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Abstract

Objectives: To assess the overall effect of vitamin D supplementation on risk of acute respiratory infection (ARI), and to identify factors modifying this effect.

Design: We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of data from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of vitamin D for ARI prevention using a random effects model. Pre-specified sub-group analyses were done to determine whether effects of vitamin D on risk of ARI varied according to baseline 25-hydroxyvitamin D (25[OH]D) concentration or dosing regimen.

Data Sources: MEDLINE, EMBASE, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Web of Science, ClinicalTrials.gov and the International Standard RCT Number (ISRCTN) registry from inception to May 2020.

Eligibility Criteria for Selecting Studies: Double-blind RCTs of supplementation with vitamin D or calcidiol, of any duration, were eligible if they were approved by a Research Ethics Committee and if ARI incidence was collected prospectively and pre-specified as an efficacy outcome.

Results: We identified 40 eligible RCTs (total 30,956 participants, aged 0 to 95 years). Data were obtained for 29,841 (96.5%) of 30,909 participants in 39 studies. For the primary comparison of vitamin D supplementation vs. placebo, the intervention reduced risk of ARI overall (Odds Ratio [OR] 0.89, 95% CI 0.81 to 0.98; P for heterogeneity 0.009). No statistically significant effect of vitamin D was seen for any of the sub-groups defined by baseline 25(OH)D concentration. However, protective effects were seen for trials in which vitamin D was given using a daily dosing regimen (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.93); at daily dose equivalents of 400-1000 IU (OR 0.70, 95% CI 0.55 to 0.89); and for a duration of ≤12 months (OR 0.82, 95% CI 0.72 to 0.94). Vitamin D did not influence the proportion of participants experiencing at least one serious adverse event (OR 0.94, 95% CI 0.81 to 1.08). Risk of bias within individual studies was assessed as being low for all but two trials. A funnel plot showed asymmetry, suggesting that small trials showing non-protective effects of vitamin D may have been omitted from the meta-analysis.
**Conclusions:** Vitamin D supplementation was safe and reduced risk of ARI, despite evidence of significant heterogeneity across trials. The overall effect size may have been over-estimated due to publication bias. Protection was associated with administration of daily doses of 400-1000 IU vitamin D for up to 12 months. The relevance of these findings to COVID-19 is not known and requires investigation.

**Systematic Review Registration:** CRD42020190633
Summary Box

**What is already known on this subject?**

- A previous individual participant data meta-analysis from 10,933 participants in 25 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of vitamin D supplementation for the prevention of acute respiratory infection (ARI) demonstrated an overall protective effect (number needed to treat to prevent one ARI [NNT]=33).
- Sub-group analysis revealed most benefit in those with the lowest vitamin D status at baseline and not receiving bolus doses.

**What this study adds**

- We updated this meta-analysis with trial-level data from an additional 14 placebo-controlled RCTs published since December 2015 (i.e. new total of 39 studies with 29,841 participants).
- An overall protective effect of vitamin D supplementation against ARI was seen (NNT=36).
- A funnel plot revealed evidence of publication bias, which could have led to an over-estimate of the protective effect.
- No statistically significant effect of vitamin D was seen for any of the sub-groups defined by baseline 25(OH)D concentration.
- Strongest protective effects were associated with administration of daily doses of 400-1000 IU vitamin D for ≤12 months (NNT=8).
Introduction

Interest in the potential for vitamin D supplementation to reduce risk of acute respiratory infections (ARI) has increased since the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic. This stems from findings of laboratory studies, showing that vitamin D metabolites support innate immune responses to respiratory viruses, together with observational studies reporting independent associations between low circulating levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D (25(OH)D, the widely accepted biomarker of vitamin D status) and increased risk of ARI caused by other pathogens. Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of vitamin D for the prevention of ARI have produced heterogeneous results, with some showing protection, and others reporting null findings. We previously meta-analysed individual participant data from 25 RCTs and showed a protective overall effect that was stronger in those with lower baseline 25(OH)D levels, and in trials where vitamin D was administered daily or weekly rather than in more widely spaced bolus doses. Since the date of the final literature search performed for that study (December 2015), fifteen RCTs with 19,569 participants fulfilling the same eligibility criteria have been completed and analysed. We therefore sought data from these more recent studies for inclusion in an updated meta-analysis of aggregate (trial-level) data to determine whether vitamin D reduced ARI risk overall, and to evaluate whether effects of vitamin D on ARI risk varied according to baseline 25(OH)D concentration and/or dosing regimen (frequency, dose size, and trial duration).
Methods

Protocol, Registration and Ethical Approvals

Methods were pre-specified in a protocol that was registered with the PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.php?RecordID=190633). Research Ethics Committee approval to conduct this meta-analysis was not required in the UK; local ethical permission to contribute data from primary trials was required and obtained for studies by Camargo et al13 (The Ethics Review Committee of the Mongolian Ministry of Health), Murdoch et al14 (Southern Health and Disability Ethics Committee, ref. URB/09/10/050/AM02), Rees et al17 (Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, Dartmouth College, USA; Protocol # 24381), Tachimoto et al28 (Ethics committee of the Jikei University School of Medicine, ref 26-333: 7839), Tran et al18 (QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute Human Research Ethics Committee, P1570) and Urashima et al20 (Ethics committee of the Jikei University School of Medicine, ref 26-333: 7839).

Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)

PPI representatives were not involved in the conduct of this study.

Eligibility Criteria

Randomised, double-blind, trials of supplementation with vitamin D3, vitamin D2 or 25(OH)D of any duration, with a placebo or low-dose vitamin D control, were eligible for inclusion if they had been approved by a Research Ethics Committee and if data on incidence of ARI were collected prospectively and pre-specified as an efficacy outcome. The latter requirement was imposed in order to minimise misclassification bias (prospectively designed instruments to capture ARI events were deemed more likely to be sensitive and specific for this outcome). Studies reporting results of long-term follow-up of primary RCTs were excluded.

