

1 **Socio-demographic and knowledge-related determinants of vitamin D** 2 **supplementation in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic: assessment** 3 **of an educational intervention**

4 **Katja Žmitek**^{1,2}, **Maša Hribar**^{1,3}, **Živa Lavriša**¹, **Hristo Hristov**¹, **Anita Kušar**¹, **Igor**
5 **Pravst**^{1,2,3*}

6 ¹ Nutrition Institute, Nutrition and Public Health research group, Tržaška cesta 40, SI-1000 Ljubljana,
7 Slovenia

8 ² VIST–Higher School of Applied Sciences, Gerbičeva cesta 51A, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

9 ³ Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

10 *** Correspondence:**

11 Prof. dr. Igor Pravst, e-mail: igor.pravst@nutris.org; tel. +386 590 68871

12 **Keywords: COVID-19; vitamin D; supplementation; deficiency; knowledge**

13 **Abstract**

14 Vitamin D is a pro-hormone, essential for musculo-skeletal health, normal immune system, and
15 numerous other body functions. Vitamin D deficiency is considered a risk factor in many conditions,
16 and there is growing evidence of its potential role in the severity of COVID-19 outcomes. However,
17 an alarmingly high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency is reported in many regions, and vitamin D
18 supplementation is commonly recommended, particularly during wintertime. To reduce the risk for
19 vitamin D deficiency in the Slovenian population during the COVID-19 pandemic, we conducted mass
20 media intervention with an educational campaign. The objective of this study was to investigate
21 vitamin D supplementation practices in Slovenia before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, and to
22 determine the effects of the educational intervention on supplementation practices. Two data
23 collections were conducted using an online panel with quota sampling for age, sex, and geographical
24 location. A pre-intervention (N=602, April 2020) and post-intervention (N=606) sampling were done
25 during the first and second COVID-19 lockdown, respectively. We also focused on the identification
26 of different factors connected to vitamin D supplementation, with a particular emphasis on vitamin D-
27 related knowledge. Study results showed significant changes in vitamin D supplementation in the
28 population. Penetration of the supplementation increased from 33% in April to 56% in December 2020.
29 The median daily vitamin D intake in supplement users was 25 µg, with about 95% of supplement
30 users taking safe intake levels below 100 µg/daily. Vitamin D-related knowledge (particularly about
31 dietary sources of vitamin D, the health-related impact of vitamin D, and the prevalence of deficiency)
32 was identified as a key independent predictor of vitamin D supplementation. Based on the study
33 findings, we prepared recommendations, which will enable the development of effective awareness
34 campaigns for increasing supplementation of vitamin D.

35 **1. Introduction**

36 Vitamin D is a pro-hormone, essential for musculo-skeletal health, normal immune system, and many
37 other body functions (Autier, Boniol, Pizot, & Mullie, 2014; Zittermann, 2003; Zittermann, Pilz,
38 Hoffmann, & Marz, 2016). This micronutrient is also at the frontier of many debates about possible

39 dietary interventions during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has introduced unique threats to the
40 population and has challenged healthcare systems worldwide.

41 The worst COVID-19 outcomes and higher mortality rates are reported among immunocompromised
42 subjects, including older adults and malnourished people (Barazzoni et al., 2020). Nutritional risks
43 have been identified as particularly relevant, highlighting the need for nutritional interventions (Liu,
44 Zhang, Mao, Wang, & Hu, 2020). Vitamin D deficiency has been recognized as a possible risk of
45 COVID-19 infection and severe disease outcomes (Meltzer et al., 2020; Merzon et al., 2020), therefore
46 vitamin D supplementation is therefore included in recommendations for nutritional support for
47 COVID-19 patients (Anderson, 2020; Caccialanza et al., 2020; Laviano, Koverech, & Zanetti, 2020;
48 Li et al., 2020). While some researchers highlighted possible role of vitamin D in prevention of acute
49 respiratory tract infections (Grant et al., 2020; Adrian R Martineau et al., 2019; A. R. Martineau et al.,
50 2017) and suggested vitamin D supplementation as a possible therapeutic strategy (C. Annweiler et al.,
51 2020; G. Annweiler et al., 2020; Benskin, 2020; Entrenas Castillo et al., 2020; Kaufman, Niles, Kroll,
52 Bi, & Holick, 2020; Rastogi et al., 2020; Siuka, Pfeifer, & Pinter, 2020), some are highlighting that
53 available results are not yet fully conclusive (Koch, 2021). While it is clear that well-controlled
54 intervention studies are needed in these areas, the high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in many
55 populations is a rational cause for concerns – with or without COVID-19 pandemic. Some countries
56 therefore updated their Vitamin D supplementation recommendations recently. In the UK for example,
57 revised governmental advice was issued in April 2020 (during the first COVID-19 lockdown),
58 recommending the use of vitamin D supplements for everyone during the autumn and winter months
59 (Koch, 2021). According to additional UK guidance from December 2020, clinically vulnerable people
60 are now offered a free supply of daily vitamin D supplements for 4 months (UK, 2020).

61 Vitamin D in the body may come both from dietary sources and from biosynthesis in the skin, triggered
62 by sun exposure, more specifically ultraviolet B (UVB) irradiation. The latter represents the main
63 vitamin D source for most of the population, but the efficiency of vitamin D biosynthesis depends on
64 the latitude, season, and several other environmental and personal factors (O'Neill et al., 2016). The
65 usual biomarker for the assessment of vitamin D status is the serum concentration of 25-hydroxy-
66 vitamin D (25(OH)D). Vitamin D deficiency is typically set at serum 25(OH)D concentrations below
67 50 nmol/l (IOM, 2011), while some researchers suggest even higher optimal target threshold (Holick
68 et al., 2011; McDonnell et al., 2018). Although it has been assumed that sun exposure during summer
69 is sufficient to avoid severe vitamin D deficiency year-round, it is now known that this is not the case
70 in many geographic areas (O'Neill et al., 2016; Spiro & Buttriss, 2014; Zittermann et al., 2016),
71 including Europe (Cashman et al., 2016). Actually, across the northern hemisphere, at latitudes greater
72 than 40°N, the small amount of UVB in sunlight from October to March is insufficient to initiate
73 effective vitamin D synthesis. Therefore, substantial proportions of the European population rely on
74 dietary vitamin D and body stores to maintain a sufficient vitamin D status during the extended winter
75 season, and quite a high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency is reported in many countries worldwide
76 (Calvo, Whiting, & Barton, 2005; Cashman et al., 2016; Pilz et al., 2018; Spiro & Buttriss, 2014).
77 Alarmingly, in our very recent nationally representative study for Slovenia (Hribar et al., 2020), during
78 the extended winter season vitamin D deficiency was found in about 80% of adults (18–74 years),
79 while almost 40% had a severe vitamin D deficiency, with serum 25(OH)D levels below 30 nmol/l.


80 Natural foods are very limited sources of vitamin D; the most notable sources are oil-rich fish and egg
81 yolks. Consequently, the dietary intake of vitamin D is low in most countries, except in those where
82 oily fish are consumed in high quantities and those with mandatory fortification of foods with vitamin
83 D (Lanham-New & Wilson, 2016). A large European survey, which included several countries,

84 revealed that the mean daily intake of vitamin D is in most cases below 5 μg (200 IU) (Freisling et al.,
85 2010) and such low intakes were confirmed in other studies (Hilger et al., 2014; Spiro & Buttriss, 2014;
86 Wahl et al., 2012). Systemic food fortification has been implemented in many countries in order to
87 increase dietary intake of vitamin D, for example, in the USA, Canada, Australia, and Finland (Pilz et
88 al., 2018). On the contrary, most European countries do not have formal public health fortification or
89 supplementation policies (Spiro & Buttriss, 2014). Slovenia is also an example of a European country
90 that does not have any formal advice or policies regarding the enrichment of food products with this
91 vitamin, and vitamin D supplementation (10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$) is advised routinely only for infants up to 1 year.
92 Our recent study revealed the penetration of vitamin D supplementation in Slovenian adults (18–74
93 years) reached about 10% (Hribar et al., 2020), but the design of that study did not enable additional
94 analyses, for example, about insights on the seasonal variations in practices of vitamin D
95 supplementation.

96 In the absence of mandatory food fortification and/or supplementation policies, supplementation
97 practices in the population are on a voluntary basis. Although many factors influence individual
98 behaviors, knowledge is a crucial factor to consider in the development of health promotion programs
99 (Boland, Irwin, & Johnson, 2015). People are exposed to various types of information from different
100 sources and we would expect that personal vitamin D supplementation decisions depend on the
101 knowledge related to this vitamin. Deschasaux et al. reported that, at least in Europe, people are often
102 confused about the sources as well as health effects of vitamin D (2016). Similar observations were
103 also reported in other studies from different countries (Boland et al., 2015; O'Connor, Glatt, White, &
104 Revuelta Iniesta, 2018; Özel, Cantarero-Arevalo, & Jacobsen, 2020; Tariq, Khan, & Basharat, 2020).
105 Physicians and the media were identified as key information providers on this topic, and it was
106 suggested that health professionals should also be better informed about the health effects of vitamin
107 D, and particularly about the vitamin D deficiency risk factors (Deschasaux et al., 2016). Moreover,
108 the public should receive information that reflects the current knowledge on vitamin D health effects
109 and sources. This could contribute to improved vitamin D status in the population.

110 Vitamin D-related knowledge has not yet been systematically investigated in the Slovenian population,
111 but the high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency and building evidence about its role in COVID-19
112 have caused increased attention of mass media for this essential micronutrient, which could have
113 affected not only vitamin D-related knowledge, but also supplementation practices. Monthly frequency
114 of articles mentioning vitamin D in Slovenian mass media in the period 2019-2020 is presented in
115 **Figure 1**. There are visible peaks in media coverage of vitamin D during the first COVID-19 lockdown
116 in March, and particularly in the last quartal of 2020. March 2020 peak corresponds with media
117 communication of physician D. Siuka (Siuka, 2020), who proposed 10-steps in the fight against
118 COVID-19 (vitamin D supplementation was mentioned as one of the steps), another peak can be further
119 observed in October 2020, when vitamin D supplementation recommendations for physicians were
120 published on the web site of Slovenian endocrine society (Pfeifer, Siuka, Pravst, & Ihan, 2020), while
121 a major peak occurred in November, after an educational intervention. A press release (NUTRIS,
122 2020) was sent to major mass media channels, focused on recent results of the national Nutrihealth
123 study (Hribar et al., 2020) about the wide prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the Slovenian
124 population.

