

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Methodological quality of public health guideline recommendations on vitamin D and calcium intakes – a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031840
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-May-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Dai, Zhaoli (Joy); The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy Kroeger, Cynthia; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy McDonald, Sally ; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy Page, Matthew; Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine McKenzie, Joanne; Monash University Allman-Farinelli, Margaret; University of Sydney, Faculty of Science Raubenheimer, David; The University of Sydney Bero, Lisa; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, NUTRITION & DIETETICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Methodological quality of public health guideline recommendations on vitamin D and**
4 **calcium intakes – a systematic review protocol**
5
6

7 Zhaoli Dai¹, Cynthia M. Kroger¹, Sally McDonald¹, Matthew J. Page², Joanne McKenzie²,
8 Margaret Allman-Farinelli¹, David Rauhbenheimer³, Lisa Bero¹
9
10

11
12 ¹Charles Perkins Centre, School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of
13 Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia

14 ²School of Public Health and Preventative Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road,
15 Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia

16 ³Charles Perkins Centre, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and
17 Health, The University of Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia
18
19

20
21
22 **Correspondence to** Zhaoli Dai, PhD, MS; Email: zhaoli.dai-keller@sydney.edu.au
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Introduction Recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium from food and supplements for bone health vary by public health guidelines among countries and professional organizations. It is unknown whether the methods used to develop these recommendations followed a rigorous process and how the differences in methods and processes used may affect the recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium. The objectives of this study include 1) collate and compare recommendations for vitamin D and calcium across guidelines, 2) appraise methodological quality of the guideline recommendations, and 3) identify methodological factors that may affect the recommended intakes for vitamin D and calcium. This study will make a significant contribution to the knowledge base of methodological rigor in public health guidelines for vitamin D and calcium recommendation.

Methods and analysis We will conduct a systematic review to evaluate recommendations for vitamin D and calcium intakes and their foods sources for osteoporosis prevention in generally healthy middle-aged and older adults. Methodological assessment will be performed for each guideline against those outlined in the 2014 World Health Organization (WHO) Handbook for Guideline Development. Systematic search strategy will be applied to locate food-based dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines indexed in various electronic databases, guideline repositories and gray literature from 1 January 2009 to 28 February 2019. Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize the data on intake recommendation and on fraction of guidelines in compliance with the WHO criteria. Logistic regression, if feasible, will be used to assess the relationships between the methodological factors and the recommendation intakes.

1
2
3 **Ethics and dissemination** Ethics approval is not required as we will only extract published data
4
5 or information from the published guidelines. Results of this review will be disseminated through
6
7 conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications.
8
9

10 **Protocol registration number** PROSPERO, CRD42019126452.
11
12

13
14 **Keywords:** vitamin D, calcium, public health guideline, guideline development methods
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study that critically appraises the methodological quality of guideline recommendations for dietary and supplemental vitamin D and calcium intakes.
- *A priori* systematic review methods will be used in the screening, data extraction, data synthesis and sub-group analysis.
- Eligible guidelines published in English only may potentially limit the sample size of and regional coverage of guideline recommendations included in our analysis.
- Information required to assess methodological quality of guidelines may be missing, particularly when other guideline development standards (e.g. the Institute of Medicine standards for trustworthy clinical guidelines) rather than the WHO handbook for guideline development were used to develop public health guidelines.

Introduction

Low intakes of vitamin D and calcium are common in older populations. Such insufficiency of vitamin D and calcium is partly due to ageing, which impairs food intake, mobility, efficiency of skin synthesis of vitamin D and biological absorption and retention of calcium.^{1 2} Due to global ageing, incidence of osteoporosis and fractures are rising rapidly worldwide.³ The burdens associated with osteoporosis in disability, premature mortality, and economics are substantial, particularly fractures at the hip. For example, global deaths and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) attributable to low bone mineral density had risen from 103,000 and 3,125,000 in 1990 to 188,000 and 5, 216,000 in 2010, respectively with one third of falls-related deaths were attributable to low bone mineral density.⁴ Because vitamin D and calcium play a significant role in bone health maintenance,² it is important to study factors in guideline recommendation development that may contribute to the appropriate recommended intakes for vitamin D, calcium, their food sources and beneficial diet for adults at risk of osteoporosis.

Public health guidelines provide guidance in maintaining well-being and disease prevention. However, current recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in the dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines vary significantly among countries and even among professional organizations.^{5 6 7 8} Several factors may have contributed to such variation: limited rich food sources of vitamin D and calcium; recommended reference intakes focused at the nutrient level with little consideration at the food level; and minimal or no recommendation for sun UVB exposure for vitamin D synthesis because of various concerns such as geographic location, seasons, health risk, etc. As a result, people may seek to take dietary supplements to increase their vitamin D and calcium intake levels. Further, conflicting results of the efficacy of

1
2
3 vitamin D and/or calcium supplementation^{7 9-16} in the prevention of osteoporosis and their
4
5 adverse effects in cardiac risks^{17 18} and compromised renal function^{14 16} can further complicate
6
7 the appropriate amount recommended in the public health guidelines. This may lead to
8
9 uncertainty in the health benefits of adequate intakes of vitamin D and / or calcium
10
11 supplementation in falls and osteoporosis prevention.
12
13

14
15 Findings from the previous review of food-based dietary guidelines have suggested that
16
17 inconsistencies exist in the methodological processes used to retrieve, appraise and synthesize
18
19 relevant evidence in national dietary guidelines.¹⁹ However, it remains unclear whether the
20
21 discordance in the recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium may be related to the
22
23 methods and processes used to develop these recommendations in public health guidelines. For
24
25 example, findings from a global review of food-based dietary guidelines suggest that social-
26
27 economic equity and cultural factors are still issues that need to be incorporated in guideline
28
29 development for the appropriate food intakes among populations with different backgrounds and
30
31 that there are significant regional differences in dairy representation and recommendations.²⁰ In
32
33 this study, we hypothesize that high adherence to guideline development criteria which span
34
35 from representation of guideline development group to external review process would be more
36
37 likely to formulate higher scientific rigour and culturally/ethnically appropriateness of public
38
39 health guideline recommendations.
40
41
42
43

44
45 The objective of this study is to compare the methods and processes used in formulating
46
47 public health guideline recommendations for vitamin D and calcium among middle-aged and
48
49 older adults for the prevention of osteoporosis, and to assess whether they comply with the
50
51 criteria outlined in the 2014 World Health Organization Handbook for Guideline Development.²¹
52
53 We will further assess whether the similarity or differences in the vitamin D and calcium intake
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 recommendations can be explained by the methodological quality of the guidelines in the
4
5 following domains, including characteristics of the guideline development group, conflicts of
6
7 interest disclosure and management, whether systemic review methods are used to synthesize the
8
9 evidence, types and quality of the evidence substantiating the recommendations, methods used to
10
11 determine the direction and strength of the recommendations, and external peer review process.
12
13 Findings from this study will illustrate methodological rigor and potential limitations in current
14
15 public health guidelines for vitamin D and calcium intakes.
16
17

18 19 **Methods**

20 21 **Overview**

22
23 We will include public health guidelines or policy statements related to vitamin D/
24
25 calcium intake and bone health for generally healthy adults aged 40 years and above. Because
26
27 middle-aged and older adults are individuals at risk to develop osteoporosis, we intend to include
28
29 those who may experience menopause as young as 40 years to ensure the coverage of all age
30
31 groups at risk across guidelines. We will include both food-based dietary guidelines and health
32
33 guidelines for osteoporosis (including fracture) prevention. We will use the definition described
34
35 in the 2014 WHO handbook for guideline development to define guidelines and
36
37 recommendations, i.e. “any document containing recommendations for clinical practice or public
38
39 health policy. A recommendation tells the intended end-user of the guideline what he or she can
40
41 or should do in specific situations to achieve the best health outcomes possible, individually or
42
43 collectively.”²¹
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Inclusion criteria**

- 50
51 - Most recent version of national food-based dietary guidelines
52
53
54
55
56
57

- 1
2
3 - Most recent version of national guidelines, policy statements or standards for
4 osteoporosis prevention
5
6

7 We will only include national guidelines that have been developed by a nationally or
8 internationally recognised government authority or by a medical/academic society or
9 organization. This is to ensure consistency between the food-based dietary guidelines and the
10 bone health guidelines at country (state) level, as food-based dietary guidelines are typically a
11 state government document. In addition to the guideline documents, we will include supporting
12 documents such as those provide details for the methodology used and evidence underpinning
13 the recommendations. For instance, guideline committee's reports, in which we can locate
14 methodology and supporting evidence will be included. An example is the "Scientific Report of
15 the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee," which describes the development of the
16 dietary guideline and supporting evidence for the "Dietary Guidelines for Americans 2015-
17 2020." Similarly, "A review of the evidence to address targeted questions to inform the revision
18 of the Australian Dietary Guidelines"²² as well as the Nutrient Reference Values (NRV)
19 document for Australia and New Zealand are companion documents with evidence substantiating
20 the recommendations for the "Australian Dietary Guidelines 2013."²³ If there are multiple
21 versions of a national guideline from the same country or authority, only the most recent version
22 will be included. Similarly, if an updated bone health guideline is based on the previous
23 documents that describe the processes of the recommendation development, these documents
24 will be included to locate the information on methods and evidence used to support the
25 recommendations.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Exclusion criteria**

52
53
54
55
56
57

- Food guides such as food pyramids, food plates, or simple designed pictorial or graphic representation
- Bone health guidelines regarding vitamin D and calcium recommendations in the management of osteoporosis, secondary osteoporosis (e.g. osteoporosis due to rheumatoid arthritis) or for a particular group of population (e.g. pregnant women) or those with health condition (e.g. patients with cancer, cirrhosis, etc.)

We will not include food guides, because they lack substantial materials to document the guideline development process. Guideline recommendations on clinical treatment of any bone disorders, or guidelines targeted to a particular group of populations such as those with HIV or cancer patients or pregnant or lactating women or a particular type of osteoporosis (e.g. glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis) will be excluded. This is because the focus of this study is to review recommended vitamin D and calcium intakes for generally healthy populations to maintain bone health or to prevent osteoporosis.

Search strategy

We will search guidelines or policy statements that are published from 1 January 2009 until 28 February 2019 in the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via OVID), EMBASE (via OVID), CINAHL (via EBSCO), and Practice Based Evidence in Nutrition. Additionally, the following sources which include guidelines specifically will be searched: National Guideline Clearinghouse, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, and Guidelines International Network. We will only include documents published in English but no geographic regions are restricted. We will use a combination of controlled vocabulary and free-text terms for vitamin D, sunlight, calcium, dairy, vegetable, seafood, fortified food (as these are the good dietary sources for vitamin D and / or calcium), dietary patterns, osteoporosis/fracture and guideline. The search

1
2
3 strategy for Medline via Ovid is described in **Appendix A**. Similar search strategies with
4 appropriate syntax will be applied to EMBASE and CINAHL. We will also search the gray
5 literature via the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) website for relevant food-based
6 dietary guidelines²⁴ and the International Osteoporosis Foundation²⁵ for bone health guidelines
7 from national government agencies or organizations. Additionally, we will consult leading
8 experts in the field of bone health to avoid any oversights.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Data extraction process**

17 *Recommendations for vitamin D and calcium*

18
19 Verbatim text of qualitative and quantitative recommendations on dietary intake of
20 vitamin D/calcium, vitamin D/calcium containing foods, a healthy dietary pattern beneficial to
21 bone health, supplementation dosage for vitamin D/calcium, nutrient reference intakes for
22 vitamin D and calcium, and timing and length of sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis will be
23 extracted from each included guideline. Because there is no standard for wording of
24 recommendation across and within guidelines,^{26 27} we will adopt the criteria described in the
25 report by Woolf and colleagues for the presentation and formulation of recommendations.²⁸
26 These criteria include “consistent semantic and formatting indicators,” “a summary section to
27 facilitate identification of recommendations,” “decidable and executable wording” and “avoiding
28 embedding recommendation text within long paragraphs.” We will not adopt “evidence quality
29 and recommendation strength in proximity to each recommendation,” as an objective in this
30 review is to assess the quality of evidence underpinning the recommendations. For example, in
31 bone health public guidelines, the following would be considered as eligible recommendations:
32 “General practitioners should recommend that postmenopausal women and older men maintain a
33 diet high in calcium to meet the Australian recommended dietary intake,” or “General
34 practitioners should recommend the following important lifestyle choices for all postmenopausal
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 women and older men: adequate but safe exposure to sunlight as a source of vitamin D.”²⁹
4
5 Statements or text mentioning vitamin D or calcium as knowledge-based information or as a
6
7 rationale to support an argument will be excluded as a recommendation. For example, “Soy
8
9 beverages fortified with calcium, vitamin A, and vitamin D, are included as part of the dairy
10
11 group, because they are similar to milk based on nutrient composition and in their use in
12
13 meals.”³⁰
14
15

16
17 We will use a pilot-tested data extraction form to capture vitamin D and calcium
18
19 recommendation intakes and categorize as “Yes” or “No” according to criteria described
20
21 above.²⁸ Verbatim text will be extracted, if rated as “Yes,” including numerical values and/or
22
23 recommendations without numerical values. Data extraction will be conducted by ZD, CMK/SM
24
25 independently via REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture), an electronic data capture tools
26
27 hosted at the University of Sydney.³¹ Any discrepancies in the data extracted will be resolved
28
29 through discussion with the other reviewer (CMK/SM); otherwise, further discussion with the
30
31 senior author (LB) will be carried out to resolve the disagreement through consensus.
32
33
34 Additionally, we will contact the guideline authors to obtain all relevant materials during the data
35
36 extraction to avoid missing documents.
37
38
39
40

41 *Methodological processes*

42
43

44 We will appraise guideline recommendation development processes against the criteria
45
46 outlined in the 2nd edition of the 2014 WHO Handbook for Guideline Development,²¹ a “gold
47
48 standard” for public health guideline development. The reasons we have chosen the 2014 WHO
49
50 handbook for guideline development include: it was developed by the primary international
51
52 public health agency; it is more recent compared with other standards; and it incorporates the
53
54 most comprehensive domains and elements for a rigorous guideline development.^{32 33} Compared
55
56
57

1
2
3 with the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation II (AGREE II),³⁴ the WHO
4 handbook criteria cover the same domains with more extensive details regarding the guideline
5 development processes. For example, for conflicts of interest, the 2014 WHO guideline
6 handbook includes both disclosure and management of conflicts of interest among the guideline
7 development group members and funders,²¹ while the AGREE II instrument addresses conflicts
8 of interest among the guideline development group members only.³⁴
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 The items outline in the WHO handbook with description of the criteria are described in
19 **Table 1**, which includes the following domains: Guideline development group, Conflicts of
20 interest, Review methods, Transparency of evidence substantiation, Recommendation
21 development, and Peer review process. We will record whether each included guideline
22 recommendation is compliant with each of the WHO criteria and classify as Yes, No, or Unclear.
23 If “Yes” is rated, verbatim text will be extracted from the guideline to substantiate per the
24 recommended item. “No” is referred to those which explicitly state none for the items to be
25 appraised. “Unclear” is referred to those that neither explicitly state none nor those with relevant
26 statements supporting the criterion. Three reviewers (ZD, CMK/SM) will perform the critical
27 appraisal and data extraction independently. Discrepancies will be first discussed and resolved
28 through consensus among the reviewers, and with the senior author (LB) if it remains unresolved
29 after the first attempt.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Other information to be extracted*

47
48

49 Guideline title, country of origin, guideline developing authority or organization,
50 publication year, age group of the population, gender of the population (men, women, or both),
51 and funding body will be extracted. Further, we will extract the information of the evidence
52 underpinning the recommendations including the types of evidence (primary research, systematic
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 review, or summary of evidence table: see details in “Transparency of evidence substantiation”
4
5 in Table 1) and their citation information.
6
7

8 **Main outcomes**

9

10
11 As mentioned earlier, a binary outcome will be created based on whether a
12
13 recommendation exists in a public health guideline for the following: vitamin D intakes, vitamin
14
15 D containing food consumption (such as fortified dairy or other fortified beverage and seafood),
16
17 a healthy diet for bone health, sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis, supplement use of vitamin
18
19 D, calcium reference intakes, calcium containing food consumption (such as dairy and dark-
20
21 green leafy vegetables,), and supplement use of calcium. If quantitative recommendations (those
22
23 with amount per day) are available, we will categorize the numerical values into different groups
24
25 and present the distribution of the recommended intake values.
26
27
28

