n = 4,448) or with unknown menopausal status(n = 233); women who reported extreme values of daily energy intake (<500 or >3,500 kcal/d), or FFQs with z15% of the 68 questions blank (n = 7,345). Women with missing or uninterpretable responses for more than four dairy products (n = 85), calcium supplements (n = 952), or multivitamin use (n = 543), or women who reported both greater than six servings of milk per day and identical responses for two types of milk (n = 42) were also excluded. Finally, women were excluded if diagnosis date was unknown (n = 32).	1992- 1993	CPS II Nutrition Cohort	nd	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16365007	McCullough 2005	Cohort study	US 30° N	97,786	68,567	63 (nd)	nd	0	nd	Mean body mass index in 1992 = 26 Mean weight gain since age 18 y = 26 to 31 (units nd)	Current smoker 5 to 13% Nulliparous 7.5 % First birth after age 30 y 7 to 8% Current HRT use 26 to 48%	Total calcium (mg/d) = 706-1544 Total vitamin D (IU/d) 220-500 Calories (kcal/d) 1218-1693 Total fat (g/d) 39-57 Alcohol (g/d) 3.3-7.0

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16365007	McCullough 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd		Total vitamin D (IU/d) included intake from diet and multivitamins (estimated to be 400 IU per pill). Nutrient estimates were adjusted for total energy using the residuals method
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ modified from Questionnaire developed by Block et al.	Diet Analysis System version 3.8a	Yes. validated using four random 24-hour recalls collected over a 1-year period as the comparison measure among 441 Nutrition Cohort participants					68-item food frequency questionnaire (FFQ), which is a modification of the brief Health Habits and History Questionnaire developed by Block et al.

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16365007	McCullough 2005	nd	Incident breast cancer	New diagnosis of either nonfatal or fatal breast cancer that occurred after enrollment in 1992 or 1993 and before August 31, 2001. Breast cancer as a contributing cause of death among cohort members was ascertained through linkage with the National Death Index. ER and progesterone receptor (PR) status of the tumors was obtained through medical record reports and through state cancer registries when available.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must be explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
16365007	McCullough 2005	"Potential effect modification of findings by potential for skin synthesis of vitamin D was examined by stratifying on UV index by state of residence for the subgroup of women (95.5%) who reported the same state of residence in 1982 and 2001. UV index levels were estimated using the 1997 monthly mean UV indices for major forecast cities in 50 states"

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16365007	McCullough 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	stratified by ER status of the tumor, multivitamin use (current versus not current use), dietary fat intake (tertiles)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age at menarche, age at menopause, age at child birth, race)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes [height (<63, 63 to <65, 65 to <67, ≥67 in, missing height), weight gain since age 18]	
		Medical conditions	history of breast cyst	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Skin synthesis of vitamin D was examined by stratifying on UV index by state of residence for the subgroup of women	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes (alcohol consumption, hormone replacement therapy, current combined replacement therapy, past combined replacement therapy)	
		Other	family hx of breast cancer in a mother or sister	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Follow-up	Mean Ca level /	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
16365007	McCullough 2005	Breast cancer	≤500	8y	≤500	457	10,620	Adjusted analysis	RR	1.00		NS	0.07
			>500-≤750	8y	>500-≤750	729	17,880	Adjusted analysis	RR	0.91	(0.81-1.02)	NS	
			>750-≤1000	8y	>750-≤1000	581	14,023	Adjusted analysis	RR	0.92	(0.81-1.04)	NS	
			>1,000-≤1,250	8y	>1,000-≤1,250	407	9,120	Adjusted analysis	RR	0.97	(0.85-1.11)	NS	
			>1250-≤1500	8y	>1250-≤1500	248	6,296	Adjusted analysis	RR	0.84	(0.72-0.98)	.05	
			>1500-≤1750	8y	>1500-≤1750	144	3,983	Adjusted analysis	RR	0.76	(0.63-0.92)	.05	
			>1750	8y	>1750	289	6,645	Adjusted analysis	RR	0.91	(0.79-1.06)	NS	

Multivariate-adjusted model controlling for age, energy, history of breast cyst, family history of breast cancer, height, weight gain since age 18, alcohol use, race, age at menopause, age at first birth and number of live births, education, mammography history, and HRT.

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16365007	McCullough 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Lot of samples excluded at the analysis phase; no biomarker uses

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18695076	Melamed 2008	Cohort study	Adults 20 years or older who had a physical exam and lab testing at baseline (Oct 1988-Oct 1994) and for whom vital status information was known during the follow-up period (through Dec 31, 2000)	Did not have complete data on the study variables of interest	Oct 1988-Oct 1994	NHANES III	NIH; PJ Schafer CVD Research fund	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18695076	Melamed 2008	Cohort study	nd (multiple cities in US)	13331	13331	44.8	>=20	46	Non-Hispanic white: 72.9%, non-Hispanic black:13.4%, Mexican American: 5.3%; other: 8.4%	Mean BMI: 26.85	Diabetes: 7.4% History of CVD: 7.9% HTN: 25% Use of cholesterol-lowering med: 3%	Use of vitamin D supplement: 26.7%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18695076	Melamed 2008	25(OH)D				Diasorin radioimmunoassay (RIA) kit (Diasorin, Stillwater, Minnesota)	CV from quality control samples, 13%-19%	nd	Winter, Jan-Mar: 25% Spring, Apr-Jun: 25% Summer, Jul-Sep: 25% Fall, Oct-Dec: 25%	See results
		Dietary calcium intake	nd							nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18695076	Melamed 2008	primary	All-cause mortality	Linked National Death Index records; selected death certificates were reviewed manually to validate the process.
		Primary	CVD mortality	Cause-specific death was coded according to the ICD-9-CM for deaths occurring between 1988 and 1998, and according to the ICD-10 for to deaths occurring in 1999 and 2000. Including deaths due to hypertensive disease, ischemic heart disease, arrhythmia, heart failure, cerebrovascular disease, atherosclerosis or other disease of the arteries.

		Primary	Cancer mortality	Including all malignant neoplasm deaths, deaths as respiratory and intrathoracic organs and genital organs, colorectal cancer, breast cancer, and prostate cancer.
		primary	Infectious disease mortality	Including deaths from infectious and parasitic disease, meningitis, acute rheumatic fever, endocarditis, acute upper and lower respiratory tract infections including influenza and pneumonia, and urinary tract infections.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18695076	Melamed 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Use of vitamin D supplementation	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, sex, race, low SES status
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	HTN, history of CVD, diabetes	
		Medication	Use of cholesterol-lowering medications	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Season	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, physical activity level
		Other	HDL, total cholesterol, estimate GFR categories, serum albumin level, log albumin to creatinine ratio, log CRP level	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL	>32.1		nd	nd	Median 8.7 (IRQ 7.1-10.2) yr	adj	RR	1			nd
				24.4-32.1		nd	nd		Adj	RR	0.93	0.79-1.10		
				17.8-24.3		nd	nd		Adj	RR	1.06	0.89-1.24		
				<17.8		nd	nd		adj	RR	1.26	1.08-1.46		
18695076	Melamed 2008	CVD mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL	>32.1		nd	nd		adj	RR	1			nd
				24.4-32.1		nd	nd		Adj	RR	0.83	0.65-1.07		
				17.8-24.3		nd	nd		Adj	RR	0.88	0.69-1.14		
				<17.8		nd	nd		adj	RR	1.20	0.87-1.64		
18695076	Melamed 2008	Cancer mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL	>32.1		nd	nd	Median 8.7 (IRQ 7.1-10.2) yr	Adjusted for cancer and external causes of death models include age, sex, race, season, cigarette use, BMI, log CRFP, serum albumin, physical activity level, use of vit D suppl, and low SES	RR	1			nd
				24.4-32.1		nd	nd			RR	0.8	0.54-1.19		
				17.8-24.3		nd	nd			RR	1.08	0.8-1.46		
				<17.8		nd	nd			RR	0.91	0.63-1.31		
18695076	Melamed 2008	Infectious disease mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL	>32.1		nd	nd	Median 8.7 (IRQ 7.1-10.2)	adj	RR	1			

								yr						
				24.4-32.1		nd	nd		Adj	RR	1.01	0.53-1.93		
				17.8-24.3		nd	nd		Adj	RR	0.87	0.43-1.74		
				<17.8		nd	nd		adj	RR	0.84	0.38-1.86		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality	During a median 8.7 years of follow-up (IRQ, 7.1-10.2 years), there were 1806 deaths, of which 777 (43%) were ascribed to CVD, 424 (23%) were ascribed to cancers, 105 (6%) were ascribed to infectious causes, and 92 (5%) were ascribed to external causes of death. Of those who died of CVD, 590 (76%) died of atherosclerotic CVD, 145 (19%) of cerebrovascular disease, and 42 (5%) of congestive heart failure. Those who died had a mean age of 66.4 years and 46% were female, 58% were hypertensive, 19% had diabetes, and 32% had prior CVD.
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality 25(OH)D deficiency: 25(OH)D levels <17.8 ng/mL	In multivariate models, increasing age, female sex, non-white race/ethnicity (particularly non-Hispanic black race/ethnicity), diabetes, current smoking and creasing BMI were all independently associated with an increased odds of being 25(OH)D deficient (ie, lowest quartile). Physical activity, vitamin D supplementation, and non-winter season were associated with a decreased odds of deficiency.
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality Subgroup analysis by CVD (present or absent)	The lowest 25(OH)D quartile was more strongly associated with mortality among participants without a history of CVD (MRR, 1.54; 95% CI, 1.23-1.94) than in those with a history of CVD (MRR, 0.90; 95% CI, 0.66-1.22) (P value for interaction, .006).
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality Subgroup analysis by HTN (present or absent)	Stronger associations, although nonsignificant, were found for participants without hypertension (P value for interaction, .09)
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality Subgroup analysis by DM (present or absent)	Stronger associations, although nonsignificant, were found for participants without diabetes (P value for interaction, .09)
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality Subgroup analysis by various risk factors of low 25(OH)D level	No interaction was observed for age, race, obesity, physical activity level, smoking, or eGFR

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL – men only	>32.1		1047	6277	adj	RR	1		P=0.06 for interaction between sex	nd
				24.4-32.1				Adj	RR	0.82	0.64-1.05		
				17.8-24.3				Adj	RR	0.94	0.75-1.19		
				<17.8				adj	RR	1.04	0.83-1.30		
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL – women only	>32.1		759	7054	adj	RR	1		P=0.06 for interaction between sex	nd
				24.4-32.1				Adj	RR	1.16	0.87-1.55		
				17.8-24.3				Adj	RR	1.27	0.97-1.66		
				<17.8				adj	RR	1.55	1.15-1.98		
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL – age ≥65 yr	>32.1		1047	6277	adj	RR	1		P=0.014 for interaction between age groups	nd
				24.4-32.1				Adj	RR	0.97	0.79-0.82		
				17.8-24.3				Adj	RR	0.99	0.82-1.20		
				<17.8				adj	RR	1.26	1.03-1.54		
18695076	Melamed 2008	All-cause mortality	25(OH)D Q1, ng/mL – age <65	>32.1		563	10464	adj	RR	1		P=0.014 for interaction between age groups	nd
				24.4-32.1				Adj	RR	0.81	0.58-1.14		
				17.8-24.3				Adj	RR	1.13	0.81-1.56		
				<17.8				adj	RR	1.28	0.93-1.76		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18695076	Melamed 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Insufficient data, number of deaths per 25(OH)D quartile was not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18827811	Mishra 2008	Cohort study	Women from the Medical MRC NSHD, a British national representative sample of men and women cohort followed from their birth in March 1946.	Men from the cohort	Since 1946 at birth – ages 53 y	Medical MRC NSHD, UK	Gov	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18827811	Mishra 2008	Cohort study	54 N	1471	1161	51.5	ND	0	ND	ND	ND	Intake levels available as categories for ages 4, 36, 43, 53

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18827811	Mishra 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				No				
18827811	Mishra 2008	Dietary calcium intake	5-day food diaries	McCance and Widdowson's food table	ND	NA	N		No	ND

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18827811	Mishra 2008	ND	Mammography density	Ratio of the absolute area of dense tissue to the sum of the absolute areas of dense and non-dense tissues.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18827811	Mishra 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age at the time of mammogram; age at menarche; social class during adult life
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	at the age of 53 y
		Medical conditions	Yes	Menopausal status at the time of mammogram
		Medication	Yes	Hormonal use
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking status
		Other	Yes	Mammographic view

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca intake mg/d	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups ***	P for trend****
18827811	Mishra 2008	Mammographic density at age 36 y	Q1		≤523	133	766	~32 y	Adj	β coefficient	Ref=1	Ref=1		NS
			Q2		524 – 648	143	766	~32 y	Adj	β coefficient	-0.11	-0.33, 0.10		
			Q3		652 – 784	156	766	~32 y	Adj	β coefficient	-0.05	-0.27, 0.17		

			Q4		785 – 940	160	766	~32 y	Adj	β coefficient	-0.04	-0.27, 0.19		
			Q5		≥941	174	766	~32 y	Adj	β coefficient	-0.08	-0.32, 0.17		
18827811	Mishra 2008	Mammographic density at age 43 y	Q1		≤611	145	755	~39	Adj	β coefficient	Ref=1	Ref=1		NS
			Q2		612-735	156	755	~39	Adj	β coefficient	-0.13	-0.35, 0.09		
			Q3		736-859	145	755	~39	Adj	β coefficient	-0.06	-0.29, 0.17		
			Q4		860-1020	156	755	~39	Adj	β coefficient	-0.11	-0.34, 0.12		
			Q5		≥1021	153	755	~39	Adj	β coefficient	-0.16	-0.42, 0.09		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18827811	Mishra 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	n	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	na					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y (<13%)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	nd					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Missing table 1 on demographics, baseline exposure data

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17106437	Mitrou 2007	Cohort study	male smokers (≥5 cigarettes/d); 50-69 y	previous history of cancer (except for non-melanoma skin cancer or carcinoma in situ); serious diseases that limited long term participation; used vit E, A, or β-carotene >pre-defined dose; anticoagulant use	1985-1988	Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene (ATBC) Cancer Prevention Study	NIH	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17106437	Mitrou 2007	Cohort study	Finland 64° N	29133	27028	56.7 (est.)	nd	100	Caucasians	BMI 26.5 (est.)	smokers at baseline	vit D 5.4 µg/d mean intake (est.)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
17106437	Mitrou 2007	Dietary calcium intake	276 item FFQ past 12 mo	database of the Natl Public Health Institute, Finland	Yes, intraclass correlation of FFQ 3 mo apart in a sample of 133 ranged from 0.6 to 0.7					dietary calcium=1513 mg/d (est.)

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17106437	Mitrou 2007	primary	prostate cancer	Finnish Cancer Registry (medical records reviewed to confirm diagnosis through 4/1999)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17106437	Mitrou 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	total energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age, education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI; Ht
		Medical conditions	Yes	type 2 DM
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	physical activity; smoke inhalation, number of cigarettes
		Other	Yes	FH of prostate cancer; marital status; urban residence; intervention group

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Event*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17106437	Mitrou 2007	total prostate cancer	<1000 mg/d dietary calcium	nd	<1000 mg	151	nd	adjusted (age, intervention group, physical activity, type 2 DM, FH of prostate cancer, ht, BMI, smoking inhalation, cigarettes, marital status, education, urban residence, total energy intake)	RR	1.0			<0.0001
			1000-1499		1000-1499	611	nd			1.28	1.07-1.54		
			1500-1999		1500-1999	402	nd			1.38	1.14-1.67		
			≥2000		≥2000	103	nd			1.63	1.27-2.10		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17106437	Mitrou 2007	prostate cancer subgroups	see Table II in paper for nonadvanced, advanced, low grade, high grade prostate cancer

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17106437	Mitrou 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	N
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16352684	Morley 2006	Cohort study	Pregnant <16 wk gestation	multiple pregnancies; maternal diseases; dark skin or concealing clothing; intention to move from the area in the foreseeable future	2002-2003	-	government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16352684	Morley 2006	Cohort study	Geelong, Australia 38° S	475	374	29	nd	0	99% white	Ht 166 cm	nd	25(OH)D in winter: 49.2 nmol/L; summer: 62.6 nmol/L (~11 wk (median) gestation)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16352684	Morley 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	y; CV 10.2%	nd	winter and summer	25(OH)D in winter: 48.3 nmol/L; summer: 68.9 nmol/L (28-32 wk gestation)
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16352684	Morley 2006	primary	birth weight	
			gestation length	
			crown-heel length	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16352684	Morley 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	infant sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	maternal height
		Medical conditions		parity
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		season of blood drawn
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	smoking
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
16352684	Morley 2006	birth weight	g	maternal vit D at 28-32 wk <28 nmol/L	adj		27			3397	57	-153	-348, 42	NS
				≥28 nmol/L			347			3555	52			
		crown-heel length	cm	maternal vit D at 28-32 wk <28 nmol/L			27			49.8	2.7	-0.6	-1.5, 0.3	NS
				≥28 nmol/L			347			50.4	2.4			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
16352684	Morley 2006		no associations between maternal 25(OH)D at recruitment (median 11 wk) and any birth measure (data not shown)
			see Table 3 in paper for results on gestation length; knee-heel length, and others

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16352684	Morley 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	N	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	Y

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	recruited only 475/2470 (19%) of potentially eligible women

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11262466	Morris 2001	Cohort study	pregnant women	nd	nd	Calcium for Preeclampsia Prevention Study (CPEP)	NICHHD	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11262466	Morris 2001	Cohort study	Albuquerque, NM; Birmingham, AL; Cleveland, OH; Memphis, TN; Portland OR	4314	4157	79% age 17-24	nd	0	51% white; 46% African American	38% with BMI ≥ 26	nd	dietary calcium pre-intervention: 1121 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
11262466	Morris 2001	Dietary calcium intake	24 h recall	nd	n					dietary calcium pre-intervention: 1121 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11262466	Morris 2001	primary	preeclampsia	HTN (DBP≥90 mm) and proteinuria (≥300 mg) within 7 d of each other

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11262466	Morris 2001	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	smoking
		Other		health insurance coverage

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11262466	Morris 2001	preeclampsia	dietary calcium		579	ND	ND	adj	RR	1.00 (ref)		NS	ND
					580-845	ND	ND			0.90	0.61-1.30		
					846-1131	ND	ND			0.95	0.65-1.39		
					1132-1560	ND	ND			0.97	0.65-1.45		
					1561	ND	ND			0.78	0.49-		

											1.24		
11262466	Morris 2001	Pregnancy-induced hypertension	dietary calcium		579	ND	ND	adj	RR	1.00 (ref)		NS	ND
					580-845	ND	ND			1.09	0.84-1.42		
					846-1131	ND	ND			1.10	0.83-1.44		
					1132-1560	ND	ND			1.14	0.85-1.53		
					1561	ND	ND			1.35	0.98-1.86		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
11262466	Morris 2001	“Because the randomized trial from which the data were obtained did not demonstrate any effect of treatment with supplemental calcium, models were fitted to data pooled across both treatment arms.”

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11262466	Morris 2001	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	unclear if the analysis was also adjusted for total energy intake

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17181890	Moschonis 2006	RCT	Greek postmenopausal women	Women diagnosed having a T-score lower than – 2.5, taking medications (i.e. thiazide diuretics, glucocortocoids) and/or dietary supplements (calcium, magnesium, phosphate or vitD) that affect bone metabolism, having any kind of degenerative chronic disease (i.e. diabetes, nephrolithiasis, heart disease, cancer, hyper-and hypothyroidism, impaired renal and liver function), smoking and being at menopause for less than 1 y, osteoporotic, or having abnormal values on aforementioned blood indices.	2004	nd	Friesland Foods Hellas	JHL MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17181890	Moschonis 2006	RCT	Greece (Nea Smyrni, Kalluthea and Neo Iraklio) 31º N	112	101	61 (nd)	55-65	0%	100% Greek	Weight - 72.9 kg Height – 157.2 cm BMI – 29.6 kg/m^2	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17181890	Moschonis 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	VitD intake 0.59 µg/d
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Dietary calcium intake	24hr recall	Database for Greek food and recipes (University of Crete)	nd					Ca 679.7 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Ca group	Supplementary Ca (87% of Calcium lactate gluconate 13% of Ca carbonate)	600 mg	12 mo	
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Dairy group	Advised to consume 3 portions of low-fat dairy products (milk and yogurt) fortified with Ca and vitD3 on daily basis (1 portion=250 ml milk, 200g yogurt)	400 mg calcium/portion (one portion is equal to 250 ml milk and to 200 g yogurt) and 2.5 ug vitamin D3 per portion. Total daily dose = 1200 mg Ca +7.5 ug vit D3	12 mo	Advice to consume dairy products on daily basis. In order to avoid excess caloric intake subjects were advised to substitute other dairy products in their diet with those provided
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Control group	No intervention, usual diet	Na	12 mo	na
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Dairy group 93% (assessed via information obtained at the biweekly sessions, combined with data obtained from the nutritional assessments conducted at baseline, 5 and 12 months of intervention) Ca group 95% (assessed by checking for remaining ca tablets in the returned packages but also via weekly phone calls)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17181890	Moschonis 2006	primary	BMD	DXA

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SE*	Delta **	Delta CI*	Net difference***	Net difference CI*	P between groups***
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Total body BMD	g/cm^2	Control group	Crude	12 m	36	1.12	0.014	-0.7 %	-1.4, -0.1 %			P<0.05, dairy vs. control
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Total body BMD	g/cm^2	Calcium-Supplemented group	Crude	12 m	26	1.077	0.022	0.6 %	-0.4, 1.6 %			P<0.05, dairy vs. Ca group
17181890	Moschonis 2006	Total body BMD	g/cm^2	Dairy group (1200 mg Ca +7.5 ug vit D3)	Crude	12 m	39	1.133	0.012	1.5 %	0.9, 2.2 %			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17181890	Moschonis 2006	RCT-Parallel	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	bloating, constipation and intestinal discomfort apparently related to the calcium supplement
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No blinding, no adjustment for confounders. Analyses only included completers: 11 subjects dropped out: 2 from the dairy group dropped out due to personal reasons, whereas 4 subjects from the control group either could not be tracked down or were not available to participate at follow-up examinations. Furthermore, 4 women from the calcium supplement group withdrew, due to complaints of side-effects, such as bloating, constipation and intestinal discomfort apparently related to the supplement used.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19125756	Nagpal 2009	RCT	Male, "apparently healthy", centrally obese (waist circumference ≥ 78 cm), ≥ 35 yrs	Fasting plasma glucose > 7.0 mmol/L, self-reported diabetes, insulin or any oral glucose-lowering medication, resting BP > 140/90 mmHg self-reported hypertensive, antihypertensive medication, cholecalciferol or Ca supplementation in last 6 mo., chromic renal, hepatic, malignant or intestinal disease or renal stones, any medication within the last month that could influence insulin secretion, insulin sensitivity, vit D or Ca metabolism, febrile illness or infective morbidity in the last 10 days, grossly deranged liver or kidney function	2006-2007	nd	Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19125756	Nagpal 2009	RCT	New Delhi, India (28 N)	100	71 (ITT analysis) 65 (per protocol analysis)	44 (8)	nd	100%	Indian	BMI = 26.4 (4) Waist circumference (cm) = 91.6 (9) Waist-hip ratio = 0.98 (0.06)	"apparently healthy", centrally obese	Most subjects severely vit D deficient

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19125756	Nagpal 2009	25(OH)D				RIA	Yes: 5% of samples re-run for quality control. Mean-centered coeff of variation for 25(OH)D was 8.0%	nd	nd	Mean (nmol/L) ± SD in supplemented group = 36.5 ± 14.55. In control group = 30.0 ± 12.50
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd		nd	Serum Ca (mmol/L) ± SD = 2.3 ± 0.20

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
19125756	Nagpal 2009	vit D	Calcirol (brand name of cholecalciferol from Cadila Pharmaceuticals, Ahmedabad, India)	8571 IU cholecalciferol	6 wk	120,000 IU sachets given 3 times, every 2 weeks, for 6 weeks
		placebo	Identical to vit D in color, taste, and external appearance and also provided by Cadila Pharmaceuticals	-	6 wk	Placebo sachets given 3 times, every 2 weeks, for 6 weeks
Co-intervention(s) *:			Both groups advised to continue their normal diet and exercise.			
Compliance/Adherence:			Supervised administration of doses by home visits			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19125756	Nagpal 2009	2°	SBP	Automated OMRON electronic device used – validated in an earlier trial. 3 serial BP recordings from the right arm were taken after 10 min rest at 10-min intervals in the sitting posture as per WHO recommendations, and the mean used for analysis.
		2°	DBP	Same as SBP
		nd	25(OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19125756	Nagpal 2009	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes – groups matched on age, gender, race, education, and income	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes – groups matched on BMI, waist circumference, waist-hip ratio	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes – groups matched on smoking, alcohol, physical activity	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference SE*	P between
19125756	Nagpal 2009	SBP (ITT analysis)	mmHg	vit D	1.5	35	124	11	0.60	9.82	+3.95	2.05	0.058
				placebo	1.5	36	124	10	-3.35	7.21			
		SBP (per protocol analysis)	mmHg	vit D	1.5	32	124	11	0.60	9.82	+3.68	2.06	0.079
				placebo	1.5	33	124	10	-3.09	7.14			
		DBP (ITT)	mmHg	vit D	1.5	35	78	8	0.43	7.66	+1.69	1.64	0.305
				placebo	1.5	36	77	9	-1.26	5.97			
		DBP (per protocol)	mmHg	vit D	1.5	32	78	8	0.43	7.66	+1.55	1.65	0.353
				placebo	1.5	33	77	9	-1.11	5.99			
		25(OH)D (ITT)	nmol/L	vit D	1.5	35	36.5	14.55	35.1	27.28	+34.52	4.94	<0.0005
				placebo	1.5	36	30.0	12.50	0.60	11.61			
		25(OH)D (per protocol)	nmol/L	vit D	1.5	32	36.5	14.55	35.1	27.28	+34.44	5.02	<0.0005
				placebo	1.5	33	30.0	12.50	0.65	11.78			
		Weight (ITT)	Kg	vit D	1.5	35	nd	nd	+0.03	1.82	+0.42	0.42	0.42
				placebo	1.5	36	nd	nd	-0.38	1.70			
		Weight (per protocol)		vit D	1.5	32	nd	nd	+0.35	1.60	+0.76	0.41	0.07
				placebo	1.5	33	nd	nd	-0.41	1.73			
		BMI (ITT)	kg/m^2	vit D	1.5	35	26.7	4.54	-0.02	0.62	+0.02	0.15	0.90
				placebo	1.5	36	26.0	3.46	-0.04	0.68			
		BMI (per protocol)		vit D	1.5	32	26.7	4.54	+0.08	0.56	+0.13	0.16	0.40
				placebo	1.5	33	26.0	3.46	-0.05	0.69			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
19125756	Nagpal 2009	RCT-parallel	Y	Y	NA	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	B (Weight C)

Adverse Event(s): **	Both groups were advised to report any interval morbidity including nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, urinary complaints, or muscle cramps or diagnosis of hypercalcemia during treatment of any illness. No specific data on AEs was provided.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	26% drop-out rate. However, authors claim that there is a low likelihood of loss to follow-up biasing results because 1) none of the baseline characteristics was significantly different between those reporting and those lost to follow-up, 2) the proportions of subjects lost to follow-up in both groups were comparable, and 3) interval morbidity in the two groups did not differ. No baseline data on weight.

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
		RCT RCT-post hoc** Other intervention study Cohort study Case-cohort study						

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
		Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes/no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19158226	Nelson 2009	RCT	Women aged 19-35 y, living in the Bangor, ME area, subjects had a BMI 18.5~40kg/m^2, have a baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration 22.5-175nmol/L, and be free of any disease or condition that influences Ca or Vit D, asked not to travel to a southern latitude (<35° N latitude) between September and March and to refrain from using tanning booths. Had not regularly consumed any Ca or Vit D-containing supplement within the previous 4 mo and agreed not to take any Ca, Vit D, or multivitamin supplements other than those provided during the study period.	Pregnant women, Women planned to become pregnant, subjects taking any medications, other than oral contraceptives, that affect Ca or Vit D	2005	nd	nd	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19158226	Nelson 2009	RCT	Bangor, ME	112 women	86 women	22.2 (3.7)	19-35 y	0	Predominantly white women	BMI 25.9 % body fat 30.1% Height 164.2 cm Weight 69.7kg	Healthy	ND

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19158226	Nelson 2009	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Y, intra-assay and inter-assay CV, <10%	1 month	September and February	Serum 25(OH)D 62.0nmol/L
19158226	Nelson 2009	Dietary calcium intake	3-d food records	ND	n	nd	nd		nd	Ca intake 908.2 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank

**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
19158226	Nelson 2009	Vit D3	Vit D3 supplement	Vit D3 20 µg/d	6 mo	One time/day
	Nelson 2009	Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			Hormonal contraceptive			
Compliance/Adherence:			Compliance was assessed by pill counts. No subject had compliance <75%			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19158226	Nelson 2009	Primary	Serum 25(OH)D change	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
19158226	Nelson 2009	The actual mean D3 content of the capsules was 22 µg. There was a run-in period from Feb until Sep 2005.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19158226	Nelson 2009	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	VitD intake, Ca intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI, total body fat %, height, weight
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Yes	Summer sun exposure
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other	Yes	Baseline 25(OH)D

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Delta**	Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
19158226	Nelson 2009	25(OH)D	nmol/L	Vit D3	12 mo	55	62.1	24.0	35.3	23.2	24.4	nd	<0.0005
				Placebo	12 mo	31	61.9	22.6	10.9	16.9			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
19158226	Nelson 2009	RCT-Parallel	nd	nd	NA	Y	nd	y	y	y	y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting of methods

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9794175	Nomura 1998	Case-cohort study	men with available blood specimen at baseline	baseline prostate cancer; enrollment in cardiolipin study; previously thawed sample for other studies	1967-1970	Honolulu Heart Program	government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9794175	Nomura 1998	Case-cohort study	Oahu, Hawaii 21° N	272	272	58 (nd)	49-70	100	Hawaiian Japanese	nd	22 pack-years smoked	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
9794175	Nomura 1998	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				protein-binding	Intra-assay CV 5 to 10%	≥23 y	nd	all subjects live in Hawaii
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9794175	Nomura 1998	primary	prostate cancer	biopsy or surgical specimen; discharge records

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9794175	Nomura 1998	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	no	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age, month & year of exam, education)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions	no	
		Medication	no	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes, all from Hawaii	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes (smoking; alcohol use)	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases *	No. of Non-cases **	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
9794175	Nomura 1998	prostate cancer	quartile of 25 OH-D	<34 ng/mL (based on controls freq)		38	34	crude (conditional logistic)	OR	1.0 (Ref)			0.68
				34-40		35	36			0.8	0.4-1.8		
				41-47		30	32			0.8	0.4-1.7		
				≥48		33	34			0.8	0.4-1.8		
			quartile of 1,25 OH-D	<33 pg/mL		42	40	crude (conditional logistic)		1.0 (Ref)			0.87
				33-39		32	30			1.0	0.5-2.1		
				40-48		28	34			0.7	0.3-1.6		
				≥49		34	32			1.0	0.5-2.1		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Median 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
9794175	Nomura 1998	Cases:	6-26 y	crude	136	41.0 ng/mL				0.66
		Control:	6-26 y	crude	136	41.6				

Duplicate one table per outcome

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Median 1, 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
9794175	Nomura 1998	Cases:	6-26 y	crude	136	39.0 pg/mL				0.66
		Control:	6-26 y	crude	136	39.5				0.68

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
9794175	Nomura 1998	prostate cancer	1. Overall results similar in 58 cases ≥75 y to 78 cases <75 y 2. Regressing the case-control difference on the month of exam showed a coefficient of -0.04 with a P of 0.92

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
9794175	Nomura 1998	prostate cancer by both 25 OH-D and 1,25 OH-D	Joint effect odds ratio

	1, 25 OH-D tertile		
25 OH-D tertile	1 (16-34)	2 (35-46)	3 (47-74)
1 (21-36)	1.0 (Ref)	0.9 (0.3-2.6)	1.0 (0.3-3.4)
2 (37-46)	0.4 (0.1-1.2)	0.7 (0.2-2.2)	1.2 (0.4-3.6)
3 (47-92)	1.5 (0.5-4.7)	0.7 (0.2-2.3)	0.5 (0.2-1.7)

