

# Effect of calcium intake on iron absorption and hematologic status: A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of randomized trials and case-cross-over studies

Ajibola Ibraheem Abioye<sup>1</sup>, Taofik A Okuneye<sup>2</sup>, Abdul-Majeed O Odesanya<sup>3</sup>, Olufunmilola Adisa<sup>4</sup>, Asanat I Abioye<sup>5</sup>, Ayorinde I Soipe<sup>6</sup>, Kamal A Ismail<sup>7</sup>, JaeWon F Yang<sup>8</sup>, Luther-King Fasehun<sup>9</sup>, Moshood O. Omotayo<sup>10,11</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Nutrition, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston MA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Family Medicine, General Hospital, Odan, Lagos, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup> St Helen's & Knowsley Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, UK

<sup>4</sup>Emory University, Atlanta GA, USA

<sup>5</sup>University of Rhode Island, Kingston RI, USA

<sup>6</sup>Department of Emergency Medicine, Rhode Island Hospital, Providence RI, USA

<sup>7</sup>Department of Hematology, Lagos State University College of Medicine, Lagos, Nigeria

<sup>8</sup>Warren Alpert Medical School, Brown University, Providence RI, USA

<sup>9</sup>Wellbeing Foundation Africa, Abuja, Nigeria

<sup>10</sup>Centre for Global Health, Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), Boston MA, USA

<sup>11</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Harvard Medical School, Boston MA, USA

Correspondence to: Moshood Omotayo, Centre for Global Health, Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), Boston MA, USA.

Phone number: 617260972. Email: [momotayo@mgh.harvard.edu](mailto:momotayo@mgh.harvard.edu)

Number of words in manuscript, title through references – 5,531

Number of Tables: 5

Running Title: Calcium intake and iron status

Abbreviations used in text:

AIC: Akaike Information Criteria; CI: Confidence Interval; CINAHL: Current Nursing and Allied Health Literature; LMIC: Low- and middle-income countries; MeSH: Medical Subject Headings; PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis; RCT: Randomized controlled trial; RR: Relative risk; SD: Standard deviation; se: Standard error; WHO: World Health Organization; WMD: Weighted mean differences

Authors' names for Pubmed indexing:

Abioye, Okuneye, Odesanya, Adisa, Abioye, Soipe, Ismail, Yang, Fasehun, Omotayo

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organization for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** The interaction between dietary (and supplementary) divalent ions has been a long-  
3 standing issue in human nutrition research. Developing optimal calcium and iron supplementation  
4 recommendation needs detailed knowledge of the potential trade-offs between: a) the clinical effects of  
5 concurrent intake on iron absorption and hematological indices, and b) the potentially negative effects of  
6 separated ingestion on adherence to either or both iron and calcium supplements. Human clinical studies  
7 have examined the effects of calcium intake on iron status, but there are no meta-analyses or recent  
8 reviews summarizing the findings. **Objective:** We aimed to summarize the literature on the effect of  
9 calcium consumption from meals and supplements on iron indices in humans, and quantify the pooled  
10 effects. **Design:** Peer-reviewed randomized and case-cross-over studies were included in this review.  
11 **Result:** The negative effect of calcium intake was statistically significant in short-term iron absorption  
12 studies but the effect magnitude was low (weighted mean difference (WMD) = -5.57%, (95% CI: -7.09,  
13 -4.04)). The effect of calcium on iron status was mixed. There was a quadratic dose-response  
14 relationship between calcium intake and serum ferritin concentration. Higher daily calcium intake was  
15 associated with a modest reduction in serum ferritin concentration. There was, however, no reduction in  
16 hemoglobin concentration (WMD = 1.22g/L, 95% CI: 0.37, 2.07). **Conclusion:** The existing body of  
17 studies is insufficient to make recommendations with high confidence due to heterogeneity in design,  
18 limitations of ferritin as an iron biomarker and lack of intake studies in pregnant women. Prescribing  
19 separation of prenatal calcium and iron supplements in free living individuals is unlikely to affect the  
20 anemia burden. There is a need for effectiveness trials comparing the effects of prescribing separated  
21 intake to concurrent intake, with functional end-points as primary outcomes, and adherence to each  
22 supplement as intermediate outcomes.

23 **Key words:** Calcium and iron interaction, Calcium and preeclampsia, Maternal nutrition, Maternal  
24 Anemia, Meta-analysis

25

## 26 **Introduction**

27 The interaction between dietary (and supplementary) divalent ions has been a long-standing issue in  
28 human nutrition research. Multiple studies have demonstrated that calcium inhibits iron absorption in  
29 short-term and single-meal studies (1-3). Studies that have measured the absorption ratio of iron in  
30 meals with different amounts of calcium have shown an inverse relationship(4). Two key mechanisms of  
31 action have been proposed for calcium-iron interaction(5). One potential mechanism is that luminal  
32 calcium leads to internalization of DMT1 receptors, limiting transfer of luminal iron into enterocytes.  
33 The other proposed mechanism is that calcium interferes with the transfer of iron across the enterocyte  
34 basolateral membrane. Recent reviews of inhibition mechanisms have provided some support for the  
35 first theory, but also suggested that homeostatic mechanisms compensate for the calcium-iron  
36 interaction, and the inhibitory effect is transient or at least not as clinically consequential as most short-  
37 term absorption studies would suggest(4).

38 Developing optimal calcium and iron supplementation recommendation requires detailed knowledge of  
39 the potential trade-offs between: a) the clinical effects of concurrent intake on iron absorption and  
40 hematological indices, and b) the potentially negative effects of separated ingestion on adherence to  
41 either or both iron and calcium supplements(6-8). While some studies have provided indication of the  
42 direction of these relationships, results are conflicting. Data from dietary and supplementation studies  
43 have been inconsistent, and it remains unclear whether there is a threshold dosage beyond which  
44 calcium exerts its inhibitory effects, the value of such threshold, and factors that might affect the  
45 threshold(9). Furthermore, longer-term studies that have examined the effect of calcium  
46 supplementation on haematological indices have reported conflicting results (10-14).

47 Prior narrative reviews have summarized existing studies of the interaction of dietary (and  
48 supplementary) calcium and iron(4, 15-17). While the narrative reviews were comprehensive, they often  
49 did not involve systematic and reproducible search strategy or meta-analysis. In addition, they did not  
50 include studies that have been published between 2010 and 2019, and we are unaware of any prior meta-  
51 analysis summarizing the clinical evidence on either of these issues. The objective of this study is to  
52 summarize human clinical studies that have examined the impact of calcium intake on iron status,  
53 identify factors moderating the effect and quantify the magnitude of the effect.

## 54 **Methods**

55 We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA)  
56 guidelines in the design, analysis, and reporting of this study (**Supplement 1**)(18). We identified studies  
57 examining the impact of calcium intake on iron outcomes, including iron absorption ratio and  
58 hematological indices. Original peer-reviewed research articles published up to August 2020 in the  
59 following medical literature databases were identified and examined for inclusion in the review:  
60 PUBMED/Medline (U.S. National Library of Medicine) and EMBASE (Elsevier). The databases were  
61 searched using queries composed of MeSH terms (Medical Subject Headings), EmTree terms and  
62 keywords representing iron, calcium and absorption/bioavailability. Hand searching of references was  
63 also done – specifically by examining the references of relevant systematic reviews and included studies  
64 as well as the first 500 hits on Google Scholar. No restrictions by age, year of publication or language  
65 were implemented. The title and abstract of each study were screened and full-texts examined in  
66 duplicate (**Figure 1**). A third author resolved discrepancies. Studies were excluded if they did not  
67 examine iron absorption or hematologic status, and did not examine calcium and iron intake, whether as  
68 supplements or in diet. If the diet differed by calcium intake and one or more other nutrient(s), the study  
69 was not included(19, 20).

70 In terms of population, studies were not required to include only individuals who were healthy at  
71 baseline or to exclude individuals who were anemic or pregnant. Only randomized controlled trials and  
72 crossover studies were included, to facilitate causal interpretation of the effect of the interventions. The  
73 studies had to have compared different doses of calcium intake in supplements or meals or compared  
74 different sequences of calcium intake – keeping total daily intake constant.

#### 75 Data extraction

76 Data extraction from full-text articles was done using a comprehensive extraction sheet. Information on  
77 study design, population, intervention, covariates and findings were extracted. The median was extracted  
78 if the mean was missing. Intake of calcium was converted to mg/day. Included studies provided calcium  
79 in the test arm by altering the composition of meals, or providing calcium supplements. In some cases,  
80 numerical values of total daily calcium intake were not provided, and were therefore imputed by  
81 estimating the calcium content of meals provided using USDA reference(21). One study provided  
82 estimates from the same individuals when iron absorption studies were conducted with and without  
83 meals, and the estimates from studies without meal were included(2). If packed cell volume (PCV) was  
84 provided, missing hemoglobin data was estimated by dividing PCV by 3. Only two studies provided iron  
85 absorption estimates adjusted to ferritin  $40\mu\text{g/L}$ , and the adjusted estimates were used (22, 23).