29 **Analysis**

30

31
32
33 We will use descriptive statistics (e.g. frequency and proportion for categorical variables)
34
35 to summarize the characteristics of each included guideline. This will include age group of the
36
37 population, gender of the population, conflict of interest disclosed and managed, and
38
39 cultural/ethnic consideration. Across the included guidelines, we will summarize the
40
41 recommendation (those with values or recommendation text) for vitamin D and calcium, their
42
43 food sources, dietary patterns and sun exposure for vitamin D by types of guidelines (food-based
44
45 dietary guidelines versus bone health guidelines), by continent (Asia, Australia, Europe, North
46
47 America, South America, and Africa), by gross national income per capita (low, middle and
48
49 high), and by disclosure of conflict of interest (yes, no). Also, we will present the fractions of the
50
51 guidelines that are compliant with each of the criteria outlined in the WHO handbook for all
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 guidelines, food-based dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines. Finally, if feasible, we will
4
5 perform logistic regression analysis to examine the associations between each methodological
6
7 factor [Yes versus None (combining No and Unclear)] in the six domains of guideline
8
9 development methods (see Table 1) and a positive recommendation (defined as “yes” for the
10
11 recommendation) for dietary vitamin D/calcium, supplemental vitamin D/calcium, a healthy diet
12
13 for bone health, and sun exposure (for vitamin D synthesis), where each of the recommendations
14
15 will be considered as a binary outcome. Also, we may perform a multinomial logistic regression
16
17 analysis for the association between each of the methodological factors (those in Table 1) and
18
19 categories of the recommended values for vitamin D / calcium (i.e. dietary intake
20
21 values/supplemental intake values on an ordinal scale), after adjustment for guideline
22
23 characteristics. The reason that a multinomial logistic regression is proposed is because that
24
25 recommended intakes for vitamin D/ calcium in public health guidelines are often clustered or
26
27 provided as a range. For example, vitamin D recommendation in a guideline could be 400-800
28
29 IU/d, 600-800 IU/d, 800-1000 IU/d, 1500-2000 IU/D; and calcium recommendation could be
30
31 600 mg/d, 700-800 mg/d, 1000 mg/d, 1000-1200 mg/d, ≥ 1000 mg/d, etc. Therefore, a logistic
32
33 regression analysis is likely more suitable in these analyses.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Analysis of subgroups or subsets**

41
42
43 We will further perform subgroup analyses by continent (North America, South/Central
44
45 America, Africa, Australia, Asia, Europe), by gross national income per capita regarding
46
47 country’s development levels (low, middle and high), by guideline types (food-based dietary
48
49 guidelines versus osteoporosis prevention guidelines), by conflicts of interest (disclosed versus
50
51 non-disclosed; and funded by not-for-profit organization versus for-profit organization if
52
53 feasible) to summarize the proportion of compliance with the WHO criteria.
54
55
56
57

Discussion and dissemination

To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study to critically appraise methodological quality regarding guideline recommendations for dietary and supplemental vitamin D and calcium intakes, their food sources, a healthy diet pattern and sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis. This review will advance our knowledge on how guideline development methodology and processes may affect the similarity or differences of the intake recommendations. These findings will further address potential limitations in public health guidelines for the recommended intakes of vitamin D, calcium, and the relevant food sources (sun exposure) for bone health.

As we will only include guidelines or statements published in English, this may reduce sample size and limit the coverage of non-English speaking countries if their guidelines/statement reports are not published in English. Although we believe that the criteria outlined in the 2014 WHO handbook for guideline development cover the most comprehensive processes for guideline recommendation development, we understand that some guideline authorities may adopt other standards. For example, the Institute of Medicine standards are commonly used to develop trustworthy clinical guidelines.³² Therefore, we might experience guidelines with missing data regarding our stringent and comprehensive methodological criteria according to the WHO handbook for guideline development. Further, recent concerns have been raised about possible over consumption of phosphorous from meat and dairy sources and highly processed foods. Because the amount of phosphorus additives in processed food products are generally not accounted for, current nutrition databases assume that phosphorous level remains similar for the same types of foods (e.g. natural beef and processed beef products), this would potentially underestimate the actual intake of phosphorous in the populations^{35 36} and result in a

1
2
3 lower recommended intake of calcium in the guidelines.³⁷ Due to the scope and feasibility of this
4
5 study, we will not further account for such underestimation of phosphorous intake at the
6
7 population level, which could be a potential limitation of this review to address the appropriate
8
9 recommendations for calcium intake in the included guidelines.
10
11

12
13 We will seek to present our findings at international academic conferences and report our
14
15 findings in a peer-reviewed medical journal article. We also plan to present our findings to key
16
17 stakeholders in public health authorities and with public health advocates for bone health and
18
19 osteoporosis prevention.
20
21

22 23 **Conclusions**

24
25 Currently, there are no studies that have comprehensively appraised methodological rigor
26
27 in guideline development methods and processes used to develop vitamin D and calcium
28
29 recommendations. Due to global ageing and a rapid rise of osteoporosis, this review will be
30
31 timely to assess guideline recommendations for vitamin D and calcium and help to address
32
33 potential limitations and identify areas for improvement in developing future guideline
34
35 recommendations for vitamin D and calcium to maintain bone health.
36
37

38 39 40 **Support sources**

41
42 ZD, CMK and MJP are funded by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council
43
44 (NHMRC) project grant APP1139997. MAF is funded by the NHMRC and New South Wales
45
46 Health.

47
48 SM is a PhD student funded by the Country Women's Association (NSW) and Edna Winifred
49
50 Blackman Postgraduate Research Scholarship.
51

52 53 54 **Funder of the project**

1
2
3 Australian National Health and Medical Research Council project grant APP1139997
4
5
6

7 **Role of Funder**

8
9 The funder did not play a role in the development of the protocol.
10
11
12

13 **Acknowledgement**

14
15 The authors would like to thank Monica Cooper, an Academic Liaison Librarian at the
16
17 School of Life and Environmental Sciences: Biochemistry, Microbiology and Nutrition
18
19 Science, Engineering & IT Cluster for her assistance to develop the search strategy in this
20
21 systematic review.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Authors' contributions**

29
30 Study Design: ZD, LB, CMK;
31

32 Data Collection: ZD, CMK, SM;
33

34 Coding: ZD, CMK, SM;
35

36 Methods and Stats: ZD, MP, JM;
37

38 Analysis: ZD, MP, JM;
39

40 Writing: ZD (first draft);
41

42 Revising and editing: all authors;
43

44 Guarantor: ZD, LB
45

46 **Competing interests statement:** None disclosed.
47
48

49 **References**

- 50
51
52 1. Hill TR, Aspray TJ. The role of vitamin D in maintaining bone health in older people. *Ther*
53 *Adv Musculoskelet Dis* 2017;9(4):89-95. doi: 10.1177/1759720x17692502 [published
54 Online First: 2017/04/07]
55
56
57

2. International Osteoporosis Foundation. Why seniors are more vulnerable to calcium and vitamin D deficiency 2014 [Available from: <https://www.iofbonehealth.org/news/why-seniors-are-more-vulnerable-calcium-and-vitamin-d-deficiency> accessed January 3 2019].
3. International Osteoporosis Foundation. The Global Burden of Osteoporosis: A Factsheet, 2014.
4. Sánchez-Riera L, Carnahan E, Vos T, Veerman L, Norman R, Lim SS, Hoy D, et al. The global burden attributable to low bone mineral density. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2014;73(9):1635-45.
5. Health Mo. Food and Nutrition Guidelines for Healthy Older People: A background paper. Wellington, New Zealand Ministry of Health, 2013.
6. Food Safety; Authority of Ireland. Scientific Recommendations for Healthy Eating Guidelines in Ireland. Dublin, 2011:92.
7. Manson JE, Bassuk SS. Vitamin and Mineral Supplements: What Clinicians Need to Know. *JAMA* 2018;319(9):859-60. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21012 [published Online First: 2018/02/07]
8. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. Vitamin and mineral requirements in human nutrition. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, 2005:341.
9. Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Owens DK, et al. Vitamin D, Calcium, or Combined Supplementation for the Primary Prevention of Fractures in Community-Dwelling Adults: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA* 2018;319(15):1592-99. doi: 10.1001/jama.2018.3185 [published Online First: 2018/04/21]
10. Lewis JR, Radavelli-Bagatini S, Rejnmark L, et al. The effects of calcium supplementation on verified coronary heart disease hospitalization and death in postmenopausal women: a collaborative meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 2015;30(1):165-75. doi: 10.1002/jbmr.2311 [published Online First: 2014/07/22]
11. Zheng YT, Cui QQ, Hong YM, et al. A meta-analysis of high dose, intermittent vitamin D supplementation among older adults. *PLoS one* 2015;10(1):e0115850. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0115850 [published Online First: 2015/01/21]
12. Theodoratou E, Tzoulaki I, Zgaga L, et al. Vitamin D and multiple health outcomes: umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of observational studies and randomised trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2014;348:g2035. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g2035 [published Online First: 2014/04/03]
13. Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Willett WC, Orav EJ, et al. A pooled analysis of vitamin D dose requirements for fracture prevention. *The New England journal of medicine* 2012;367(1):40-9. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1109617 [published Online First: 2012/07/06]
14. Avenell A, Mak JC, O'Connell D. Vitamin D and vitamin D analogues for preventing fractures in post-menopausal women and older men. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2014;4:CD000227. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000227.pub4
15. Zhao JG, Zeng XT, Wang J, et al. Association Between Calcium or Vitamin D Supplementation and Fracture Incidence in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2017;318(24):2466-82. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.19344 [published Online First: 2017/12/28]

16. Kahwati LC, Weber RP, Pan H, et al. Vitamin D, Calcium, or Combined Supplementation for the Primary Prevention of Fractures in Community-Dwelling Adults: Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA* 2018;319(15):1600-12. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21640 [published Online First: 2018/04/21]
17. Bolland MJ, Avenell A, Baron JA, et al. Effect of calcium supplements on risk of myocardial infarction and cardiovascular events: meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2010;341:c3691. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c3691 [published Online First: 2010/07/31]
18. Wang X, Chen H, Ouyang Y, et al. Dietary calcium intake and mortality risk from cardiovascular disease and all causes: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMC medicine* 2014;12:158. doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0158-6 [published Online First: 2014/09/26]
19. Blake P, Durao S, Naude CE, et al. An analysis of methods used to synthesize evidence and grade recommendations in food-based dietary guidelines. *Nutr Rev* 2018;76(4):290-300. doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nux074
20. Herforth A, Arimond M, Alvarez-Sanchez C, et al. A Global Review of Food-Based Dietary Guidelines. *Adv Nutr* 2019 doi: 10.1093/advances/nmy130
21. The World Health Organization. WHO handbook for guideline development – 2nd ed: WHO Library 2014:179.
22. National Health and Medical Research Council; Department of Health and Ageing; Australian Government. A REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE TO ADDRESS TARGETED QUESTIONS TO INFORM THE REVISION OF THE AUSTRALIAN DIETARY GUIDELINES. In: Ageing DoHa, ed. Canberra ACT: NATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESOURCE COUNCIL, 2011.
23. National Health and Medical Research Council; Department of Health and Ageing; Australian Government. Australian Dietary Guidelines. In: Ageing DoHa, ed. Canberra, Australia: National Health and Medical Research Council, 2013.
24. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. Food-based dietary guidelines, 2019.
25. International Osteoporosis Foundation. Guideline references.
26. T H, Michel G Fau - Shiffman RN, RN S. - The Yale Guideline Recommendation Corpus: a representative sample of the knowledge content of guidelines. *Int J Med Inform* 2009;78(5):354-63.
27. AD O, Schunemann HJ Fau - Fretheim A, A F. - Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 14. Reporting guidelines. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2006;4(26):1478-4505.
28. Woolf S, Schunemann HJ, Eccles MP, et al. Developing clinical practice guidelines: types of evidence and outcomes; values and economics, synthesis, grading, and presentation and deriving recommendations. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:61. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-61
29. Clinical guideline for the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women and older men: The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, 2010:83.
30. AU.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2015 – 2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans. 8th Edition. December 2015. Available at <https://health.gov/dietaryguidelines/2015/guidelines/>.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 31. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a
- 5 metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research
- 6 informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;42(2):377-81. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
- 7
- 8 32. Committee on Standards for Developing Trustworthy Clinical Practice Guidelines. Robin
- 9 Graham MM, Dianne Miller Wolman, Sheldon Greenfield, and Earl Steinberg, Editors.
- 10 Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust. In: Academies Institute of Medicine, ed.
- 11 Washington, D.C.: THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS, 2011:266.
- 12
- 13 33. Qaseem A, Forland F, Macbeth F, et al. Guidelines International Network: toward
- 14 international standards for clinical practice guidelines. *Annals of internal medicine*
- 15 2012;156(7):525-31. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-156-7-201204030-00009
- 16
- 17 34. Brouwers M KM, Browman GP, Cluzeau F, feder G, Fervers B, Hanna S, Makarski J on
- 18 behalf of the AGREE, Consortium. NS. AGREE II: Advancing guideline development,
- 19 reporting and evaluation in healthcare. . *Can Med Assoc J* 2013;182:E839-542. doi:
- 20 10.1503/cmaj.090449
- 21
- 22 35. Uribarri J, Calvo MS. Dietary phosphorus excess: a risk factor in chronic bone, kidney, and
- 23 cardiovascular disease? *Adv Nutr* 2013;4(5):542-4. doi: 10.3945/an.113.004234
- 24
- 25 36. Calvo MS, Uribarri J. Public health impact of dietary phosphorus excess on bone and
- 26 cardiovascular health in the general population. *The American journal of clinical*
- 27 *nutrition* 2013;98(1):6-15. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.112.053934
- 28
- 29 37. Bai RJ, Cheng XG, Yan D, et al. Rabbit model of primary hyperparathyroidism induced by
- 30 high-phosphate diet. *Domest Anim Endocrinol* 2012;42(1):20-30. doi:
- 31 10.1016/j.domaniend.2011.09.001
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Table 1. Appraisal of the processes and methods used in the recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in public health guidelines

Process and Method domains	Process and Method criteria	Description	Examples where to look
I. Guideline development group (GDG, including members of steering group, research team and individuals involved formulating the final recommendations)			
Were each of the following considered in the formation of the guideline development group?	1. Discipline representation	Information about the composition, discipline, and relevant expertise of the guideline development group should be provided.	Information can be located in methods, guideline panel member list, acknowledgements, and appendices.
	2. Diversity representation	Information about gender, diversity, across the life-course, subject to different gender norms, and belonging to different income and education groups of the guideline development group.	
	3. Stakeholder input	Stakeholders such as nongovernmental organizations, advocacy groups, funders, target audiences, and service-users may be invited to ensure transparency of the processes and facilitate implementation.	
II. Conflicts of interest			
Were each of the following steps addressed regarding conflicts of interest?	4. Disclosure of conflicts of interest obtained (extract verbatim text of COI for each member)	Is there an explicit statement that all group members have declared whether they have any competing interests?	Paragraphs/chapters describing the guideline development group or
	5. Conflicts of interest managed	Members declaration of interests must be reported to the steering group. Potential candidates for membership who have major conflicts of interest, be they financial or nonfinancial, cannot be appointed to the GDG. Minor conflicts of interest can be managed at the individual	

		level (e.g. by restricting participation in parts of the GDG meeting) or at the group level.	acknowledgements section in methods, conflicts of interest, guideline panel, and appendix
	6. Disclosure of funders of the guideline obtained and disclose funder's role in influencing the guideline development process and recommendations	Is there an explicit statement of funder of the guideline and the role of funders in the final guideline recommendations?	
III. Systematic review methods			
Were methods for each of the following addressed in the guideline?	7. Formulation of key questions for the evidence review in PICO, PICOT, or PEO format (also extract the key questions in such format)	Key questions are framed in a way that enables a systematic search of the literature and delineates inclusion and exclusion criteria for the body of evidence to formulate the research questions for the recommendations in such format.	Examine the paragraphs/chapters describing the guideline development process in methods, literature search strategy and appendices.
	8. Choosing (finalizing) priority outcomes for systematic review	List high-priority key questions and the outcomes to formulate recommendations.	
	9. Systematic methods to search for evidence	Details of the strategy used to search for evidence should be provided including search terms used, sources consulted, and dates of the literature covered. Sources may include electronic databases, hand searching journals, reviewing conference proceedings, and other guidelines.	
	10. Evidence retrieval (screening and selection of eligible studies)	Process of data from eligible studies are extracted and search strategy and results should be carefully documented.	
	11. Evidence quality assessment	Each study included in a systematic review should be assessed for risk of bias (e.g. use the Cochrane risk of bias tool, Quality assessment tolls project report, etc.)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	12. Evidence synthesis	The findings of the systematic review may be synthesized in a narrative manner or quantitatively in a meta-analysis. The review should describe how data were handled and why a given approach to synthesis was taken for each outcome.	
IV. Transparency of evidence substantiation			
If evidence was explicitly linked to recommendation, what type of evidence was reported?	13. Are recommendations explicitly linked to substantiating evidence?	An explicit link between the recommendations and the evidence on which they are based should be included in the guideline. The guideline user should be able to identify the components of the body of evidence relevant to each recommendation.	Define and examine the recommendations in the guideline and the text describing the body of evidence that underpins them. Examples of commonly labeled sections or chapters in a guideline where this information can be found include: recommendations and key evidence.
	a. Primary research	Primary individual studies	
	b. Systematic reviews	Systematic reviews of clinical trials / observational studies	
	c. Summary table of the evidence	Summary of evidence table	
	d. GRADE evidence profiles	GRADE summary of evidence table	
	e. Evidence to decision table		
	f. If evidence is explicitly linked to recommendation, what is the citation information, if applicable?	List the citations of the studies underlying the recommendations	
V. Recommendation development: Factors that determine the direction and strength of a recommendation			
Was each of the following items considered when developing the recommendation? (also communicate	14. Was a consensus process clearly described for developing recommendations	A description of the methods used to formulate the recommendations and how final decisions were arrived at should be provided. For example, methods may include a voting system, informal consensus, and formal consensus	

