

1 **Vitamin D and Covid-19 Susceptibility and Severity: a Mendelian Randomization**
2 **Study**

3

4 **Authors:**

5 *Guillaume Butler-Laporte^{1,2}, *Tomoko Nakanishi^{1,3,4,5}, Vincent Mooser^{3,6}, David R.
6 Morrison¹, Tala Abdullah¹, Olumide Adeleye¹, Noor Mamlouk¹, Nofar Kimchi^{1,7}, Zaman
7 Afrasiabi¹, Nardin Rezk¹, Annarita Giliberti⁸, Alessandra Renieri^{8,9}, Yiheng Chen¹, Sirui
8 Zhou^{1,2}, Vincenzo Forgetta¹, J Brent Richards^{1,2,3,10}

9

10 *These authors made equal contributions to this manuscript.

11

12 **Affiliations:**

- 13 1) Lady Davis Institute, Jewish General Hospital, McGill University, Montréal,
14 Québec, Canada
15 2) Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill
16 University, Montréal, Québec, Canada
17 3) Department of Human Genetics, McGill University Montréal, Québec, Canada
18 4) Kyoto-McGill International Collaborative School in Genomic Medicine, Graduate
19 School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
20 5) Research Fellow, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
21 6) Canada Excellence Research Chair in Genomic Medicine, McGill University,
22 Montréal, Québec, Canada
23 7) Ruth and Bruce Rappaport Faculty of Medicine, Technion Israel Institute of
24 Technology, Israel
25 8) Medical Genetics, University of Siena, Siena, Italy
26 9) Genetica Medica, Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Senese, Siena, Italy
27 10) Department of Twin Research, King's College London, London, United Kingdom

28

29 **Corresponding author:**

30 Brent Richards, Professor of Medicine
31 McGill University
32 Senior Lecturer, King's College London (Honorary)

33 Contact:

34 Pavilion H-413, Jewish General Hospital
35 3755 Côte-Ste-Catherine
36 Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3T 1E2
37 T: +1 514 340 8222 x24362 F: +1 514 340 7529

38 E: brent.richards@mcgill.ca
39 www.mcgill.ca/genepi

40

41 **Funding:**

42 The Richards research group is supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research
43 (CIHR: 365825; 409511), the Lady Davis Institute of the Jewish General Hospital, the
44 Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the NIH Foundation, Cancer Research UK, Genome
45 Québec, the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Fonds de Recherche Québec Santé
46 (FRQS). GBL is supported by a joint scholarship from the FRQS and Québec's Ministry of
47 Health and Social Services. TN is supported by Research Fellowships of Japan Society
48 for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) for Young Scientists and JSPS Overseas Challenge
49 Program for Young Researchers. JBR is supported by a FRQS Clinical Research
50 Scholarship. Support from Calcul Québec and Compute Canada is acknowledged.
51 TwinsUK is funded by the Wellcome Trust, Medical Research Council, European Union,

52 the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)-funded BioResource, Clinical Research
53 Facility and Biomedical Research Centre based at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation
54 Trust in partnership with King's College London. These funding agencies had no role in
55 the design, implementation or interpretation of this study.

56

57 **Disclosures:**

58 JBR has served as an advisor to GlaxoSmithKline and Deerfield Capital. These agencies
59 had no role in the design, implementation or interpretation of this study.

60

61 **Article type:** Research

62 **Word count:** 3115 (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion)

63 **Key words:** Vitamin D, Covid-19, Sars-CoV-2, Mendelian Randomization, Outcome

64

65

66 **Abstract**

67 *Introduction*

68 Increased vitamin D levels, as reflected by 25OHD measurements, has been proposed to
69 protect against Covid-19 disease based on *in-vitro*, observational, and ecological studies.
70 However, vitamin D levels are associated with many confounding variables and thus
71 associations described to date may not be causal. Vitamin D MR studies have provided
72 results that are concordant with large-scale vitamin D randomized trials. Here, we used
73 two-sample MR to assess the effect of circulating 25OHD levels on Covid-19 susceptibility.
74

75 *Methods and findings*

76 Genetic variants strongly associated with 25OHD levels in a 443,734-participant genome-
77 wide association study (GWAS) were used as instrumental variables. GWASs of Covid-
78 19 susceptibility and severity from the Covid-19 Host Genetics Initiative were used as
79 outcomes. Cohorts from the Covid-19 Host Genetics Initiative GWAS included up to
80 14,134 individuals with Covid-19, and 1,284,876 with Covid-19, from 11 countries.
81 Analyses were restricted to individuals of European descent when possible. Using inverse-
82 weighted MR, genetically increased 25OHD levels by one standard deviation on the
83 logarithmic scale had no clear association with Covid-19 susceptibility (OR = 0.97; 95%
84 CI: 0.95, 1.10; P=0.613), hospitalization (OR = 1.11; 95% CI: 0.91, 1.35; P=0.299), and
85 severe disease (OR = 0.93; 95% CI: 0.73, 1.17; P=0.531). We used an additional 6 meta-
86 analytic methods, as well as sensitivity analysis after removal of variants at risk of
87 horizontal pleiotropy, and obtained similar results. These results may be limited by weak
88 instrument bias in some analyses. Further, our results do not apply to individuals with
89 vitamin D deficiency.
90

91 *Conclusion*

92 Our results do not support that patients be advised to take vitamin D supplementation to
93 protect against Covid-19 outcomes. Further, other therapeutic or preventative avenues
94 should be given higher priority for Covid-19 randomized controlled trials.

95

96

97 **Author Summary**

98

99

• *Why was this study done?*

100

- The Covid-19 pandemic is the most important public health emergency in recent memory.

