

1 **Vitamin D deficiency as risk factor for severe COVID-19: a convergence of two pandemics**

2

3

4 De Smet D. (MD)¹, De Smet K. (MD)², Herroelen P. (MSc.)¹, Gryspeerdt S. (MD)² and Martens G.A.
5 (MD, PhD)^{1,3}

6 ¹ AZ Delta Medical Laboratories and ² Department of Radiology, AZ Delta General Hospital, Roeselare,
7 Belgium ³ VUB Metabolomics Platform, Brussels Free University

8

9 Corresponding author: Geert A. Martens, AZ Delta Medical Laboratories, AZ Delta General Hospital,

10 Deltalaan 1, 8800 Roeselare. ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1208-6289> Tel:+32 51 23 71 96

11 Email: geert.martens@azdelta.be

12

13

14

15

16 Word count body: 2365

17 Word count abstract: 249

18

19

20

21 medRxiv doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.20079376>

22 **Revised version 2, May 15, 2020**

23

24

25 **Trial registration:** Clinical Trial Number IRB B1172020000009

26

28 **SUMMARY BOX**

29 **What is already known on this topic**

30 Vitamin D deficiency increases the incidence and severity of respiratory viral infections by
31 exacerbation of pro-inflammatory immune responses. Lung damage in COVID-19 involves excessive
32 inflammation and cytokine release. With more than 1 billion people worldwide affected by vitamin D
33 deficiency the world might now face a convergence of two pandemics. Data are emerging that
34 variations in vitamin D deficiency rates across ethnic and demographic subgroups are correlated to
35 severity of SARS-CoV-2 infections.

36

37 **What this study adds**

38 Our data reveal that more than 40% of the adult population in a wealthy European country is vitamin
39 D deficient. We show that vitamin D deficiency is correlated with the risk for hospitalization for
40 COVID-19 pneumonia and predisposes to more advanced radiological disease stages. Specifically,
41 men were at risk. This correlation was not confounded by vitamin D-impacted morbidities such as
42 coronary artery disease, diabetes and chronic lung disease. Our findings support a causal relation
43 between vitamin D deficiency and severe COVID-19 and call for vitamin D supplementation as safe,
44 widely available and inexpensive mitigation strategy.

45

46

47

48 **Structured abstract**

49 **Context.** Through its immunological functions, vitamin D attenuates inflammatory responses to
50 respiratory viruses. Vitamin D deficiency might be a highly prevalent risk factor for severe SARS-CoV-
51 2 infections.

52 **Objective.** To investigate the level of vitamin D deficiency in West Flanders, Belgium and its
53 correlation to severity of COVID-19 as staged by CT

54 **Design.** Retrospective observational study

55 **Setting.** Central network hospital

56 **Participants.** 186 SARS-CoV-2-infected patients hospitalized from March 1, 2020 to April 7, 2020

57 **Main outcome measure.** Analysis of 25(OH)D in COVID-19 patients versus season/age/sex-matched
58 diseased controls

59 **Results.** The rate of vitamin D deficiency (25(OH)D<20 ng/mL) in West Flanders varies with age, sex
60 and season but is overall very high (39.9%) based on analysis of 16274 control samples. We
61 measured 25(OH)D levels in 186 COVID-19 patients (109 males (median age 68 years, IQR 53-79) and
62 77 females (median age 71 years, IQR 65-74)) and 2717 age/season-matched controls (999 males
63 (median age 69 years, IQR 53-81) and 1718 females (median age 68 years, IQR 43-83)). COVID-19
64 patients showed lower median 25(OH)D (18.6 ng/mL, IQR 12.6-25.3, versus 21.5 ng/mL, IQR 13.9-
65 30.8; P=0.0016) and higher vitamin D deficiency rates (58.6% versus 45.2%, P=0.0005). Surprisingly,
66 this difference was restricted to male COVID-19 patients who had markedly higher deficiency rates
67 than male controls (67.0% versus 49.2%, P=0.0006) that increased with advancing radiological stage
68 and were not confounded vitamin D-impacted comorbidities.

69 **Conclusions:** vitamin D deficiency is a prevalent risk factor for severe COVID-19. Vitamin D
70 supplementation might be an inexpensive and safe mitigation for the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

71

72 Introduction

73 In severe SARS-CoV-2 infections excessive activity of pro-inflammatory immune cells contributes to
74 alveolar and endothelial damage triggering a vicious cycle that evolves towards severe COVID-19 ^{1,2}.
75 Beside its role in calcium metabolism, 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D (25(OH)D) is a pleiotropic regulator of
76 the immune system ^{3,4}. It stimulates the expression of cathelicidins and beta-defensin in respiratory
77 epithelia as barrier to pathogen invasion ^{5,6}. It acts as a pro-tolerogenic cytokine dampening
78 excessive inflammation by inhibiting neutrophils and switching Th1 CD4 T cells and M1-polarized
79 macrophages towards a type II immunity. Vitamin D deficiency increases the severity of respiratory
80 virus infections ^{7,8} and contributes to variations in their incidence across seasons, age groups,
81 socioeconomic status and geographies. Data are emerging that vitamin D deficiency is more
82 prevalent in patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia requiring intensive care ⁹. More than a billion
83 people worldwide are vitamin D deficient ¹⁰ with variations between sexes, ethnicities, social groups
84 and geographies that appear to correlate with differences in incidence and outcome of COVID-19
85 lung disease based on modeling of large data sets ¹¹⁻¹³. Here we provide a first field validation of
86 these models. We provide a detailed view on the surprisingly high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency
87 in a wealthy European region, the province of West Flanders, Belgium. We investigated the
88 correlation of serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D (25(OH)D) level to the risk to be hospitalized for severe
89 COVID-19 pneumonia, the radiological disease stage as proxy for immunological stage and its
90 possible confounding by vitamin D-impacted comorbidities, in cohort of 186 consecutive patients
91 hospitalized for severe SARS-CoV-2 infection in a large Belgian network hospital.

