

1 **Impact of Vitamin D supplementation on cognition in adults with mild to moderate vitamin D**  
2 **deficiency: Outcomes from the VitaMIND randomised controlled trial.**

3

4 **Short Title: RCT of vitamin D in adults at risk of dementia**

5

6 Anne Corbett PhD<sup>1\*</sup>, Rod Taylor PhD<sup>2</sup>, David Llewellyn PhD<sup>1</sup>, Janice M. Ranson PhD<sup>1</sup>, Adam  
7 Hampshire PhD<sup>3</sup>, Ellie Pickering MSc<sup>1</sup>, Abbie Palmer BSc<sup>1</sup>, Dag Aarsland MD<sup>3</sup>, Dorina Cader PhD<sup>4</sup>,  
8 Diana Frost<sup>1</sup>, Clive Ballard MD<sup>1</sup>

9

10

11 <sup>1</sup> Department of Health & Community Sciences, University of Exeter Medical School, University of  
12 Exeter, Exeter EX1 2LU, UK

13 <sup>2</sup> MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit & Robertson Centre for Biostatistics, School of  
14 Health and Well Being, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G12 8QQ, Scotland

15 <sup>3</sup> Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK

16 <sup>4</sup> Brighton & Sussex Medical School, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RY

17

18 \* Corresponding Author

19 Anne Corbett

20 Address: University of Exeter Medical School, St Luke's Campus, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX1  
21 2LU, UK

22 Email: [a.m.j.corbett@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:a.m.j.corbett@exeter.ac.uk) Tel: 01392724464

23 ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2015-0316

24 **Word Count: 5619**

25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background**

28 Preserved cognitive health with ageing is a public health imperative. Vitamin D deficiency is  
29 associated with poor cognition, but it is unclear whether supplementation would provide benefit,  
30 particularly in individuals with mild/moderate deficiencies which do not have other clinical risks.  
31 The objective of this study was to establish the impact of daily vitamin D supplementation on  
32 cognition in older adults with mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency.

33 **Methods and Findings**

34 Two-arm parallel 24-month randomised controlled trial, with Vitamin D supplementation compared  
35 with a placebo. This was a remote trial, completed from home involving 620 adults 50 years or older  
36 with mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency and early cognitive impairment. The primary outcome  
37 was executive function measured through Trail making B and other secondary measures of  
38 cognition, function and wellbeing.

39 Vitamin D supplementation conferred no significant benefit to executive function compared to  
40 placebo at follow-up on the primary outcome (between-group difference: 5770, 95% CI: -2189 to  
41 13730) or cognition, function, or wellbeing. Secondary analyses in defined subgroups and a per-  
42 protocol analysis also showed no significant impact on any outcome measures.

43 **Conclusions**

44 Vitamin D supplementation produced no measurable improvement in cognitive outcomes in older  
45 adults with mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency. The remote trial methodology provides an  
46 innovative approach to large-scale trials.

47 **Trial Registration:** ISRCTN79265514 <https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN79265514>

48 Word count: 218

49

## 50 **Introduction**

51 Dementia is a devastating condition that affects over 850,000 people in the UK and carries enormous  
52 emotional, societal and financial burdens, with an estimated cost of £26.3 billion each year to the UK  
53 health service(1). Worldwide, this figure reaches US\$818billion. While new disease-modifying  
54 treatments are in the pipeline, there is a continuing imperative to deliver approaches to reduce the  
55 risk of cognitive decline and dementia, particularly in high-risk groups. The largest at-risk group for  
56 dementia are individuals with Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI), which affects 10-20% of older  
57 adults, of whom up to 10% develop dementia each year(2). A larger and less well-defined group of  
58 individuals experience Age-Associated Cognitive Decline (AACD), a risk state for MCI, which has been  
59 clinically defined by recent diagnostic criteria(3). The opportunity to apply precision medicine  
60 approaches to risk reduction in these groups would enable tailored treatment and preventative  
61 interventions to be targeted in the most impactful way to achieve better public health. The potential  
62 impact of such a strategy to preserve cognition in older age and delay the onset of dementia  
63 symptoms, even by a few months, could have a significant impact at a population level and improve  
64 the health and wellbeing of older adults.