Study Identification and Selection
Two investigators (ARM and DAJ) searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Web of Science, ClinicalTrials.gov and the International Standard Randomized Controlled Trials Number (ISRCTN) registry using the electronic search strategies described in the Methods Section of Supplementary Material. Searches were regularly updated up to and including 1st May 2020. No language restrictions were imposed. These searches were supplemented by searching review articles and reference lists of trial publications. Collaborators were asked if they knew of any additional trials. Three investigators (DAJ, CAC and ARM) determined which trials met the eligibility criteria.

**Data Collection Processes**

Summary data from trials which contributed to our previous meta-analysis of individual participant data\(^3\) were extracted from our central database, with permission from the Principal Investigators. Summary data relating to the primary outcome (overall and by sub-group) and secondary outcomes (overall only) from newly identified trials were requested from Principal Investigators. On receipt, they were assessed for consistency with associated publications. Study authors were contacted to provide missing data and to resolve any queries arising from these consistency checks. Once queries had been resolved, clean summary data were uploaded to the study database, which was held in STATA IC v14.2 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

Data relating to study characteristics were extracted for the following variables: study setting, eligibility criteria, 25(OH)D assay and levels, details of intervention and control regimens, trial duration, case definitions for ARI and number entering primary analysis (after randomisation). Follow-up summary data were requested for the proportions of participants experiencing one or more ARI during the trial, both overall and stratified by baseline serum 25(OH)D concentration, where this was available. We also requested summary data on the proportions of participants who experienced one or more of the following events during the trial: upper respiratory infection (URI); lower respiratory infection (LRI); Emergency Department attendance and/or hospital admission for ARI; death due to ARI or respiratory failure; use of antibiotics to treat an ARI; absence from work or school due to ARI; a serious adverse event; death due to any cause; and potential adverse reactions to vitamin D (hypercalcaemia and renal stones).
Risk of Bias Assessment for Individual Studies

We used the Cochrane Collaboration Risk of Bias tool\textsuperscript{46} to assess the following variables: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants, personnel and outcome assessors, completeness of outcome data, evidence of selective outcome reporting and other potential threats to validity. Study quality was assessed independently by two investigators (ARM and DAJ), except for the five trials for which DAJ and/or ARM were investigators, which were assessed by CAC. Discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

Definition of outcomes

The primary outcome of the meta-analysis was the proportion of participants experiencing one or more ARIs, with the definition of ARI encompassing events classified as URI, LRI and ARI of unclassified location (i.e. infection of the upper and/or lower respiratory tract). Secondary outcomes were incidence of URI and LRI, analysed separately; incidence of Emergency Department attendance and/or hospital admission for ARI; death due to ARI or respiratory failure; use of antibiotics to treat an ARI; absence from work or school due to ARI; incidence of serious adverse events; death due to any cause; and incidence of potential adverse reactions to vitamin D (hypercalcaemia and renal stones).

Synthesis Methods

Data were analysed by DAJ; results were checked and verified by JDS. Our meta-analysis approach followed published guidelines.\textsuperscript{47} The primary comparison was of participants randomised to vitamin D vs. placebo: this was performed for all of the outcomes listed above. For trials that included higher-dose, lower-dose and placebo arms, data from higher-dose and lower-dose arms were pooled for analysis of the primary comparison. A secondary comparison of participants randomised to higher vs. lower doses of vitamin D was performed for the primary outcome only. A log odds ratio and its standard error was calculated for each outcome within each trial from the proportion of participants experiencing one or more events in the intervention vs.
control arm. These were meta-analysed in a random effects model using the Metan package\textsuperscript{48} within STATA IC v14.2 to obtain a pooled odds ratio with a 95% confidence interval and a measure of heterogeneity summarized by the $I^2$ statistic and its corresponding P value. The number needed to treat for an additional beneficial outcome (NNT) was calculated using the Visual Rx NNT calculator (http://www.nntonline.net/visualrx/) where meta-analysis of dichotomous outcomes revealed a statistically significant beneficial effect of allocation to vitamin D vs. placebo.

Exploration of variation in effects

To explore reasons for heterogeneity of effect of the intervention between trials we performed a stratified analysis according to baseline vitamin D status (serum 25(OH)D <25 vs. 25-49.9 vs. 50-74.9 vs. ≥75 nmol/L) and sub-group analyses according to vitamin D dosing regimen (administration of daily vs. weekly vs. monthly or less frequent doses), dose size (daily equivalent <400 IU vs. 400-1000 IU vs. 1001-2000 IU vs. >2,000 IU) and trial duration (≤12 months vs. >12 months). The thresholds for baseline 25(OH)D concentration used in sub-group analyses were selected \textit{a priori} on the basis that they represent cut-offs that are commonly used to distinguish profound vitamin D deficiency (<25 nmol/L), moderate vitamin D deficiency (25-49.9 nmol/L) and sub-optimal vitamin D status (so-called ‘vitamin D insufficiency’, 50-74.9 nmol/L).\textsuperscript{49} An exploratory analysis restricted to studies with optimal frequency, dose size and duration was also performed.