#### 86 Outcomes

87 The primary outcomes of interest were the iron absorption ratio (%) – total, heme and non-heme, serum  
88 ferritin ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) and hemoglobin (g/L). While iron absorption ratio reflects short term effects, serum  
89 ferritin and hemoglobin reflect longer term effects. Regardless, all relevant outcomes reported in the  
90 included studies were reviewed. These include anemia (%), mucosal uptake of iron (% or mg), iron  
91 serosal transfer index, iron retention (mg), erythrocyte incorporation of iron (% of absorbed iron), zinc

92 protoporphyrin (mmol/L), soluble transferrin receptor ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), mean corpuscular volume (fL) and iron  
93 bioavailability (% of absorbed iron).

#### 94 Risk of bias assessment

95 We assessed the risk of bias of individual studies using the Cochrane risk of bias tool(24). For crossover  
96 trials, the Cochrane tool was modified as follows. Bias in randomization was described as high if the  
97 order of intervention was not randomized. In addition, bias due to carryover effects was assessed by the  
98 presence of absence of a washout period or a follow-up period non-interventional period ( $\geq 14$  d) in the  
99 studies. Two investigators independently assessed the studies and disagreements were resolved by  
100 consensus with a third author. This ranking did not influence decisions concerning exclusion of studies  
101 or analytic approach.

#### 102 Statistical analysis

103 Included studies differed in the details of exposure assessment and outcome ascertainment. Random  
104 effects models, which explicitly model the between-study variation, were therefore selected *a priori* for  
105 the meta-analyses(25). Weighted mean differences for total, heme and non-heme iron absorption (%)  
106 and serum ferritin ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) were obtained from pooled analysis of the highest daily calcium intake  
107 compared to the lowest daily calcium intake. For studies reporting the outcome of interest at multiple  
108 time points, the longest reported follow-up was included in the main analysis.

109 Heterogeneity was formally assessed with the  $I^2$  statistics, a measure of the total variability that is due to  
110 between-study variation.  $I^2$  was regarded as low if  $< 50\%$ , substantial if  $50 - 90\%$  and considerable is  
111  $> 90\%$ , in accordance with the general guidelines for Cochrane reviews, and p-values for Q-statistic  
112 reported(24). Heterogeneity was further assessed using meta-regression approaches and analysis within  
113 subgroups defined by age ( $< 18$ ,  $18 - 65$  and  $\geq 65$  years), sex, nature of intervention (supplement or diet),  
114 and baseline iron status. The impact of an individual study on the WMD meta-analysis was evaluated by

115 leaving one study out sequentially and obtaining pooled estimates. Publication bias was evaluated with  
116 funnel plots and Egger's tests(26, 27).

117 Dose response meta-analysis of differences in means was conducted following the two-stage approach  
118 proposed by Crippa and Orsini, based on restricted maximum likelihood estimation method(28, 29).

119 This approach makes no assumptions about the underlying shape of the association. Studies that did not  
120 report more than 2 categories from the same sets of individuals were not included in the dose-response  
121 meta-analysis (11, 23, 30). Included studies measured outcomes on similar, interpretable scales, and  
122 pooled difference estimates were therefore obtained on an absolute scale. Dose-response meta-analyses  
123 were conducted using a variety of regression approaches – restricted cubic splines, fractional polynomial  
124 and quadratic models, and the model with the lowest quantitative value of the Akaike Information  
125 Criteria (AIC) was selected as the final model. In the presence of nonlinearity, the selected model was  
126 presented in graphical form using predicted mean differences. Predicted mean differences for 1000,  
127 1500 and 2000mg/d were obtained, in comparison to 500mg/d.

128 *P*-values are two sided and significance set at  $p<0.05$ . Statistical analyses were conducted using RStudio  
129 1.0.153(16). Values presented in the text are means ( $\pm$ SD), means (95% CI), and means ( $\pm$ SE).

## 130 **Results**

### 131 Description of studies

132 We identified 30 papers from an initial set of 1287 titles and abstracts (**Figure 1**) reporting on the  
133 influence of consumption of calcium on iron absorption and hematologic indices. These were 12  
134 randomized controlled trials(1, 10-12, 14, 22, 31-36) and 18 case-crossover studies(2, 23, 30, 36-48),  
135 including 1,623 and 592 participants respectively. The studies were conducted in Africa (14), Asia (10,  
136 31, 36), Europe (1, 11, 12, 22, 23, 43), North America (2, 3, 13, 30, 34, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47-49), and  
137 South America (32, 33, 42). Fourteen of the studies included women only (2, 3, 12-14, 22, 31, 32, 39,

138 41, 42, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51). Almost all studies explicitly excluded pregnant or lactating women or both  
139 (11, 12, 14, 22, 32, 33, 36, 42, 48) and none of the studies examined pregnant women alone. One study  
140 did not report the sex of participants (48). The interventions consisted of regular or low-calcium meals  
141 with or without calcium supplements (1-3, 11-14, 23, 30-33, 36, 39, 41, 42, 46, 48, 51), or high-calcium  
142 versus low-calcium meals (10, 22, 34, 38, 43-45, 47, 49, 52). The studies assessed iron absorption using  
143 radiolabeled iron (1, 2, 22, 32, 34, 36, 49) or gastrointestinal lavage and body scintillation procedures  
144 (30). Most of the studies were short-term and intervening over < 3 months (1, 3, 22, 30-32, 36, 38, 39,  
145 41, 42, 44-49, 52), while others were longer-term and lasted 3 – 6 months (11, 33) or 1 – 4 years (12, 14,  
146 51). Of these, two studies evaluated the outcome at multiple time points, allowing their inclusion in both  
147 short term and long-term analyses (11, 14). **Table 1** presents the characteristics of included studies.

148 Most of the included studies were of low risk of bias. The others were of moderate risk of bias (1, 10,  
149 11, 14, 22, 30-33, 36, 42, 48, 51). Studies regarded as having a moderate risk of bias most often did not  
150 report (or perform) allocation concealment or blinding of participants and personnel.

#### 151 Total iron absorption

152 We pooled 24 estimates from 7 studies (1, 2, 11, 22, 23, 30, 34, 36, 39, 42, 43, 46-49) to obtain weighted  
153 mean differences comparing the influence of high calcium intake on iron absorption relative to low  
154 calcium intake, and found that calcium intake was associated with lower iron absorption (**Figure 2**.  
155 WMD = -5.91, 95% CI: -8.38, -3.44;  $I^2=84%$ ,  $p$ -heterogeneity<0.0001). Follow-up for the included  
156 studies was from 1 – 18 days. There was no evidence from influence analysis that the pooled estimate  
157 was dominated by any of the individual studies. Neither the funnel plot nor Egger's mixed effects  
158 regression revealed any evidence of publication bias ( $p$ -value = 0.75; **Supplementary Figure 1**).

159 Heterogeneity was partly explained by the nature of the intervention ( $p<0.0001$ ). The total iron  
160 absorption was -1.02 (95% CI: -3.77, 1.73) when intervention was based on meals alone, and differed by

161 -7.90 (95% CI: -11.4, -4.3) when intervention was included supplements. Heterogeneity was not  
162 significantly explained by participant's age (p-heterogeneity = 0.78), sex (p-heterogeneity=0.19),  
163 baseline serum ferritin (p-heterogeneity=0.13), hemoglobin concentration (p-heterogeneity=0.64),  
164 duration of follow-up (p-heterogeneity=0.19) or year of publication (p-heterogeneity=0.43).

165 We pooled 32 difference measures from 3 absorption studies(1, 2, 36) using quadratic model-based  
166 meta-analysis to evaluate the dose-response relationship of calcium intake and the daily iron absorption  
167 (**Figure 3**). The dose-response association of calcium intake on total iron absorption was significantly  
168 non-linear – total iron absorption was poorer with higher calcium intake ( $p$ -value = 0.026).

#### 169 Heme iron absorption

170 We pooled 7 estimates from 4 studies(1, 23, 42, 48) to obtain weighted mean differences comparing the  
171 influence of high calcium intake on heme iron absorption relative to low calcium intake, and found that  
172 calcium intake was associated with a slightly lower heme iron absorption (**Figure 4**, WMD = -4.84, 95%  
173 CI: -8.59, -1.09;  $I^2=60%$ ,  $p$ -heterogeneity=0.021). Follow-up of the included studies was from 1 – 18  
174 days. All included studies had provided a supplement as the intervention. The influence of age, sex and  
175 baseline hematologic status on heterogeneity was not assessed due to missing covariate data. Visual  
176 inspection of the funnel plot suggests possible publication bias (**Supplementary figure 2**), although  
177 there was no evidence from Egger's test of small study effects ( $p$ -value=0.35).