92

93 Methods

94 **Patients** This is a retrospective observational study on 186 consecutive patients hospitalized from
95 March 1, 2020 to April 7, 2020 for COVID-19 pneumonia at AZ Delta General Hospital in Roeselare,
96 Belgium (demographics in Table 2). 25(OH)D levels in COVID-19 patients were compared to an age-
97 and season-matched diseased control population, consisting of 2717 consecutive unselected patients

98 sampled from March 1, 2019 to April 30, 2019. The prevalence and age/sex/seasonal-distribution of
99 vitamin D status in the general population was derived from all 25(OH)D measurements from January
100 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019 on 16274 consecutive, unselected and unique patient samples (Table
101 1). This study was approved by the AZ Delta ethical committee (Clinical Trial Number IRB
102 B117202000009) with a waiver of informed consent from study participants considering the study is
103 based on secondary analysis of existing data.

104

105 **Procedures:** *Chest CT* On admission all COVID-19 patients received a chest CT (detailed CT scanning
106 protocol in Supplementary Information) to determine the disease stage by consensus evaluation of
107 the predominant radiological presentation: ground-glass opacities (early stage, 0-4 days, “stage 1”),
108 crazy paving pattern (progressive stage, 5-8 days, “stage 2”), (3) consolidation (peak stage, 10-13
109 days, “stage 3”) ¹⁴. *Analysis of comorbidities:* prevalence of diabetes was registered by anamnesis and
110 review of electronic patient records. Chronic lung disease (emphysema, fibrosis, bronchiectasis) and
111 coronary artery disease (coronary artery calcification scoring) were objectified by chest CT.
112 *Laboratory analyses:* all serum 25(OH)D measurements in this study were done in a central lab by the
113 exact same method using Elecsys® vitamin D total II (Roche, Switzerland) traced to the official
114 reference ID-LC-MS/MS (Ghent University). SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed in all COVID-19
115 patients by PCR for E/N/RdRP genes (Allplex™ 2019-nCoV assay, Seegene, Seoul, Korea) on
116 nasopharyngeal swabs.

117

118 **Statistical analysis** Data (not normally distributed) are expressed as medians (IQR) and Mann-
119 Whitney test was used to test statistical differences between groups. Proportions for categorical
120 variables were compared using chi-squared test. Spearman’s rank correlation was used to identify
121 correlations between 25(OH)D and comorbidities as confounding factors (r_s , 95% CI). Statistical
122 analyses were performed using MedCalc (version 12.2.1, Mariakerke, Belgium) and considered
123 significant if P value was less than .05.

124

125 **Results**

126 ***Epidemiology and distribution of vitamin D deficiency in the general population*** The prevalence and
127 distribution of vitamin D deficiency the general population in the province of West Flanders, Belgium,
128 was derived from 25(OH)D measurements in 16274 consecutive, unselected and unique patient
129 sampled from January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019. Table 1 summarizes the demographics and
130 distributions according to sex, age and season and lists relevant statistical differences. Males had
131 lower median 25(OH)D than females (22.3 ng/mL, IQR 14.9-31.3 versus 23.7 ng/mL, IQR 15.6-33.1,
132 $P<0.0001$) and higher rates of vitamin D deficiency (42.0% versus 38.6%, $P<0.0001$) (Fig. 1A). With
133 the exception of the very young (<10 years), vitamin D deficiency was endemic in all age groups (Fig.
134 1B, Table 1). Men and women above 18 years showed lower median 25(OH)D levels and higher
135 vitamin D deficiency rates than individuals of 18 years or younger ($P<0.05$). As expected, 25(OH)D
136 levels were lower in winter and spring than in summer ($P<0.0001$) and fall ($P<0.05$) (Fig. 1C). Above
137 the age of 30 years more than 40% of the population was vitamin D-deficient, with men consistently
138 more ($P<0.05$) affected than women (Fig.1D) and in all seasons except summer (Fig. 1E). The time
139 frame of peak SARS-CoV-2 infection in our population thus coincided with the time frame of lowest
140 25(OH)D levels and highest rates of vitamin D deficiency, with men (48.6%) markedly more affected
141 than females (42.5%, $P<0.05$).

142

143 ***Demographics and vitamin D status of COVID-19 patients.*** 186 patients with PCR-confirmed SARS-
144 CoV-2 infection were admitted to the hospital from March 1, 2020 to April 7,2020 for COVID-19
145 pneumonia: 109 males (median age 68 years, IQR 53-79 years) and 77 females (median age 71 years,
146 IQR 65-74 years). 25(OH)D in COVID-19 patients was compared a control group of 2717 patients with
147 similar age distribution, sampled in March and April, 2019. COVID-19 patients had an even lower
148 median 25(OH)D on admission (18.6 ng/mL, IQR 12.6-25.3) than controls (21.5 ng/mL, IQR 13.9-20.8,
149 $P=0.0016$) and a markedly higher percentage of vitamin D deficiency (defined as 25(OH)D <

150 20ng/mL): 58.6% versus 45.2% (P=0.0005) (Table 2). Considering the male preponderance in COVID-
151 19 patients (59%) but underrepresentation in controls (37%), we then stratified 25(OH)D for sex
152 (Fig.2A-C and Table 2). Remarkably, we observed a sexual dimorphism. Female COVID-19 patients
153 were not more vitamin D deficient than female controls (46.8% versus 42.8%, P=0.5646, Fig.2B).
154 Control males showed higher vitamin D deficiency rates than control females (49.2% versus 42.8%,
155 P<0.0001 Fig.2A). In male COVID-19 patients, vitamin D deficiency was even more profound (Fig.2C),
156 with lower median 25(OH)D (17.6 ng/mL, IQR 12.7-24.0 versus 20.3 ng/mL, IQR 13.7-28.3, P=0.0234)
157 and a markedly higher deficiency rate (67.0% versus 49.2%, P=0.0006) than male controls.