65 There is good evidence to support several approaches for reducing the risk of dementia. One  
66 promising avenue is through supplementation of dietary deficiencies, particularly with Vitamin D.  
67 Vitamin D deficiency is prevalent in the UK, particularly in the winter months. The Scientific Advisory  
68 Committee on Nutrition reports that 23% of adults fulfil criteria for severe vitamin D deficiency,  
69 categorised as clinically at risk of reduced bone mineralisation, causing bone pain, muscle pain and  
70 fatigue, and potential impacts on respiratory and cardiovascular conditions (< 25nmol/L of 25-  
71 hydroxy-vitamin D (25(OH)D) in the blood), while 40.4% fulfil criteria for inadequate levels  
72 (<50nmol/l)(4-6). These figures highlight the prevalence of deficiency across the UK population.  
73 Seasonality is a significant factor in levels, with severe deficiency prevalence rising from 23% to 29%  
74 in adults over 65 from summer to winter months. Dietary supplementation, therefore, offers a  
75 means of significantly increasing vitamin D levels above the current UK baseline.

76

77 A rapidly growing body of evidence indicates that Vitamin D may play a role in brain health and  
78 cognition. Vitamin D receptors (VDR), one of the nuclear receptor family of transcription factors, are  
79 found extensively throughout the brain, and they are associated with neuroprotection and anti-  
80 inflammatory effects(7). For example, vitamin D reduces the hallmarks of Alzheimer's disease,  
81 including amyloid beta in in vitro models(8, 9). Vitamin D was first identified as a potential  
82 intervention for dementia prevention in 2009 by a study that linked low vitamin D levels in 1,766  
83 older adults to cognitive impairment(10). Subsequently, a large prospective study established that  
84 severe vitamin D deficiency (<25 nmol/L) was associated with a risk of substantial cognitive decline  
85 over six years by around 60%, and a more recent study showed that vitamin D exposure was  
86 associated with a significant reduction in dementia risk, particularly in individuals at greater risk of  
87 dementia(11). People with severe vitamin D deficiency are 120% more likely to develop dementia  
88 over six-years(12). These landmark studies have been replicated by other groups and confirmed in a  
89 series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses(13, 14). This evidence base, in addition to clinical  
90 links to conditions such as osteoporosis and osteoarthritis, clearly shows the importance of treating  
91 severe vitamin D deficiency to improve cognitive health. The strength of this evidence would  
92 preclude a randomised trial in these patients since the benefit to health is so clear. However, the  
93 case is less clear-cut with regard to mild and moderate deficiency, where a trial is warranted. A  
94 meta-analysis of 37 studies explored cognitive performance in people above and below the mild  
95 deficiency threshold of 50nmol/l and reported significantly worse cognition in individuals with mild  
96 vitamin D deficiency. A further observational and Mendelian randomisation study also showed non-  
97 linear associations of dementia risk in individuals up to 50nmol/l(15, 16) Therefore, the key  
98 emerging question is whether treating mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency confers benefits  
99 regarding cognitive outcomes.

100 People with severe vitamin D deficiency are usually identified and treated through established  
101 clinical care pathways, ensuring that their resulting dementia risk and other health issues are likely

102 to be mitigated through effective supplementation. However, mild to moderate deficiencies of 25-  
103 50nmol/l are less likely to be detected despite being prevalent in the community. There is a need to  
104 establish whether supplementation of these groups could improve cognitive outcomes and whether  
105 this should be incorporated into risk reduction strategies for wider public health initiatives. This  
106 study conducts a definitive trial to determine whether Vitamin D supplementation is an effective  
107 means of maintaining cognitive function in people with mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency. Trials  
108 of this nature, which are investigating low-risk interventions in a large cohort of individuals in the  
109 community, offer the opportunity to employ innovative remote trial methodologies, using a  
110 combination of online assessment, digital tools for engagement, and remote dispensing approaches  
111 to deliver large-scale trials without the need for in-person clinic visits and assessments. The  
112 PROTECT-UK platform offers the infrastructure to deliver remote, virtual trials(17). This study  
113 represents the first large-scale proof of concept for this model of trial delivery.