101

- Vitamin D levels have been associated with Covid-19 outcomes in multiple observational studies, though confounders are likely to bias these associations.

102

103

104

- By using genetic instruments which are not affected by such confounders, Mendelian randomization studies have steadily obtained results consistent with vitamin D supplementation randomized trials and may also be used in the context of Covid-19.

105

106

107

108

109

• *What did the researchers do and find?*

110

- We used the genetic variants obtained from the largest cohort of Covid-19 cases and controls, and the largest study on genetic determinants of vitamin D levels.

111

112

- We used Mendelian randomization to combine these genetic variants to estimate the effect of increase vitamin D on Covid-19 outcomes, while controlling for confounders.

113

114

115

- In multiple analysis, our results consistently showed no evidence for an association between vitamin D levels and Covid-19 susceptibility, hospitalization, or severe disease.

116

117

118

119

• *What do these findings mean?*

120

- Vitamin D is a highly confounded variables, and traditional observational studies are at high risk of biased estimates.

121

- We do not find evidence that vitamin D supplementation would improve Covid-19 outcomes.

122

123

- Given mendelian randomization's past record with randomized controlled trial, other therapeutic and preventative avenues should be prioritized for Covid-19 randomized trials.

124

125

126

127 **Introduction**

128 SARS-CoV-2 infection has killed hundreds of thousands of individuals and has led to the
129 largest economic contraction since the Great Depression[1]. Therefore, therapies are
130 required to treat severe Covid-19 disease and to prevent its complications. Therapeutic
131 development, in turn, requires well-validated drug targets to lessen Covid-19 severity.

132
133 Recently, vitamin D status, as reflected by 25-hydroxy-vitamin D (25OHD) level has been
134 identified potentially actionable drug target in the prevention and treatment of Covid-19[2].
135 As the pre-hormone to the biologically active calcitriol, 25OHD has been epidemiologically
136 linked to many health outcomes[3,4]. Given calcitriol's recognized *in-vitro*
137 immunomodulatory role[5], as well as observational and ecological studies on measured
138 25OHD blood levels and Covid-19[6,7], the vitamin D pathway might be a biologically
139 plausible target in Covid-19. This could be of public health importance, given that the
140 prevalence of vitamin D insufficiency is high in most countries, and that more than 37% of
141 elderly adults in the USA take vitamin D supplements[8]. Further, 25OHD supplementation
142 is inexpensive and reasonably safe—thus providing a potential avenue to lessen the
143 burden of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

144
145 However, observational studies on 25OHD are prone to confounding and reverse
146 causation bias. Confounding happens when the relationship between exposure (25OHD)
147 and the outcome (Covid-19) is influenced by an unobserved, or improperly controlled
148 common causes. Reverse causation happens when the outcome itself is a cause of the
149 exposure. Likewise, conclusions drawn from *in-vitro* may not be applicable *in-vivo*.
150 Accordingly, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on 25OHD supplementation have been
151 undertaken to test their effect on disease outcomes where observational studies have
152 supported a role for 25OHD level. However, across endocrinology, respirology, cardiology,
153 and other specialties, these trials have most often have failed to show clinical benefits[9–
154 11]. Some RCTs have even shown detriment to 25OHD supplementation[12]. In the field
155 of infectious diseases, an individual patient data meta-analysis of randomized controlled
156 trial of 25OHD supplementation[13] showed some benefit to prevent respiratory tract
157 infections (OR 0.80, 95% CI: 0.69 to 0.93). However, this effect was driven by generally
158 benign upper respiratory tract infections, and was not observed in lower respiratory tract
159 disease (OR: 0.96, 95% CI: 0.83 to 1.10) and even showed numerically worse all-cause
160 mortality (OR: 1.39, 95% CI: 0.85 to 2.27). Likewise, a recent trial on sepsis obtained a
161 numerically higher mortality rate in patients who received 25OHD supplementation[14].
162 For now, we are only aware of one RCT on vitamin D supplementation in Covid-19[15],
163 which showed less intensive care unit admissions in the treatment arm. However, the
164 combination of its small size (n=75), varying follow-up time for mortality, and open label
165 design put it at high risk of bias and is unlikely to be able to inform physicians and public
166 health authorities on vitamin D supplementation. Hence, while RCTs can control for
167 confounding and provide unbiased estimates of the effect of 25OHD supplementation in
168 Covid-19, large well-designed RCTs require considerable resources and time.

169
170 Mendelian randomization (MR) is a genetic epidemiology method that uses genetic
171 variants as instrumental variables to infer the causal effect of an exposure (in this case
172 25OHD level) on an outcome (in this case, Covid-19 susceptibility and severity)[16]. MR
173 overcomes confounding bias since genetic alleles are randomized to the individual at
174 conception, thereby breaking associations with most confounders. Similarly, since genetic
175 alleles are always assigned prior to disease onset, they are not influenced by reverse
176 causation. MR has been used in conjunction with proteomics and metabolomics to
177 [15]prioritize drug development and repurposing, and support investment in RCTs which

178 have a higher chances of success[17,18]. In the case of vitamin D, MR has been able to
179 provide causal effect estimates consistently in line with those obtained from RCTs[9,19–
180 23], and may support investments in 25OHD supplementation trials in Covid-19, if a
181 benefit was shown. Further, since MR results can be generated rapidly, such evidence
182 may provide interim findings while awaiting RCT results.