158

159 ***Correlation between vitamin D status and disease stage*** Patients were screened by CT to determine
160 the temporal phase of COVID-19 lung disease and classified based on the predominant radiological
161 lesion (Fig.2D-F) as early stage 1 (ground-glass opacities), progressive stage 2 (crazy paving pattern)
162 or peak stage 3 (consolidation). These stages are considered as proxy for the immunological phase of
163 COVID-19 with an early phase of active viral replication in lower airways (stage 1), progressive
164 recruitment of pro-inflammatory cells to the lung interstitial space (stage 2), ending in diffuse
165 alveolar damage and fibrosis (stage 3). 24.7%, 29.6% and 45.7% of patients presented in stage 1, 2
166 and 3, respectively with similar distribution in males and females (Table 2). Analysis of 25(OH)D
167 across radiological disease stages (Fig.2G-H, Table 2) strengthened the correlation: male COVID-19
168 patients showed progressively lower median 25(OH)D with advancing stage, resulting in vitamin D
169 deficiency rates increasing from 55.2% in stage 1, 66.7% in stage 2 to 74.0% in stage 3 (P=0.0010). No
170 such stage-dependent 25(OH)D variations were seen in female COVID-19 patients.

171

172 ***Analysis of possible confounders by vitamin D-impacted comorbidities*** The higher rates of vitamin D
173 deficiency in COVID-19 patients might reflect a causal relation or be no more than a marker of poor
174 general health or nutritional status predisposing to severe COVID-19. To identify possible
175 confounders, we compared the prevalence of known vitamin D-impacted comorbidities such as

176 chronic obstructive lung disease^{15,16}, coronary artery disease and diabetes, in male versus female
177 and in vitamin D-deficient versus -replete COVID-19 patients. Prevalence of chronic lung disease,
178 coronary artery disease and diabetes in all COVID-19 patients were 15.1%, 59.1% and 14.0%,
179 respectively, with no differences across COVID-19 disease stages (Table 2). The high prevalence of
180 coronary artery disease in COVID-19 patients was strongly correlated to patients' age ($r_s = 0.655$, 95%
181 CI 0.565-0.730, $P < 0.0001$). Male COVID-19 patients showed similar prevalence of diabetes and
182 coronary artery disease and a tendency towards more chronic lung diseases, that attained
183 significance only in male COVID-19 stage 1 patients. The latter difference was, however, not related
184 to differences in vitamin D status: male and female COVID-19 patients with normal (25(OH)D ≥ 20
185 ng/mL) or deficient vitamin D status showed comparable prevalence of chronic lung disease,
186 coronary artery disease and diabetes (Table 3), indicating that the correlation between vitamin D
187 deficiency and the risk for severe COVID-19 was not confounded by any of these comorbidities.

188

189 Discussion

190

191 This study is one of several rapidly emerging reports that correlate vitamin D deficiency to the risk for
192 severe presentations of COVID-19 lung disease. It is compatible with a recent study that correlated
193 severe vitamin D deficiency in the Philippines's population with COVID-19 disease burden and poor
194 outcome⁹. Our study is the first to show that more profound vitamin D deficiency predisposes to
195 more advanced radiological stages as proxy for the severity of the inflammatory process of COVID-19
196 pneumonia. It also describes a remarkable sexual dimorphism, not directly explained by sex
197 differences in overall vitamin D status in our population. This study also highlights vitamin D
198 deficiency as a neglected health issue, even in a wealthy population with access to good nutrition
199 and healthcare: with exception of the very young, more than 40% of our control population have
200 25(OH)D levels below 20 ng/mL, a widely used threshold for adequate bone health. It can be
201 assumed that these numbers are representative for the total Belgian population that showed much
202 higher all-cause excess mortality during the SARS-CoV-2 peak infection phase than neighboring

203 countries according to the European Mortality Monitoring project ¹⁷ despite largely sufficient
204 hospital and ICU capacity. Our data thus represent a first field validation of a recent global
205 epidemiological analysis that clearly correlated the overall incidence and mortality of COVID-19 to
206 geographical latitude, nations' nutritional status and the associated known impact on vitamin D
207 deficiency as proposed causal factor ¹³.

208 Vitamin D deficiency might be cause or consequence of severe COVID-19 lung disease. It might also
209 be simply a surrogate marker for an underlying confounding comorbidity or general indicator of poor
210 nutrition and ill health. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma have been shown to alter
211 25(OH) metabolism or sequestration ^{15,16} with lower increments in circulating 25(OH)D status after
212 controlled repletion. Vitamin D deficiency has also been correlated ¹⁸ to known COVID-19 risk factors
213 such as hypertension and diabetes. Our analysis of comorbidities strongly argue against such
214 confounding effect: vitamin D deficiency was strongly correlated to the risk of advanced COVID-19,
215 specifically in males, but vitamin D deficient COVID-19 patients did not show higher prevalence of
216 known vitamin D-impacted diseases such as diabetes, coronary artery disease and chronic lung
217 disease. Another possible confounder is increased catabolism of circulating 25(OH)D in COVID-19
218 patients, attributed to extrarenal CYP27B1 activity and VDR expressed by the expanded repertoire of
219 immune cells. In a USA population survey, subjects with CRP>5 mg/L showed 1.6 ng/L lower median
220 25(OH)D ²⁰. However, the stable 25(OH)D levels in female COVID-19 patients across all stages of the
221 disease argue against such effect. Combined, our data thus support a causal role of vitamin D
222 deficiency, in line with a recent modeling study using causal interference analysis of global COVID-19
223 incidence and mortality data ¹³.