125 **Figure 1.** A monthly number of vitamin D-related articles in Slovenian mass media in the years 2019
126 and 2020.



127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135

Notes: Figure 1 was constructed using the press coverage data of Klipping media agency (Slovenia), which collects full texts of publications from all relevant mass media channels in Slovenia (covering major television and radio stations (transcripts), print media, and internet portals). Press coverage peaks correspond with:

- ① Media communication of physician D. Siuka about 10-steps in the fight against COVID-19 (Siuka, 2020);
- ② Release of recommendations for supplementation with vitamin D for physicians (Pfeifer et al., 2020);
- ③ Mass media intervention: Press release about the prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in Slovenia by the Nutrition Institute (NUTRIS, 2020), followed by series of interviews and media reports.

136 Considering these challenges, the objective of this study was to investigate individual vitamin D
137 supplementation practices in Slovenia before and during the COVID-19 pandemic and to determine
138 the effects of the abovementioned educational intervention on supplementation practices. Two data
139 collections were conducted: first during the first COVID-19 lockdown in April 2020, and second
140 during the second COVID-19 lockdown in December 2020 – after an educational intervention. We
141 were focused on the identification of different factors connected to vitamin D supplementation, with a
142 particular emphasis on vitamin D-related personal knowledge. In the absence of mandatory food
143 fortification and vitamin D supplementation, the identification of key knowledge gaps in the population
144 is essential for the preparation of efficient and educational public health campaigns for reducing
145 vitamin D deficiency. Identified knowledge gaps were already used for the educational intervention,
146 which was evaluated with sampling in December 2020.

147 2. Materials and Methods

148 3.1. Data collection

149 This study was conducted in Slovenia. Sampling was done using an online panel survey in two periods.
150 Frist (pre-intervention) sampling period was between 22nd and 27th April 2020, during the first
151 COVID-19 lockdown, while the second (post-intervention) sampling (N=606) was between 11th and
152 30th December 2020, during the second COVID-19 lockdown. Educational intervention (press release
153 to mass media) was done between both collections, on 2nd November 2020 (details provided in Section
154 3.4). The survey was conducted in the Slovenian language as an amendment to the international Food-
155 COVID-19 survey. Participants provided their informed consent to participate using an online form.
156 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Bioethical Committee of the Higher School of
157 Applied Sciences in Ljubljana, Slovenia (VIST ET-6/2020).

158 Participants were recruited via a consumer panel marketing agency with quota sampling for age groups,
159 gender, and region. The international Food-COVID-19 questionnaire (Janssen et al., 2021) was
160 amended with additional socio-demographic details (self-reported financial and health status; see
161 details in Section 3.2), with questions about individual vitamin D supplementation practices before and
162 during the COVID-19 pandemic (detail provided in Section 3.2), and vitamin D-related knowledge
163 (detail provided in Section 3.3). Only valid responses for subjects that passed two attention check
164 questions and provided responses to all survey questions are included.

165 April 2020 pre-intervention sample included N=602 valid responses. Same subjects were also invited
166 to participate in December 2020 post-intervention survey, with a response rate of 62% (n=373). To
167 assure a comparable sample size, additional 233 participants were recruited via the same consumer
168 panel marketing agency, again with quota sampling for age groups, gender, and region. Complete
169 December 2020 post-intervention sample therefore contained a total of N=606 valid responses.

170 *3.2. Variables*

171 Respondents provided information about their age, which, for the purpose of the analysis, was
172 transformed into a categorical variable with four levels: 18–35, 36–49, 50–65, and ≥66 years. Using
173 participants’ postal codes and the classification proposed by the European Commission (EUROSTAT,
174 2020), respondents were classified into three categories: urban, intermediate, and rural. Educational
175 status was also collected using EUROSTAT categorisation (Primary school; Upper secondary –
176 vocational school; Upper secondary – high school; Vocational post-secondary school; First cycle
177 Bologna degree; University or second cycle Bologna degree; Scientific MSc or PhD). For statistical
178 analyses, these categories were joined into three larger education categories—lower (primary school),
179 medium (vocational school or high school), and higher (beyond high school). Self-reported financial
180 status was also measured (Very below average; Below average; Average; Above average; Very above
181 average). For statistical analyses, respondents were then classified into three categories: the below
182 average income category (includes respondents indicating very below and below average financial
183 status); the average group (indicates average financial status); and the above average category
184 (indicates above and very above average self-reported financial status). Respondents also reported the
185 size of their household, which was classified into three categories: household with children, single
186 person household, household with 2+ adults without children living together. Health condition was
187 also defined by three categories. The first included those with very low- and low health condition, the
188 second included respondents with average health condition and the third included participants
189 indicating high and very high self-reported health condition. Moreover, participants were asked to
190 report if they were supplementing their diet with vitamin D (a) before and (b) during the COVID-19
191 pandemic. If supplementation was reported, the participant was asked to provide the dosage of vitamin
192 D taken in as much detail as possible in order to enable a calculation of individual daily vitamin D
193 dosage. Questions were also asked about the extent to which their household had been afflicted with
194 COVID-19 using three questions that asked about infection, isolation or quarantine, and hospitalized
195 members. For the purpose of the analysis, these categories were further joined by one variable with
196 two levels. The participants who responded positively to any of the three questions were classified in
197 the “COVID-19 afflicted households” group, and the remaining respondents in the “COVID-19 not
198 afflicted households” group. The following three questions measured respondents’ perceived risk in
199 relation to the disease: (1) the likelihood of any member of your household becoming infected by the
200 virus; (2) the likely severity of the virus for any member of your household; and (3) the level of your
201 anxiety concerning the potential impact of the virus on your household. Participants were asked to
202 score these on a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).

203 3.3. Vitamin D-related knowledge

204 Vitamin D-related knowledge was measured using an online tool, developed and described in detail by
205 Boland et al. (Boland et al., 2015). This questionnaire contains questions on the following dimensions
206 of vitamin D: (a) dietary sources; (b) health impact; (c) dietary needs; (d) sun exposure and
207 biosynthesis; (e) other factors of biosynthesis; and (f) prevalence of deficiency. The following
208 modifications of the questionnaire were needed:

209 (1) Translation to Slovenian language.

210 (2) The sun exposure and biosynthesis dimension (d) of the original questionnaire has two questions
211 about the time one needed to spend in the sun to get enough vitamin D—one for fair-skinned persons,
212 and one for non-fair-skinned (i.e., non-Caucasian) persons. We only used the question for fair-skinned
213 persons, as the vast majority of the Slovenian population is Caucasian.

214 (3) The dietary needs (d) of the original questionnaire refer to the daily amount of vitamin D
215 recommended for adults by Health Canada. This question was changed to refer to recommendations
216 applicable in Slovenia, and responses were provided both in International Units and micrograms of
217 vitamin D (only IU in the original questionnaire). While, in the original questionnaire, the correct
218 response was 600 IU (according to Health Canada recommendations), responses of 600 IU/15µg and
219 800 IU IU/20 µg were considered as correct in our survey, because of the differences between regional
220 and EU-level recommendations (EFSA, 2016; GNS, 2012)

221 The vitamin D-related knowledge questionnaire used is provided in the Supplementary Information.
222 Six questions were used to assess all six of the above-mentioned dimensions of vitamin D-related
223 knowledge, and each question contributed equally to the calculation of the total knowledge score.
224 Every knowledge question was worth 1 point, producing a maximum score of 6 points. Single questions
225 were scored with 1 if the answer was correct, and 0 if the answer was incorrect. For multiple choice
226 questions, each correct response accounted for a fraction of the overall question. For instance, if a
227 question had 5 correct answers, each contributed 0.2 points. When calculating the total score, the sum
228 of correct responses was deducted from the sum of incorrect responses multiplied by the fraction parts.
229 In this way, a penalty for guessing was implemented to prevent participants from scoring maximum by
230 selecting all possible responses as correct. For this reason, the response “don’t know” was not penalized
231 within the knowledge score. Penalization only occurred within a specific question. In cases where
232 negative scores were given, the whole question was scored as zero.

233 3.4. Educational intervention

234 Results of pre-intervention data collection in April 2020 were used to identify vitamin D-related
235 knowledge dimensions, connected with vitamin D supplementation practices. Population-based
236 educational intervention started with the launch of a press release on November 2nd 2020, which was
237 sent to e-mail addresses of major Slovenian media channels. The press release was focused on the
238 wide prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the Slovenian population (NUTRIS, 2020). Intervention
239 resulted in several interviews and numerous publications in mass media. For example, in the last quartal
240 (Q4) of 2020 there were more vitamin D-related publications (N=911) in mass media, than together in
241 the whole year 2019 (N=786) (**Figure 1**).

242 3.5. Data analysis

243 All statistical analyses were done using STATA version 15.1 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX,
244 USA). Descriptive characteristics (mean, median, proportions) are presented for different socio-
245 demographic and individual-based variables and those related to vitamin D supplementation before
246 and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Multivariable linear and logistic regression analyses were used
247 to investigate the predictors of knowledge and supplementation with vitamin D and to determine
248 differences between different sub-populations in terms of knowledge and supplementation. The
249 estimates of vitamin D-related knowledge were determined using age, sex, place of living, education,
250 financial status, health status, and employment, while the estimates of supplementation with vitamin
251 D were determined with respect to age, sex, place of living, education, financial status, and health
252 status. Additionally, a multivariable logistic regression analysis was used to investigate predictors of
253 an increase in vitamin D-related knowledge (December vs. April scoring). In this regard the analyses
254 were conducted using a subsample of subjects, which participated in both pre-intervention (April 2020)
255 and post-intervention (December 2020) data collection, with the exploitation of previously mentioned
256 socio-demographic determinants (age, sex, place of living, education, financial and health status).
257 Multivariable logistic regression analysis was also used to investigate the influence of different
258 dimensions of vitamin D-related knowledge on supplementation with vitamin D, separately for first
259 (April 2020) and second (December 2020) COVID-19 lockdown. For the purpose of binomial
260 regression analysis, respondents were classified into two categories: respondents taking and not taking
261 vitamin D supplements. The model parameters were estimated by the maximum likelihood method.
262 Odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated. A two-tailed z-test for
263 proportions was used to identify significant changes between the pre- and post-intervention
264 supplementation practices. In addition, a t-test for independent samples was used to test the difference
265 in overall vitamin D-related knowledge in pre- and post-intervention sample. Differences were
266 considered significant at $p < 0.05$.