183

184 However, MR relies on several core assumptions[24]. First, genetic variants must be
185 associated with the exposure of interest. Second, they should not affect the outcome
186 except through effects on the exposure (also known as lack of horizontal pleiotropy).
187 Specifically, MR also assumes that the relationship between the exposure and the
188 outcome is linear. However, this assumption still provides valid results when studying
189 population-level effects[25]. Third, genetic variants should not associate with the
190 confounders of the exposure-outcome relationship. Of these, the most problematic is the
191 second assumption. Yet, in the case of 25OHD, many of its genetic determinants reside
192 at loci that harbour genes whose roles in 25OHD production, metabolism and transport
193 are well known[26]. Leveraging this known physiology can help to prevent the
194 incorporation of genetic variants that could lead to horizontal pleiotropy. Lastly, MR
195 assumes linearity of causal effect.

196

197 Here, we used genetic determinants of serum 25OHD from a recent genome-wide
198 association study (GWAS) and meta-analysis of more than 443,734 participants of
199 European ancestry[27] in an MR study to test the effect of increased 25OHD level on
200 Covid-19 susceptibility and severity.

201

202 **Methods**

203 We used a two-sample MR approach to estimate the effect of 25OHD levels on Covid-19
204 susceptibility and severity. In two-sample MR[28], the effect of genetic variants on 25OHD
205 and on Covid-19 outcomes are estimated in separate GWASs from different populations.
206 This allows for increased statistical power by increasing the sample size in both the
207 exposure and outcome cohorts.

208

209 Our study did not employ a prospective protocol. Analyses were first planned and
210 performed in July 2020 and updated following peer-review in December 2020. Three major
211 changes were made during the update. First, we used the most up to date Covid-19 Host
212 Genetics Initiative (Covid-19 HGI) genome-wide association study summary statistics.
213 These were made available during the peer-review process. Second, to alleviate potential
214 selection and collider bias, we modified the outcome phenotypes to include population
215 controls. Lastly, we performed additional mendelian randomization sensitivity analyses to
216 check for the robustness of our results. The latter two modifications were made at the
217 request of peer-reviewers.

218

219 *Choice of 25OHD genetic instruments*

220 To find genetic variants explaining 25OHD levels[27], we used a GWAS from our group,
221 which is the largest published GWAS of 25OHD levels. Importantly, this meta-analysis
222 controlled for vitamin D levels season of vitamin D measurement to obtain genetic variants
223 significantly associated with 25OHD levels. From the list of conditionally independent
224 variants provided, we further selected SNPs whose effect on 25OHD level was genome-
225 wide significant ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$), minor allele frequency was more than 1%, and with linkage
226 disequilibrium coefficients (r^2) of less than 5%. For SNPs that were not available in the
227 outcome GWAS or with palindromic alleles of intermediate frequency (between 42% and

228 58%), we used the LDlink tool[29] to find genetic proxies in the European 1000 Genomes
229 dataset (excluding Finnish populations) using linkage disequilibrium r^2 of 90% or more.

230

231 *Covid-19 outcome definitions and GWASs*

232 We used the Covid-19 HGI phenotype definitions and GWAS summary statistics for Covid-
233 19 susceptibility, hospitalization, and severe disease outcomes[30]. The susceptibility
234 phenotype compared confirmed Covid-19 cases, defined as laboratory confirmed of
235 SARS-CoV-2 infection based on RNA or serology tests, or by electronic health records
236 (using International Classification of Diseases or physician notes), with controls defined
237 as any individuals in each cohort without a history of Covid-19. The hospitalized phenotype
238 compared cases defined as hospitalized patients with Covid-19, and controls as any
239 individuals in each cohort without a hospitalization with Covid-19. The severe disease
240 phenotype cases were defined as hospitalized individuals with Covid-19 and requiring
241 respiratory support. Respiratory support was defined as intubation, CPAP, BiPAP,
242 continuous external negative pressure, or high flow nasal cannula. Controls for the severe
243 Covid-19 phenotype were defined as any individuals without severe Covid-19. These three
244 outcome phenotypes are referred to as C2, B2, and A2, respectively, in the Covid-19 HGI
245 documentation.

246

247 For our study, we used the October 20th, 2020 Covid-19 HGI fixed effect meta-analysis of
248 GWAS from up to 22 cohorts, performed in up to 11 countries. Every participating cohort
249 was asked to provide summary statistics from a GWAS on the above three outcomes, and
250 including the following non-genetic covariates: age, sex, age*age, age*sex, 20 genetic
251 principal components, as well as any locally relevant covariates at the discretion of
252 participating studies (e.g. hospital, genotype panel, etc.). Cohorts were asked to follow
253 common sample and variant quality control, and only performed analysis if they enrolled
254 100 cases or more. Analyses were done separately for each major ancestry group to
255 further control for population stratification. For the purposes of our study, we used the
256 meta-analysis results from European ancestry cohorts, except for the severe Covid-19
257 cohort, for which this meta-analysis was not available. Further details on the three
258 phenotypes and participating cohorts are found in **Table 1** and **Supplement 1**.

259

260 *Primary MR analysis*

261 The effect of 25OHD level on Covid-19 outcomes was obtained for each SNP by using the
262 Wald ratio method. The effect of each SNP was given in standardized log-transformed
263 25OHD level. Each estimate was meta-analyzed using the IVW method, and we
264 performed variant heterogeneity tests to check robustness of IVW results. Allele
265 harmonization and computations were performed using the TwoSampleMR package[31].

266

267 *Horizontal pleiotropy sensitivity analysis*

268 We undertook extensive analysis to assess the risk of horizontal pleiotropy (a violation of
269 the second MR assumption). First, we used MR Egger method, which allows for an
270 additional intercept (alpha) term which also provides an estimate of directional horizontal
271 pleiotropy. Given possible instability in MR Egger estimates[32], we also used the
272 bootstrap MR Egger method to meta-analyze the causal effect estimates from each SNP
273 instrument. Further, we used four additional meta-analysis methods known to be more
274 robust to presence of horizontal pleiotropy (at the expense of statistical power): penalised
275 weighted median, simple mode, weighted median, and weighted mode[33].