178 We pooled 16 difference measures from 3 studies(1, 42, 48) using quadratic model-based meta-analysis  
179 to assess the presence of a non-linear dose response association. There was no evidence that the dose-  
180 response association of calcium intake on heme iron absorption was non-linear ( $p$ -value = 0.33).  
181 Heterogeneity was, however, substantial ( $I^2=98%$ ).

#### 182 Non-heme iron absorption

183 We pooled 11 estimates from 8 studies(2, 11, 22, 30, 34, 42, 43, 47, 48) to obtain weighted mean  
184 differences comparing the influence of high calcium intake on non-heme iron absorption relative to low  
185 calcium intake, and found that calcium intake was associated with a slightly lower non-heme iron  
186 absorption (**Figure 5**. WMD = -2.40, 95% CI: -4.98, 0.18;  $I^2=98%$ ,  $p$ -heterogeneity<0.0001), although  
187 the confidence limits included the null of 0. Follow-up of the included studies was from 1 – 15 days.  
188 Heterogeneity was not significantly explained by participant's age ( $p$ -heterogeneity = 0.90), sex ( $p$ -  
189 heterogeneity=0.76), baseline serum ferritin ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.73), nature of intervention ( $p$ -  
190 heterogeneity=0.43) or year of publication ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.31). Visual inspection of the funnel plot  
191 suggested possible publication bias, though there was no evidence from Egger's test of small study  
192 effects (Supplementary **Figure 4**,  $p$ -value=0.29).

193 We pooled 44 difference measures from 5 studies(22, 34, 42, 47, 48) using quadratic model-based meta-  
194 analysis. There was no evidence that the dose-response association of calcium intake on heme iron  
195 absorption was non-linear ( $p$ -value = 0.13). Heterogeneity was, however, substantial ( $I^2=96%$ ).

#### 196 Serum Ferritin

197 We pooled 13 estimates from 13 studies (10-14, 30-34, 50-52) to obtain weighted mean differences  
198 comparing the influence of high calcium intake and low calcium intake on serum ferritin concentration,  
199 and found no significant association of calcium intake and ferritin concentration (**Figure 6**. WMD = -  
200 1.21 $\mu$ g/L, 95% CI: -5.47, 3.05). There was significant heterogeneity ( $I^2=97%$ ,  $p$ -heterogeneity<0.001).

201 Heterogeneity was partly explained by whether the intervention included a calcium supplement or not  
202 ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.005). Use of supplements was associated with 11.5  $\mu$ g/L lower total iron absorption  
203 (95% CI: -19.5, -3.53) compared to calcium from diet alone. Heterogeneity was not significantly  
204 explained by participant's age ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.23), sex ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.11), baseline serum  
205 ferritin ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.26), hemoglobin concentration ( $p$ -heterogeneity=0.64), duration ( $p$ -

206 heterogeneity=0.61) or year of study publication (p-heterogeneity=0.19). The duration of the  
207 interventions ranged from 2 – 52 weeks. Heterogeneity was not significantly explained by duration of  
208 follow-up (p-heterogeneity=0.19). There was no evidence from influence analysis that the pooled  
209 estimate was dominated by any of the individual studies. There was also no evidence of publication bias  
210 from visual inspection of funnel plots (**Supplementary Figure 5**) as well as Egger’s test for small study  
211 effects (p-value=0.92).

212 We pooled 32 difference measures from 3 short-term studies (12, 31, 47) using a quadratic model-based  
213 meta-analysis to explore dose-response relationship of calcium intake and iron absorption (**Figure 7**).  
214 The dose of calcium in the included studies ranged from 22 – 1,250mg. The dose-response association  
215 of calcium intake with serum ferritin concentration was significant (p-value = 0.0004). Calcium intake  
216 was associated with reduced serum ferritin concentration as the dose increased. There was no  
217 meaningful heterogeneity ( $I^2=0\%$ ).

#### 218 Hemoglobin concentration

219 We pooled 8 estimates from 6 studies (10, 12, 32, 33, 50, 51) to obtain weighted mean differences  
220 comparing the influence of high calcium intake on hemoglobin concentration relative to low calcium  
221 intake, and found that calcium intake no association with hemoglobin concentration (**Figure 8**. WMD =  
222 0.44g/L, 95% CI: -0.90, 1.78). There was substantial heterogeneity ( $I^2=77\%$ , p-heterogeneity=0.001).  
223 The duration of intervention for the studies was 5 – 26wks, with one study that lasted 4 years. When we  
224 excluded the long-term study in sensitivity analysis, the WMD was 1.22 (95% CI: 0.37, 2.07).

225 Neither the funnel plot nor Egger’s test for small study effects (p=0.17) suggested possible publication  
226 bias (**Supplementary figure 6**). There were too few studies reporting multiple dose categories (n>2)  
227 and dose response analysis was not done.

## 228 Sequencing of calcium intake

229 One study evaluated the extent to which the sequencing of calcium intake may influence iron  
230 absorption(45). Keeping daily dietary calcium intake constant, the investigators compared the iron  
231 absorption in 21 women who had dietary calcium at every meal to those who had no dietary calcium at  
232 lunch and dinner. They found that total, non-heme and heme iron absorption were greater in those who  
233 had no dietary calcium at lunch and dinner.

## 234 **Other outcomes**

### 235 Iron retention

236 Three studies(3, 38, 41) examined the effect of calcium intake on iron retention. Among 11 boys and  
237 girls in Texas, USA who participated in a case-crossover study(38), there was no significant difference  
238 in the incorporation of iron into red blood cells between times when they were randomly assigned to  
239 high calcium diets compared to low calcium diets (mean difference: 1.0%, 95% CI: -6.2% to 4.2%).  
240 Two crossover studies in Boston, USA studied the effect of calcium intake on iron absorption among  
241 postmenopausal women and found significantly lower retention of iron with intake of calcium from  
242 different sources. Among 13 women(3), intake of either calcium carbonate (percent reduction: 43.3%  
243  $\pm 8.8$ ,  $p=0.002$ ) or hydroxyapatite (percent reduction: 45.9%  $\pm 10$ ,  $p=0.003$ ) led to significantly lower  
244 retention of iron, compared to placebo. Among 19 women(41), intake of milk (mean  $\pm$ SD: 3.4  $\pm$ 3.4) and  
245 calcium citrate-malate salt (mean  $\pm$ SD: 6.0  $\pm$ 4.2) led to significantly lower retention of iron ( $p < 0.05$ ),  
246 compared to placebo (mean  $\pm$ SD: 8.3  $\pm$ 4.6).

## 247 **Discussion**

248 In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we summarized the human clinical studies that have  
249 examined the impact of calcium intake on iron status. We found that calcium intake was associated with  
250 overall reduced iron absorption and iron status in a dose dependent manner, but no impact on  
251 hemoglobin concentration in the long term. The effect estimates were small and unlikely to be

252 biologically significant. Overall, the inverse relationship between calcium intake and iron status is  
253 unlikely to be clinically significant in free-living populations.

254 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis of the effect of calcium intake on iron status.  
255 The issue of calcium-iron interaction has assumed renewed significance in recent years, particularly in  
256 the context of low- and middle-income countries, due to recent WHO recommendations that calcium  
257 supplementation be included in routine ante-natal care for prevention of preeclampsia. The WHO  
258 currently recommends 1.5-2g of calcium supplements for pregnant women in communities with  
259 inadequate habitual calcium intake(53). The concern about the potential for a co-administered calcium  
260 and iron supplementation regimen to worsen the burden of anemia in pregnancy is also one of the  
261 justifications for calling for a lower dose for calcium supplementation(8, 54, 55), besides the issues of  
262 cost, logistical complexity and side effects.

263 Overall, our findings suggest that the magnitude of inhibition is unlikely to be clinically significant over  
264 time even if separated intake is not prescribed, but these findings should be interpreted and applied in  
265 the context of the weaknesses of the relevant body of work. We had set out to examine the impact of  
266 combined intake on hematological indices that have been robustly linked to functional consequences  
267 such as hemoglobin indices, over time periods that take iron homeostatic mechanisms into  
268 consideration. Unfortunately, the only study that compared combined intake to separated intake was a  
269 short-term study with iron absorption outcomes(45). There is a dearth of studies that have specifically  
270 examined the effects of concurrent ingestion of iron and calcium supplements compared to delayed  
271 intake of one or the other on biomarkers with well-established functional implications over extended  
272 periods.