114

## 115 **Methods**

### 116 *Study Design*

117 This VitaMIND study was a parallel, double-blind, 24-month remote randomised controlled trial to  
118 establish the impact of vitamin D supplementation on cognition, function and wellbeing in adults  
119 over 50 with mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency and age-associated cognitive decline. The study  
120 was approved by the Wales Research Ethics Committee 3 under the UK Health Research Authority  
121 (Ref 19/WA/0007). The protocol is registered on the ISRCTN database (Ref: ISRCTN79265514). The  
122 study is reported in accordance with CONSORT guidelines (ref). Patients, clinicians, and the research  
123 team were all blinded to group allocation.

124

### 125 *Participants*

126 Adults over the age of 50 in the UK were invited to take part through the UK online ageing cohort,  
127 PROTECT(17, 18). All participants were already registered on the PROTECT cohort and were invited

128 to the trial by email correspondence as part of the consent for contact in place in the PROTECT  
129 cohort. Eligible participants were over the age of 50, without a diagnosis of dementia, had access to  
130 a computer and the internet, fulfilled criteria for high risk of vitamin D deficiency of 50nmol/l  
131 25(OH)D or below based on a self-reported screening questionnaire (Table1) and fulfilled criteria for  
132 AACD (performing one standard deviation below norm on at least one cognitive test in the PROTECT-  
133 UK Cognitive Test System, described elsewhere)(19). The PROTECT-UK cohort was pre-screened for  
134 age and AACD criteria. Interested individuals registered and provided consent for the study through  
135 an ethically approved digital consent process embedded on the PROTECT website. Participants then  
136 accessed the trial by navigating to the VitaMIND trial area on their online dashboard. Automated  
137 emails were scheduled to remind participants to take their study tablets and complete their  
138 cognitive assessments.

139

#### 140 *Screening Questionnaire for Vitamin D deficiency*

141 In order to identify participants with Vitamin D deficiency (<50 nmol/L), predictive algorithms were  
142 trained using data from 3,519 community-dwelling participants aged 50 and over from the English  
143 Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA)(20). Potential predictors were based on those identified in  
144 previous risk prediction models for vitamin D deficiency, as well as those with an established  
145 association with vitamin D levels. In the absence of a suitable external test dataset, split-sample  
146 development and validation were conducted (80% used for development, 20% for validation).  
147 Missing data was dealt with using multivariate imputation by chained equations. Predictors were  
148 selected using multivariable fractional polynomial bootstrapped regression with 1000 bootstrap  
149 replications. Ten predictors were included in the final algorithm: Body mass index, treatment for  
150 osteoporosis, month of assessment, smoking status, exercise, marital status, age, alcohol  
151 consumption, ethnicity and self-rated poor health. See Table 1 for full details of the questionnaire  
152 and response options. Participants with a 30% or higher predicted probability of mild Vitamin D  
153 deficiency (<50 nmol/L) were eligible for the study.

154 **Table 1: Screening questionnaire and algorithm for vitamin D deficiency**

Description	Wording	Response options	Notes
<b>BMI</b>	How much do you weigh? How tall are you?	Kg or stones and pounds Meters or feet and inches	<b>To calculate BMI</b> <b>Either:</b> Weight (kg) / height (m) <sup>2</sup>  <b>Or:</b> Weight (lb) / height (in)*703 (in which case, weight first needs to be converted to lbs and height converted to inches.
<b>Treatment for osteoporosis</b>	Do you take calcium pills or Vitamin D for osteoporosis, sometimes called thin or brittle bones?	Yes / No	'No' is the reference category
<b>Month of assessment</b>	N/A	N/A	
<b>Physical activity</b>	A. Do you take part in sports or activities that are vigorous?	A1 More than once a week A2 Once a week A3 1-3 times a month A4 Hardly ever or never	Physical activity has four categories depending on combination of responses to these three questions: '0' is the reference category A participant is assigned to the lowest number category for which they are eligible. Category response requirements are below:  0 = High (A1)  1 = Moderate (B1 or B2) or (A2 or A3)  2 = Low (C1 or C2) or (B2 or B3 or B4) + (A4)  3 = Sedentary (C3 or C4) + (B4) + (A4)
	B. Do you take part in sports or activities that are moderately energetic?	B1 More than once a week B2 Once a week B3 1-3 times a month B4 Hardly ever or never	
	C. Do you take part in sports or activities that are mildly energetic?	C1 More than once a week C2 Once a week C3 1-3 times a month C4 Hardly ever or never	
<b>Current smoking status</b>	Do you currently smoke cigarettes, cigars or a pipe?	Yes / No	'No' is the reference category
<b>Age</b>	What is your date of birth?	Date / Month / Year	
<b>Couple status</b>	Are you currently married or living with a partner?	Yes / No	'Yes' is the reference category
<b>Ethnicity</b>	To which of these groups	White / Mixed /	0/1 binary variable