To investigate factors associated with heterogeneity of effect between subgroups of trials, we performed multivariable meta-regression analysis on trial-level characteristics, namely, dose frequency, dose size and trial duration, to produce an adjusted odds ratio, a 95% confidence interval and a P value for interaction for each factor. Independent variables were dichotomised to create a more parsimonious model (serum 25(OH)D of <25 vs. ≥25 nmol/L; administration of daily vs. non-daily doses; daily equivalent of ≤1000 IU vs. >1000 IU; and trial duration of ≤12 vs. >12 months). The meta-regression analysis excluded data from one trial that included higher-dose, lower-dose and placebo arms,\textsuperscript{18} since the higher-dose and lower-dose arms spanned the 1,000 IU/day cut-off, rendering it unclassifiable for the purposes of this analysis.
Quality Assessment Across Studies

For the primary analysis, the likelihood of publication bias was investigated through the construction of a contour-enhanced funnel plot.50 We used the five GRADE considerations (study limitations, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness and publication bias)51 to assess the quality of the body of evidence contributing to analyses of the primary efficacy outcome and major secondary outcomes of our meta-analysis.

Sensitivity analyses

We conducted two exploratory sensitivity analyses for the primary comparison of the primary outcome: one excluded RCTs where risk of bias was assessed as being unclear; the other excluded RCTs in which incidence of ARI was not the primary or co-primary outcome.

Role of the funding source

This study was conducted without external funding.
Results

Study selection and data obtained

The study selection process is illustrated in Figure 1. Our search identified a total of 1,519 unique studies that were assessed for eligibility; of these, 40 studies with a total of 30,956 randomised participants fulfilled eligibility criteria, of which 31 compared effects of a single vitamin D regimen vs. placebo only,5-17 19 20 22 23 25-28 31 33 36 38-40 42-45 and 4 compared effects of higher-dose, lower-dose and placebo arms,18 21 24 41 and 5 compared effects of higher- vs. lower-dose regimens of vitamin D only.29 32 34 35 37 Aggregate data were sought and obtained for all but 1 study.45 Data for the primary outcome (proportion of participants with one or more ARI) was obtained for 29,841 (96.5%) of 30,909 participants in 39 studies. Reasons for excluding potentially relevant studies are presented in Table S1.

Study and participant characteristics

Characteristics of the 39 studies contributing data to this meta-analysis and their participants are presented in Table 1. Trials were conducted in 17 different countries on 4 continents, and enrolled participants of both sexes from birth to 95 years of age. Baseline serum 25(OH)D concentrations were determined in 32 of 39 trials: mean baseline 25(OH)D concentration ranged from 18.9 to 90.9 nmol/L (to convert to ng/ml, divide by 2.496). Thirty-eight studies administered oral vitamin D₃ to participants in the intervention arm, while 1 study administered oral 25(OH)D. Vitamin D was given as monthly to 3-monthly bolus doses in 12 studies; as weekly doses in 5 studies; as daily doses in 20 studies; and as a combination of bolus and daily doses in 2 studies. Trial duration ranged from 8 weeks to 3 years. Incidence of ARI was primary or co-primary outcome for 21 studies, and a secondary outcome for 18 studies.

Risk of Bias Within Studies

Details of the risk of bias assessment are provided in supplementary Table S2. Two trials were assessed as being at unclear risk of bias due to high loss to follow-up. In the trial by Laaksi and colleagues,8 37% of randomised participants were lost to follow-
up. In the trial by Dubnov-Raz and colleagues, 52% of participants did not complete all symptom questionnaires. All other trials were assessed as being at low risk of bias for all seven aspects assessed.

**Overall Results, Primary Outcome**

For the primary comparison of vitamin D vs. placebo control, supplementation resulted in a statistically significant reduction in the proportion of participants experiencing at least one ARI (Odds Ratio [OR] 0.89, 95% Confidence Interval [CI] 0.81 to 0.98; 27,815 participants in 34 studies; Figure 2, Table 2; Cates Plot, Figure S1). Heterogeneity of effect was moderate (I² 40.0%, P for heterogeneity 0.009). The associated NNT was 36 (95% CI 20 to 206).

For the secondary comparison of higher- vs. lower-dose vitamin D, we observed no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants with at least one ARI (OR 0.86, 95% CI 0.71 to 1.04; 2,889 participants in 9 studies; I² 8.0%, P for heterogeneity 0.37; Figure S2).

**Sub-group analyses, Primary Outcome**

To investigate reasons for the observed heterogeneity of effect for the primary comparison of vitamin D vs. placebo control, we stratified this analysis by one participant-level factor (baseline vitamin D status) and by three trial-level factors (dose frequency, dose size, and trial duration). Results are presented in Table 2 and Figures S3-S6. No statistically significant effect of vitamin D was seen for participants with baseline 25(OH)D <25 nmol/L (OR 0.78, 95% CI 0.53 to 1.16; 3,617 participants in 19 studies), 25-49.9 nmol/L (OR 1.03, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.17; 9,128 participants in 27 studies), 50-74.9 nmol (OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.07; 5,303 participants in 28 studies), or ≥75 nmol/L (OR 0.97, 95% CI 0.81 to 1.16; 2,978 participants in 24 studies; Figure S3). With regard to dosing frequency, a statistically significant protective effect was seen for trials where vitamin D was given daily (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.93; 4,005 participants in 18 studies), but not for trials in which it was given weekly (OR 0.97, 95% CI 0.88 to 1.06; 12,562 participants in 5 studies), or monthly to 3-monthly (OR 1.00, 95% CI 0.91 to 1.09; 11,248 participants in 11 studies; Figure
Statistically significant protective effects of the intervention were also seen in trials where vitamin D was administered at daily equivalent doses of 400-1000 IU (OR 0.70, 95% CI 0.55 to 0.89; 2,305 participants in 10 studies), but not <400 IU (OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.31 to 1.37; 2,308 participants in 2 studies), 1001-2000 IU (OR 0.96, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.06; 15,702 participants in 14 studies), or >2000 IU (OR 1.05, 95% CI 0.84 to 1.31; 6,906 participants in 7 studies; Figure S5). Statistically significant protective effects were also seen for trials with a duration of ≤12 months (OR 0.82, 95% CI 0.72 to 0.94; 9,061 participants in 28 studies) but not in those lasting >12 months (OR 1.03, 95% CI 0.95 to 1.11; 18,754 participants in 6 studies; Figure S6). An exploratory analysis restricted to placebo-controlled trials investigating effects of daily dosing at doses of 400-1000 IU/day with duration ≤12 months showed a statistically significant reduction in the proportion of participants experiencing at least one ARI (OR 0.58, 95% CI 0.45 to 0.75; 1,232 participants in 8 studies; Figure S7; Cates Plot, Figure S1). Heterogeneity of effect was low (I² 0.0%, P for heterogeneity 0.67). The associated NNT was 8 (95% CI 6 to 15).

