

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy (Review)

Mahomed	K	Gülmezogl	ιι ΔΜ
Manonieu	r\.	Gullilezogi	u Aivi

Mahomed K, Gülmezoglu AM. Vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2011, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD000228. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000228.pub2.

www.cochranelibrary.com

i



TABLE OF CONTENTS

REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION	1
FEEDBACK	1
WHAT'S NEW	2
HISTORY	2
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	-



[Intervention Review]

Vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy

Kassam Mahomed¹, A Metin Gülmezoglu²

¹Ipswich Hospital, Ipswich, Australia. ²UNDP/UNFPA/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, Department of Reproductive Health and Research, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

Contact: Sonja Henderson, Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group, Department of Women's and Children's Health, The University of Liverpool, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Crown Street, Liverpool, L8 7SS, UK. sonjah@liverpool.ac.uk, s.l.henderson@liverpool.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

Publication status and date: Withdrawn from publication for reasons stated in the review, published in Issue 2, 2011.

Citation: Mahomed K, Gülmezoglu AM. Vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD000228. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000228.pub2.

Copyright © 2011 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION

This review has been withdrawn from publication because it is out of date. It is being updated by a new review team following a new protocol: Ansary A, Palacios C, De-Regil LM, Peña-Rosas JP. Vitamin D supplementation for women during pregnancy (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2010, Issue 12. Art. No.: CD008873. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD008873.

The editorial group responsible for this previously published document have withdrawn it from publication.

FEEDBACK

Deeks, June 2001

Summary

Analysis:

For France 1986, the reported standard deviations for mean birthweight are too small to be believable. It is likely that the numbers reported in the paper are actually standard errors, not standard deviations. Standard deviation for birthweight of term babies is known to be between 300 and 600 grammes, as reported for UK 1980 in this review. In France 1986, the values reported for daily supplementation, single dose supplement and control are 80, 90 and 70 grammes. Multiplying these by the square root of the samples sizes gives 367, 468 and 377 grammes, much more sensible values for standard deviations. Also, the paper reports the difference between groups as being non-significant: if the values of 80, 90 and 70 grammes are standard deviations, the difference between the groups would be significant.

This error has probably arisen because the original trial paper is unclear: the values are reported in the text and not the table, using +-notation. At one point early in the section +- notation is used to describe standard deviations, but its meaning when used with mean birthweight is not stated.

[Summary of comments from Jon Deeks, June 2001]

Reply

A response from the reviewer will be published as soon as it is available.

Contributors

Jon Deeks



WHAT'S NEW

Date	Event	Description
19 January 2011	Amended	Review withdrawn from publication.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 2, 1996 Review first published: Issue 2, 1996

Date	Event	Description
20 September 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.
30 November 2007	Amended	We corrected an error in the results relating to the outcome 'neonatal hypocalcaemia': "Neonatal hypocalcaemia was less common (0/107 versus 6/96) in the supplemented groups" and not, as mentioned in the previous version of the review, the "unsupplemented groups". Sonja Henderson Review Group Co-ordinator
1 November 2004	Amended	A new review team has taken over responsibility for the 'Vitamin D supplementation in pregnancy' review and is currently reviewing the current publication. In the meantime, we have conducted another search and identified one additional report, which has been added to the Studies awaiting assessment.
16 October 1998	New search has been performed	Search updated.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

• No sources of support supplied

External sources

• Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, UK.