224 A substantial body of evidence explains a causal pathophysiological role of vitamin D in the severity
225 of respiratory viral infections. The immunological response to SARS-CoV-2 shows many similarities to
226 the response to SARS-CoV ²¹: in individuals with delayed type I/III interferon response and delayed
227 viral clearance, progressive recruitment of neutrophils and pro-inflammatory Th1/M1-polarized
228 immune cells contribute to endothelial and alveolar cell death and in some patients trigger a

229 cytokine storm ¹ that enhances diffuse alveolar damage. Severe COVID-19 can thus be
230 conceptualized as an unbalance between pro-inflammatory type I immune response required for
231 viral clearance and tolerogenic type II response required for repair ^{1,2,21}. Vitamin D modulates the
232 immunological response to respiratory viruses at various phases: in the early phase of infection it
233 limits viral entry and replication by boosting cathelicidins/defensins expression in respiratory
234 epithelia ⁵. Later on it exerts a tolerogenic effect by directly mediating IL-4/IL-13-dependent
235 polarization towards M2-macrophages and Th2 CD4 T cells ⁶. The mammalian immune system shows
236 conserved estrogen/androgen-dependent sexual dimorphism ²². SARS-CoV-infected female mice
237 show lower viral replication, lower recruitment of inflammatory monocytes and neutrophils to the
238 lungs and less alveolar and endothelial cell death ²³. If vitamin D deficiency favors a pro-inflammatory
239 balance, the higher rates of vitamin D deficiency in male humans might thus act in concert with
240 estrogen/androgen-dependent immune differences and contribute to higher incidence and severity
241 in male COVID-19 patients.

242 Several randomized controlled interventional trials with vitamin D supplementation for bone health
243 or to reduce mortality in cardiovascular disease and cancer gave mixed or negative results, entailing
244 a sense of indifference from the medical community towards the value of vitamin D monitoring and
245 supplementation. An overlooked issue, however, was that many of those interventional trials
246 showed inappropriate design by targeting populations with no prior vitamin D deficiency, and were
247 not guided by actual 25(OH)D measurements ²⁴. A prior meta-analysis indicated that vitamin D
248 supplementation reduces the incidence and severity of acute respiratory infections but only in those
249 patients with a deficient vitamin D level at the start as measured by 25(OH)D ²⁵.

250 In conclusion, our study shows a strong correlation between vitamin D deficiency and severe COVID-
251 19 lung disease that is not explained by confounding comorbidities. In light of the established
252 immunological functions of vitamin D, it is compatible with a causal role of vitamin D deficiency that
253 can explain variations in disease burden of COVID-19 across geographies, skin pigment types
254 (African/Latino), body mass (obese), socioeconomic status (poor) and lifestyle (institutionalized

255 people). Given the global prevalence of vitamin D deficiency, our data thus argue for vitamin D
256 supplementation as inexpensive, safe and readily available mitigation of the syndemic convergence
257 of two pandemics.

258 **Competing interest and funding declaration**

259 The authors declare no conflict of interest. The authors received no funding for this study.

260

261 **Contributor and guarantor information**

262 D.D.S., K.D.S and G.M. were responsible for planning and design of the study. Statistical analysis was
263 done by D.D.S. P.H. was responsible for laboratory analyses. S.G. and K.D.S. were responsible for CT
264 and structured reporting of radiological data. All authors contributed to the manuscript preparation,
265 read and approved it. G.M. was responsible for preparing the manuscript and is guarantor of the
266 study. The guarantor affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of
267 the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any
268 discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained. The
269 authors declare that they will share anonymized source data of this study upon written request to
270 the guarantor.