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9794175	Nomura 1998	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	N	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	N	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	unclear what factors were included in conditional logistic analysis; 34/170 cases were not included in the analysis because the diagnosis was within 5 years of their examination and had their sera sample thawed

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17379616	Oh 2007	Cohort study	Registered nurses 30-55y in the Unites States, who returned the 1980 FFQ, Participants who had no diagnosis of cancer (excluding nonmelanoma skin cancer), inflammatory bowel disease, familial polyposis, or colorectal polyp prior to 1980, who reported having undergone at least one colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy between 1980 and 2002	Nd	1976	The Nurses' Health Study	National Institute of Health	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17379616	Oh 2007	Cohort study	US (38° N)	121700	48115	nd	nd	0%	nd	BMI 24	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17379616	Oh 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Nd
17379616	Oh 2007	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	USDA	Yes, correlation coefficient btw 1980 dietary records and the 1984 FFQ: 0.56 for energy adjusted total Ca, 0.51 for dietary Ca					Ca Quintile 1; 510mg Quintile 3: 741mg Quintile 5: 946mg

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17379616	Oh 2007	nd	Colorectal adenoma	Reviewed the medical records the histologic type, the anatomic location, and the size of reported polyps, cases of distal colorectal adenoma confirmed by histopathologic report

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17379616	Oh 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Energy intake, energy-adjusted intakes of fiber, folate, phosphorus, and retinol, and red meat intake, vitD intake Yes - age Yes - BMI Postmenopausal hormone use, regular aspirin use Yes - pack –years of smoking, alcohol consumption, vigorous physical activity Family history of colorectal cancer, history of previous endoscopy, indication for endoscopy	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose*****	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17379616	Oh 2007	Adenoma	Ca quintile 1		584	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	1			0.06
			Ca quintile 2		779	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	1.05	0.93-1.20		
			Ca quintile 3		949	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.96	0.84-1.11		
			Ca quintile 4		1139	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.96	0.82-1.12		
			Ca quintile 5		1451	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.88	0.74-1.04		
17379616	Oh 2007	Distal colon cancer	Ca quintile 1		584	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	1			0.20
			Ca quintile 2		779	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	1.04	0.90-1.20		
			Ca quintile 3		949	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.96	0.82-1.13		
			Ca quintile 4		1139	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.97	0.82-1.16		
			Ca quintile 5		1451	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.90	0.74-1.09		
17379616	Oh 2007	Rectum cancer	Ca quintile 1		584	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	1			0.24
			Ca quintile 2		779	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	1.02	0.81-1.29		
			Ca quintile 3		949	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.93	0.72-1.20		
			Ca quintile 4		1139	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.91	0.69-1.21		
			Ca quintile 5		1451	nd	nd	Adjusted	RR	0.85	0.62-1.16		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****Median Ca level

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17379616	Oh 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Power calculation not reported; cases, non-cases per calcium category not provided; exposure assessors blinding not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17521921	Oken 2007	Cohort study	pregnancy	no outpatient medical records; did not complete 1st trimester dietary questionnaire; preexisting chronic HTN and did not develop preeclampsia; missing covariate information	1999-2002	Project Viva	NIH and others	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17521921	Oken 2007	Cohort study	MA 41° – 42° N	1718	1718	68% age 30 to <40	nd	0	72% white; 12% black	67% prepregnancy BMI <24.9	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
17521921	Oken 2007	Dietary calcium intake	semi-quantitative FFQ	Harvard (based on USDA)	n					calcium (dietary & supplement): 1308 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17521921	Oken 2007	primary	preeclampsia	BP >140/90 & proteinuria (dipstick 1+ ≥2 occasions or dipstick 2+) >4 h and ≤7 days apart
			gestational HTN	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17521921	Oken 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age; race; education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	prepregnancy BMI
		Medical conditions		1st trimester SBP; parity
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
17521921	Oken 2007	Cases: preeclampsia		adj for total energy intake only	59			1270 mg	443	NS
		Control: normal BP			1540			1309 mg	416	

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17521921	Oken 2007	preeclampsia	A multivariate logistic regression did not show an association between calcium (dietary and supplement) intake and preeclampsia (OR 1.03 per 300 mg of calcium; 95%CI 0.84-1.27).
		gestational HTN	see table 2 in paper for results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17521921	Oken 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	did not calibrate the semi-quantitative FFQ for calcium

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17622244	Otani 2007	Case-cohort study	• Residents living in several municipalities administered by the Japan Public Health Center (Aged 40-59y for Cohort 1, Aged 40-69y for Cohort 2) (n=133323) • Subjects donated blood, returned the baseline questionnaire, without diagnosis of any cancer (n=38873) • Cases: adenocarcinoma including CIS • Controls: 1:2 matching based on sex, age (<3 y), date of blood draw (<3 mo), time since last meal (<4 h), study location	• Cases: Non-adenocarcinoma or no pathological verification (n=25)	1990 (Cohort 1) 1993 (Cohort 2)	The Japan Public Health Centre-based Prospective Study	Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare, Japan	JHL/TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17622244	Otani 2007	Case-cohort study	Japan (~ 30° – 40° N)	Original cohort (N=133323), Subjects donated blood, returned the baseline questionnaire, without diagnosis of any cancer (N=38873), cases (N=375) and controls (N=750)	1125	Men 56.9 (no SD) Women 56.4 (no SD)	40-69	52%	(Japanese or Asian ~100%)	BMI Men: 23.4 Women: 23.6	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (e.g. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17622244	Otani 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Competitive protein-binding assay with Gc-Globulin modification	Intra-assay coefficient of variation (CV)=8.4% (n=9)	Inferring 9-14 y (cohort 2) or 12-17 y (cohort 1). (Collected in 1990-1992 for Cohort 1, and 1993-1995 for cohort 2. Last follow-up 12/2003)	nd	VitD intake (μg/d) Men: 6.6 Women: 5.3
17622244	Otani 2007	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (Tsubono et al, 2003), 44 items (cohort 1) and 52 items (cohort 2)	nd	nd					Ca intake (mg/d) Men: 455.7 Women: 432.7

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17622244	Otani 2007	nd	Colorectal cancer	Adenocarcinoma (Collected for the JPHC cancer registry through local major hospitals, and population-based cancer registries) with pathological verification ~95%, death certificates only ~5%. ICD 180-189, 199, and 209
17622244	Otani 2007	nd	Colon cancer	See above (ICD180-189 only)
17622244	Otani 2007	nd	Rectal cancer	See above (ICD199 and 209 only)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17622244	Otani 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Energy intake, vitamin supplement use Yes - age, gender Yes - BMI Family Hx of colorectal cancer Physical exercise Yes - smoking, alcohol Family history of colorectal cancer, cohort	Matching factors: sex, age, date of blood draw, time since last meal, study location Further adjustment for n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acid or fish intake (results not materially changed [data not shown])

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17622244	Otani 2007	Colorectal cancer	Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – lowest	<22.9		43	74	Adjusted	RR	1.0 (ref)			0.39
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – second	22.9-27.5		40	85	Adjusted		0.76	0.42-1.4		
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – third	27.6-32.0		36	85	Adjusted		0.76	0.39-1.5		

			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – highest	32.1+		44	80	Adjusted		0.73	0.35-1.5		
17622244	Otani 2007	Colorectal cancer	Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – lowest	<22.9		41	77	Adjusted	RR	1.0 (ref)			0.74
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – second	22.9-27.5		34	73	Adjusted		1.0	0.55-1.9		
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – third	27.6-32.0		44	71	Adjusted		1.2	0.65-2.3		
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – highest	32.1+		41	76	Adjusted		1.1	0.50-2.3		
17622244	Otani 2007	Colon cancer	Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – lowest	<22.9		25	54	Adjusted	RR	1.0 (ref)			0.70
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – second	22.9-27.5		27	55	Adjusted		0.98	0.48-2.0		
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – third	27.6-32.0		29	66	Adjusted		1.0	0.48-2.3		
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – highest	32.1+		38	62	Adjusted		1.2	0.51-2.7		
17622244	Otani 2007	Colon cancer	Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – lowest	<22.9		21	53	Adjusted	RR	1.0 (ref)			0.12
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – second	22.9-27.5		27	48	Adjusted		1.7	0.78-3.6		
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – third	27.6-32.0		27	41	Adjusted		2.1	0.90-4.7		
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – highest	32.1+		31	53	Adjusted		2.1	0.78-5.6		
17622244	Otani 2007	Rectal cancer	Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – lowest	<22.9		18	20	Adjusted	RR	1.0 (ref)			0.06
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – second	22.9-27.5		13	30	Adjusted		0.17	0.024-1.2		
			Men 25 (OH)vitaminD – third	27.6-32.0		7	19	Adjusted		0.25	0.051-1.3		
			Men	32.1+		6	18	Adjusted		0.075	0.0057-		

			25 (OH)vitaminD – highest								0.99		
17622244	Otani 2007	Rectal cancer	Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – lowest	<22.9		20	24	Adjusted	RR	1.0 (ref)		0.22	0.17
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – second	22.9-27.5		7	25	Adjusted		0.26	0.069-1.0		
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – third	27.6-32.0		17	30	Adjusted		0.46	0.15-1.4		
			Women 25 (OH)vitaminD – highest	32.1+		10	23	Adjusted		0.33	0.084-1.3		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
17622244	Otani 2007 (colorectal)	Cases: Men	10-13 y	Adjusted**	196	27.3***	22.2-32.8****			0.67
		Control: Men		Adjusted**	392	27.6***	22.9-32.1****			
	Otani 2007 (colorectal)	Cases: Women	10-13 y	Adjusted**	179	22.5***	18.5-27.1****			0.91
		Control: Women		Adjusted**	358	22.3***	18.7-27.0****			
	Otani 2007 (colon)	Cases: Men	10-13 y	Adjusted**	141	28.3	23.0-35.0			0.25
		Control: Men		Adjusted**	282	28.0	23.0-32.3			
	Otani 2007 (colon)	Cases: Women	10-13 y	Adjusted**	115	23.3	19.1-27.3			0.25
		Control: Women		Adjusted**	230	22.0	18.5-27.5			
	Otani 2007 (rectal)	Cases: Men	10-13 y	Adjusted**	55	24.3	20.2-29.1			0.0051
		Control: Men		Adjusted**	110	26.6	22.9-31.2			
	Otani 2007 (rectal)	Cases: Women	10-13 y	Adjusted**	64	20.6	17.8-25.3			0.093
		Control: Women		Adjusted**	128	22.6	19.1-26.5			

Duplicate one table per outcome
**Tested by extensions of Mantel-Haenszel procedure with matched pairs.
***median
****interquartile range

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17622244	Otani 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	nd	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	nd					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some poor reporting, no internal calibration of FFQ

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

Comments

***During follow-up, 9.9% moved away, and 0.2% were lost.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17215380	Park 2007	Cohort study	Adults aged 45-75 years from five targeted ethnic racial groups: African Americans, Native Hawaiians, Japanese Americans, Latinos, and Whites	Participants who are not in one of the targeted ethnic group or who reported implausible dietary intakes. Participants with previous colorectal cancer reported on the baseline questionnaire or identified from the cancer registries of Hawaii and California	1993-1996	Multiethnic Cohort Study	National Cancer Institute	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17215380	Park 2007	Cohort study	Hawaii (21° N) Los Angeles, California (34° N)	215,000	191,011	nd	nd	45%	African Americans, Native Hawaiians, Japanese Americans, Latinos, and Whites	nd	nd	Nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17215380	Park 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	VitD intake 335 IU (men) 340 IU (women)
17215380	Park 2007	Dietary calcium intake	Food frequency questionnaire	Data base developed at the cancer research center of Hawaii	Y, quantitative food frequency questionnaire, 3 repeated 24-hr recalls, correlations (Ca: 0.67, VitD: 0.61)					Ca 960mg (men) 1066mg (women)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17215380	Park 2007	nd	Colorectal cancer	Identified by means of linkage of to the Surveillance, Epidemiology, End Results cancer registries covering Hawaii and California

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17215380	Park 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Total energy intake, dietary fiber intake Yes - ethnicity, age Yes - BMI, Use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, hormone replacement therapy (women); use of multivitamins Yes - smoking, family history of colorectal cancer, physical activity, history of intestinal polyps	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Follow up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (Men)	Ca quintile 1		<288 mg/1000kcal/d	342	nd	87.6	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.006
			Ca quintile 2		288 -< 369 mg/1000kcal/d	271	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		1.02	0.86-1.22		
			Ca quintile 3		369 -< 457 mg/1000kcal/d	258	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		1.08	0.89-1.31		
			Ca quintile 4		457 -< 611 mg/1000kcal/d	177	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.85	0.68-1.07		
			Ca quintile 5		≥ 611 mg/1000kcal/d	90	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.70	0.52-0.93		
17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (Women)	Ca quintile 1		<288 mg/1000kcal/d	172	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		1.00			0.003
			Ca quintile 2		288 -< 369 mg/1000kcal/d	175	nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.77	0.60-0.97		
			Ca quintile 3		369 -< 457 mg/1000kcal/d	194	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.76	0.60-0.97		
			Ca quintile 4		457 -< 611 mg/1000kcal/d	197	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.74	0.57-0.94		
			Ca quintile 5		≥ 611 mg/1000kcal/d	234	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.64	0.50-0.83		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
********Models were also included intakes from food, supplements and foods excluding users of multivitamin or calcium supplements for data analysis.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Follow up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (African Americans)	Ca quintile 1		<309 mg/1000kcal/d	126	nd	87.6	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.18
			Ca quintile 2		309 -< 410 mg/1000kcal/d	121	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.77	0.58-1.03		
			Ca quintile 3		410 -< 558 mg/1000kcal/d	133	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		1.03	0.77-1.40		
			Ca quintile 4		≥ 558 mg/1000kcal/d	67	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.70	0.48-1.02		

17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (Native Hawaiians)	Ca quintile 1		<309 mg/1000kcal/d	69	Nd	87.6	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.08
			Ca quintile 2		309 -< 410 mg/1000kcal/d	33	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.69	0.43-1.12		
			Ca quintile 3		410 -< 558 mg/1000kcal/d	28	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.93	0.54-1.58		
			Ca quintile 4		≥ 558 mg/1000kcal/d	11	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.44	0.20-0.99		
17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (Japanese Americans)	Ca quintile 1		<309 mg/1000kcal/d	312	Nd	87.6	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.008
			Ca quintile 2		309 -< 410 mg/1000kcal/d	177	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.99	0.80-1.22		
			Ca quintile 3		410 -< 558 mg/1000kcal/d	125	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.85	0.66-1.10		
			Ca quintile 4		≥ 558 mg/1000kcal/d	117	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.69	0.52-0.91		
17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (Latinos)	Ca quintile 1		<309 mg/1000kcal/d	45	Nd	87.6	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.12
			Ca quintile 2		309 -< 410 mg/1000kcal/d	122	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		1.12	0.77-1.62		
			Ca quintile 3		410 -< 558 mg/1000kcal/d	117	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.85	0.58-1.26		
			Ca quintile 4		≥ 558 mg/1000kcal/d	81	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.79	0.51-1.08		
17215380	Park 2007	Colorectal cancer (Whites)	Ca quintile 1		<309 mg/1000kcal/d	89	Nd	87.6	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.04
			Ca quintile 2		309 -< 410 mg/1000kcal/d	89	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.73	0.54-1.01		
			Ca quintile 3		410 -< 558 mg/1000kcal/d	126	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.81	0.60-1.11		
			Ca quintile 4		≥ 558 mg/1000kcal/d	122	Nd	87.6	Adjusted		0.65	0.46-0.91		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17215380	Park 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Power calculation not reported; blinding assessor not reported; cancer cases not confirmed by histology reports; study designed to assess relationship of diet with several cancer sites not specifically between calcium and CRC

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18000020	Park 2007	Cohort study	AARP members (50-71); satisfactory dietary data	questionnaires completed by proxy; cancer before baseline (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer); self-reported ESRD; extreme total energy and calcium (food) intakes (>2x IQR of log-transformed intake)	1995-1996	(NIH)-AARP Diet & Health Study	NCI	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18000020	Park 2007	Cohort study	CA, FL, LA, NJ, NC, PA	339671	293888	nd	50-71	100	92% white (est.)	BMI 27.2 (est.)	nd	calcium from non-dairy food (346-370 mg/d); dairy calcium (211-997 mg/d); supplemental calcium (34-514 mg/d)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
18000020	Park 2007	Dietary calcium intake	124 item FFQ past 12 mo	USDA	FFQ validated by two 24 h recalls in 1953 participants; correlation with reference method was 0.63					calcium from non-dairy food (346-370 mg/d); dairy calcium (211-997 mg/d); supplemental calcium (34-514 mg/d)

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18000020	Park 2007	primary	incident prostate cancer	8 state cancer registry databases; SSA Death Master File; Natl Death Index Plus

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18000020	Park 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	tomato, red meat, fish , vit E, α-linolenic acid, total energy intake, vit D
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age; race; education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM; PSA screen
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	physical activity; smoking; alcohol
		Other	Yes	marital status; FH prostate cancer

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18000020	Park 2007	total prostate cancer	total calcium intake (diet + supplement)		<500 mg/d	767		adj	RR	1.01	0.93-1.10		0.41
					500 to <750	2927				1.00			
					750 to <1000	2808				0.99	0.93-1.04		
					1000 to <1500	2572				0.99	0.93-1.05		

					1500 to <2000	797				0.96	0.88-1.05		
					≥2000	309				0.97	0.85-1.10		
18000020	Park 2007	fatal prostate cancer	total calcium intake (diet + supplement)		<500 mg/d	11		adj	RR	0.76	0.38-1.53		0.99
					500 to <750	43				1.00			
					750 to <1000	56				1.50	0.97-2.32		
					1000 to <1500	50				1.42	0.86-2.35		
					1500 to <2000	18				1.05	0.54-2.05		
					≥2000	-				-	-		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18000020	Park 2007	nonadvanced and advanced prostate cancer	see Table 2 in paper

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18000020	Park 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	excluded 14,495 questionnaires filled out by proxies

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17925283	Park 2007	Cohort study	Male adults aged 45-75 years from five racial and ethnic populations living in California and Hawaii: African Americans, Native Hawaiians, Japanese Americans, Latinos, and Whites	Not in one of the specified ethnic groups or reporting implausible dietary intakes. Participants with prior prostate cancer occurrence through questionnaire or registry data. Men missing information on height, weight, education level, or smoking.	1993-1996	Multiethnic Cohort Study	National Cancer Institute	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17925283	Park 2007	Cohort study	Hawaii (20° N) and California (32.30°-42° N)	Original cohort of 215,000 men and women, including 96,958 men	82,483	Nd	45-75	100%	African Americans, Native Hawaiians, Japanese Americans, Latinos, and Whites	Nd	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17925283	Park 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	ND
		Dietary calcium intake	Self-administered quantitative FFQ	Food composition table developed by Cancer Research Center of Hawaii for use in Multiethnic Cohort Study	Y: calibration study comparing to 24-hr recall showed correlations of 0.67 and 0.61 respectively for calcium and vitamin D respectively.					7% took calcium supplements regularly

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17925283	Park 2007	nd	Prostate cancer	Identified by linkage of cohort to SEER registry, state death files, National Death Index file. Includes all prostate cancers except in situ tumors.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17925283	Park 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Energy intake	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Ethnicity, education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Family history of prostate cancer	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking
		Other	Time since cohort entry	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
17925283	Park 2007	Prostate cancer	Total calcium <470 mg	nd	Nd	706	Nd	adjusted	RR	1.00	Reference	Nd	0.69
			Total calcium 470-<692 mg	Nd	Nd	925	Nd			1.03	0.93-1.15	Nd	
			Total calcium 692-<935 mg	Nd	Nd	949	Nd			1.04	0.93-1.17	Nd	
			Total calcium 935-<1,300 mg	Nd	Nd	936	Nd			1.05	0.93-1.18	Nd	
			Total calcium ≥1,301 mg	nd	Nd	888	nd			1.04	0.91-1.20	Nd	
17925283	Park 2007	Prostate cancer	Total vit D <66 IU	nd	Nd	639	Nd	adjusted	RR	1.00	Reference	Nd	0.64
			66 - <136 IU	Nd	Nd	938	Nd			1.15	1.03-1.28	Nd	
			136 - <256 IU	Nd	Nd	910	Nd			1.06	0.95-1.19	Nd	
			256 -<521 IU	Nd	Nd	940	Nd			1.11	1.00-1.24	Nd	
			≥ 521 IU	nd	Nd	977	nd			1.09	0.98-1.22	Nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17925283	Park 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	NA	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Incident cases ascertained through registries, unclear if they were verified. Solid dietary assessment description; sample size calculations and explanation for if analysis was pre-planned not reported.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19237724	Park 2009	Cohort study	• AARP members in 6 specific states and 2 specific metropolitan area, age 50 to 71 (n=?) • Participants who returned questionnaires (n=567,169)****	**GENERAL***** • Provided duplicate questionnaires (n=179) • Requested to be withdrawn (n=6) • Had moved out of the study area or died before baseline (n=582) • Proxies for the intended respondents (n=15,760) • Any prevalent cancer except non-melanoma skin cancer at baseline (n=51,193) • End-stage renal disease at baseline (n=997) • Extreme*** intakes of total energy (n=4417) • Extreme*** intakes of total calcium (n=1225) **OVARIAN CANCER ONLY (in addition to GENERAL)** • History of oophorectomy (n=43,536) **ENDOMETRIAL CANCER ONLY (in addition to GENERAL)** • History of hysterectomy (n=81,025)	1995-1996	NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study (NIH-AARP = National Institutes of Health-American Association of Retired Persons)	NIH (US)	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT
*** Extreme was defined as “greater than twice the interquartile ranges above the 75th percentile or below the 25th percentile of sex-specific log-transformed intake”
**** Unclear how many is the total number of AARP members (=denominator of this number to estimate a response rate)
***** At least 13% of questionnaire responders excluded for some reason.

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19237724	Park 2009	Cohort study	California, Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, and North Carolina (6 states), and Pennsylvania, Atlanta, Georgia, Detroit, and Michigan (2 metropolitan regions)	N=492,810 (M=293,907, F=198,903)	N=492,810 (M=293,907, F=198,903)	nd	50-71 (range)	60%	White (non-Hispanic): M= ~92% F= ~89%	BMI: M= ~27.2 F= ~26.7	Family history of any cancer: M= ~47% F= ~51% Current smoker: M= ~12% F= ~15% Antacid user: M=~31% F= ~30% Hormone replacement therapy user: F= ~40%	Ca-containing multivitamin user: M=49%, F=57% Ca supplement user (only 4 or more times/week): M=14%, F=41%

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
19237724	Park 2009	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (NCI-DHQ)	USDA 1994-1996	Yes (in 1953 participants against 2 non-consecutive 24-hour dietary recalls)***** The energy-adjusted correlation coefficient of dietary Ca intake and the reference method: M (0.63), F (0.64)	nd				Total calcium intake (10^{th} to 90^{th} percentile): M=526 to 1530 mg/d, F=494 to 1881 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance
***** Not explicitly mentioned how they were extracted or if they were representative of the included cohort.

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19237724	Park 2009	Nd***	All cancers	Identified thorough a cancer registry database from 11 states by ICD codes (3^{rd} edition). Previous study showed that approximately 90% of cases were identified within 2years of cancer occurrence****.
		Nd***	Head and neck cancer	The same as all cancer

		Nd***	Esophageal cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Stomach cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Colorectal cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Liver cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Pancreatic cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Lung cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Breast cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Ovarian cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Endometrial cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Bladder cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Kidney cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Thyroid cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Brain cancer	The same as all cancer
		Nd***	Non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL)	Identified through “Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program”
		Nd***	Leukemia	The same as NHL
		Nd***	Myeloma	The same as NHL
		Nd***	“Digestive system”	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Respiratory system” (excluding larynx)	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Reproductive system”	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Women”	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Urinary system”	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Brain and other nervous system”	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Endocrine system”	A combined category. See the foot note***** below.
		Nd***	“Others”	A combined category excluding above categories (not explicitly stated)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

*** Twenty-six outcomes reported without explicit description of “what is the primary outcome of interest”

**** Head and neck (C000-C009, C019-C119, C129-C140, C142-C148, C300-C301, C310-C329, C339-C349, C381-C384, C388, C390, C398, and C399), esophageal (C150-C159), stomach (C160-C169), colorectal (C180-C189, C199, C209, and C260), liver (C220 and C221), pancreatic (C250-C259), lung (C340-C349), breast (C500-C509), ovarian (C569), endometrial (C540-C549 and C559), prostate (C619), bladder (C670-C679), kidney (C649 and C659), thyroid (C739), and brain (C710-C719) cancer.

***** Digestive system (C150-C189, C199, C209-C212, C218, C220-C221, C239-C260, C268-C269, C480-C482, and C488); respiratory system, excluding larynx (C300-C301, C310-C319, C339-C349, C381-C384, C388, C390, C398, and C399); reproductive system (men: C600-C609, C619-C639; women: C510-C519, C529-C549, C559, and C569-C589); urinary system (C649, C659, and C669-C689); brain and other nervous systems (C700-C729); endocrine system (C739-C759, and C379)

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19237724	Park 2009	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (intake of fruits and vegetables, red meat, whole grains, tomatoes, total fat, protein, folate, linoleic acid, selenium, and total energy	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (race/ethnicity, education	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (body mass index	
		Medical conditions	Yes (family history of cancer, history of hypertension and diabetes, PSA test in men, age at menopause; and history of oophorectomy and hysterectomy in women)	
		Medication	Yes (antacid use, menopausal hormone therapy and duration, parity; oral contraceptive use	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (vigorous physical activity, smoking status; time since quitting smoking; smoking dose, consumptionof alcohol and total beverages	
		Other	marital status	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median total Ca intake (mg/d)	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
Men														
19237724	Park 2009	All cancers (N=36965)	Q1		526			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.74
			Q2		498			84	Adj	HR	0.99	0.96-1.03		
			Q3		857			84	Adj	HR	0.99	0.96-1.03		

			Q4		1073			84	Adj	HR	0.95	0.96-1.03		
			Q5		1530			84	Adj	HR	0.99	0.95-1.03		
19237724	Park 2009	Colorectal cancer (n=3463)	Q1		526			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.001
			Q2		498			84	Adj	HR	0.89	0.80-0.98		
			Q3		857			84	Adj	HR	0.83	0.75-0.93		
			Q4		1073			84	Adj	HR	0.87	0.78-0.97		
			Q5		**1530**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	0.79	0.70-0.89		
19237724	Park 2009	Pancreatic cancer (n=717)	Q1		526			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.39
			Q2		498			84	Adj	HR	0.93	(0.74-1.16)		
			Q3		857			84	Adj	HR	0.9	(0.72-1.14)		
			Q4		1073			84	Adj	HR	0.98	(0.78-1.23)		
			Q5		**1530**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	0.87	(0.68-1.11)		
19237724	Park 2009	Prostate cancer (n=17 189)	Q1		526			84	Adj	HR	1	ref		0.21
			Q2		498			84	Adj	HR	0.99	(0.95-1.04)		
			Q3		857			84	Adj	HR	1.01	(0.96-1.06)		
			Q4		1073			84	Adj	HR	1	(0.95-1.05)		
			Q5		**1530**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	1.03	(0.98-1.08)		
Women														
19237724	Park 2009	All cancers (N=16605)	Q1		494			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.23
			Q2		717			84	Adj	HR	0.98	0.93-1.03		
			Q3		969			84	Adj	HR	0.94	0.89-0.99		
			Q4		1296			84	Adj	HR	0.93	0.88-0.98		
			Q5		**1881**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	0.96	0.91-1.02		

19237724	Park 2009	Colorectal cancer (n=1635)	Q1		494			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.001
			Q2		717			84	Adj	HR	0.87	0.75-1.01		
			Q3		969			84	Adj	HR	0.83	0.71-0.97		
			Q4		1296			84	Adj	HR	0.71	0.60-0.84		
			Q5		**1881**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	0.72	0.61-0.86		
19237724	Park 2009	Pancreatic cancer (n=384)	Q1		494			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.4
			Q2		717			84	Adj	HR	1.03	0.75-1.40		
			Q3		969			84	Adj	HR	0.93	0.67-1.28		
			Q4		1296			84	Adj	HR	0.97	0.71-1.34		
			Q5		**1881**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	0.88	0.63-1.24		
19237724	Park 2009	Breast cancer (n=5856)	Q1		494			84	Adj	HR	1	Ref		0.84
			Q2		717			84	Adj	HR	0.96	0.88-1.04		
			Q3		969			84	Adj	HR	0.95	0.87-1.03		
			Q4		1296			84	Adj	HR	0.94	0.86-1.02		
			Q5		**1881**			**84**	**Adj**	**HR**	0.98	0.90-1.07		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
19237724	Park 2009	All the presented outcomes: **Men**

Cancer category	Q1	CI	Q2	CI	Q3	CI	Q4	CI	Q5	CI	p for trend
All cancers (N=36965)	1	[Reference]	0.99	(0.96-1.03)	0.99	(0.96-1.03)	0.95	(0.96-1.03)	0.99	(0.95-1.03)	0.74
Head and neck cancer (n=1038)	1	[Reference]	1	(0.83-1.20)	0.9	(0.74-1.10)	0.99	(0.82-1.21)	0.99	(0.81-1.21)	0.99
Esophageal cancer (n=468)	1	[Reference]	0.98	(0.74-1.29)	0.84	(0.63-1.13)	0.89	(0.67-1.19)	0.84	(0.62-1.13)	0.23
Stomach cancer (n=512)	1	[Reference]	1.07	(0.81-1.41)	1.13	(0.86-1.48)	1.04	(0.79-1.38)	0.96	(0.72-1.29)	0.58
Colorectal cancer (n=3463)	1	[Reference]	0.89	(0.80-0.98)	0.83	(0.75-0.93)	0.87	(0.78-0.97)	0.79	(0.70-0.89)	0.001
Liver cancer (n=311)	1	[Reference]	0.75	(0.52-1.08)	1.2	(0.87-1.67)	0.83	(0.58-1.20)	0.88	(0.61-1.27)	0.61
Pancreatic cancer (n=717)	1	[Reference]	0.93	(0.74-1.16)	0.9	(0.72-1.14)	0.98	(0.78-1.23)	0.87	(0.68-1.11)	0.39
Lung cancer (n=4287)	1	[Reference]	1.05	(0.96-1.15)	1.03	(0.94-1.13)	1.03	(0.94-1.13)	1.03	(0.93-1.13)	0.76

Prostate cancer (n=17189)	1	[Reference]	0.99	(0.95-1.04)	1.01	(0.96-1.06)	1	(0.95-1.05)	1.03	(0.98-1.08)	0.21
Prostate cancer excluding non-aggressive cases (n=nd)	1	{Reference}	1.00	nd	0.98	nd	0.99	nd	0.96	(0.92-1.02)	0.16
Bladder cancer (n=1417)	1	[Reference]	0.96	(0.82-1.13)	0.82	(0.69-0.97)	0.87	(0.73-1.03)	0.87	(0.73-1.03)	0.11
Kidney cancer (n=991)	1	[Reference]	0.9	(0.74-1.10)	0.93	(0.76-1.14)	0.94	(0.76-1.15)	0.8	(0.64-1.01)	0.1
Thyroid cancer (n=170)	1	[Reference]	0.95	(0.58-1.56)	1.07	(0.66-1.74)	1.15	(0.71-1.87)	0.79	(0.46-1.34)	0.43
Brain cancer (n=390)	1	[Reference]	0.79	(0.57-1.10)	0.82	(0.59-1.13)	0.91	(0.66-1.25)	0.89	(0.65-1.23)	0.98
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma (n=1267)	1	[Reference]	1.03	(0.86-1.24)	1.15	(0.96-1.38)	0.95	(0.79-1.14)	1.02	(0.85-1.23)	0.77
Leukemia (n=757)	1	[Reference]	0.93	(0.74-1.17)	0.95	(0.75-1.19)	0.96	(0.76-1.21)	0.88	(0.69-1.21)	0.38
Myeloma (n=369)	1	[Reference]	1.03	(0.74-1.43)	1.07	(0.77-1.48)	0.91	(0.65-1.28)	0.92	(0.65-1.30)	0.42