273 This study has other notable limitations. The evidence base is mostly informed by studies that have  
274 examined the effect of different daily doses from meals and supplements on iron status over time,

275 without indication of whether they were concurrently ingested or separated. In addition, the studies  
276 reviewed included subjects from a broader population and not pregnant women in low and middle-  
277 income countries only. In fact, most primary studies specifically excluded pregnant women; however the  
278 key population motivating the renewed debate about calcium-iron interaction is pregnant women.  
279 Moreover, the baseline iron status of the participants was not reported in many of the studies. It is well  
280 known that extant iron status is an important determinant of iron metabolism. Given the location of most  
281 of the studies in high income countries, it is plausible that the baseline iron status of participants might  
282 be higher than that of pregnant women in most communities in low- and middle-income countries.  
283 Furthermore, we examined hematologic status using serum ferritin and hemoglobin concentration. Too  
284 few studies have examined the effects of calcium intake on transferrin and other hematological markers  
285 and indices with important physiological and functional implications(12). The significant limitations of  
286 ferritin as a marker of iron status across populations is well known.

287 In conclusion, in the present systematic review and meta-analysis, we found statistically significant  
288 negative effect of calcium intake on iron status in the short term ( $\leq 90$  days), but the magnitude of the  
289 effect was low and unlikely to be biologically significant, and longer-term studies consistently failed to  
290 find this effect. In fact, despite the negative effect of calcium intake on iron absorption, hemoglobin  
291 concentration was increased in this analysis. Our findings suggest that lowering the dose of calcium and  
292 iron supplement intake among pregnant women is unlikely to affect the anemia burden in the long-term.  
293 These findings should be interpreted with caution because of the significant heterogeneity and  
294 limitations of the underlying studies. There is a need for effectiveness trials comparing the effects of  
295 recommending separated supplement intake to combined intake among pregnant women in low and  
296 middle-income countries, with blood pressure and iron status as primary outcomes, and adherence to  
297 each supplement as intermediate outcomes.

298 **Acknowledgment**

299 The authors are grateful to Dr Alessio Crippa of Karolinska Institutet for help with the R code for the  
300 dose-response analysis.

301 AIA and MOO designed research; All authors extracted data from primary studies; AIA and MOO  
302 analyzed data; AIA and MOO wrote the paper; MOO had primary responsibility for final content. All  
303 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

304

305 **Literature Cited**

- 306 1. Hallberg L, Rossander-Hulthen L, Brune M, Gleeurup A. Inhibition of haem-iron absorption in man by  
307 calcium. *The British journal of nutrition*. 1993;69(2):533-40.
- 308 2. Cook JD, Dassenko SA, Whittaker P. Calcium supplementation: effect on iron absorption. *The American*  
309 *journal of clinical nutrition*. 1991;53(1):106-11.
- 310 3. Dawson-Hughes B, Seligson FH, Hughes VA. Effects of calcium carbonate and hydroxyapatite on zinc and  
311 iron retention in postmenopausal women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 1986;44(1):83-8.
- 312 4. Lönnerdal B. Calcium and iron absorption—mechanisms and public health relevance. *International*  
313 *Journal for Vitamin and Nutrition Research*. 2010;80(4):293.
- 314 5. Shawk A, Mackenzie B. Interaction of calcium with the human divalent metal-ion transporter-1.  
315 *Biochemical and biophysical research communications*. 2010;393(3):471-5.
- 316 6. Omotayo M. Integrating Strategies For Prevention Of Pre-Eclampsia And Anemia In Pregnancy Into  
317 Primary Healthcare Delivery In Kenya. 2016.
- 318 7. Omotayo MO, Dickin KL, O'Brien KO, Neufeld LM, De Regil LM, Stoltzfus RJ. Calcium supplementation to  
319 prevent preeclampsia: translating guidelines into practice in low-income countries. *Advances in Nutrition*.  
320 2016;7(2):275-8.
- 321 8. Omotayo MO, Dickin KL, Pelletier DL, Mwanga EO, Kung'u JK, Stoltzfus RJ. A simplified regimen  
322 compared with WHO guidelines decreases antenatal calcium supplement intake for prevention of preeclampsia  
323 in a cluster-randomized noninferiority trial in rural Kenya. *The Journal of nutrition*. 2017;147(10):1986-91.
- 324 9. Omotayo M, Dickin K, Stoltzfus R. Perinatal mortality due to pre-eclampsia in Africa: a comprehensive  
325 and integrated approach is needed. *Global Health: Science and Practice*; 2016.
- 326 10. Agustina R, Bovee-Oudenhoven IMJ, Lukito W, Fahmida U, Van De Rest O, Zimmermann MB, et al.  
327 *Lactobacillus reuteri* DSM 17938 and *lactobacillus casei* CRL 431 modestly increase growth, not iron and zinc  
328 status, among Indonesian children. *Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism*. 2013;63:212-3.
- 329 11. Minihaane AM, Fairweather-Tait SJ. Effect of calcium supplementation on daily nonheme-iron absorption  
330 and long-term iron status. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 1998;68(1):96-102.
- 331 12. Mølgaard C, Kæstel P, Michaelsen KF. Long-term calcium supplementation does not affect the iron  
332 status of 12-14-y-old girls. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2005;82(1):98-102.
- 333 13. Sokoll LJ, Dawson-Hughes B. Calcium supplementation and plasma ferritin concentrations in  
334 premenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1992;56(6):1045-8.
- 335 14. Yan L, Prentice A, Dibba B, Jarjou LM, Stirling DM, Fairweather-Tait S. The effect of long-term calcium  
336 supplementation on indices of iron, zinc and magnesium status in lactating Gambian women. *The British journal*  
337 *of nutrition*. 1996;76(6):821-31.
- 338 15. Whiting SJ, Wood RJ. Adverse effects of high-calcium diets in humans. *Nutrition reviews*. 1997;55(1):1-9.
- 339 16. Whiting SJ. The inhibitory effect of dietary calcium on iron bioavailability: a cause for concern? *Nutrition*  
340 *reviews*. 1995;53(3):77-80.
- 341 17. Lynch SR. The effect of calcium on iron absorption. *Nutrition research reviews*. 2000;13(2):141-58.
- 342 18. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for  
343 reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation  
344 and elaboration. *PLoS medicine*. 2009;6(7):e1000100.
- 345 19. Hennigar SR, Gaffney-Stomberg E, Lutz LJ, Cable SJ, Pasiakos SM, Young AJ, et al. Consumption of a  
346 calcium and vitamin D-fortified food product does not affect iron status during initial military training: a  
347 randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 2016;115(4):637-43.

- 348 20. Toxqui L, Pérez-Granados AM, Blanco-Rojo R, Wright I, González-Vizcayno C, Vaquero MP. Intake of an  
349 iron or iron and vitamin dfortified skimmed milk and iron metabolism in women. *Annals of Nutrition and*  
350 *Metabolism*. 2013;63:1609.
- 351 21. National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference [Internet]. National Agricultural Library. 2018 [cited  
352 23 June 2019]. Available from: <https://ndb.nal.usda.gov/ndb/>.
- 353 22. Grindler-Pedersen L, Bukkave K, Jensen M, Højgaard L, Hansen M. Calcium from milk or calcium-fortified  
354 foods does not inhibit nonheme-iron absorption from a whole diet consumed over a 4-d period. *American*  
355 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2004;80(2):404-9.
- 356 23. Hallberg L, Brune M, Erlandsson M, Sandberg A-S, Rossander-Hulten L. Calcium: effect of different  
357 amounts on nonheme-and heme-iron absorption in humans. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*.  
358 1991;53(1):112-9.
- 359 24. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's  
360 tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj*. 2011;343:d5928.
- 361 25. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled clinical trials*. 1986;7(3):177-88.
- 362 26. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for  
363 publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*. 2000;56(2):455-63.
- 364 27. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test.  
365 *Bmj*. 1997;315(7109):629-34.
- 366 28. Crippa A, Orsini N. Dose-response meta-analysis of differences in means. *BMC medical research*  
367 *methodology*. 2016;16(1):91.
- 368 29. Crippa A, Crippa MA. Package 'dosresmeta'. 2017.
- 369 30. Roughead ZK, Zito CA, Hunt JR. Initial uptake and absorption of nonheme iron and absorption of heme  
370 iron in humans are unaffected by the addition of calcium as cheese to a meal with high iron bioavailability. *Am J*  
371 *Clin Nutr*. 2002;76(2):419-25.
- 372 31. Faghih S, Abadi AR, Hedayati M, Kimiagar M. The effect of the combination of restricted energy diet and  
373 low fat milk or calcium supplement on iron status of premenopausal overweight or obese women. *Clinical*  
374 *Nutrition, Supplement*. 2012;7(1):238-9.
- 375 32. Ríos-Castillo I, Olivares M, Brito A, López de Romaña D, Pizarro F. One-month of calcium  
376 supplementation does not affect iron bioavailability: A randomized controlled trial. *Nutrition*. 2014;30(1):44-8.
- 377 33. Miranda M, Olivares M, Brito A, Pizarro F. Reducing iron deficiency anemia in Bolivian school children:  
378 calcium and iron combined versus iron supplementation alone. *Nutrition*. 2014;30(7-8):771-5.
- 379 34. Reddy MB, Hurrell RF, Cook JD. Estimation of nonheme-iron bioavailability from meal composition.  
380 *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2000;71(4):937-43.
- 381 35. Sokoll LJ, Dawson-Hughes B. Calcium supplementation and plasma ferritin concentrations in  
382 premenopausal women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 1992;56(6):1045-8.
- 383 36. Walczyk T, Muthayya S, Wegmuller R, Thankachan P, Sierksma A, Frenken LG, et al. Inhibition of iron  
384 absorption by calcium is modest in an iron-fortified, casein- and whey-based drink in Indian children and is easily  
385 compensated for by addition of ascorbic acid. *The Journal of nutrition*. 2014;144(11):1703-9.
- 386 37. Abrams SA, Griffin IJ, Davila P, Liang L. Calcium fortification of breakfast cereal enhances calcium  
387 absorption in children without affecting iron absorption. *The Journal of pediatrics*. 2001;139(4):522-6.
- 388 38. Ames SK, Gorham BM, Abrams SA. Effects of high compared with low calcium intake on calcium  
389 absorption and incorporation of iron by red blood cells in small children. *The American journal of clinical*  
390 *nutrition*. 1999;70(1):44-8.
- 391 39. Benkhedda K, L'Abbé MR, Cockell KA. Effect of calcium on iron absorption in women with marginal iron  
392 status. *British journal of nutrition*. 2010;103(5):742-8.
- 393 40. Dawson-Hughes B, Seligson F, Hughes V. Effects of calcium carbonate and hydroxyapatite on zinc and  
394 iron retention in postmenopausal women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 1986;44(1):83-8.