276

277 Second, we restricted our choices of SNPs to those whose closest gene is directly involved
278 in the Vitamin D pathway. These genes have an established role in vitamin D regulation

279 through its synthesis (*DHCR7/NADSYN1* and *CYP2R1*), transportation (*GC*), and
280 degradation (*CYP24A1*) (**Supplement 2**). This decreases the risk of selecting a genetic
281 variant that effects Covid-19 outcomes independent of their effect on 25OHD levels.

282

283 Third, we used the Phenoscanner tool[34,35] on the remaining SNPs to check for variants
284 associated (at a genome-wide significant threshold of $p=5 \times 10^{-8}$) with phenotypes at risk of
285 affecting Covid-19 outcomes independent of 25OHD, making them at higher risk of
286 horizontal or vertical pleiotropy. Note that vertical pleiotropy, which happens when the
287 Covid-19 outcome is influenced by a phenotype directly in the causal pathway between
288 25OHD level and Covid-19 outcome, does not violate MR assumptions.

289

290 *Research Ethics*

291 Each cohort included in this study received their respective institutional research ethics
292 board approval to enroll patients. All information used for this study are publicly available
293 as deidentified GWAS summary statistics.

294

295 **Results**

296 *Choice of 25OHD genetic instruments*

297 We obtained our 25OHD genetic instruments from our previously published GWAS[27] on
298 circulating 25OHD levels in 401,460 white British participants in the UK Biobank
299 (UKB)[36], which was meta-analyzed with a GWAS on 25OHD levels of 42,274
300 participants of European ancestry[37]. Of the 138 reported conditionally independent
301 SNPs (explaining 4.9% of the 25OHD variance), 100 had a minor allele frequency of more
302 than 1%, of which 78 were directly available in the Covid-19 HGI GWAS summary statistic
303 and had linkage disequilibrium coefficient of less than 5%. Additionally, 3 more variants
304 had good genetic proxies ($r^2 > 90\%$) and were therefore added to our instrument lists, for a
305 total of 81 variants. These explained 4.3% of the variance in 25OHD serum levels. The
306 full list of SNPs used can be found in **Supplement 3**.

307

308 *Covid-19 outcome definitions and GWASs*

309 Using the Covid-19 HGI results restricted to cohorts of European ancestry, we used a total
310 of 14,134 cases and 1,284,876 controls to define Covid-19 susceptibility, 6,406 cases and
311 902,088 controls to define Covid-19 hospitalization, and 4,336 cases and 623,902 controls
312 to define Covid-19 severe disease. **Table 1** summarizes the definition and sample size of
313 both the exposure and outcome GWASs. Since the UKB was used in the two phases of
314 the MR study, some overlap between the exposure and the outcome GWASs was
315 unavoidable (**Supplement 1**).

316

317 *Primary MR analysis*

318 We first used inverse-weighted variance (IVW) meta-analysis to combine effect estimates
319 from each genetic instrument. For a standard deviation increase in log-transformed
320 25OHD level, we observed no clear effect upon odds of susceptibility (OR = 0.97; 95% CI:
321 0.85, 1.10; P = 0.61). Of note, a one standard deviation increase in 25OHD serum levels
322 translated to a rise of 21.1 nmol/L of 25OHD in the UK Biobank population, a rise that is
323 comparable to what can be achieved with vitamin D supplementation, especially in short
324 courses[38]. Similarly, we observed no significant different in risk of hospitalization (OR =
325 1.11; 95% CI: 0.91, 1.35; P = 0.30) or risk of severe disease (OR = 0.93; 95% CI: 0.73,
326 1.17; P = 0.53) (**Table 2** and **Figure 1**).

327

328 *Horizontal pleiotropy assessment and sensitivity analysis*

329 Using the MR Egger intercept terms, we do not observe clear evidence of horizontal
330 pleiotropy. While they have less statistical power than IVW meta-analysis, the 6 sensitivity
331 meta-analysis we used also showed no evidence of an effect of 25OHD levels on Covid-
332 19 susceptibility, hospitalization, and severe disease, with each confidence interval
333 crossing the null in the primary analysis using all SNPs (**Figure 1** and **Supplement 4**).
334 Our results are therefore unlikely to be strongly biased by horizontal pleiotropy.

335
336 Second, we restricted our analysis to SNPs which reside close to the four genes directly
337 involved in 25OHD metabolism. This left 12 SNPs, explaining 3.2% of 25OHD variation.
338 Using IVW, each standard deviation increase in log-transformed 25OHD was again not
339 associated with a clear effect on Covid-19 susceptibility (OR = 0.962; 95% CI: 0.83, 1.11;
340 P = 0.594), hospitalization (OR = 1.07 [95% CI: 0.78, 1.47]; P = 0.668) and severe disease
341 (OR = 0.869; 95% CI: 0.635, 1.19; P = 0.378). For the three phenotypes, the MR Egger
342 intercept term did not support bias from directional horizontal pleiotropy.

343
344 Lastly, we used the Phenoscanner[34,35] tool to check if the SNPs used in the MR study
345 were associated with other phenotypes. Using Phenoscanner, rs11723621 was
346 associated with white blood cell level, and rs6127099 was associated with glomerular
347 filtration rate. In both cases, the effect on each phenotype was mild compared to their
348 effect on 25OHD level, as rs11723621 explained less than 0.03% of the variance in white
349 blood cell counts, and rs6127099 explained less than 0.001% of the glomerular filtration
350 rate variance[39,40]. Removing these SNPs from the 12 SNPs above further decreased
351 the proportion of 25OHD variance explained to 1.7%. While confidence intervals widened,
352 effect estimates when restricting our analysis to these SNPs remained null for
353 susceptibility (0.797; 95% CI: 0.77, 1.23; P=0.798), hospitalization (1.09; 95% CI: 0.681,
354 1.75; P=0.714), and severe disease (0.91; 95% CI: 0.54, 1.55; P=0.73).