"Digestive system cancer" multivariate HR (Q5 vs Q1) = 0.84 (95%CI, 0.77-0.92); No associations between total Ca intake and other anatomical system cancers

Women

Cancer category	Q1	CI	Q2	CI	Q3	CI	Q4	CI	Q5	CI	p for trend
All cancers (N=16605)	1	[Reference]	0.98	(0.93-1.03)	0.94	(0.89-0.99)	0.93	(0.88-0.98)	0.96	(0.91-1.02)	0.23
Head and neck cancer (n=325)	1	[Reference]	1.33	(0.97-1.83)	0.92	(0.64-1.31)	1.02	(0.71-1.46)	1.3	(0.91-1.86)	0.42
Esophageal cancer (n=79)	1	[Reference]	1.47	(0.80-2.71)	1.14	(0.59-2.22)	0.56	(0.24-1.31)	0.83	(0.38-1.81)	0.18
Stomach cancer (n=143)	1	[Reference]	0.9	(0.54-1.50)	1.37	(0.85-2.20)	0.55	(0.30-1.01)	0.71	(0.40-1.25)	0.08
Colorectal cancer (n=1635)	1	[Reference]	0.87	(0.75-1.01)	0.83	(0.71-0.97)	0.71	(0.60-0.84)	0.72	(0.61-0.86)	0.001
Liver cancer (n=86)	1	[Reference]	1.38	(0.73-2.61)	1.1	(0.55-2.17)	1.05	(0.52-2.13)	0.96	(0.46-2.03)	0.6
Pancreatic cancer (n=384)	1	[Reference]	1.03	(0.75-1.40)	0.93	(0.67-1.28)	0.97	(0.71-1.34)	0.88	(0.63-1.24)	0.4
Lung cancer (n=2457)	1	[Reference]	0.96	(0.85-1.08)	0.91	(0.81-1.03)	0.94	(0.83-1.07)	1	(0.88-1.14)	0.95
Breast cancer (n=5856)	1	[Reference]	0.96	(0.88-1.04)	0.95	(0.87-1.03)	0.94	(0.86-1.02)	0.98	(0.90-1.07)	0.84
Ovarian cancer (n=515)	1	[Reference]	1.04	(0.78-1.38)	0.99	(0.74-1.33)	1.05	(0.79-1.41)	1.14	(0.85-1.52)	0.34
Endometrial cancer (n=1171)	1	[Reference]	1.11	(0.92-1.33)	1.01	(0.84-1.22)	1.1	(0.91-1.32)	0.99	(0.81-1.20)	0.66
Bladder cancer (n=264)	1	[Reference]	0.97	(0.67-1.41)	0.94	(0.64-1.37)	0.91	(0.61-1.35)	0.97	(0.65-1.46)	0.85
Kidney cancer (n=367)	1	[Reference]	0.87	(0.63-	0.81	(0.58-	0.73	(0.51-	0.79	(0.55-	0.21

					1.21)		1.13)		1.03)		1.13)		
Thyroid cancer (n=199)	1	[Reference]	0.98	(0.63-1.54)	1.07	(0.69-1.67)	0.88	(0.55-1.41)	1.04	(0.65-1.65)	0.98
Brain cancer (n=160)	1	[Reference]	0.94	(0.59-1.50)	0.7	(0.42-1.16)	0.79	(0.48-1.29)	0.72	(0.43-1.21)	0.2
Non-Hodgkin lymphoma (n=660)	1	[Reference]	0.96	(0.75-1.23)	0.89	(0.69-1.15)	0.99	(0.77-1.28)	1.24	(0.97-1.59)	0.03
Leukemia (n=280)	1	[Reference]	0.92	(0.63-1.35)	1	(0.68-1.46)	0.92	(0.62-1.36)	1.25	(0.86-1.83)	0.17
Myeloma (n=175)	1	[Reference]	1.33	(0.79-2.24)	1.54	(0.93-2.57)	1.91	(1.16-3.15)	1.36	(0.79-2.36)	0.25
“Digestive system cancer” multivariate HR (Q5 vs Q1) = 0.77 (95%CI, 0.69-0.91); No associations between total Ca intake and other anatomical system cancers (Excerpt from the paper) In nonparametric regression analyses, the HRs for total cancer incidence in women decreased up to approximately 1300 mg/d of total Ca intake, and no further reduction was observed above 1300 mg/d (Fig 1)													

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.
NO data available stratified by age, or other categories of interest

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
19237724	Park 2009	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	n	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Many eligible members might have been excluded, no blinded assessment of exposure and outcomes, and multiple outcomes collected and assessed without an explicitly stated analyses plan. No independent verification of the cases, only registry dependent data.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	RCT	25(OH)D < 50 nmol/L	-Hypercalcemia or 1° hyperparathyroidism -fractures of extremities due to osteoporosis -therapy w/ thiazide, bisphosphonate, calcitonin, vit D3 and other vit D metabolites, estrogen, antiestrogen in the previous 6 months -therapy w/ fluoride in previous 2 yrs. -known intolerance to study meds -chronic renal failure -hx of drug or EtOH abuse -nicotine abuse - > 7 cups coffee daily -scheduled holiday along the geographic longitude during the study period - DM - severe CVD - severe HTN (SBP>180 mm Hg, DBP >95 mm Hg	1997	-	Strathmann, Inc., which markets vit D and Ca, provided the supplements and funding for the study.	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	RCT	Lower Saxony, Germany 52°N	148	145	75 ± 4 yrs.	Age range = 70 – 86 yrs.	0%	nd	Mean weight = 65 kg. Mean height = 162 cm.	nd	25(OH)D < 50 nmol/L

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D and 1,25(OH)D via RIA	Coeffs of variation for ALL assays ranged from 5.5 – 7.9%	nd		Serum 25(OH)D = 25 ± 13 nmol/mL. Serum 1,25(OH)D = 36.5 ± 16 ng/L.
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	Vit D + calcium	Ca carbonate Vit D3	1200 mg elemental Ca and 800 IU vit D3	8 wks	Capsules were taken 2x/day (breakfast and dinner with a meal)
		Calcium	Ca carbonate	1200 mg elemental Ca	8 wks	Capsules were taken 2x/day (breakfast and dinner with a meal)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/adherence:			Assessed by pill counts, 95±12% for the Ca tablets and 96±10% for the Vit D3+Ca tablets, one subject in Ca group excluded for non-compliance			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	1°	SBP	Measured after at least 5 min of supine rest using a sphygmomanometer. Systolic and diastolic blood pressures were taken at Korotkov sounds I and V.
		1°	DBP	Same as SBP
			25(OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	32 (47%) of the subjects in the Ca group and 36 (53%) of the subjects in the Ca+D group were on HTN medication.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		"Both tx groups were comparable concerning age, ht, wt, physical activity, concomitant diseases, and concomitant medication."

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final**	Final SD*	Net difference (CaD – Ca)	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	SBP	mmHg	Ca + D	8 wks	73	144.1	20.4	131.0	16.9	-7.4		0.02
				Ca	8 wks	72	140.6	14.7	134.9	19.9			
		DBP	mmHg	Ca + D	8 wks	73	84.7	7.6	77.5	12.4	-0.3		0.10
				Ca	8 wks	72	82.6	6.4	75.7	12.5			
		25(OH)D	nmol/L	Ca + D	8 wks	73	25.65	13.63	64.84	25.84			<0.01
				Ca	8 wks	72	24.63	12.14	44.36	27.38			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	SBP	60 (81%) of the subjects in the Ca+D group had a decrease in SBP > 5 mmHg compared to 35 (47%) in the Ca group (P = 0.04). 8 (11%) of the subjects in the Ca+D group had a increase in SBP > 5 mmHg compared to 29 (39%) in the Ca group (P = 0.05).
		DBP	58 (78%) of the subjects in the Ca+D group had a decrease in DBP > 5 mmHg compared to 36 (49%) in the Ca group (P = 0.1). 21 (28%) of the subjects in the Ca group had an increase in DBP > 5 mmHg compared to 10 (13%) in the Ca+D group (P = 0.02).

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
11297596	Pfeifer 2001	RCT parallel	nd	nd	NA	Y	nd	Y	Y	nd	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No data on randomization technique, allocation concealment, blinded outcome assessment, or assessment for confounding

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Cohort study Based on data collected during an RCT	Male smokers, 50-69 years of age at entry; recruited from the total male population of this age group in southwestern Finland; they had to smoke at least 5 cigarettes per day and to give written consent	History of cancer or other serious disease; use of vitamin E, vitamin A, or beta-carotene supplements in excess of predefined doses; and treatment with anticoagulant agents	nd	Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study (ATBC Study)	US NCI	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others

**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Cohort study Based on data collected during an RCT	Southwestern Finland	27111	27111	Median, cases: 60.1; non cases: 57.1	nd	100	Finish	Median BMI (kg/m2), cases: 26.3 ; non cases: 26	Physical activity (moderate), cases: 13.9; non cases: 25.8 Median daily alcohol intake (g), cases: 9.6; non cases: 11.2	Median daily energy intake (kcal), cases: 2731; non cases: 2720 Median daily total protein intake(g), cases: 98; non cases: 100 Median daily total triglycerides intake (g), cases: 100; non cases: 101 Median daily saturated fatty acids intake (g), cases: 47.8; non cases: 50 Median daily monounsaturated fatty acids intake (g), cases: 35.2; non cases: 35 Median daily polyunsaturated fatty acids intake (g), cases: 10.2; non cases: 9.6 Median daily trans fatty acids intake (g), cases: 3; non cases: 2.9 Median daily dietary fiber intake (g), cases: 24.6; non cases: 24.2 Median daily calcium intake (mg), cases: 1286; non cases: 1338 Median daily vitamin D intake (mg), cases: 4.8; non cases: 4.8

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Cohort study Based on data collected during an RCT	Southwestern Finland	27111	27111	Median, cases: 60.1; non cases: 57.1	nd	100	Finish	Median BMI (kg/m2), cases: 26.3 ; non cases: 26	Physical activity (moderate), cases, %: 25.7 Median daily alcohol intake (g), cases: 9.6; non cases: 11.2	Median daily milk products consumption (g), cases: 684; non cases: 735 Median daily whole grain products consumption (g), cases: 216; non cases: 212 Median daily vegetables consumption (g), cases: 103; non cases: 99 Median daily cruciferous vegetables consumption (g), cases: 16.1; non cases: 12.8 Median daily fruit consumption (g), cases: 111; non cases: 103 Median daily red meat consumption (g), cases: 125; non cases: 128

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
10530608	Pietinen 1999	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Food composition database at the National Public Health Institute, Finland; fatty acid content, fiber content of foods: analyses carried out at the Department of Food Chemistry, University of Helsinki	y Validation study of the dietary method carried out prior to the trial: correlation between the questionnaire-based, energy-adjusted intakes and those based on 24 days of food recording was 0.66 for calcium					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Secondary outcome	Colon cancer or rectal cancer	Incident cases of colon or rectal cancer (ICD-9) diagnosed between randomization and 30 April 1995, and identified through the Finnish Cancer Registry. All cases were reviewed centrally by two oncologists and a pathologist checked the original histological specimens.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
10530608	Pietinen 1999	In cases of multiple colorectal cancers, the first one was chosen (n = 2), and when the tumors were diagnosed simultaneously, the most invasive one was chosen (n = 2). In one case with three simultaneous colorectal cancers, the data were combined, and the ICD-9 code not indicating a specific site within the colon was used. Average follow up: 8 years

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (supplement group; calcium intake; energy adjustment) Yes [age (for 5-year categories); education] Yes [BMI (tertiles)] No No No Yes [smoking years (<35 vs. over); alcohol consumption (tertiles); occupational physical activity]	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

Adjusted for age (5-year categories) and supplement group

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Colorectal cancer	1st quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		856	60	nd	96	adjusted	RR	1.0			0.04
			2nd quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		1241	41	nd	96	adjusted	RR	0.7	0.4-1.0	nd	

			3rd quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		1484	45	nd	96	adjusted	RR	0.7	0.5-1.1	nd	
			4th quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		1789	39	nd	96	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.6-0.9	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

Adjusted for age (5-year categories), supplement group, smoking years, body mass index, alcohol, education, and physical activity at work, and calcium intake

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
10530608	Pietinen 1999	Colorectal cancer	1st quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		856	60	nd	96	adjusted	RR	1.0			0.04
			2nd quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		1241	41	nd	96	adjusted	RR	0.7	0.5-1.0	nd	
			3rd quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		1484	45	nd	96	adjusted	RR	0.7	0.5-1.1	nd	
			4th quartile, total calcium intake, median (mg)		1789	39	nd	96	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.6-0.9	nd	

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
10530608	Pietinen 1999	The analyses were also redone excluding all cases from the first two years of follow-up, but this did not alter the results (data not shown). Type of analyses represents a cohort study and not an RCT

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
10530608	Pietinen 1999	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	n	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	na	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	n	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	na					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Assessor blinding not reported; power calculation not reported; post hoc analyses; number of non-cases per calcium quartile is not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11045788	Platz 2000	Case-cohort study	• Participants of NHS (i.e., female nurse, age 30-55 y) (n=121700) • Volunteer blood sample providers between 05/1989-06/1991 (n=32826) • Undertook sigmoid- or colonoscopy between1989-1996 • Free from cancer (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer) • Cases: newly diagnosed distal or rectal adenoma polyps confirmed by pathology reports (n=326) • Control: 1:1 matching controls by endoscopy during the same 2-year period, year of birth (age), indication(s) of endoscopy, time period of first and most recent endoscopy (n=326)	Cases: • hyperplastic and other non-adenoma polyps • adenoma polyps reported but not confirmed (7% or all reports)	1976	Nurses' health study	NIH	JHL/TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT
Undetected proximal polyps can be either cases or controls

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11045788	Platz 2000	Case-cohort study	US, various locations	652	652	58.5±6.6	nd	0%	nd	BMI 25.0 kg/m2 Mean physical activity 15.4 METe-h/wk Mean solar exposure 352 langleys/d	Regular aspirin use: 26.1% Hormone replacement: 35.5% Prior negative endoscopy: 34.4%	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (e.g. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
11045788	Platz 2000	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Intrapair coefficient of variation (CV) 1,25(OH)2D=9.9% 25(OH)D=7.5%	Nd ~6-~11 y(earliest should be 1996 latest should be 2000)	Nd (but stratified analyses based on season of blood draw performed)	$1,25(OH)_2D$=31.9 pg/ml 25(OH)D=26.6 pg/ml Vit D=323 IU/d
11045788	Platz 2000	Dietary calcium intake	SFFQ	nd	nd					984.5mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	(distal) colorectal polyps	Adenomatous polyps by review of histopathological reports.
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	(distal) colon polyps	Same as above
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	Rectal polyps	Same as above
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	"high-risk" (distal) colorectal polyps	Large (1 cm or larger), villous or tubulovillous adenoma
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	"low-risk" (distal) colorectal polyps	Small (<1 cm), tubular adenoma

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
Data on "low-risk" (distal) colorectal polyps were not extracted.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11045788	Platz 2000	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Yes: Intake of red meat and methionine, 1980 folic acid Yes – matched on age Yes - BMI No Yes: Aspirin use, 1990 postmenopausal hormone use Yes: physical activity Yes - smoking, alcohol consumption	Matching factors: endoscopy during the same 2-year period, year of birth, indication(s) for endoscopy, time period of first or most recent endoscopy excluding the one in the current time period, and date of blood draw Stratified analyses on: use of Vit D or Ca supplement, total intake of Vit D or Ca, daily solar UV irradiation, season of blood draw

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose*****	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	1,25(OH)2D quartile 1	22.3 pg/ml		97	80	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.4
			quartile 2	29.0 pg/ml		71	84			0.64	0.41-1.02		
			quartile 3	33.9 pg/ml		84	80			0.80	0.50-1.30		
			quartile 4	40.9 pg/ml		74	82			0.71	0.43-1.15		

11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3 pg/ml		103	82	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			1.0
			quartile 2	22.6 pg/ml		62	80			0.64	0.41-1.00		
			quartile 3	28.3 pg/ml		61	82			0.58	0.36-0.95		
			quartile 4	38.0 pg/ml		100	82			1.04	0.66-1.66		
11045788	Platz 2000	Rectal adenoma	1,25(OH)2D quartile 1	22.3 pg/ml		16	17	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.9
			quartile 2	29.0 pg/ml		18	14			1.35	0.41-4.43		
			quartile 3	33.9 pg/ml		13	16			0.58	0.16-2.09		
			quartile 4	40.9 pg/ml		18	18			1.06	0.30-3.73		
11045788	Platz 2000	Rectal adenoma	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3 pg/ml		24	18	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.9
			quartile 2	22.6 pg/ml		7	16			0.38	0.12-0.19		
			quartile 3	28.3 pg/ml		10	13			0.34	0.08-1.42		
			quartile 4	38.0 pg/ml		24	18			1.59	0.50-5.03		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colon adenoma	1,25(OH)2D quartile 1	22.3 pg/ml		81	63	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.2
			quartile 2	29.0 pg/ml		53	70			0.51	0.30-0.86		
			quartile 3	33.9 pg/ml		71	64			0.78	0.45-1.34		
			quartile 4	40.9 pg/ml		56	64			0.60	0.34-1.04		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colon adenoma	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3 pg/ml		79	64	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			1.0
			quartile 2	22.6 pg/ml		55	64			0.71	0.43-1.18		
			quartile 3	28.3 pg/ml		51	69			0.60	0.35-1.02		
			quartile 4	38.0 pg/ml		76	64			1.02	0.60-1.73		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	25(OH)D	nd		nd	nd	Adjusted (after 2 years from blood draw only)	OR	1.00 (ref)	nd		Nd “comparable to main analysis”
										0.73	nd		

										0.85	nd		
										0.96	nd		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	1,25(OH)D quartile 1	nd		nd	nd	Adjusted (season of blood draw taken into account)	OR	1.00 (ref)	nd		Nd "comparable to main analysis"
			quartile 2							0.64	nd		
			quartile 3							0.75	nd		
			quartile 4							0.68	nd		
11045788	Platz 2000	"high-risk" distal colon cancer	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3		45	36	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.9
			quartile 2	22.6		24	37			0.54	0.25-1.16		
			quartile 3	28.3		26	35			0.67	0.31-1.44		
			quartile 4	38.0		47	34			1.30	0.59-2.86		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****median

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SD*	P between groups
11045788	Platz 2000	Cases:	-7y	Adjusted	326	31.6 pg/ml	8.4			0.3
		Control:	-7y	(matching)	326	32.2 pg/ml	8.6			
11045788	Platz 2000	Cases:		Adjusted	326			977 mg/d	334	0.6
		Control:		(matching)	326			992 mg/d	332	

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11045788	Platz 2000	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some unclear reporting (inclusion and blinding) and retrospective analyses of an existing cohort, no internal calibration of SFFQ

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11045788	Platz 2000	Case-cohort study	• Participants of NHS (i.e., female nurse, age 30-55 y) (n=121700) • Volunteer blood sample providers between 05/1989-06/1991 (n=32826) • Undertook sigmoid- or colonoscopy between1989-1996 • Free from cancer (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer) • Cases: newly diagnosed distal or rectal adenoma polyps confirmed by pathology reports (n=326) • Control: 1:1 matching controls by endoscopy during the same 2-year period, year of birth (age), indication(s) of endoscopy, time period of first and most recent endoscopy (n=326)	Cases: • hyperplastic and other non-adenoma polyps • adenoma polyps reported but not confirmed (7% or all reports)	1976	Nurses' health study	NIH	JHL/TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT
Undetected proximal polyps can be either cases or controls

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11045788	Platz 2000	Case-cohort study	US, various locations	652	652	58.5±6.6	nd	0%	nd	BMI 25.0 kg/m2 Mean physical activity 15.4 METe-h/wk Mean solar exposure 352 langleys/d	Regular aspirin use: 26.1% Hormone replacement: 35.5% Prior negative endoscopy: 34.4%	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
11045788	Platz 2000	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Intrapair coefficient of variation (CV) 1,25(OH)2D=9.9% 25(OH)D=7.5%	Nd ~6-~11 y(earliest should be 1996 latest should be 2000)	Nd (but stratified analyses based on season of blood draw performed)	$1,25(OH)_2D$=31.9 pg/ml 25(OH)D=26.6 pg/ml Vit D=323 IU/d
11045788	Platz 2000	Dietary calcium intake	SFFQ	nd	nd	nd	nd			984.5mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	(distal) colorectal polyps	Adenomatous polyps by review of histopathological reports.
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	(distal) colon polyps	Same as above
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	Rectal polyps	Same as above
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	"high-risk" (distal) colorectal polyps	Large (1 cm or larger), villous or tubulovillous adenoma
11045788	Platz 2000	nd	"low-risk" (distal) colorectal polyps	Small (<1 cm), tunular adenoma

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
Data on "low-risk" (distal) colorectal polyps were not extracted.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11045788	Platz 2000	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Yes: Intake of red meat and methionine, 1980 folic acid Yes – matched on age Yes - BMI No Yes: Aspirin use, 1990 postmenopausal hormone use Yes: physical activity Yes - smoking, alcohol consumption	Matching factors: endoscopy during the same 2-year period, year of birth, indication(s) for endoscopy, time period of first or most recent endoscopy excluding the one in the current time period, and date of blood draw Stratified analyses on: use of Vit D or Ca supplement, total intake of Vit D or Ca, daily solar UV irradiation, season of blood draw

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose*****	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	1,25(OH)2D quartile 1	22.3 pg/ml		97	80	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.4
			quartile 2	29.0 pg/ml		71	84			0.64	0.41-1.02		
			quartile 3	33.9 pg/ml		84	80			0.80	0.50-1.30		
			quartile 4	40.9 pg/ml		74	82			0.71	0.43-1.15		

11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3 pg/ml		103	82	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			1.0
			quartile 2	22.6 pg/ml		62	80			0.64	0.41-1.00		
			quartile 3	28.3 pg/ml		61	82			0.58	0.36-0.95		
			quartile 4	38.0 pg/ml		100	82			1.04	0.66-1.66		
11045788	Platz 2000	Rectal adenoma	1,25(OH)2D quartile 1	22.3 pg/ml		16	17	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.9
			quartile 2	29.0 pg/ml		18	14			1.35	0.41-4.43		
			quartile 3	33.9 pg/ml		13	16			0.58	0.16-2.09		
			quartile 4	40.9 pg/ml		18	18			1.06	0.30-3.73		
11045788	Platz 2000	Rectal adenoma	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3 pg/ml		24	18	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.9
			quartile 2	22.6 pg/ml		7	16			0.38	0.12-0.19		
			quartile 3	28.3 pg/ml		10	13			0.34	0.08-1.42		
			quartile 4	38.0 pg/ml		24	18			1.59	0.50-5.03		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colon adenoma	1,25(OH)2D quartile 1	22.3 pg/ml		81	63	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.2
			quartile 2	29.0 pg/ml		53	70			0.51	0.30-0.86		
			quartile 3	33.9 pg/ml		71	64			0.78	0.45-1.34		
			quartile 4	40.9 pg/ml		56	64			0.60	0.34-1.04		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colon adenoma	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3 pg/ml		79	64	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			1.0
			quartile 2	22.6 pg/ml		55	64			0.71	0.43-1.18		
			quartile 3	28.3 pg/ml		51	69			0.60	0.35-1.02		
			quartile 4	38.0 pg/ml		76	64			1.02	0.60-1.73		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	25(OH)D	nd		nd	nd	Adjusted (after 2 years from blood draw only)	OR	1.00 (ref)	nd		Nd “comparable to main analysis”
										0.73	nd		

										0.85	nd		
										0.96	nd		
11045788	Platz 2000	Distal colorectal adenoma	1,25(OH)D quartile 1	nd		nd	nd	Adjusted (season of blood draw taken into account)	OR	1.00 (ref)	nd		Nd "comparable to main analysis"
			quartile 2							0.64	nd		
			quartile 3							0.75	nd		
			quartile 4							0.68	nd		
11045788	Platz 2000	"high-risk" distal colon cancer	25(OH)D quartile 1	16.3		45	36	Adjusted	OR	1.00 (ref)			0.9
			quartile 2	22.6		24	37			0.54	0.25-1.16		
			quartile 3	28.3		26	35			0.67	0.31-1.44		
			quartile 4	38.0		47	34			1.30	0.59-2.86		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****median

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SD*	P between groups
11045788	Platz 2000	Cases:	-7y	Adjusted	326	31.6 pg/ml	8.4			0.3
		Control:	-7y	(matching)	326	32.2 pg/ml	8.6			
11045788	Platz 2000	Cases:		Adjusted	326			977 mg/d	334	0.6
		Control:		(matching)	326			992 mg/d	332	

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11045788	Platz 2000	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some unclear reporting (inclusion and blinding) and retrospective analyses of an existing cohort, no internal calibration of SFFQ

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15090720 and 17440943	Platz 2004 and Mikhak 2007	Case-cohort study	available blood specimen, white male (Mikhak)	cancer prior to blood drawn (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer); T1a prostate cancer	1993-95	Health Professionals Follow-up Study	government	SI, KP (for Mikhak study)

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15090720	Platz 2004	Case-cohort study	NE, S, W, Midwest US	920 (460 cases and 460 controls)	920	66.5 (7.4)	nd	100	6% non-white	BMI 22.8	18% smoker; DM 3.6%	448 IU/d of vit D; 962 mg/d of calcium
17440943	Mikhak 2007	Case-cohort study	NE, S, W, Midwest US	51,529 in original cohort, 1408 in case-control (704 each for cases and controls)	1366	66 (7)	nd	100	100% white	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15090720	Platz 2004	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	y; 2 separate analytical runs; intrapair CV 5.4%, 5.6% for 25OH-D; 5.3%, 7.3% for 1,25 OH-D	nd	nd; but cases matched to controls for season of blood drawn	Vit D (IU/day): cases = 459(268) ;controls = 436(271)
17440943	Mikhak 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA for 25(OH)D, radioceptor assay with calf thymus receptors for 1,25(OH)D	nd	nd	nd	nd
15090720	Platz 2004	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					Calcium (mg/day): cases= 975(474); controls = 950(455)
17440943	Mikhak 2007	Dietary calcium intake	Nd	Nd	Nd					Nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15090720	Platz 2004	primary	prostate cancer	deaths, diagnosis or self-reported
17440943	Mikhak 2007	Nd	Prostate cancer	Deaths, diagnosis, or self-reported

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15090720	Platz 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	yes; intake of energy, red meat, fish, lycopene, fructose and α-linolenic acid, vit E, Se, Ca and vit D	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	
		Medical conditions	DM; vasectomy	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	yes; season, location	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes; smoking	
		Other		
17440943	Mikhak 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total intake of tomato sauce, alcohol, energy, fish, calcium, retinol, alpha linolenic acid, vitamin E supplement use, selenium supplement use
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age (match), race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Family history of prostate cancer	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	Region of residence
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Smoking status
		Other	History of PSA test before blood draw (match), quadrant of day of blood draw (match), year of blood draw (match)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
17440943	Mikhak 2007	Total prostate cancer	25(OH)D <= 15 ng/ml	Nd	627	1231	OR: 25(OH)D deficient/non-deficient	0.63	0.44-0.90	nd	0.62	0.43-0.91	0.01
			25(OH)D > 15 ng/ml	Nd	57	145							
		Total prostate cancer	1,25(OH)D <= 26 pg/ml	Nd	565	1151	OR: 1,25(OH)D deficient/non-deficient	1.22	0.89-1.65	nd	1.25	0.91-1.73	nd
			1,25(OH)D > 26 pg/ml	Nd	119	225							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo
Note: unadjusted model still matched for matching factors as listed in confounder table

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15090720	Platz 2004	Prostate cancer	25 OH-D; Quartile* (separate cut points by analytical run (there were 2);	Quartile 1		109	114	mutually adjusted for 1,25 and 25-OH-D using conditional	OR	1.00 (Ref)			0.41

			season of the year and distributions among control, see Table 3 in paper)					logistic regression					
				Quartile 2		115	113			1.05	0.71-1.54		
				Quartile 3		94	120			0.82	0.56-1.20		
				Quartile 4		142	113			1.27	0.86-1.86		
				Quartile 1		109	114	mutually adjusted for 1,25 and 25-OH-D; FH; ht; physical activity; DM; vasectomy; smoking, diet; vit E, Se supplements using conditional logistic regression	OR	1.00 (Ref)			0.59
				Quartile 2		115	113			1.00	0.67-1.49		
				Quartile 3		94	120			0.77	0.51-1.15		
				Quartile 4		142	113			1.19	0.79-1.79		
			1,25 OH-D	Quartile 1		102	110	mutually adjusted for 1,25 and 25-OH-D using conditional logistic regression		1.00 (Ref)			0.16
				Quartile 2		103	115			0.99	0.67-1.45		
				Quartile 3		120	122			1.08	0.73-1.61		
				Quartile 4		135	113			1.25	0.83-1.88		
				Quartile 1		102	110	mutually adjusted for 1,25 and 25-OH-D; FH; ht; physical activity; DM; vasectomy; smoking, diet; vit E, Se supplements using conditional		1.00 (Ref)			0.16

								logistic regression					
				Quartile 2		103	115			0.93	0.62-1.39		
				Quartile 3		120	122			1.04	0.69-1.56		
				Quartile 4		135	113			1.25	0.82-1.90		

*From Platz 2004, table 3 footnotes:
Medians for each quartile: Among controls matched to cases diagnosed between date of blood draw and 1/1996: 25(OH)D - summer: 20.1, 24.1,27.6,32.9; fall: 14.9,22.4,25.4,31.1; spring: 12.0, 16.6,20.9,24.5; winter: 9.3, 15.8, 19.9,24.6. I,25(OH)D - summer: 27.0, 31.0, 35.7, 42.6; fall: 26.8, 30.1, 34.4, 39.9; spring: 25.6, 28.9, 33.7, 37.1; winter: 19.1 27.1,33.5,39.2. Ratio (xIO-3) - summer: 0.89,1.25,1.38,1.90; fall: 0.99,1.20, 1.54,2.11; spring: 1.00, 1.54, 1.88,2.78; winter: 1.06, 1.42, 1.81,2.84. Among controls matched to cases diagnosed 2/1996 - 1/1998: 25(OH)D in ng/ml- summer: 17.4,23.8,28.4,36.5; fall: 16.8,22.0,27.7,38.2; spring: 13.9, 19.7,24.0,29.9; winter: 13.8, 19.4,21.8,26.9. 1,25(OH)D in pg/ml - summer: 25.5, 30.6, 37.3, 45.2; fall: 27.5, 31.9, 36.7,44.0; spring: 25.0, 30.0, 34.3, 38.8; winter: 27.6, 31.7, 36.8, 39.9. Ratio (xI0-3) - summer: 0.88; 1.11, 1.47, 1.96; fall: 0.95, 1.14, 1.54,2.10; spring: 0.91, 1.33, 1.56,2.19; winter: 1.14, 1.50, 1.84,2.70.

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
15090720	Platz 2004	Cases:	2.2 ± 1.2 y	crude	460	24.6 ng/mL	7.7			0.20
		Control:			460	23.9 ng/mL	8.2			

Duplicate one table per outcome

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 1,25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
15090720	Platz 2004	Cases:	2.2 ± 1.2 y	crude	460	34.3 pg/mL	7.1			0.06
		Control:			460	33.5 pg/mL	7.1			

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17440943	Mikhak 2007	Prostate cancer	No significant differences in 25(OH)D or 1,25(OH)D between cases and matched controls, as well as no differences in quintile trend.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
15090720	Platz 2004	mean time between blood drawn and diagnosis was 2.2 ± 1.2 y

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15090720 and 17440943	Platz 2004 and Mikhak 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	N	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Platz did not adjust for calcium intake (Mikhak did), Mikhak does not describe how cancer cases and staging were ascertained, nor do the total cases match up from text to result table (Table 3).