- 395 41. Deehr MS, Dallal GE, Smith KT, Taulbee JD, Dawson-Hughes B. Effects of different calcium sources on  
396 iron absorption in postmenopausal women. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 1990;51(1):95-9.
- 397 42. Gaitan D, Flores S, Saavedra P, Miranda C, Olivares M, Arredondo M, et al. Calcium does not inhibit the  
398 absorption of 5 milligrams of nonheme or heme iron at doses less than 800 milligrams in nonpregnant women.  
399 *The Journal of nutrition*. 2011;141(9):1652-6.
- 400 43. Galan P, Cherouvrier F, Preziosi P, Hercberg S. Effects of the increasing consumption of dairy products  
401 upon iron absorption. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 1991;45(11):553-9.
- 402 44. Glerup A, Rossander-Hulten L, Hallberg L. Duration of the inhibitory effect of calcium on non-haem iron  
403 absorption in man. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 1993;47(12):875-9.
- 404 45. Glerup A, Rossander-Hulthen L, Gramatkovski E, Hallberg L. Iron absorption from the whole diet:  
405 comparison of the effect of two different distributions of daily calcium intake. *The American journal of clinical*  
406 *nutrition*. 1995;61(1):97-104.
- 407 46. Monsen ER, Cook J. Food iron absorption in human subjects IV. The effects of calcium and phosphate  
408 salts on the absorption of nonheme iron. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 1976;29(10):1142-8.
- 409 47. Reddy MB, Cook JD. Effect of calcium intake on nonheme-iron absorption from a complete diet.  
410 *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 1997;65(6):1820-5.
- 411 48. Roughead ZK, Zito CA, Hunt JR. Inhibitory effects of dietary calcium on the initial uptake and subsequent  
412 retention of heme and nonheme iron in humans: comparisons using an intestinal lavage method. *American*  
413 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2005;82(3):589-97.
- 414 49. Abrams SA, Griffin IJ, Davila P, Liang L. Calcium fortification of breakfast cereal enhances calcium  
415 absorption in children without affecting iron absorption. *Journal of Pediatrics*. 2001;139(4):522-6.
- 416 50. Kalkwarf H, Harrast SD. Effects of calcium supplementation and lactation on iron status. *American*  
417 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 1998;67(6):1244-9.
- 418 51. Ilich-Ernst JZ, McKenna AA, Badenhop NE, Clairmont AC, Andon MB, Nahhas RW, et al. Iron status,  
419 menarche, and calcium supplementation in adolescent girls. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*.  
420 1998;68(4):880-7.
- 421 52. Snedeker SM, Smith SA, Greger J. Effect of dietary calcium and phosphorus levels on the utilization of  
422 iron, copper, and zinc by adult males. *The Journal of nutrition*. 1982;112(1):136-43.
- 423 53. Organization WH. Guideline: Calcium supplementation in pregnant women: World Health Organization;  
424 2013.
- 425 54. Hofmeyr G, Belizán J, Von Dadelszen P, Calcium, Group PeS. Low-dose calcium supplementation for  
426 preventing pre-eclampsia: a systematic review and commentary. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics &*  
427 *Gynaecology*. 2014;121(8):951-7.
- 428 55. Omotayo MO, Dickin KL, Pelletier DL, Martin SL, Kung'u JK, Stoltzfus RJ. Feasibility of integrating calcium  
429 and iron-folate supplementation to prevent preeclampsia and anemia in pregnancy in primary healthcare  
430 facilities in Kenya. *Maternal & child nutrition*. 2018;14:e12437.

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440 **Figures and Tables**

Figure 1. Flowchart of included studies

Figure 2. Forest plot for the relationship of calcium intake and total iron absorption (highest vs least calcium intake)

Figure 3. Dose-response relationship of calcium intake and total iron absorption

Figure 4. Forest plot for the relationship of calcium intake and heme iron absorption (highest vs least calcium intake)

Figure 5. Forest plot for the relationship of calcium intake and non-heme iron absorption (highest vs least calcium intake)

Figure 6. Forest plot for the relationship of calcium intake and serum ferritin (highest vs least calcium intake)

Figure 7. Dose-response relationship of calcium intake and serum ferritin concentration

Figure 8. Forest plot for the relationship of calcium intake and hemoglobin concentration

Supplementary figures

Supplementary figure 1 – Funnel plot for the relationship of calcium intake and total iron absorption (highest vs least calcium intake)

Supplementary figure 2 – Funnel plot for the relationship of calcium intake and heme iron absorption (highest vs least calcium intake)

Supplementary figure 3 – Funnel plot for the relationship of calcium intake and non-heme iron absorption (highest vs least calcium intake)

Supplementary figure 4 – Funnel plot for the relationship of calcium intake and serum ferritin (highest vs least calcium intake)

Supplementary figure 5 – Funnel plot for the relationship of calcium intake and hemoglobin concentration



**Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies**

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Abrams (2001)	Houston, USA	Case crossover (N=27)	7.8 y; 48%	NR	Intervention: 14 d Follow-up: 14 d	Total iron absorption, %	Test: Fortified cereal with calcium 925mg/d Ctrl: Low cereal with calcium 702mg/d	Mean ±SD 4.2 ±3.5  3.9 ±3.1	Moderate
Agustina (2013)	East Jakarta, Indonesia	RCT (N=494)	5 y; 46%	21% anemic; 31% iron deficient	Intervention: 168 d	Change in serum ferritin, µg/L	Test: Regular calcium milk twice daily (440mg/d); Ctrl: Low calcium milk twice daily (50mg/d)	Med (IQR) -4.4 (-15.7, 1.6)  -4.0 (-11.1, 1.0)	Moderate
						Change in hemoglobin, g/L	Test Ctrl	Mean ±SD Test: -1.5 ±8.8 Ctrl: -1.9 ±7.7	
Ames (1999)	Texas, USA	Case crossover (N=11)	4.3 y; 45%	NR	Intervention: 35 d Washout: 15 d	Iron incorporation into red blood cells, %	Test: High calcium diet with calcium 1180 mg/d; Ctrl: Low calcium diet with calcium 502 mg/d	Mean ±SD Test: 7.9 ±5.5 Ctrl: 6.9 ±4.2	Moderate
Benkhedda (2010)	Ontario, Canada	Case crossover (N=13)	30.9 y; 100%	Mean hemoglobin: 133g/L; Mean ferritin: 17.8 µg/L	Intervention: 1 d Follow-up: 14 d	Total iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (500mg) with meal; Ctrl: Meal only	Mean (-SD, +SD) Test: 4.8 (1.8, 13.0) Ctrl: 10.2 (5.3, 19.7)	Low
Cook (1991)	Kansas, USA	Case crossover (N=61)	21 y; 100%	Mean hematocrit: 41%, Mean ferritin: 21µg/L	Intervention: 2 d Follow-up: 16 d	Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (300mg) with meal; Ctrl: Meal only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 1.6 (1.3, 2.0) Ctrl: 2.1 (1.7, 2.7)	Low
						Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (300mg) with water; Ctrl: Water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 6.5 (5.6, 7.5) Ctrl: 7.7 (6.6, 9.0)	
			23 y; 89%	Mean hematocrit: 40%; Mean ferritin: 24µg/L		Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (600mg) with meal; Ctrl: Meal only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 7.3 (5.6, 9.4) Ctrl: 13.0 (9.7, 17.3)	
						Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (600mg) with water; Ctrl: Water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 21.5 (16.7, 27.6) Ctrl: 18.0 (14.1, 23.0)	
			23 y; 100%	Mean hematocrit: 46%; Mean ferritin:		Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (600mg) with meal; Ctrl: Meal only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 3.3 (2.4, 4.5) Ctrl: 3.9 (2.8, 5.3)	