Multivariable Meta-Regression Analysis

Multivariable meta-regression analysis of trial-level sub-groups did not identify a statistically significant interaction between allocation to vitamin D vs. placebo and dose frequency, size or trial duration (Table S3).

Secondary outcomes

Meta-analysis of secondary outcomes was performed for results of placebo-controlled trials only; results are presented in Table 3. Overall, without consideration of participant- or trial-level factors, vitamin D supplementation did not have a statistically significant effect on the proportion of participants with one or more URI, LRI, courses of antimicrobials for ARI, work/school absences due to ARI, hospitalisations or emergency department attendances for ARI, serious adverse events of any cause, death due to ARI or respiratory failure, death due to any cause, or episodes of hypercalcaemia or renal stones.
Risk of bias across studies

A funnel plot for the proportion of participants experiencing at least one ARI showed
left-sided asymmetry, raising the possibility that small trials showing non-protective
effects of vitamin D may not have been included in the meta-analysis (Figure S8). An
Egger’s regression test for publication bias\textsuperscript{52} confirmed asymmetry (P=0.002).
Accordingly, the quality of the body of evidence contributing to analyses of the primary
efficacy outcome and major secondary outcomes was downgraded to moderate (Table
S4).

Sensitivity Analyses

Results of exploratory sensitivity analyses are presented in Table S5. Meta-analysis of
the proportion of participants in placebo-controlled trials experiencing at least one ARI,
excluding 2 studies assessed as being at unclear risk of bias,\textsuperscript{8,26} revealed protective
effects of vitamin D supplementation consistent with the main analysis (OR 0.91, 95% CI 0.83 to 0.997; 27,626 participants in 32 studies). Sensitivity analysis for the same
outcome, excluding 17 placebo-controlled trials that investigated ARI as a secondary
outcome, did not show a statistically significant protective effect (OR 0.89, 95% CI
0.77 to 1.03; 7,343 participants in 17 studies).

Discussion

This updated meta-analysis of RCTs of vitamin D supplementation for the prevention
of ARI includes data from an additional 18,908 participants in 14 studies published
since December 2015, when we performed the final literature search for our prior
individual participant data meta-analysis.\textsuperscript{30} For expediency during the COVID-19
pandemic, we used a trial-level approach for this update, which includes data from a
total of 29,841 participants in 39 trials. Overall, we report a modest statistically
significant protective effect of vitamin D supplementation, as compared with placebo
(OR 0.89, 95% CI 0.81 to 0.98). As expected, there was significant heterogeneity
(P=0.009) across trials, which might have led to an under-estimate of the protective
effect. On the other hand, a funnel plot revealed evidence of publication bias, which
might have led to an over-estimate of the protective effect. In contrast to findings of our
previous meta-analysis,\textsuperscript{30} we did not observe enhanced protection in those with the lowest 25(OH)D levels at baseline. However, there was evidence that efficacy of vitamin D supplementation varied according to dosing regimen and trial duration, with protective effects associated with daily administration of doses of 400-1000 IU vitamin D given for ≤12 months. An exploratory analysis restricted to data from 8 trials fulfilling these design criteria revealed a larger protective effect (OR 0.58, 95% CI 0.45 to 0.75) without significant heterogeneity across trials (P for heterogeneity 0.67).

The magnitude of the overall protective effect seen in the current analysis (OR 0.89, 95% CI 0.81 to 0.98) is similar to the value reported in our previous meta-analysis of individual participant data (adjusted OR 0.88, 95% CI 0.81 to 0.96).\textsuperscript{30} In keeping with our previous study, the point estimate for this effect was lower among those with baseline 25(OH)D <25 nmol/L than in those with higher baseline vitamin D status. However, in contrast to our previous finding, a statistically significant protective effect of vitamin D was not seen in those with the lowest 25(OH)D concentrations. This difference reflects the inclusion of null data from three new RCTs in which vitamin D was given in relatively high doses at weekly or monthly intervals over 2-3 years.\textsuperscript{40,42,44} Null results of these studies contrast with protective effects reported from earlier trials in which smaller daily doses of vitamin D were given over shorter periods.\textsuperscript{8,9,13,16} These differing findings suggest that the frequency, amount and duration of vitamin D supplementation may be key determinants of its protective efficacy. In keeping with this hypothesis, statistically significant protective effects of vitamin D were seen for meta-analysis of trials where vitamin D was given daily; where it was given at doses of 400-1000 IU/day; and where it was given for 12 months or less. When results of trials that investigated daily administration of 400-1000 IU over ≤12 months were pooled in an exploratory meta-analysis, a protective effect was seen (OR 0.58, 95% CI 0.45 to 0.75) with low heterogeneity (I\textsuperscript{2} 0.0%, P for heterogeneity 0.67) and a NNT of 8 (95% CI 6 to 15).