	do you consider that you belong?	Black / Black British / Asian / Asian British /Other	'White' versus all other categories. 'White' is the reference category.
<b>Weekly alcohol consumption</b>	During the last seven days, how many measures of spirits did you have?	Continuous	The responses to these three questions need to be totalled to produce a single weekly number of drinks.
	During the last seven days, how many glasses of wine did you have?	Continuous	
	During the last seven days, how many pints of beer did you have?	Continuous	
<b>Self-rated poor health</b>	Would you say your health is...	Excellent / Very good / Good / Fair / Poor	0/1 binary variable 'Poor' versus all other categories. 'Other' is the reference category.
<p><b>Algorithm to predict Vitamin D deficiency (&lt;50nmol/l)</b></p> $\text{gen pred\_vitd50} = -2.987615 + (\text{bmi} * .0642204) + (\text{osteomed} * -1.178731) + (((\text{month}/10)^3 - .4303164208) * -1.336699) + (((\text{month}/10)^3 * \ln(\text{month}/10) + .1209525476) * 7.583981) + (\text{smoker} * .7837381) + (\text{exercise\_1} * .4699397) + (\text{exercise\_2} * .7609146) + (\text{exercise\_3} * .7766721) + (((\text{age}/10)^2 - 44.36322732) * -.1511723) + (((\text{age}/10)^3 - 295.4844962) * .0147316) + (\text{couple} * .4051173) + (\text{ethnic} * 1.224978) + ((((\text{drink} + 1) / 10)^{-5} - 1.226242542) * .1254607) + (\text{selfhealthpoor} * .1064709)$ $\text{Gen prob\_vitd50} = (\exp(\text{pred\_vitd50}) / (1 + \exp(\text{pred\_vitd50}))) * 100$			

155

156 *Treatment Interventions*

157 Participants were randomised to receive either 4000IU Vitamin D3, supplied in two-piece HPMC  
 158 capsules, or an identical placebo capsule without the active Vitamin D3 supplement. This dose is the  
 159 highest publicly available vitamin D3 supplement and was chosen for relevance to existing available  
 160 treatments and due to known safety data. Capsules were provided in blister packs of 28, stamped  
 161 with the days of the week to aid compliance. Participants were instructed to take one tablet daily for  
 162 the 24-month duration of the study.

163

164 *Outcome Measures*

165 Outcome measures were completed at baseline, six, 12 and 24 months. All outcome measures were  
 166 completed online through the PROTECT cohort platform.



167

168 Primary Outcome Measure

169 The primary outcome measure was executive function and task-switching as measured by a  
170 computerised version of the well-validated Trail making B task in which a participant connects an  
171 alternating sequence of alphanumeric characters(21). Total time and accuracy are captured and  
172 combined to provide a total score.

173

174 Secondary Outcome Measures

175 Secondary cognitive outcomes were measured using a wider computerised cognitive test system  
176 consisting of five cognitive tests described in full in previous papers (22) (18, 23). The test system  
177 included measures of spatial working memory (Paired Associate Learning, Self-Ordered Search),  
178 numerical working memory (Digit Span) and executive function (Verbal Reasoning, Switching  
179 Stroop). Additional secondary outcome measures were also collected to assess function  
180 (Instrumental Activities of Daily Living), behaviour (Mild Behaviour Impairment Scale) and wellbeing  
181 (EQ5D)(24-26).

182

183 *Sample Size*

184 The sample size calculation was based on a published study of online cognitive training in adults over  
185 50, which showed significant change in executive function in adults with AACD (27). Based on an  
186 effect size of 0.3, which is clinically meaningful and has been achieved through similar trials in this  
187 field, 165 participants would be required for each group to provide 80% power at a two-sided 0.05  
188 significance level, assuming a conservative drop-out rate of 40%. Therefore, a total of at least 462  
189 participants (231 per group) were required for this trial.