267 **3. Results**

268 *4.1. Socio-demographic and other characteristics of the sample*

269 Socio-demographic and other characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. The
270 compositions of the pre-intervention (April 2020; N=602), the post-intervention (December 2020;
271 N=606), and the combined sample (April and December 2020; N=835) study samples are close to the
272 distribution in the population. Both sex and age distribution are quite comparable, with age groups 19–
273 35 and 36–49 slightly over-represented, while the 50+ age group is somewhat under-represented.
274 Regarding educational level, the sample is under-represented for the lower education group.
275 Nevertheless, as the study was done as an online survey, such data could not be considered
276 representative, because the population who do not have access to the internet cannot be included.

277 The results in Table 1 reveal that about 9% of participants were somehow affected by COVID-19 in
278 April 2020, while the mean COVID-19 risk perception scores were below medium (3). While the
279 proportion of participants from COVID-19-affected households was much higher in December (25%),
280 all mean risk perception scores (rated from 1- very low to 5- very high) were still below scale medium
281 (3). In April the mean score for the likelihood of a household member becoming infected with the virus
282 (2.2 ± 0.9) was lower in comparison with the score for the likely severity of the virus for household
283 members, and the score for the level of anxiety concerning the potential impact of the virus on the
284 household (2.6 ± 1.2 and 2.7 ± 1.1 , respectively). This changed in December, when we observed
285 significant increase ($p < 0.001$) in the reported likelihood of a household member becoming infected
286 with the virus in comparison with April (score 2.7 vs. 2.2, respectively). We should also note that

287 almost half of the sample (45.2 and 46.4% in April and December, respectively) was from a rural
 288 environment, which might have affected the COVID-19 risk perceptions of study participants.

289 **Table 1:** Socio-demographic and other characteristics of study participants (Slovenia, 2020).

Variables	Levels	April	December	Combined
		2020	2020	sample*
		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Sample size		602 (100)	606 (100)	835 (100)
Age	Mean age in years (SD)	44.1 (13.5)	42.94 (13.8)	41.92 (13.7)
Age groups	18–35 years of age	179 (29.7)	206 (34.0)	301 (36.1)
	36–49 years of age	202 (33.6)	184 (30.4)	273 (32.7)
	50–65 years of age	186 (30.9)	187 (30.9)	224 (26.8)
	66 years and above	35 (5.8)	29 (4.8)	37 (4.4)
Sex	Male	300 (49.8)	312 (51.5)	416 (49.8)
	Female	302 (50.2)	294 (48.5)	419 (50.2)
Place of living	Urban	125 (20.8)	123 (20.3)	169 (20.2)
	Intermediate	205 (34.1)	202 (33.3)	283 (33.9)
	Rural	272 (45.2)	281 (46.4)	383 (45.9)
Education	Primary school	24 (4.0)	22 (3.6)	32 (3.8)
	Upper secondary – vocational school	77 (12.8)	52 (8.6)	92 (11.0)
	Upper secondary – high school	231 (38.4)	227 (37.5)	320 (38.3)
	Vocational post-secondary school	69 (11.5)	84 (13.9)	107 (12.8)
	First cycle Bologna degree	94 (15.6)	107 (17.7)	132 (15.8)
	University or second cycle Bologna degree	95 (15.8)	100 (16.5)	133 (15.9)
	Scientific MSc or PhD	12 (2.0)	14 (2.3)	19 (2.3)
Financial status	Very below average	22 (3.7)	28 (4.6)	27 (3.2)
	Below average	115 (19.1)	119 (19.6)	157 (18.8)
	Average	363 (60.3)	361 (59.6)	505 (60.5)
	Above average	101 (16.8)	95 (16.7)	143 (17.1)
	Very above average	1 (0.2)	3 (0.5)	3 (0.4)
Health status	Very low	6 (1.0)	5 (0.8)	6 (0.7)
	Low	17 (2.8)	18 (3.0)	21 (2.5)
	Average	121 (20.1)	126 (20.8)	159 (19.0)
	High	326 (54.2)	330 (54.5)	460 (55.1)
	Very high	132 (21.9)	127 (21.0)	189 (22.6)
Employment	Full time employed	318 (52.8)	331 (54.6)	449 (53.8)
	Part time employed	26 (4.3)	29 (4.8)	37 (4.4)
	Unemployed	71 (11.8)	70 (11.6)	101 (12.1)
	Keeping house or home maker	8 (1.3)	8 (1.3)	10 (1.2)
	Self-employed	31 (5.2)	23 (3.8)	36 (4.3)
	Student	49 (8.1)	58 (9.6)	92 (11.0)
	Retired	99 (16.5)	87 (14.4)	110 (13.2)
Household composition	Household with children	247 (41.0)	286 (47.2)	389 (46.6)
	Single person household	53 (8.8)	54 (8.9)	70 (8.4)
	Household with 2+ adults without children	302 (50.2)	266 (43.9)	376 (45.0)
From COVID-19 affected households	Affected	53 (8.8)	151 (24.9)	N/A
	Not affected	549 (91.2)	455 (75.1)	N/A
COVID-19 risk perception: Mean score ± SD	The likelihood of any member of your household becoming infected with the virus.	2.2 ±0.9	2.7 ±1.0	N/A
	The likely severity of the virus for any member of your household.	2.6 ±1.2	2.8 ±1.2	N/A
	The level of your anxiety concerning the potential impact of the virus on your household.	2.7 ±1.1	2.9 ±1.1	N/A

290 **Notes:** SD = standard deviation; N/A = Not applicable COVID-19 risk perception score on scale from 1 (very low) to 5
 291 (very high). *Combined sample include different participants included in both April and December 2020 samples (373
 292 subjects participated in both April and December surveys, 229 in April study, and 233 in Decembers study only)

293 4.2. Vitamin D-related knowledge

294 The results of the measurements of vitamin D-related knowledge are presented in **Table 2** and **Figure**
 295 **2**. The maximum vitamin D-related knowledge score would be 6, but in the April 2020 pre-intervention
 296 study the highest observed score in our survey was 3.73, with a mean score of only 1.60 (95% CI:
 297 1.53–1.67). The specific dimensions of the vitamin D knowledge provide even more interesting results.
 298 Mean scores for dietary vitamin D sources (Q1) and vitamin D’s health impact (Q2) were 0.26 (95%
 299 CI: 0.25–0.28), while mean scores for factors affecting the biosynthesis of vitamin D (Q5) were
 300 somewhat lower (0.23; 95% CI: 0.21–0.24). The majority of the respondents (54.5%) were aware that
 301 the prevalence of vitamin D is above 20%, while the proportion of participants (Q3) knowing their
 302 recommended daily intake of vitamin D (15–20 µg) and (Q4) the necessary sun exposure for an average
 303 fair-skinned person, when legs and arms are exposed (10–60 minutes per week), was 10% and 28%,
 304 respectively.

305 December 2020 measurements after conduction of educational intervention showed a statistically
 306 significant increase in vitamin-D related knowledge scores ($p < 0.001$). Mean total score significantly
 307 increased for 38% - to score 2.21 (95% CI: 2.12–2.90). Notable differences were also observed in
 308 specific dimensions of the vitamin D knowledge (Table 2), particularly in scores for vitamin D’s health
 309 impact (Q2: +54%; 0.40; 95% CI: 0.38–0.43), and factors affecting the biosynthesis of vitamin D (Q5:
 310 +96%; 0.45; 95% CI: 0.43–0.47), were significant increase was observed ($p < 0.001$). We also observed
 311 a significant increase (+32%; $p < 0.001$) in the knowledge of vitamin D deficiency prevalence: 72.0%
 312 of participants answered this question correctly, in comparison with 54.5% in April 2020. Changes in
 313 other vitamin D-related knowledge were much less pronounced. As can be observed from knowledge
 314 distribution histograms in **Figure 2**, the educational intervention resulted in increase in knowledge on
 315 the tail of the distribution, with the population with poor pre-intervention vitamin D-related knowledge
 316 having most notable knowledge increase after the intervention.

317 **Table 2.** Vitamin D-related knowledge score in study samples (N=602; N=606).
 318


Sampling period	April 2020	December 2020
Variables	Result	Result
Number of subjects; N [%]	602 [100%]	606 [100%]
Knowledge total score:		
<i>Mean (95% CI)</i>	1.60 (1.53–1.67)	2.21 (2.12–2.90)
Vitamin D-related knowledge for all dimensions*:		
Food and other sources (Q1)—mean score (95% CI)	0.26 (0.25–0.28)	0.28 (0.27–0.30)
Health impact (Q2) – mean score (95% CI)	0.26 (0.25–0.28)	0.40 (0.38–0.43)
Dietary needs (Q3) – N (%) of correct answers	60.0 (10.0)	49 (8.2)
Sun exposure and biosynthesis (Q4) – N (%) of correct answers	171 (28.4)	167 (27.6)
Other factors and biosynthesis (Q5) – mean score (95% CI)	0.23 (0.21–0.24)	0.45 (0.43–0.47)
Deficiency prevalence (Q6) – N (%) of correct answers	328 (54.5)	436 (72.0)

319 **Notes:** * Knowledge score consider sum of scores from two types of questions: three multiple choice questions scaled from
 320 0 to 1 and three single choice questions with two discrete options: correct and incorrect.
 321

322 **Figure 2.** Histograms of pre-intervention (N=602; April 2020) and post-intervention (N=606;
 323 December 2020) vitamin D-related knowledge in the study sample. The horizontal (x) scale uses the

324 vitamin D-related knowledge score units, while the respondent’s knowledge distribution is represented
 325 by the vertical bars (Red color line depicts normal Gaussian distribution of pre-intervention knowledge
 326 score, while blue color line depicts normal Gaussian distribution of post-intervention knowledge
 327 score).