The current study has several strengths: it contains the very latest RCT data available in this fast-moving field, including findings from a soon-to-be published very large trial conducted using directly-observed, higher-dose, weekly vitamin D supplementation in very deficient children.\textsuperscript{42} The inclusion of additional studies allowed us to analyse results of placebo-controlled studies vs. high-dose / low-dose studies separately, and
gave us the power to investigate reasons for heterogeneity of effect observed across trials. For example, we could distinguish the effects of daily vs. weekly dosing, which were previously pooled.\textsuperscript{30}

Our work also has limitations. Given the need to generate a rapid update of our previous work in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, we meta-analysed aggregate (trial-level) data, rather than individual participant data; this allowed us to proceed rapidly, without the delays introduced by the need to establish multiple data sharing agreements. However, we did contact authors to get unpublished estimates of effect that were stratified by pre-defined baseline 25(OH)D levels, harmonised across studies: thus, we were able to provide accurate data for the major participant-level effect-modifier of interest. Despite the large number of trials overall, relatively few compared effects of lower- vs. higher-dose vitamin D: our power for this secondary comparison was therefore limited. We lacked the individual participant data to investigate race/ethnicity and obesity as potential effect-modifiers. We also could not account for other factors that might influence the efficacy of vitamin D supplements for ARI prevention (e.g., taking the supplement with or without food) or secular trends that would influence trials, such as the increased societal use of vitamin D supplements;\textsuperscript{53} concurrent use of standard dose vitamin D supplements or multivitamins in the “placebo” group would effectively render these as high- vs. low-dose trials and potentially drive results toward the null. A final limitation relates to the funnel plot, which suggests that the overall effect size may have been over-estimated due to publication bias.