355
356 *Genetic instruments heterogeneity*
357 Overall, our results showed little evidence of heterogeneity of effect between our genetic
358 instruments. We nonetheless observe that for at least one of the analyses we would have
359 rejected the null hypothesis of lack of heterogeneity in the Covid-19 hospitalization
360 phenotype. However, given the large number of hypothesis tested, this may be due to
361 chance.

362
363 **Discussion**
364 In this large-scale MR study, we found that genetically increased 25OHD levels did not
365 protect against Covid-19 susceptibility, hospitalization, or severity. This lack of effect was
366 consistent across phenotypes, sensitivity analyses, and choice of genetic instruments.
367 These findings highlight the confounded association between vitamin D and Covid-19 due
368 to factors such as older age, institutionalization, or medical comorbidities, that are all
369 linked to lower vitamin D levels and cannot be controlled for even when using advanced
370 statistical adjustments. Therefore, in contrast to observational studies, our findings do not
371 support vitamin D supplementation to prevent worse Covid-19 outcomes. Further, while a
372 small randomized trial showed benefit of vitamin D supplementation, this trial used a
373 flawed endpoint and a small sample size, and it is therefore unable to invalidate our
374 results.

375
376 Our study's main strength is MR's track record in the study of vitamin D, with multiple
377 studies like ours having provided results consistent with RCTs in multiple medical
378 conditions [9–11,20–23,41,42]. Our study also leverages the largest cohort of Covid-19
379 cases and controls currently available (even outside of genetic studies) and the largest

380 study on genetic determinant of 25OHD levels to date. Using these data sources, we were
381 able to obtain results robust to multiple sensitivity analysis and MR methodology.

382

383 Our study still has limitations. First, our results do not take true vitamin D deficiency into
384 account, and it remains possible that truly deficient patients may benefit from
385 supplementation for Covid-19 related purposes. However, when comparing previous
386 results from MR studies and RCTs, we do not expect a large impact even in this
387 population. Second, our study may suffer from weak instrument bias, especially the
388 sensitivity analyses restricted to smaller sets of genetic instruments. In two-sample MR,
389 this bias would pull our estimates towards the null. Nonetheless, similar studies have been
390 able to use MR to establish an association between 25OHD levels and other disease (most
391 notably multiple sclerosis[26]), suggesting that these instruments are strong enough to
392 find associations. Further, given the large percentage of shared individuals from the UK
393 Biobank between the vitamin D exposure GWAS[27] and the severe Covid-19 phenotype,
394 this analysis is close to a one-sample MR, which would show bias towards the
395 observational studies effect. Given that this analysis also shows largely null effects, we do
396 not suspect that weak instruments bias is a significant issue in our results. Third, given
397 that vitamin D levels are affected by season (with higher levels after sunlight exposure),
398 even if our SNP-instruments were obtained from a GWAS that controlled for season of
399 blood draw, there is still a chance for effect attenuation by averaging the effect of 25OHD
400 levels on Covid-19 over all seasons. Nevertheless, the size of this bias is likely small, and
401 its direction remains unclear. Fourth, our MR analyses assumes a linear exposure-
402 outcome relationship. While this may slightly bias our results, simulation studies have
403 previously shown that this assumption provides adequate results when looking at a
404 population effect[25]. Therefore, for the purpose vitamin D supplementation RCT
405 prioritization, our conclusions should still be valid. Lastly, as we only studied the effect of
406 25OHD and Covid-19 in individuals of European ancestry, and it remains possible that
407 25OHD levels might have different effects on Covid-19 outcomes in other populations.
408 However, previous RCTs on vitamin D supplementation have given similar results in
409 populations of various ancestries[41,42].

410

411 In conclusion, using a method that has consistently replicated RCT results for 25OHD
412 outcomes in large sample sizes, we find no evidence to support a protective role for
413 vitamin D supplementation in Covid-19 outcomes. Most importantly, our results suggest
414 that investment in other therapeutic or preventative avenues should be prioritized for
415 Covid-19 randomized controlled trials.

416

417 **Acknowledgement**

418 We thank the patients and investigators who contributed to the Covid-19 HGI
419 (**Supplement 4**) and the Vitamin D GWAS consortium. Members of the GEN-COVID study
420 are acknowledged in **Supplement 5**.

421

422 **Contributions**

423 Conception and design: GBL, TN, JBR. Data acquisition and standardization: AR, AG,
424 DRM, TA, OA, NM, NK, ZA. Data analyses: GBL and TN. Interpretation: GBL, TN, VM,
425 DRM, TA, OA, NM, NK, ZA, AR, AG, SZ, YC, VF, JBR. Computational resources and
426 support: VF, JBR. Writing original draft: GBL, TN, JBR. All authors were involved in
427 reviewing the manuscript and critically reviewed its content. All authors gave final approval
428 of the version to be published. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors
429 meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

430

431 **Data availability**

432 Covid-19 outcome GWAS summary statistics are freely available for download directly
433 through the Covid-19 HGI website (<https://www.covid19hg.org/results/>). The October 20th
434 data freeze summary statistics were used for our study.