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47</p> <p>authority whether other documentation may provide such information if they cannot be located in the main guideline reports)</p>	<p>techniques. Areas of disagreement and methods of resolving them should be specified.</p> <p>15. Was a method employed to determine strength and/or certainty of the recommendation?</p> <p>16. Priority of the problem: Is the problem a burden of disease?</p> <p>17. Quality of the evidence: Is higher quality of the body of evidence included to support the recommendation?</p> <p>18. Certainty of evidence: Does the recommendation include consistent body of evidence (e.g. confidence in effect estimates)?</p> <p>19. Benefits and harms: Are evaluations performed on the net benefit or net harm associate with an intervention or exposure?</p> <p>20. Balance: Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects support the recommendation?</p>	<p>Is there a method provided to influence the direction and strength of a recommendation (e.g. use GRADE framework and others)</p> <p>The problem's priority is determined by its importance and frequency (i.e. burden of disease, disease prevalence or baseline risk). The greater the importance of the problem, the greater the likelihood of a strong recommendation.</p> <p>Is there a method provided to grade the quality of body of evidence to assess the strength of the recommendation (e.g. GRADE and others)</p> <p>The quality of the evidence – the degree of confidence in the estimates of effect. This is a key factor in determining the strength of a recommendation.</p> <p>The balance between an intervention's or exposure's benefits and harms. Did the guideline development group consider the magnitude of the effects and the relative importance of the outcomes, including any disadvantages or inconveniences associated with the intervention.</p> <p>Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favour the intervention or the comparison?</p>	<p>Examples of commonly labeled sections or chapters in a guideline where this information can be found include methods and guideline development process or in appendices.</p>
---	--	---	---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	21. Outcome importance: Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcome?	Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcomes, including adverse effects and burden of the test and downstream outcomes of clinical management that is guided by the test results?	
	22. Equity: Does the evidence used reduce inequalities, improve equity or contribute to the realization of one of several human rights defined under the international legal framework?	What would be the impact on health equity?	
	23. Acceptability: Is the option acceptable to key stakeholders?	A strategy to address concerns about acceptability during implementation will be included in the guideline with the recommendations. Acceptability is affected by several factors, such as who benefits from an intervention and who is harmed by it; who pays for it or saves money on account of it; and when the benefits, harms and costs occur.	
	24. Feasibility: Is the option feasible to implement?	Feasibility is influenced by the resources available, programmatic considerations, the existing and the necessary infrastructure and training, etc.	
VI. Peer review process			
	25. Was the guideline/recommendation reviewed by an external review group?	Is there an explicit statement about the peer review of the draft final guideline? The external review group is composed of persons interested in the subject of the guideline as well as individuals who will be affected by the recommendations.	Information can be located in methods, guideline panel member list, acknowledgements, and appendices.

Appendix A. Medline search strategy via Ovid

1. Vitamin D/
2. Cholecalciferol/
3. Ergocalciferols/
4. Vitamin D Deficiency/
5. Sunlight/
6. Ultraviolet Rays/
7. Vit* D.tw.
8. Ergocalciferol.tw.
9. Calciferol.tw.
10. Cholecalciferol.tw.
11. Sunlight.tw.
12. (Light adj3 expos*).tw.
13. UV.tw.
14. Ultraviolet.tw.
15. or/1-14
16. exp Calcium/
17. Calcium, Dietary/
18. calcium.mp.
19. or/16-18
20. 15 or 19
21. Diet/
22. "Diet, Food, and Nutrition"/
23. Diet, Vegetarian/
24. Diet, Vegan/
25. Diet, Western/
26. Diet Therapy/
27. Healthy Diet/

- 1
- 2
- 3 28. Food, Fortified/
- 4
- 5 29. Dietary supplements/
- 6
- 7 30. exp Dairy Products/
- 8
- 9 31. Shellfish/
- 10
- 11 32. Fishes/
- 12
- 13 33. exp Seafood/
- 14
- 15 34. Vegetables/
- 16
- 17 35. exp Vegetable Products/
- 18
- 19 36. Agaricales/
- 20
- 21 37. Diet*.tw.
- 22
- 23 38. (Diet* adj3 supplement*).tw.
- 24
- 25 39. (Fortified adj3 food*).tw.
- 26
- 27 40. Vegetable*.tw.
- 28
- 29 41. Mushroom*.tw.
- 30
- 31 42. Dairy.tw.
- 32
- 33 43. Milk.tw.
- 34
- 35 44. Cheese.tw.
- 36
- 37 45. Yog?urt.tw.
- 38
- 39 46. Seafood.tw.
- 40
- 41 47. Fish.tw.
- 42
- 43 48. Shellfish.tw.
- 44
- 45 49. or/21-48
- 46
- 47 50. 20 or 49
- 48
- 49 51. 20 and 49
- 50
- 51 52. exp clinical pathway/
- 52
- 53 53. exp clinical protocol/
- 54
- 55 54. exp consensus/
- 56
- 57 55. exp consensus development conference/
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3 56. exp consensus development conferences as topic/
- 4
- 5 57. critical pathways/
- 6
- 7 58. exp guideline/
- 8
- 9 59. guidelines as topic/
- 10
- 11 60. exp practice guideline/
- 12
- 13 61. practice guidelines as topic/
- 14
- 15 62. health planning guidelines/
- 16
- 17 63. (guideline or practice guideline or consensus development conference or consensus
- 18 development conference, NIH).pt.
- 19
- 20 64. (position statement* or policy statement* or practice parameter* or best
- 21 practice*).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 22
- 23 65. (standards or guideline or guidelines).ti,kf,kw.
- 24
- 25 66. ((practice or treatment* or clinical) adj guideline*).ab.
- 26
- 27 67. (CPG or CPGs).ti.
- 28
- 29 68. consensus*.ti,kf,kw.
- 30
- 31 69. consensus*.ab. /freq=2
- 32
- 33 70. ((critical or clinical or practice) adj2 (path or paths or pathway or pathways or
- 34 protocol*).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 35
- 36 71. recommendat*.ti,kf,kw.
- 37
- 38 72. (care adj2 (standard or path or paths or pathway or pathways or map or maps or plan or
- 39 plans)).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 40
- 41 73. (algorithm* adj2 (screening or examination or test or tested or testing or assessment* or
- 42 diagnosis or diagnoses or diagnosed or diagnosing)).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 43
- 44 74. or/52-73
- 45
- 46 75. Osteoporosis/
- 47
- 48 76. Fractures, Bone/
- 49
- 50 77. Bone Density/
- 51
- 52 78. osteoporosis.tw.
- 53
- 54 79. fracture*,bone.tw.
- 55
- 56 80. bone density.tw.
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1
2
3 81. bone health.mp.
4

5 82. 75 or 76 or 77 or 78 or 79 or 80 or 81
6

7 83. Adult/
8

9 84. Aged/
10

11 85. Middle Aged/
12

13 86. adult*.tw.
14

15 87. aged.tw.
16

17 88. middle aged.tw.
18

19 89. 83 or 84 or 85 or 86 or 87 or 88
20

21 90. 74 and 82 and 89
22

23 91. 50 and 90
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	(Page No.#)
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	16
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; n/a otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	15
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	15
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	16
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	4-5
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	5
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-7
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	8
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	26-29
Study records:			

Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	9-10
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	10
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	10 and 11
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9-11
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	12
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	10-11
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	12
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)	12-13
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	13
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	12
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	n/a
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	n/a

* It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

BMJ Open

Methodological quality of public health guideline recommendations on vitamin D and calcium intakes – a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031840.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Dai, Zhaoli (Joy); The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy Kroeger, Cynthia; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy McDonald, Sally ; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy Page, Matthew; Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine McKenzie, Joanne; Monash University Allman-Farinelli, Margaret; University of Sydney, Faculty of Science Raubenheimer, David; The University of Sydney Bero, Lisa; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy
Primary Subject Heading:	Health policy
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, NUTRITION & DIETETICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Methodological quality of public health guideline recommendations on vitamin D and**
4 **calcium intakes – a systematic review protocol**
5
6

7 Zhaoli Dai¹, Cynthia M. Kroeger¹, Sally McDonald¹, Matthew J. Page², Joanne E. McKenzie²,
8 Margaret Allman-Farinelli¹, David Raubenheimer³, Lisa Bero¹
9
10

11
12 ¹Charles Perkins Centre, School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of
13 Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia

14 ²School of Public Health and Preventative Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road,
15 Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia

16 ³Charles Perkins Centre, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and
17 Health, The University of Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia
18
19

20
21
22 **Correspondence to** Zhaoli Dai, PhD, MS; Email: zhaoli.dai-keller@sydney.edu.au
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Abstract**

2 **Introduction** Current recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in dietary guidelines and
3 bone health guidelines vary significantly among countries and professional organizations. It is
4 unknown whether the methods used to develop these recommendations followed a rigorous
5 process and how the differences in methods used may affect the recommended intakes of vitamin
6 D and calcium. The objectives of this study are 1) collate and compare recommendations for
7 vitamin D and calcium across guidelines, 2) appraise methodological quality of the guideline
8 recommendations, and 3) identify methodological factors that may affect the recommended
9 intakes for vitamin D and calcium. This study will make a significant contribution to enhancing
10 the methodological rigour in public health guidelines for vitamin D and calcium
11 recommendations.

12 **Methods and analyses** We will conduct a systematic review to evaluate vitamin D and calcium
13 recommendations for osteoporosis prevention in generally healthy middle-aged and older adults.
14 Methodological assessment will be performed for each guideline against those outlined in the
15 2014 World Health Organization (WHO) Handbook for Guideline Development. A systematic
16 search strategy will be applied to locate food-based dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines
17 indexed in various electronic databases, guideline repositories and gray literature from 1 January
18 2009 to 28 February 2019. Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize the data on intake
19 recommendation and on proportion of guidelines consistent with the WHO criteria. Logistic
20 regression, if feasible, will be used to assess the relationships between the methodological factors
21 and the recommendation intakes.

1
2
3 22 **Ethics and dissemination** Ethics approval is not required as we will only extract published data
4
5 23 or information from the published guidelines. Results of this review will be disseminated through
6
7 24 conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications.
8
9

10 25 **Protocol registration number** PROSPERO, CRD42019126452.
11
12 26

13
14 27 **Keywords:** vitamin D, calcium, public health guidelines, guideline development methods
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study that critically appraises the methodological quality of guideline recommendations for vitamin D and calcium intakes.
- This study will provide insights to address potential limitations in guideline development and identify areas for improvement in developing vitamin D and calcium recommendations.
- Eligible guidelines published in English only may potentially limit the sample size of and regional coverage of the guideline recommendations included in our analysis.
- Information required to assess methodological quality of guidelines may be missing, particularly when other guideline development standards (e.g. the Institute of Medicine standards for trustworthy clinical guidelines) rather than the WHO Handbook for Guideline Development were used to develop public health guidelines.

28 Introduction

29 Current recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in dietary guidelines and bone
30 health guidelines vary significantly among countries and professional organizations.^{1 2 3 4}
31 Several factors may have contributed to such variation: dietary sources of vitamin D and calcium
32 are different among countries and regions, with some but not all fortifying the nutrients in the
33 food products as an example; some guidelines may consider supplement use as part of the
34 recommendations, while others recommend sunlight exposure as a source of vitamin D. For the
35 latter, race and skin tone also contribute to the appropriate length of time of sun exposure to
36 achieve certain vitamin D levels. Another possible reason for these varied recommendations is
37 that evidence on the efficacy of vitamin D and/or calcium supplementation^{3 5-14} in the prevention
38 of osteoporosis, particularly in fracture prevention, is conflicting; and their adverse effects in
39 cardiac risks^{15 16} and compromised renal function^{10 12} must also be taken into account. Further,
40 what defines vitamin D deficiency measured by serum 25(OH)D is debatable and varies among
41 the general populations.^{14 17-19} This variation of optimal vitamin D level further contributes to the
42 inconsistent findings in randomized control trials testing the effects of different dosages of
43 vitamin D and/or calcium supplementation in fracture prevention.^{13 14}

44 Additionally, inconsistencies exist in the guideline development processes used to
45 retrieve, appraise and synthesize relevant evidence, as well as in reporting conflicts of interest
46 and funding sources in national dietary guidelines.²⁰ This can potentially further affect the
47 discordance in the recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium in guideline
48 recommendations. For example, findings from a global review of food-based dietary guidelines
49 suggest that social and economic equity and cultural factors need to be incorporated in guideline
50 development in order to recommend appropriate food intakes among populations with different

1
2
3 51 backgrounds. Further, there are significant regional differences in dairy intake recommendations
4
5 52 across different dietary guidelines.²¹ As dairy is the main source of dietary calcium and vitamin
6
7 53 D in some but not all populations,^{22 23} recommendations about dietary sources need to consider
8
9 54 the ethnic and cultural contexts. Taken together, guideline development methods should include,
10
11 55 but be not limited to, evidence identification, evaluation, and synthesis; as well as incorporating
12
13 56 stakeholders' positions, feasibility and acceptability of the recommendations.
14
15

16
17 57 The objective of this study is to compare recommendations for vitamin D and calcium
18
19 58 intakes and their associated parameters [e.g. sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis and serum
20
21 59 25(OH)D level to define vitamin D status], and the methods used in formulating these
22
23 60 recommendations for middle-aged and older adults in public health guidelines. We will further
24
25 61 assess whether the similarity or differences in the vitamin D and calcium intake
26
27 62 recommendations can be explained by the guidelines' methodological quality. Findings from this
28
29 63 study will illustrate methodological rigour and potential limitations in current public health
30
31 64 guidelines for vitamin D and calcium recommended intakes.
32
33

34 35 65 **Methods**

36 37 66 **Overview**

38
39 67 We will include public health guidelines or policy statements related to vitamin D/
40
41 68 calcium intake and bone health for generally healthy adults aged 40 years and above. Because
42
43 69 middle-aged and older adults are individuals at risk to develop osteoporosis, we intend to include
44
45 70 those who may experience menopause as young as 40 years to ensure the coverage of all age
46
47 71 groups at risk in the included guidelines. We will include both food-based dietary guidelines and
48
49 72 health guidelines for osteoporosis (including fracture) prevention. We will use the definition
50
51 73 described in the 2014 World Health Organization (WHO) Handbook for Guideline Development
52
53 74 to define guidelines and recommendations, i.e. "any document containing recommendations for
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 75 clinical practice or public health policy. A recommendation tells the intended end-user of the
4
5 76 guideline what he or she can or should do in specific situations to achieve the best health
6
7
8 77 outcomes possible, individually or collectively.”²⁴
9

10 78 **Inclusion criteria**

- 11 79 - Most recent version of national food-based dietary guidelines
- 12
- 13 80 - Most recent version of national guidelines, policy statements or standards for
- 14
- 15
- 16 81 osteoporosis prevention
- 17
- 18

19
20 82 We will only include national guidelines that have been developed by a nationally or
21
22 83 internationally recognised government authority or by a medical/academic society or
23
24 84 organization. This is to ensure consistency between the food-based dietary guidelines and the
25
26 85 bone health guidelines at country (state) level, as food-based dietary guidelines are typically a
27
28 86 state government document. In addition to the guideline documents, we will include supporting
29
30 87 documents such as those provide details for the methodology used and evidence underpinning
31
32 88 the recommendations. For instance, guideline committee’s reports, in which we can locate
33
34 89 methodology and supporting evidence will be included. An example is the “Scientific Report of
35
36 90 the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee,” which describes the development of the
37
38 91 dietary guideline and supporting evidence for the “Dietary Guidelines for Americans 2015-
39
40 92 2020.” Similarly, “A review of the evidence to address targeted questions to inform the revision
41
42 93 of the Australian Dietary Guidelines”²⁵ as well as the Nutrient Reference Values (NRV)
43
44 94 document for Australia and New Zealand are companion documents with evidence substantiating
45
46 95 the recommendations for the “Australian Dietary Guidelines 2013.”²⁶ If there are multiple
47
48 96 versions of a national guideline from the same country or authority, only the most recent version
49
50 97 will be included. Similarly, if an updated bone health guideline is based on the previous
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 98 documents that describe the processes of the recommendation development, these documents
4
5 99 will be included to locate the information on methods and evidence used to support the
6
7
8 100 recommendations.