In summary, this updated meta-analysis of data from RCTs of vitamin D for the prevention of ARI showed a statistically significant overall protective effect of the intervention. The number needed to treat to prevent one ARI was 36. The protective effect was heterogenous across trials; it also may have been over-estimated due to publication bias. In contrast to findings of our previous meta-analysis of individual participant data, we did not see a protective effect of vitamin D supplementation among those with the lowest baseline vitamin D status. The vitamin D dosing regimen of most benefit was daily and used standard doses (e.g., 400 to 1000 IU) for up to 12 months. The relevance of these findings to COVID-19 is not known and requires investigation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study first author, year</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Participations</th>
<th>Mean age (s.d.)</th>
<th>Male: Female</th>
<th>25(OH)D assay, EGA scheme</th>
<th>Mean baseline 25(OH)D, nmol/L (s.d.)</th>
<th>Baseline 25(OH)D &lt;25 nmol/L (%)</th>
<th>Mean attained 25(OH)D, intervention arm, nmol/L (s.d.)</th>
<th>Intervention: Control (total)</th>
<th>Oral dose of vitamin D, intervention arm</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Trial duration</th>
<th>ARI definition</th>
<th>ARI primary or secondary outcome?</th>
<th>N contributing data / N randomised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li-Ng 2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Healthy adults</td>
<td>37.9 (13.6)</td>
<td>34:128</td>
<td>RIA (DiaSorin), DEQAS</td>
<td>63.7 (25.5)</td>
<td>3/150 (2.0)</td>
<td>88.5 (23.2)</td>
<td>84.78 (162)</td>
<td>50 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
<td>URI:±2 URI symptoms in absence of allergy symptoms</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>175/162 (96.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urashima 2010</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Schoolchildren</td>
<td>10.2 (2.3)</td>
<td>242:188</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>217:213 (430)</td>
<td>30 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>URI: Influenza A/B diagnosed by RDT or RIDT-negative ILI</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>334/430 (77.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasek-Holland 2010</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Pre-school children with pneumonia</td>
<td>1.1 (0.8)</td>
<td>25/196</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>224:229 (452)</td>
<td>2.5 mg bolus once</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
<td>URI: repeated episode of pneumonia – age-specific ashpynxons without wheeze ARI: medical record diagnosis</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>423/423 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majak 2011</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Children with asthma</td>
<td>10.9 (3.3)</td>
<td>32:16</td>
<td>RIA (BioSource Europe), DEQAS</td>
<td>89.9 (38.2)</td>
<td>3/48 (0.0)</td>
<td>37.6 (13.1)</td>
<td>24:24 (48)</td>
<td>12.5 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>URI: self-report</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>164/164 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trickle-Kumar 2011</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Low birthweight infants</td>
<td>8.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>870:1109</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>1039:1040 (2079)</td>
<td>35 µg weekly</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>ARI: medical record diagnosis of events causing hospitalisation</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>204/2079 (93.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehouck 2012</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Adults with COPD</td>
<td>67.9 (8.3)</td>
<td>145:37</td>
<td>RIA (DiaSorin), DEQAS</td>
<td>49.8 (29.2)</td>
<td>31/182 (17.0)</td>
<td>130.0 (44.7)</td>
<td>91.91 (182)</td>
<td>2.5 mg bolus monthly</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>URI: self-report</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>179/162 (98.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasek-Holland 2012</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>3rd to 4th grade schoolchildren</td>
<td>10.0 (0.9)</td>
<td>129:118</td>
<td>LC-MS/MS, DEQAS</td>
<td>18.9 (7.9)</td>
<td>192/245 (78.4)</td>
<td>49.1 (15.1)</td>
<td>1524:1522 (3046)</td>
<td>2.5 mg bolus monthly</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1.5 yr</td>
<td>URI: pneumonia confirmed by chest radiograph</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>301/3046 (98.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camargo 2012</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Healthy adults</td>
<td>48.1 (9.7)</td>
<td>81:241</td>
<td>LC-MS/MS, DEQAS</td>
<td>72.1 (22.1)</td>
<td>5/322 (1.6)</td>
<td>123.6 (27.5)</td>
<td>161:161 (322)</td>
<td>7.5 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>7 wk</td>
<td>URI: parent-reported chest infections or colds' URI: assessed with symptom score</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>234/247 (98.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergman 2012</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Adults with increased susceptibility to ARI</td>
<td>53.1 (13.1)</td>
<td>38:102</td>
<td>CLA (DiaSorin), DEQAS</td>
<td>49.3 (23.2)</td>
<td>15/131 (11.45)</td>
<td>94.9 (38.1)</td>
<td>70.70 (140)</td>
<td>100 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>ARI: assessed with symptom score</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>124/140 (88.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchisio 2013</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Children with recurrent acute otitis media</td>
<td>2.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>64:52</td>
<td>CLA (DiaSorin), ISO9001</td>
<td>65.3 (7.3)</td>
<td>2/116 (1.7)</td>
<td>90.3 (21.1)</td>
<td>58.58 (116)</td>
<td>25 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>URI: doctor-diagnosed acute otitis media</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>116/116 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees 2013</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Adults with previous colorectal adenoma</td>
<td>61.2 (6.6)</td>
<td>438:321</td>
<td>RIA (IDS), DEQAS</td>
<td>62.5 (21.3)</td>
<td>3/759 (0.0)</td>
<td>186.9 (455.1)</td>
<td>399/360 (759)</td>
<td>25 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>13 mo (average)</td>
<td>URI: assessed from daily symptom diary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>759/759 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran 2014</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Healthy older adults</td>
<td>71.7 (6.9)</td>
<td>343:301</td>
<td>CLA (DiaSorin), DEQAS</td>
<td>41.7 (13.5)</td>
<td>66/643 (10.3)</td>
<td>71.0 (19.6)</td>
<td>430/214 (664)</td>
<td>0.75 mg bolus vs. 1.5 mg bolus monthly</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>URI: self-reported cold</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>394/644 (92.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodall 2014</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Healthy university students</td>
<td>19.6 (2.2)</td>
<td>218:362</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>300:300 (600)</td>
<td>0.25 mg weekly/factorial with gargling</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>8 wk</td>
<td>URI: self-reported cold</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>492/600 (85.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urashima 2014</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>High school students</td>
<td>16.5 (1.0)</td>
<td>162:85</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>148:99 (247)</td>
<td>50 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
<td>URI: Influenza A/B diagnosed by RDT or RIDT-negative ILI</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>247/247 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 2014</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Pregnant women and offspring</td>
<td>36.20 (18.0)</td>
<td>260:200</td>
<td>LC-MS/MS, DEQAS</td>
<td>54.8 (25.8)</td>
<td>30/200 (15.0)</td>
<td>82.9 (41.6)</td>
<td>173:87 (pregnant women, 260) 164:85 (offspring, 249)</td>
<td>Pregnant women: 25 µg vs. 50 µg daily, Offspring: 10 µg vs. 20 µg daily</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>9 mo (3 mo in pregnancy + 6 mo in infancy)</td>
<td>ARI: doctor-diagnosed ARI precipitating primary care consultation</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>239/280 (90.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martineau 2015a</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Adults with COPD</td>
<td>64.7 (8.5)</td>
<td>144:96</td>
<td>LC-MS/MS, DEQAS</td>
<td>46.1 (25.7)</td>
<td>50/240 (20.8)</td>
<td>67.3 (27.5)</td>
<td>122:118 (240)</td>
<td>3 mg bolus 2-4 mo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>URI: assessed from daily symptom diary</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>240/240 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martineau 2015b</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Adults with</td>
<td>47.9 (14.4)</td>
<td>199:141</td>
<td>LC-MS/MS, DEQAS</td>
<td>49.6 (24.7)</td>
<td>46/250 (14.4)</td>
<td>69.4 (21.0)</td>
<td>125:125 (250)</td>
<td>3 mg bolus 2-4 mo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>URI: assessed from daily</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>251/250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study first author, year</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Mean age, years (s.d.)</td>
<td>Male: Female</td>
<td>25(OH)D assay, EQA scheme</td>
<td>Mean baseline 25(OH)D, nmol/L (s.d.)</td>
<td>Baseline 25(OH)D &lt;25 nmol/L (%)</td>
<td>Mean attained 25(OH)D intervention arm, nmol/L (s.d.)</td>
<td>Intervention: (total)</td>
<td>Oral dose of vitamin D intervention arm</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Trial duration</td>
<td>ARI definition</td>
<td>ARI primary or secondary outcome?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015b</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Older adults and their carers</td>
<td>82:158</td>
<td>67.1 (13.0)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>42.9 (23.0)</td>
<td>60/240 (25.0)</td>
<td>84.8 (24.1)</td>
<td>137:103 (240)</td>
<td>Older adults: 2.4 mg bolus 2-monthly + 10 µg daily Carers: 3 mg 2-monthly Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>240:240 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson 2015c</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>70.4 (12.9)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>47.0 (16.9)</td>
<td>55/408 (13.5)</td>
<td>104.3 (32.4)</td>
<td>201:207 (408)</td>
<td>2.5 mg bolus then 100 µg daily Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>28 wk</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>408:408 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubnov-Raz 2015b</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>130:278</td>
<td>32.2 (12.2)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>70.9 (23.0)</td>
<td>0/33 (0.0)</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>18:16 (34)</td>
<td>0.5 mg weekly Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>17 wk</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>34:34 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denlinger 2016a</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Healthy adults</td>
<td>84:82</td>
<td>15.2 (1.6)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>60.4 (11.9)</td>
<td>0/54 (0.0)</td>
<td>73.7 (16.6)</td>
<td>27:27 (54)</td>
<td>50 µg daily Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>12 wk</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>25:46 (46.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tachimoto 2016b</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Adolescents with asthma</td>
<td>50:39</td>
<td>1.89 (1.1)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>74.9 (24.6)</td>
<td>12/107 (11.2)</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>54.35 (89)</td>
<td>20 µg daily, first 2 mo 2.5 mg bolus monthly + ≤25 µg per day equivalent Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>107/107 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drage 2016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>84:82</td>
<td>80.7 (9.9)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>57.3 (22.7)</td>
<td>0/54 (0.0)</td>
<td>85.7 (24.5)</td>
<td>55.52 (107)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>107/107 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simanjiro 2016b</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Healthy adults</td>
<td>66:149</td>
<td>1.14 (1.1)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>64.1 (43.9)</td>
<td>162/324 (33.3)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>Physician confirmed recurrent pneumonia</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>314:324 (96.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aglay 2017a</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Healthy children</td>