435

436 **Funding source:** The Richards research group is supported by the Canadian Institutes
437 of Health Research (CIHR), the Lady Davis Institute of the Jewish General Hospital, the
438 Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the NIH Foundation, Cancer Research UK and the
439 Fonds de Recherche Québec Santé (FRQS). GBL is supported by a joint scholarship from
440 the FRQS and Québec's Ministry of Health and Social Services. TN is supported by
441 Research Fellowships of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) for Young
442 Scientists and JSPS Overseas Challenge Program for Young Researchers. JBR is
443 supported by a FRQS Clinical Research Scholarship. TwinsUK is funded by the Wellcome
444 Trust, Medical Research Council, European Union, the National Institute for Health
445 Research (NIHR)-funded BioResource, Clinical Research Facility and Biomedical
446 Research Centre based at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust in partnership
447 with King's College London. These funding agencies had no role in the design,
448 implementation or interpretation of this study. This research has been conducted using
449 the UK Biobank Resource (project number: 27449).

450

451 **Competing interests:** JBR has served as an advisor to GlaxoSmithKline and Deerfield
452 Capital. These companies had no role in the design, implementation or interpretation of
453 this study.

454

455 **Transparency statement:** The manuscript's guarantors affirm that the manuscript is an
456 honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important
457 aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as
458 planned have been explained.

459

460 **Supplementary files captions**

461 **Supplement 1:** Cohorts used for each outcome phenotype for the Covid-19 Host Genetics
462 Initiative.

463 **Supplement 2:** Vitamin D metabolism pathway and genes involved.

464 **Supplement 3:** Genetic instruments summary statistics.

465 **Supplement 4:** results from mendelian randomization sensitivity analyses.

466 **Supplement 5:** Acknowledgement to data contributors and the Covid-19 Host Genetics
467 Initiative.

468 **Supplement 6:** GEN-COVID Multicenter Study.

469

470 References

- 471 1. McKee M, Stuckler D. If the world fails to protect the economy, COVID-19 will
472 damage health not just now but also in the future. *Nat Med.* 2020;26: 640–642.
473 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0863-y
- 474 2. Mansur JL, Tajer C, Mariani J, Inserra F, Ferder L, Manucha W. Vitamin D high
475 doses supplementation could represent a promising alternative to prevent or treat
476 COVID-19 infection. *Clin e Investig en Arterioscler Publ Of la Soc Esp*
477 *Arterioscler.* 2020. doi:10.1016/j.arteri.2020.05.003
- 478 3. Charoenngam N, Holick MF. Immunologic Effects of Vitamin D on Human Health
479 and Disease. *Nutrients.* 2020;12. doi:10.3390/nu12072097
- 480 4. Marcos-Pérez D, Sánchez-Flores M, Proietti S, Bonassi S, Costa S, Teixeira JP,
481 et al. Low Vitamin D Levels and Frailty Status in Older Adults: A Systematic
482 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nutrients.* 2020;12. doi:10.3390/nu12082286
- 483 5. Skrobot A, Demkow U, Wachowska M. Immunomodulatory Role of Vitamin D: A
484 Review. *Adv Exp Med Biol.* 2018;1108: 13–23. doi:10.1007/5584_2018_246
- 485 6. Martineau AR, Forouhi NG. Vitamin D for COVID-19: a case to answer? *Lancet*
486 *Diabetes Endocrinol.* 2020. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(20)30268-0
- 487 7. Munshi R, Hussein MH, Toraih EA, Elshazli RM, Jardak C, Sultana N, et al.
488 Vitamin D insufficiency as a potential culprit in critical COVID-19 patients. *J Med*
489 *Virol.* 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.26360
- 490 8. Rooney MR, Harnack L, Michos ED, Ogilvie RP, Sempos CT, Lutsey PL. Trends
491 in Use of High-Dose Vitamin D Supplements Exceeding 1000 or 4000
492 International Units Daily, 1999–2014. *JAMA.* 2017;317: 2448–2450.
493 doi:10.1001/jama.2017.4392
- 494 9. Manson JE, Cook NR, Lee I-M, Christen W, Bassuk SS, Mora S, et al. Vitamin D
495 Supplements and Prevention of Cancer and Cardiovascular Disease. *N Engl J*
496 *Med.* 2019;380: 33–44. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1809944
- 497 10. Pittas AG, Dawson-Hughes B, Sheehan P, Ware JH, Knowler WC, Aroda VR, et
498 al. Vitamin D Supplementation and Prevention of Type 2 Diabetes. *N Engl J Med.*
499 2019;381: 520–530. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1900906
- 500 11. Wactawski-Wende J, Kotchen JM, Anderson GL, Assaf AR, Brunner RL,
501 O’Sullivan MJ, et al. Calcium plus vitamin D supplementation and the risk of
502 colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354: 684–696.
503 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa055222
- 504 12. Sanders KM, Stuart AL, Williamson EJ, Simpson JA, Kotowicz MA, Young D, et
505 al. Annual High-Dose Oral Vitamin D and Falls and Fractures in Older Women: A
506 Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA.* 2010;303: 1815–1822.
507 doi:10.1001/jama.2010.594
- 508 13. Martineau AR, Jolliffe DA, Hooper RL, Greenberg L, Aloia JF, Bergman P, et al.
509 Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory tract infections:
510 systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ.*
511 2017;356: i6583. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6583
- 512 14. Ginde AA, Brower RG, Caterino JM, Finck L, Banner-Goodspeed VM, Grissom
513 CK, et al. Early High-Dose Vitamin D(3) for Critically Ill, Vitamin D-Deficient
514 Patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381: 2529–2540. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1911124
- 515 15. Entrenas Castillo M, Entrenas Costa LM, Vaquero Barrios JM, Alcalá Díaz JF,
516 López Miranda J, Bouillon R, et al. “Effect of calcifediol treatment and best
517 available therapy versus best available therapy on intensive care unit admission
518 and mortality among patients hospitalized for COVID-19: A pilot randomized
519 clinical study.” *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol.* 2020/08/29. 2020;203: 105751.
520 doi:10.1016/j.jsbmb.2020.105751