328



329
 330

331 To provide further insights, linear regression analyses were used to determine adjusted means of
 332 vitamin D-related knowledge, considering various socio-demographic and other factors – namely age,
 333 sex, place of living, education, financial status, health, and employment status. Analyses were done
 334 separately for pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) sample (Table 3).
 335 The pre-intervention analysis shows that age ($F=4.05$, $p < 0.01$), sex ($F=5.58$, $p < 0.05$) and financial
 336 status ($F=3.01$, $p < 0.05$) significantly affected vitamin D-related knowledge in different population
 337 groups. Older respondents with a higher financial status had significantly increased vitamin D-related
 338 knowledge, as shown by the groups’ marginal means. Additionally, significantly higher vitamin D-
 339 related knowledge was observed for females compared to the male population. On the other hand, in
 340 the post-intervention analyses (December 2020), financial status and sex were not identified as
 341 significant factors affecting vitamin D-related knowledge anymore. However, the effect of age
 342 ($F=7.18$; $p < 0.01$) was still significant, and the effect of place of living also became significant
 343 ($F=3.06$; $p < 0.05$), with the highest knowledge scores in participants from urban areas.

344

345 **Table 3.** Pre-intervention (N=602; April 2020) and post-intervention (N=606; December 2020)
 346 adjusted mean (95% CI) levels of vitamin D-related knowledge by age, sex, place of living, education,
 347 financial status, health status, and employment.

348

Variables	Levels	Pre-intervention (April 2020)		Post-intervention (December 2020)	
		N (%)	Adjusted	N (%)	Adjusted
Overall		602 (100)		606 (100)	
Age groups	18–35 years of age	179 (29.7)	1.43 (1.30–1.58) ^a	206 (34.0)	1.99 (1.83–2.15) ^a

Variables	Levels	Pre-intervention (April 2020)		Post-intervention (December 2020)	
		N (%)	Adjusted	N (%)	Adjusted
	36–49 years of age	202 (33.6)	1.53 (1.39–1.67) ^{ab}	184 (30.4)	2.08 (1.92–2.24) ^a
	50–65 years of age	186 (30.9)	1.80 (1.66–1.95) ^b	187 (30.9)	2.52 (2.36–2.68) ^b
	66 years and above	35 (5.8)	1.86 (1.47–2.25) ^{ab}	29 (4.8)	2.53 (2.08–2.97) ^{ab}
Sex	Male	300 (49.8)	1.49 (1.39–1.60) ^a	312 (51.5)	2.15 (2.03–2.26)
	Female	302 (50.2)	1.71 (1.60–1.82) ^b	294 (48.5)	2.27 (2.15–2.39)
Place of living	Urban	125 (20.8)	1.65 (1.48–1.82)	123 (20.3)	2.41 (2.23–2.59) ^b
	Intermediate	205 (34.1)	1.60 (1.50–1.73)	202 (33.3)	2.18 (2.04–2.32) ^{ab}
	Rural	272 (45.2)	1.59 (1.49–1.70)	281 (46.4)	2.13 (2.02–2.26) ^a
Education	Lower	24 (4.0)	1.64 (1.25–2.03)	22 (3.6)	1.98 (1.54–2.42)
	Medium	308 (51.2)	1.56 (1.46–1.67)	279 (46.0)	2.11 (1.99–2.24)
	Higher	270 (44.9)	1.65 (1.53–1.77)	305 (50.3)	2.31 (2.19–2.42)
Financial status	Below average	137 (22.8)	1.36 (1.19–1.53) ^a	147 (24.3)	2.12 (1.94–2.77)
	Average	363 (60.3)	1.65 (1.55–1.75) ^b	361 (59.6)	2.22 (2.03–2.41)
	Above average	102 (16.9)	1.78 (1.59–1.98) ^b	98 (16.2)	2.26 (2.06–2.47)
Health status	Low	23 (3.8)	2.04 (1.64–2.44)	23 (3.8)	2.35 (1.93–2.77)
	Average	121 (20.1)	1.65 (1.47–1.83)	126 (20.8)	2.22 (2.03–2.41)
	High	458 (76.1)	1.57 (1.48–1.66)	457 (75.4)	2.19 (2.10–2.29)
Employment	Employed	375 (62.3)	1.63 (1.53–1.73)	383 (63.2)	2.16 (2.05–2.27)
	Unemployed	79 (13.1)	1.43 (1.19–1.68)	87 (14.4)	2.16 (1.88–2.43)
	Student	49 (8.1)	1.70 (1.40–2.01)	58 (9.6)	2.58 (2.26–2.88)
	Retired	99 (16.5)	1.64 (1.43–1.86)	78 (12.9)	2.19 (1.95–2.43)

349 **Note:** Identified factors based on contrast of marginal linear predictions accounting for vitamin D-related knowledge: (1)
350 April 2020 sample: $p < 0.01$ (age); $p < 0.01$ (sex), $p < 0.01$ (financial status), $p < 0.1$ (health status); (2) December 2020 sample:
351 $p < 0.01$ (age); $p < 0.05$ (place of living), $p < 0.1$ (education), $p < 0.1$ (employment). Predictor levels not sharing the same
352 subscript are significantly different at $p < 0.05$ using pairwise comparisons of predictive margins with Sidak's adjustment
353 method.
354

355 Intervention-related changes were additionally investigated using a sample of subjects, for which we
356 had available two measurements of vitamin D-related knowledge. These were $N = 373$ subjects, who
357 collaborated in both pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) surveys. We
358 investigated predictors of an increase in vitamin D-related knowledge using multivariable logistic
359 regression analysis, focusing on age, sex, place of living, education, financial, and health status (Table
360 4). Altogether, 74% ($N = 274$) of subjects had increased vitamin D-related knowledge scores in
361 December, in comparison with their April 2020 knowledge scoring. Education of the respondents have
362 shown to be the only significant ($p < 0.01$) predictor of increased knowledge score. Those with medium
363 and higher education level have higher chances to increase their vitamin D-related knowledge with
364 intervention, in comparison to those with lower education level (OR 5.36, 6.34 vs. 1.00, respectively).
365

366 **Table 4.** Assessment of intervention-related changes in vitamin D-related knowledge by age, sex, place
367 of living, education, financial status, health status and employment (analyses on $N = 373$ subjects,
368 included in both April and December 2020 sampling).
369

Variables	Levels	N (%)	Subjects with increase ¹ in vitamin-D related knowledge; N (%)	Odds Ratio (CI)
Overall		373 (100)	274 (73.5)	
Age groups	66 years and above	27 (7.2)	21 (77.8)	1.21 (0.40–3.60)
	50–65 years of age	144 (38.6)	109 (75.7)	1.10 (0.56–2.18)
	36–49 years of age	117 (31.4)	82 (70.1)	0.86 (0.44–1.68)
	18–35 years of age	85 (22.8)	62 (72.9)	1

Sex	Female	177 (47.4)	135 (76.3)	1.36 (0.83–2.23)
	Male	196 (52.6)	139 (70.9)	1
Place of living	Urban	79 (21.2)	60 (76.0)	1
	Intermediate	124 (33.2)	95 (76.6)	1.08 (0.54–2.16)
	Rural	170 (45.6)	119 (70.0)	0.82 (0.43–1.57)
Education	Higher	178 (47.7)	128 (71.9)	5.36 (1.61–17.78) ^b
	Medium	181 (48.5)	141 (77.9)	6.34 (1.93–20.78) ^b
	Lower	14 (3.8)	5 (35.7)	1 ^a
Financial status	Above average	60 (16.1)	40 (66.7)	0.71 (0.31–1.62)
	Average	225 (60.3)	170 (75.6)	1.08 (0.59–1.99)
	Below average	88 (23.6)	64 (72.7)	1
Health status	Low	13 (3.5)	10 (76.9)	1
	Average	81 (21.7)	55 (67.9)	0.46 (0.10–2.07)
	High	279 (74.8)	209 (74.9)	0.73 (0.17–3.14)

370 **Note:** ¹Increase in December 2020 vitamin D-related knowledge score, in comparison with April 2020 scoring. Three
 371 respondents showed no change in vitamin D related knowledge. Identified factors based on contrast of marginal linear
 372 predictions accounting for increase in vitamin D-related knowledge: $p < 0.01$ (education). Predictor levels not sharing the
 373 same subscript are significantly different at $p < 0.05$ using pairwise comparisons of predictive margins with Sidak's
 374 adjustment method.

375 4.3. Vitamin D-supplementation practices

376 The penetration of the pre-COVID-19 vitamin D supplementation was 33.7%, and very similar also in
 377 the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in April 2020 (33.2%). Among those participants who
 378 reported the amount of vitamin D supplementation they took before the COVID-19 pandemic or during
 379 the pandemic in April, 58% did not report any change in their vitamin D supplementation practice,
 380 while 21% reported increased vitamin D dosage, and the same percentage (21%) reported reduced
 381 vitamin D dosage. Only few subjects reported using daily doses above 100 µg, exceeding the Tolerable
 382 Upper Intake Level (UL) of vitamin D (EFSA, 2012). The mean pre- and -mid pandemic daily vitamin
 383 D supplementation, calculated after the exclusion of these subjects, was 31.0 µg (95% CI: 27.3–34.7)
 384 and 32.2 µg (95% CI: 28.1–36.2), respectively. Median intake was 25 µg in both cases.

386 On the other hand, notably different supplementation practices were observed in the later phase of the
 387 COVID-19 pandemic, after the educational intervention. Analyses of the post-intervention dataset
 388 showed significantly higher penetration of vitamin D supplementation, in comparison to both April
 389 and pre-COVID-19 data ($p < 0.001$ in both cases). Post-intervention proportion of vitamin D
 390 supplementation in December 2020 increased considerably (+65% in comparison to pre-COVID data)
 391 to 55.6%. While median intake of vitamin D was not changed (25 µg), daily vitamin D supplementation
 392 dosage increased to 41.1 µg (95% CI: 37.5 - 44.7). Among participants who reported the amount of
 393 vitamin D supplementation before the pandemic, or during the December COVID-19 lockdown, 63%
 394 reported increased vitamin D dosage, while 20% and 17% reported no change or decrease of daily
 395 vitamin D dosage, respectively. The proportion of supplement users exceeding the UL of 100 µg
 396 Vitamin D was comparable with April 2020 (5%).