101 **Exclusion criteria**

- 102 - Food guides such as food pyramids, food plates, or simple designed pictorial or graphic
103 representation
- 104 - Bone health guidelines regarding vitamin D and calcium recommendations in the
105 management of osteoporosis, secondary osteoporosis (e.g. osteoporosis due to
106 rheumatoid arthritis) or for a particular group of population (e.g. pregnant women) or
107 those with health condition (e.g. patients with cancer, cirrhosis, etc.)

108 We will not include food guides, because they lack substantial materials to document the
109 guideline development process. Guideline recommendations on clinical treatment of any bone
110 disorders, or guidelines targeted to a particular group of populations such as those with HIV or
111 cancer patients or pregnant or lactating women or a particular type of osteoporosis (e.g.
112 glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis) will be excluded. This is because the focus of this study is
113 to review recommended vitamin D and calcium intakes for generally healthy populations to
114 maintain bone health or to prevent osteoporosis.

115 **Search strategy**

116 We will search guidelines or policy statements that are published from 1 January 2009
117 until 28 February 2019 in the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via OVID), EMBASE
118 (via OVID), CINAHL (via EBSCO), and Practice Based Evidence in Nutrition. Additionally, the
119 following sources which include guidelines specifically will be searched: National Guideline
120 Clearinghouse, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, and Guidelines International

1
2
3 121 Network. We will only include documents published in English but no geographic regions are
4
5 122 restricted. We will use a combination of controlled vocabulary and free-text terms for vitamin D,
6
7
8 123 sunlight, calcium, dairy, vegetable, seafood, fortified food (as these are the good dietary sources
9
10 124 for vitamin D and / or calcium), dietary patterns, osteoporosis/fracture and guideline. The search
11
12 125 strategy for Medline via Ovid is described in **Supplemental material**. Similar search strategies
13
14
15 126 with appropriate syntax will be applied to EMBASE and CINAHL. We will also search the gray
16
17 127 literature via the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) website for relevant food-based
18
19 128 dietary guidelines²⁷ and the International Osteoporosis Foundation²⁸ for bone health guidelines
20
21
22 129 from national government agencies or organizations. Additionally, we will consult leading
23
24 130 experts in the field of bone health to avoid any oversights.
25
26

27 131 **Data extraction process**

28 132 *Recommendations for vitamin D and calcium*

29
30 133 Verbatim text of qualitative and quantitative recommendations on dietary intake of
31
32
33 134 vitamin D/calcium, vitamin D/calcium containing foods, a healthy dietary pattern beneficial to
34
35 135 bone health, supplementation dosage for vitamin D/calcium, nutrient reference intakes for
36
37 136 vitamin D and calcium, timing and length of sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis, and serum
38
39
40 137 25(OH)D level to define vitamin D status will be extracted from each included guideline.
41
42 138 Because there is no standard for wording of recommendation across and within guidelines,^{29 30}
43
44 139 we will adopt the criteria described in the report by Woolf and colleagues for the presentation
45
46 140 and formulation of recommendations.³¹ These criteria include “consistent semantic and
47
48 141 formatting indicators,” “a summary section to facilitate identification of recommendations,”
49
50
51 142 “decidable and executable wording” and “avoiding embedding recommendation text within long
52
53
54 143 paragraphs.” We will not adopt “evidence quality and recommendation strength in proximity to
55
56 144 each recommendation,” as an objective in this review is to assess the quality of evidence
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 145 underpinning the recommendations. For example, in bone health public guidelines, the following
4
5 146 would be considered as eligible recommendations: “General practitioners should recommend that
6
7 147 postmenopausal women and older men maintain a diet high in calcium to meet the Australian
8
9 148 recommended dietary intake,” or “General practitioners should recommend the following
10
11 149 important lifestyle choices for all postmenopausal women and older men: adequate but safe
12
13 150 exposure to sunlight as a source of vitamin D.”³² Statements or text mentioning vitamin D or
14
15 151 calcium as knowledge-based information or as a rationale to support an argument will be
16
17 152 excluded as a recommendation. For example, “Soy beverages fortified with calcium, vitamin A,
18
19 153 and vitamin D, are included as part of the dairy group, because they are similar to milk based on
20
21 154 nutrient composition and in their use in meals.”³³
22
23
24
25
26

27 155 We will use a pilot-tested data extraction form to capture vitamin D and calcium
28
29 156 recommendation intakes and categorize as “Yes” or “No” according to criteria described
30
31 157 above.³¹ Verbatim text will be extracted, if rated as “Yes,” including numerical values and/or
32
33 158 recommendations without numerical values. Data extraction will be conducted by ZD, CMK/SM
34
35 159 independently via REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture), an electronic data capture tools
36
37 160 hosted at the University of Sydney.³⁴ Any discrepancies in the data extracted will be resolved
38
39 161 through discussion with the other reviewer (CMK/SM); otherwise, further discussion with the
40
41 162 senior author (LB) will be carried out to resolve the disagreement through consensus.
42
43
44

45 163 Additionally, we will contact the guideline authors to obtain all relevant materials during the data
46
47 164 extraction to avoid missing documents.
48
49

50 165 *Methodological processes*

51
52

53 166 We will appraise the guideline recommendation development processes against the
54
55 167 criteria outlined in the 2nd edition of the 2014 WHO Handbook for Guideline Development,²⁴ a
56
57

1
2
3 168 “gold standard” for public health guideline development. The reasons we have chosen the 2014
4
5 169 WHO Handbook for Guideline Development include: it was developed by the primary
6
7 170 international public health agency; it is more recent compared with other standards; and it
8
9 171 incorporates the most comprehensive domains and elements for a rigorous guideline
10
11 172 development.^{35 36} Compared with the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation II
12
13 173 (AGREE II),³⁷ the WHO handbook criteria cover the same domains with more extensive details
14
15 174 regarding the guideline development processes. For example, for conflicts of interest, the 2014
16
17 175 WHO guideline handbook includes both disclosure and management of conflicts of interest
18
19 176 among the guideline development group members and funders,²⁴ while the AGREE II instrument
20
21 177 addresses conflicts of interest among the guideline development group members only.³⁷
22
23
24
25
26

27 178 The items outline in the WHO handbook with description of the criteria are described in
28
29 179 **Table 1**, which includes the following domains: Guideline development group, Conflicts of
30
31 180 interest, Review methods, Transparency of evidence substantiation, Recommendation
32
33 181 development, and Peer review process. We will record whether each included guideline
34
35 182 recommendation is consistent with each of the WHO criteria and classify as Yes, No, or Unclear.
36
37 183 If “Yes” is rated, verbatim text will be extracted from the guideline to substantiate per the
38
39 184 recommended item. “No” is referred to those which explicitly state none for the items to be
40
41 185 appraised. “Unclear” is referred to those that neither explicitly state none nor those with relevant
42
43 186 statements supporting the criterion. Three reviewers (ZD, CMK/SM) will perform the critical
44
45 187 appraisal and data extraction independently. Discrepancies will be first discussed and resolved
46
47 188 through consensus among the reviewers, and with the senior author (LB) if it remains unresolved
48
49 189 after the first attempt.
50
51
52
53
54

55 190 *Other information to be extracted*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 191 Guideline title, country of origin, guideline developing authority or organization,
4
5 192 publication year, age group of the population, gender of the population (men, women, or both),
6
7 193 and funding body will be extracted. Further, we will extract the information of the evidence
8
9 194 underpinning the recommendations including the types of evidence (primary research, systematic
10
11 195 review, or summary of evidence table: see details in “Transparency of evidence substantiation”
12
13 196 in Table 1) and their citation information.
14
15
16

17 197 **Patient and public involvement**

18
19
20 198 No patient involved.
21
22

23 199 **Main outcomes**

24
25
26 200 As mentioned earlier, a binary outcome will be created based on whether a
27
28 201 recommendation exists in a public health guideline for the following: vitamin D intakes, vitamin
29
30 202 D containing food consumption (such as fortified dairy or other fortified beverage and seafood),
31
32 203 a healthy diet for bone health, sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis, supplement use of vitamin
33
34 204 D, serum 25(OH)D level to define vitamin D status, calcium reference intakes, calcium
35
36 205 containing food consumption (such as dairy and dark-green leafy vegetables,), and supplement
37
38 206 use of calcium. If quantitative recommendations (those with amount per day) are available, we
39
40 207 will categorize the numerical values into different groups and present the distribution of the
41
42 208 recommended intake values.
43
44
45
46
47

48 209 **Data synthesis**

49
50
51 210 Using the information extracted from the included guidelines, we will summarize the
52
53 211 recommendation (those with values or recommendation text) for vitamin D and calcium, their
54
55 212 food sources, dietary patterns and sun exposure for vitamin D, as well as serum level of
56
57

1
2
3 213 25(OH)D to define vitamin D status, by types of guidelines (food-based dietary guidelines versus
4
5 214 bone health guidelines), by continent (Asia, Australia, Europe, North America, South America,
6
7
8 215 and Africa), by gross national income per capita (low, middle and high), and by disclosure of
9
10 216 conflict of interest (yes, no). Also, we will present the proportions of the guidelines that are
11
12 217 consistent with each of the criteria outlined in the WHO handbook for all guidelines, and
13
14 218 separately for the dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines. We will also use descriptive
15
16 219 statistics (e.g. frequency and proportion for categorical variables) to summarize the
17
18
19 220 characteristics of each included guideline.

21
22 221 If feasible, we will perform logistic regression analysis to examine the associations
23
24 222 between each methodological factor [Yes versus None (combining No and Unclear)] in the six
25
26 223 domains of guideline development methods (see Table 1) and a positive recommendation
27
28 224 (defined as “yes” for the recommendation) for dietary vitamin D/calcium, supplemental vitamin
29
30 225 D/calcium, a healthy diet for bone health, sun exposure (for vitamin D synthesis), and optimal
31
32 226 vitamin D level, where each of the recommendations will be considered as a binary outcome.
33
34
35 227 Also, we may perform a multinomial logistic regression analysis for the association between
36
37 228 each of the methodological factors (those in Table 1) and categories of the recommended values
38
39 229 for vitamin D / calcium (i.e. dietary intake values/supplemental intake values and optimal
40
41 230 25(OH)D level on an ordinal scale), after adjustment for key guideline characteristics. The
42
43 231 reason that a multinomial logistic regression is proposed is because that recommended intakes
44
45 232 for vitamin D/ calcium and optimal vitamin D level in public health guidelines are often
46
47 233 clustered or provided as a range. For example, vitamin D recommendation in a guideline could
48
49 234 be 400-800 IU/d, 600-800 IU/d, 800-1000 IU/d, 1500-2000 IU/d; and calcium recommendation
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 235 could be 600 mg/d, 700-800 mg/d, 1000 mg/d, 1000-1200 mg/d, ≥ 1000 mg/d, etc. Therefore, a
4
5 236 logistic regression analysis is likely more suitable in these analyses.
6
7

8 237 **Discussion and dissemination**

9

10
11 238 To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study to critically appraise
12
13 239 methodological quality regarding guideline recommendations for dietary and supplemental
14
15 240 vitamin D and calcium intakes, their food sources, a healthy diet pattern and sun exposure for
16
17 241 vitamin D synthesis. This review will advance our knowledge on how guideline development
18
19 242 methodology and processes may affect the similarity or differences of the intake
20
21 243 recommendations. These findings will further address potential limitations in public health
22
23 244 guidelines for the recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium in middle-aged and older
24
25 245 adults.
26
27
28
29

30 246 As we will only include guidelines or statements published in English, this may reduce
31
32 247 sample size and limit the coverage of non-English speaking countries if their
33
34 248 guidelines/statement reports are not published in English. Although we believe that the criteria
35
36 249 outlined in the 2014 WHO handbook for guideline development cover the most comprehensive
37
38 250 processes for guideline recommendation development, we understand that some guideline
39
40 251 authorities may adopt other standards. For example, the Institute of Medicine standards are
41
42 252 commonly used to develop trustworthy clinical guidelines.³⁵ Therefore, we might experience
43
44 253 guidelines with missing data regarding our stringent and comprehensive methodological criteria
45
46 254 according to the WHO handbook for guideline development. Further, recent concerns have been
47
48 255 raised about possible over consumption of phosphorous from meat and dairy sources and highly
49
50 256 processed foods. Because the amount of phosphorus additives in processed food products are
51
52 257 generally not accounted for, current nutrition databases assume that phosphorous level remains
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 258 similar for the same types of foods (e.g. natural beef and processed beef products), this would
4
5 259 potentially underestimate the actual intake of phosphorous in the populations,^{38 39} and result in a
6
7
8 260 lower recommended intake of calcium in the guidelines.⁴⁰ Due to the scope and feasibility of this
9
10 261 study, we will not further account for such underestimation of phosphorous intake at the
11
12 262 population level, which could be a potential limitation of this review to address the appropriate
13
14
15 263 recommendations for calcium intake in the included guidelines.
16

17
18 264 Also, assessment of the quality of the evidence underpinning the recommendations for
19
20 265 vitamin D and calcium is out of the scope in this study protocol, as the focus here is to appraise
21
22 266 the methods used to develop the public health guidelines. However, we will extract information
23
24
25 267 about the types of evidence cited to support each included recommendation. In a follow-up
26
27 268 study, we will further assess the evidence quality (e.g. risk of bias) of the cited studies and
28
29 269 systematic reviews.
30

31
32 270 We will seek to present our findings at international academic conferences and report our
33
34 271 findings in a peer-reviewed medical journal article. We also plan to present our findings to key
35
36
37 272 stakeholders in public health authorities and with public health advocates for bone health and
38
39 273 osteoporosis prevention.
40

41 42 274 **Conclusions** 43

44 275 Currently, there are no studies that have comprehensively appraised methodological
45
46 276 rigour in guideline development methods and processes used to develop vitamin D and calcium
47
48
49 277 recommendations. Due to global ageing and a rapid rise of osteoporosis, this review will provide
50
51 278 a timely assessment of guideline recommendations for vitamin D and calcium, and help to
52
53
54 279 address potential limitations and identify areas for improvement in developing future guideline
55
56 280 recommendations for vitamin D and calcium.
57

1
2
3 2814
5 282 **Support sources**

6 283 ZD, CMK and MJP are funded by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council
7
8 284 (NHMRC) project grant APP1139997. JEM is supported by an Australian NHMRC Career
9
10 285 Development Fellowship (1143429). MAF is funded by the NHMRC and New South Wales
11
12 286 Health.

13 287 SM is a PhD student funded by the Country Women's Association (NSW) and Edna Winifred
14
15
16 288 Blackman Postgraduate Research Scholarship.

17
18 28919
20 290 **Funder of the project**

21
22 291 Australian National Health and Medical Research Council project grant APP1139997

23
24 29225
26 293 **Role of Funder**

27
28 294 The funder did not play a role in the development of the protocol.

29
30 29531
32 296 **Acknowledgement**

33
34
35 297 The authors would like to thank Monica Cooper, an Academic Liaison Librarian at the
36
37 298 School of Life and Environmental Sciences: Biochemistry, Microbiology and Nutrition
38
39 299 Science, Engineering & IT Cluster for her assistance to develop the search strategy in this
40
41
42 300 systematic review.