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
				74µg/L		Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium carbonate (600mg) with water; Ctrl: Water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 9.4 (8.1, 10.9) Ctrl: 10.3 (8.5, 12.3)	
			23 y; 29%	Mean hematocrit: 43%; Mean ferritin: 54µg/L		Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium citrate (600mg) with meal; Ctrl: Meal only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 6.1 (4.5, 8.2) Ctrl: 10.1 (7.6, 13.5)	
						Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium citrate (600mg) with water; Ctrl: Water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 6.6 (5.2, 8.5) Ctrl: 12.9 (10.9, 15.2)	
			23 y; 14%	Mean hematocrit: 44%; Mean ferritin: 75µg/L		Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium phosphate (600mg) with water; Ctrl: Water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 3.2 (2.3, 4.3) Ctrl: 7.3 (5.8, 9.2)	
						Iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium phosphate (600mg) with water; Ctrl: Water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 6.0 (4.7, 7.6) Ctrl: 16.0 (12.5, 20.5)	
			23 y; 50%	Mean hematocrit: 42%; Mean ferritin: 42µg/L		Iron absorption, %	Enhancing meal with: Ctrl: water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Ctrl: 13.4 (10.0, 18.1)	
							Test1: Calcium carbonate	Test 1: 9.1 (6.5, 12.8)	
							Test2: Calcium citrate	Test 2: 11.9 (9.2, 15.5)	
							Test3: Calcium phosphate	Test 3: 8.2 (6.1, 11.1)	
			23 y; 50%	Mean hematocrit: 42%; Mean ferritin: 42µg/L		Non-heme iron absorption, %	Enhancing meal with: Ctrl: water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Ctrl: 13.4 (10.0, 18.1)	
							Test1: Calcium carbonate	Test 1: 9.1 (6.5, 12.8)	
							Test2: Calcium citrate	Test 2: 11.9 (9.2, 15.5)	
							Test3: Calcium phosphate	Test 3: 8.2 (6.1, 11.1)	
			25 y; 67%	Mean hematocrit: 43%; Mean ferritin: 66µg/L		Non-heme iron absorption, %	Inhibiting meal with: Ctrl: water only	Mean (-SE, +SE) Ctrl: 1.2 (0.8, 1.7)	
							Test1: Calcium carbonate	Test 1: 0.7 (0.4, 1.1)	
							Test2: Calcium citrate	Test 2: 0.5 (0.4, 0.7)	
							Test3: Calcium phosphate	Test 3: 0.4 (0.3, 0.6)	

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Dawson-Hughes (1986)	Boston, USA	Case-crossover (N=13)	65 y; 100%	NR	Intervention: 1 d; Follow-up: 14 d	Iron retention	Ctrl: Meal with Placebo Test 1: Meal with Calcium carbonate Test 2: Meal with Hydroxyapatite	Mean ±SD Ctrl: 6.3 ±7.2 Test 1: 3.2 ±4.4 Test 2: 1.7 ±1.4	Low
Deehr (1990)	Boston, USA	Case-crossover (N=19)	63 y; 100%	Mean hematocrit: 42%; Mean ferritin: 111 µg/L	Intervention: 1 d; Follow-up: 14 d	Iron retention	Ctrl: Meal with Placebo Test 1: Meal with Calcium citrate malate (CCM) Test 2: Meal with CCM and orange juice Test 3: Milk	Mean ±SD Ctrl: 8.3 ±4.6 Test 1: 6.0 ±4.2 Test 2: 7.4 ±7.4 Test 3: 3.4 ±3.4	Low
Faghih (2012)	Tehran, Iran	RCT (N=64)	37 y; 100%	Mean ferritin: 59µg/L ±47	Intervention: 2 d; Follow-up: 56 d	Serum ferritin, µg/L	Ctrl: Meal (500mg/d) Before After  Test 1: Meal with calcium carbonate tablets (800mg/d);  Test 2: Milk diet (1200 – 1300mg/d)	Mean ±SD 60.9 ±46.8 60.7 ±38.6  Test 2: Before: 59.1 ±47.3 After: 58.6 ±71.4  Test 2: Before: 57.7 ±43.5 After: 48.9 ±38.2	Moderate
Gaitan (2011)	Chile	Case-crossover (N=54)	NR; 100%	Mean hemoglobin  133g/L ±8  133g/L ±8  131g/L ±8  131g/L ±8	Intervention: Multiple, 1 day each; Follow-up: 1 day	Non-heme iron absorption, %   Non-heme iron absorption, %  Heme iron absorption, %  Heme iron absorption, %	Different doses of calcium chloride  Grp A (N=15): 0 mg 200 mg 400mg 800mg  Grp B (N=13): 0 mg 1000 mg 1250mg 1500mg  Grp C (N=15): 0 mg 200 mg 400mg 800mg  Grp D (N=11):	Geometric mean (-SD, +SD)  17.9 (7.0, 45.6) 15.9 (7.6, 33.6) 15.3 (5.8, 40.2) 11.9 (4.7, 30.5)  21.3 (10.1, 40.5) 10.7 (5.3, 21.8) 12.7 (6.2, 26.0) 13.3 (6.6, 26.7)  13.9 (8.7, 22.1) 11.5 (6.9, 19.1) 11.6 (6.8, 19.9) 8.6 (4.2, 17.4)	Moderate

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
							0 mg 500 mg 600mg 700mg	11.1 (6.2, 19.8) 9.0 (4.7, 17.0) 9.6 (5.3, 17.5) 10.1 (5.8,17.5)	
Galan (1991)	Paris, France	Case-crossover (N=13)	32 y; 0%	Mean hemoglobin: 153 g/L; Mean ferritin: 128 µg/L	Intervention: 1 d Follow-up: 14 d	Non-heme iron absorption, %	Ctrl: Meal alone Test1: Meal + yoghurt Test2: Meal + skimmed milk	Mean ±SD 2.2 ±4.9 2.0 ±13.7 2.1 ±6.3	Moderate
Gleerup (1993)	Goteborg, Sweden	Case-crossover (N=21)	38 y; 67%	Mean ferritin: 50 µg/L	Intervention: 1 d Follow-up: 1 d	Total iron absorption, %	Ctrl: Meal alone Test: Meal with milk and cheese	Mean ±SEM 13.8 ±3.6 13.1 ±3.5	High
						Total iron absorption, %	Ctrl: Meal alone Test: Meal with milk and cheese	Mean ±SEM 16.3 ±2.5 16.5 ±2.5	
Gleerup (1995)	Sweden	Case-crossover (N=21)	29 y; 100%	NR	Intervention: 10 d Follow-up: 4 w	Non-heme iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium at all meals (937mg/d) Ctrl: No calcium at lunch & dinner	Mean ±SEM 12.1 ±4.76 15.9 ±2.2	Moderate
						Heme iron absorption, %	Test: Calcium at all meals (937mg/d) Ctrl: No calcium at lunch & dinner	0.25 ±0.02 0.33 ±0.02	
Grinder-Pederson (2004)	Denmark	RCT (N=14)	24 y; 100%	Non-anemic; no excess iron	Intervention: 4 d; Follow-up: 18 d	Non-heme iron absorption, %, adjusted to ferritin of 40µg/L	Diet (varying calcium/d): Basic (224 mg/d) Milk (826 mg/d) Calcium lactate (802 mg/d) Milk mineral (801 mg/d)	Geom mean (95% CI): 2.6 (1.5, 4.4) 1.9 (1.1, 3.4) 2.3 (1.6, 3.3) 2.1 (1.4, 3.3)	Moderate
						Non-heme iron absorption, %, unadjusted	Diet (varying calcium/d): Basic (224 mg/d) Milk (826 mg/d) Calcium lactate (802 mg/d) Milk mineral (801 mg/d)	Geom mean (95% CI): 7.4 (5.3, 10.5) 5.2 (3.5, 7.9) 6.7 (5.0, 8.9) 5.1 (3.2, 7.9)	
Hallberg (1991)	Gothenburg, Sweden	Case-crossover (N=126)	NR; 36%	NR	Intervention: 4 d; Follow-up: 18 d	Heme iron absorption	Calcium added to wheat flour  Series 1: 0 mg	Mean ±SE  22.0 ±3.6	Moderate