398 **Table 5.** Vitamin D supplementation practices before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.
 399

Variables	Before COVID 19	During COVID-19 Pre-intervention	During COVID-19 Post-intervention
Number of subjects N (%)	602 (100)	602 (100)	606 (100)
Reporting Vitamin D supplementation N (%)	203 (33.7)	200 (33.2)	337 (55.6)

Reporting daily vitamin D dosage N (%)	168 (27.9)	159 (26.4)	279 (46.0)
Daily vitamin D dosage [$\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$] (95% CI)*	31.0 (27.3–34.7)	32.2 (28.1–36.2)	41.1 (37.5–44.7)
<i>Std. Err.</i>	1.9	2.1	1.8
<i>Median</i>	25	25	25
Subjects with vitamin D dosage above 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$; N (%)	125 (74.4)	124 (95.0)	231 (82.8)
Subjects with vitamin D dosage above 100 $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$; N(%)	4 (2.4)	8 (5.0)	14 (5.0)

Note: Before COVID-19 pandemic data were collected in April 2020 survey (N=602); *daily vitamin D dosage was calculated based on the responses of participants who reported the amount of vitamin D supplementation they took before, and during the COVID-19 pandemic (April, December 2020).

Further we investigated predictors of vitamin D supplementation using multivariable logistic regression analysis, focusing on age, sex, place of living, education, financial and health status (Table 6). Analyses were done separately for pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) samples. In the model, respondents were classified into two categories (respondents supplementing and not supplementing with vitamin D), while model parameters were estimated by the maximum likelihood method. The only two significant ($p < 0.05$) predictors were financial and health status. In April 2020, the likelihood for supplementing vitamin D was higher for population with higher financial status (OR 2.20, 95% CI: 1.18–4.09, $p = 0.01$) and lower health status (OR 3.05, 95% CI: 1.26–7.40, $p = 0.03$). Situation changed considerably after the educational intervention, in the December 2020 dataset. Health status was not a significant predictor for vitamin D supplementation anymore, while the financial status was marginally significant ($p = 0.07$). On the other hand, age appear as significant predictor ($p = 0.01$), with the highest vitamin D supplementation odds for elderly subjects (supplementation rate 72.4%; OR 2.66; 95% CI: 1.09–6.47).

To provide further insights into the connection between vitamin D supplementation practices and vitamin D-related knowledge, we used a modeling approach based on the logistic regression method (Figure 3). Two models were constructed to investigate the probability of vitamin D supplementation, using all six investigated dimensions of vitamin D-related knowledge. Model 1 examined pre-intervention vitamin D supplementation practices (April 2020), while Model 2 referred to post-intervention supplementation practices in December 2020. The analysis shows that the increase in vitamin D-related knowledge in three of the six dimensions significantly predicted the likelihood of vitamin D supplementation. The increase in knowledge about dietary sources of vitamin D was found significant predictor in post-intervention Model 2 (OR 2.88, 95% CI: 1.20–6.91, $p = 0.02$), while it was close to significant in pre-intervention model (OR 2.55, 95% CI: 0.98–6.65, $p = 0.05$). On the other hand knowledge about the health-related impact of vitamin D (OR 6.16, 95% CI: 2.89–16.56, $p < 0.001$ in pre-intervention, and OR 4.22, 95% CI: 2.36–7.56, $p < 0.001$ post-intervention) and knowledge about prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the population (OR 1.64, 95% CI: 1.10–2.44, $p = 0.02$ before the pandemic, and OR 1.56, 95% CI: 1.06–2.29, $p < 0.03$ during the pandemic) significantly increase the probability of vitamin D supplementation in both models.

433
434
435


Table 6. The proportion of the population using vitamin D supplements during COVID-19 pandemic by age, sex, place of living, education, financial status, and health status: pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) data

Variables	Levels	Pre-intervention (April 2020)			Post-intervention (December 2020)		
		N (%)	Subjects supplementing Vitamin D; N (%)	Odds Ratio (CI)	N (%)	Subjects supplementing Vitamin D; N (%)	Odds Ratio (CI)
Overall		602 (100)	201 (33.4)		606 (100)	337 (55.6)	
Age groups	18–35 years of age	179 (29.7)	57 (31.8)	1	206 (34.0)	101 (49.0)	1 ^a
	36–49 years of age	202 (33.6)	64 (31.7)	1.00 (0.64–1.56)	184 (30.4)	94 (51.1)	1.13 (0.75–1.70) ^{ab}
	50–65 years of age	186 (30.9)	66 (35.5)	1.19 (0.75–1.88)	187 (30.9)	121 (64.7)	1.95 (1.27–3.01) ^b
	66 years and above	35 (5.8)	14 (40.0)	0.71 (0.74–3.35)	29 (4.8)	21 (72.4)	2.66 (1.09–6.47) ^{ab}
Sex	Male	300 (49.8)	95 (31.7)	1	312 (51.5)	170 (54.5)	1
	Female	302 (50.2)	106 (35.1)	1.21 (0.85–1.73)	294 (48.5)	167 (56.8)	1.21 (0.86–1.69)
Place of living	Rural	272 (45.2)	85 (31.3)	1	281 (46.4)	152 (54.1)	1
	Intermediate	205 (34.1)	71 (34.6)	1.12 (0.75–1.66)	202 (33.3)	117 (57.9)	1.03 (0.71–1.51)
	Urban	125 (20.8)	45 (36.0)	1.19 (0.75–1.89)	123 (20.3)	68 (55.3)	1.00 (0.64–1.54)
Education	Lower	24 (4.00)	7 (29.2)	1	22 (3.6)	14 (63.6)	1
	Medium	308 (51.2)	96 (31.2)	1.04 (0.41–2.65)	279 (46.0)	154 (55.2)	0.54 (0.21–1.39)
	Higher	270 (44.6)	98 (36.3)	1.22 (0.47–3.14)	305 (50.3)	169 (55.4)	0.55 (0.21–1.43)
Financial status	Below average	137 (22.8)	34 (24.8)	1 ^a	147 (24.3)	77 (52.4)	1
	Average	363 (60.3)	129 (35.5)	2.00 (1.24–3.22) ^b	361 (59.6)	201 (55.7)	1.47 (0.96–2.24)
	Above average	102 (16.9)	38 (37.3)	2.20 (1.18–4.09) ^b	98 (16.2)	59 (60.2)	1.91 (1.08–3.41)
Health status	High	458 (76.1)	146 (31.9)	1 ^a	457 (75.4)	241 (52.7)	1
	Average	121 (20.1)	43 (35.5)	1.35 (0.86–2.13) ^{ab}	126 (20.8)	80 (63.5)	1.42 (0.91–2.21)
	Low	23 (3.8)	12 (52.2)	3.05 (1.26–7.40) ^b	23 (3.8)	16 (69.6)	2.16 (0.84–5.53)

436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444

Note: Surveying was done during the first (April 2020) and second (December 2020) COVID-19 lockdown period. Vitamin D-related educational intervention was done between both measurements in November 2020. We identified predictors based on the contrast in marginal linear predictions accounting for vitamin D supplementation: $p = 0.01$ (financial status), $p = 0.03$ (health status) for pre-intervention sample; $p < 0.01$ (age), $p = 0.07$ (financial status) for post-intervention sample. Predictor levels not sharing the same subscript are significantly different using pairwise comparisons of predictive margins with Sidak’s adjustment method.

445 **Figure 3.** Logistic regression analysis for distinct dimensions of vitamin D-related knowledge in pre-
 446 intervention (Model 1: April 2020) and post-intervention (Model 2: December 2020) prevalence of
 447 vitamin D supplementation
 448



449

450 4. Discussion

451 Due to previously established high prevalence of wintertime vitamin D deficiency in populations not
 452 taking vitamin D supplements (Calvo et al., 2005; Hribar et al., 2020; Pilz et al., 2018; Spiro & Buttriss,
 453 2014), an educational intervention was conducted in Slovenia in November 2020, during COVID-19
 454 pandemic. Objectives of this study were to investigate the voluntarily vitamin D supplementation
 455 practices, factors, that are affecting these practices, and to evaluate the effects of the educational
 456 intervention on vitamin D supplementation practices during the COVID-19 pandemic.

457 Interestingly, despite the very high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in many countries, very few
 458 studies investigated the penetration of supplementation practices. While some countries introduced
 459 policies to implement vitamin D supplementation in specific and more at-risk groups (i.e., children up
 460 to 12 months of age in Slovenia), supplementation is typically voluntary in the general population.
 461 Spiro et al. (2014) highlighted major differences in the use of food supplements across Europe, with a
 462 clear north–south gradient. Typically, intake of food supplements is higher in northern countries.
 463 Greater use of food supplements is also commonly reported in women in comparison with men (Skeie
 464 et al., 2009). It has been established that, globally, dietary supplementation contributes 6–47% of the
 465 mean intake of vitamin D (Calvo et al., 2005). In a recent UK study, 43% of participants (adults) used
 466 vitamin D supplements (O'Connor et al., 2018); however, the study sample mostly included females
 467 and was not representative. Nevertheless, similar penetration of vitamin D supplementation was
 468 reported in Pakistani students (Tariq et al., 2020). On the other hand, a nationally representative French
 469 study reported the use of vitamin D supplements at a much lower level of 11% (Deschasaux et al.,
 470 2016). Similarly, only about 9% of adults reported year-round vitamin D supplementation in a
 471 Slovenian nationally representative dietary Si.Menu/Nutrihealth survey, conducted in 2017/2018
 472 (Hribar et al., 2020). The same study also identified an alarmingly high prevalence of vitamin D

473 deficiency (about 80%) in adults between the beginning of October and the end of April (extended
474 wintertime), but the study design did not allow insights into the seasonal use of food supplements to
475 be captured.

476 In April 2020, about one-third of our study sample reported extended wintertime vitamin D
477 supplementation, and we did not observe considerable differences before and during the COVID-19
478 pandemic (33.7% vs. 33.2%, respectively). The observed greater penetration of vitamin D
479 supplementation, in comparison with Si.Menu/Nutrihealth 2017/2018 data, can be partially explained
480 by the fact that our measurements were done during the extended winter period when vitamin D
481 supplementation is usually advised. Although at that time there were no official policy
482 recommendations for vitamin D supplementation in the general population in Slovenia, this topic was
483 addressed by the mass media in March 2020 (Figure 1), and greater penetration of the supplementation
484 was expected during COVID-19 lockdown in April 2020. At that time some mass media reports were
485 published (Siuka, 2020) about the importance of this vitamin for the functioning of the immune system,
486 and about the possible beneficial role of vitamin D during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, there
487 were no notable changes in the prevalence of vitamin D supplementation, or the daily dosages of
488 vitamin D.