43
44 301

45 302

46 303 **Authors' contributions**

47
48
49 304 Study Design: ZD, LB, CMK;

50 305 Data Collection: ZD;

51 306 Coding: ZD, CMK, SM;

52 307 Methods and Stats: ZD, MJP, JEM;

1
2
3 308 Writing: ZD (first draft);
4
5 309 Revising and editing: ZD, CMK, SM, MJP, JEM, MAF, DR, LB;
6
7 310 Guarantor: ZD, LB

8 311 **Competing interests statement:** None disclosed.
9
10 312
11 313

13 314 **References**

- 15 315
16 316 1. Ministry of Health. Food and Nutrition Guidelines for Healthy Older People: A background
17
18 317 paper. Wellington, New Zealand Ministry of Health, 2013.
19
20 318 2. Food Safety Authority of Ireland. Scientific Recommendations for Healthy Eating Guidelines
21
22 319 in Ireland. Dublin, 2011:92.
23
24 320 3. Manson JE, Bassuk SS. Vitamin and Mineral Supplements: What Clinicians Need to Know.
25
26 321 *JAMA* 2018;319(9):859-60. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21012 [published Online First:
27
28 322 2018/02/07]
29
30 323 4. World Health Organization and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
31
32 324 Vitamin and mineral requirements in human nutrition. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO
33
34 325 Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, 2005:341.
35
36 326 5. Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Owens DK, et al. Vitamin D, Calcium, or Combined
37
38 327 Supplementation for the Primary Prevention of Fractures in Community-Dwelling
39
40 328 Adults: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA*
41
42 329 2018;319(15):1592-99. doi: 10.1001/jama.2018.3185 [published Online First:
43
44 330 2018/04/21]
45
46 331 6. Lewis JR, Radavelli-Bagatini S, Rejnmark L, et al. The effects of calcium supplementation on
47
48 332 verified coronary heart disease hospitalization and death in postmenopausal women: a
49
50 333 collaborative meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of bone and mineral*

- 1
2
3 334 *research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research*
4
5 335 2015;30(1):165-75. doi: 10.1002/jbmr.2311 [published Online First: 2014/07/22]
6
7
8 336 7. Zheng YT, Cui QQ, Hong YM, et al. A meta-analysis of high dose, intermittent vitamin D
9
10 337 supplementation among older adults. *PloS one* 2015;10(1):e0115850. doi:
11
12 338 10.1371/journal.pone.0115850 [published Online First: 2015/01/21]
13
14
15 339 8. Theodoratou E, Tzoulaki I, Zgaga L, et al. Vitamin D and multiple health outcomes: umbrella
16
17 340 review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of observational studies and randomised
18
19 341 trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2014;348:g2035. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g2035 [published
20
21 342 Online First: 2014/04/03]
22
23
24 343 9. Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Willett WC, Orav EJ, et al. A pooled analysis of vitamin D dose
25
26 344 requirements for fracture prevention. *The New England journal of medicine*
27
28 345 2012;367(1):40-9. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1109617 [published Online First: 2012/07/06]
29
30
31 346 10. Avenell A, Mak JC, O'Connell D. Vitamin D and vitamin D analogues for preventing
32
33 347 fractures in post-menopausal women and older men. *The Cochrane database of*
34
35 348 *systematic reviews* 2014;4:CD000227. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000227.pub4
36
37
38 349 11. Zhao JG, Zeng XT, Wang J, et al. Association Between Calcium or Vitamin D
39
40 350 Supplementation and Fracture Incidence in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A
41
42 351 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2017;318(24):2466-82. doi:
43
44 352 10.1001/jama.2017.19344 [published Online First: 2017/12/28]
45
46
47 353 12. Kahwati LC, Weber RP, Pan H, et al. Vitamin D, Calcium, or Combined Supplementation
48
49 354 for the Primary Prevention of Fractures in Community-Dwelling Adults: Evidence Report
50
51 355 and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 356 2018;319(15):1600-12. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21640 [published Online First:
4
5 357 2018/04/21]
6
7
8 358 13. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Avenell A. Assessment of research waste part 2: wrong study
9
10 359 populations- an exemplar of baseline vitamin D status of participants in trials of vitamin
11
12 360 D supplementation. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2018;18(1):101. doi: 10.1186/s12874-018-
13
14 361 0555-1
15
16
17 362 14. Burt LA, Billington EO, Rose MS, et al. Effect of High-Dose Vitamin D Supplementation on
18
19 363 Volumetric Bone Density and Bone Strength: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*
20
21 364 2019;322(8):736-45. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.11889
22
23
24 365 15. Bolland MJ, Avenell A, Baron JA, et al. Effect of calcium supplements on risk of myocardial
25
26 366 infarction and cardiovascular events: meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*
27
28 367 2010;341:c3691. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c3691 [published Online First: 2010/07/31]
29
30
31 368 16. Wang X, Chen H, Ouyang Y, et al. Dietary calcium intake and mortality risk from
32
33 369 cardiovascular disease and all causes: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMC*
34
35 370 *medicine* 2014;12:158. doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0158-6 [published Online First:
36
37 371 2014/09/26]
38
39
40 372 17. Manson JE, Brannon PM, Rosen CJ, et al. Vitamin D Deficiency - Is There Really a
41
42 373 Pandemic? *The New England journal of medicine* 2016;375(19):1817-20.
43
44
45 374 18. Thacher TD, Clarke BL CJ R. Clinical practice. Vitamin D insufficiency. *The New England*
46
47 375 *journal of medicine* 2011;364(3):248-54.
48
49
50 376 19. Heaney RP, Holick MF Why the IOM recommendations for vitamin D are deficient. *Journal*
51
52 377 *of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and*
53
54 378 *Mineral Research* 2011;26(3):455-7.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 379 20. Blake P, Duraio S, Naude CE, et al. An analysis of methods used to synthesize evidence and
4
5 380 grade recommendations in food-based dietary guidelines. *Nutr Rev* 2018;76(4):290-300.
6
7 381 doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nux074
8
9
10 382 21. Herforth A, Arimond M, Alvarez-Sanchez C, et al. A Global Review of Food-Based Dietary
11
12 383 Guidelines. *Adv Nutr* 2019 doi: 10.1093/advances/nmy130
13
14 384 22. Ohta H, Uenishi K, Shiraki M. Recent nutritional trends of calcium and vitamin D in East
15
16 385 Asia. *Osteoporos Sarcopenia* 2016;2(4):208-13. doi: 10.1016/j.afos.2016.08.002
17
18 386 23. O'Neil CE, Nicklas TA, Keast DR, et al. Ethnic disparities among food sources of energy and
19
20 387 nutrients of public health concern and nutrients to limit in adults in the United States:
21
22 388 NHANES 2003-2006. *Food Nutr Res* 2014;58:15784. doi: 10.3402/fnr.v58.15784
23
24 389 24. World Health Organization. WHO handbook for guideline development – 2nd ed: WHO
25
26 390 Library 2014:179.
27
28 391 25. National Health and Medical Resource Council. A review of the evidence to address targeted
29
30 392 questions to inform the revision of the Australian Dietary Guidelines. In Department of
31
32 393 Health and Ageing, ed. Canberra ACT: National Health and Medical Resource Council,
33
34 394 2011.
35
36 395 26. National Health and Medical Resource Council. Australian Dietary Guidelines. In: In
37
38 396 Department of Health and Ageing, ed. Canberra, Australia: National Health and Medical
39
40 397 Research Council, 2013.
41
42 398 27. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Food-based dietary guidelines,
43
44 399 2019.
45
46 400 28. International Osteoporosis Foundation. Guideline references. URL:
47
48 401 <http://www.iofbonehealth.org/guideline-references>; accessed on 03 March 2019.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 402 29. Hussain T, Michel G, Shiffman RN. The Yale Guideline Recommendation Corpus: a
4
5 403 representative sample of the knowledge content of guidelines. *Int J Med Inform*
6
7 404 2009;78(5):354-63.
8
9
10 405 30. Schünemann HJ, Fretheim A, Oxman AD; WHO Advisory Committee on Health Research.
11
12 406 Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 14. Reporting
13
14 407 guidelines. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2006;4(26):1478-4505.
15
16
17 408 31. Woolf S, Schunemann HJ, Eccles MP, et al. Developing clinical practice guidelines: types of
18
19 409 evidence and outcomes; values and economics, synthesis, grading, and presentation and
20
21 410 deriving recommendations. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:61. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-61
22
23
24 411 32. The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners. Clinical guideline for the prevention
25
26 412 and treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women and older men: The Royal
27
28 413 Australian College of General Practitioners, 2010:83.
29
30
31 414 33. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2015-
32
33 415 2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans. 8th Edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department
34
35 416 of Agriculture, 2015:144.
36
37
38 417 34. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a
39
40 418 metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research
41
42 419 informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;42(2):377-81. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
43
44
45 420 35. Committee on Standards for Developing Trustworthy Clinical Practice Guidelines. Graham
46
47 421 R, Mancher M, Wolman DM, Greenfield S, and Steinberg E, Editors. Clinical Practice
48
49 422 Guidelines We Can Trust. In: Academies Institute of Medicine, ed. Washington, D.C.:
50
51 423 The National Academies Press, 2011:266.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 424 36. Qaseem A, Forland F, Macbeth F, et al. Guidelines International Network: toward
4
5 425 international standards for clinical practice guidelines. *Annals of internal medicine*
6
7 426 2012;156(7):525-31. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-156-7-201204030-00009
9
10 427 37. Brouwers M KM, Browman GP, Cluzeau F, feder G, Fervers B, Hanna S, Makarski J on
11
12 428 behalf of the AGREE, Consortium. NS. AGREE II: Advancing guideline development,
13
14 429 reporting and evaluation in healthcare. . *Can Med Assoc J* 2013;182:E839-542. doi:
15
16 430 10.1503/cmaj.090449
18
19 431 38. Uribarri J, Calvo MS. Dietary phosphorus excess: a risk factor in chronic bone, kidney, and
20
21 432 cardiovascular disease? *Adv Nutr* 2013;4(5):542-4. doi: 10.3945/an.113.004234
22
23 433 39. Calvo MS, Uribarri J. Public health impact of dietary phosphorus excess on bone and
24
25 434 cardiovascular health in the general population. *The American journal of clinical*
26
27 435 *nutrition* 2013;98(1):6-15. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.112.053934
28
29 436 40. Bai RJ, Cheng XG, Yan D, et al. Rabbit model of primary hyperparathyroidism induced by
30
31 437 high-phosphate diet. *Domest Anim Endocrinol* 2012;42(1):20-30. doi:
32
33 438 10.1016/j.domaniend.2011.09.001
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 440
42 441
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Appraisal of the processes and methods used in the recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in public health guidelines

Process and Method domains	Process and Method criteria	Description	Examples where to look
I. Guideline development group (GDG, including members of steering group, research team and individuals involved formulating the final recommendations)			
Were each of the following considered in the formation of the guideline development group?	1. Discipline representation	Information about the composition, discipline, and relevant expertise of the guideline development group should be provided.	Information can be located in methods, guideline panel member list, acknowledgements, and appendices.
	2. Diversity representation	Information about gender, diversity, across the life-course, subject to different gender norms, and belonging to different income and education groups of the guideline development group.	
	3. Stakeholder input	Stakeholders such as nongovernmental organizations, advocacy groups, funders, target audiences, and service-users may be invited to ensure transparency of the processes and facilitate implementation.	
II. Conflicts of interest			
Were each of the following steps addressed regarding conflicts of interest?	4. Disclosure of conflicts of interest obtained (extract verbatim text of COI for each member)	Is there an explicit statement that all group members have declared whether they have any competing interests?	Paragraphs/chapters describing the guideline development group or
	5. Conflicts of interest managed	Members declaration of interests must be reported to the steering group. Potential candidates for membership who have major conflicts of interest, be they financial or nonfinancial, cannot be appointed to the GDG. Minor conflicts of interest can be managed at the individual	

		level (e.g. by restricting participation in parts of the GDG meeting) or at the group level.	acknowledgements section in methods, conflicts of interest, guideline panel, and appendix
	6. Disclosure of funders of the guideline obtained and disclose funder's role in influencing the guideline development process and recommendations	Is there an explicit statement of funder of the guideline and the role of funders in the final guideline recommendations?	
III. Systematic review methods			
Were methods for each of the following addressed in the guideline?	7. Formulation of key questions for the evidence review in PICO, PICOT, or PEO format (also extract the key questions in such format)	Key questions are framed in a way that enables a systematic search of the literature and delineates inclusion and exclusion criteria for the body of evidence to formulate the research questions for the recommendations in such format.	Examine the paragraphs/chapters describing the guideline development process in methods, literature search strategy and appendices.
	8. Choosing (finalizing) priority outcomes for systematic review	List high-priority key questions and the outcomes to formulate recommendations.	
	9. Systematic methods to search for evidence	Details of the strategy used to search for evidence should be provided including search terms used, sources consulted, and dates of the literature covered. Sources may include electronic databases, hand searching journals, reviewing conference proceedings, and other guidelines.	
	10. Evidence retrieval (screening and selection of eligible studies)	Process of data from eligible studies are extracted and search strategy and results should be carefully documented.	
	11. Evidence quality assessment	Each study included in a systematic review should be assessed for risk of bias (e.g. use the Cochrane risk of bias tool, Quality assessment tolls project report, etc.)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	12. Evidence synthesis	The findings of the systematic review may be synthesized in a narrative manner or quantitatively in a meta-analysis. The review should describe how data were handled and why a given approach to synthesis was taken for each outcome.	
IV. Transparency of evidence substantiation			
If evidence was explicitly linked to recommendation, what type of evidence was reported?	13. Are recommendations explicitly linked to substantiating evidence?	An explicit link between the recommendations and the evidence on which they are based should be included in the guideline. The guideline user should be able to identify the components of the body of evidence relevant to each recommendation.	Define and examine the recommendations in the guideline and the text describing the body of evidence that underpins them. Examples of commonly labeled sections or chapters in a guideline where this information can be found include: recommendations and key evidence.
	a. Primary research	Primary individual studies	
	b. Systematic reviews	Systematic reviews of clinical trials / observational studies	
	c. Summary table of the evidence	Summary of evidence table	
	d. GRADE evidence profiles	GRADE summary of evidence table	
	e. Evidence to decision table		
	f. If evidence is explicitly linked to recommendation, what is the citation information, if applicable?	List the citations of the studies underlying the recommendations	
V. Recommendation development: Factors that determine the direction and strength of a recommendation			
Was each of the following items considered when developing the recommendation? (also communicate	14. Was a consensus process clearly described for developing recommendations	A description of the methods used to formulate the recommendations and how final decisions were arrived at should be provided. For example, methods may include a voting system, informal consensus, and formal consensus	

<p>authority whether other documentation may provide such information if they cannot be located in the main guideline reports)</p>		<p>techniques. Areas of disagreement and methods of resolving them should be specified.</p>	<p>Examples of commonly labeled sections or chapters in a guideline where this information can be found include methods and guideline development process or in appendices.</p>
<p>15. Was a method employed to determine strength and/or certainty of the recommendation?</p>	<p>Is there a method provided to influence the direction and strength of a recommendation (e.g. use GRADE framework and others)</p>		
<p>16. Priority of the problem: Is the problem a burden of disease?</p>	<p>The problem's priority is determined by its importance and frequency (i.e. burden of disease, disease prevalence or baseline risk). The greater the importance of the problem, the greater the likelihood of a strong recommendation.</p>		
<p>17. Quality of the evidence: Is higher quality of the body of evidence included to support the recommendation?</p>	<p>Is there a method provided to grade the quality of body of evidence to assess the strength of the recommendation (e.g. GRADE and others)</p>		
<p>18. Certainty of evidence: Does the recommendation include consistent body of evidence (e.g. confidence in effect estimates)?</p>	<p>The quality of the evidence – the degree of confidence in the estimates of effect. This is a key factor in determining the strength of a recommendation.</p>		
<p>19. Benefits and harms: Are evaluations performed on the net benefit or net harm associate with an intervention or exposure?</p>	<p>The balance between an intervention's or exposure's benefits and harms. Did the guideline development group consider the magnitude of the effects and the relative importance of the outcomes, including any disadvantages or inconveniences associated with the intervention.</p>		
<p>20. Balance: Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects support the recommendation?</p>	<p>Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favour the intervention or the comparison?</p>		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	21. Outcome importance: Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcome?	Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcomes, including adverse effects and burden of the test and downstream outcomes of clinical management that is guided by the test results?	
	22. Equity: Does the evidence used reduce inequalities, improve equity or contribute to the realization of one of several human rights defined under the international legal framework?	What would be the impact on health equity?	
	23. Acceptability: Is the option acceptable to key stakeholders?	A strategy to address concerns about acceptability during implementation will be included in the guideline with the recommendations. Acceptability is affected by several factors, such as who benefits from an intervention and who is harmed by it; who pays for it or saves money on account of it; and when the benefits, harms and costs occur.	
	24. Feasibility: Is the option feasible to implement?	Feasibility is influenced by the resources available, programmatic considerations, the existing and the necessary infrastructure and training, etc.	
VI. Peer review process			
	25. Was the guideline/recommendation reviewed by an external review group?	Is there an explicit statement about the peer review of the draft final guideline? The external review group is composed of persons interested in the subject of the guideline as well as individuals who will be affected by the recommendations.	Information can be located in methods, guideline panel member list, acknowledgements, and appendices.