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15827103	Reid 2005	RCT	5 y post-menopausal, age >55 y	Osteoporosis therapy, Ca supplement, major ongoing disease, 25(OH)D<10 µg/L (25 nmol/L), metabolic bone disease, regular users of HRT, anabolic steroids, glucocorticoids, bisphosphonates, LS bone density z score<-2	~2000	Same as Bolland 2008	Govt (suppl supplied by industry)	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15827103	Reid 2005	RCT	Auckland, New Zealand (36.5°S)	1471	1471 (ITT), 153 withdrew prior to 30 months	74 (~4.2)	≥55 y	0	nd	BMI 26.4	healthy	25(OD)D≥25 nmol/L

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
15827103	Reid 2005	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					Dietary calcium 857 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18198394	Reid 2005	Ca supplement	Calcium citrate (Citracal)	1 g (elemental)	5 years	2 x 200 mg before breakfast; 3 x 200 mg evening
		Identical placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Calcium: 396 (54%) alive, continuing followup, continuing intervention at 5 years. Overall compliance 55% Placebo: 443 (60%) alive, continuing followup, continuing intervention at 5 years. Overall compliance 58%			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18198394	Reid 2005	2°	Weight	Kg, BMI
		2°	BP	SBP, DBP

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18198394	Reid 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Final or Delta SE	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
18198394	Reid 2005	Weight	Kg	Calcium	30	732	66.9	11.5	-0.368	0.132	0		0.93
				Placebo		739	67.1	11.8	-0.369	0.134			
		BMI	kg/m^2	Calcium	30	732	26.5	4.3	+0.01	0.05	-0.01		0.83
				Placebo		739	26.4	4.2	+0.02	0.05			
		SBP	mm Hg	Calcium	30	732	134.9	22.6	0.0	0.9	-2.4		0.14
				Placebo		739	133.9	22.9	+2.4	0.9			
		DBP	mm Hg	Calcium	30	732	70.1	10.7	-0.2	0.4	-1.0		0.13
				Placebo		739	69.6	10.0	+0.8	0.4			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18198394	Reid 2005	RCT	Y	Y	NA	Y	nd	Y	Y	N	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Since these are 2° outcomes (from original study perspective), fully adjusted analyses should have been performed

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	Cohort study	-residing in one of 21 states with population-based state cancer registries	-men with a history of cancer -incomplete dietary information -loss to follow-up from baseline through August 31, 1999 -those with prevalent cancer at baseline, except nonmelanoma skin cancer -those whose self report of prostate cancer could not be confirmed -extreme values of energy intake reported -leaving 15% or more of FFQ items blank, four or more out of seven dairy food questions blank, uninterpretable responses to calcium or multivitamin questions.	1992-1993	Cancer Prevention Study II Nutrition Cohort	Nd	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	Cohort study	United States (various)	86,404 male participants in the CPS-II Nutrition Cohort	65,321	nd	50-74	100%	Nd	BMI mean = 26.1	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subject selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd	-Intake <700 mg/day of calcium: mean vitamin D intake = 168.2 IU/day -Intake <700 mg/day of calcium: mean vitamin D intake = 168.2 IU/day
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (modified Block)	Diet Analysis System version 3.8a	Y, energy-adjusted correlation controlling for day-to-day variations in 24-hour recalls is 0.68					Nd 6547130

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	Nd	Prostate cancer	Incident cases identified through self-report, verified through medical records or linkage with state cancer registries. Also through death certificates among cohort members not reporting cancer at enrollment.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Total energy intake, total fat intake, phosphorous, total vitamin D	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age at entry, education, race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	Family history of prostate cancer in brother or father	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	Prostate cancer	Total calcium intake <700 mg/day	nd	nd	1323	23,653	147,858 person-years	adjusted	RR	1	Reference	Nd	0.02
			Total calcium intake 700-999 mg/day	nd	nd	1293	Nd	137,184 person-years			1.0	0.9-1.1	Nd	
			Total calcium intake 1000-1499 mg/day	nd	nd	835	Nd	88,023 person-years			1.0	0.9-1.1	Nd	
			Total calcium intake 1500-1999 mg/day	nd	nd	265	nd	23,174 person-years			1.3	1.1-1.5	Nd	
			Total calcium intake ≥2000 mg/day	nd	nd	95	1,330	8,152 person-years			1.2	1.0-1.6	Nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups

		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
12869397	Rodriguez 2003	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17315319	Rohrmann 2007	Cohort study	men; completed FFQ	<35 y in 1989; baseline cancer; skipped >32 items in FFQ; <3 food items consumed per day; total energy intake outside the range of 800-5000 Kcal	1989	CLUE II study	government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17315319	Rohrmann 2007	Cohort study	Washington County, Maryland	5620	3892	53.8 (nd)	nd	100	99% white	BMI 27.2	nd	25% used calcium supplements

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
17315319	Rohrmann 2007	Calcium intake (dietary and supplement)	60 item Block FFQ	nd	n					25% used calcium supplements

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17315319	Rohrmann 2007	primary	incident prostate cancer	Cancer Registry; death certificates; Natl Death Index

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17315319	Rohrmann 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		energy intake; tomato; saturated fat
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI at age 21
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca dose (diet & suppl combined)	No. of Event*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17315319	Rohrmann	incident prostate cancer	tertile 1		<685.77 mg/d	58	nd	adj	HR	1.00			0.99
			tertile 2		685.77 to 957.58 mg/d	65	nd			0.98	0.72-1.47		
			tertile 3		>957.58 mg/d	76	nd			0.99	0.70-1.41		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome

**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17315319	Rohrmann 2007	low-stage and high-stage prostate cancer	see Table 2 in paper

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17315319	Rohrmann	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	N
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Calcium intake is from combined diet and supplement; only 25% of participants used supplement; not all relevant confounders adjusted

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9236416	Ross 1997	Case-cohort study	Men 45-64 yo at screening Cases: Fatal stroke Controls: 5 per case, matched for age, month of interview, neighborhood, alive at time of death of index case	History of cancer	1986-89	None	NCI	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9236416	Ross 1997	Case-cohort study	Shanghai, China 31° N	18,244	245 cases 1225 controls	nd	45-64	100%	Chinese	BMI quartiles: <20, 20-<22, 22-<24.2, ≥24.2	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
9236416	Ross 1997	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Chinese Food Composition Tables	nd					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9236416	Ross 1997	1°	Fatal stroke	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9236416	Ross 1997	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age matched
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	HTN
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Cigarettes, alcohol
		Other	Yes	Education, marital status

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	F/up	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
9236416	Ross 1997	Fatal stroke	Calcium tertile 1	12 years	nd	103	460	Adjusted	RR	1.0	--		NS
			Calcium tertile 2		nd	68	369			0.8	0.6, 1.6	NS	
			Calcium tertile 3		nd	74	396			1.0	0.8, 1.4	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
9236416	Ross 1997	Cases:	12 years	Crude	245			228 mg		0.38
		Control:			1225			241 mg		

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9236416	Ross 1997	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No data on tertile ranges. Unclear why some factors adjusted for and not others. Unclear if all stroke fatalities captured. No data on blinding.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15531500	Sambrook 2004	Cohort study	≥65 y; resides in nursing homes or hostels; ≥16 mo follow-up; available 25OH-D data	bedridden; bilateral amputees; non-English speaking; 1º hyperparathyroidism; severe renal impairment (serum Cr >300 µmol/L)	1999	Fracture Risk Epidemiology in the Elderly (FREE)	nd	SI
16598375	Sambrook 2006	Cohort study	All individuals from FREE study in whom serum samples were available for biochemical analysis	Patients with primary hyperparathyroidism were excluded from the analysis	June 1999 and Jan 2003	Fracture Risk Epidemiology in the frail Elderly (FREE) Study	National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia and Arthritis Australia	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15531500	Sambrook 2004	Cohort study	N. Sydney, Australia	842	842	85 (nd)	nd	22	nd	60 Kg	7.2% DM; 62% HTN	nd
16598375	Sambrook 2006	Cohort study	North Sydney, Australia 33° 55' South	2005 (original cohort)	1112	86.0 (6.9)	65-104 (data for 2005 enrolled only)	21.2	nd	Mean weight: 59.6 kg	Mean number of medication: 6.8	"frail elderly"; 7.8% had hip fracture

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (e.g. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15531500 16598375	Sambrook 2004 Sambrook 2006	25(OH)D				Diasorin radioimmunoassay kit (Stillwater, MN, US)	Intra-assay CV=7.6%; Inter-assay CV=9.0%.	nd	nd	Mean (SD) = 25 (18-37) nM vit D supplement (100-1000 IU daily) in 6.6% men; 10% women
		Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16598375	Sambrook 2006	Secondary (assumed because primary outcome of the original cohort was falls and fractures)	Total mortality	Mortality and cause of death were ascertained from death certificates and chart review during regular visits to institutions

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
15531500	Sambrook 2004	This paper described first 865 subjects who had completed at least 16 months follow-up from FREE study
16598375	Sambrook 2006	Backward elimination was used to select confounders to be included in the final multivariate regression analyses. 25(OH)D was not selected. Therefore, only results of univariate analysis were extracted here.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15531500	Sambrook 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	No Yes age; gender no illness severity no no no serum PTH, albumin, phosphate and calcium; bone U/S attenuation; Cr clearance	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16598375	Sambrook 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	 no no no	See above comments. Only results of univariate analysis were extracted here

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
15531500	Sambrook 2004	Cases: 345	16-53 mo	adjusted for age and gender	345	24.9	14.4			0.006
		Control: 497	16-53 mo	adjusted for age and gender	1112	27.9	15.7			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
15531500	Sambrook 2004	Total mortality	After adjustment for age and gender, log 25OH-D was a significant predictor of mortality (HR 0.990 (0.982-0.998), P=0.001). In multivariate analysis that included serum PTH, 25OH-D and bone U/S attenuation, only PTH, Cr clearance, albumin, gender & illness severity remained significant predictors of mortality.
16598375	Sambrook 2006	Total mortality	Over a median follow-up of 817 days (mean, 852 days; range: 4–2028 days), a total of 559 (50.3%) subjects died. Causes of death were cardiac (n=184), cerebrovascular (n=94), infections (mainly pneumonia; n=157), other (n=120: renal failure 19, cancer 24, respiratory 16, dementia 29, and others 32), and undetermined (n= 4). Eighty eight hip fractures occurred in 87 subjects during the period of follow-up. Result from univariate analysis for potential risk factors for total mortality: Using Log 25(OH)D as the independent variable, HR (95%CI) of total mortality was 0.87 (0.75-1.01), p=0.07 (n=1112)

UI	Author	Comments for Results

	Year	

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15531500	Sambrook 2004	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	did not adjust for dietary factors, anthropometrics and additional variables relevant to vitamin D

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16598375	Sambrook 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	NA	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	N	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	N	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Very selected subgroup of individuals from original cohort; 25(OH)D was not selected to enter final multivariate model. Therefore, only results of univariate analysis were used (no confounding was controlled).

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
10362125	Schuurman 1999	Case-cohort study	-male	-Hx of cancer (except skin cancer) -incomplete or inconsistent dietary data	1986-1992	Netherlands Cohort Study	Dutch Cancer Society	MB/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
10362125	Schuurman 1999	Case-cohort study	Netherlands, 52.30 N	2392 (original cohort size = 58279. 704 cases derived from entire cohort. Random subcohort sample of 1688 men used to estimate accumulated person years at risk)	2167 (642 cases, 1525 controls)	Cases: 63.9±3.8 Controls: 61.4±4.2	Range: 55-69 yrs	100%	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
10362125	Schuurman 1999	25(OH)D and/or 1,25$(OH)_2$D				nd				nd
		Dietary calcium intake	SFFQ (given at baseline to estimate consumption during the year preceding start of study)	Dutch food composition table	N					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
10362125	Schuurman 1999	nd	Prostate cancer	Computerized record linkage with all nine cancer registries in The Netherlands, and with the Dutch national data base of pathology reports

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
10362125	Schuurman 1999	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Intake of Ca adjusted for energy. Total energy intake-adjusted. Mean intake of fresh meat, fish, cured meat, milk and milk products, cheese, eggs, calcium and protein did not differ among cases and subcohort members.
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age-adjusted
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	Yes	Adjusted for family hx of prostate cancer and SES

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Quintiles [Median Ca intake (mg/d) /cutpoint]	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event) *	Person-years	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend*** *
10362125	Schuurman 1999	Prostate cancer	602/709 (reference group)			120	1821	75	Adjusted	RR	1.0	N/A		
			780/848			126	1845	75	Adjusted	RR	1.10	0.80-1.51	>0.05	
			911/984			127	1840	75	Adjusted	RR	1.04	0.76-1.42	>0.05	
			1064/1164			140	1817	75	Adjusted	RR	1.21	0.89-1.66	>0.05	
			1329/nd			129	1800	75	Adjusted	RR	1.09	0.79-1.50	>0.05	p=0.34

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
10362125	Schuurman 1999	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):								B									
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):								Unclear the proportion of questionnaire validated against the 9-day diet record; accumulated person years at risk in the total cohort are estimated using a subcohort; no 1º outcome specified.									

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
7498100	Scragg 1995	RCT	-Subjects recruited from general practitioner registers -63 – 76 yrs	-vit D medication/supplements -antihypertensive med	Dec. 1991 – Jan. 1992	None	nd	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT
for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
7498100	Scragg 1995	RCT	Cambridge, UK 52°N	191	189	69.6 (nd)	Age range: 63 – 76 yrs.	46%	nd	Mean weight = 70.3 kg. Mean BMI = 25.8	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
7498100	Scragg 1995	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D competitive protein binding assay	Y, intra-assay coefficient of variation 2.7%	nd		At baseline: Tx group mean = 13.8 ng/mL Control group mean = 12.9 ng/mL
7498100	Scragg 1995	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
7498100	Scragg 1995	Cholecalciferol	Prepared in Arachis oil by a hospital and checked for bioactivity	2.5 mg (100,000 IU)	Follow-up assessment 5 wks post drink	One time drink taken in presence of interviewer
7498100	Scragg 1995	Placebo	Prepared in Arachis oil by a hospital and checked for (lack of) bioactivity			One time drink taken in presence of interviewer
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
7498100	Scragg 1995	1°	SBP	BP was measured twice pre and post intervention with a Hg sphygmomanometer and averaged
7498100	Scragg 1995	1°	DBP	BP was measured twice pre and post intervention with a Hg sphygmomanometer and averaged
7498100	Scragg 1995	2°	25(OH)D	As measured by competitive protein binding assay

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
7498100	Scragg 1995	Complete trial performed during winter with goal of eliminating UV exposure as a confounder

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
7498100	Scragg 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	no	NS diff. in age between groups
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	NS diff. In BMI and body weight between groups
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables	no	NS diff in % smokers between groups
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7498100	Scragg 1995	SBP	mmHg	Vit D	5 wks	95	149	22	-5	13	0		0.81
				placebo	5 wks	94	147	23	-5	16			
		DBP		Vit D	5 wks	95	82	12	-1	9	0		0.92
				placebo	5 wks	94	82	10	-1	9			
		25(OH)D	ng/mL	Vit D	5 wks	95	13.8	5.9	+7.2	3.8	8.6		0.0001
				placebo	5 wks	94	12.9	5.4	-1.4	1.1			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
7498100	Scragg 1995	RCT Parallel	Y	nd	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	possible confounders not accounted for

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12208895	Shin 2002	Cohort study	Registered nurses from 11 states in the United Sates, women who completed the 1980 dietary questionnaire, did not have implausible values for total energy intake (<500 kcal or >3500kcal), had not left more than 10 food items blank, and had not been diagnosed with cancer by 1980	nd	1980	Nurses' Health Study	National cancer institute, national institutes of health, department of health and human services; American cancer society international union against cancer; and the Korean science and engineering foundation	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12208895	Shin 2002	Cohort study	US	88691	88381	46.7 (nd)	Nd	0	nd	Mean BMI at age 18y: 21.4, Mean height: 64.5 in.	History of osteoporosis: 1.2% Current smokers: 28.9%	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subject selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12208895	Shin 2002	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	Total Vit D intake 306.7 IU/d
12208895	Shin 2002	Dietary calcium intake	(1980) 61 item FFQ, (1984, 1986, 1990, and 1994) approximately 130 foods - FFQ	USDA Nutrient data base	Y (see other article, Willett et al. 1988, Salvini et al. 1989)					Total Ca intake 773.7 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12208895	Shin 2002	nd	Breast cancer	Medical records were obtained for breast cancer cases identified by either self-report or vital records, and more than 99% of these records confirmed the self-report.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12208895	Shin 2002	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Total energy intake, total fat intake, glycemic index, β-carotene intake, total active vit E intake, Yes - age, BMI at age 18 Yes - height, weight change since age 18, age at menarche, History of benign breast disease, family history of breast cancer, Yes - physical activity, alcohol intake, Time period, parity, age at first birth	For the analysis of postmenopausal women, age at menopause and postmenopausal hormone use were added.

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
12208895	Shin 2002	Premenopausal women - Breast cancer	Total Ca group 1		≤ 500	142		192	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.05
			Total Ca group 2		>500-≤600	106		192	Adjusted	RR	0.88	0.68-1.13		
			Total Ca group 3		>600-≤700	133		192	Adjusted	RR	0.97	0.76-1.24		
			Total Ca group 4		>700-≤800	119		192	Adjusted	RR	0.95	0.74-1.22		
			Total Ca group 5		>800-≤1000	161		192	Adjusted	RR	0.82	0.64-1.05		
			Total Ca group 6		>1000-≤1250	104		192	Adjusted	RR	0.75	0.57-0.99		
			Total Ca group 7		>1250	62		192	Adjusted	RR	0.80	0.58-1.12		
12208895	Shin 2002	Postmenopausal women - Breast cancer	Total Ca group 1		≤ 500	240		192	Adjusted	RR	1.00			0.70
			Total Ca group 2		>500-≤600	216		192	Adjusted	RR	0.86	0.72-1.04		
			Total Ca group 3		>600-≤700	293		192	Adjusted	RR	0.94	0.79-1.12		
			Total Ca group 4		>700-≤800	292		192	Adjusted	RR	0.92	0.77-1.10		
			Total Ca group 5		>800-≤1000	518		192	Adjusted	RR	0.93	0.79-1.10		
			Total Ca group 6		>1000-≤1250	433		192	Adjusted	RR	0.90	0.76-1.07		
			Total Ca group 7		>1250	353		192	Adjusted	RR	0.93	0.77-1.12		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
12208895	Shin 2002	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	nd	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17019716	Shin 2006	Cohort study	Women between the ages of 40 and 70 years were recruited in urban Shanghai	Subjects who had a previous history of cancer at baseline; those who reported an implausible total calorie intake (<500 or >3500 kcal/day); and those who moved away from Shanghai immediately after the baseline survey	March 1997 to May 2000	Shanghai Women's Health Study	NIH	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17019716	Shin 2006	Cohort study	urban Shanghai, China (31° 14' N)	73314	73314	Cases: 59 (8.5); non-cases: 52 (9.1)	nd	0	Chinese	BMI, average (Kg/m^2): 24 Waist to hip ratio, average: 0.81	Menopause: 49% CRC in first degree relatives: 2.2% Ever smoked regularly: 2.8% Ever drank alcohol regularly: 2.3% Ever exercised regularly: 35% Ever used hormone replacement: 2%	Fruits/vegetables intake (g/day), average: 567.7 Meat intake (g/day), average: 50.1

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17019716	Shin 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
17019716	Shin 2006	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	The Chinese Food Composition Table was used to estimate the intake level of major nutrients for the study participants	y Intake levels of major nutrients and food obtained from the FFQ compared with those derived from multiple 24-hr dietary recalls. The correlation coefficients between FFQ and 24-hr dietary recalls were 0.54 for calcium					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17019716	Shin 2006	primary	Colorectal cancer	Cohort members have been followed by a combination of biennial follow-up surveys and record linkage to the Shanghai Cancer Registry and the Shanghai Vital Statistics Registry. The matching criteria used for linkage to identify cancer cases and deceased subjects in the cohort were citizen identification number, name, date of birth and address. International Classification of Diseases-9 (ICD-9) codes 153 and 154 were used to identify colon and rectal cancer cases, respectively. All possible matches were checked manually and verified through home visits.
		secondary	Colon cancer	
		secondary	Rectal cancer	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
17019716	Shin 2006	Subjects were followed until diagnosis of cancer, death or June 30, 2004, whichever came first. If the subjects' in-person contact occurred between June 30, 2004 and December 31, 2004, the date of contact was used as a last follow-up date. Mean values for the total sample were calculated by the mean values given for cases and non-cases respectively in the paper Median follow up: 5.75 years

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17019716	Shin 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (vitamin supplement use and total energy intake)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age at recruitment, education)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	Yes (menopausal status, family history of colorectal cancer among first degree relatives)	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (cigarette smoking, alcohol consumption, physically active during past 5 years)	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

All cases included (event = 283)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
17019716	Shin 2006	Colorectal cancer	1st quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 291.9	nd	nd	Median, 68.9	adjusted	RR	1.0			
		Colorectal cancer	2nd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 389.9	nd	nd	Median, 68.9	adjusted	RR	1.0	0.7–1.4	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	3rd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 488.2	nd	nd	Median, 68.9	adjusted	RR	1.0	0.7–1.4	nd	0.484
		Colorectal cancer	4th quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 610.8	nd	nd	Median, 68.9	adjusted	RR	0.9	0.6–1.3	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	5th quintile, median (mg/day)		> 610.8	nd	nd	Median, 68.9	adjusted	RR	0.9	0.6–1.3	nd	

Exclude first 2 years of follow-up (event = 220)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
17019716	Shin 2006	Colorectal cancer	1st quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 291.9	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			
		Colorectal cancer	2nd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 389.9	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.9	0.6–1.3	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	3rd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 488.2	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.8	0.5–1.2	nd	0.023
		Colorectal cancer	4th quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 610.8	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.7	0.4–1.1	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	5th quintile, median (mg/day)		> 610.8	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.3–1.0	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17019716	Shin 2006	Additional analyses were performed after excluding the first year or first 2 years of follow-up periods to evaluate whether undiagnosed cancer cases at the baseline survey may affect the results. After excluding the first year of follow-up, higher intakes of calcium were associated with a decreased risk of colorectal cancer (*P* for trend = 0.058, data not shown). In the subgroup analyses, similar associations were observed for colon and rectal cancer (data not shown). After excluding the first 2 years of follow-up, higher calcium intake significantly decreased the risk of colon cancer (p for trend = 0.030), but failed to reach any statistical significance for rectal cancer (*P* for trend = 0.345).

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Exclude first 2 years of follow-up (colon cancer, N = 129; rectal cancer, N = 91)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
17019716	Shin 2006	Colon cancer	1st quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 291.9	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			
			2nd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 389.9	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0	0.6–1.0	nd	
			3rd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 488.2	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.4–1.1	nd	0.030
			4th quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 610.8	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.3–1.0	nd	
			5th quintile, median (mg/day)		> 610.8	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.3–1.1	nd	
		Rectal cancer	1st quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 291.9	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			
			2nd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 389.9	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.8	0.4–1.5	nd	
			3rd quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 488.2	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.2	0.6–2.1	nd	0.345
			4th quintile, median (mg/day)		≤ 610.8	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.9	0.5–1.8	nd	
			5th quintile, median (mg/day)		> 610.8	nd	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.6–1.4	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17019716	Shin 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Assessor blinding not reported; power calculation not reported; number of cases and non-cases per calcium quintile intake are not reported; confirmation of cases by histology not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16985031	Skinner 2006	Cohort study	Nurses' Healthy Study (NHS): initiated in 1976 when 121,701 US female registered nurses ages 30 to 55 years responded to a mailed questionnaire Health Professionals Follow-up (HPFS): began in 1986 when 51,529 US male health professionals ages 40 to 75 years responded to a mailed questionnaire	Prior cancers, except nonmelanoma skin cancer; missing dietary information	NHS: 1984 HPFS: 1986	1. NHS 2. HPFS	NIH and NHS's grant	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16985031	Skinner 2006	Cohort study	Multiple cities in US	NHS: 121,701 HPFS: 51,529	NHS: 75,427 HPFS: 46,771	NHS: 51 (nd) HPFS: 55 (nd)	NHS: 30-55 HPFS: 40-75	NHS: 0 HPFS: 100	nd	Mean BMI - NHS: 24 HPFS: 25	Diabetic – NHS: 3% HPFS: 1%	Residence in northern state – NHS: 50% HPFS: 74%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16985031	Skinner 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				nd
16985031	Skinner 2006	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (Willet, 1990)	Harvard University Food Composition Database, derived from USDA	Pearson r between FFQ and 4 1-week diet records for energy-adjusted calcium intake = 0.56 (HPFS cohort)					See results

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16985031	Skinner 2006	nd	Pancreatic cancer	Self-reported diagnosis in the 2-year period before each questionnaire. Some permitted to confirm through medical records. Additionally, primary case of death by pancreatic cancer was used. Because no material differences were observed between these two types of cases, both cases with and without medical records were included in final analyses.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
16985031	Skinner 2006	This article gave a pooled analysis of HPFS and NHS cohorts and separate data for each cohort. Only data from each cohort were extracted

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16985031	Skinner 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Use of multivitamin supplement, dietary intake of vitamin D	Two statistical models: with and without adjustment for vitamin D were reported
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI, height
		Medical conditions	History of DM	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Region of residence (south, north)	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	smoking
		Other	Parity (for women only)	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
16985031	Skinner 2006	Pancreatic cancer	Total daily calcium intake (mg) in HPFS (men, 1986-2000)		<500	17	Person-year: 59,963	Adjusted (but no dietary vitamin D)	RR	1			0.19
					500-999	119	372,213	Adjusted (but no dietary vitamin D)	RR	1.10	0.66-1.81		
					≥1000	51	179,381	Adjusted	RR	0.85	0.49-		

								(but no dietary vitamin D)			1.49		
16985031	Skinner 2006	Pancreatic cancer	Total daily calcium intake (mg) in HPFS (men, 1986-2000)		<500	17	Person-year: 59,963	Adjusted (including dietary vitamin D)	RR	1			0.86
					500-999	119	372,213	Adjusted (including dietary vitamin D)	RR	1.28	0.76-2.18		
					≥1000	51	179,381	Adjusted (including dietary vitamin D)	RR	1.23	0.67-2.25		

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
16985031	Skinner 2006	Pancreatic cancer	Total daily calcium intake (mg) in NHS (women, 1984-2000)		<500	24	Person-year: 156,300	Adjusted (but no dietary vitamin D)	RR	1			0.04
					500-999	109	665,099	Adjusted (but no dietary vitamin D)	RR	1.01	0.65-1.58		
					≥1000	45	340,595	Adjusted (but no dietary vitamin D)	RR	0.69	0.42-1.15		
16985031	Skinner 2006	Pancreatic cancer	Total daily calcium intake (mg) in NHS (women, 1984-2000)		<500	24	Person-year: 156,300	Adjusted (including dietary vitamin D)	RR	1			0.09
					500-999	109	665,099	Adjusted (including dietary vitamin D)	RR	1.09	0.69-1.73		
					≥1000	45	340,595	Adjusted (including dietary vitamin D)	RR	0.75	0.43-1.30		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others

***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16985031	Skinner 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
8478144	Slob 1993	Cohort study	All civil servants in Amsterdam, aged between 40 and 65 years, and their spouses	Subjects without information on survival status or cause of death, with missing information on calcium intake and other potential confounding variables, with extremely low energy intake (i.e., for men <1500kcal, for women <1250kcal)	1953-1954	nd	nd	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
8478144	Slob 1993	Cohort study	Amsterdam (52°18' N)	3091	2591	Men 53(7.3) Women 52 (7.2)	40-65y	50.9%	nd	BMI Men 24.7 (2.7) Women 26.4 (3.7)	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
8478144	Slob 1993	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
8478144	Slob 1993	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ (one-week recall)	Dutch food tables	n					Men 929±415mg/d Women 660±283mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
8478144	Slob 1993	nd	Gastrointestinal cancer mortality	The residence at death and the municipal death registration number were obtained from the Dutch Central Bureau of Genealogy. The combination of residence at death, date at death and municipal death registration number enabled linkage with the cause of death in the records of the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics.
8478144	Slob 1993	nd	Cancer mortality	The residence at death and the municipal death registration number were obtained from the Dutch Central Bureau of Genealogy. The combination of residence at death, date at death and municipal death registration number enabled linkage with the cause of death in the records of the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics.
8478144	Slob 1993	nd	All-cause mortality	The residence at death and the municipal death registration number were obtained from the Dutch Central Bureau of Genealogy. The combination of residence at death, date at death and municipal death registration number enabled linkage with the cause of death in the records of the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
8478144	Slob 1993	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Energy intake, dietary fiber	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes - age	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Followup Duration	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
8478144	Slob 1993	All cause mortality – Men	Ca quintile 1	28 yr	≤585	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.7-1.6	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 2		585<, ≤725	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.7-1.6	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 3		725<, ≤935	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.8	0.5-1.2	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 4		935<, ≤1245	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.9	0.6-1.3	nd	nd

			Ca quintile 5		>1245	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0		nd	nd
8478144	Slob 1993	Total cancer mortality – Men	Ca quintile 1	28 yr	≤585	232 (total cases)	1321 (total)	Adjusted	OR	1.0	0.6-1.6	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 2		585<, ≤725	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0	0.6-1.6	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 3		725<, ≤935	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0	0.6-1.5	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 4		935<, ≤1245	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.8	0.5-1.3	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 5		>1245	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0		nd	nd
8478144	Slob 1993	Gastrointestinal cancer mortality– Men	Ca quintile 1	28 yr	≤585	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.5	0.7-3.2	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 2		585<, ≤725	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.5-2.3	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 3		725<, ≤935	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.5-2.2	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 4		935<, ≤1245	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.6	0.3-1.4	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 5		>1245	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0		nd	nd
8478144	Slob 1993	All cause mortality – Women	Ca quintile 1	28 yr	≤445	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.2	0.8-1.9	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 2		445<, ≤540	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.7-1.7	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 3		540<, ≤640	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.3	0.9-2.0	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 4		640<, ≤850	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.7-1.7	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 5		>850	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0		nd	nd
8478144	Slob 1993	Total cancer mortality – Women	Ca quintile 1	28 yr	≤445	127 (total cases)	1270 (total)	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.6-2.1	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 2		445<, ≤540	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	0.8	0.4-1.5	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 3		540<, ≤640	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.6	0.9-2.8	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 4		640<, ≤850	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.4	0.7-2.5	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 5		>850	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0		nd	nd
8478144	Slob 1993	Gastrointestinal cancer mortality– Women	Ca quintile 1	28 yr	≤445	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	3.1	0.8-12.3	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 2		445<, ≤540	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.6	0.4-7.2	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 3		540<, ≤640	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	3.8	1.0-13.9	nd	nd

			Ca quintile 4		640<, ≤850	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.8	0.4-7.7	nd	nd
			Ca quintile 5		>850	nd	nd	Adjusted	OR	1.0		nd	nd

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
8478144	Slob 1993	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No internal calibration of dietary assessment (FFQ). No data on number of cases per calcium intake category.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19056900	Sneve 2008	RCT	-men and women -21-70 yrs old -BMI between 28.0 and 47.0 kg/m^2	- diabetes, hx of MI, angina pectoris, stroke, renal stone disease, sarcoidosis -wt loss of more than 10% of total body wt during the last 6 mos., those using antidepressant drugs or wt reducing drugs, participation in an organized wt loss program, pregnant or lactating women, women planning to become pregnant in the next 12 mos., women below the age of 50 yrs without adequate contraception, subjects with serum Ca > 2.55 mmol/L, males with serum creatinine > 129 micromol/L, and females with serum creatinine > 104 micromol/L	2005-2007	nd	The Northern Norway Regional Health Authority	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19056900	Sneve 2008	RCT	North Norway (latitude = 70 N)	445	334	47.6 (11.4)	nd	36%	nd	Weight(kg)=100.1 (14.2) BMI=34.8(3.9) % body fat=43.0 (7.5) waist hip ratio=0.97 (0.09)	Overweight or obese, 22% smokers	Serum Ca(mmol/L)=2.31(0.11) Serum 25(OH)D (nmol/L)=53.1(16.9) Calorie intake (J/day)=9161(2887) Ca intake (mg/day)=940(398) Vit D intake (mcg/day)=8.9(6.6)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19056900	Sneve 2008	25(OH)D				electrochemiluminescence	Yes: according to producer, the assay has, for total analytical precison, a coeff of variation ≤7.8% as judged in any of three different concentrations (48.6 – 73.8 – 177.0 nmol/L)	nd	nd	Vit D intake (mcg/day)=8.9(6.6) Serum 25(OH)D (nmol/L)=53.1(16.9)
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	nd	Serum Ca was measured at baseline and at 3, 6, 9, and 12 months. Urine for measurement of Ca excretion was collected for 24 hr at baseline and at the end of the study.	nd		nd	Ca intake (mg/day)=940(398) Serum Ca(mmol/L)=2.31(0.11)