271

272

273 **References**

274

- 275 1. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, et al. Clinical and immunological features of severe and
276 moderate coronavirus disease 2019. *J Clin Invest*. 2020.
- 277 2. Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, et al. COVID-19: consider cytokine storm syndromes
278 and immunosuppression. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10229):1033-1034.
- 279 3. Chirumbolo S, Bjorklund G, Sboarina A, Vella A. The Role of Vitamin D in the Immune
280 System as a Pro-survival Molecule. *Clin Ther*. 2017;39(5):894-916.
- 281 4. Cantorna MT, Yu S, Bruce D. The paradoxical effects of vitamin D on type 1 mediated
282 immunity. *Mol Aspects Med*. 2008;29(6):369-375.
- 283 5. Liu PT, Stenger S, Li H, et al. Toll-like receptor triggering of a vitamin D-mediated
284 human antimicrobial response. *Science*. 2006;311(5768):1770-1773.
- 285 6. Cantorna MT. Vitamin D and Lung Infection. *Infect Immun*. 2016;84(11):3094-3096.
- 286 7. Zdrenghea MT, Makrinioti H, Bagacean C, Bush A, Johnston SL, Stanciu LA. Vitamin D
287 modulation of innate immune responses to respiratory viral infections. *Rev Med
288 Virol*. 2017;27(1).
- 289 8. Greiller CL, Martineau AR. Modulation of the immune response to respiratory viruses
290 by vitamin D. *Nutrients*. 2015;7(6):4240-4270.
- 291 9. Alipio N. Vitamin D Supplementation Could Possibly Improve Clinical Outcomes of
292 Patients Infected with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-2019). *Preprint available at SSRN:*
293 <https://ssrncom/abstract=3571484>. 2020.
- 294 10. Hilger J, Friedel A, Herr R, et al. A systematic review of vitamin D status in
295 populations worldwide. *Br J Nutr*. 2014;111(1):23-45.
- 296 11. Khunti KP, M. Is ethnicity linked to incidence or outcomes of covid-19? *BMJ* (369).
- 297 12. Alipio N. Vitamin D Supplementation Could Possibly Improve Clinical Outcomes of
298 Patients Infected with Coronavirus-2019 (COVID-19) (April 9, 2020). *Preprint
299 available at SSRN: <http://dxdoiorq/102139/ssrn3571484>*.
- 300 13. Davies G, Garami AR, Byers J. Evidence Supports a Causal Model for Vitamin D in
301 COVID-19 Outcomes. *medRxiv 2020050120087965*; doi:
302 <https://doiorg/101101/2020050120087965>.
- 303 14. Bernheim A, Mei X, Huang M, et al. Chest CT Findings in Coronavirus Disease-19
304 (COVID-19): Relationship to Duration of Infection. *Radiology*. 2020:200463.
- 305 15. Jolliffe DA, Stefanidis C, Wang Z, et al. Vitamin D Metabolism is Dysregulated in
306 Asthma and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *American journal of respiratory
307 and critical care medicine*. 2020.
- 308 16. Hiemstra PS, de Jongh RT. Vitamin D Deficiency in Asthma and Chronic Obstructive
309 Pulmonary Disease: A Chicken or Egg Story. *American journal of respiratory and
310 critical care medicine*. 2020.
- 311 17. Kanieff M, Rago G, Minelli G, et al. The potential for a concerted system for the rapid
312 monitoring of excess mortality throughout Europe. *Euro surveillance : bulletin
313 Europeen sur les maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin*.
314 2010;15(43).
- 315 18. Gouni-Berthold I, Berthold HK. Vitamin D and vascular disease. *Current vascular
316 pharmacology*. 2020.

- 317 19. Mondul AM, Weinstein SJ, Layne TM, Albanes D. Vitamin D and Cancer Risk and
318 Mortality: State of the Science, Gaps, and Challenges. *Epidemiologic reviews*.
319 2017;39(1):28-48.
- 320 20. Haynes BM, Pfeiffer CM, Sternberg MR, Schleicher RL. Selected physiologic variables
321 are weakly to moderately associated with 29 biomarkers of diet and nutrition,
322 NHANES 2003-2006. *J Nutr*. 2013;143(6):1001S-1010S.
- 323 21. Channappanavar R, Perlman S. Pathogenic human coronavirus infections: causes and
324 consequences of cytokine storm and immunopathology. *Semin Immunopathol*.
325 2017;39(5):529-539.
- 326 22. Trigunaite A, Dimo J, Jorgensen TN. Suppressive effects of androgens on the immune
327 system. *Cell Immunol*. 2015;294(2):87-94.
- 328 23. Channappanavar R, Fett C, Mack M, Ten Eyck PP, Meyerholz DK, Perlman S. Sex-
329 Based Differences in Susceptibility to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
330 Coronavirus Infection. *J Immunol*. 2017;198(10):4046-4053.
- 331 24. Grant WB, Boucher BJ, Bhattoa HP, Lahore H. Why vitamin D clinical trials should be
332 based on 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentrations. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*.
333 2018;177:266-269.
- 334 25. Martineau AR, Jolliffe DA, Hooper RL, et al. Vitamin D supplementation to prevent
335 acute respiratory tract infections: systematic review and meta-analysis of individual
336 participant data. *BMJ*. 2017;356:i6583.
- 337

338

339

340

341 **Table legends**

342

343 **Table 1: Sex, age and seasonal variations in 25(OH) levels in the general population** as derived from
344 25(OH)D measurements in 16274 unselected, consecutive and unique diseased control samples. The
345 table lists for the number (percentage) of patients for the indicated groups, median (IQR) age (years),
346 median (IQR) 25(OH)D level (ng/mL) and percentage vitamin D deficiency. Data (not normally
347 distributed) are expressed as medians (25th–75th percentiles), and the Mann-Whitney test was used
348 to test statistical difference between groups. Proportions for categorical variables were compared
349 using chi-squared test. Upper case letters indicate relevant statistical differences detailed in the
350 footnote.

351

352 **Table 2: Demographic and comorbidity characteristics of diseased controls and COVID-19 patients**
353 **and 25(OH) levels stratified by sex and radiological COVID-19 disease stage.** † Indicates differences
354 with diseased controls for which P values less than .05 were considered statistically significant. ‡
355 Indicates differences with CT Stage 1 COVID-19 patients for which P values less than .05 were
356 considered statistically significant. § Indicates differences of male versus female comorbidity
357 prevalence for which P values less than .05 were considered statistically significant. Data (not
358 normally distributed) are expressed as medians (25th–75th percentiles), and the Mann-Whitney test
359 was used to test statistical difference between groups. Proportions for categorical variables were
360 compared using chi-squared test. Exact P values listed in Supplementary information.