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
							40mg	12.8 ±1.6	
							Series 2: 0 mg 75mg	20.0 ±3.6 11.2 ±2.0	
							Series 3: 0 mg 165 mg	20.8 ±2.8 8.8 ±1.2	
							Series 4: 0 mg 300 mg	19.2 ±3.6 6.4 ±2.8	
							Series 5: 0 mg 600 mg	18.0 ±2.4 3.6 ±0.4	
							Calcium added before serving Series 6: 0 mg 40 mg	21.6 ±2.8 22.4 ±2.8	
							Series 7: 0 mg 75 mg	23.6 ±3.6 19.6 ±3.2	
							Series 8: 0 mg 165 mg	23.2 ±3.2 14.0 ±0.8	
							Series 9: 0 mg 300 mg	26.0 ±2.8 12.0 ±2.0	
							Series 10: 0 mg 600 mg	26.8 ±5.2 13.2 ±4.4	
							Series 11: Wheat Wheat + 150 mL milk	18.8 ±1.6 7.2 ±1.2	
							Series 12: Wheat Wheat + 20g cheese	24.0 ±2.8 13.6 ±2.4	
							Series 13 Hamburger + Wheat	15.6 ±2.4	

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Hallberg (1993)	Goteborg, Sweden	RCT (N=28)	NR: 57%	NR	Intervention: 1 d Follow-up: 1 d	Heme iron absorption, %	Hamburger + Wheat + 165mg Ca	11.6 ±2.0	High
							Test: Meat-containing meal with 165mg calcium chloride; Ctrl: Meat containing meal alone	Mean ±SE Test: 12.1 ±1.5 Ctrl: 22.7 ±3.9	
Ilich-Ernst (1998)	Cincinnati, USA	RCT; (N=354)	10.8 y; 100%	Mean ferritin: 29.2 µg/L	Intervention: 4 y Follow-up: 4 y	Hemoglobin, g/L, year 4	Test: Calcium citrate malate, 1000mg/d Ctrl: Placebo	Mean ±SD Test: 132 ±9 Ctrl: 134 ±8	Moderate
							Serum ferritin, µg/L, in lactating women (N=76)	Baseline – Test: Baseline – 29.1 ±1.3 Year 1 – 31.1 ±1.5 Year 2 – 31.1 ±1.6 Year 3 – 30.6 ±2.0 Year 4 – 29.5 ±1.9  Ctrl: Baseline – 29.3 ±1.4 Year 1 – 33.8 ±1.7 Year 2 – 32.3 ±1.4 Year 3 – 30.9 ±1.5 Year 4 – 29.5 ±1.6	
Kalkwarf (1998)	Cincinnati, USA	RCT; (N=158)	31 y; 100%	Mean hemoglobin: 133 g/L	Intervention: 26 wk Follow-up: 26 wk	Serum ferritin, µg/L, in lactating women (N=76)	Test: Calcium supplements 500mg twice daily Ctrl: None	Geom Mean (-SD, +SD) Test: 28.4 (12.3, 51.0) Ctrl: 27.5 (9.3, 55.)	Low
							Hemoglobin, g/L, in lactating women (N=76)	Mean ±SD Test: 133 ±7 Ctrl: 130 ±6	
							Hemoglobin, g/L, in non-lactating women (N=82)	Test: 129 ±7 Ctrl: 130 ±8	
							MCV, g/L, in lactating women (N=76)	Test: 90 ±4 Ctrl: 88 ±4	

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Minihane (1998)	Norwich, UK	RCT (N=24)	44 y; 71%	Non-anemic; Mean ferritin: 44µg/l	Intervention: 183 d	MCV, g/L, in non-lactating women (N=82)		Test: 88 ±4 Ctrl: 88 ±4	Moderate
						Hemoglobin, g/L	Test: Calcium carbonate (1200mg) supplements; Ctrl: None	Mean (SE) Test: 136 (4) Ctrl: 139 (4)	
						Serum ferritin, µg/L		Test: 50 (7) Ctrl: 38 (7)	
						Zinc protoporphyrin (ZPP), µg/L		Test: 226 (18) Ctrl: 277 (19)	
Miranda (2014)	Sucre, Bolivia	RCT (N=179)	8.3 y; 44%	Hemoglobin >83g/L	Intervention: 90 d	Hemoglobin, g/L	Test: 700mg Calcium with iron; Ctrl: Iron only	Mean ±SD Test: 148 ±7 Ctrl: 147 ±8	Moderate
						Serum ferritin, µg/L		Mean (-SD, +SD) Test: 35 (24-52) Ctrl: 38 (25-57)	
Mølgaard (2005)	Frederiksberg & Copenhagen, Denmark	RCT (N=113)	13 y; 100%	Non-anemic; Mean ferritin: 27µg/l	Intervention: 52 wk	Hemoglobin, g/L in low dietary Ca group	Test: Calcium supplements - 500mg/d; Ctrl: Placebo	Mean (95% CI) Test: 135 (132, 138) Ctrl: 134 (131, 137)	Low
						Hemoglobin, g/L in medium dietary Ca group		Test: 137 (134, 139) Ctrl: 135 (132, 137)	
						Serum ferritin, µg/L, in low dietary Ca group		Test: 24.3 (20.3, 29.2) Ctrl: 26.9 (22.6, 31.9)	
						Serum ferritin, µg/L, in medium dietary Ca group		Test: 26.7 (22.3, 32.1) Ctrl: 24.9 (20.9, 29.7)	
						sTfR <sup>3</sup> , mg/L, in low dietary Ca group		Test: 4.0 (3.7, 4.4) Ctrl: 4.1 (3.8, 4.5)	
						sTfR <sup>3</sup> , mg/L, in medium dietary Ca group		Test: 4.1 (3.8, 4.5) Ctrl: 4.5 (4.2, 4.9)	
						sTfR-ferritin index, in low dietary Ca group		Test: 163 (137, 194) Ctrl: 145 (123, 171)	
sTfR-ferritin index, in medium dietary Ca group		Test: 156 (127, 192) Ctrl: 177 (145, 217)							

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Monsen (1976)	Washington, USA	Case-crossover (N=21)	25 y; 100%	NR	Intervention: 1 d Follow-up: 14 d	Total iron absorption, %	Ctrl: Meal alone Test: Meal with Calcium phosphate salts	Mean ±SD Test: 1.6 ±2.3 Ctrl: 2.6 ±2.7	Moderate
						Non-heme iron absorption, %		Mean ±SD Test: 6.8 ±6.5 Ctrl: 12.1 ±8.3	
Reddy (1997)	Kansas, USA	Case-crossover (N=14)	25 y; 57%	Mean ferritin: 50µg/L	Intervention: 2 d; Follow-up: 14 d; Washout: 5 d	Non-heme iron absorption, %	Four diets: 1. Standard hamburger meal 2. Self-selected (685mg/d) 3. High calcium (1281mg/d); 4. Low calcium (280mg/d)	Standard: 4.8 (3.7, 6.2) Self: 5.0 (4.1, 6.2) High Ca: 4.7 (3.8, 5.9) Low Ca: 5.8 (4.7, 7.3)	Moderate
Reddy (2000)	USA	RCT (N=86)	26 y; 40%	Mean ferritin: 41µg/L	Intervention: 2 d; Follow-up: 14 d	Non-heme iron absorption, %	Test: 25 different meals <sup>4</sup> 22 mg Ca 589 mg Ca	Geom mean (-SE, +SE) 11.5 (9.6, 15.2) 2.6 (2.0, 3.5)	Low
						Serum ferritin, µg/L	22 mg Ca 589 mg Ca	28 (22, 36) 34 (24, 39)	
Rios-Castillo (2014)	Santiago, Chile	RCT (N=26)	39 y; 100%	Non-anemic; non-iron deficient	Intervention: 34 d	Hemoglobin, g/L	Test: Calcium (600mg) supplements with iron; Ctrl: Iron only	Mean ±SD Test: 141 ±11 Ctrl: 145 ±11	Moderate
						Mean corpuscular volume (MCV), fL		Test: 86 ±5 Ctrl: 86 ±4	
						Zinc protoporphyrin, µg/dL		Geom mean (-SD, +SD) Test: 65 (52, 80) Ctrl: 60 (47, 78)	
						Serum ferritin, µg/L		Test: 18.5 (7.3, 46.8) Ctrl: 24.9 (14, 44.2)	
						Heme iron bioavailability, % of absorption		Test: 26 (15.5, 43.6) Ctrl: 25.1 (16.5, 38.3)	
Roughead (2002)	USA	Case-crossover (N=17)	34 y; 53%	Non-anemic; no excess iron	Intervention: 1 day; Follow-up: 15 d; Washout: 28 d	Non-heme iron absorption, %	Test: High iron, low calcium meal with 127mg calcium supplements; Ctrl: Test intervention with no calcium supplements	Mean (-SD, +SD) Test: 7.4 (3.4, 16.1) Ctrl: 6.6 (3.0, 14.4)	Moderate