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
19056900	Sneve 2008	Vit D + Ca	Vit D capsules from Jenapharm, Jena, Germany. Ca supplement – Nycoplus Ca, Nycomed, Oslo, Norway)	5714 IU cholecalciferol + 500 mg Ca	1 yr	2 capsules each containing 20,000 IU cholecalciferol taken twice a week (Monday and Thursday). Ca supplement taken daily
		Vit D + Ca + placebo	Vit D capsules from Jenapharm, Jena, Germany. Ca supplement – Nycoplus Ca, Nycomed, Oslo, Norway). Placebo capsules, purchased from Hasco-lek, Wroclaw, Poland, were identical to the vit D capsules	2857 IU cholecalciferol + 500 mg Ca	1 yr	1 capsule containing 20,000 IU cholecalciferol taken once a week (Monday or Thursday). One placebo capsule taken each week (Monday or Thursday). Ca supplement taken daily.
		Ca + placebo	Ca supplement – Nycoplus Ca, Nycomed, Oslo, Norway. Placebo capsules, purchased from Hasco-lek, Wroclaw, Poland, were identical to the vit D capsules	500 mg Ca	1 yr	2 placebo capsules taken each week (Monday and Thursday). Ca supplement taken daily.
Co-intervention(s) *:			At the baseline visit, any supplements with Ca and vit D were discontinued. Participants were given written recommendations on healthy diet and physical activity.			
Compliance/Adherence:			If participant missed a capsule on assigned day, it could be taken another day. If a whole week was missed, double dose could be taken the next week. The compliance rate for cholecalciferol/placebo capsules were 95% in all 3 groups, and for the calcium tablets 81, 85, and 83% in the vitD+Ca, vitD+Ca+placebo, and Ca+placebo groups respectively.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19056900	Sneve 2008	1°	weight	
		2°	BMI	
		2°	Serum 25(OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19056900	Sneve 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes – 3 groups matched on vit D intake, Ca intake, calorie intake Yes – 3 groups matched on age, adjusted for sex Yes – 3 groups matched on BMI, body weight, % body fat, and waist hip ratio Yes – 3 groups matched on % smokers and physical activity score	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP) (SEE COMMENTS FOR RESULTS SECTION BELOW)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
19056900	Sneve 2008	weight	kg	Vit D + Ca	crude	12	116	101	14.5	+0.1	3.8	vs. Ca+placebo group = -0.4		NS
				Vit D + Ca + placebo	crude	12	106	98.6	14.3	+0.3	3.2	vs. Ca+placebo group = -0.2		NS
				Ca + placebo	crude	12	112	100.6	13.9	+0.5	3.9			NS
19056900	Sneve 2008	BMI	Kg/m^2	Vit D + Ca	crude	12	116	35.0	4.1	0.0	1.3	vs. Ca+placebo group = -0.2		NS
				Vit D + Ca + placebo	crude	12	106	34.4	3.9	+0.1	1.1	vs. Ca+placebo group = -0.1		NS
				Ca + placebo	crude	12	112	35.1	3.8	+0.2	1.4			NS
19056900	Sneve 2008	Serum 25(OH)D	nmol/L	Vit D + Ca	crude	12	116	54.5	16.7	+59.8	21.1	vs. Ca+placebo group = +62.1		P<0.05 versus Ca+placebo group
				Vit D + Ca + placebo	crude	12	106	51.4	18.4	+37.8	15.7	vs. Ca+placebo group = +40.1		P<0.05 versus Ca+placebo group
				Ca + placebo	crude	12	112	53.2	15.4	-2.3	9.5			NS

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
19056900	Sneve 2008	In results above, baseline values are for all 445 subjects randomized but the delta values are for the 334 subjects who completed the study.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
19056900	Sneve 2008	RCT - parallel	nd	Y	NA	N	nd	Y	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	2 subjects were diagnosed with 1° hyperparathyroidism during the study and 1 subject had an increase in serum Ca to 2.62 mmol/L. All 3 subjects were excluded from the study. 4 subjects had transient increases in serum Ca > 2.59 mmol/L and remained in the study. 317 other adverse events were recorded, most of them related to GI discomfort. There were no significant differences between the treatment groups regarding adverse events.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Dropout rate greater than 20%. No explanation for high non-completion rate. Randomization technique not described.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cohort study	Men of Japanese ancestry born in the years 1900 through 1919 and living on the Hawaiian island of Oahu in 1965	Men excluded because of prevalent colorectal cancer; or because the subject considered his intake in the previous 24 hours to be atypical	1965 - 1968	Japan Hawaii Cancer Study	NCI	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cohort study	Hawaiian island of Oahu (21° 19'N)	8006	8006	nd	nd	100	Japanese	nd	nd	Average calcium intake (mg/day): 503.23 Average fat intake (g/day): 85.58

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Dietary calcium intake	24h diet recall interview was administered to each subject by dieticians; food models and serving utensils were used to illustrate portion sizes	y Food composition tables were compiled from the best available sources to calculate individual intakes of nutrients	nd					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	primary	Colon cancer	Ascertainment of incident cancers was conducted by a periodic review of hospital discharge records for the island of Oahu. A computerized record linkage was performed between the study file and files of the Hawaii Tumor Registry to reduce the possibility of missing incidence cases. Each case of carcinoma was confirmed by histologic examination. The number of cancer cases identified by subsites of the large bowel were as follows: cecum and ascending colon (ICD-8: 153.0); transverse (ICD-8: 153.1) and descending colon (ICD-8: 153.2); sigmoid colon (ICD-8: 153.3); rectosigmoid (ICD-8: 154.0); and rectal (ICD-8: 154.1)
		primary	Cecum /ascending colon cancer	
		primary	Transverse /descending colon cancer	
		primary	Sigmoid colon cancer	
		primary	Rectal cancer	
		primary	Rectosigmoid cancer	
		primary	Rectum cancer	
		secondary	Large bowel cancer	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	max follow up: 22 years

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	All colon tumors	High tertile		nd	58	2403	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			0.16
			Medium tertile		nd	57	2399	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0	0.7-1.4	nd	
			Low tertile		nd	74	2392	nd	adjusted	RR	1.3	0.9-1.8	nd	
		Cecum /ascending colon cancer	High tertile		nd	16	2403	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			0.76
			Medium tertile		nd	9	2400	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.2-1.3	nd	
			Low tertile		nd	18	2392	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0	0.6-2.2	nd	
		Transverse /descending colon cancer	High tertile		nd	14	2403	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			0.20
			Medium tertile		nd	11	2399	nd	adjusted	RR	0.8	0.4-1.7	nd	
			Low tertile		nd	8	2392	nd	adjusted	RR	0.6	0.2-1.3	nd	
		Sigmoid colon cancer	High tertile		nd	28	2403	nd	adjusted	RR	1.0			0.02
			Medium tertile		nd	37	2399	nd	adjusted	RR	1.3	0.8-2.2	nd	
			Low tertile		nd	48	2392	nd	adjusted	RR	1.7	1.1-2.8	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE) NOTE: for this specific study (cohort study) this type of analysis may be considered inappropriate

Colon cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 189	nd	adjusted	189			481.50	21.97	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Duplicate one table per outcome

Cecum /ascending colon cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 43	nd	adjusted	43			518.90	46.05	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Transverse /descending colon cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 33	nd	adjusted	33			551.55	52.56	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Sigmoid colon cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 113	nd	adjusted	113			446.86	28.40	0.05
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Rectal cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 88	nd	adjusted	88			524.48	32.21	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Rectosigmoid cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 39	nd	adjusted	39			495.23	48.34	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Rectum cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 49	nd	adjusted	49			547.87	43.16	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

Large bowel cancer

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SE*	P between groups
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Cases: 277	nd	adjusted	277			495.14	18.16	ns
		Control: 7195	nd	adjusted	7195			502.76	3.56	

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	Besides total calcium intake, results were also given as subgroup analyses for dairy calcium intake and non-dairy calcium intake Rectosigmoid and rectum cancer were not associated with calcium intake (data not shown)

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
2311461	Stemmermann 1990	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	N	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Study designed to compare cancer events in large bowel subsites between group with dairy calcium intake and group with non-dairy calcium intake; assessor blinding not reported; confounding factors not included in the analyses; power calculations not reported; results are not reported for all the outcomes (large bowel cancer per subsite); use of 24h recall interview instead of FFQ

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Case-cohort study	Men and women, aged 55 to 74 y, from the Prostate, Lung, ovarian, and Colorectal Cancer Screening Trial (PLCO). Cases: All incident cases of pancreatic adenocarcinomas occurred between 1994 and 2006 (follow-up to 11.7 y; median, 5.4 y) Controls: selected from all PLCO study participants with serum samples and who were alive at the time the case was diagnosed. Two controls were matched to each case by age (±5 y), race, sex, and calendar date of blood draw in 2-mo blocks.	A personal history of one of the 4 PLCO cancers or those currently undergoing treatment for any cancer, except nonmelanoma of the skin, as well as subjects who had been screened fro prostate or colorectal cancer during the prior 3 y	November 1993 – July 2001	PLCO	NIH	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Case-cohort study	Multicenters in the US: Birmingham, AL; Denver, CO; Detroit, MI; Honolulu, HI; Marshfield, WI; Minneapolis, MN; Pittsburgh, PA; Salt lake City, UT; St. Louis MO; and Washington, DC)	Original RCT participants: 152,810 Cases: 184 Controls: 368	Cases: 184 Controls: 368	Cases: 66 Controls: 66	Cases: IQR 59-72 Controls: IQR 58-72	65.2	90.2% White, 3.3% Black, 1.6% Hispanic, 4.9% Asian	Mean (IQR) BMI – Cases: 26.7 (22.3-32.7) Controls: 26.3 (22.0-33.0)	DM: 10.5% Gallbladder disease: 13.2%	Vit D inadequacy (<40 nol/L): 14%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	25(OH)D				RIA (Heartland Assays lab)	Yes Overall CV = 4.7%	Within 2 hr	calendar date of blood draw in 2-mo blocks was matching factor to control for seasonal variation in the analysis	Residential sum exposure at study entry- Low sun: 47% Moderate sun 45% High sun: 8%
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Dietary calcium intake	137 item FFQ (Deeb, 2007)	nd	nd	N/A				Median (IQR) total calcium intake – Cases: 1091 (710-1942) mg/d Controls: 1133 (732-1776) mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009		Pancreatic cancer	Vital status of cohort participants and pancreatic cancer cases was identified by self-report survey, state cancer registries, death certificates, physician referrals, and reports from next of kin for deceased individuals. Medical and pathologic records related to pancreatic cancer diagnosis and supporting doc were obtained. 90.2% of pancreatic cancer cases were confirmed through medical review.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	2.5% had family history of pancreatic cancer. No differences between cases and controls.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	Seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, and residential sun exposure (low, moderate or high)	Seasonal variation of 25(OH)D was one of the matching factor; residential sun exposure was treated as effect modifier (stratified analyses)
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes*	smoking
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Pancreatic cancer	25(OH)D quintiles, nmol/L	≤45.9		44	74	Median 5.4 y (up to 11.7 y)	Adjusted	OR	1 (ref)		nd	0.49
				>45.9 and ≤60.3		40	74				0.97	0.47-1.98		
				>60.3 and ≤69.5		27	73				0.86	0.40-1.84		

				>69.5 and ≤82.3		31	74				0.84	0.39-1.80		
				>82.3		42	73				1.45	0.66-3.15		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Pancreatic cancer		25(OH)D, nmol/L (quartile)				P interaction
				<49.3	>49.3 and <65.2	>65.2 and <78.4	>78.4	
			Residential sum exposure, low*	Case/control, n (91/167)	22/44	22/42	21/43	26/38	
				Adj OR (95% CI)	1 (ref)	2.52 (0.92-6.90)	2.33 (0.83-6.48)	4.03 (1.38-11.79)	0.015
			Residential sum exposure, moderate/high*	Case/control, n (93/201)	33/48	15/50	18/49	24/54	
				Adj OR (95% CI)	1.97 (0.80-4.82)	0.66 (0.22-2.01)	0.91 (0.31-2.71)	1.45 (0.53-3.96)	
			*Residential regions based on ranges of UV radiation levels obtained from annual R-B meter in states in which screening centers are located: low sun (R-B≤105, Detroit, MI; Minneapolis, MN; Marshfield, WI), moderate/high sun (R-B=113-134, Pittsburgh, PA; St. Louis, MO; Denver, CO; Washington, DC; Salt Lake City, UT, and R-B≥154, Brimingham, AL; Honolulu, HI)						
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Pancreatic cancer	The adjusted Ors for each respective quartile compared with the first after the exclusion of the cases that occurred during the first 2 years (n=153 cases in analysis) were 0.78, 0.98 and 1.47 (95%Ci, 0.70-2.99, p trend=0.3) and 5 years (n=105 cases in analysis) were 0.52, 1.27 and 2.21 (95% CI, 0.92-5.30; p trend-0.06)						

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	There was no significant interaction of 25(OH)D status and pancreatic cancer by smoker status, sex, physical activity, or total vitamin A intake.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Blood drawn in fall and winter season

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Pancreatic cancer	25(OH)D quintiles, nmol/L	≤45.9		25	50	Median 5.4 y (up to 11.7 y)	Adjusted	OR	1 (ref)		nd	0.10
				>45.9 and ≤60.3		15	37				1.95	0.72-5.27		
				>60.3 and ≤69.5		10	26				1.82	0.56-5.96		
				>69.5 and		13	29				1.06	0.35-3.27		

				≤82.3										
				>82.3		14	12				3.91	1.19-12.85		

Blood drawn in spring and summer season

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	Pancreatic cancer	25(OH)D quintiles, nmol/L	≤45.9		19	24	Median 5.4 y (up to 11.7 y)	Adjusted	OR	1 (ref)		nd	0.55
				>45.9 and ≤60.3		25	37				0.39	0.13-1.23		
				>60.3 and ≤69.5		17	47				0.38	0.13-1.14		
				>69.5 and ≤82.3		18	45				0.44	0.14-1.35		
				>82.3		28	61				0.59	0.20-1.75		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
19208842	Stolzenberg, 2009	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	n	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	n	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	n
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	n					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	n	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	n

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Small number of cases in some subgroup analyses; analyses were not planned when trial was formed.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Case-cohort study	All cases of pancreatic cancer diagnosed between January 1985 and December 2001 were identified through the Finnish Cancer Registry among 29,133 eligible men in southwestern Finland, ages 50 to 69 years, who smoked at least 5 cigarettes per day, were randomized Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study Controls: participants from the same study who were alive at the time the case was diagnosed and free from cancer (except nonmelanoma skin cancer) as of December 2001.	1) history of malignancy other than nonmelanoma cancer of the skin or carcinoma in situ 2) severe angina on exertion, 3) chronic renal insufficiency 4) liver cirrhosis, 5) chronic alcoholism, or other medical conditions that might limit long-term participation, 6) anticoagulant therapy **7)** used supplements containing vitamin E (> 20 mg/d), vitamin A (> 20,000 IU/d), or β-carotene (> 6 mg/d)	Trial enroll: 1985 – 1988 Cases ascertained: 1985 - 2001	Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene Cancer Prevention Study	NIH	GR

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others

**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Case-cohort study	Finland 64° N	200 cases 400 controls	200 cases 400 controls	58	54-62	100%	Caucasian	BMI 26 kg/m^2	Diabetes 9% Bronchial asthma 4% Mean BP = 140/90 Smoking h/o both case and controls = 90%	Vit D food 5µg Supplement 8% yes Serum 25(OH)vitamin D (D2 and D3), nmol/L 49 in cases, 46 in controls Vitamin D inadequacy (<40 nmol/L), 28% in cases, 37.2% in controls

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	25(OH)D and/or 1,25(OH)$_2$D				RIA	Y intrabatch and interbatch coefficient of variation percent of the 25(OH)D assay was 16.5%.	The interval between serum collection and diagnosis was up to 16 years (median follow-up time, 11.8 years).		Energy Kcal 2700 Fish 33g Eggs 47 g Milk 763 g Alcohol 9 g n-3 fatty acids 2 g saturated fat 54 g Folate 330 µg
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd						

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank

**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table

***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Cancer	Pancreatic cancer	odds ratios (OR) for pancreatic cancer with subjects in the lowest quintile as the reference category

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Data also available according to the seasonal variations of vit D Data also available after exclusion of cases by 5 years and 10 years

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Y	serum retinol
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	education, occupational activity matching based on age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions	N	
		Medication	N	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	N	Subgroup analyses based on seasonal variation Matching based on month of blood draw
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes/no	smoking intensity and duration, reporting to have quit smoking > 3 consecutive visits
		Other	N	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Adjusted analysis	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	pancreatic cancer	< 32	Na	Na	27	80	Age and multivariable adjusted OR of baseline fasting 25(OH)vitamin D (D2 and D3)	OR	1.00	(reference)		0.001

								status					
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Pancreatic cancer	> 32 and < 41.1			34	80		OR	1.30	(0.70-2.40)		0.001
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Pancreatic cancer	> 41.1 and < 51.1			47	80		OR	2.12	(1.15-3.90)		0.001
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Pancreatic cancer	> 51.1 and < 65.5			35	81		OR	1.50	(0.81-2.76)		0.001
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Pancreatic cancer	> 65.5			57	79		OR	2.92	(1.56-5.48)		0.001

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Pancreatic cancer	Data according to seasonal variation and quintile available

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	Data after excluding cases at 5 y and 10 y are available

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17047087	Stolzenberg-Solomon 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A): mostly well conducted study	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Post-hoc Case-cohort study on a lung cancer prevention RCT on alpha-tocopherol and beta-carotene	Participants of ATBC study • Male • Age 50-69 y • Current smoker (> 5 per day) • Residents in southwestern Finland Cases (colorectal cancer): ICD-9-153 (colon) or 154 (rectum) by Finish cancer registry Controls: 2 age, study clinic, date of blood draw matching controls (including 9 patients of another cancer) by incidence-density sampling	No serum controls (2 controls for 2 independent cases were excluded)	1985-1993	ATBC study	nd	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Post-hoc Case-cohort study on a lung cancer prevention RCT on alpha-tocopherol and beta-carotene	Southwestern Finland (~ 60° N)	438 (146 cases, 292 controls)	436 (146 cases, 290 controls)	Median 60	50-69	100	nd	Wt=79.1 BMI=26.3	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (e.g. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
9242478	Tangrea 1997	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA with I^{125} [25(OH)D] Radioreceptor assay [$1,25(OH)_2D$]	Intraset Coeff of Va: 9.5% [25(OH)D] and 7.5% [$1,25(OH)_2D$]	nd~9 to ~12 y inferred)	nd	Vit D intake: 5.3 g/d (4% supplement user)
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	nd					Ca=1.3 g/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9242478	Tangrea 1997	nd	Colorectal cancer	Diagnosis of primary adenocarcinoma through the Finish cancer registry supplemented by medical records and pathology reports with pathological review
		nd	Colon cancer	Diagnosis of primary adenocarcinoma (see above for details)
		nd	Rectal cancer	Diagnosis of primary adenocarcinoma (see above for details)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (fat, fiber, protein, calcium, cholesterol, alpha-tocopherol, beta-carotene) Yes (matched on age, education) Yes (BMI) No No Yes (residence) Yes (physical activity, marital status, smoking history) Yes (Tx allocation of alpha-tocopherol and beta-carotene)	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Colorectal cancer	[25(OH)D] Q1	-9.8	nd	46	72	crude	RR	1.0	-	nd	
			Q2	>9.8-13.9		35	73			0.7	0.4-1.3		
			Q3	>13.9-19.3		36	73			0.8	0.4-1.3		0.13
			Q4	>19.3		29	72			0.6	0.3-1.1		
9242478	Tangrea	Colon	[25(OH)D]Q1	-9.8	nd	30	47	crude	RR	1.0	-		0.69

	1997	cancer	Q2	>9.8-13.9		18	47			0.6	0.3-1.2		
			Q3	>13.9-19.3		22	45			0.8	0.4-1.6		
			Q4	>19.3		21	42			0.8	0.4-1.6		
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Colon cancer (excluding the 2 y RCT period)	[25(OH)D] Q1	-9.8	nd	19	38	crude	RR	1.0	-	nd	0.58
			Q2	>9.8-13.9		13	35			0.8	0.3-1.8		
			Q3	>13.9-19.3		19	32			1.2	0.5-2.8		
			Q4	>19.3		17	31			1.2	0.5-2.8		
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Rectal cancer	[25(OH)D] Q1	-9.8	nd	16	25	crude	RR	1.0	-	nd	0.06
			Q2	>9.8-13.9		17	26			0.9	0.4-2.4		
			Q3	>13.9-19.3		14	28			0.8	0.3-2.0		
			Q4	>19.3		8	30			0.4	0.1-1.1		
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Rectal cancer (excluding the 2 y RCT period)	[25(OH)D] Q1	-9.8	nd	12	15	crude	RR	1.0	-	nd	0.04
			Q2	>9.8-13.9		13	16			0.8	0.2-2.4		
			Q3	>13.9-19.3		7	21			0.4	0.1-1.3		
			Q4	>19.3		7	25			0.3	0.1-1.1		

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Colorectal cancer	[1,25(OH)2D] Q1	-31.7	nd	32	72	crude	RR	1.0	-	nd	0.76
			Q2	>31.7-37.3		43	72			1.3	0.8-2.4		
			Q3	>37.3-43.1		41	74			1.2	0.7-2.2		
			Q4	>43.1		30	72			0.9	0.5-1.7		
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Colon cancer	[1,25(OH)2D]Q1	-31.7	nd	20	51	crude	RR	1.0	-		0.80
			Q2	>31.7-37.3		29	44			1.7	0.8-3.4		
			Q3	>37.3-43.1		20	41			1.2	0.6-2.6		
			Q4	>43.1		22	45			1.2	0.6-2.6		
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Colon cancer (excluding the 2 y RCT period)	[1,25(OH)2D]Q1	-31.7	nd	12	21	crude	RR	1.0	-	nd	0.39
			Q2	>31.7-37.3		14	28			0.7	0.3-2.2		
			Q3	>37.3-43.1		21	33			1.0	0.4-2.5		
			Q4	>43.1		8	27			0.5	0.2-1.5		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
9242478	Tangrea 1997 [25(OH)D]	Cases:	Nd	Crude	146	12.2	11.2-13.2	nd	Nd	<0.01
		Control:			290	13.8	13.1-14.5			
9242478	Tangrea 1997 [1,25(OH)2D]	Cases:	nd	crude	146	36.5	35.2-37.8	nd	nd	NS
		Control:			290	36.7	35.7-37.7			

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
9242478	Tangrea 1997	Only univariate/crude analysis (controlled only for matching factors) was reported as the results based on multivariate model were comparable to non-adjusted analysis.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9242478	Tangrea 1997	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (e.g. quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Post-hoc assessment of a cohort of another RCT with multiple subgroup analyses. Family history not considered in adjustment.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12467133	Terry 2002	Cohort study	Women born between 1914-1948 who received invitation to participate in mammography screening program and also completed and returned a six-page questionnaire including items about age, weight (kg), height (cm), education, and diet	Women > 76 years old; women whose questionnaires had missing or incorrect national identification numbers, were nit properly dated or lacked the date the woman moved out of the study area; women whose date of death were verified through the Swedish Death Registry; women with answers in the dietary portion of the questionnaire suggesting they had extreme energy intakes (3 SD below or above the mean value for natural logarithmically transformed calories using cut points of 417 and 3729 kcal) or had carelessly completed the dietary questionnaire; women with a previous cancer diagnosis (by linkage to the Swedish Cancer Registry)	1987-1990	Swedish Mammography Screening Cohort	Swedish Cancer Society and Swedish Research Council	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12467133	Terry 2002	Cohort study	Vastmanland county (59°45'N) and Uppsala county (59°53'N), Sweden	61463 This number is smaller than the number of women reported at the baseline data table	61463	According to calcium intake quartile Age: 1st quartile:53; 2nd quartile: 52; 3rd quartile: 52; 4th quartile: 53	nd	0	Swedish	According to calcium intake quartile BMI (Kg/m^2) (unclear whether it is mean or median): 1st quartile:24.2; 2nd quartile: 24; 3rd quartile: 24.1; 4th quartile: 24.5	nd	Calcium intake, median (mg/day): 688 (IQR 486-914) Vitamin D intake, median (µg/day): 3.2 (IQR 2.9-3.7)

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12467133	Terry 2002	Cohort study	Vastmanland county and Uppsala county, Sweden	61463 This number is smaller than the number of women reported at the basely data table	61463	According to calcium intake quartile Mean age: 1st quartile:53; 2nd quartile: 52; 3rd quartile: 52; 4th quartile: 53	nd	0	Swedish	According to calcium intake quartile BMI (Kg/m^2) (unclear whether it is mean or median): 1st quartile:24.2; 2nd quartile: 24; 3rd quartile: 24.1; 4th quartile: 24.5	nd	According to calcium intake quartile Energy (kcal/day): 1st quartile:1266; 2nd quartile: 1331; 3rd quartile: 1349; 4th quartile: 1265 Total fat (g/day): 1st quartile: 42.2; 2nd quartile: 42.2; 3rd quartile: 42.7; 4th quartile: 42.8 Dietary fiber (g/day): 1st quartile: 16.6; 2nd quartile: 16; 3rd quartile: 15.6; 4th quartile: 14.9 Vitamin C (mg/day): 1st quartile: 58.8; 2nd quartile: 58.9; 3rd quartile: 58.1; 4th quartile: 56.2 Folic acid (µg/day): 1st quartile:170; 2nd quartile: 176; 3rd quartile: 180; 4th quartile: 186

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12467133	Terry 2002	Cohort study	Vastmanland county and Uppsala county, Sweden	61463 This number is smaller than the number of women reported at the basely data table	61463	According to calcium intake quartile Age: 1st quartile:53; 2nd quartile: 52; 3rd quartile: 52; 4th quartile: 53	nd	0	Swedish	According to calcium intake quartile BMI (Kg/m^2) (unclear whether it is mean or median): 1st quartile:24.2; 2nd quartile: 24; 3rd quartile: 24.1; 4th quartile: 24.5	nd	According to calcium intake quartile Fruit and vegetables (servings/wk): 1st quartile:25.3; 2nd quartile: 26.7; 3rd quartile: 26.2; 4th quartile: 24.8 Red meat (servings/wk): 1st quartile:5.1; 2nd quartile: 5.1; 3rd quartile: 4.6; 4th quartile: 4.1 Alcohol (drinks/wk): 1st quartile: 2.1; 2nd quartile: 2.2; 3rd quartile: 2.3; 4th quartile: 2

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12467133	Terry 2002	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				na	na	na	na	na
12467133	Terry 2002	Dietary calcium intake	Self administered FFQ	Swedish National Food Administration Data	y Validity evaluated for 129 of the 213 women who weighed and recorded what they consumed during 4 7-					nd

					day periods at 3 to 4 month intervals. Validity estimates for dietary calcium intake: 0.5 (Pearson's correlation coefficient between FFQ and Food records)					

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12467133	Terry 2002	primary	Colorectal cancer	Matching two independent sources: computerized Regional Cancer Registries and a list of all pathology reports from the two pathology departments covering the study area (until December 31, 1998) For the last two years of follow up (through December 31, 2000) matching with computerized Regional Cancer Registry only
		secondary	Colon cancer	Cancer occurring above the peritoneal delineation of the abdominal cavity
		secondary	Rectal cancer	Cancer occurring below the peritoneal delineation of the abdominal cavity
		secondary	Proximal colon cancer	Cancer occurring from the cecum through the splenic flexure
		secondary	Distal colon cancer	Cancer occurring from the descending colon through the sigmoid colon

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments
12467133	Terry 2002	Average duration of follow up: 11.3 years. Age, BMI, nutrition status are given as mean, or median per calcium intake quartile at baseline. Median values for the total cohort are given only for calcium intake and vitamin D.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12467133	Terry 2002	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption) Other	Yes (red meat, energy adjusted folic acid and vitamin C consumption quartiles, energy adjusted nutrients) Yes (age: in 5 year age groups; education level: less than high school, high school, university) Yes (BMI in quartiles) No No No Yes (alcohol consumption)	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

Age adjusted model

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12467133	Terry 2002	CRC	1st total calcium intake quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		486±79	156	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			
		CRC	2nd quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		631±34	149	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.97	0.77-1.21	nd	
		CRC	3rd quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		747±37	145	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.96	0.77-1.21	nd	0.04
		CRC	4th quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		914±136	122	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.77	0.61-0.98	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

Multivariate model including age, BMI, education level, red meat intake, alcohol consumption, energy adjusted saturated fat, folic acid, vitamin C, and vitamin D intake

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12467133	Terry 2002	CRC	1st quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		486±79	156	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			
		CRC	2nd quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		631±34	149	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.97	0.77-1.21	nd	0.02

		CRC	3rd quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		747±37	145	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.95	0.75-1.20	nd	
		CRC	4th quartile total calcium intake (median±SD, mg/day)		914±136	122	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.72	0.56-0.93	nd	

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Age adjusted model

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12467133	Terry 2002	Colon cancer	1st quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		486±79	100	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			
			2nd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		631±34	97	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.98	0.74-1.30	nd	
			3rd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		747±37	92	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.95	0.72-1.27	nd	0.17
			4th quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		914±136	82	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.81	0.61-1.09	nd	
		Rectal cancer	1st quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		486±79	55	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			2nd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		631±34	48	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.90	0.61-1.32	nd	
			3rd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		747±37	49	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.92	0.62-1.36	nd	0.11
			4th quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		914±136	39	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.70	0.46-1.06	nd	

Multivariate model including age, BMI, education level, red meat intake, alcohol consumption, energy adjusted saturated fat, folic acid, vitamin C, and vitamin D intake

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12467133	Terry 2002	Colon cancer	1st quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		486±79	100	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.06
			2nd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		631±34	97	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.97	0.74-1.30	nd	
			3rd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		747±37	92	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.93	0.70-1.24	nd	
			4th quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		914±136	82	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.74	0.54-1.01	nd	
		Rectal cancer	1st quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		486±79	55	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	0.12
			2nd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		631±34	48	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.89	0.60-1.32	nd	
			3rd quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		747±37	49	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.94	0.63-1.39	nd	
			4th quartile (median±SD, mg/day)		914±136	39	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.70	0.45-1.09	nd	

Women < 55 years old vs. women ≥ 55 years old
Multivariate model including age, BMI, education level, red meat intake, alcohol consumption, energy adjusted saturated fat, folic acid, vitamin C, and vitamin D intake

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI**	P between groups***	P for trend****
12467133	Terry 2002	Colon cancer	Women < 55 years 1st quartile (mg/day)		176 to <568	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			
		Colon cancer	Women < 55 years 2nd quartile (mg/day)		568 to <688	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.32	0.75-2.30	nd	
		Colon cancer	Women < 55 years 3rd quartile (mg/day)		688 to <816	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.02	0.55-1.85	nd	0.92
		Colon cancer	Women < 55 years 4th quartile (mg/day)		816 to 1300	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.11	0.60-2.05	nd	
		Rectal cancer	Women < 55 years 1st quartile (mg/day)		176 to <568	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			
		Rectal cancer	Women < 55 years 2nd quartile (mg/day)		568 to <688	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.33	0.34-1.59	nd	
		Rectal cancer	Women < 55 years 3rd quartile (mg/day)		688 to <816	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.30	0.66-2.56	nd	0.75
		Rectal cancer	Women < 55 years 4th quartile (mg/day)		816 to 1300	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.70	0.31-1.62	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	Women < 55 years 1st quartile (mg/day)		176 to <568	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			
		Colorectal cancer	Women < 55 years 2nd quartile (mg/day)		568 to <688	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.06	0.68-1.66	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	Women < 55 years 3rd quartile (mg/day)		688 to <816	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.11	0.71-1.73	nd	0.77
		Colorectal cancer	Women < 55 years 4th quartile (mg/day)		816 to 1300	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.91	0.56-1.48	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 1st quartile (mg/day)		176 to <568	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.008

		Colorectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 2nd quartile (mg/day)		568 to <688	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.93	0.71-1.21	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 3rd quartile (mg/day)		688 to <816	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.89	0.68-1.17	nd	
		Colorectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 4th quartile (mg/day)		816 to 1300	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.66	0.49-0.89	nd	
		Colon cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 1st quartile (mg/day)		176 to <568	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.02
		Colon cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 2nd quartile (mg/day)		568 to <688	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.89	0.64-1.23	nd	
		Colon cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 3rd quartile (mg/day)		688 to <816	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.91	0.65-1.26	nd	
		Colon cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 4th quartile (mg/day)		816 to 1300	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.64	0.44-0.92	nd	
		Rectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 1st quartile (mg/day)		486	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.15
		Rectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 2nd quartile (mg/day)		631	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.96	0.61-1.52	nd	
		Rectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 3rd quartile (mg/day)		747	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.79	0.48-1.29	nd	
		Rectal cancer	Women ≥ 55 years 4th quartile (mg/day)		914	nd	nd	135.6	adjusted	RR	0.70	0.42-1.19	nd	

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Number of women when baseline data are presented is inconsistent (larger) with the sample size reported in the methods section; blinding assessor not reported; number of non-cases per calcium intake quartile is not given; also number of cases and non-cases in the subgroup analyses by age; statistical methods to compare all different subgroups per cancer type, in the analysis by age, are not applied; power calculations are not reported; confirmation of cases by histology not reported for al participants

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
3307307	Thomsen 1987	RCT	Early post-menopausal women without history of diseases or receiving drugs known to influence calcium metabolism or the cardiovascular system.	nd	nd	nd	nd	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
3307307	Thomsen 1987	RCT	Copenhagen, Denmark 55°40' N	28	28	nd	nd	0%	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
3307307	Thomsen 1987	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
3307307	Thomsen 1987	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
3307307	Thomsen 1987	Calcium	Sandoz (calcium lactate-gluconate, calcium carbonate)	2,000 mg	One year	nd
		placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
3307307	Thomsen 1987	nd	Bodyweight	Change in kg/yr

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
3307307	Thomsen 1987	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
3307307	Thomsen 1987	Bodyweight change	Kg	Calcium	1 yr	14	60.6	SD = 5.4	61.0	SD = 5.1	-0.2	ND	Not significant
				placebo	1 yr	14	66.4	SD = 13.8	67.0	SD = 14.0			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome

**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
3307307	Thomsen 1987	RCT-parallel	Y	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	N	Y	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poorly described methods and demographics. Large baseline difference in weight.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
12609940	Trivedi 2003	RCT	•Men & women*** •65-85 years*** •The British doctor study register or the sex-age register of a GP in Ipswich, Suffolk***	•Already Vit D supplements takers •Contraindication to Vit D (eg, renal stone, sarcoidosis, malignancy)	06/96-03/97	Nd	Medical Research Council, UK	TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT
***Registry participants to which a recruit mail sent (n=11120), who agreed to participate (n=3504 [32%])

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
12609940	Trivedi 2003	RCT	UK (Oxford [**52°N**] & Ipswich [**52°N**])	2686	2686	75 (5)	65-85****	76	nd	BMI=24.4	Hx of CAD: 16% Hx of stroke: 4% Hx of CVD: 28% Hx of cancer Steroids user: 5% Hormone replacement therapy (female): 7% Physically active (>moderately): 84%	Mean total Ca intake at 4 year after start of the intervention: 742 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.
Inclusion criteria
CAD = coronary artery disease/ischemic heart disease; CVD = cardiovascular disease comprising CAD, stroke, and other cardiac diseases

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
12609940	Trivedi 2003	25(OH)D at 4 years after the intervention in the placebo group (n=114 only)				nd	nd	nd	nd	53.4 nmol/L
12609940	Trivedi 2003	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd	NA	NA			Mean total Ca intake at 4 year after start of the intervention: 742 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
12609940	Trivedi 2003	Vit D	Vit D3 (cholecalciferol)	100,000 IU q 4 months (~833 IU/d)	5 years (15 total doses)	1 cap q 4 mo
		Placebo	Matching placebo			
Co-intervention(s) *:			Participants continued any usual medications (only data on steroids and hormone replacement therapy reported)			
Compliance/Adherence:			76% with at least 80% compliance; 66% at last dose (80% if excluding deaths)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
12609940	Trivedi 2003	Secondary	All cause mortality	Death certificate (based on ICD-9*) by investigators blinded to the intervention***
		Secondary	Cardiovascular disease mortality	same as above
		Secondary	Ischemic heart disease mortality	same as above
		Secondary	Cerebrovascular disease mortality	same as above
		Secondary	All cancers mortality	same as above
		Secondary	Colorectal caner mortality	same as above
		Secondary	Respiratory cancer mortality	same as above
		Secondary	Breast cancer mortality (female)	same as above
		Secondary	Cardiovascular disease incidence	Death certificate (ICD-9*) and self-reported questionnaire data***
		Secondary	Ischemic heart disease incidence	same as above
		Secondary	Cerebrovascular disease incidence	same as above
		Secondary	All cancers incidence	same as above
		Secondary	Colorectal cancer incidence	same as above
		Secondary	Respiratory cancer incidence	same as above
		Secondary	Breast cancer incidence (female)	same as above
		Secondary	Falls incidence	same as above

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
*Cardiovascular disease=ICD-9 codes 390.0-459.9; ischaemic heart disease=410.0-414.0; cerebrovascular disease=430.0-438.0; all cancers=140.0-239.9; colorectal cancer=153.0-154.8; respiratory cancer=160.0-165.9; breast cancer=174.0-175.0
****Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"**
***None of the causes were verified independently (e.g. by medical charts or pathology reports)

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
12609940	Trivedi 2003	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	No	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (Age, gender [subgroup])	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	No	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other	None	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Max Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
12609940	Trivedi 2003	**Mortality Men and Women**											
			Vit D	60-69	224	1345	HR					0.74-	
		All Causes	Placebo		247	1341					0.88	1.06	0.18
		Cardiovascular	Vit D	60-69	101	1345	HR						
		Disease	Placebo		117	1341					0.84	0.65-1.1	0.2
		Ischaemic Heart	Vit D	60-69	42	1345	HR				0.84	0.56-1.27	0.41

			Placebo		49	1341							
		Cerebrovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	28	1345	HR				1.04	0.61-1.77	0.89
			Placebo		26	1341							
		All Cancers	Vit D	60-69	63	1345	HR				0.86	0.61-1.2	0.37
			Placebo		72	1341							
		Colorectal	Vit D	60-69	7	1345	HR				0.62	0.24-1.6	0.33
			Placebo		11	1341							
		Respira-ry	Vit D	60-69	10	1345	HR				0.89	0.38-2.09	0.78
			Placebo		11	1341							
		Mortality Men											
		All Causes	Vit D	60-69	199	1019	HR				0.88	0.73-1.07	0.19
			Placebo		220	1018							
		Cardiovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	90	1019	HR				0.83	0.62-1.1	0.19
			Placebo		106	1018							
		Ischaemic Heart Disease	Vit D	60-69	38	1019	HR				0.83	0.54-1.28	0.4
			Placebo		45	1018							
		Cerebrovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	24	1019	HR				0.92	0.52-1.61	0.77
			Placebo		25	1018							
		All Cancers	Vit D	60-69	56	1019	HR				0.93	0.64-1.34	0.69
			Placebo		59	1018							
		Colorectal	Vit D	60-69	7	1019	HR				0.97	0.34-2.78	0.96
			Placebo		7	1018							
		Respiratory	Vit D	60-69	10	1019	HR				1.08	0.44-2.65	0.87
			Placebo		9	1018							
		Mortality Women											
		All Causes	Vit D	60-69	25	326	HR				0.91	0.53-1.56	0.73
			Placebo		27	323							
		Cardiovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	11	326	HR				0.99	0.43-2.3	0.99
			Placebo		11	323							
		Ischaemic Heart Disease	Vit D	60-69	4	326	HR				0.99	0.25-3.96	0.99
			Placebo		4	323							
		Cerebrovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	4	326	HR				3.98	0.44-35.64	0.22
			Placebo		1	323							
		All Cancers	Vit D	60-69	7	326	HR				0.53	0.21-1.33	0.18
			Placebo		13	323							
		Colorectal	Vit D	60-69	0	326	HR				NA		0.04
			Placebo		4	323							
		Respiratory	Vit D	60-69	0	326	HR				NA		0.16
			Placebo		2	323							
		Breast	Vit D	60-69	0	326	HR				NA		NA
			Placebo		0	323							
		Incidence Men & Women											

		Cardiovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	477	1345	HR				0.9	0.77-1.06	0.22
			Placebo		503	1341							
		IschaemicHeart Disease	Vit D	60-69	224	1345	HR				0.94	0.77-1.15	0.57
			Placebo		233	1341							
		Cerebrovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	105	1345	HR				1.02	0.77-1.36	0.87
			Placebo		101	1341							
		All Cancers	Vit D	60-69	188	1345	HR				1.09	0.86-1.36	0.47
			Placebo		173	1341							
		Cancer Excluding Skin	Vit D	60-69	144	1345	HR				1.11	0.86-1.42	0.43
			Placebo		130	1341							
		Colorectal Cancer	Vit D	60-69	28	1345	HR				1.02	0.60-1.74	0.94
			Placebo		27	1341							
		Respiratory Cancer	Vit D	60-69	17	1345	HR				1.12	0.56-2.25	0.75
			Placebo		15	1341							
		Self Reported Falls	Vit D	60-69	254	1027	HR				0.93	0.76-1.14	0.5
			Placebo		261	1011							
		Incidence Men											
		Cardiovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	392	1019	HR				0.91	0.76-1.09	0.3
			Placebo		412	1018							
		Ischaemic Heart Disease	Vit D	60-69	191	1019	HR				0.98	0.78-1.22	0.86
			Placebo		193	1018							
		Cerebrovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	86	1019	HR				0.99	0.72-1.36	0.96
			Placebo		85	1018							
		All Cancers	Vit D	60-69	163	1019	HR				1.11	0.87-1.42	0.39
			Placebo		147	1018							
		Cancer Excluding Skin	Vit D	60-69	129	1019	HR				1.17	0.89-1.54	0.26
			Placebo		111	1018							
		Colorectal Cancer	Vit D	60-69	25	1019	HR				1.18	0.65-2.12	0.59
			Placebo		21	1018							
		Respiratory Cancer	Vit D	60-69	17	1019	HR				1.29	0.62-2.68	0.49
			Placebo		13	1018							
		Self Reported Falls	Vit D	60-69	154	757	HR				0.87	0.68-1.12	0.27
			Placebo		169	756							
		Incidence Women											

		Cardiovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	85	326	HR				0.89	0.63-1.27	0.52
			Placebo		91	323							
		Ischaemic Heart Disease	Vit D	60-69	33	326	HR				0.79	0.48-1.29	0.35
			Placebo		40	323							
		Cerebrovascular Disease	Vit D	60-69	19	326	HR				1.19	0.60-2.37	0.62
			Placebo		16	323							
		All Cancers	Vit D	60-69	25	326	HR				0.95	0.54-1.68	0.85
			Placebo		26	323							
		Cancer Excluding Skin	Vit D	60-69	15	326	HR				0.77	0.39-1.55	0.47
			Placebo		19	323							
		Colorectal Cancer	Vit D	60-69	3	326	HR				0.49	0.12-1.98	0.32
			Placebo		6	323							
		Respiratory Cancer	Vit D	60-69	0	326	HR				NA		0.16
			Placebo		0.6	323							
		Breast Cancer	Vit D	60-69	4	326	HR				0.99	0.25-3.99	0.99
			Placebo		4	323							
		Self Reported Falls	Vit D	60-69	100	270	HR				1.03	0.72-1.48	0.86
			Placebo		92	255							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR,	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD	P between groups***	P for trend****

			Groups				N**			%)		**		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
12609940	Trivedi 2003	RCT	nd	nd	nd	y	y	y	y	NA	y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No independent verification of cases identified through the death certificates and self-reported data and suboptimal reporting of methodology of randomization.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
15883441	Tseng 2005	Cohort study		Diagnosis of prostate cancer at or before the 1982-1984 baseline interview	1982-1984	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES I) Epidemiologic Follow-up Study (NHEFS)	NIH, American Cancer Society, Department of Defense, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	KP/SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
15883441	Tseng 2005	Cohort study	United States various, excluding Hawaii, Alaska, and Native American lands	14407	3779	57.8(14.6)	25-74	100%	White 88%, Black 11%, Other 1%	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
15883441	Tseng 2005	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	Vitamin D dietary intake 172(101) IU/d
15883441	Tseng 2005	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	No specific information, but reference to Ursin 1993	N					Calcium 730(347) mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
15883441	Tseng 2005	Nd	Prostate cancer	Confirmation through histopathology reports or medical records deemed “definite” case status. “Probable” case status given when confirmation could only be confirmed through death certificates or interview.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
15883441	Tseng 2005	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Energy intake, recreational and usual level of physical activity	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, race, education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	US region, rural/urban/suburban residence, recreational sun exposure	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking status, current alcohol intake
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
15883441	Tseng 2005	Prostate cancer	Tertile 1: Calcium median intake 455.4 mg/d	nd	nd	28	Nd	7.7 yrs	Adjusted	RR	1.0	Reference	Nd	0.001
			Tertile 2: Calcium median intake 642.1 mg/d	nd	nd	37	Nd	7.7 yrs			1.0	0.6-1.7	Nd	
			Tertile 3: Calcium median intake 920.6 mg/d	nd	nd	66	Nd	7.7 yrs			2.2	1.4-3.5	nd	

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
15883441	Tseng 2005	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Part of dietary estimates derived from recall data based on NHANES II conducted ~4 y earlier; only ~65% cases were “definite” (confirmed by histopathology or medical records), rest were “probable”.

***Check “NA” and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	Case-cohort study	enrolled in heart studies; available blood sample		1973; 1981-82; 1985-ongoing	Helsinki Heart Study; Janus Project; Vasterbotten Intervention Project	non-profit	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	Case-cohort study	Helsinki, Finland; Norway; Northern Sweden	2073	2073	nd	<40 to >60	100	nd	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	25(OH)D				RIA, Incstar, MN	y; intraassay 8.5%; interassay 16%	nd	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	primary	prostate cancer	national cancer registries

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	nd	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	yes	age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions	nd	
		Medication	nd	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	yes	region
		Smoking and other life styles variables	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases *	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	prostate cancer		≤19		19	nd	conditional logistic	OR	1.5	0.8-2.7		
				20-39		169	nd			1.3	0.98-1.6		
				40-49 (ref)		229	nd			1			
				60-79		138	nd			1.2	0.9-1.5		
				≥80		67	nd			1.7	1.1-		

											2.4		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	used conditional logistic regression analysis to maintain matching status, but unclear which factors were matched

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
14618623	Tuohimaa 2004	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	N	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	N
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	unclear if additional relevant confounders were also adjusted for in analysis

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	Case-cohort study	prostate cancer	nd	1981-82	Helsinki Heart Study	non-profit	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	Case-cohort study	Helsinki, Finland	588	588	51 (3.7)	nd	100	nd	BMI 26.3	subjects enrolled in gemfibrozil trial	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA (Incstar Corp., MN)	intraassay CV: 8.5%; interassay CV: 16%	10.8 y	nd	most sample collected during winter months
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	Primary	prostate cancer	from Finnish Cancer Registry

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	no	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	
		Medical conditions	Yes, BMI >28; SBP >150; HDL-C ≤1.05	
		Medication	Yes	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	nd	
		Smoking and other life styles variables	no*	
		Other	specimens were accidentally thawed or not	54/132 (41%) accidentally thawed

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	prostate cancer				132 (total)	456 (total)						
				<40 nmol/L				crude	OR	1.93	1.19-3.13		
				40-59 (reference)						1			
				≥60				crude		1.32	0.69-2.56		
				<40 nmol/L				adjusted	OR	1.88	1.15-		

											3.08		
				40-59 (reference)						1			
				≥60				adjusted		1.25	0.64-2.43		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
17301263	Tuohimaa	some data reported in Tuohimaa 2004

	2007	UI 14618623

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17301263	Tuohimaa 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	N	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	N	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Y	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	41% of the specimens were accidentally thawed; no explicit information provided for adjustment for additional factors relevant to vitamin D

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16339476	Umesawa 2006	Cohort study	40-79 y	Stroke, CHD, cancer, valid FFQ	1988-1990	Japan Collaborative Cohort	Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16339476	Umesawa 2006	Cohort study	Japan, various	53,387	53,387	56	40-79	39%	Japanese	Men 22.7 Women 22.9	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
16339476	Umesawa 2006	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Japan Food Table v4	No (data from other study reported)					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16339476	Umesawa 2006	1°	Total stroke mortality	Death certificates (ICD-9 & 10)
			specific stroke data	not extracted
		2°	Coronary heart disease mortality	Death certificates (ICD-9 & 10)
		2°	Total CVD mortality	Death certificates (ICD-9 & 10), "total CVD" not defined

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16339476	Umesawa 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	K intake, total energy intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	HTN, DM
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, EtOH
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N (person years)	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
MEN														
16339476	Umesawa 2006	Total stroke death	Calcium intake quintile 1		250	61	4623	8.9 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	0.13
			quintile 2		363	76	4624				1.14	0.76 ,1.70	NS	
			quintile 3		449	69	4623				0.90	0.56, 1.45	NS	
			quintile 4		536	59	4624				0.69	0.40, 1.18	NS	
			quintile 5		665	57	4623				0.68	0.37, 1.26	NS	
WOMEN														
16339476	Umesawa 2006	Total stroke death	Calcium intake quintile 1		266	70	7121	8.9 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	.01
			quintile 2		379	82	7122				1.38	0.95, 2.01	NS	
			quintile 3		462	73	7122				1.24	0.79, 1.95	NS	
			quintile 4		545	42	7122				0.69	0.40, 1.18	NS	
			quintile 5		667	55	7122				0.94	0.51, 1.72	NS	
MEN														
16339476	Umesawa 2006	CHD death	Calcium intake quintile 1		250	37	4623	8.9 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	0.43
			quintile 2		363	26	4624				0.84	0.47, 1.50	NS	
			quintile 3		449	33	4623				1.20	0.62, 2.30	NS	
			quintile 4		536	32	4624				1.27	0.60, 2.68	NS	
			quintile 5		665	20	4623				0.92	0.37, 2.29	NS	
WOMEN														
16339476	Umesawa 2006	CHD death	Calcium intake quintile 1		266	38	7121	8.9 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	0.50
			quintile 2		379	21	7122				0.88	0.48, 1.62	NS	

			quintile 3		462	25	7122				1.28	0.62, 2.61	NS	
			quintile 4		545	17	7122				0.84	0.35, 2.02	NS	
			quintile 5		667	15	7122				0.87	0.31, 2.45	NS	
MEN														
16339476	Umesawa 2006	CVD death	Calcium intake quintile 1		250	140	4623	8.9 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	0.95
			quintile 2		363	141	4624				0.98	0.75, 1.30	NS	
			quintile 3		449	135	4623				0.93	0.67, 1.29	NS	
			quintile 4		536	135	4624				0.92	0.64, 1.32	NS	
			quintile 5		665	134	4623				0.97	0.64, 1.48	NS	
WOMEN														
16339476	Umesawa 2006	CVD death	Calcium intake quintile 1		266	153	7121	8.9 y	Adjusted "multivariate"	RR	1.0	--	--	0.14
			quintile 2		379	156	7122				1.29	0.99, 1.67	NS	
			quintile 3		462	136	7122				1.24	0.90, 1.69	NS	
			quintile 4		545	98	7122				0.92	0.64, 1.34	NS	
			quintile 5		667	101	7122				1.14	0.74, 1.74	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16339476	Umesawa 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y #	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	N ##	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A (B for total CVD mortality)
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Definition of CVD mortality implied only

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

Median only

CVD

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18635855	Umesawa 2008	Cohort Study	40-59 y	MI, angina, stroke, cancer at baseline	1990	Japan Public Health Center (JPHC)–based study (cohort I)	Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18635855	Umesawa 2008	Cohort Study	4 areas Japan Okinawa (24°) to Akita (40°)	41,526	41,526	~49 (nd)	40-59	48%	Japanese	~23.5	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
18635855	Umesawa 2008	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	Yes Spearman rank correlation coefficient 0.41					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18635855	Umesawa 2008	1°	Stroke incidence (also stroke subtypes)	Participant reporting and hospital medical record review (National Survey of Stroke criteria)
18635855	Umesawa 2008	1°	Fatal stroke	Death certificates & medical records
18635855	Umesawa 2008	2°	Coronary heart disease	MI, sudden cardiac death, per participant reporting and medical record review (standard criteria)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18635855	Umesawa 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Na intake, K intake, n-3 fa intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, sex
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM, HTN
		Medication	Yes	for hypercholesterolemia
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, EtOH
		Other	Yes	Menopause

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Median Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	N (Person-yr)	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
18635855	Umesawa 2008	Total stroke	Ca intake Quintile 1		233	314	~8305 (112,018)	13 y	Adjusted ("multivariable+HTN)	HR	1.00	--	--	.02
			Quintile 2		344	257	~8305 (106,354)				0.94	0.79, 1.13	NS	
			Quintile 3		439	252	~8305 (106,435)				0.79	0.65, 0.97	<0.05	
			Quintile 4		603	247	~8305 (104,697)				0.78	0.63, 0.96	<0.05	
			Quintile 5		753	251	~8305 (104,186)				0.71	0.56, 0.89	<0.05	
18635855	Umesawa 2008	CHD	Ca intake Quintile 1		233	72	~8305 (112,018)		Adjusted ("multivariable+HTN)	HR	1.00	--	--	NS
			Quintile 2		344	72	~8305 (106,354)				1.18	0.83, 1.68	NS	
			Quintile 3		439	56	~8305 (106,435)				0.91	0.60, 1.37	NS	
			Quintile 4		603	58	~8305 (104,697)				1.08	0.71, 1.65	NS	
			Quintile 5		753	64	~8305 (104,186)				0.93	0.58, 1.50	NS	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18635855	Umesawa 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive ? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Well conducted. Generally well reported.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
3788835	Van Beresteyn 1986	RCT	Female dietetic students 20-23 yrs of age, 49-76 kg bodyweight, not receiving any medical treatment at time of recruitment	nd	nd	Nd	Netherlands Institute for Dairy Research	KP

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
3788835	Van Beresteyn	RCT	Netherlands (52°N)	58	58	21(1.0)	20-23	0%	Nd	Bodyweight = 49-76 kg	Nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
3788835	Van Beresteyn	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				Nd	Nd	Nd	Nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake	Specially developed questionnaire (CIVO/TNO Department for Toxicology and Nutrition, Zeist, The Netherlands)	Dutch computerized food composition table	N					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
3788835	Van Beresteyn	Calcium	Calcium powder containing calcium carbonate, citric acid, sodium-hydrogen carbonate, dextrose, and corn flour. Powders were consumed with lemonade or apple juice.	1500 mg Ca++	6 weeks	Three times a day
		placebo	Placebo powder containing citric acid, sodium-hydrogen carbonate, dextrose, and corn flour. Powders were consumed with lemonade or apple juice.	0 mg Ca++	6 weeks	Three times a day
Co-intervention(s) *:			NA			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
3788835	Van Beresteyn	Secondary	Body weight	Body weight in kg

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
3788835	Van Beresteyn	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
3788835	Van Beresteyn	Body weight	Kg	Calcium	6 weeks	29	61.8	SD = 6.9	Final = 61.5	Final SD = 6.4	0.8	Nd	Not significant
				placebo	6 weeks	29	62.5	SD = 6.9	Final = 63.0	Final SD = 6.6			
		BMI	Kg/m^2	Calcium	6 weeks	29	20.8	SD = 2.0	Final = 20.7	Final SD = 1.9	0.2	Nd	Not significant
				placebo	6 weeks	29	21.0	SD = 1.9	Final = 21.1	Final SD = 1.8			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR,	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD	P between groups***	P for trend****

			Groups				N**			%)		**		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
3788835	Van Beresteyn	RCT-parallel	nd	nd	nd	Y	nd	nd	Y	N	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No information on blinding, dropouts (or lack thereof)

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18065592	van der Pols 2007	Cohort study	Residence in England and Scotland	Subjects could not identified through the National Health Service Central Register, censored before 1948, lost to follow-up	1937-1939	The Boyd Orr cohort	The World Cancer Research Fund, The National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia	JHL

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18065592	van der Pols 2007	Cohort study	England (54° N) Scotland (55° 57' N)	1343 families	4374 children	7.6 (sd, nd)	4-11 yr	49.5%	nd	Height z score: -0.01 BMI z score: 0.01	nd	Nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18065592	van der Pols 2007	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
18065592	van der Pols 2007	Dietary calcium intake	7-d household inventory method	Diet in, data-out program (DIDO software; Medical Research Council Human Nutrition Research Center, Cambridge, United Kingdom), Fruit and vegetable consumption (McCance and Widdowson's The Composition of Foods) Prewar food tables were used to adapt the database if the composition of 1930s foods was very different from that of foods today, or if there was no modern-day equivalent.	nd					Ca 547.82 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18065592	van der Pols 2007	nd	Colorectal cancer	Derived from the presence of a cancer code anywhere on the death certificate or from the first cancer that was registered.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18065592	van der Pols 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Energy, fruit intakes	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes* - age, gender	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18065592	van der Pols 2007	Colorectal cancer	Ca intake did not have a clear independent association with colorectal cancer risk in this population (multivariate adjusted OR for highest vs. lowest intake: 1.91; 95% CI: 0.84. 4.32; P for trend=0.18) CRC cases =76

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18065592	van der Pols 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Per capita food and nutrient intake were calculated by dividing daily total intake by the total number of household members. Childhood diet was based on household rather than individual consumption. 7 day diet inventory instead of FFQ; cases not confirmed by histology reports blinding not reported; power calculation not reported; blinding not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	Cohort study	Civil servants or spouses 40-65 yo	nd on survival or cause of death, Ca intake, men <1500 Kcal/day, women <1250 Kcal/day	1953-54	Dutch civil servants	Heart foundation	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	Cohort study	Amsterdam, Netherlands 52°	2925 (incl those with nd)	2605	52	40-65	51%	White (implied)	Men 24.6 Women 26.3	All	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	Dietary calcium intake	1 week FFQ	Dutch Food Composition Tables	N					Ca intake Men 928±413 mg Women 660±283 mg

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	1°	CVD mortality	Death certificates, national records of cause of death ICD codes
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	1°	CHD mortality	same
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	2°	All cause mortality	same

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	smoking, EtOH
		Other	Yes	SBP, cholesterol

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Follow-up	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	All cause mortality, men	Quintile 1	28 y	≤585	nd	271	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.7-1.5	NS	
			Quintiles 2-4		585-1245	nd	798			0.9	0.7-1.2	NS	
			Quintile 5		>1245	nd	271			1.0	--		
		All cause mortality, women	Quintile 1	28 y	≤445	nd	258	Adjusted	OR	1.3	0.8-2.0	NS	
			Quintiles 2-4		445-850	nd	750			1.2	0.8-1.8	NS	
			Quintile 5		>850	nd	257			1.0	--		
		CVD mortality, men	Quintile 1	28 y	≤585	31.9% (age adj)	271	Adjusted	OR	1.3	0.8-1.9	NS	
			Quintiles 2-4		585-1245	26.7%	798			1.1	0.8-1.5	NS	
			Quintile 5		>1245	24.9%	271			1.0	--		
		CVD mortality, women	Quintile 1	28 y	≤445	14.6% (age adj)	258	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.6-2.0	NS	
			Quintiles 2-4		445-850	14.4%	750			1.1	0.7-1.7	NS	
			Quintile 5		>850	12.6%	257			1.0	--		
		CHD mortality, men	Quintile 1	28 y	≤585	16.6% (age adj)	271	Adjusted	OR	0.9	0.6-1.6	NS	
			Quintiles 2-4		585-1245	15.1%	798			1.0	0.6-1.5	NS	
			Quintile 5		>1245	14.5%	271			1.0	--		
		CHD mortality, women	Quintile 1	28 y	≤445	6.2% (age adj)	258	Adjusted	OR	1.1	0.5-2.5	NS	
			Quintiles 2-4		445-850	6.3%	750			1.2	0.6-2.3	NS	
			Quintile 5		>850	4.4%	257			1.0	--		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	Same outcomes	Similar results at 15 y follow-up, results not shown.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
1544755	van der Vijver 1992	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Analyses simplistic. More complete analyses were not performed.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16960177	Visser 2006	Cohort study (posthoc)	representative Dutch older population (≥65 y); born before 1930; has blood sample	not living independently; no blood sample; missing contact information	1996	Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam	government	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16960177	Visser 2006	Cohort study	W, NE, S of the Netherlands	1260	1260	≥65 y	65 to ≥80 y	51	nd	BMI <25 to ≥30	31-41% with CVD; 44-59% with arthritis	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16960177	Visser 2006	25(OH)D				Competitive protein-binding (Nichols Diagnostics, CA)	Y interassay CV <15%	1-2 y	nd	nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16960177	Visser 2006	primary	mortality	by death certificate

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16960177	Visser 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes* age, sex, education	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes* frailty indicators and lifestyle variables	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
16960177	Visser 2006	mortality											

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of cases (events)*	Total N	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
16960177	Visser 2006	mortality	published cutoffs 25(OH)D	<25 nmol/L		66	127	adjusted for sex, age, education	HR	1.61	1.09-2.37		0.0058
				25-49.9		42	462			1.17	0.85-1.62		
				50-74.9		30	440			0.93	0.67-1.29		
				≥75		29	231			1.0			
16960177	Visser	mortality	published cutoffs	<25		66	127	adjusted for		1.54	1.04-		0.021

	2006		25(OH)D					above plus chronic diseases, serum creatinine, cognition, depressive symptoms			2.29		
				25-49.9		42	462			1.11	0.80-1.54		
				50-74.9		30	440			0.95	0.68-1.32		
				≥75		29	231			1.0			
16960177	Visser 2006	mortality	published cutoffs 25(OH)D	<25		66	127	adjusted for above plus lifestyle variables		1.47	0.99-2.19		0.046
				25-49.9		42	462			1.08	0.78-1.51		
				50-74.9		30	440			0.95	0.68-1.32		
				≥75		29	231			1.0			
16960177	Visser 2006	mortality	published cutoffs 25(OH)D	<25		66	127	adjusted for above plus frailty indicators		1.28	0.85-1.92		0.19
				25-49.9		42	462			1.00	0.72-1.40		
				50-74.9		30	440			0.91	0.65-1.26		
				≥75		29	231			1.0			

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
16960177	Visser 2006	mortality	association did not differ significantly between men and women or between subjects aged <70, 70-79, and ≥80 y (P>0.33); subjects who were excluded from this study were more likely to die (59.4%) than the ones included (30.2%).

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
16960177	Visser 2006	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	N	a) One of the prespecified methods was used? (y/n)	N	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	N
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	posthoc analysis; reported results are likely biased because selected only subjects with available blood sample and subjects who were excluded from this study were more likely to die than the ones included

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	1. RCT (for supplement part of study) 2. Case-cohort***	RCT part: • Postmenopausal women (aged 50-79) (n=36282) Case-cohort part: • Cases: invasive colorectal cancer (n=317; although 322 cases were found in the entire study…) • Controls: 1:1 matching colorectal cancer free participants by age, center, race, ethnic group (n=317)	RCT part: • Predicted survival of less than three 3years • a history of renal calculi or hypercalcemia • current use of oral corticosteroids • current daily use of at least 600IU of supplemental vitamin D or calcitriol Case-cohort part: Cases: carcinoma in situ and primary cancers of other sites Inadequate serum (11 pairs [cases+controls])	1993-1998 (after 1-year run-in period followed, patients were randomized in between 1995-2000)	1. Women's Health Initiative randomized trials 2. Ca+VitD supplementation trial	NHLBI, DHHS	JHL/TTe
18092326	Ding 2008	RCT						

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT
***After a review of initial findings, a nested case-control study was proposed to determine whether the serum 25-hydroxyvitaminD level at baseline modified the outcome.