<td>26:32</td>
<td>2.7 (1.5)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>68.8 (22.0)</td>
<td>322/532 (62)</td>
<td>117.7 (26.1)</td>
<td>119:118 (237)</td>
<td>12.5 µg daily Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>Lab confirmed influenza</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>223:237 (94.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhiro 2018b</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>467:467</td>
<td>44.7 (1.3)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>35.7 (16.5)</td>
<td>16/62 (26)</td>
<td>92.4 (23.7)</td>
<td>31:31 (62)</td>
<td>2.5 mg bolus, single dose Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>260:260 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgs 2018a</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>African American preterm infants</td>
<td>260:260</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>55.4 (22.2)</td>
<td>2/300 (0.0)</td>
<td>85.0 (21.2)</td>
<td>153:147 (300)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>300:300 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee 2018a</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Children and young adults with sickle cell disease</td>
<td>30:32</td>
<td>9.9 (3.9)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>92.4 (23.7)</td>
<td>32:32 (100)</td>
<td>31:31 (62)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>32:32 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeb 2018b</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Healthy children and adolescents</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>9.3 (4.0)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>81.8 (23.6)</td>
<td>5/151 (3.3)</td>
<td>91.8 (23.6)</td>
<td>255/350 (1300)</td>
<td>0.35 mg weekly Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>8 mo</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>115:130 (88.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenblatt 2018a</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Healthy infants</td>
<td>68:68</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>80.4 (21.5)</td>
<td>119/118 (100)</td>
<td>118.6 (32.7)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>10 µg daily</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>118/118 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimizu 2018a</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Healthy adults</td>
<td>126:126</td>
<td>52.7 (6.5)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>114.6 (32.7)</td>
<td>126/262 (47.0)</td>
<td>126:126 (52)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>126:126 (47.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloia 2019a</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Healthy African American women aged over 60 years</td>
<td>255:255</td>
<td>69.0 (5.3)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>93.0 (39.9)</td>
<td>135.0 (39.9)</td>
<td>5/50 (1.0)</td>
<td>255/255 (100)</td>
<td>5 µg bolus loading dose: then 2.5 mg bolus monthly Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>50:50 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camargo 2019b</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>84:84</td>
<td>66.4 (8.3)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>63.4 (23.6)</td>
<td>89/506 (1.8)</td>
<td>135.0 (39.9)</td>
<td>255/255 (100)</td>
<td>5 µg bolus loading dose: then 2.5 mg bolus monthly Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Co-primary</td>
<td>50:50 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haugb 2019a</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Healthy children</td>
<td>58:58</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>70.4 (23.7)</td>
<td>170.0 (28.0)</td>
<td>170:170 (100)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>170:170 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammaa, Mongolia</td>
<td>Healthy school</td>
<td>244:244</td>
<td>9.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>DEQAS</td>
<td>114.6 (32.7)</td>
<td>126/262 (47.0)</td>
<td>126:126 (52)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
<td>Symptom diary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>126:126 (47.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study first author, year</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Mean age, years (s.d.)</td>
<td>Male: Female</td>
<td>25(OH)D assay, EQA scheme</td>
<td>Mean baseline 25(OH)D, nmol/L (s.d.)</td>
<td>Baseline 25(OH)D &lt;25 nmol/L (%)</td>
<td>Mean attained 25(OH)D, intervention arm, nmol/L (s.d.)</td>
<td>Intervention: Control (total)</td>
<td>Oral dose of vitamin D₃, intervention arm</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Trial duration</td>
<td>ARI definition</td>
<td>ARI primary or secondary outcome?</td>
<td>N contributing data / N randomised (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandlik 2020</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Healthy children</td>
<td>8.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>158:127</td>
<td>EIA (DLD diagnostics)</td>
<td>68.9 (10.9)</td>
<td>4/237 (0.0)</td>
<td>80 (23.3)</td>
<td>135:150 (285)</td>
<td>25 µg daily + 500 mg calcium</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>6 mo</td>
<td>URI: self-reported</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>244/285 (85.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rake 2020</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Healthy older adults</td>
<td>72.2 (4.9)</td>
<td>408:379</td>
<td>CLA (Cobas 6000 Roche)</td>
<td>50.2 (27.1)</td>
<td>127/787 (16.1)</td>
<td>109.2 (33.9)</td>
<td>255:292 (787)</td>
<td>2.5 mg bolus monthly</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>URI/LRI: GP recorded</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>787/787 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Sex missing for two participants randomised to intervention arm and subsequently excluded from analysis due to lack of outcome data. [b] Sex missing for one participant. [c] equivalent to 30 µg vitamin D₃. 1 µg vitamin D₃ = 40 international units (IU); 25(OH)D concentrations reported in ng/ml were converted to nmol/L by multiplying by 2.496. 25(OH)D, 25-hydroxyvitamin D; RIDT, rapid influenza diagnostic test; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; D₃, vitamin D₃ (cholecalciferol); p.o., per os (orally); mo, month; yr, year; wk, week. ARI, acute respiratory infection; CAP, College of American Pathologists; CLA, chemiluminescent assay; DEQAS, Vitamin D External Quality Assessment Scheme; EIA, enzyme immunoassay; EQA, external quality assessment; LC-MS/MS, liquid chromatography tandem-mass spectrometry, RIA, radio-immunoassay; URI, upper respiratory infection; LRI, lower respiratory infection; ILI, influenza-like illness; RIQAQS, Randox International Quality Assessment Scheme; VDSP, Vitamin D Standardisation Program of the Office of Dietary Supplements, National Institutes of Health, USA.
Table 2: Placebo controlled RCTs: Proportion of participants experiencing at least one acute respiratory infection, overall and stratified by potential effect-modifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No of trials</th>
<th>Proportion with ≥1 ARI, intervention group (%)</th>
<th>Proportion with ≥1 ARI, control group (%)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>I² %</th>
<th>P for heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8307/14155 (58.7)</td>
<td>8196/13660 (60.0)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.81 to 0.98)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline 25(OH)D, nmol/L</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1348/1798 (75.0)</td>
<td>1388/1819 (76.3)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.53 to 1.16)</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 49.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3411/4637 (73.6)</td>
<td>3337/4491 (74.3)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.91 to 1.17)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 74.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1607/2761 (58.2)</td>
<td>1531/2542 (60.2)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.75 to 1.07)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>923/1520 (60.7)</td>
<td>895/1458 (61.4)</td>
<td>0.97 (0.81 to 1.16)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dosing frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1056/2134 (49.5)</td>
<td>1020/1871 (54.5)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.61 to 0.93)</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4357/6288 (69.3)</td>
<td>4388/6274 (69.9)</td>
<td>0.97 (0.88 to 1.06)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or less frequently</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2894/5733 (50.5)</td>
<td>2788/5515 (50.6)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.91 to 1.09)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily dose equivalent, IU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>482/1175 (41.0)</td>
<td>511/1133 (45.1)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.31 to 1.37)</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-1000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>656/1236 (53.1)</td>
<td>627/1069 (58.7)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.55 to 0.89)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4693/7885 (59.5)</td>
<td>4712/7817 (60.3)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.87 to 1.06)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2291/3462 (66.2)</td>
<td>2250/3444 (65.3)</td>
<td>1.05 (0.84 to 1.31)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trial duration, months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1852/4754 (39.0)</td>
<td>1807/4307 (42.0)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.72 to 0.94)</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6455/9401 (68.7)</td>
<td>6389/9353 (68.3)</td>
<td>1.03 (0.95 to 1.11)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Data from one trial that included higher-dose, lower-dose and placebo arms are excluded from this sub-group analysis, since the higher-dose and lower-dose arms spanned the 1,000 IU/day cut-off, rendering it unclassifiable.
Table 3: Placebo-controlled studies: Secondary outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No of trials</th>
<th>Proportion with ≥1 event, intervention group (%)</th>
<th>Proportion with ≥1 event, control group (%)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>I² %</th>
<th>P for heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper respiratory infection</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7600/12175 (62.4)</td>
<td>7483/11754 (63.7)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.89 to 1.02)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower respiratory infection</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3245/10849 (29.9)</td>
<td>3265/10747 (30.4)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.92 to 1.05)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency department</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>110/9759 (1.1)</td>
<td>123/9707 (1.3)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.68 to 1.15)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Control (n = 11833)</td>
<td>Exposed (n = 11364)</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (95% CI)</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and/or hospital admission due to ARI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death due to ARI or respiratory failure</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14/13479 (0.1)</td>
<td>11/12996 (0.1)</td>
<td>1.05 (0.61 to 1.81)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of antibiotics to treat an ARI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1967/6340 (31.0)</td>
<td>1995/6236 (32.0)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.85 to 1.04)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence from work or school due to ARI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>378/1527 (24.7)</td>
<td>364/1044 (34.9)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.69 to 1.20)</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious adverse event of any cause</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>403/11833 (3.4)</td>
<td>424/11364 (3.7)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.81 to 1.08)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death due to any cause</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>117/13721 (0.9)</td>
<td>97/13231 (0.7)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.89 to 1.50)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypercalcaemia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28/7394 (0.4)</td>
<td>19/7019 (0.3)</td>
<td>1.28 (0.77 to 2.16)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal stones</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79/9640 (0.8)</td>
<td>86/9238 (0.9)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.67 to 1.22)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 1:** Flow chart of study selection