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Roughead (2005)	North Dakota, USA	Case-crossover (N=27)	38 y; NR	Non-anemic; no excess iron	Intervention: 1 day; Follow-up 14 d; Washout: 42 d	Heme iron absorption, %	Experiment A: Test: Calcium supplements 450mg with high iron, moderate calcium meal with 360mg calcium; Ctrl: Meal only	Test: 16.2 (11.8, 22.4) Ctrl: 14.5 (9.7, 21.7)	Moderate
						Serum ferritin, µg/L		Test: 55 (22, 138) Ctrl: 54 (21, 143)	
						Non-heme iron absorption, %		Mean (-SE, +SE) Test: 0.4 (0.3, 0.5) Ctrl: 0.5 (0.4, 0.6)	
						Heme iron absorption, %		Test: 22 (19, 25) Ctrl: 30 (27, 32)	
Snedeker (1982)	Wisconsin, USA	Case-crossover (N=9)	NR; 0%	NR	Intervention: 12 d Follow-up: 12 d	Serum ferritin, µg/L in adult males receiving high phosphate diets	Test: High calcium Ctrl: Moderate calcium	Mean ±SD Test: 96 ±41 Ctrl: 104 ±50	Low
						Change in plasma ferritin, µg/L	Test: Ca supplements, 250mg twice Ctrl: None	Test: -2.2 ±38.4 Ctrl: 2.6 ±39.7	
						Change in hemoglobin, g/L		Test: 1.0 ±4.7 Ctrl: 0.6 ±4.7	
						Iron absorption, %, in iron-replete children	Ctrl: Drink Test 1: Drink with 100mg Ca	Mean (-SD, +SD) 10.1 (6.1, 16.7) 7.8 (4.9, 12.5)	
Sokoll (1992)	Boston, USA	RCT (N=109)	32 y; 100%	Hematocrit ≥32%	Intervention: 12 wk Follow-up: 12 wk	Change in plasma ferritin, µg/L	Test: Ca supplements, 250mg twice Ctrl: None	Test: -2.2 ±38.4 Ctrl: 2.6 ±39.7	Low
						Change in hemoglobin, g/L		Test: 1.0 ±4.7 Ctrl: 0.6 ±4.7	
						Iron absorption, %, in iron-replete children	Ctrl: Drink Test 1: Drink with 100mg Ca	Mean (-SD, +SD) 10.1 (6.1, 16.7) 7.8 (4.9, 12.5)	
						Iron absorption, %, in IDA children	Ctrl: Drink Test 1: Drink with 100mg Ca	10.2 (5.6, 18.7) 6.8 (3.8, 12.3)	
Walczyk (2014)	Bangalore, India	Case-crossover (N=96)	Iron-replete subgroup: 9 y; 40%	Mean hemoglobin: 126g/L ±4; Mean ferritin: 48µg/L ±20	Intervention: 1 day; Washout: 14 d	Iron absorption, %, in iron-replete children	Ctrl: Drink Test 1: Drink with 100mg Ca	Mean (-SD, +SD) 10.1 (6.1, 16.7) 7.8 (4.9, 12.5)	Moderate
						Iron absorption, %, in IDA children	Ctrl: Drink Test 1: Drink with 100mg Ca	10.2 (5.6, 18.7) 6.8 (3.8, 12.3)	
						Iron absorption, %, in IDA children	Ctrl: Drink Test 1: Drink with 100mg Ca	13.0 (7.7, 21.9) 11.3 (6.9, 18.4)	
						Iron absorption, %, in IDA children	Ctrl: Drink	14.5 (10.7, 19.6) 10.7 (7.8, 19.6)	

Author (year)	City, Country	Design; Sample size (N)	Age; %Female	Baseline hematologic status	Duration of intervention <sup>1</sup>	Outcomes	Description of intervention (categories)	Findings <sup>2</sup>	Risk of bias
Yan (1996)	Keneba & Manduar, The Gambia	RCT (N=60)	28 y; 100%	Mean ferritin: 20.4 µg/L	Intervention: 5 d weekly for 52 wk Follow-up: 52 wk & 78 wk	Serum ferritin, µg/L	Test 2: Drink with 200mg Ca  Test: Two calcium supplements 500mg each daily Ctrl: Placebo	Mean ±SD at 52 wk Test: 1.2 ±0.4 Ctrl: 1.1 ±0.4  Mean ±SD at 78 wk Test: 1.2 ±0.4 Ctrl: 1.1 ±0.3	Moderate

<sup>1</sup>Follow-up begins from the first day of the intervention to the day of evaluation.

<sup>2</sup>Findings are means ±SD or mean (95% confidence interval) or means (SE). NR – Not reported. NA – Not applicable.

<sup>3</sup>Abbreviations: Ca – calcium; Geom – Geometric; IDA – Iron Deficiency Anemia; sTfR – soluble transferrin receptor

<sup>4</sup>Only the highest and lowest outcome measures shown, but outcome measures not shown were considered for the dose-response analysis.



## Supplement 1. PRISMA Checklist

<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2-3
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	5-6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	6
<b>METHODS</b>			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	7
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	8-9
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	7

Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	7
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	10
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	11
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	11-12
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	14
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	12
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., $I^2$ ) for each meta-analysis.	13-14
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	14
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	14
<b>RESULTS</b>			

Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	15, 48, SI
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	41-44
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	15-21
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	15-21, SI, Figures
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	15-21
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	15-21
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	15-21
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	22-23
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	24
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	27-28
<b>FUNDING</b>			

Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	29
---------	----	--	----

## Supplement 2. Search Strategy

Database	Search query	Original search	Updated search
PUBMED	("Iron"[Mesh] AND "Calcium"[Mesh]) AND ("gastrointestinal absorption"[MeSH Terms] OR "biological availability"[Mesh] OR "inhibition"[All Fields] OR "interaction"[All Fields] OR "Iron-Binding Proteins"[Mesh] OR "Iron-Regulatory Proteins"[Mesh] OR "Hematologic Diseases"[Mesh])	505	47
EMBASE	'iron'/exp AND 'calcium'/exp AND ('bioavailability'/exp OR 'gastrointestinal absorption'/exp OR 'iron regulatory factor'/exp OR 'iron binding protein'/exp OR 'anemia'/exp) AND [embase]/lim NOT [medline]/lim NOT 'review'/it	549	164

## Supplement 3. Risk of Bias Assessment of randomized controlled trials

Author (year of publication)	Random sequence generation	Blinding of participants and personnel	Incomplete outcome data	Measurement of outcome	Selective reporting
Agustina (2013)	Low	High	High	Low	Low
Faghih (2012)	Low	High	High	Low	Low
Grinder-Pederson (2004)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Hallberg (1993)	Low	High	High	Low	Low
Israel Rios-Castillo (2014)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Minihane (1998)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Miranda (2014)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Reddy (2000)	Some concerns	High	Low	Low	Low


Sokoll (1992)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Walczyk (2014)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Yan (1996)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Mølgaard (2005)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

#### Supplement 4. Risk of Bias Assessment for Crossover trials

Author (year of publication)	Random sequence generation <sup>1</sup>	Blinding of participants and personnel	Incomplete outcome data	Measurement of outcome	Selective reporting	Carryover effects
Abrams (2001)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	High
Ames (1999)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Benkedda (2010)	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low
Cook (1991)	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low
Dawson-Hughes (1986)	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low
Deehr (1990)	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low
Gaitan (2011)	Some concerns	High	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns
Galan (1991)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Gleerup (1993)	Some concerns	High	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns
Gleerup (1995)	Some concerns	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Hallberg (1991)	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low
Monsen (1976)	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low
Reddy (1997)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Roughead (2002)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Roughead (2005)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Walczyk (2014)	Low	High	Low	Low	Low	Low

<sup>1</sup>For crossover studies, studies with “Some concerns” random sequence generation where those that did not specify whether the order of treatments was randomized or not.


## PRISMA 2009 Diagram





From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097


For more information, visit [www.prisma-statement.org](http://www.prisma-statement.org).











Mean Difference in femoral, mg

6  
5  
4  
3  
2  
1  
0  
-1  
-2  
-3  
-4  
-5


0


500

1000

1500

Calcium Intake (mg/day)





RF Model: Mean Difference = 0.44 [-0.06, 1.30]



Reduces concentration

Increases concentration