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	1. RCT (for supplement part of study) 2. Case-cohort	US (38˚ N)	RCT part: 36282 (Ca+vitD supplements n=18176, placebo n=18106) Case-cohort part: 634 (cases n=317, controls n=317)	RCT part: 36282 Case-cohort part: 612 (cases n=306, controls n=306)	nd	50-79y	0%	White 83.1% Black 9.1% Hispanic 4.2% Indian/Alaskan Native 0.4% Asian or Pacific Islander 2.0% Unknown 1.2%	nd	Previous polyps: 8% Family Hx: 15% Aspirin: 19.4% HRT: 68.3% Participants of other trials: WHI hormone therapy trial: 56% WHI dietary modification trial: 31%	nd
18092326	Ding 2008	RCT			N=16089							

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
16481636 18092326	Wactawski-Wende 2006 Ding 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	Y, interassay coefficient of variation=11.8%	nd	nd	nd
16481636 18092326	Wactawski-Wende 2006 Ding 2008	Dietary calcium intake	nd	nd	nd					Ca (supplements+diet) <800mg/d(%)=34 800-<1200mg/d(%)=26.3 ≥1200mg/d(%)=39.6

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
16481636 18092326	Wactawski-Wende 2006 Ding 2008	VitD+Ca	VitD – GlaxoSmithKline Ca – calcium carbonate	VitD 400 IU Ca 1000 mg	7y	200IU of VitD twice daily 500mg of Ca twice daily
		placebo	"identical appearing placebo tablet"	NA	7y	Taken twice daily
Co-intervention(s) *:			54%of the participants enrolled in the trial of dietary modification, 69% enrolled in the trial of dietary modification and 14% participated in the both trials.			
Compliance/Adherence:			During year 1, 60% of the participants took at least 80% of their study medication, and this % remained stable through year 6, with small differences between groups. At least 70 % took 50% or more of their study medication through year 6.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
16481636 & 18092326	Wactawski-Wende 2006 & Ding 2008	Secondary (primary: hip fracture)	(Invasive) colorectal cancer	Verified in a blinded fashion and coded with the use of the surveillance, epidemiology, and end results system; 99.4% of reported cancers were centrally confirmed. A total of 339 colorectal cancers. Of these, 9 were in situ and 8 were primary cancers of other sites. (Excluded in situ and primary cancers of other sites)
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	(Invasive) colon cancer	Excluded in situ and primary cancers of other sites
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	(invasive) rectal cancer	Excluded in situ and primary cancers of other sites
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	All cause mortality	nd
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	Death from colorectal cancer	Death from colorectal cancer
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	Intestinal polyps	Intestinal polyps based on participants' self-report not centrally verified.
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	Kidney stone	Kidney stone based on participants' self-report not centrally verified.
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	Total cancer incidence	Intestinal polyps based on participants' self-report not centrally verified.
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	nd	Cancer related mortality	Kidney stone based on participants' self-report not centrally verified.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
16481636 18092326	Wactawski-Wende 2006 Ding 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		No significant interactions were found with any baseline characteristic examined. ([Shown in Figure 1] Baseline characteristics: age at screening, race or ethnic group, education, first-degree relative with colorectal cancer, history of poly removal, BMI, physical activity, total energy intake, energy from saturated fat, total calcium intake, total vitD intake, region according to solar irradiance, multivitamin use, smoking status, NSAID use, hormone therapy use, enrollment in WHI hormone therapy trials, enrollment in WHI dietary modification trail)
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	
		Medical conditions	History of colorectal cancer	
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	
		Other	Clinical center	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Invasive colorectal cancer	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	168	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				1.08	0.86-1.34	0.51
			Placebo	84	154	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Invasive colon cancer	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	128	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				1.00	0.78-1.28	0.99
			Placebo	84	126	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Invasive rectal cancer	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	44	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				1.46	0.92-2.32	0.11
			Placebo	84	30	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Death from colorectal cancer	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	34	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				0.82	0.52-1.29	0.39
			Placebo	84	41	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	All cause mortality	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	744	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				0.91	0.83-1.01	0.07
			Placebo	84	807	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Total cancer	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	1634	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				0.98	0.91-1.05	0.53
			Placebo	84	1655	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Cancer mortality	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	344	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				0.89	0.77-1.03	0.12
			Placebo	84	382	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Kidney stone (UL)	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	449	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				1.17	1.02-1.34	0.02
			Placebo	84	381	18106							
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Intestinal Polyp	VitD 400 IU + Ca 1000 mg	84	2983	18176	HR Vit D+Ca / placebo				0.99	0.94-1.04	0.71
			Placebo	84	2997	18106							

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18092326	Ding 2008	Colorectal cancer	While Ca + vitamin D supplementation among women concurrently assigned to estrogen therapies suggested increased risk (HR=1.5, 95% CI: 0.96, 2.33), among women concurrently assigned to placebo arms of the estrogen trials, Ca + vitamin D indicated suggestive benefits (HR=0.71, 95% CI=0.46-1.09) (p-for-estrogen-interaction=0.018)

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

Nested Case-Control study

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases **	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	Invasive colorectal cancer	25-hydroxyvitaminD group 1	≥58.4nmol/liter		60	93	Adjusted	OR	1.00			0.02
			25-hydroxyvitaminD group 2	42.4-58.3nmol/liter		78	73	Adjusted	OR	1.96	1.18-3.24		
			25-hydroxyvitaminD group 3	31.0-42.3nmol/liter		80	73	Adjusted	OR	1.95	1.18-3.24		
			25-hydroxyvitaminD group 4	<31.0nmol/liter		88	67	Adjusted	OR	2.53	1.49-4.32		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
16481636	Wactawski-Wende 2006	RCT-parallel	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	Kidney stones
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Original study was designed for assessing the risks and benefits of hormone therapy and dietary modification. At the time the study ended, 352 women assigned to calcium with vitamin D supplements and 332 women assigned to placebo had withdrawn; 144 and 152, respectively, had been lost to follow-up. This study was downgraded to B because there are very serious problems with WHI as a study reporting no association of Ca+D on endpoints. The most prominent problem with the trial as evidence for no association for Ca+D is the poor compliance with study treatment. Another serious problem is the allowance in the trial of use of supplements. The trial is a B when reporting no association because non-compliance and the "contamination" of the non-intervention group would cause bias to the null. It was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18092326	Ding 2008	RCT-parallel	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	The reduced sample size (<50%) of the original WHI power calculations assuming no interaction with estrogen therapies It was the consensus among the Tufts EPC that overall, the methodological quality of the trial was B, particularly when the trial is being used to guide decisions about DRI, as opposed to decisions about whether to actively recommend supplementation for an individual woman.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):									
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):									

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17661565	Wagner 2006	RCT	Fully lactating mothers within 1 mo postpartum	DM; HTN; parathyroid disease; uncontrolled thyroid disease	nd	-	academic; NIH	SI

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17661565	Wagner 2006	RCT	Charleston, SC 32°47'N	19	19	29		0	89% white			dietary calcium intake: 1125 mg/d; dietary vit D 273 IU/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17661565	Wagner 2006	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA	n			dietary vit D 273 IU/d
17661565	Wagner 2006	Dietary calcium intake	Block 1998.2 FFQ		n					calcium intake: 1125 mg/d

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
17661565	Wagner 2006		United Research Labs, PA RXChoice®, NY	mom: 400 IU vit D3 infant: 300 IU vit D3/d	6 mo	one prenatal vitamin and two placebo study tablets qd
17661565	Wagner 2006		United Research Labs, PA; Tishcon Corp., NY	mom: 400 IU + 6000 IU vit D3 infant: placebo drops		one prenatal vitamin and two vitamin D study tablets qd
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			≥80% for mom; as low as 61% for infants			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17661565	Wagner 2006	primary	25(OH)D level in mom	
17661565	Wagner 2006		vit D3 level in mom	
17661565	Wagner 2006		25(OH)D level in infant	
17661565	Wagner 2006		anti-rachitic activity in milk	vit D3 and 25 (OH)D in milk converted into biological activity using reference data
17661565	Wagner 2006		infant weight and length	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
17661565	Wagner 2006	subjects compensated with gift cards

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17661565	Wagner 2006	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	age, race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes*	changes in skin pigmentation
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes*	outdoor activities
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
17661565	Wagner 2006	mom 25 (OH)D at 1 mo	ng/mL	mom 400		10			32.2				nd
				mom 6400		9			34				
		at 2 mo		mom 400		10			35.1				
				mom 6400		9			47.1				
		at 3 mo		mom 400		10			35.1				
				mom 6400		9			48.4				
		at 4 mo		mom 400		10			28.9				
				mom 6400		9			45				
		at 5 mo		mom 400		10			25.9				
				mom 6400		9			50.6				
		at 6 mo		mom 400		10			33.5				
				mom 6400		9			51.9				
		at 7 mo		mom 400		10			38.4				
				mom 6400		9			58.8				
17661565	Wagner 2006	mom vit D3 level at 1 mo	ng/mL	mom 400		10			2.2				nd
				mom 6400		9			4.1				
		at 2 mo		mom 400		10			2.8				
				mom 6400		9			30.3				
		at 3 mo		mom 400		10			3.5				
				mom 6400		9			32.4				
		at 4 mo		mom 400		10			2.8				
				mom 6400		9			39.2				

		at 5 mo		mom 400		10			3.7				
				mom 6400		9			49.6				
		at 6 mo		mom 400		10			5.3				
				mom 6400		9			43.9				
		at 7 mo		mom 400		10			4				
				mom 6400		9			49.7				
17661565	Wagner 2006	antirachitic activity in milk at 1 mo	IU	mom 400		10			59.6				nd
				mom 6400		9			82.4				
		at 2 mo		mom 400		10			71.2				
				mom 6400		9			387				
		at 3 mo		mom 400		10			78.6				
				mom 6400		9			370.5				
		at 4 mo		mom 400		10			45.7				
				mom 6400		9			374.4				
		at 5 mo		mom 400		10			68.3				
				mom 6400		9			555.2				
		at 6 mo		mom 400		10			69.9				
				mom 6400		9			624.5				
		at 7 mo		mom 400		10			76.3				
				mom 6400		9			873.5				<0.0003
17661565	Wagner 2006	infant 25 (OH)D at 1 mo	ng/mL	infant 300		10			13				nd
				infant placebo		9			14				
		at 2 mo		infant 300		10			33				
				infant placebo		9			36				
		at 7 mo		infant 300		10			43				
				infant placebo		9			46				
		infant weight at 1 mo	Kg	infant 300		10			4.7	0.4			0.80
				infant placebo		9			4.6	0.7			
		at 4 mo		infant 300		10			6.7	0.5			0.91
				infant placebo		9			6.6	0.8			
		at 7 mo		infant 300		10			7.6	0.8			0.30
				infant placebo		9			8.4	1.1			
		infant length at 1 mo	cm	infant 300		10			54.6	1.1			0.29
				infant placebo		9			55.9	2.9			
		at 4 mo		infant 300		10			62.4	1.7			0.75
				infant placebo		9			62.8	1.9			
		at 7 mo		infant 300		10			65.5	1.8			0.06
				infant placebo		9			69.3	2.9			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
17661565	Wagner 2006	RCT	Y	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	pilot study, small sample size, details of analysis not reported; up to 39% of infants might not have received the intended intervention

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18259007	Wang 2008	Cohort Study	Women US health professionals, ≥45 y	CVD, Nonmelanoma cancer, insufficient completion of FFQ, implausible total energy intake (not defined), Baseline HTN (self reported MD diagnosis, SBP≥140, DBP≥90, or antihypertensive drug)	1992-1995	Women's Health Study	Gov't	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18259007	Wang 2008	Cohort Study	US various	28,886	28,886	53.8 (~6.5)	≥45 y	0%	~94% white	~25.1±~4.5	Healthy	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				nd				
18259007	Wang 2008	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	Harvard School of Public Health	No, but in "similar cohorts of health professionals" data provided					nd

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18259007	Wang 2008	1°	Incident HTN	At least 1 of: self report of new physician diagnosis; self-report starting antihypertensive drug; self-report SBP≥140 mm Hg; self-report DBP≥90 mm Hg (censored on the date of CVD diagnosis)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18259007	Wang 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Total energy intake; fruit, vegetable, whole grain, red meat intake
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, Race
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM, hypercholestolemia
		Medication	Yes	randomization to aspirin, vitamin E, multivitamin use
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Smoking, EtOH, physical activity
		Other		Menopausal status

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Median (range) Vit D dose	Median (range) Ca intake	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
18259007	Wang 2008	Incident HTN	Dietary Calcium Quintile 1		483.5 (189-557.9)	1860	5777	10 y	Adjusted (“multivariate)	HR	1.00	--		<.0001
			Quintile 2		620.4 (558-678.9)	1778	5777				0.96	0.90, 1.03	NS	
			Quintile 3		739.6 (679-801.9)	1626	5777				0.89	0.83, 0.95	<.05	
			Quintile 4		883.5 (802-999.9)	1634	5777				0.89	0.83, 0.95	<.05	
			Quintile 5		1170.4 (1000-2559)	1631	5777				0.87	0.81, 0.93	<.05	
18259007	Wang 2008	Incident HTN	Supplement Vit D Quartile 1	0 (0)		5745	nd	10 y	Adjusted (“multivariate)	HR	1.00	--		
			Quartile 2	228 (2-249)		951	nd				1.00	0.93, 1.09	NS	
			Quartile 3	400 (250-399)		1648	nd				1.03	0.96, 1.11	NS	
			Quartile 4	800 (400-2000)		185	nd				1.09	0.93, 1.27	NS	0.27

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18259007	Wang 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	?
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N#					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	Calcium: A Vit D: C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Good methods and analysis of Calcium. Vitamin D analysis poorly described. Minor errors in text regarding methods for Vit D analysis. Report that vitamin D analyzed in 4 “quintiles” (sic), but bottom quintile is no vitamin D supplement and nd given on numbers of participants in each group.

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

\# **Data reported for similar studies**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18180395	Wang 2008	Cohort study	Framingham Offspring 25(OH)D measured 1996-2000	Prevalent CVD or CKD	1996-2000 (originally 1971)	Framingham Offspring	nd	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18180395	Wang 2008	Cohort study	Probably mostly still around Framingham, MA 42°	1739 (Originally 5124)	1739	59 (9)	nd	45%	White 100%	BMI 28.1	No CVD, CKD	Vit D supplement 4% Multivitamin 41%

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18180395	Wang 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				RIA (DiaSorin)	Yes CoV 8.5% (intraassay); 13.2% (interassay)	≤3 yr		nd
		Dietary calcium intake								

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18180395	Wang 2008	Primary	First cardiovascular event	MI, coronary insufficiency, angina, stroke, TIA, claudication, heart failure (all defined per Framingham study criteria)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18180395	Wang 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes	Use of Vit D containing supplements
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Age, sex, education (<12 y)
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes	BMI
		Medical conditions	Yes	DM
		Medication	Yes	anti-HTNive
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location)	Yes	Season of blood draw Physical activity
		Smoking and other life styles variables	Yes	Smoking
		Other	Yes	SBP, TC/HDL, SCr, (CRP, analysis not included here)

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw
18180395	Wang 2008	CV event	25(OH)D <15 ng/mL	5.4 yr	50	481	Unadjusted: Rate (age and sex adjusted) Adjusted: HR	8.9%	5.5, 12.2	nd	1.70	1.08, 2.67	.02
			25(OH)D ≥15 ng/mL		70	1258		4.4%	2.8, 5.9				

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas

*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section

**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18180395	Wang 2008	CV event	Severe deficiency	<10 ng/mL		nd	nd	Adjusted†	HR	1.80	1.05, 3.08	<.05	.01
			Deficiency	10-<15 ng/mL		nd	nd	Adjusted†	HR	1.53	1.00, 2.36	P=.05	
			Referent	≥15 ng/mL		70	1258	Adjusted†					

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

† **Not** adjusted for physical activity, vit D suppl, educational attainment, season.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18180395	Wang 2008	CV event	Multivariable Cox with continuous 25(OH)D and regression splines with nonlinear relationship: Suggest increased hazard at 25(OH)D levels below 15-20 ng/mL (see figure 2, page 508).

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
18180395	Wang 2008	There are also analyses based on prespecified subgroups analyses by HTN status.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18180395	Wang 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	NA	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	NA	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	Y					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	NA					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	A (though C for 3 category results)
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Rigorous, appropriate adjustments (except for 3 category results, which were not fully adjusted, particularly including season), well analyzed and reported.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18988909	Weng 2008	Cohort study	> 40 yrs old (n=3282) Total energy intake range between 500 to 5500 kcal/d for men and 500 to 4000 kcal/d for women	Hx of cancer, stroke which may have changed their dietary habits (n=84), and people who had missing values for FFQ (n=613), for other variables (n=797), or was lost to follow-up (n=11). Also excluded those with extreme dietary data (n=5)	1989-2002	CVD-FACTS	National Health Research Institutes in Taiwan	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18988909	Weng 2008	Cohort study	Taiwan	3282	1772	Stroke group = 62.6(8.1) Nonevent group=56.1(9.8)	nd	44%	nd	Mean BMI stroke group=25.3(3.4) Mean BMI nonevent group=24.4(3.3)	10.5% diabetics, 4.2% self-report heart disease, 17% use antihypertensive medication	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
18988909	Weng 2008	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	N (but authors state that the FFQ was validated previously by comparing to 15-days food records)	no			nd	nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank

**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18988909	Weng 2008	nd	stroke	Self-reported and cross-checked by medical records or death certificates

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18988909	Weng 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes	Matched on gender, adjusted for age
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions	Yes	Adjusted for DM, htn, heart disease, hypertriglceridemia
		Medication	Yes	Adjusted for use of htn meds
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes	Matched on smoking hx, EtOH habits, physical activity
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
18988909	Weng 2008	stroke	Quartile 3 + Quartile 4		>591.50 mg			127	adjusted	HR	reference			
			Quartile 2		451.24-591.50 mg			127	adjusted	HR	1.49	0.99-2.24		
			Quartile 1		<451.24			127	adjusted	HR	1.52	0.98-2.35		0.031

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
18988909	Weng 2008	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Nd	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	Nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):							B										
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):							No data on exposure assessor blinded to outcome or outcome assessor blinded to exposure. Food composition database not reported.										

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9022561	Whelton, 1997	RCT	Healthy, 30-54 yo DBP 80-89 mm Hg	Treatment with antihypertensive	1987-88	TOHP	nd	EB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9022561	Whelton, 1997	RCT	10 sites	471	445	43~+/-6.6	30-54	68%	86% white	~83 Kg BMI ~27	Healthy Borderline DBP	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
9022561	Whelton, 1997	Dietary calcium intake	none	NA	NA					none

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
9022561	Whelton, 1997	Ca supplement	Ca carbonate	1 g	18 mo	500 mg 2x/day
		Placebo				
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			nd for Ca vs Placebo arms			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9022561	Whelton, 1997	1°	Change in SBP/DBP	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9022561	Whelton, 1997	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	No	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	No	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	No	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
9022561	Whelton, 1997	SBP	mm Hg	Ca supplement	18 mo	221	126.0	7.7	nd	nd	~-0.5 (figure)	~0.75	NS
				Placebo		224	125.4	8.8	nd	nd			
9022561	Whelton, 1997	DBP	mm Hg	Ca supplement	18 mo	221	84.1	2.9	nd	nd	~+0.3 (figure)	~0.5	NS
				Placebo		224	83.9	2.8	nd	nd			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
9022561	Whelton, 1997	RCT	nd	nd	NA	Y	nd	nd	probably	N	N	C

Adverse Event(s): **	nd
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No data on background diet. Ca vs Placebo analysis very poorly reported. Primary outcome of HTN incidence not reported. Clear results data not presented. Results not in text of results section.

NA=not applicable
***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**
****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
3620314	Wu, 1987	Cohort study	Residents who moved into the Large retirement community between June, 1981 and June 1982 were mailed a questionnaire on June 1982. A total of 11,888 (625) of the 19,752 residents returned the questionnaire.	Pre-existing CRC were excluded from the analysis	1982	nd	nd	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
3620314	Wu, 1987	Cohort study	About 50 miles south of Los Angeles, California [21° N]	11,888	11,644	nd	nd (to adjust for age, the cohort were divided into 4 age strata: <=64, 65-74, 75-84, >=85)	~33%	100% Caucasian (upper-middle socio-economic class)	nd	nd	nd

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
		25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$								
3620314	Wu, 1987	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ – 56 foods and coffee	USDA	N					nd

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.

*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
3620314	Wu, 1987	nd	Colorectal cancer	Pathological diagnosis of cancer from local hospitals was available among 85% study participants. In addition, all participants are sent a follow-up questionnaire on a biennial basis. All residents were followed until the diagnosis of CRC, death or March 31, 1985 whichever occurred first.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
3620314	Wu, 1987	No main result for calcium and CRC. Only subgroup analysis results by gender.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
3620314	Wu, 1987	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	no*	
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
3620314	Wu, 1987	CRC - male	Calcium intake Tertile 1 (low)	nd	nd	nd	nd*	Person-yrs= 13875	adjusted	RR	1		nd	nd
			Tertile 2	nd	nd	nd	nd*	Person-yrs= 13840	adjusted	RR	1.19	0.6, 2.2		
			Tertile 3 (high)	nd	nd	nd	nd*	Person-yrs= 13611	adjusted	RR	0.86	0.4, 1.7		
3620314	Wu, 1987	CRC - female	Calcium intake Tertile 1 (low)	nd	nd	nd	nd*	4.5 yr Person-yrs= 13875	adjusted	RR	1		nd	nd
			Tertile 2	nd	nd	nd	nd*	Person-yrs= 13840	adjusted	RR	0.9	0.5, 1.6		
			Tertile 3 (high)	nd	nd	nd	nd*	Person-yrs= 13611	adjusted	RR	0.89	0.5, 1.6		

***Total number of subjects (both male and female) per tertile: tertile 1=3865, tertile 2=3873; tertile 3=3828**

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
3620314	Wu, 1987	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	nd	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	N	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	N	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	Y	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	nd					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	nd
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	N	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Poor reporting of baseline characteristics and exposures' data. No adjustment for confounding other than age and sex. Confirmation by histology not performed for all cases; number of cases, non-cases per gender not provided

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
11904316	Wu 2002	Cohort study 1: HPFS Cohort study 2: NHS	HPFS: male dentists, podiatrists, pharmacists, optometrists, osteopaths, and veterinarians who were 40-75 years old and completed a mailed questionnaire requesting information on various exposures and medical diagnosis in 1986; and also completed a 131-item semi-quantitative FFQ at the same year (1986) (follow up FFQ included were mailed during the years: 1990, 1994) NHS: registered US nurses who were 30-55 years old and completed a mailed questionnaire requesting information on various exposures and medical diagnosis in 1976; and completed a 61-item semi-quantitative FFQ in 1980 (follow up FFQ included 121-134 items during the years: 1984, 1986, 1990, 1994)	HPFS: men who failed to fill in the FFQ at baseline or left a large number of items blank (>70); men with unreasonably high (>4200 kcal/day or low (<800 kcal/day) total energy intake; men with history of previous cancer (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer), and ulcerative colitis NHS: women who failed to fill in the FFQ at baseline or left a large number of items blank (>10); women with unreasonably high (>3500 kcal/day or low (<600 kcal/day) total energy intake; women with history of previous cancer (except for nonmelanoma skin cancer), and ulcerative colitis	HPFS: 1986 NHS: 1980	HPFS: Health Professionals Follow-up Study NHS: Nurses' Health Study	HPFS: NCI NHS: NCI	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others

**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
11904316	Wu 2002	Cohort study 1 (HPFS) Cohort study 2 (NHS)	HPFS: nd NHS: US	HPFS: 47344 NHS: 87998	HPFS: 47344 NHS: 87998	HPFS: 54.4 (nd) NHS: 46.6 (nd)	HPFS: nd NHS: nd	HPFS: 100 NHS: 0	HPFS: nd NHS: nd	HPFS: Average BMI (kg/m^2): 25.5 NHS: Average BMI (kg/m^2): 24.4	HPFS: %current smokers: 9.6; %aspirin users: 29.3; %family history CRC: 10; %history of polyps: 3.5; %previous endoscopy: 25.8; %current multivitamin supplementation: 41.6 NHS: %current smokers: 28.9; %aspirin users: 32.8; %family history CRC: 8.4; %history of polyps: 0.8; %previous endoscopy: 9.8; %current multivitamin supplementation: 34.1; %menopausal women: 33	HPFS: Average total energy intake (kcal/day): 1985; average vitamin D intake (IU/day): 363; average calcium intake (mg/day): 897 NHS: Average total energy intake (kcal/day): 1566; average vitamin D intake (IU/day): 292; average calcium intake (mg/day): 733

*Please copy from above

**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
11904316	Wu 2002	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
11904316	Wu 2002	Dietary calcium intake	HPFS: FFQ NHS: FFQ	HPFS: USDA and others (REF 33-36) NHS: USDA and others (REF 33-36)	y (REF 33-36) HPFS: Pearson correlation coefficient (energy adjusted) between calcium intake computed from the FFQ and average calcium intake of two 1-week diet records for 127 men: 0.53 (with supplements and without supplements) NHS: Pearson correlation coefficient (energy adjusted) between calcium intake computed from the FFQ and average calcium intake of two 1-week diet records for 191 women: 0.63 (with supplements); and 0.70 (without supplements)					NA

* Write “nd” if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
11904316	Wu 2002	primary	Primary adenocarcinoma	Reported as diagnosis of colon or rectal cancer by the patients and confirmed by reviewing medical records of pathology reports. Data extracted from pathology reports included: histology, anatomic location, and sage of cancer
		primary	Proximal (right sided) colon cancer	Colon cancer located in cecum, ascending colon, or transverse colon
		primary	Distal (left sided) colon cancer	Colon cancer located in descending colon, or sigmoid colon

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
11904316	Wu 2002	86 cases with colorectal cancer in HPFS and 97 cases with colorectal cancer in NHS were included in the analyses with missing information on anatomic site. These additional cases were confirmed by medical records, by autopsy, or death reports, or by reconfirming the self-reported diagnosis from the patients. Exclusion of these cases yielded similar results. Death was confirmed by the National Death Index or reports from family members

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
11904316	Wu 2002	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (red meat consumption)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (Age)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (BMI)	
		Medical conditions	Yes (family history CRC; for NHS only: menopausal status)	
		Medication	Yes (aspirin use; for NHS only: post-menopausal hormone use)	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (physical activity; pack-years of smoking before age 30; alcohol consumption)	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

HPFS: adjusted for age, BMI, family history CRC, aspirin use, red meat consumption, physical activity; pack-years of smoking before age 30, alcohol consumption (5 out of 313 confirmed cancer case subjects were excluded for cancer from subsite analyses because of insufficient information on cancer location)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11904316	Wu 2002	Primary adenocarcinoma (CRC)	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	47	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	0.17

			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	48	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.69	0.46-1.04	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	58	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.69	0.47-1.01	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		701-800	51	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.60	0.40-0.90	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	81	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.67	0.47-0.97	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	84	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.62	0.42-0.92	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	60	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.64	0.43-0.95	nd	
		Proximal (right sided) colon cancer	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	12	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	15	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.84	0.39-1.81	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	19	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.87	0.42-1.79	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		701-800	22	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.98	0.48-1.99	nd	0.91
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	34	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.06	0.54-2.07	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	24	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.01	0.50-2.05	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	24	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.92	0.45-1.87	nd	
		Distal (left sided) colon cancer	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	22	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	25	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.77	0.43-1.37	nd	0.12
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	25	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.64	0.36-1.14	nd	
			Cumulative		701-	16	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.41	0.21-	nd	

			average calcium intake (mg)		800							0.78		
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	28	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.51	0.29-0.91	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	18	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.46	0.24-0.86	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	24	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.58	0.32-1.05	nd	

NHS: adjusted for age, BMI, family history CRC, aspirin use, red meat consumption, physical activity; pack-years of smoking before age 30, alcohol consumption, post-menopausal hormone use, menopausal status

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11904316	Wu 2002	Primary adenocarcinoma (CRC)	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	70	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	0.35

			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	79	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.19	0.86-1.64	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	83	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.07	0.77-1.47	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		701-800	90	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.18	0.86-1.63	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	130	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.04	0.77-1.40	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	106	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.05	0.77-1.44	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	68	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.94	0.66-1.33	nd	
		Proximal (right sided) colon cancer	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	27	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	25	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.92	0.53-1.61	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	37	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.18	0.72-1.96	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		701-800	46	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.55	0.96-2.52	nd	0.32
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	56	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.13	0.70-1.81	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	50	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.28	0.79-2.08	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	35	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.28	0.75-2.16	nd	
		Distal (left sided) colon cancer	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	33	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	37	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.24	0.77-2.00	nd	0.06
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	40	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.16	0.72-1.85	nd	
			Cumulative		701-	33	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.98	0.60-	nd	

			average calcium intake (mg)		800							1.61		
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	46	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.78	0.49-1.25	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	40	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.91	0.56-1.48	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	24	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.73	0.41-1.27	nd	

NHS: adjusted for age, BMI, family history CRC, aspirin use, red meat consumption, physical activity; pack-years of smoking before age 30, alcohol consumption, post-menopausal hormone use, menopausal status

UI	**Author Year**	**Outcome**	**Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups**	**Mean Vit D level / dose**	**Mean Ca level / dose**	**No. of Cases (Event)***	**Total N****	**Mean Follow-up, mo**	**Crude or Adjusted analysis?**	**Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)**	**Outcome effect size**	**CI / SE / SD ****	**P between groups*****	**P for trend******
11904316	Wu 2002	Primary adenocarcinoma (CRC)	Total calcium intake at baseline (mg/day)		Lowest category	nd	20,599	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
11904316	Wu 2002	Primary adenocarcinoma (CRC)	Total calcium intake at baseline (mg/day)		Highest category	nd	5636	nd	adjusted	RR	0.83	0.64-1.09		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

HPFS and NHS: pooled analysis adjusted for age, BMI, family history CRC, aspirin use, red meat consumption, physical activity; pack-years of smoking before age 30, alcohol consumption, post-menopausal hormone use, menopausal status

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
11904316	Wu 2002	Proximal (right sided) colon cancer	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	70	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	0.41

			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	79	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.90	0.57-1.04	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	83	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.07	0.71-1.62	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		701-800	90	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.33	0.87-2.04	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	130	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.10	0.75-1.63	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	106	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.19	0.80-1.77	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	68	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.14	0.72-1.81	nd	
		Distal (left sided) colon cancer	Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		≤ 500	70	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.00		nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		501-600	79	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	1.01	0.64-1.59	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		601-700	83	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.88	0.50-1.57	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		701-800	90	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.65	0.28-1.53	nd	0.01
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		801-100	130	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.65	0.44-0.98	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		1001-1250	106	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.67	0.34-1.30	nd	
			Cumulative average calcium intake (mg)		>1250	68	nd	nd	adjusted	RR	0.65	0.43-0.98	nd	

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
11904316	Wu 2002	HPFS: follow up years, 1986-1996; multivariate adjustment did not substantially alter the age specific estimates; results were similar when baseline total calcium intake was used without updating dietary information. NHS: follow up years, 1980-1996; multivariate adjustment did not substantially alter the age specific estimates; the inverse association between CRC and baseline total calcium intake (without updating dietary information) was stronger

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

HPFS

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11904316	Wu 2002	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only		a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Assessor blinding not reported; post-hoc analyses; power calculation not reported; results are not reported completely; data on several analyses are not shown

NHS

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
11904316	Wu 2002	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only		a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Assessor blinding not reported; post-hoc analyses; power calculation not reported; results are not reported completely; data on several analyses are not shown

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
17623801	Wu 2007	Case-cohort study	• Male US health professionals (N=51,129) • subjects provided a blood sample in 1993 -1995 (N=18,225) • Cases: colorectal cancer diagnosed between 1993-01/2002 • Controls: 1:2 matching by age (<2 y), year of enrollment, month of blood donation (<1 mo)	nd	1986	Health Professionals Follow-up Study (HPFS) cohort	National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health (DiaSorin Corp (Maker of Vit D assay kit))	JHL/TTe

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
17623801	Wu 2007	Case-cohort study	US, various	Original cohort (N=51,129), subjects provided a blood sample (N=18,225), cases (N=179) and controls (n=356)	535	66.2	nd	100	nd	BMI 25.7	Aspirin use in 1994: 40% Current smoking: 5% Previous colonoscopy: 65%	Vit D: 455.7 IU/d Ca: 939 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
17623801	Wu 2007	25(OH)D				RIA	Intrapair coefficient of variation (CV)=10.1% (n=15 triplets [1 case and 2 matching controls])	~7 to 14 y (based on blood collection, last follow-up, submission)	Winter: 28% Spring/Fall: 21% Summer: 52%	455.7 IU/d
17623801	Wu 2007	Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	nd	nd					939 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
17623801	Wu 2007	nd	Colorectal cancer	The vast majority of colorectal cancers (>90%) confirmed through medical records; the remaining cases confirmed by corroborating information on cancer diagnosis from participants.
17623801	Wu 2007	nd	Colon cancer	
17623801	Wu 2007	nd	Proximal colon cancer	
17623801	Wu 2007	nd	Distal colon cancer	
17623801	Wu 2007	nd	Rectal cancer	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
17623801	Wu 2007	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)? Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)? Medical conditions Medication Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., physical activity level, occupation, sun exposure, location) Smoking and other life styles variables Other	Intakes of folate, calcium, retinol, meat intake Yes - age Yes - BMI Family history of colorectal cancer Aspirin use physical activity Yes - smoking, alcohol intake Fasting status, month of blood donation	

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose*****	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17623801	Wu 2007	Colorectal cancer	25(OH)D – quintile 1	18.4		45	71	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.24
			25(OH)D – quintile 2	25.0		44	71	Adjusted		0.97	0.55-1.70		
			25(OH)D – quintile 3	29.1		30	68	Adjusted		0.66	0.35-1.24		
			25(OH)D – quintile 4	33.3		23	74	Adjusted		0.51	0.27-0.97		
			25(OH)D – quintile	39.4		37	72	Adjusted		0.83	0.45-		

			5								1.52		
17623801	Wu 2007	Colon cancer	25(OH)D – quartile 1	19.3		49	66	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.005
			25(OH)D – quartile 2	26.7		44	68	Adjusted		0.74	0.42-1.33		
			25(OH)D – quartile 3	32.0		17	68	Adjusted		0.29	0.14-0.59		
			25(OH)D – quartile 4	38.8		29	74	Adjusted		0.46	0.24-0.89		
17623801	Wu 2007	Proximal colon cancer	25(OH)D – quartile 1	19.3		20	30	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.36
			25(OH)D – quartile 2	26.7		21	36	Adjusted		0.84	0.29-2.41		
			25(OH)D – quartile 3	32.0		10	35	Adjusted		0.35	0.11-1.09		
			25(OH)D – quartile 4	38.8		18	35	Adjusted		0.69	0.23-2.08		
17623801	Wu 2007	Distal colon cancer	25(OH)D – quartile 1	19.3		19	27	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.29
			25(OH)D – quartile 2	26.7		16	22	Adjusted		0.93	0.34-2.55		
			25(OH)D – quartile 3	32.0		4	21	Adjusted		0.31	0.07-1.36		
			25(OH)D – quartile 4	38.8		8	24	Adjusted		0.71	0.21-2.39		
17623801	Wu 2007	Rectal cancer	25(OH)D – tertile 1	21.2		11	30	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.08
			25(OH)D – tertile 2	29.3		15	28	Adjusted		1.74	0.61-5.00		
			25(OH)D – tertile 3	37.4		14	22	Adjusted		3.32	0.87-12.69		
17623801	Wu 2007	Colorectal cancer (only >2y since blood donation)	25(OH)D – quintile 1	18.4		36	58	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.31
			25(OH)D – quintile 2	25.0		38	55	Adjusted		1.29	0.66-2.51		
			25(OH)D – quintile 3	29.1		22	56	Adjusted		0.63	0.31-1.28		
			25(OH)D – quintile 4	33.3		20	60	Adjusted		0.63	0.30-1.29		
			25(OH)D – quintile 5	39.4		29	59	Adjusted		0.84	0.41-1.72		
17623801	Wu 2007	Colon cancer	25(OH)D – quartile 1	19.3		40	55	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.008

		(only >2y since blood donation)											
			25(OH)D – quartile 2	26.7		37	52	Adjusted		0.91	0.46-1.78		
			25(OH)D – quartile 3	32.0		16	59	Adjusted		0.32	0.15-0.69		
			25(OH)D – quartile 4	38.8		20	58	Adjusted		0.43	0.20-0.94		

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses
*****medians were calculated among control subject only.