Supplemental material: Medline search strategy via Ovid

1. Vitamin D/
2. Cholecalciferol/
3. Ergocalciferols/
4. Vitamin D Deficiency/
5. Sunlight/
6. Ultraviolet Rays/
7. Vit* D.tw.
8. Ergocalciferol.tw.
9. Calciferol.tw.
10. Cholecalciferol.tw.
11. Sunlight.tw.
12. (Light adj3 expos*).tw.
13. UV.tw.
14. Ultraviolet.tw.
15. or/1-14
16. exp Calcium/
17. Calcium, Dietary/
18. calcium.mp.
19. or/16-18
20. 15 or 19
21. Diet/
22. "Diet, Food, and Nutrition"/
23. Diet, Vegetarian/
24. Diet, Vegan/
25. Diet, Western/
26. Diet Therapy/
27. Healthy Diet/

- 1
- 2
- 3 28. Food, Fortified/
- 4
- 5 29. Dietary supplements/
- 6
- 7 30. exp Dairy Products/
- 8
- 9 31. Shellfish/
- 10
- 11 32. Fishes/
- 12
- 13 33. exp Seafood/
- 14
- 15 34. Vegetables/
- 16
- 17 35. exp Vegetable Products/
- 18
- 19 36. Agaricales/
- 20
- 21 37. Diet*.tw.
- 22
- 23 38. (Diet* adj3 supplement*).tw.
- 24
- 25 39. (Fortified adj3 food*).tw.
- 26
- 27 40. Vegetable*.tw.
- 28
- 29 41. Mushroom*.tw.
- 30
- 31 42. Dairy.tw.
- 32
- 33 43. Milk.tw.
- 34
- 35 44. Cheese.tw.
- 36
- 37 45. Yog?urt.tw.
- 38
- 39 46. Seafood.tw.
- 40
- 41 47. Fish.tw.
- 42
- 43 48. Shellfish.tw.
- 44
- 45 49. or/21-48
- 46
- 47 50. 20 or 49
- 48
- 49 51. 20 and 49
- 50
- 51 52. exp clinical pathway/
- 52
- 53 53. exp clinical protocol/
- 54
- 55 54. exp consensus/
- 56
- 57 55. exp consensus development conference/
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3 56. exp consensus development conferences as topic/
- 4
- 5 57. critical pathways/
- 6
- 7 58. exp guideline/
- 8
- 9 59. guidelines as topic/
- 10
- 11 60. exp practice guideline/
- 12
- 13 61. practice guidelines as topic/
- 14
- 15 62. health planning guidelines/
- 16
- 17 63. (guideline or practice guideline or consensus development conference or consensus
- 18 development conference, NIH).pt.
- 19
- 20 64. (position statement* or policy statement* or practice parameter* or best
- 21 practice*).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 22
- 23 65. (standards or guideline or guidelines).ti,kf,kw.
- 24
- 25 66. ((practice or treatment* or clinical) adj guideline*).ab.
- 26
- 27 67. (CPG or CPGs).ti.
- 28
- 29 68. consensus*.ti,kf,kw.
- 30
- 31 69. consensus*.ab. /freq=2
- 32
- 33 70. ((critical or clinical or practice) adj2 (path or paths or pathway or pathways or
- 34 protocol*).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 35
- 36 71. recommendat*.ti,kf,kw.
- 37
- 38 72. (care adj2 (standard or path or paths or pathway or pathways or map or maps or plan or
- 39 plans)).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 40
- 41 73. (algorithm* adj2 (screening or examination or test or tested or testing or assessment* or
- 42 diagnosis or diagnoses or diagnosed or diagnosing)).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 43
- 44 74. or/52-73
- 45
- 46 75. Osteoporosis/
- 47
- 48 76. Fractures, Bone/
- 49
- 50 77. Bone Density/
- 51
- 52 78. osteoporosis.tw.
- 53
- 54 79. fracture*,bone.tw.
- 55
- 56 80. bone density.tw.
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1
2
3 81. bone health.mp.
4

5 82. 75 or 76 or 77 or 78 or 79 or 80 or 81
6

7 83. Adult/
8

9 84. Aged/
10

11 85. Middle Aged/
12

13 86. adult*.tw.
14

15 87. aged.tw.
16

17 88. middle aged.tw.
18

19 89. 83 or 84 or 85 or 86 or 87 or 88
20

21 90. 74 and 82 and 89
22

23 91. 50 and 90
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	(Page No.#)
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	16
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; n/a otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	15
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	15
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	16
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	4-5
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	5
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-7
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	8
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	26-29
Study records:			

Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	9-10
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	10
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	10 and 11
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9-11
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	12
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	10-11
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	12
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)	12-13
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	13
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	12
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	n/a
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	n/a

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

BMJ Open

Methodological quality of public health guideline recommendations on vitamin D and calcium intakes – a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031840.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Dai, Zhaoli (Joy); The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy Kroeger, Cynthia; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy McDonald, Sally ; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy Page, Matthew; Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine McKenzie, Joanne; Monash University Allman-Farinelli, Margaret; University of Sydney, Faculty of Science Raubenheimer, David; The University of Sydney Bero, Lisa; The University of Sydney, School of Pharmacy
Primary Subject Heading:	Health policy
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, NUTRITION & DIETETICS

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Methodological quality of public health guideline recommendations on vitamin D and**
4 **calcium intakes – a systematic review protocol**
5
6

7 Zhaoli Dai¹, Cynthia M. Kroeger¹, Sally McDonald¹, Matthew J. Page², Joanne E. McKenzie²,
8 Margaret Allman-Farinelli¹, David Raubenheimer³, Lisa Bero¹
9
10

11
12 ¹Charles Perkins Centre, School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of
13 Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia
14

15
16 ²School of Public Health and Preventative Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road,
17 Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia
18

19
20 ³Charles Perkins Centre, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and
21 Health, The University of Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia
22
23

24
25 **Correspondence to** Zhaoli Dai, PhD, MS; Charles Perkins Centre, School of Pharmacy, Faculty
26 of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, D17, The Hub, Camperdown, NSW, 2006,
27 Australia. Telephone: 61(0)286277707; Email: zhaoli.dai-keller@sydney.edu.au.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Abstract**

2 **Introduction** Current recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in dietary guidelines and
3 bone health guidelines vary significantly among countries and professional organizations. It is
4 unknown whether the methods used to develop these recommendations followed a rigorous
5 process and how the differences in methods used may affect the recommended intakes of vitamin
6 D and calcium. The objectives of this study are 1) collate and compare recommendations for
7 vitamin D and calcium across guidelines, 2) appraise methodological quality of the guideline
8 recommendations, and 3) identify methodological factors that may affect the recommended
9 intakes for vitamin D and calcium. This study will make a significant contribution to enhancing
10 the methodological rigour in public health guidelines for vitamin D and calcium
11 recommendations.

12 **Methods and analyses** We will conduct a systematic review to evaluate vitamin D and calcium
13 recommendations for osteoporosis prevention in generally healthy middle-aged and older adults.
14 Methodological assessment will be performed for each guideline against those outlined in the
15 2014 World Health Organization (WHO) Handbook for Guideline Development. A systematic
16 search strategy will be applied to locate food-based dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines
17 indexed in various electronic databases, guideline repositories and gray literature from 1 January
18 2009 to 28 February 2019. Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize the data on intake
19 recommendation and on proportion of guidelines consistent with the WHO criteria. Logistic
20 regression, if feasible, will be used to assess the relationships between the methodological factors
21 and the recommendation intakes.

1
2
3 22 **Ethics and dissemination** Ethics approval is not required as we will only extract published data
4
5 23 or information from the published guidelines. Results of this review will be disseminated through
6
7 24 conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications.
8
9

10 25 **Protocol registration number** PROSPERO, CRD42019126452.
11
12 26

13
14 27 **Keywords:** vitamin D, calcium, public health guidelines, guideline development methods
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study that critically appraises the methodological quality of guideline recommendations for vitamin D and calcium intakes.
- This study will provide insights to address potential limitations in guideline development and identify areas for improvement in developing vitamin D and calcium recommendations.
- Eligible guidelines published in English only may potentially limit the sample size of and regional coverage of the guideline recommendations included in our analysis.
- Information required to assess methodological quality of guidelines may be missing, particularly when other guideline development standards (e.g. the Institute of Medicine standards for trustworthy clinical guidelines) rather than the WHO Handbook for Guideline Development were used to develop public health guidelines.

28 Introduction

29 Current recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in dietary guidelines and bone
30 health guidelines vary significantly among countries and professional organizations.^{1 2 3 4}
31 Several factors may have contributed to such variation: dietary sources of vitamin D and calcium
32 are different among countries and regions, with some but not all fortifying the nutrients in the
33 food products as an example; some guidelines may consider supplement use as part of the
34 recommendations, while others recommend sunlight exposure as a source of vitamin D. For the
35 latter, race and skin tone also contribute to the appropriate length of time of sun exposure to
36 achieve certain vitamin D levels. Another possible reason for these varied recommendations is
37 that evidence on the efficacy of vitamin D and/or calcium supplementation^{3 5-14} in the prevention
38 of osteoporosis, particularly in fracture prevention, is conflicting; and their adverse effects in
39 cardiac risks^{15 16} and compromised renal function^{10 12} must also be taken into account. Further,
40 what defines vitamin D deficiency measured by serum 25(OH)D is debatable and varies among
41 the general populations.^{14 17-19} This variation of optimal vitamin D level further contributes to the
42 inconsistent findings in randomized control trials testing the effects of different dosages of
43 vitamin D and/or calcium supplementation in fracture prevention.^{13 14}

44 Additionally, inconsistencies exist in the guideline development processes used to
45 retrieve, appraise and synthesize relevant evidence, as well as in reporting conflicts of interest
46 and funding sources in national dietary guidelines.²⁰ This can potentially further affect the
47 discordance in the recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium in guideline
48 recommendations. For example, findings from a global review of food-based dietary guidelines
49 suggest that social and economic equity and cultural factors need to be incorporated in guideline
50 development in order to recommend appropriate food intakes among populations with different

1
2
3 51 backgrounds. Further, there are significant regional differences in dairy intake recommendations
4
5 52 across different dietary guidelines.²¹ As dairy is the main source of dietary calcium and vitamin
6
7 53 D in some but not all populations,^{22 23} recommendations about dietary sources need to consider
8
9 54 the ethnic and cultural contexts. Taken together, guideline development methods should include,
10
11 55 but be not limited to, evidence identification, evaluation, and synthesis; as well as incorporating
12
13 56 stakeholders' positions, feasibility and acceptability of the recommendations.
14
15

16
17 57 The objective of this study is to compare recommendations for vitamin D and calcium
18
19 58 intakes and their associated parameters [e.g. sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis and serum
20
21 59 25(OH)D level to define vitamin D status], and the methods used in formulating these
22
23 60 recommendations for middle-aged and older adults in public health guidelines. We will further
24
25 61 assess whether the similarity or differences in the vitamin D and calcium intake
26
27 62 recommendations can be explained by the guidelines' methodological quality. Findings from this
28
29 63 study will illustrate methodological rigour and potential limitations in current public health
30
31 64 guidelines for vitamin D and calcium recommended intakes.
32
33

34 35 65 **Methods**

36 37 66 **Overview**

38
39 67 We will include public health guidelines or policy statements related to vitamin D/
40
41 68 calcium intake and bone health for generally healthy adults aged 40 years and above. Because
42
43 69 middle-aged and older adults are individuals at risk to develop osteoporosis, we intend to include
44
45 70 those who may experience menopause as young as 40 years to ensure the coverage of all age
46
47 71 groups at risk in the included guidelines. We will include both food-based dietary guidelines and
48
49 72 health guidelines for osteoporosis (including fracture) prevention. We will use the definition
50
51 73 described in the 2014 World Health Organization (WHO) Handbook for Guideline Development
52
53 74 to define guidelines and recommendations, i.e. "any document containing recommendations for
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 75 clinical practice or public health policy. A recommendation tells the intended end-user of the
4
5 76 guideline what he or she can or should do in specific situations to achieve the best health
6
7
8 77 outcomes possible, individually or collectively.”²⁴
9

10 78 **Inclusion criteria**

- 11 79 - Most recent version of national food-based dietary guidelines
- 12
- 13 80 - Most recent version of national guidelines, policy statements or standards for
- 14
- 15
- 16 81 osteoporosis prevention
- 17
- 18

19
20 82 We will only include national guidelines that have been developed by a nationally or
21
22 83 internationally recognised government authority or by a medical/academic society or
23
24 84 organization. This is to ensure consistency between the food-based dietary guidelines and the
25
26 85 bone health guidelines at country (state) level, as food-based dietary guidelines are typically a
27
28 86 state government document. In addition to the guideline documents, we will include supporting
29
30 87 documents such as those provide details for the methodology used and evidence underpinning
31
32 88 the recommendations. For instance, guideline committee’s reports, in which we can locate
33
34 89 methodology and supporting evidence will be included. An example is the “Scientific Report of
35
36 90 the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee,” which describes the development of the
37
38 91 dietary guideline and supporting evidence for the “Dietary Guidelines for Americans 2015-
39
40 92 2020.” Similarly, “A review of the evidence to address targeted questions to inform the revision
41
42 93 of the Australian Dietary Guidelines”²⁵ as well as the Nutrient Reference Values (NRV)
43
44 94 document for Australia and New Zealand are companion documents with evidence substantiating
45
46 95 the recommendations for the “Australian Dietary Guidelines 2013.”²⁶ If there are multiple
47
48 96 versions of a national guideline from the same country or authority, only the most recent version
49
50 97 will be included. Similarly, if an updated bone health guideline is based on the previous
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 98 documents that describe the processes of the recommendation development, these documents
4
5 99 will be included to locate the information on methods and evidence used to support the
6
7
8 100 recommendations.

101 **Exclusion criteria**

- 102 - Food guides such as food pyramids, food plates, or simple designed pictorial or graphic
103 representation
- 104 - Bone health guidelines regarding vitamin D and calcium recommendations in the
105 management of osteoporosis, secondary osteoporosis (e.g. osteoporosis due to
106 rheumatoid arthritis) or for a particular group of population (e.g. pregnant women) or
107 those with health condition (e.g. patients with cancer, cirrhosis, etc.)

108 We will not include food guides, because they lack substantial materials to document the
109 guideline development process. Guideline recommendations on clinical treatment of any bone
110 disorders, or guidelines targeted to a particular group of populations such as those with HIV or
111 cancer patients or pregnant or lactating women or a particular type of osteoporosis (e.g.
112 glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis) will be excluded. This is because the focus of this study is
113 to review recommended vitamin D and calcium intakes for generally healthy populations to
114 maintain bone health or to prevent osteoporosis.

115 **Search strategy**

116 We will search guidelines or policy statements that are published from 1 January 2009
117 until 28 February 2019 in the following electronic databases: MEDLINE (via OVID), EMBASE
118 (via OVID), CINAHL (via EBSCO), and Practice Based Evidence in Nutrition. Additionally, the
119 following sources which include guidelines specifically will be searched: National Guideline
120 Clearinghouse, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, and Guidelines International

1
2
3 121 Network. We will only include documents published in English but no geographic regions are
4
5 122 restricted. We will use a combination of controlled vocabulary and free-text terms for vitamin D,
6
7
8 123 sunlight, calcium, dairy, vegetable, seafood, fortified food (as these are the good dietary sources
9
10 124 for vitamin D and / or calcium), dietary patterns, osteoporosis/fracture and guideline. The search
11
12 125 strategy for Medline via Ovid is described in **Supplemental material**. Similar search strategies
13
14
15 126 with appropriate syntax will be applied to EMBASE and CINAHL. We will also search the gray
16
17 127 literature via the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) website for relevant food-based
18
19 128 dietary guidelines²⁷ and the International Osteoporosis Foundation²⁸ for bone health guidelines
20
21
22 129 from national government agencies or organizations. Additionally, we will consult leading
23
24 130 experts in the field of bone health to avoid any oversights.
25
26

27 131 **Data extraction process**

28 132 *Recommendations for vitamin D and calcium*

29
30 133 Verbatim text of qualitative and quantitative recommendations on dietary intake of
31
32
33 134 vitamin D/calcium, vitamin D/calcium containing foods, a healthy dietary pattern beneficial to
34
35 135 bone health, supplementation dosage for vitamin D/calcium, nutrient reference intakes for
36
37 136 vitamin D and calcium, timing and length of sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis, and serum
38
39
40 137 25(OH)D level to define vitamin D status will be extracted from each included guideline.
41
42 138 Because there is no standard for wording of recommendation across and within guidelines,^{29 30}
43
44 139 we will adopt the criteria described in the report by Woolf and colleagues for the presentation
45
46 140 and formulation of recommendations.³¹ These criteria include “consistent semantic and
47
48 141 formatting indicators,” “a summary section to facilitate identification of recommendations,”
49
50
51 142 “decidable and executable wording” and “avoiding embedding recommendation text within long
52
53
54 143 paragraphs.” We will not adopt “evidence quality and recommendation strength in proximity to
55
56 144 each recommendation,” as an objective in this review is to assess the quality of evidence
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 145 underpinning the recommendations. For example, in bone health public guidelines, the following
4
5 146 would be considered as eligible recommendations: “General practitioners should recommend that
6
7 147 postmenopausal women and older men maintain a diet high in calcium to meet the Australian
8
9 148 recommended dietary intake,” or “General practitioners should recommend the following
10
11 149 important lifestyle choices for all postmenopausal women and older men: adequate but safe
12
13 150 exposure to sunlight as a source of vitamin D.”³² Statements or text mentioning vitamin D or
14
15 151 calcium as knowledge-based information or as a rationale to support an argument will be
16
17 152 excluded as a recommendation. For example, “Soy beverages fortified with calcium, vitamin A,
18
19 153 and vitamin D, are included as part of the dairy group, because they are similar to milk based on
20
21 154 nutrient composition and in their use in meals.”³³
22
23
24
25
26