**1,519 studies identified through database searching:**
- Medline: 447
- Web of Science: 345
- Cochrane central: 601
- Embase: 72
- Clinicaltrials.gov: 53

→ 370 duplicates removed

**1,149 unique studies after duplicates removed**

→ **1,109 studies ineligible** (not relevant, review article, not RCTs, ARI not pre-specified as efficacy outcome, only abstract published, allocation not concealed, intervention not vitamin D or calcidiol)

→ **40 studies with total of 30,956 participants eligible:**
  - 31 studies with total of 27,523 participants comparing a single vitamin D regimen vs. placebo only
  - 4 studies with total of 1,274 participants including higher-dose, lower-dose and placebo arms
  - 5 studies with total of 2,159 participants comparing higher- vs. lower-dose regimens of vitamin D only

→ Data not obtained for 1 study with 47 participants comparing vitamin D vs. placebo only

**Number of participants and studies contributing primary outcome data to meta-analysis:**
- 26,782/27,476 participants in 30 studies comparing a single vitamin D regimen vs. placebo only
- 994/1,274 participants in 4 studies including higher-dose, lower-dose and placebo arms
- 2,065/2,159 participants in 5 studies comparing higher- vs. lower-dose regimens of vitamin D only
Figure 2: Forest plot of placebo-controlled RCTs reporting proportion of participants experiencing 1 or more acute respiratory infection.

*This analysis includes data from the subset of ViDiFlu trial participants who were randomised to vitamin D vs. placebo control.*
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