- 521 16. Davies NM, Holmes M V, Davey Smith G. Reading Mendelian randomisation
522 studies: a guide, glossary, and checklist for clinicians. *BMJ*. 2018;362: k601.
523 doi:10.1136/bmj.k601
- 524 17. Zheng J, Haberland V, Baird D, Walker V, Haycock PC, Hurle MR, et al.
525 Phenome-wide Mendelian randomization mapping the influence of the plasma
526 proteome on complex diseases. *Nat Genet*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41588-020-0682-
527 6
- 528 18. Suhre K, Arnold M, Bhagwat AM, Cotton RJ, Engelke R, Raffler J, et al.
529 Connecting genetic risk to disease end points through the human blood plasma
530 proteome. *Nat Commun*. 2017;8: 14357. doi:10.1038/ncomms14357
- 531 19. Hysinger EB, Roizen JD, Mentch FD, Vazquez L, Connolly JJ, Bradfield JP, et al.
532 Mendelian randomization analysis demonstrates that low vitamin D is unlikely
533 causative for pediatric asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2016/08/20. 2016;138:
534 1747-1749.e4. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2016.06.056
- 535 20. Ye Z, Sharp SJ, Burgess S, Scott RA, Imamura F, Langenberg C, et al.
536 Association between circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D and incident type 2 diabetes:
537 a mendelian randomisation study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2015;3: 35–42.
538 doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(14)70184-6
- 539 21. He Y, Timofeeva M, Farrington SM, Vaughan-Shaw P, Svinti V, Walker M, et al.
540 Exploring causality in the association between circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D
541 and colorectal cancer risk: a large Mendelian randomisation study. *BMC Med*.
542 2018;16: 142. doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1119-2
- 543 22. Trajanoska K, Morris JA, Oei L, Zheng H-F, Evans DM, Kiel DP, et al.
544 Assessment of the genetic and clinical determinants of fracture risk: genome wide
545 association and mendelian randomisation study. *BMJ*. 2018;362: k3225.
546 doi:10.1136/bmj.k3225
- 547 23. Despoina M, E. ML, Stephanie R, David G, Brent RJ. Mendelian Randomization
548 Studies Do Not Support a Role for Vitamin D in Coronary Artery Disease. *Circ*
549 *Cardiovasc Genet*. 2016;9: 349–356. doi:10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.116.001396
- 550 24. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. ‘Mendelian randomization’: can genetic epidemiology
551 contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease?*. *Int J*
552 *Epidemiol*. 2003;32: 1–22. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg070
- 553 25. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Instrumental variable analysis with a
554 nonlinear exposure-outcome relationship. *Epidemiology*. 2014;25: 877–885.
555 doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000161
- 556 26. Mokry LE, Ross S, Ahmad OS, Forgetta V, Smith GD, Leong A, et al. Vitamin D
557 and Risk of Multiple Sclerosis: A Mendelian Randomization Study. *PLOS Med*.
558 2015;12: e1001866. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001866>
- 559 27. Manousaki D, Mitchell R, Dudding T, Haworth S, Harroud A, Forgetta V, et al.
560 Genome-wide Association Study for Vitamin D Levels Reveals 69 Independent
561 Loci. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2020;106: 327–337.
562 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2020.01.017>
- 563 28. Lawlor DA. Commentary: Two-sample Mendelian randomization: opportunities
564 and challenges. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016/07/17. 2016;45: 908–915.
565 doi:10.1093/ije/dyw127
- 566 29. Machiela MJ, Chanock SJ. LDlink: a web-based application for exploring
567 population-specific haplotype structure and linking correlated alleles of possible
568 functional variants. *Bioinformatics*. 2015;31: 3555–3557.
569 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btv402
- 570 30. Initiative TC-19 HG. The COVID-19 Host Genetics Initiative, a global initiative to
571 elucidate the role of host genetic factors in susceptibility and severity of the