489 A very different situation was observed during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, which
490 affected Slovenia much harder. It should be noted that at the launch of the April 2020 survey, there
491 were cumulatively 1,366 COVID-19 cases and 79 deaths reported in Slovenia, while in December there
492 were already had 95,479 COVID-19 cases and 2,041 deaths (SIGOV, 2021). This also affected our
493 study. In April 2020 survey, about 9% of participants reported that their household was somehow
494 affected by COVID-19 (i.e. due to illness or quarantine of household member), while in December
495 2020 this was the case in 25% of subjects (Table 1). Furthermore, April 2020 mean score for the
496 reported likelihood of a household member becoming infected with the virus was notably lower (score
497 2.2/5) in comparison with December 2020 measurement (score 2.7/5). Also, the December 2020 survey
498 was conducted after the educational intervention. A press release (NUTRIS, 2020) about the wide
499 prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the Slovenian population (Hribar et al., 2020) was sent to all
500 major mass media at the beginning of November 2020, which received a lot of media attention (Figure
501 1).

502 Analyses of the December 2020 dataset showed that penetration of dietary supplementation with
503 vitamin D increased to 55.6% (from 33.7% in April), with the majority of supplement users taking a
504 daily dosage of at least 25 µg vitamin D. The proportion of subjects with very high vitamin D intakes
505 (above UL level of 100 µg/day (EFSA, 2012) increased during the pandemic, however about 95% of
506 those supplementing vitamin D were still within safe intake levels (<100 µg/day). Nevertheless, the
507 observation that, in some subjects, vitamin D intakes increased drastically during the pandemic
508 highlights the need for very careful communication of vitamin D supplementation practices in relation
509 to specific health-related events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

510 Vitamin D supplementation in the general population is likely to stay voluntarily in most countries. To
511 use dietary supplementation as a strategy for lowering the risk of vitamin deficiency in such
512 circumstances, very efficient public awareness programs would need to be implemented. In this study,
513 we therefore focused on the identification of predictors of vitamin D supplementation practices. In
514 April 2020 the most important predictors of vitamin D supplementation were the financial and health
515 status of the participants, and specific dimensions of individual vitamin D-related knowledge.
516 Multivariable logistic regression analysis highlighted the highest odd ratios for vitamin D
517 supplementation in participants with a lower health status and in those with a higher financial status.

518 In April 2020, only 33% of subjects used vitamin D supplements, while in the low health status group
519 this was the case in 52%, and in the below-average financial status group in 25%. This indicates that
520 the lowest supplementation rates were observed in those, who would probably need the
521 supplementation the most. These observations are in line with our expectations that wealthier persons
522 can more easily afford to purchase food supplements and that those with a lower self-reported health
523 status more commonly used supplements. Interestingly, we did not observe significant differences
524 between different sexes and age groups, although we would expect a higher penetration of
525 supplementation in older adults (where vitamin D deficiency is commonly more pronounced (Spiro &
526 Buttriss, 2014)), and in women, who are typically more frequent users of food supplements (Tariq et
527 al., 2020). But the situation changed after the educational intervention; in December 2020 dataset age
528 became the only strongly significant ($P=0.01$) parameter, with the highest supplementation rates in
529 elderly subjects (72%). It should be also noted, that 52% of participants in the lower financial status
530 group reported vitamin D supplementation. Study results indicate that we managed to considerably
531 increase vitamin D supplementation across different population groups, including in the most
532 vulnerable groups, such as the elderly population.

533 Similar to the observations of O'Connor et al. (2018) in the UK and of Boland et al. (2015) in Canada,
534 subjects with better vitamin D-related knowledge are more likely users of vitamin D food supplements.
535 Looking into different dimensions of vitamin D-related knowledge, logistic regression analysis
536 highlighted three dimensions as independent predictors of vitamin D supplementation.

- 537 - (Q1) Dietary vitamin D sources: only a few foods are natural sources of vitamin D, and
538 therefore dietary intake of vitamin D is typically very low (Lanham-New & Wilson, 2016). It
539 seems that those who know that their diet is typically very poor in vitamin D are more likely to
540 use vitamin D supplements.
- 541 - (Q2) Vitamin D health impact: vitamin D is a pro-hormone and is essential for musculo-skeletal
542 health, normal immune system, and numerous other body functions (Autier et al., 2014;
543 Zittermann, 2003; Zittermann et al., 2016). People that are more aware of these health-related
544 functions are more likely to supplement their diet with vitamin D.
- 545 - (Q6) Prevalence of vitamin D deficiency: there is a very high prevalence of vitamin D
546 deficiency in the population, particularly during the winter season (Hribar et al., 2020). Those
547 that were aware of this fact can more easily consider themselves as at risk for vitamin D
548 deficiency and are more likely to use vitamin D supplements. We should also note the
549 previously reported strong inconsistency between personal opinions about Vitamin D status
550 and actual vitamin D status (Deschasaux et al. 2016).

551 Interestingly, some vitamin D knowledge dimensions were not significantly connected to
552 supplementation practices. For instance, knowledge about the (Q3) recommended daily amount of
553 vitamin D, about the (Q4) time needed in the sun to get enough vitamin D, and about (Q5) factors that
554 affect the skin's biosynthesis of vitamin D were not independent predictors of vitamin D
555 supplementation. This was noted both in pre- and post-intervention surveys. The above-mentioned
556 observations are very important for the preparation of key messages that need to be well communicated
557 if we want to increase vitamin D supplementation in the general population.

558 Our study also provides interesting insights into the overall knowledge about vitamin D in the
559 Slovenian population. Knowledge was scored using a tool developed by Boland et al. (Boland et al.,
560 2015). The original questionnaire was tested on Canadian students; the results showed poor knowledge
561 and highlighted the need for more efficient health promotion programs. The reported mean total score
562 in the Canadian study was 29%, while in our case it was 27% (1.60/6) before the intervention, and 37%

563 (2.21/6) after the educational intervention. Knowledge about factors affecting vitamin D levels were
564 also comparably low both in the Canadian study and in our pre-intervention April 2020 study (23%),
565 but in our case this score increased to 45% after the educational intervention. On the other hand, in
566 April 2020 we observed notably lower scores for vitamin D health impact than in the Canadian study
567 (26% vs 37%, respectively), but this factor also notably improved after the intervention (40%).
568 Contrary, about a quarter of our participants (both in pre- and post-intervention survey) correctly
569 identified the amount of time in the sun required to produce adequate vitamin D (only 14% in the
570 Canadian study), while, in both studies, less than 10% identified the correct recommended vitamin D
571 intakes. It should be noted that other studies also identified serious vitamin D-related knowledge gaps
572 in various other populations. Deschasaux et al. (2016) investigated vitamin D-related knowledge in a
573 very large study in France, highlighting several knowledge gaps related to vitamin D sources and (non-
574 skeletal) health effects. Tariq et al. recently investigated the vitamin D knowledge in Pakistani students
575 (2020). Only 9% of study subjects correctly identified dietary sources of vitamin D, while one third
576 were aware of the bone health-related effects of vitamin D, and only 36% identified sunlight exposure
577 as a factor influencing vitamin D production. Interestingly, they also observed that those with more
578 knowledge about the health functions of vitamin D were more likely to use vitamin D supplements.
579 We should note, however, that there were considerable differences in the tools used for measuring
580 vitamin D-related knowledge in these studies.

581 The strength of this study is in the controlled sampling conducted in two short duration periods during
582 very early (April 2020) and late stage (December 2020) of the COVID-19 pandemic. While the use of
583 an online panel could be considered as a study limitation, we should mention that considering
584 pandemic-related restrictions, the use of an online study was the only option in practice. Both data
585 collections were done during national lockdowns when all schools and universities were closed, non-
586 essential workplaces in the public sector were closed and the private sector was recommended to close
587 or restrict the number of people working; personal movement was restricted to within one's
588 municipality and operation of the public transport was limited. While food stores were open, non-
589 essential stores were mostly closed. There was governmental advice in place to stay at home and to
590 limit contact with others, while gatherings in public places were limited. We should note that, for some
591 people, these circumstances might have limited the access of participants to vitamin D supplements
592 during the COVID-19 pandemic. The quota sampling approach enabled a fair balance between the
593 genders, age groups, and urban and rural areas. However, the approach used is also subject to
594 limitations. The requirements for computer/smartphone use and internet access denied the inclusion of
595 participants of the lowest socio-economic status. On the other hand, Slovenia has a very good internet
596 infrastructure, and most households use computers. According to data from the Slovenian Statistical
597 Office, more than 80% of the Slovenian population (16-74 years) is using internet (STAT, 2019). Also,
598 home-schooling was in place in Slovenia during COVID-19 lockdowns for all elementary/secondary
599 schools and universities, with online lectures. Nevertheless, the sampling approach may partially
600 explain the difficulties in achieving representativeness in the study samples in the terms of educational
601 level.

602 Another limitation is related to the vitamin D-related knowledge survey used. To provide some
603 international comparability, we used a tool that was previously tested on Canadian students (Boland et
604 al., 2015), but has not been validated or used in other subject groups. Despite the above-mentioned
605 limitations, the authors believe that the tool used provided reliable predictors of vitamin D
606 supplementation practices. We should also note that some of the study subjects participated both in
607 April and December 2020 data collections. While this strengthens our study, because enabled us to
608 investigate changes in the same subjects, such sampling could also present a limitation. Although study

609 surveys were not conducted in a way to increase vitamin-D related knowledge or to affect vitamin D
610 supplementation practices in study participants, survey questions brought vitamin D topic under
611 attention. A series of control checks were therefore performed to verify, if this had any meaningful
612 effect on the reported study results. For example, we have compared mean vitamin-D knowledge scores
613 in the second survey (December 2020) between new subjects (N=233), and those that already
614 participated in April 2020 survey (N=373), but no significant differences were observed. Furthermore,
615 we compared December 2020 vitamin D supplementation prevalence in both these two groups. No
616 meaningful differences were observed; in both groups vitamin D supplementation rates were above
617 50%, and median daily vitamin D intake was 25 μ . Therefore, we believe that the reported results were
618 not majorly affected by exposing subjects to vitamin D topics.