27 155 We will use a pilot-tested data extraction form to capture vitamin D and calcium
28
29 156 recommendation intakes and categorize as “Yes” or “No” according to criteria described
30
31 157 above.³¹ Verbatim text will be extracted, if rated as “Yes,” including numerical values and/or
32
33 158 recommendations without numerical values. Data extraction will be conducted independently via
34
35 159 REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture), an electronic data capture tools hosted at the
36
37 160 University of Sydney.³⁴ Any discrepancies in the data extracted will be resolved through
38
39 161 discussion with the other reviewer; otherwise, further discussion with the senior author will be
40
41 162 carried out to resolve the disagreement through consensus. Additionally, we will contact the
42
43 163 guideline authors to obtain all relevant materials during the data extraction to avoid missing
44
45 164 documents.
46
47
48
49

50 165 *Methodological processes*

51
52
53 166 We will appraise the guideline recommendation development processes against the
54
55 167 criteria outlined in the 2nd edition of the 2014 WHO Handbook for Guideline Development,²⁴ a
56
57

1
2
3 168 “gold standard” for public health guideline development. The reasons we have chosen the 2014
4
5 169 WHO Handbook for Guideline Development include: it was developed by the primary
6
7 170 international public health agency; it is more recent compared with other standards; and it
8
9 171 incorporates the most comprehensive domains and elements for a rigorous guideline
10
11 172 development.^{35 36} Compared with the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research and Evaluation II
12
13 173 (AGREE II),³⁷ the WHO handbook criteria cover the same domains with more extensive details
14
15 174 regarding the guideline development processes. For example, for conflicts of interest, the 2014
16
17 175 WHO guideline handbook includes both disclosure and management of conflicts of interest
18
19 176 among the guideline development group members and funders,²⁴ while the AGREE II instrument
20
21 177 addresses conflicts of interest among the guideline development group members only.³⁷
22
23
24
25
26

27 178 The items outline in the WHO handbook with description of the criteria are described in
28
29 179 **Table 1**, which includes the following domains: Guideline development group, Conflicts of
30
31 180 interest, Review methods, Transparency of evidence substantiation, Recommendation
32
33 181 development, and Peer review process. We will record whether each included guideline
34
35 182 recommendation is consistent with each of the WHO criteria and classify as Yes, No, or Unclear.
36
37 183 If “Yes” is rated, verbatim text will be extracted from the guideline to substantiate per the
38
39 184 recommended item. “No” is referred to those which explicitly state none for the items to be
40
41 185 appraised. “Unclear” is referred to those that neither explicitly state none nor those with relevant
42
43 186 statements supporting the criterion. Three reviewers will perform the critical appraisal and data
44
45 187 extraction independently. Discrepancies will be first discussed and resolved through consensus
46
47 188 among the reviewers, and with the senior author if it remains unresolved after the first attempt.
48
49
50
51
52

53 189 *Other information to be extracted*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 190 Guideline title, country of origin, guideline developing authority or organization,
4
5
6 191 publication year, age group of the population, gender of the population (men, women, or both),
7
8 192 and funding body will be extracted. Further, we will extract the information of the evidence
9
10 193 underpinning the recommendations including the types of evidence (primary research, systematic
11
12 194 review, or summary of evidence table: see details in “Transparency of evidence substantiation”
13
14
15 195 in Table 1) and their citation information.

16 17 18 196 **Patient and public involvement**

19
20
21 197 No patient involved.

22 23 24 198 **Main outcomes**

25
26 199 As mentioned earlier, a binary outcome will be created based on whether a
27
28 200 recommendation exists in a public health guideline for the following: vitamin D intakes, vitamin
29
30 201 D containing food consumption (such as fortified dairy or other fortified beverage and seafood),
31
32 202 a healthy diet for bone health, sun exposure for vitamin D synthesis, supplement use of vitamin
33
34 203 D, serum 25(OH)D level to define vitamin D status, calcium reference intakes, calcium
35
36 204 containing food consumption (such as dairy and dark-green leafy vegetables,), and supplement
37
38 205 use of calcium. If quantitative recommendations (those with amount per day) are available, we
39
40 206 will categorize the numerical values into different groups and present the distribution of the
41
42 207 recommended intake values.

43 44 45 46 47 48 208 **Data synthesis**

49
50
51 209 Using the information extracted from the included guidelines, we will summarize the
52
53 210 recommendation (those with values or recommendation text) for vitamin D and calcium, their
54
55 211 food sources, dietary patterns and sun exposure for vitamin D, as well as serum level of

1
2
3 212 25(OH)D to define vitamin D status, by types of guidelines (food-based dietary guidelines versus
4
5 213 bone health guidelines), by continent (Asia, Australia, Europe, North America, South America,
6
7 214 and Africa), by gross national income per capita (low, middle and high), and by disclosure of
8
9 215 conflict of interest (yes, no). Also, we will present the proportions of the guidelines that are
10
11 216 consistent with each of the criteria outlined in the WHO handbook for all guidelines, and
12
13 217 separately for the dietary guidelines and bone health guidelines. We will also use descriptive
14
15 218 statistics (e.g. frequency and proportion for categorical variables) to summarize the
16
17 219 characteristics of each included guideline.
18
19
20
21

22 220 If feasible, we will perform logistic regression analysis to examine the associations
23
24 221 between each methodological factor [Yes versus None (combining No and Unclear)] in the six
25
26 222 domains of guideline development methods (see Table 1) and a positive recommendation
27
28 223 (defined as “yes” for the recommendation) for dietary vitamin D/calcium, supplemental vitamin
29
30 224 D/calcium, a healthy diet for bone health, sun exposure (for vitamin D synthesis), and optimal
31
32 225 vitamin D level, where each of the recommendations will be considered as a binary outcome.
33
34 226 Also, we may perform a multinomial logistic regression analysis for the association between
35
36 227 each of the methodological factors (those in Table 1) and categories of the recommended values
37
38 228 for vitamin D / calcium (i.e. dietary intake values/supplemental intake values and optimal
39
40 229 25(OH)D level on an ordinal scale), after adjustment for key guideline characteristics. The
41
42 230 reason that a multinomial logistic regression is proposed is because that recommended intakes
43
44 231 for vitamin D/ calcium and optimal vitamin D level in public health guidelines are often
45
46 232 clustered or provided as a range. For example, vitamin D recommendation in a guideline could
47
48 233 be 400-800 IU/d, 600-800 IU/d, 800-1000 IU/d, 1500-2000 IU/d; and calcium recommendation
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 234 could be 600 mg/d, 700-800 mg/d, 1000 mg/d, 1000-1200 mg/d, ≥ 1000 mg/d, etc. Therefore, a
4
5 235 logistic regression analysis is likely more suitable in these analyses.
6
7

8 236 **Discussion**

9

10
11 237 To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first study to critically appraise
12
13 238 methodological quality regarding guideline recommendations for dietary and supplemental
14
15 239 vitamin D and calcium intakes, their food sources, a healthy diet pattern and sun exposure for
16
17 240 vitamin D synthesis. This review will advance our knowledge on how guideline development
18
19 241 methodology and processes may affect the similarity or differences of the intake
20
21 242 recommendations. These findings will further address potential limitations in public health
22
23 243 guidelines for the recommended intakes of vitamin D and calcium in middle-aged and older
24
25 244 adults.
26
27
28
29

30 245 As we will only include guidelines or statements published in English, this may reduce
31
32 246 sample size and limit the coverage of non-English speaking countries if their
33
34 247 guidelines/statement reports are not published in English. Although we believe that the criteria
35
36 248 outlined in the 2014 WHO handbook for guideline development cover the most comprehensive
37
38 249 processes for guideline recommendation development, we understand that some guideline
39
40 250 authorities may adopt other standards. For example, the Institute of Medicine standards are
41
42 251 commonly used to develop trustworthy clinical guidelines.³⁵ Therefore, we might experience
43
44 252 guidelines with missing data regarding our stringent and comprehensive methodological criteria
45
46 253 according to the WHO handbook for guideline development. Further, recent concerns have been
47
48 254 raised about possible over consumption of phosphorous from meat and dairy sources and highly
49
50 255 processed foods. Because the amount of phosphorus additives in processed food products are
51
52 256 generally not accounted for, current nutrition databases assume that phosphorous level remains
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 257 similar for the same types of foods (e.g. natural beef and processed beef products), this would
4
5 258 potentially underestimate the actual intake of phosphorous in the populations,^{38 39} and result in a
6
7
8 259 lower recommended intake of calcium in the guidelines.⁴⁰ Due to the scope and feasibility of this
9
10 260 study, we will not further account for such underestimation of phosphorous intake at the
11
12 261 population level, which could be a potential limitation of this review to address the appropriate
13
14
15 262 recommendations for calcium intake in the included guidelines.
16

17
18 263 Also, assessment of the quality of the evidence underpinning the recommendations for
19
20 264 vitamin D and calcium is out of the scope in this study protocol, as the focus here is to appraise
21
22 265 the methods used to develop the public health guidelines. However, we will extract information
23
24
25 266 about the types of evidence cited to support each included recommendation. In a follow-up
26
27 267 study, we will further assess the evidence quality (e.g. risk of bias) of the cited studies and
28
29 268 systematic reviews.
30

31 32 269 **Ethics and dissemination** 33

34 270 Ethics approval is not required as we will only extract published data or information from
35
36
37 271 the published guidelines. We will seek to present our findings at international academic
38
39 272 conferences and report our findings in a peer-reviewed medical journal article. We also plan to
40
41 273 present our findings to key stakeholders in public health authorities and with public health
42
43
44 274 advocates for bone health and osteoporosis prevention.
45

46 275 **Conclusions** 47

48 276 Currently, there are no studies that have comprehensively appraised methodological
49
50 277 rigour in guideline development methods and processes used to develop vitamin D and calcium
51
52
53 278 recommendations. Due to global ageing and a rapid rise of osteoporosis, this review will provide
54
55 279 a timely assessment of guideline recommendations for vitamin D and calcium, and help to
56
57

1
2
3 280 address potential limitations and identify areas for improvement in developing future guideline
4
5 281 recommendations for vitamin D and calcium.
6
7

8 282 **Support sources**

9 283 ZD, CMK and MJP are funded by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council
10 284 (NHMRC) project grant APP1139997. JEM is supported by an Australian NHMRC Career
11 285 Development Fellowship (1143429). MAF is funded by the NHMRC and New South Wales
12 286 Health.
13 287 SM is a PhD student funded by the Country Women's Association (NSW) and Edna Winifred
14 288 Blackman Postgraduate Research Scholarship.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 289 22 290 **Funder of the project**

23 291 Australian National Health and Medical Research Council project grant APP1139997
24
25
26
27
28

29 293 **Role of Funder**

30 294 The funder did not play a role in the development of the protocol.
31
32
33
34
35

36 296 **Acknowledgement**

37
38 297 The authors would like to thank Monica Cooper, an Academic Liaison Librarian at the
39 298 School of Life and Environmental Sciences: Biochemistry, Microbiology and Nutrition
40 299 Science, Engineering & IT Cluster for her assistance to develop the search strategy in this
41 300 systematic review.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 301 49 302 **Authors' contributions**

50 303
51 304 Study Design: ZD, LB, CMK;
52 305 Data Collection: ZD;
53 306 Methods and Stats: ZD, MJP, JEM;
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 307 Writing: ZD (first draft);
4
5 308 Revising and editing: ZD, CMK, SM, MJP, JEM, MAF, DR, LB;
6
7 309 Guarantor: ZD, LB

8 310 **Competing interests statement:** None disclosed.
9
10 311
11 312

13 313 **References**

- 15 314
16 315 1. Ministry of Health. Food and Nutrition Guidelines for Healthy Older People: A background
17
18 316 paper. Wellington, New Zealand Ministry of Health, 2013.
- 21 317 2. Food Safety Authority of Ireland. Scientific Recommendations for Healthy Eating Guidelines
22
23 318 in Ireland. Dublin, 2011:92.
- 25 319 3. Manson JE, Bassuk SS. Vitamin and Mineral Supplements: What Clinicians Need to Know.
26
27
28 320 *JAMA* 2018;319(9):859-60. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21012 [published Online First:
29
30 321 2018/02/07]
- 32 322 4. World Health Organization and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
33
34 323 Vitamin and mineral requirements in human nutrition. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO
35
36 324 Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, 2005:341.
- 39 325 5. Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Owens DK, et al. Vitamin D, Calcium, or Combined
40
41 326 Supplementation for the Primary Prevention of Fractures in Community-Dwelling
42
43 327 Adults: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA*
44
45 328 2018;319(15):1592-99. doi: 10.1001/jama.2018.3185 [published Online First:
46
47 329 2018/04/21]
- 51 330 6. Lewis JR, Radavelli-Bagatini S, Rejnmark L, et al. The effects of calcium supplementation on
52
53 331 verified coronary heart disease hospitalization and death in postmenopausal women: a
54
55 332 collaborative meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of bone and mineral*