- 572 SARS-CoV-2 virus pandemic. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2020;28: 715–718.
573 doi:10.1038/s41431-020-0636-6
- 574 31. Walker VM, Davies NM, Hemani G, Zheng J, Haycock PC, Gaunt TR, et al. Using
575 the MR-Base platform to investigate risk factors and drug targets for thousands of
576 phenotypes. *Wellcome open Res.* 2019;4: 113.
577 doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15334.2
- 578 32. Burgess S, Davies NM, Thompson SG. Bias due to participant overlap in two-
579 sample Mendelian randomization. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2016; 1–12.
580 doi:10.1002/gepi.21998
- 581 33. Slob EAW, Burgess S. A comparison of robust Mendelian randomization methods
582 using summary data. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2020;44: 313–329.
583 doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.22295
- 584 34. Staley JR, Blackshaw J, Kamat MA, Ellis S, Surendran P, Sun BB, et al.
585 PhenoScanner: a database of human genotype-phenotype associations.
586 *Bioinformatics.* 2016;32: 3207–3209. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btw373
- 587 35. Kamat MA, Blackshaw JA, Young R, Surendran P, Burgess S, Danesh J, et al.
588 PhenoScanner V2: an expanded tool for searching human genotype-phenotype
589 associations. *Bioinformatics.* 2019;35: 4851–4853.
590 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btz469
- 591 36. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK
592 Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature.* 2018;562:
593 203–209. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z
- 594 37. Manousaki D, Dudding T, Haworth S, Hsu Y-H, Liu C-T, Medina-Gómez C, et al.
595 Low-Frequency Synonymous Coding Variation in CYP2R1 Has Large Effects on
596 Vitamin D Levels and Risk of Multiple Sclerosis. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2017;101:
597 227–238. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2017.06.014
- 598 38. Żebrowska A, Sadowska-Krępa E, Stanula A, Waśkiewicz Z, Łakomy O, Bezuglov
599 E, et al. The effect of vitamin D supplementation on serum total 25(OH) levels and
600 biochemical markers of skeletal muscles in runners. *J Int Soc Sports Nutr.*
601 2020;17: 18. doi:10.1186/s12970-020-00347-8
- 602 39. Astle WJ, Elding H, Jiang T, Allen D, Ruklisa D, Mann AL, et al. The Allelic
603 Landscape of Human Blood Cell Trait Variation and Links to Common Complex
604 Disease. *Cell.* 2016;167: 1415-1429.e19. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.10.042
- 605 40. Wuttke M, Li Y, Li M, Sieber KB, Feitosa MF, Gorski M, et al. A catalog of genetic
606 loci associated with kidney function from analyses of a million individuals. *Nat*
607 *Genet.* 2019;51: 957–972. doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0407-x
- 608 41. Aloia JF, Talwar SA, Pollack S, Yeh J. A randomized controlled trial of vitamin D3
609 supplementation in African American women. *Arch Intern Med.* 2005;165: 1618–
610 1623. doi:10.1001/archinte.165.14.1618
- 611 42. Aspray TJ, Chadwick T, Francis RM, McColl E, Stamp E, Prentice A, et al.
612 Randomized controlled trial of vitamin D supplementation in older people to
613 optimize bone health. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2019;109: 207–217.
614 doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqy280
- 615 43. Cholecalciferol to Improve the Outcomes of COVID-19 Patients. [cited 11 Aug
616 2020]. Available: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT04411446>
- 617 44. Preventing COVID-19 With High-dose Vitamin D Supplements. [cited 11 Aug
618 2020]. Available: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT04483635>
- 619

Phenotype	Source of genetic variants	
	Cohort	Participants
25OHD circulating levels	Manousaki <i>et al</i> [27]	Meta-analysis of two 25OHD GWAS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 401,460 adult white British participants from the UKB[36] - 42,274 from an international consortium of adult individuals of European ancestry[37]
Covid-19 susceptibility	Susceptibility	Meta-analysis of 22 GWAS performed in individuals of European ancestry from 11 countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cases: 14,134 individuals with Covid-19 by laboratory confirmation, chart review, or self-report - Controls: 1,284,876 individuals without confirmation or history of Covid-19
Covid-19 severity	Hospitalized	Meta-analysis of 13 GWAS performed in individuals of European ancestry from 11 countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cases: 6,406 hospitalized individuals with Covid-19 Controls: 902,088 without hospitalization with Covid-19
	Severe Disease	Meta-analysis of 12 GWAS performed in individuals of European ancestry from 9 countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cases: 4,336 Covid-19 infected hospitalized individuals who died or required respiratory support (intubation, CPAP, BiPAP, continuous external negative pressure, high flow nasal cannula). - Controls: 623,902 without severe Covid-19

Table 1: Sources of data for the analysis. Covid-19 susceptibility and severity outcomes are taken from the Covid-19 HGI[30]. See [Supplement 1](#) for details on cohorts of Covid-19 susceptibility and severity phenotypes.

Outcome	nSNPs	IVW OR (95% CI)	IVW p-value	IVW SNP Heterogeneity p-value	Egger alpha	Alpha p-value
25OHD primary analysis with all SNPs						
Susceptibility	81	0.97 (0.85, 1.10)	0.613	0.008	0.003 (-0.004, 0.009)	0.432
Hospitalization	81	1.11 (0.91, 1.35)	0.299	0.066	0.0002 (-0.010, 0.011)	0.970
Severe disease	81	0.93 (0.73, 1.17)	0.531	0.126	0.010 (-0.002, 0.022)	0.107
25OHD sensitivity analysis restricted to genes in the vitamin D pathway						
Susceptibility	12	0.96 (0.83, 1.11)	0.594	0.160	0.005 (-0.021, 0.032)	0.702
Hospitalization	12	1.07 (0.78, 1.47)	0.668	0.004	0.031 (-0.027, 0.088)	0.323
Severe disease	12	0.87 (0.64, 1.19)	0.378	0.105	0.056 (0.006, 0.106)	0.054
25OHD sensitivity analysis after removal of SNPs identified by Phenoscanner						
Susceptibility	10	0.97 (0.77, 1.23)	0.798	0.083	0.004 (-0.032, 0.040)	0.834
Hospitalization	10	1.09 (0.68, 1.75)	0.714	0.010	0.014 (-0.059, 0.088)	0.713
Severe disease	10	0.91 (0.54, 1.55)	0.730	0.095	0.072 (-0.003, 0.146)	0.097

Table 2: MR results. SNP: single nucleotide polymorphism. nSNPs: number of SNPs retained for this analysis. IVW: inverse-weighted variance method. CI: confidence interval. Confidence intervals were obtained using Normal approximations, explaining minor discrepancies with p-values close to the alpha=5% statistical significance threshold.




Figure 1: Odds ratio point estimates and 95% confidence intervals for a one standard deviation increase in 25OHD levels (on the log scale) on Covid-19 susceptibility and severity. Restricted to 25-OHD Genes: analysis restricted to SNPs near the 4 genes involved in known vitamin D metabolic pathways. Phenoscanner Filtered: analysis restricted to the 4 genes above, and with removal of SNPs identified to have other associations in Phenoscanner.