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca SD*	P between groups
17623801	Wu 2007	Cases:	8y	Crude	179	28.7	9.2	917	419	0.07*
17623801	Wu 2007	Control:	8y	Crude	356	29.4	8.6	950	422	

Duplicate one table per outcome
*p value for plasma 25(OH)D concentrations

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose*****	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****
17623801	Wu 2007	Age<65y Colorectal cancer	25(OH)D – quartile 1	19.3		25	34	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.13
			25(OH)D – quartile 2	26.7		15	28	Adjusted		1.03	0.36-2.91		
			25(OH)D – quartile 3	32.0		9	30	Adjusted		0.38	0.12-1.26		
			25(OH)D – quartile 4	38.8		14	36	Adjusted		0.45	0.15-1.40		
17623801	Wu 2007	Age≥65y Colorectal cancer	25(OH)D – quartile 1	19.3		34	55	Adjusted	OR	1.0 (ref)			0.34
			25(OH)D – quartile 2	26.7		36	61	Adjusted		0.97	0.50-1.87		
			25(OH)D – quartile 3	32.0		19	58	Adjusted		0.56	0.27-1.15		
			25(OH)D – quartile 4	38.8		27	54	Adjusted		0.83	0.39-1.75		

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
17623801	Wu 2007	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	nd	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	Y	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	Y	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	nd	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	nd	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	N	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	N					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	NA	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	N
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	N					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	N	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	B
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Some poor reporting on inclusion criteria, blinding.

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	RCT	-high-normal DBP (80 to 90 mm Hg) and not taking antihypertensive drugs -BMI < 36.15 kg/m^2 -black or white	-preexisting cardiovascular or life-threatening conditions -conditions requiring or contraindicating and of the study interventions -intent to become pregnant during the study period -consuming more than 21 alcohol-containing drinks weekly	nd	Trials of Hypertension Prevention (TOHP)	NHLBI NIH	MB

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	RCT	US, various	471	447 at 3 mo. 438 at 6 mo.	43±6.5	Age range: 30-54	69%	86% white 10.5% black	BMI=27.4±3.7	"healthy"	Ca intake= 970mg/d 24-hr urinary Ca=189 mg

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	25(OH)D and/or 1,25(OH)$_2$D				nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	Dietary calcium intake	24-hr diet recall, FFQ	nd	n					Ca 970mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)

****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	Ca	Calcium carbonate	1 g Ca	6 mo.	Pills were taken 2 times a day
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	placebo	nd	N/A	6 mo.	Pills were taken 2 times a day
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:			Eligibility for randomization required consumption of at least two-thirds of 6 wks of supplement placebo dosing. During the study, pill counts were similar among race-gender subgroups and averaged 95% (with three-fourths taking at least 95% of their supplements).			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	1º	Δ in DBP	
		1º	Δ in SBP	
		nd	BMI	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	Eligibility blood pressures (baseline) were calculated from the average of 9 seated readings taken over 3 visits, 10 to 30 days apart. Final pressures were calculated from 9 readings at 6 months. Blood pressure was taken by certified technicians using standardized techniques with a Hawksley random-zero sphygmomanometer. Pressures were taken at the visit's start after the subject had been seated for 5 minutes. The first and fifth Korotkoff sounds were recorded.

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?		Ca/placebo groups similar age, race/gender, and education
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?		Ca/placebo group similar BMI
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)		Ca/placebo groups similar % current smokers and EtOH intake
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	BMI	kg/m^2	Ca	6 mo.	217	27.4	3.7	+0.07	0.95	-0.05		NS
				placebo	6 mo.	218	27.0	3.7	+0.12	1.02			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	Overall, active treatment and placebo groups showed no significant differences for DBP or SBP after 3 or 6 months of Ca supplementation. Black men taking Ca showed BP increases, but CIs were wide.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	DBP in white women	mmHg	Ca	6 mo	62	83.8	2.9			-1.89		< 0.05
				placebo	6 mo	60	83.5	2.9					
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	SBP in white women	mmHg	Ca	3 mo	62	126.3	8.1			-3.68		< 0.05
				placebo	3 mo	60	124.2	9.1					
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	SBP in white women	mmHg	Ca	6 mo	62	126.3	8.1			-2.99		= 0.06
				placebo	6 mo	60	124.2	9.1					

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	SBP in white women	mmHg	20.3-124.9 mg urinary Ca	Adjusted	3 mo.				-8				P < 0.05 (vs. placebo)
				125.0-169.0		3 mo.								
				169.1-235.9		3 mo.								
				236-606.4		3 mo.								
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	DBP in white women		20.3-124.9		6 mo.				-5				P < 0.01 (vs. placebo)
				125.0-169.0		6 mo.								
				169.1-235.9		6 mo.								
				236-606.4		6 mo.								

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	BMI in white men	kg/m^2	Ca	6 mo.	130	27.6	3.5	-0.04	0.84	-0.02		NS
				placebo	6 mo.	129	27.1	3.5	-0.02	1.05			
		BMI in black men		Ca	6 mo.	12	28.0	4.0	+0.58	0.46	+0.64		NS
				placebo	6 mo.	11	28.4	4.9	-0.06	1.30			
		BMI in white women		Ca	6 mo.	59	27.5	3.9	+0.19	1.18	-0.14		NS
				placebo	6 mo.	55	26.6	3.9	+0.33	0.96			
		BMI in black women		Ca	6 mo.	7	25.7	4.3	+0.28	1.00	-0.34		NS
				placebo	6 mo.	13	27.3	3.6	+0.62	0.64			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
7795837	Yamamoto 1995	RCT-parallel	Y	Y	NA	Y	nd	N	Y	Y	Y	A

Adverse Event(s): **	For the Ca group compared to the placebo group, excessive gas and bloating were more frequently reported by white women at 3 months and by whites, in general, at 6 months, and white men reported more loose stools at 6 months.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	No major problems

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
9521437	Zheng 1998	Cohort study	Women 55-69 years old who completed a mailed questionnaire in January 1986 and were followed for mortality and cancer incidence for 9 years	Baseline history of cancer, including melanoma; 30 or more blanks on the dietary questionnaire; determined to have extreme total energy intake (<600 or ≥5000 kcal/day); not postmenopausal	1986	Iowa Women's Health Study	US NCI	AT

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
9521437	Zheng 1998	Cohort study	Iowa, US (40°23′ - 40°30′ N)	34702	34702	nd	55-59 years old: 107377 person-yr; 60-64 years old: 104081 person-yr; ≥65 years old: 81632 person-yr	0	nd	nd	Pack-yr of smoking: Never 192,062 person-yr; <30 pack-yr; 54,287 person-yr; ≥30 pack-yr 40,695 person-yr Hormone replacement therapy: Never 179,130 person-yr; <5 years 79,408 3 person-yr; ≥5 years 31,946 person-yr Post-menopausal: 100%	Total energy intake (tertile, kcal/day) <1499.1: 97428 person-yr; 1499.1-1970.3: 97685 person-yr; ≥1940.4: 97987 person-yr Total fat intake (tertile, g/day) <54.6: 97319 person-yr; 54.6-75.9: 97506 person-yr; ≥76.0: 98266 person-yr Total fruit and vegetable intake (tertile, servings/week) <33.5: 96744 person-yr; 33.5-48.5: 98806 person-yr; ≥48.6 97540 person-yr

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.

***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
9521437	Zheng 1998	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
9521437	Zheng 1998	Dietary calcium intake	Semiquantitative FFQ (by Willet)	USDA Nutrient Database	y For validity and reliability see Munger et al. Am J Epidemiol, 1992 Pearson's correlation coefficients of nutrient intake from FFQ with those from five 24-h dietary recalls is 0.67 for calcium					Ca mg/d < 800.8 (n=56), 800.8-1278.8 (n=52), > 1278.7 (n=36)

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
Co-intervention(s) *:						
Compliance/Adherence:						

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
9521437	Zheng 1998	secondary	Rectal cancer	State Health Registry of Iowa, part of the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program of the National Cancer Institute; cancer of the rectum (International Classification of Diseases-Oncology, code = 154)

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments
9521437	Zheng 1998	Primary outcome: mortality; cancer incidence

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
9521437	Zheng 1998	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Yes (total energy intake)	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes (age)	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes (body mass index, fat and protein intake)	in some analyses
		Medical conditions	No	
		Medication	Yes (use of hormone replacement therapy)	
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)	No	
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes (smoking status, pack-years of smoking)	in some analyses also: alcohol consumption , physical activity
		Other		

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI	P between groups***	P for trend****
9521437	Zheng 1998	Rectal cancer	Low total calcium intake tertile (mg/day)		<800.8	56	nd	108	adjusted	RR	1.00			0.02
9521437	Zheng 1998	Rectal cancer	Intermediate total calcium intake tertile (mg/day)		800.8-1278.7	52	nd	108	adjusted	RR	0.90	0.61-1.33	nd	

9521437	Zheng 1998	Rectal cancer	High total calcium intake tertile (mg/day)		≥1278.7	36	nd	108	adjusted	RR	0.59	0.37-0.94	nd	

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
9521437	Zheng 1998	Follow up: 9 years. Subgroup analysis was also conducted based on intake sources of calcium (supplement vs. no supplement group)

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade

Adverse Event(s): **	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population		Exposure (All)		Dietary assessment*		Biomarkers*		Comparator		Statistical Analysis		Outcome		Design	
9521437	Zheng 1998	a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	Y	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	N	a) Method reported? (y/n)	Y	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	NA	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	Y	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	Y	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	Y	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)	Y
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	N	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	N	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Y	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)	NA					b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	Y	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)	Y
						c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)	Y					b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	Y	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	Y	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)	N

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	C
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Study designed for cancer incidence and mortality; not specifically for rectal cancer; power calculation for rectal cancer not stated; number of women without cancer per calcium tertile not reported; blinding for assessors not reported; confirmation of cancer cases by histology not reported

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18089701	Zhu 2008	RCT-post hoc	Substudy of the larger Calcium Intake Fracture Outcome Study (N=1500). The first 120 sequential patients presenting in September 1998 (end of winter in Western Australia) enrolled in this substudy. Aged 70 yr old, and not receiving bone active agent	nd	1998	Substudy of Calcium Intake Fracture Outcome Study	Healthway Health Promotion Foundation of Western Australia, the Australian Menopause Society, and the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council	JHL MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18089701	Zhu 2008	RCT	Western Australia	120	120	74.8 (2.6)	nd	0%	nd	nd	nd (some subjects, unclear how many developed cancer or vascular disease during the study)	"living in sunny climate"

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed as possible information on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18089701	Zhu 2008	25(OH)D and/or $1,25(OH)_2D$				25(OH)D - competitive protein biding essay	n	nd	September 1998 (end of winter in Western Australia)	68.0 (28.7) nmol/liter
18089701	Zhu 2008	Dietary calcium intake	Semiquantitative food frequency questionnaire	nd	nd					1010 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Vit D and/or Ca Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18089701	Zhu 2008	Ca group + Placebo vitD	Ca (Caltrate; Wyeth Consumer Healthcare, Baulkham Hills, New South Wales, Australia) Placebo vitD (nd)	Ca 1200 mg	5y	600 mg of Ca twice/day
18089701	Zhu 2008	CaD group	Ca (Caltrate; Wyeth Consumer Healthcare, Baulkham Hills, New South Wales, Australia) VitD2 (Ostelin; Boots Healthcare, North Ryde, New South Wales, Australia)	Ca 1200 mg VitD2 1000 IU	5y	600 mg of Ca twice/day 1000 IU of vitD2 once/day
18089701	Zhu 2008	Placebo group	Placebo Ca (nd) Placebo vitD (nd)		5y	
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Measured by counting tablets returned every 12 months, so significant differences among 3 groups, Ca or placebo in the Ca, CaD, and control groups (80.9, 80.7, and 86.9% respectively), for vitD or placebo (84.2, 86.9, and 89.8% respectively)			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18089701	Zhu 2008	Secondary	25(OH)D	Measured by competitive protein binding essay after column extraction
18089701	Zhu 2008	Primary	BMD	Measured at the hip with an Acclaim 4500A fan beam densitometer (Hologic Corp., Waltham, MA) ay baseline yr 1,3, and 5 using an identical protocol.

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.
**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter "nd"

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
18089701	Zhu 2008	Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake	Baseline calcium intake and vitamin D status	
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes* - Age	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes * - height, body weight	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other	VitD status	

*Please choose "yes" if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline***	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference	Net difference SD*	P between
18089701	Zhu 2008	Hip BMD	mg/cm2	Ca group + Vit D	60	39 / 33	782.9	88.8	nd		2.2 %	1.1 %	0.05
				Placebo	60	41 / 36	827.8	125.4	nd				
18089701	Zhu 2008	Hip BMD	mg/cm2	Ca group + Vit D2	12	39 / 33	782.9	88.8	0.19	nd	1.2 %	0.6 %	0.04
				Placebo	12	41/ 36	827.8	125.4	-1.27				
18089701	Zhu 2008	Hip BMD	mg/cm2	Ca group + Placebo vit D	12	40 / 38	833.9	92.9	-0.17	nd	1.5 %	0.5 %	0.007
				Placebo	12	41 / 36	827.8	125.4	-1.27				

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Baseline data are for all subjects enrolled

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Final **	Final SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***
18089701	Zhu 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/liter	Ca group year 1	Crude	12	37	66.6	25.9	64.5	26.5	nd	nd	NS
				Ca group year 3	Crude	36	35	66.6	25.9	74.6	23.8	nd	nd	NS
				Ca group year 5	Crude	60	34	66.6	25.9	63.7	28.7	nd	nd	NS
18089701	Zhu 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/liter	CaD group year 1	Crude	12	34	70.2	25.6	97.8	31.8	nd	nd	*P* < 0.001 vs. Ca or control group
				CaD group year 3	Crude	36	32	70.2	25.6	118.4	44.38	nd	nd	*P* < 0.001 vs. Ca or control group
				CaD group year 5	Crude	60	29	70.2	25.6	106.4	29.0	nd	nd	*P* < 0.001 vs. Ca or control group
18089701	Zhu 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/liter	Control group year 1	Crude	12	38	67.3	34.2	59.7	28.8	nd	nd	NS
				Control group year 3	Crude	36	32	67.3	34.2	63.6	32.3	nd	nd	NS
				Control group year 5	Crude	60	30	67.3	34.2	61.5	23.0	nd	nd	NS

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write “nd” if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using “+” or “-“ sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18089701	Zhu 2008	Hip BMD	Both Ca and CaD groups had significantly better maintenance of hip BMD than the control group at yr 1 (Ca-control: 1.5±0.5%, p=0.007; CaD-control: 1.2±0.6%, p=0.04). However, only the CaD group had significantly better maintenance of hip BMD, compared with the control group, at yr3 (CaD-control: 2.8±1.1%, p=0.01) and 5 (CaD-control: 2.2±1.1%, P=0.05). In the CaD group, there was no bone loss over the 5 yr of the study. The results were unchanged after adjusted for baseline age, height, and body weight.

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results
18089701	Zhu 2008	No year-5 net change BMD data for Ca vs. placebo group but the net difference was not statistically significant. This is a sub study of the larger Calcium Intake Fracture Outcome Study, a 5-yr double-blinded, randomized, controlled calcium supplementation study, in which 1500 community-living ambulant women over the age of 70 yr were randomized to received either 1200mg Calcium per day or identical placebo.

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results
18089701	Zhu 2008	Hip BMD	Further analysis was carried out by grouping subjects according to the median of the baseline 25OHD values (68nmol/liter). In those patients with 25OHD concentrations below the median, the hip BMD was maintained, compared with controls, whereas in those with higher baseline 25OHD levels, there was no treatment effect.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18089701	Zhu 2008	RCT-parallel	Y	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	B

Adverse Event(s): **	No significant differences among the three groups in the rate of incident cancer or vascular disease. No case of kidney stones was reported.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	Differential dropout rates between groups. During the study, 2 patients withdrew from the Ca group, 6 from CaD group, and 5 from the control group. The reasons for the two withdrawals in the Ca group were concurrent illnesses or health concerns; in the CaD group, the reasons for withdrawal were personal reasons not related to the study (n=3), concurrent illnesses or health concerns (n=2), and investigator's decision (n =1). In the control group, the reasons for withdrawal were personal reasons not related to the study (n=1), death (n=2), and investigator's decision (n=2). Not sure if all subjects had hip BMD measurements (not shown in table or figure, but assumed complete data for BMD in this data extraction form (excluding withdraws). ITT analyses. Not all subjects had 25(OH)D data. Crude analysis for curve 4 data only. **Grade C for curve 4 data.** No information on food composition database

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)
OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):									
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):									

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**
****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**
*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Inclusion	Exclusion	Enrollment Years	Trial or Cohort Name	Funding Source	Extractor
18410225	Zhu, 2008	RCT	Women between 70 and 90 yr of age were recruited from three sources: patients attending the emergency departments of teaching hospitals, patients receiving services from the local community home nursing service (Silver Chain) for management of falls, and the Electoral roll, which lists >98% of women of this age. The inclusion criteria were a plasma 25(OH)D <60 nM and a history of >1 fall in the previous 12 mo.	Current vitamin D consumption, current consumption of bone or mineral active agents apart from calcium, a BMD Z-score at the total hip site of less than -2.0, medical conditions or disorders that influence bone mineral metabolism including lab evidence of renal insufficiency (creatinine >2-fold above the normal value), a fracture in the past 6 mo, and a Mini Mental State Exam score <24 or the presence of significant neurological conditions likely to substantially impair balance or physical activity such as stroke and Parkinson's disease.	April 2003 and October 2004	nd	government	MC

*Leave appropriate choice of study design and delete all others
**Post hoc analyses of an existing RCT for outcomes that were not planned in the original RCT

POPULATION (BASELINE)**

UI	Author Year	Study Design*	Location (e.g., City and Country, latitude)	N enrolled***	N analyzed	Mean (SD) Age, yr	Age Range / IQR	Male, %	Race / Ethnicity	Anthropometry data (e.g., BMI, weight, or %body fat …etc)	Health Status	Specific Nutrition Status Data (e.g., malnourish, low Vit D or Ca intake …etc.)
18410225	Zhu, 2008	RCT	Perth, Australia (32 °S)	302	256	77 (4.5)	70 to 90	0	nd	Mean BMI = 29	nd (based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, assume subjects were not very healthy but normal physical functioning)	Mean 25(OH)D = 44 nM Only 37% had a calcium intake >1200 mg/d

*Please copy from above
**Report baseline data for all subjects: preferred data for subjects actually analyzed than for subjects that enrolled in the study.
***For RCT, N enrolled is the number of subjects randomized. For cohort study, N enrolled is the total number of subjects fulfilled study inclusion criteria. For case-cohort study, please report as detailed information as possible on subjects selection. For example, original cohort sample size, number of subjects provided exposure data (eg. blood sample or dietary assessment), number of subjects had outcome data …etc.

Background Diet*

UI	Author Year	Exposure	Dietary Assessment Method**	Food Composition Database***	Internal Calibration (or Validity) of Dietary Assessment? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Biomarker Assay****	Analytical Validity of Biomarker Data Reported? (y/n) If Yes, Provide Data	Time between Biomarker Sampling and Analysis	Season/Date when the biomarker samples were drawn	Background exposure data
18410225	Zhu, 2008	25(OH)D				RIA (DiaSorin, Stillwater, MN, USA)	no	nd	nd	Mean 25(OH)D = 44.3 (12.9) nM; 14% had levels <30 nM.
		Dietary calcium intake	FFQ	NUTTAB 90	no	no				Mean calcium intake = 1097 mg/d

* Write "nd" if there was no data reported. Please do not leave blank
**Please refer to common dietary assessment method table. If other method was used, please describe the detail. Otherwise, please simply use the brief name described in the table
***USDA Nutrient Database, Minnesota Food and Nutrient Database (NDSR), Food product manufacturer, McCance and Widdowson's food table, Country-specific food tables, Other nutrient analysis (please specify)
****ONLY biomarker of interest for calcium is calcium balance

INTERVENTION(S), SKIP IF OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

UI	Author Year	Intervention(s)	Source (e.g., brand name, foods, or formulation)	Vit D and/or Ca Total Daily Dose	Intervention Duration	Intervention Frequency (e.g. capsules were taken 2 times a day)
18410225	Zhu, 2008	Vitamin D2 + Calcium	Ostelin; Boots Healthcare, North Ryde, Australia	1000 IU vit D2 + 1000 mg/d Ca	1 yr	Consume with evening meal
		Calcium + placebo	Calcium citrate (Citracal; Mission Pharmacal, Key Pharmaceutical, Phodes, Ausralia)	1000 mg/d	1 yr	Consume with evening meal
Co-intervention(s) *:			None			
Compliance/Adherence:			Tablet counting, 86.7% and 86.8% in the vitamin D and the control groups.			

Duplicate one row per intervention, including control intervention.
*Report the non-vit D or Ca intervention(s) (e.g., other drug intervention, or background low-fat diet). We are interested in only independent effect of vitamin D and/or calcium. Therefore, describe how effects of co-intervention(s) were controlled for in the analyses or study design.

LIST OF ALL OUTCOMES

UI	Author Year	Primary / Secondary Outcome**	Outcome	Definition
18410225	Zhu, 2008	primary	BMD	Hip and total body. DXA
		Secondary	25(OH)D	

Duplicate one row per outcome of interest. Only need to list outcomes that were included in the result section.

**Must have been explicitly stated in the original paper. Otherwise, please enter “nd”

UI	Author Year	Comments

-----Confounders: Please report all confounders controlled in the analyses reported in the following result section (adjusted results)

UI	Author Year	Confounder Groups	Please List Name of Confounder (including matching factors)	Specific comments for confounders
		Other nutrients or dietary factors (e.g., certain food consumption), including supplement use and total energy intake		
		Demographics (e.g., age, gender, race, education)?	Yes/no*	
		Anthropometrics (e.g., BMI, body weight, % body fat)?	Yes/no*	
		Medical conditions		
		Medication		
		Sunlight exposure and its proxy variables (e.g., seasonal variation of 25(OH)D, UV exposure, location)		
		Smoking and other life styles variables (e.g., physical activity, occupation, alcohol consumption)	Yes/no*	
		Other		

*Please choose “yes” if any one of the confounders in this group was controlled in the analysis

FOLLOWING IS RESULT SECTION. PLEASE CHOOSE APPROPRIATE TYPE OF DATA COLLECTION TABLE FOR ALL OUTCOMES OF INTEREST

-----Main Analyses (For analyses that adjusted for confounders, choose the "best" model)

2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	N Event	N Total	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %) and direction of comparison*	Unadjusted			Adjusted		
								Result	95% CI	P btw	Result	95% CI	P btw

*Example: OR Ca/placebo

2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure / Intervention	Mean Follow-up, mo	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline SD*	Delta**	Delta SD*	Net difference	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between
18410225	Zhu, 2008	25(OH)D	nmol/L	Vit D2 + Ca	12	123	44.8	12.7	34%	nd	34%	nd	<0.001
				Ca	12	133	43.7	12.9	0%	nd			
18410225	Zhu, 2008	Hip BMD	mg/cm2	Vit D2 + Ca	12	123	851	127	0.5%	0.3	0.3%	nd	NS
				Ca	12	133	826	129	0.2%	0.2			

Baseline=baseline value; Final=final value; Delta=change value from baseline, which is Final-Baseline value; Net difference=differences in deltas
*Enter outcome metric reported in the unadjusted or adjusted result section
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. OR, RR, %death)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Exposure Categories(e.g., Tertiles) / Intervention Groups	Mean Vit D level / dose	Mean Ca level / dose	No. of Cases (Event)*	No. of Non-cases / Total N**	Mean Follow-up, mo	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Outcome Metric (e.g. OR, RR, HR, %)	Outcome effect size	CI / SE / SD **	P between groups***	P for trend****

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group.
*Number of subjects with outcome
**Please choose one and delete the others
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8
****P value for testing the linear trend of the OR/RR across different categories or doses

≥2 ARMS/GROUPS: CONTINOUS OUTCOMES (e.g. BMD, BP)

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Unit	Exposure Category / Intervention Group	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	Mean Follow-up (months)	No. Analyzed	Baseline	Baseline CI / SE / SD*	Final or Delta**	Final or Delta CI / SE / SD*	Net difference***	Net difference CI / SE / SD*	P between groups***

Duplicate one row per exposure category or intervention group. Please write "nd" if there was no data reported. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.
*Please choose one and delete the others
**Delta value is preferred than the Final value. Please report the direction for the change by using "+" or "-" sign: e.g. +2.8 or -2.8
***Specify the comparison. For example group 1 vs. 3 = -6; group 1 vs. 2 = -8

MEAN DATA. THIS SHOULD ONLY APPLY TO CASE-COHORT STUDIES THAT COMPARE BASELINE VIT D / CA LEVELS BETWEEN CASES (WITH DISEASE) AND CONTROLS (WITHOUT DISEASE)

UI	Author Year	Outcome Group	Time between Baseline Exposure and Outcome Assessments	Crude or Adjusted analysis?	No. Analyzed	Mean 25(OH)D Level	Vit D level CI / SE / SD*	Mean Ca intake or Ca balance	Ca CI / SE / SD*	P between groups
		Cases:								
		Control:								

Duplicate one table per outcome

OTHER RESULTS. ONLY USE THE FOLLOWING BOX WHEN THE TYPE OF RESULT DATA DO NOT FIT THE TABLES PROVIDED ABOVE

UI	Author Year	Outcome	Results

UI	Author Year	Comments for Results

-----Subgroup Analyses

Please copy the appropriate table above for all subgroup analyses of interest.

QUALITY of INTERVENTIONAL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Design*	Appropriate Randomization Technique (y/n/nd/NA)	Allocation Concealment (y/n/nd/NA)	Appropriate Washout Period (y/n/nd/NA)	Dropout Rate <20%	Blinded Outcome Assessment (y/n/nd)	Intention to Treat Analysis (y/n/nd)	Appropriate Statistical Analysis** (y/n)	Assessment for Confounding (y/n/nd/NA)	Clear Reporting with No Discrepancies (y/n)	OVERALL Grade
18410225	Zhu, 2008	RCT	yes	yes	NA	yes	nd	yes	yes	no	yes	A

Adverse Event(s): **	There were no significant differences between the vitamin D and the control groups in the rate of incident cancer and vascular disease (ischemic heart disease and stroke). There were 8 and 5 adverse events in vitamin D and the control groups, respectively. One participant in the vitamin D group had mild asymptomatic hypercalcemia one occasion. No case of renal calculus was reported. 1 participant was deceased during the study.
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

NA=not applicable

***Please do not copy the 4 categories of study designs from above sections. Specify the exact study design: RCT – Parallel, RCT – Cross-over, RCT – Cluster, quasi-RCT, Non-randomized, but controlled trial, before-and-after trial, other interventional design (please explain in detail)**

****Please do not leave blank. Type nd if there was no data on adverse events.**

QUALITY of COHORT OR NESTED CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

UI	Author Year	Population	Exposure (All)	Dietary assessment*	Biomarkers*	Comparator	Statistical Analysis	Outcome	Design
		a) Eligibility criteria clear? (y/n)	a) Exposure assessor blinded to outcome info? (y/n)	a) Method reported? (y/n)	a) One of the prespecified methods*** was used? (y/n)	a) Level of the exposure in comparative categories (eg quartiles) is given (ranges)? (y/n) applicable for categorical analyses only	a) Adjusted or matched for ANY confounders (other than age and sex)?** (y/n)	a) Clear definition of outcome, including time of ascertainment? (y/n)	a) Prospective collection of data? (y/n)
		b) Sampling of population random or consecutive? (y/n)	b) Outcome assessor blinded to exposure measurement? (y/n)	b) Food composition database or suppl composition reported? (y/n)	Time from sample collection to sample analysis reported? (y/n)			b) Loss to follow-up <20%? (y/n)	b) Analysis was planned when cohort was formed? (y/n)
				c) Internal calibration of method perform (if FFQ)? (y/n/NA)			b) Justification of final adjusted model selection? (y/n)	c) Do the authors specify a primary outcome? (y/n)	c) Justification of sample size (includes sample size calculations)? (y/n)

OVERALL Grade (A/B/C):	
Explanation for Overall Quality Grade (if not Grade A):	

***Check "NA" and skip all questions if study did not use dietary assessment or biomarkers**

****We will judge in the end if the set of confounders is adequate**

*****Prespecified methods: HPLC, RIA kits, LC-MS/MS; EIA/Chemiluminescence**