361

362 **Table 3: Prevalence of comorbidities within COVID-19 patients stratified for sex and vitamin D**
363 **deficiency status.** Prevalence of the indicated vitamin D-impacted comorbidities are listed for all
364 COVID-19 patients and grouped per sex (absolute number and percentage per subgroup) and
365 compared between patients with or without vitamin D deficiency (25(OH)D < 20 ng/mL). P values
366 calculated by chi-squared testing indicate statistical differences between prevalence of the indicated

367 comorbidity between all, female or male vitamin D deficient versus sufficient COVID-19 patients. †

368 Indicates no statistical differences between males and females for the indicated comorbidity.

369

370

Table 1: Table 1: Sex, age and seasonal variations in 25(OH) levels in the general population

Patient group	n (%)	Age, Median (IQR), y	25-OH-Vit D, Median (IQR), ng/mL	25-OH-Vit D < 20 ng/mL, n (%)
Gender distribution				
All	16274 (100)	64.2 (39.8-81.3)	23.3 (15.3-32.4)	6491 (39.9)
Female	10045 (61.7)	63.3 (37.4-82.0)	23.7 (15.6-33.1)	3875 (38.6)
Male	6229 (38.3)	65.2 (44.5-80.3)	22.3 (14.9-31.3) ^a	2616 (42.0) ^b
Age (year) distribution				
All				
≤ 1	113 (0.7)	0.7 (0.3-0.8)	44.4 (37.3-55.1)	6 (5.3)
1-10	761 (4.7)	5.0 (2.9-7.3)	32.7 (26.0-42.0)	83 (10.9)
10-18	399 (2.5)	13.1 (11.5-15.3)	23.9 (17.4-30.0)	130 (32.6)
18-30	1410 (8.7)	25.8 (22.6-27.9)	22.2 (15.5-30.0) ^{c, d}	600 (42.6) ^{e, f}
30-50	2842 (17.5)	40.1 (34.9-45.5)	22.5 (15.7-30.6) ^{c, d}	1171 (41.2) ^e
50-70	3727 (22.9)	60.1 (55.4-65.1)	23.4 (15.6-32.6) ^c	1467 (39.4) ^e
>70	7022 (43.1)	82.9 (77.5-87.7)	22.3 (13.9-31.9) ^{c, d}	3034 (43.2) ^{e, f}
Female				
≤ 1	49 (0.5)	0.7 (0.4-0.8)	44.8 (38.8-54.6)	4 (8.2)
1-10	360 (3.6)	5.5 (3.2-7.3)	32.9 (25.5-41.7)	33 (9.2)
10-18	240 (2.4)	13.6 (11.5-15.5)	23.3 (17.0-29.9) ^g	83 (34.6) ⁱ
18-30	1088 (10.8)	26.2 (23.1-28.0)	22.4 (15.6-30.1) ^{g, h}	455 (41.8) ^{i, j}
30-50	1862 (18.5)	39.1 (34.3-44.6)	22.9 (15.9-31.6) ^{g, h}	737 (39.6) ⁱ
50-70	2104 (20.9)	59.7 (55.2-64.8)	24.7 (16.5-34.2) ^g	766 (36.4) ^{i, j}
>70	4342 (43.2)	83.6 (78.2-88.1)	23.1 (14.0-32.9) ^{g, h}	1797 (41.4) ⁱ
Male				
≤ 1	64 (1.0)	0.6 (0.3-0.8)	44.3 (37.1-55.7)	2 (3.1)
1-10	401 (6.4)	4.7 (2.6-7.3)	32.1 (26.3-42.0)	50 (12.5)
10-18	159 (2.6)	12.8 (11.4-14.9)	24.5 (18.7-31.1)	47 (29.6)
18-30	322 (5.2)	24.4 (21.2-27.4)	21.6 (14.9-29.1) ^k	145 (45.0) ^m
30-50	980 (15.7)	41.7 (36.4-46.2)	21.8 (15.5-29.3) ^{k, l}	434 (44.3) ^{m, n}
50-70	1623 (26.1)	60.7 (55.6-65.5)	21.9 (14.4-30.7) ^{k, l}	701 (43.2) ^{m, n}
>70	2680 (43.0)	81.9 (76.5-86.7)	21.2 (13.8-30.1) ^{k, l}	1237 (46.2) ^{m, n}
Seasonal distribution				
Winter				
All	3889 (100)	62.5 (37.7-81.4)	21.8 (14.3-31.4) ^o	1740 (44.7) ^q
Female	2448 (62.9)	62.5 (36.1-81.3)	22.6 (14.5-32.4) ^o	1040 (42.5) ^q
Male	1441 (37.1)	62.8 (40.9-79.5)	20.4 (14.1-29.8) ^{o, p}	700 (48.6) ^{q, r}
Spring				
All	4277 (100)	65.8 (40.5-81.6)	22.2 (14.4-31.0) ^o	1832 (42.8) ^q
Female	2563 (59.9)	64.2 (37.3-82.0)	22.4 (14.8-31.6) ^o	1075 (41.9) ^q
Male	1714 (40.1)	67.5 (46.3-81.0)	21.8 (14.0-30.3) ^{o, p}	757 (44.2) ^q
Summer				
All	3619 (100)	63.3 (40.6-81.6)	25.7 (17.0-35.0)	1202 (33.2)
Female	2296 (63.4)	63.6 (38.8-82.5)	25.8 (17.2-35.4)	748 (32.6)
Male	1323 (36.6)	62.9 (43.3-80.1)	25.6 (16.7-34.2)	454 (34.3)
Fall				
All	4489 (100)	64.7 (40.1-80.9)	23.6 (15.9-32.6) ^o	1717 (38.3) ^q

Female	2738 (61.0)	63.1 (37.4-81.3)	24.2 (16.1-33.3) ^o	1012 (37.0) ^q
Male	1751 (39.0)	66.3 (45.7-80.3)	23.0 (15.6-31.3) ^{o,p}	705 (40.3) ^{q,r}