619 **5. Conclusions, policy, and research recommendations**

620 While most foods are generally quite poor in vitamin D, they can assure adequate intake of this vitamin,
621 particularly in regions with efficient food fortification policies (Calvo et al., 2005). However, in regions
622 without such policies, a considerable proportion of the population is at risk for insufficient vitamin D
623 status, which could be managed with supplementation. Findings of our study suggest that at beginning
624 of 2020 most of the Slovenian population did not supplement their diet with vitamin D, despite the fact
625 that previous studies indicated alarmingly high vitamin D deficiency prevalence between October and
626 April. While we did not observe notable changes in vitamin D supplementation practices early in the
627 COVID-19 pandemic (April 2020), in comparison to pre-COVID-19 observations, a very successful
628 educational campaign using mass media resulted in a major increase in frequency of winter-time
629 vitamin D supplementation. Pre-intervention study highlighted financial status as an independent
630 predictor of vitamin D supplementation, with those with a below average financial status having the
631 lowest proportion of vitamin D supplementation. This indicates that the financial dimensions of vitamin
632 D supplementation also need to be considered by policy makers to ensure the protection of vulnerable
633 groups.

634 Vitamin D-related knowledge was also found to be a key predictor of dietary supplementation, with
635 some knowledge dimensions being more important than others. The three key dimensions identified as
636 predictors of more likely vitamin D supplementation are knowledge about dietary sources of vitamin
637 D, the health-related impact of vitamin D, and the prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the population.
638 Considering the study findings, the following key messages would need to be embedded into awareness
639 campaigns in order to increase supplementation with vitamin D:

- 640 (a) Vitamin D can be biosynthesized by human skin when we are sufficiently exposed to sunlight,
641 but such biosynthesis is efficient only between May and September. (Note: this is geolocation-
642 related information reflecting the situation in Slovenia).
- 643 (b) In the absence of efficient biosynthesis, enough vitamin D needs to be provided by the diet.
644 However, only oily fish and a few other foods are notable natural dietary sources of vitamin D.
645 Therefore, the typical dietary intake of vitamin D with natural foods is much lower than
646 recommended intake for the normal functioning of the human body.
- 647 (c) Vitamin D has numerous health functions. It also contributes to the maintenance of normal
648 bones, muscle function, and the function of the immune system.
- 649 (d) In particular, between October and April, there is a very high prevalence of vitamin D
650 deficiency in the population. (Note: this is nationally specific information reflecting the
651 situation in Slovenia).

652 These key messages were constructed based on our preliminary results, using April 2020 sampling,
653 and used in the populational educational intervention in November 2020. Herein reported study results
654 showed that the intervention was very efficient, however long-term effects are yet to be determined in
655 future seasons. Additional studies are therefore needed in the future, preferably in a similar calendar
656 season – during the winter. If vitamin D supplementation practices will change in long term,
657 epidemiological data on vitamin D status in key population groups should be also revisited. It should
658 be noted that the above provided communication messages result from data collected in the Slovenian
659 population. While very similar messages might also be applicable in other regions, they should be
660 adapted to address regional and population differences. The efficiency of awareness campaigns should
661 be always carefully evaluated.

662 **Data Availability Statement**

663 The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without
664 undue reservation.

665 **Ethics Statement**

666 Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Bioethical Committee of the Higher School of
667 Applied Sciences in Ljubljana, Slovenia (VIST ET-6/2020). The survey was conducted in the
668 Slovenian language as an amendment of the international survey Food-COVID-19: Lifestyle and
669 dietary patterns, and nutrition knowledge. The participants provided their informed consent to
670 participate in this study via an online form.

671 **Author Contributions**

672 I.P. and K.Z. conceived the study. I.P., K.Z., M.H. and A.K. designed the study questionnaire. K.Z.,
673 H.H., and I.P. analyzed and interpreted the data. M.H. and Z.L. supported with the data analyses, and
674 H.H. conducted the statistical analyses. K.Z. wrote the first manuscript draft and all authors then made
675 revisions. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

676 **Funding**

677 This study was conducted within the national research program “Nutrition and Public Health” (P3-
678 0395) and the research project “Challenges in achieving adequate vitamin D status in the adult
679 population” (L7-1849), funded by the Slovenian Research Agency and the Ministry of Health of the
680 Republic of Slovenia.

681 **Conflict of Interest**

682 The authors declare that this research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
683 relationships that could be construed as potential conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the
684 design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the
685 manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results. We acknowledge that I.P. has led and participated
686 in various other research projects in the areas of nutrition, public health, and food technology, which
687 were (co)funded by the Slovenian Research Agency, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Slovenia,
688 the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food of the Republic of Slovenia and, in cases of specific
689 applied research projects, also by food businesses. I.P. and K.Z. are members of a national workgroup

690 responsible for the development of recommendations for assuring adequate vitamin D status among
691 the Slovenian population.

692 **Acknowledgments**

693 We acknowledge the support of Nina Zupanič and Sanja Krušič (Nutrition Institute, Ljubljana,
694 Slovenia) in the testing of the survey tool, and the support of Mr. Primož Logar and the team at
695 Marketagent reSEARCH GmbH (Baden, Austria) for the programming of the survey tool and the use
696 of their consumer panel in Slovenia. We also acknowledge the support of physicians in
697 communications with media and practitioners, particularly Marija Pfeifer, Darko Siuka, Barbara
698 Hrovatin, Bojana Pinter, Zvonka Slavec and Alojz Ihan.

699 **6. References**

700 Anderson, L. (2020). Providing nutritional support for the patient with COVID-19. *Br J Nurs*, 29(8),
701 458-459. doi:10.12968/bjon.2020.29.8.458

702 Annweiler, C., Hanotte, B., Grandin de l'Eprevier, C., Sabatier, J.-M., Lafaie, L., & Célarier, T. (2020).
703 Vitamin D and survival in COVID-19 patients: A quasi-experimental study. *The Journal of*
704 *Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 204, 105771.
705 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsbmb.2020.105771>

706 Annweiler, G., Corvaisier, M., Gautier, J., Dubée, V., Legrand, E., Sacco, G., & Annweiler, C. (2020).
707 Vitamin D Supplementation Associated to Better Survival in Hospitalized Frail Elderly
708 COVID-19 Patients: The GERIA-COVID Quasi-Experimental Study. *Nutrients*, 12(11).
709 doi:10.3390/nu12113377

710 Autier, P., Boniol, M., Pizot, C., & Mullie, P. (2014). Vitamin D status and ill health: a systematic
711 review. *Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 2(1), 76-89. doi:10.1016/s2213-8587(13)70165-7

712 Barazzoni, R., Bischoff, S. C., Breda, J., Wickramasinghe, K., Krznaric, Z., Nitzan, D., . . . Singer, P.
713 (2020). ESPEN expert statements and practical guidance for nutritional management of
714 individuals with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clinical Nutrition*, 39(6), 1631-1638.
715 doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2020.03.022

716 Benskin, L. L. (2020). A Basic Review of the Preliminary Evidence That COVID-19 Risk and Severity
717 Is Increased in Vitamin D Deficiency. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8.
718 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00513

719 Boland, S., Irwin, J. D., & Johnson, A. M. (2015). A survey of university students' vitamin D-related
720 knowledge. *J Nutr Educ Behav*, 47(1), 99-103. doi:10.1016/j.jneb.2014.08.013

721 Caccialanza, R., Laviano, A., Lobascio, F., Montagna, E., Bruno, R., Ludovisi, S., . . . Cereda, E.
722 (2020). Early nutritional supplementation in non-critically ill patients hospitalized for the 2019
723 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Rationale and feasibility of a shared pragmatic
724 protocol. *Nutrition*, 74. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2020.110835

725 Calvo, M. S., Whiting, S. J., & Barton, C. N. (2005). Vitamin D intake: A global perspective of current
726 status. *Journal of Nutrition*, 135(2), 310-316.

727 Cashman, K. D., Dowling, K. G., Skrabakova, Z., Gonzalez-Gross, M., Valtuena, J., De Henauw, S., .
728 . . . Kiely, M. (2016). Vitamin D deficiency in Europe: pandemic? *American Journal of Clinical*
729 *Nutrition*, 103(4), 1033-1044. doi:10.3945/ajcn.115.120873

- 730 Deschasaux, M., Souberbielle, J. C., Partula, V., Lécuyer, L., Gonzalez, R., Srouf, B., . . . Touvier, M.
731 (2016). What Do People Know and Believe about Vitamin D? *Nutrients*, 8(11).
732 doi:10.3390/nu8110718
- 733 EFSA. (2012). Scientific Opinion on the Tolerable Upper Intake Level of vitamin D. *EFSA Journal*,
734 10(7), 2813. doi:doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2813
- 735 EFSA. (2016). Dietary reference values for vitamin D. *EFSA Journal*, 14(10), e04547.
736 doi:doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4547
- 737 Entrenas Castillo, M., Entrenas Costa, L. M., Vaquero Barrios, J. M., Alcalá Díaz, J. F., López
738 Miranda, J., Bouillon, R., & Quesada Gomez, J. M. (2020). Effect of calcifediol treatment and
739 best available therapy versus best available therapy on intensive care unit admission and
740 mortality among patients hospitalized for COVID-19: A pilot randomized clinical study. *The*
741 *Journal of Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 203, 105751.
742 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsbmb.2020.105751>
- 743 EUROSTAT. (2020). Correspondence table for Local Administrative Units (LAU) - NUTS 2016/2021,
744 EU-27, UK and EFTA. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/local-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/local-administrative-units)
745 [administrative-units](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/local-administrative-units)
- 746 Freisling, H., Fahey, M. T., Moskal, A., Ocke, M. C., Ferrari, P., Jenab, M., . . . Slimani, N. (2010).
747 Region-specific nutrient intake patterns exhibit a geographical gradient within and between
748 European countries. *Journal of Nutrition*, 140(7), 1280-1286. doi:10.3945/jn.110.121152
- 749 GNS. (2012). German Nutrition Society: New reference values for vitamin D. *Ann Nutr Metab*, 60(4),
750 241-246. doi:10.1159/000337547
- 751 Grant, W. B., Lahore, H., McDonnell, S. L., Baggerly, C. A., French, C. B., Aliano, J. L., & Bhattoa,
752 H. P. (2020). Evidence that Vitamin D Supplementation Could Reduce Risk of Influenza and
753 COVID-19 Infections and Deaths. *Nutrients*, 12(4), 19. doi:10.3390/nu12040988
- 754 Hilger, J., Friedel, A., Herr, R., Rausch, T., Roos, F., Wahl, D. A., . . . Hoffmann, K. (2014). A
755 systematic review of vitamin D status in populations worldwide. *Br J Nutr*, 111(1), 23-45.
756 doi:10.1017/s0007114513001840
- 757 Holick, M. F., Binkley, N. C., Bischoff-Ferrari, H. A., Gordon, C. M., Hanley, D. A., Heaney, R. P., .
758 . . Weaver, C. M. (2011). Evaluation, treatment, and prevention of vitamin D deficiency: an
759 Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and*
760 *Metabolism*, 96(7), 1911-1930. doi:10.1210/jc.2011-0385
- 761 Hribar, M., Hristov, H., Gregorič, M., Blaznik, U., Zaletel, K., Oblak, A., . . . Pravst, I. (2020).
762 Nutrihealth Study: Seasonal Variation in Vitamin D Status Among the Slovenian Adult and
763 Elderly Population. *Nutrients*, 12(6). doi:10.3390/nu12061838
- 764 IOM. (2011). *Institute of Medicine: Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D*.
765 Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- 766 Janssen, M., Chang, B., Hristov, H., Pravst, I., Profeta, A., & Millard, J. (2021). Changes in food
767 consumption during the COVID-19 pandemic: analysis of consumer survey data from the first
768 lockdown period in Denmark, Germany and Slovenia. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *In press* (doi:
769 10.3389/fnut.2021.635859). .