- 1
2
3 333 *research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research*
4
5 334 2015;30(1):165-75. doi: 10.1002/jbmr.2311 [published Online First: 2014/07/22]
6
7
8 335 7. Zheng YT, Cui QQ, Hong YM, et al. A meta-analysis of high dose, intermittent vitamin D
9
10 336 supplementation among older adults. *PloS one* 2015;10(1):e0115850. doi:
11
12 337 10.1371/journal.pone.0115850 [published Online First: 2015/01/21]
13
14
15 338 8. Theodoratou E, Tzoulaki I, Zgaga L, et al. Vitamin D and multiple health outcomes: umbrella
16
17 339 review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of observational studies and randomised
18
19 340 trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2014;348:g2035. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g2035 [published
20
21 341 Online First: 2014/04/03]
22
23
24 342 9. Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Willett WC, Orav EJ, et al. A pooled analysis of vitamin D dose
25
26 343 requirements for fracture prevention. *The New England journal of medicine*
27
28 344 2012;367(1):40-9. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1109617 [published Online First: 2012/07/06]
29
30
31 345 10. Avenell A, Mak JC, O'Connell D. Vitamin D and vitamin D analogues for preventing
32
33 346 fractures in post-menopausal women and older men. *The Cochrane database of*
34
35 347 *systematic reviews* 2014;4:CD000227. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000227.pub4
36
37
38 348 11. Zhao JG, Zeng XT, Wang J, et al. Association Between Calcium or Vitamin D
39
40 349 Supplementation and Fracture Incidence in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A
41
42 350 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2017;318(24):2466-82. doi:
43
44 351 10.1001/jama.2017.19344 [published Online First: 2017/12/28]
45
46
47 352 12. Kahwati LC, Weber RP, Pan H, et al. Vitamin D, Calcium, or Combined Supplementation
48
49 353 for the Primary Prevention of Fractures in Community-Dwelling Adults: Evidence Report
50
51 354 and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 355 2018;319(15):1600-12. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.21640 [published Online First:
4
5 356 2018/04/21]
6
7
8 357 13. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Avenell A. Assessment of research waste part 2: wrong study
9
10 358 populations- an exemplar of baseline vitamin D status of participants in trials of vitamin
11
12 359 D supplementation. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2018;18(1):101. doi: 10.1186/s12874-018-
13
14 360 0555-1
15
16
17 361 14. Burt LA, Billington EO, Rose MS, et al. Effect of High-Dose Vitamin D Supplementation on
18
19 362 Volumetric Bone Density and Bone Strength: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*
20
21 363 2019;322(8):736-45. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.11889
22
23
24 364 15. Bolland MJ, Avenell A, Baron JA, et al. Effect of calcium supplements on risk of myocardial
25
26 365 infarction and cardiovascular events: meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*
27
28 366 2010;341:c3691. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c3691 [published Online First: 2010/07/31]
29
30
31 367 16. Wang X, Chen H, Ouyang Y, et al. Dietary calcium intake and mortality risk from
32
33 368 cardiovascular disease and all causes: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMC*
34
35 369 *medicine* 2014;12:158. doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0158-6 [published Online First:
36
37 370 2014/09/26]
38
39
40 371 17. Manson JE, Brannon PM, Rosen CJ, et al. Vitamin D Deficiency - Is There Really a
41
42 372 Pandemic? *The New England journal of medicine* 2016;375(19):1817-20.
43
44
45 373 18. Thacher TD, Clarke BL CJ R. Clinical practice. Vitamin D insufficiency. *The New England*
46
47 374 *journal of medicine* 2011;364(3):248-54.
48
49
50 375 19. Heaney RP, Holick MF Why the IOM recommendations for vitamin D are deficient. *Journal*
51
52 376 *of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and*
53
54 377 *Mineral Research* 2011;26(3):455-7.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 378 20. Blake P, Duraio S, Naude CE, et al. An analysis of methods used to synthesize evidence and
4
5 379 grade recommendations in food-based dietary guidelines. *Nutr Rev* 2018;76(4):290-300.
6
7 380 doi: 10.1093/nutrit/nux074
8
9
10 381 21. Herforth A, Arimond M, Alvarez-Sanchez C, et al. A Global Review of Food-Based Dietary
11
12 382 Guidelines. *Adv Nutr* 2019 doi: 10.1093/advances/nmy130
13
14
15 383 22. Ohta H, Uenishi K, Shiraki M. Recent nutritional trends of calcium and vitamin D in East
16
17 384 Asia. *Osteoporos Sarcopenia* 2016;2(4):208-13. doi: 10.1016/j.afos.2016.08.002
18
19 385 23. O'Neil CE, Nicklas TA, Keast DR, et al. Ethnic disparities among food sources of energy and
20
21 386 nutrients of public health concern and nutrients to limit in adults in the United States:
22
23 387 NHANES 2003-2006. *Food Nutr Res* 2014;58:15784. doi: 10.3402/fnr.v58.15784
24
25
26 388 24. World Health Organization. WHO handbook for guideline development – 2nd ed: WHO
27
28 389 Library 2014:179.
29
30
31 390 25. National Health and Medical Resource Council. A review of the evidence to address targeted
32
33 391 questions to inform the revision of the Australian Dietary Guidelines. In Department of
34
35 392 Health and Ageing, ed. Canberra ACT: National Health and Medical Resource Council,
36
37 393 2011.
38
39
40 394 26. National Health and Medical Resource Council. Australian Dietary Guidelines. In: In
41
42 395 Department of Health and Ageing, ed. Canberra, Australia: National Health and Medical
43
44 396 Research Council, 2013.
45
46
47 397 27. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Food-based dietary guidelines,
48
49 398 2019.
50
51 399 28. International Osteoporosis Foundation. Guideline references. URL:
52
53 400 <http://www.iofbonehealth.org/guideline-references>; accessed on 03 March 2019.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 401 29. Hussain T, Michel G, Shiffman RN. The Yale Guideline Recommendation Corpus: a
4
5 402 representative sample of the knowledge content of guidelines. *Int J Med Inform*
6
7 403 2009;78(5):354-63.
8
9
10 404 30. Schünemann HJ, Fretheim A, Oxman AD; WHO Advisory Committee on Health Research.
11
12 405 Improving the use of research evidence in guideline development: 14. Reporting
13
14 406 guidelines. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2006;4(26):1478-4505.
15
16
17 407 31. Woolf S, Schunemann HJ, Eccles MP, et al. Developing clinical practice guidelines: types of
18
19 408 evidence and outcomes; values and economics, synthesis, grading, and presentation and
20
21 409 deriving recommendations. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:61. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-61
22
23
24 410 32. The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners. Clinical guideline for the prevention
25
26 411 and treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women and older men: The Royal
27
28 412 Australian College of General Practitioners, 2010:83.
29
30
31 413 33. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2015-
32
33 414 2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans. 8th Edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department
34
35 415 of Agriculture, 2015:144.
36
37
38 416 34. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a
39
40 417 metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research
41
42 418 informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;42(2):377-81. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
43
44
45 419 35. Committee on Standards for Developing Trustworthy Clinical Practice Guidelines. Graham
46
47 420 R, Mancher M, Wolman DM, Greenfield S, and Steinberg E, Editors. Clinical Practice
48
49 421 Guidelines We Can Trust. In: Academies Institute of Medicine, ed. Washington, D.C.:
50
51 422 The National Academies Press, 2011:266.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 423 36. Qaseem A, Forland F, Macbeth F, et al. Guidelines International Network: toward
4
5 424 international standards for clinical practice guidelines. *Annals of internal medicine*
6
7 425 2012;156(7):525-31. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-156-7-201204030-00009
9
10 426 37. Brouwers M KM, Browman GP, Cluzeau F, feder G, Fervers B, Hanna S, Makarski J on
11
12 427 behalf of the AGREE, Consortium. NS. AGREE II: Advancing guideline development,
13
14 428 reporting and evaluation in healthcare. . *Can Med Assoc J* 2013;182:E839-542. doi:
15
16 429 10.1503/cmaj.090449
18
19 430 38. Uribarri J, Calvo MS. Dietary phosphorus excess: a risk factor in chronic bone, kidney, and
20
21 431 cardiovascular disease? *Adv Nutr* 2013;4(5):542-4. doi: 10.3945/an.113.004234
22
23 432 39. Calvo MS, Uribarri J. Public health impact of dietary phosphorus excess on bone and
24
25 433 cardiovascular health in the general population. *The American journal of clinical*
26
27 434 *nutrition* 2013;98(1):6-15. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.112.053934
28
29 435 40. Bai RJ, Cheng XG, Yan D, et al. Rabbit model of primary hyperparathyroidism induced by
30
31 436 high-phosphate diet. *Domest Anim Endocrinol* 2012;42(1):20-30. doi:
32
33 437 10.1016/j.domaniend.2011.09.001
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 439
42 440
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Appraisal of the processes and methods used in the recommendations for vitamin D and calcium in public health guidelines

Process and Method domains	Process and Method criteria	Description	Examples where to look
I. Guideline development group (GDG, including members of steering group, research team and individuals involved formulating the final recommendations)			
Were each of the following considered in the formation of the guideline development group?	1. Discipline representation	Information about the composition, discipline, and relevant expertise of the guideline development group should be provided.	Information can be located in methods, guideline panel member list, acknowledgements, and appendices.
	2. Diversity representation	Information about gender, diversity, across the life-course, subject to different gender norms, and belonging to different income and education groups of the guideline development group.	
	3. Stakeholder input	Stakeholders such as nongovernmental organizations, advocacy groups, funders, target audiences, and service-users may be invited to ensure transparency of the processes and facilitate implementation.	
II. Conflicts of interest			
Were each of the following steps addressed regarding conflicts of interest?	4. Disclosure of conflicts of interest obtained (extract verbatim text of COI for each member)	Is there an explicit statement that all group members have declared whether they have any competing interests?	Paragraphs/chapters describing the guideline development group or
	5. Conflicts of interest managed	Members declaration of interests must be reported to the steering group. Potential candidates for membership who have major conflicts of interest, be they financial or nonfinancial, cannot be appointed to the GDG. Minor conflicts of interest can be managed at the individual	

		level (e.g. by restricting participation in parts of the GDG meeting) or at the group level.	acknowledgements section in methods, conflicts of interest, guideline panel, and appendix
	6. Disclosure of funders of the guideline obtained and disclose funder's role in influencing the guideline development process and recommendations	Is there an explicit statement of funder of the guideline and the role of funders in the final guideline recommendations?	
III. Systematic review methods			
Were methods for each of the following addressed in the guideline?	7. Formulation of key questions for the evidence review in PICO, PICOT, or PEO format (also extract the key questions in such format)	Key questions are framed in a way that enables a systematic search of the literature and delineates inclusion and exclusion criteria for the body of evidence to formulate the research questions for the recommendations in such format.	Examine the paragraphs/chapters describing the guideline development process in methods, literature search strategy and appendices.
	8. Choosing (finalizing) priority outcomes for systematic review	List high-priority key questions and the outcomes to formulate recommendations.	
	9. Systematic methods to search for evidence	Details of the strategy used to search for evidence should be provided including search terms used, sources consulted, and dates of the literature covered. Sources may include electronic databases, hand searching journals, reviewing conference proceedings, and other guidelines.	
	10. Evidence retrieval (screening and selection of eligible studies)	Process of data from eligible studies are extracted and search strategy and results should be carefully documented.	
	11. Evidence quality assessment	Each study included in a systematic review should be assessed for risk of bias (e.g. use the Cochrane risk of bias tool, Quality assessment tolls project report, etc.)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	12. Evidence synthesis	The findings of the systematic review may be synthesized in a narrative manner or quantitatively in a meta-analysis. The review should describe how data were handled and why a given approach to synthesis was taken for each outcome.	
IV. Transparency of evidence substantiation			
If evidence was explicitly linked to recommendation, what type of evidence was reported?	13. Are recommendations explicitly linked to substantiating evidence?	An explicit link between the recommendations and the evidence on which they are based should be included in the guideline. The guideline user should be able to identify the components of the body of evidence relevant to each recommendation.	Define and examine the recommendations in the guideline and the text describing the body of evidence that underpins them. Examples of commonly labeled sections or chapters in a guideline where this information can be found include: recommendations and key evidence.
	a. Primary research	Primary individual studies	
	b. Systematic reviews	Systematic reviews of clinical trials / observational studies	
	c. Summary table of the evidence	Summary of evidence table	
	d. GRADE evidence profiles	GRADE summary of evidence table	
	e. Evidence to decision table		
	f. If evidence is explicitly linked to recommendation, what is the citation information, if applicable?	List the citations of the studies underlying the recommendations	
V. Recommendation development: Factors that determine the direction and strength of a recommendation			
Was each of the following items considered when developing the recommendation? (also communicate	14. Was a consensus process clearly described for developing recommendations	A description of the methods used to formulate the recommendations and how final decisions were arrived at should be provided. For example, methods may include a voting system, informal consensus, and formal consensus	

<p>authority whether other documentation may provide such information if they cannot be located in the main guideline reports)</p>		<p>techniques. Areas of disagreement and methods of resolving them should be specified.</p>	<p>Examples of commonly labeled sections or chapters in a guideline where this information can be found include methods and guideline development process or in appendices.</p>
<p>15. Was a method employed to determine strength and/or certainty of the recommendation?</p>	<p>Is there a method provided to influence the direction and strength of a recommendation (e.g. use GRADE framework and others)</p>		
<p>16. Priority of the problem: Is the problem a burden of disease?</p>	<p>The problem's priority is determined by its importance and frequency (i.e. burden of disease, disease prevalence or baseline risk). The greater the importance of the problem, the greater the likelihood of a strong recommendation.</p>		
<p>17. Quality of the evidence: Is higher quality of the body of evidence included to support the recommendation?</p>	<p>Is there a method provided to grade the quality of body of evidence to assess the strength of the recommendation (e.g. GRADE and others)</p>		
<p>18. Certainty of evidence: Does the recommendation include consistent body of evidence (e.g. confidence in effect estimates)?</p>	<p>The quality of the evidence – the degree of confidence in the estimates of effect. This is a key factor in determining the strength of a recommendation.</p>		
<p>19. Benefits and harms: Are evaluations performed on the net benefit or net harm associate with an intervention or exposure?</p>	<p>The balance between an intervention's or exposure's benefits and harms. Did the guideline development group consider the magnitude of the effects and the relative importance of the outcomes, including any disadvantages or inconveniences associated with the intervention.</p>		
<p>20. Balance: Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects support the recommendation?</p>	<p>Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favour the intervention or the comparison?</p>		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

	21. Outcome importance: Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcome?	Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcomes, including adverse effects and burden of the test and downstream outcomes of clinical management that is guided by the test results?	
	22. Equity: Does the evidence used reduce inequalities, improve equity or contribute to the realization of one of several human rights defined under the international legal framework?	What would be the impact on health equity?	
	23. Acceptability: Is the option acceptable to key stakeholders?	A strategy to address concerns about acceptability during implementation will be included in the guideline with the recommendations. Acceptability is affected by several factors, such as who benefits from an intervention and who is harmed by it; who pays for it or saves money on account of it; and when the benefits, harms and costs occur.	
	24. Feasibility: Is the option feasible to implement?	Feasibility is influenced by the resources available, programmatic considerations, the existing and the necessary infrastructure and training, etc.	
VI. Peer review process			
	25. Was the guideline/recommendation reviewed by an external review group?	Is there an explicit statement about the peer review of the draft final guideline? The external review group is composed of persons interested in the subject of the guideline as well as individuals who will be affected by the recommendations.	Information can be located in methods, guideline panel member list, acknowledgements, and appendices.

Supplemental material: Medline search strategy via Ovid

1. Vitamin D/
2. Cholecalciferol/
3. Ergocalciferols/
4. Vitamin D Deficiency/
5. Sunlight/
6. Ultraviolet Rays/
7. Vit* D.tw.
8. Ergocalciferol.tw.
9. Calciferol.tw.
10. Cholecalciferol.tw.
11. Sunlight.tw.
12. (Light adj3 expos*).tw.
13. UV.tw.
14. Ultraviolet.tw.
15. or/1-14
16. exp Calcium/
17. Calcium, Dietary/
18. calcium.mp.
19. or/16-18
20. 15 or 19
21. Diet/
22. "Diet, Food, and Nutrition"/
23. Diet, Vegetarian/
24. Diet, Vegan/
25. Diet, Western/
26. Diet Therapy/
27. Healthy Diet/

- 1
- 2
- 3 28. Food, Fortified/
- 4
- 5 29. Dietary supplements/
- 6
- 7 30. exp Dairy Products/
- 8
- 9 31. Shellfish/
- 10
- 11 32. Fishes/
- 12
- 13 33. exp Seafood/
- 14
- 15 34. Vegetables/
- 16
- 17 35. exp Vegetable Products/
- 18
- 19 36. Agaricales/
- 20
- 21 37. Diet*.tw.
- 22
- 23 38. (Diet* adj3 supplement*).tw.
- 24
- 25 39. (Fortified adj3 food*).tw.
- 26
- 27 40. Vegetable*.tw.
- 28
- 29 41. Mushroom*.tw.
- 30
- 31 42. Dairy.tw.
- 32
- 33 43. Milk.tw.
- 34
- 35 44. Cheese.tw.
- 36
- 37 45. Yog?urt.tw.
- 38
- 39 46. Seafood.tw.
- 40
- 41 47. Fish.tw.
- 42
- 43 48. Shellfish.tw.
- 44
- 45 49. or/21-48
- 46
- 47 50. 20 or 49
- 48
- 49 51. 20 and 49
- 50
- 51 52. exp clinical pathway/
- 52
- 53 53. exp clinical protocol/
- 54
- 55 54. exp consensus/
- 56
- 57 55. exp consensus development conference/
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3 56. exp consensus development conferences as topic/
- 4
- 5 57. critical pathways/
- 6
- 7 58. exp guideline/
- 8
- 9 59. guidelines as topic/
- 10
- 11 60. exp practice guideline/
- 12
- 13 61. practice guidelines as topic/
- 14
- 15 62. health planning guidelines/
- 16
- 17 63. (guideline or practice guideline or consensus development conference or consensus
- 18 development conference, NIH).pt.
- 19
- 20 64. (position statement* or policy statement* or practice parameter* or best
- 21 practice*).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 22
- 23 65. (standards or guideline or guidelines).ti,kf,kw.
- 24
- 25 66. ((practice or treatment* or clinical) adj guideline*).ab.
- 26
- 27 67. (CPG or CPGs).ti.
- 28
- 29 68. consensus*.ti,kf,kw.
- 30
- 31 69. consensus*.ab. /freq=2
- 32
- 33 70. ((critical or clinical or practice) adj2 (path or paths or pathway or pathways or
- 34 protocol*).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 35
- 36 71. recommendat*.ti,kf,kw.
- 37
- 38 72. (care adj2 (standard or path or paths or pathway or pathways or map or maps or plan or
- 39 plans)).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 40
- 41 73. (algorithm* adj2 (screening or examination or test or tested or testing or assessment* or
- 42 diagnosis or diagnoses or diagnosed or diagnosing)).ti,ab,kf,kw.
- 43
- 44 74. or/52-73
- 45
- 46 75. Osteoporosis/
- 47
- 48 76. Fractures, Bone/
- 49
- 50 77. Bone Density/
- 51
- 52 78. osteoporosis.tw.
- 53
- 54 79. fracture*,bone.tw.
- 55
- 56 80. bone density.tw.
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1
2
3 81. bone health.mp.
4

5 82. 75 or 76 or 77 or 78 or 79 or 80 or 81
6

7 83. Adult/
8

9 84. Aged/
10

11 85. Middle Aged/
12

13 86. adult*.tw.
14

15 87. aged.tw.
16

17 88. middle aged.tw.
18

19 89. 83 or 84 or 85 or 86 or 87 or 88
20

21 90. 74 and 82 and 89
22

23 91. 50 and 90
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	(Page No.#)
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	3
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	16
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; n/a otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	15
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	15
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	16
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	4-5
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	5
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-7
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	8
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	26-29
Study records:			

Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	9-10
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	10
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	10 and 11
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9-11
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	12
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	10-11
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	12
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)	12-13
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	13
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	12
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	n/a
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	n/a

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.