- ^a 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower ($P < .0001$) in men than in women.
- ^b Prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency was significantly higher ($P < .0001$) in men than in women.
- ^c 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower ($P < .05$) for all individual age groups > 18 years as compared with those aged ≤ 18 years.
- ^d For all individuals aged > 18 years, subgroup 50-70 years showed significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) as compared with the other age groups.
- ^e All age groups > 18 years showed significantly higher ($P < .05$) prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency as compared with the individual age groups ≤ 18 years.
- ^f For individuals aged > 18 years, subgroup 50-70 years showed significantly lower ($P < 0.05$) prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency than the age groups 18-30 years and > 70 years.
- ^g 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower ($P < .0001$) for female age groups > 10 years as compared with those aged ≤ 10 years.
- ^h For women aged > 18 years, subgroup 50-70 years showed significantly higher ($P < 0.001$) 25-OH Vitamin D levels as compared with the other age groups.
- ⁱ All female age groups > 10 years showed significantly higher ($P < .001$) prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency as compared with the individual age groups ≤ 10 years.
- ^j For women aged > 10 years, subgroups 10-18 years and 50-70 years showed significantly lower ($P < .05$) prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency as compared with the other age groups.
- ^k 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower ($P < .001$) for male age groups > 18 years as compared with those aged ≤ 18 years. Male age groups > 18 years did not show significant mutual differences.
- ^l 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower ($P < .001$) for male age groups > 30 years as compared with female age groups > 30 years.
- ^m All male age groups > 18 years showed significantly higher ($P < .001$) prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency as compared with the individual age groups ≤ 18 years. Male age groups > 18 years did not show significant mutual differences.
- ⁿ Male age groups 30-50 years, 50-70 years and > 70 years showed significantly higher prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency as compared with the female age groups (respectively $P < .05$, $P = .0001$ and $P < .0001$).
- ^o For all patients and gender subgroups, 25-OH Vitamin D levels in winter and spring did not differ significantly. Winter-spring 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower as compared with summer ($P < .0001$) and fall ($P < .05$). 25-OH Vitamin D levels were significantly lower ($P < .0001$) in fall than those measured in summer.
- ^p In all seasons, except for the summer, males have significantly lower 25-OH Vitamin D levels ($P < .05$) as compared with women.
- ^q For all patients and female patients, prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency in winter versus spring did not differ significantly. In contrast, male patients showed significantly higher ($P < .05$) prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency in winter versus spring. For all patients and gender subgroups, winter-spring prevalence of 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency were significantly higher as compared with summer ($P < .001$) and fall ($P < .05$). 25-OH Vitamin D deficiency was significantly more prevalent ($P < .001$) in fall than in summer.
- ^r In winter and fall, prevalence of 5-OH Vitamin D deficiency was significantly higher ($P < .05$) in men than in women.

Table 2. Demographic and comorbidity characteristics of diseased controls and COVID-19 patients and 25(OH) levels stratified by sex and radiological COVID-19 disease stage

Patient group	Characteristic	Diseased Controls	COVID-19 (all)	COVID-19 (CT Stage 1)	COVID-19 (CT Stage 2)	COVID-19 (CT Stage 3)
All patients	n	2717	186	46	55	85
	Age, median (IQR), y	68 (49-82)	69 (52-80)	74 (53-82)	71 (60-78)	63 (50-80)
	Sex					
	Female, n (%)	1718 (63.2)	77 (41.4) [†]	17 (37.0) [†]	25 (45.5) [†]	35 (41.2) [†]
	Male, n (%)	999 (36.8)	109 (58.6) [†]	29 (63.0) [†]	30 (54.5) [†]	50 (58.8) [†]
	Comorbidity					
	Chronic lung disease, n (%)	n.d.	28 (15.1)	8 (17.4)	9 (16.4)	11 (12.9)
	Coronary artery disease, n (%)	n.d.	110 (59.1)	32 (69.6)	32 (58.2)	46 (54.1)
	Diabetes, n (%)	n.d.	26 (14.0)	9 (19.6)	7 (12.7)	10 (11.8)
	25-OH-Vitamin D					
	Median (IQR), ng/mL	21.5 (13.9-20.8)	18.6 (12.6-25.3) [†]	19.7 (16.2-30.8)	17.6 (12.0-26.0) [†]	16.9 (12.6-23.8) [†]
	≥ 20 ng/mL, n (%)	1490 (54.8)	77 (41.4) [†]	22 (47.8)	23 (41.8)	32 (37.6) [†]
	< 20 ng/mL, n (%)	1227 (45.2)	109 (58.6) [†]	24 (52.2)	32 (58.2)	53 (62.4) [†]
Female patients	n	1718	77	17	25	35
	Age, median (IQR), y	68 (46-83)	71 (65-74)	68 (46-83)	72 (64-76)	66 (49-82)
	Comorbidity					
	Chronic lung disease, n (%)	n.d.	7 (9.1)	0 (0.0) [§]	3 (12.0)	4 (11.4)
	Coronary artery disease, n (%)	n.d.	43 (55.8)	11 (64.7)	13 (52.0)	19 (54.3)
	Diabetes, n (%)	n.d.	11 (14.3)	4 (23.5)	4 (16.0)	3 (8.6)
	25-OH-Vitamin D					
	Median (IQR), ng/mL	22.4 (14.2-32.0)	20.7 (12.4-29.8)	20.7 (10.4-33.0)	20.3 (11.7-27.7)	21.2 (15.1-29.6)
	≥ 20 ng/mL, n (%)	983 (57.2)	41 (53.2)	9 (52.9)	13 (52.0)	19 (54.3)
	< 20 ng/mL, n (%)	735 (42.8)	36 (46.8)	8 (47.1)	12 (48.0)	16 (45.7)
Male patients	n	999	109	29	30	50
	Age, median (IQR), y	69 (53-81)	68 (53-79)	74 (58-81)	71 (59-78)	59 (52-77)
	Comorbidity					
	Chronic lung disease, n (%)	n.d.	21 (19.3)	8 (27.6) [§]	6 (20.0)	7 (14.0)
	Coronary artery disease, n (%)	n.d.	67 (61.5)	21 (72.4)	19 (63.3)	27 (54.0)
	Diabetes, n (%)	n.d.	5 (13.8)	5 (17.2)	3 (10.0)	7 (14.0)
	25-OH-Vitamin D					
	Median (IQR), ng/mL	20.3 (13.7-28.4)	17.6 (12.7-24.0) [†]	19.4 (18.2-29.8)	16.5 (12.1-24.0) [†]	16.0 (12.0-22.1) [†]
	≥ 20 ng/mL, n (%)	507 (50.8)	36 (33.0) [†]	13 (44.8)	10 (33.3)	13 (26.0) [†]
	< 20 ng/mL, n (%)	492 (49.2)	73 (67.0) [†]	16 (55.2)	20 (66.7)	37 (74.0) [†]