- 770 Kaufman, H. W., Niles, J. K., Kroll, M. H., Bi, C., & Holick, M. F. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 positivity
771 rates associated with circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels. *PloS One*, *15*(9), e0239252.
772 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0239252
- 773 Koch, M. (2021). Vitamin D and COVID-19: why the controversy? *The Lancet Diabetes &*
774 *Endocrinology*, *9*(2), 53. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00003-6
- 775 Lanham-New, S. A., & Wilson, L. R. (2016). Vitamin D - has the new dawn for dietary
776 recommendations arrived? *J Hum Nutr Diet*, *29*(1), 3-6. doi:10.1111/jhn.12360
- 777 Laviano, A., Koverech, A., & Zanetti, M. (2020). Nutrition support in the time of SARS-CoV-2
778 (COVID-19). *Nutrition*, *74*. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2020.110834
- 779 Li, L., Li, R. R., Wu, Z. X., Yang, X. H., Zhao, M. Y., Liu, J., & Chen, D. C. (2020). Therapeutic
780 strategies for critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Annals of Intensive Care*, *10*(1).
781 doi:10.1186/s13613-020-00661-z
- 782 Liu, G. L., Zhang, S. W., Mao, Z. F., Wang, W. X., & Hu, H. F. (2020). Clinical significance of
783 nutritional risk screening for older adult patients with COVID-19. *European Journal of Clinical*
784 *Nutrition*, *74*(6), 876-883. doi:10.1038/s41430-020-0659-7
- 785 Martineau, A. R., Jolliffe, D. A., Greenberg, L., Aloia, J. F., Bergman, P., Dubnov-Raz, G., . . . Goodall,
786 E. C. (2019). Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory infections: individual
787 participant data meta-analysis. *Health Technology Assessment*, *23*(2), 1-44.
788 doi:10.3310/hta23020
- 789 Martineau, A. R., Jolliffe, D. A., Hooper, R. L., Greenberg, L., Aloia, J. F., & Bergman, P. (2017).
790 Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory tract infections: systematic review and
791 meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, *356*, i6583.
792 doi:10.1136/bmj.i6583
- 793 McDonnell, S. L., Baggerly, C. A., French, C. B., Baggerly, L. L., Garland, C. F., Gorham, E. D., . . .
794 Lappe, J. M. (2018). Breast cancer risk markedly lower with serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D
795 concentrations ≥ 60 vs < 20 ng/ml (150 vs 50 nmol/L): Pooled analysis of two randomized trials
796 and a prospective cohort. *PloS One*, *13*(6), e0199265. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0199265
- 797 Meltzer, D. O., Best, T. J., Zhang, H., Vokes, T., Arora, V., & Solway, J. (2020). Association of
798 Vitamin D Status and Other Clinical Characteristics With COVID-19 Test Results. *JAMA*
799 *Network Open*, *3*(9), e2019722-e2019722. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19722
- 800 Merzon, E., Tworowski, D., Gorohovski, A., Vinker, S., Golan Cohen, A., Green, I., & Frenkel-
801 Morgenstern, M. (2020). Low plasma 25(OH) vitamin D level is associated with increased risk
802 of COVID-19 infection: an Israeli population-based study. *The FEBS Journal*, *287*(17), 3693-
803 3702. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15495>
- 804 NUTRIS. (2020). Jeseni in pozimi vitamina D primanjkuje kar 80% prebivalcem Slovenije (Engl.
805 translation: During autumn and winter 80% of the Slovenian population has not enough vitamin
806 D). Retrieved from <https://www.nutris.org/sporocila-za-medijske/jesen-in-pozimi-vitamina-d-primanjkuje-kar-80-prebivalcem-slovenije>
- 808 O'Connor, C., Glatt, D., White, L., & Revuelta Iniesta, R. (2018). Knowledge, Attitudes and
809 Perceptions towards Vitamin D in a UK Adult Population: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Int J*
810 *Environ Res Public Health*, *15*(11). doi:10.3390/ijerph15112387
- 811 O'Neill, C. M., Kazantzidis, A., Ryan, M. J., Barber, N., Sempos, C. T., Durazo-Arvizu, R. A., . . .
812 Cashman, K. D. (2016). Seasonal Changes in Vitamin D-Effective UVB Availability in Europe

- 813 and Associations with Population Serum 25-Hydroxyvitamin D. *Nutrients*, 8(9), 15.
814 doi:10.3390/nu8090533
- 815 Özel, E., Cantarero-Arevalo, L., & Jacobsen, R. (2020). Vitamin D Knowledge, Attitudes, and
816 Behaviors in Young Danish Women with a Non-Western Ethnic Minority Background-A
817 Questionnaire Survey. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 17(21). doi:10.3390/ijerph17218053
- 818 Pfeifer, M., Siuka, D., Pravst, I., & Ihan, A. (2020). Priporočila za nadomeščanje vitamina D3 (Engl.
819 translation: Recommendations for supplementation with vitamin D). Retrieved from
820 <https://endodiab.si/2020/11/02/priporocila-za-nadomescanje-vitamina-d3/>
- 821 Pilz, S., Marz, W., Cashman, K. D., Kiely, M. E., Whiting, S. J., Holick, M. F., . . . Zittermann, A.
822 (2018). Rationale and Plan for Vitamin D Food Fortification: A Review and Guidance Paper.
823 *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 9, 16. doi:10.3389/fendo.2018.00373
- 824 Rastogi, A., Bhansali, A., Khare, N., Suri, V., Yaddanapudi, N., Sachdeva, N., . . . Malhotra, P. (2020).
825 Short term, high-dose vitamin D supplementation for COVID-19 disease: a randomised,
826 placebo-controlled, study (SHADE study). *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, postgradmedj-
827 2020-139065. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2020-139065
- 828 SIGOV. (2021). Coronavirus disease COVID-19 in Slovenia. Retrieved from
829 <https://www.gov.si/en/topics/coronavirus-disease-covid-19/>
- 830 Siuka, D. (2020). Zdravnik svetuje: 10 korakov v boju proti koronavirusu (Engl. transl: Doctor advises:
831 10 steps in the fight against coronavirus). Retrieved from
832 [https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/zdravnik-opozarja-ko-bo-umrlo-med-20-in-40-ljudi-](https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/zdravnik-opozarja-ko-bo-umrlo-med-20-in-40-ljudi-dnevno-bo-prepozno.html)
833 [dnevno-bo-prepozno.html](https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/zdravnik-opozarja-ko-bo-umrlo-med-20-in-40-ljudi-dnevno-bo-prepozno.html)
- 834 Siuka, D., Pfeifer, M., & Pinter, B. (2020). Vitamin D Supplementation During the COVID-19
835 Pandemic. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 95(8), 1804-1805. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2020.05.036
- 836 Skeie, G., Braaten, T., Hjartåker, A., Lentjes, M., Amiano, P., Jakszyn, P., . . . Slimani, N. (2009). Use
837 of dietary supplements in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition
838 calibration study. *Eur J Clin Nutr*, 63 Suppl 4, S226-238. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2009.83
- 839 Spiro, A., & Buttriss, J. L. (2014). Vitamin D: An overview of vitamin D status and intake in Europe.
840 *Nutr Bull*, 39(4), 322-350. doi:10.1111/nbu.12108
- 841 STAT. (2019). Usage of internet in households and by individuals, Slovenia, 2019. Retrieved from
842 <https://www.stat.si/StatWeb/en/news/Index/8423>
- 843 Tariq, A., Khan, S. R., & Basharat, A. (2020). Assessment of knowledge, attitudes and practice towards
844 Vitamin D among university students in Pakistan. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 355.
845 doi:10.1186/s12889-020-8453-y
- 846 UK. (2020). Vitamin D and clinically extremely vulnerable (CEV) guidance. Retrieved from
847 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vitamin-d-for-vulnerable-groups/vitamin-d-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vitamin-d-for-vulnerable-groups/vitamin-d-and-clinically-extremely-vulnerable-cev-guidance)
848 [clinically-extremely-vulnerable-cev-guidance](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vitamin-d-for-vulnerable-groups/vitamin-d-and-clinically-extremely-vulnerable-cev-guidance)
- 849 Wahl, D. A., Cooper, C., Ebeling, P. R., Eggersdorfer, M., Hilger, J., Hoffmann, K., . . . Dawson-
850 Hughes, B. (2012). A global representation of vitamin D status in healthy populations. *Arch*
851 *Osteoporos*, 7, 155-172. doi:10.1007/s11657-012-0093-0
- 852 Zittermann, A. (2003). Vitamin D in preventive medicine: are we ignoring the evidence? *British*
853 *Journal of Nutrition*, 89(5), 552-572. doi:10.1079/bjn2003837

854 Zittermann, A., Pilz, S., Hoffmann, H., & Marz, W. (2016). Vitamin D and airway infections: a
855 European perspective. *European Journal of Medical Research*, 21, 10. doi:10.1186/s40001-
856 016-0208-y

857