[†] Indicates differences with diseased controls for which P values less than .05 were considered statistically significant.

[‡] Indicates differences with CT Stage 1 COVID-19 patients for which P values less than .05 were considered statistically significant.

[§] Indicates differences of male vs female comorbidity prevalence for which P values less than .05 were considered statistically significant.

372

Table 3. Prevalence of comorbidities within COVID-19 patients stratified for sex and vitamin D deficiency status.

Patient group	Comorbidity	25-OH-vitamin D ≥ 20 ng/mL	25-OH-vitamin D < 20 ng/mL	P
All patients (n = 186)	n	77	109	
	Chronic lung disease, n (%)	13 (16.9)	15 (13.8)	.7085
	Coronary artery disease, n (%)	48 (62.3)	62 (56.9)	.5575
	Diabetes, n (%)	11 (14.3)	15 (13.8)	.9063
Female patients (n = 77)	n	41	36	
	Chronic lung disease, n (%)	4 (9.8)	3 (8.3)	.8660
	Coronary artery disease, n (%)	25 (61.0)	18 (50.0)	.4594
	Diabetes, n (%)	7 (17.1)	4 (11.1)	.6714
Male patients (n = 109)	n	36	73	
	Chronic lung disease, n (%)	9 (25.0) [†]	12 (16.4) [†]	.4163
	Coronary artery disease, n (%)	23 (63.9) [†]	44 (60.3) [†]	.8776
	Diabetes, n (%)	4 (11.1) [†]	11 (15.1) [†]	.7838


P values less than .05 were considered statistically significant.

† Additional male to female comparisons for prevalence of comorbidities showed no statistical differences (P >.05).

373


374

375 **Figure 1**
376



378
379 **Figure 1: Prevalence and distribution of vitamin D deficiency in the general population** as derived
380 from 25(OH)D measurements in 16274 unselected, consecutive and unique diseased control samples
381 Box-and-Whisker plots show median (IQR) 25(OH)D levels (ng/mL) grouped by (A) sex, (B) the
382 indicated age groups and (C) Northern hemisphere meteorological seasons. Background color in box
383 plots indicates normal vitamin D status (green, 25(OH)D > 30 ng/mL), vitamin D deficiency (pale red,
384 25(OH)D < 20 ng/mL), severe vitamin D deficiency (darker red, 25(OH)D < 12 ng/mL) and a gray zone
385 (20 ng/mL ≤ 25(OH)D ≤ 30 ng/mL). Lower panels indicate the percentage vitamin D deficiency
386 (25(OH)D < 20 ng/mL) in females (gray bars) and males (black bars) (D) in the indicated age groups
387 (years) and (E) across seasons. Corresponding numbers per group, median (IQR) 25(OH)D, deficiency
388 rates and relevant statistical differences are detailed in Table 1.
389
390

391 **Figure 2**
392



393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406

Figure 2: 25(OH)D levels in male and female COVID-19 patients and age/season-matched controls and stratification by COVID-19 disease stage Panels A-C: Box-and-Whisker plots showing median (red line) serum 25(OH) levels and interquartile ranges (green box) in (A) season- and age-matched female (n=1718) versus male (n=999) diseased controls; (B) female COVID-19 patients on admission (n=77) versus female controls; (C) male COVID-19 patients on admission (n=109) versus male controls. Panels D-F: representative images of radiological stages of COVID-19 lung disease with predominantly (D) ground-glass opacities in early stage; (E) crazy paving patterns in progressive stage 2; and (F) consolidation in peak stage 3. Panel G-H: box-and-whisker plots of 25(OH)D in (G) female COVID-19 patients and (H) male COVID-19 patients grouped according to radiological stage. Background color in box plots indicates normal vitamin D status (green, 25(OH)D > 30 ng/mL), vitamin D deficiency (pale red, 25(OH)D < 20 ng/mL), severe vitamin D deficiency (darker red, 25(OH)D < 12 ng/mL) and a gray zone (20 ng/mL ≤ 25(OH)D ≤ 30 ng/mL). P values indicate statistical

407 differences between groups calculated by Mann-Whitney test. Exact P values listed in Supplementary
408 information.