190

191 *Randomisation and masking*

192 Randomisation of participants was achieved through a purpose-built algorithm embedded in REDCap  
193 Cloud. Randomisation occurred after a participant had completed their baseline assessments. The  
194 algorithm allocated participants randomly, stratifying for age (age brackets of five years), gender and  
195 Vitamin D deficiency severity (mild-moderate (< 50 nmol/L) or severe (< 25 nmol/L) Vitamin D level).

196

197 The treatment allocation of participants was recorded electronically in REDCap Cloud, hosted by the  
198 University of Exeter's Clinical Trials Unit. This ensured that both participants and the research team  
199 were blind to allocation, thus removing any bias. Study staff with direct participant contact were not  
200 involved in any data analysis, thus avoiding any unconscious bias as a result of their contact.

201

#### 202 *Safety Monitoring*

203 All AEs and SAEs occurring from the time of the start of trial treatment until the end of the trial  
204 were reported by participants using an online form. Participants were prompted to enter any  
205 details of events at each quarterly login event and encouraged to report any event proactively using  
206 the online form or by contacting the study team by telephone and email. All AEs were logged and  
207 reported to the study team for review within 24 hours.

208

#### 209 *Compliance*

210 Participants completed a regular tablet count record on the study website to track compliance  
211 across the full study and to support the per-protocol analysis. Ten per cent of the cohort was also  
212 randomly selected to complete finger-prick blood tests at baseline and 24 months to quantify  
213 vitamin D blood levels. Participants received the vitamin D blood spot test kit in the post, completed  
214 the tests at home according to the kit instructions, and returned them to the Sandwell and West  
215 Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust laboratory for analysis.

216

#### 217 *Data Analysis*

218 Analysis was performed according to a prespecified statistical analysis plan. The primary analyses  
219 compared primary and secondary outcomes between intervention and control groups at 24 months  
220 using linear regression models with adjustment for baseline outcome score and stratification  
221 variables. Primary analyses were based on an intention-to-treat (ITT) approach.

222

223 A number of secondary analyses were undertaken. A repeated measures analysis using a mixed  
224 effects linear regression model with a random effect on participants) for primary and secondary  
225 continuous outcomes, to compare intervention and control groups including data from participants  
226 with observed data for at least one of the three follow-up timepoints. A fixed effect interaction  
227 between the time point and trial arm was used to evaluate differential treatment effects across time  
228 points. Adjustments for baseline covariates were made for the primary analysis regression models.  
229 Multiple imputation using chained equations was used to impute missing primary and secondary  
230 continuous outcome data. Imputation models were informed by the treatment arm, baseline scores,  
231 and stratification covariates to be included in the primary analysis model. Primary analysis models  
232 for primary and secondary outcomes were rerun using imputed data sets. To assess the potential  
233 effect of tablet adherence, an additional analysis was undertaken with the primary ITT  
234 analysis adjusted for the difference in baseline and 24-month follow-up tablet count. Blood  
235 test data for compliance was analysed using a t-test.

#### 236 *Role of Funding Source*

237 The funder had no input into the study's design, interpretation of results, writing of the manuscript,  
238 or decision to publish.

239

## 240 **Results**

### 241 *Cohort Characteristics*

242 620 participants consented to the study between 1<sup>st</sup> September 2020 and 26<sup>th</sup> March 2021, of whom  
243 75% were female, with an average age of 60 (SD 6.58) and an average educational attainment

244 corresponding to completion of secondary education with an additional vocational qualification. 310  
 245 participants were randomised to the Vitamin D intervention group, and 310 were randomised to the  
 246 control group. There were no significant differences between the characteristics of the two groups.  
 247 In the sub-group of participants who completed a blood sample at baseline, the median vitamin D  
 248 level was 42 nmol/l with no significant difference between groups (p=0.44). The baseline  
 249 characteristics of the study participants are described in Table 2, and the flow of participant  
 250 selection through the study is presented in Figure 1. The trial ended after the last follow-up  
 251 assessment of the last participant was completed.

252 **Table 2: Cohort characteristics for the VitaMIND trial**

Characteristic		Full cohort n = 620	VitaMIND group n = 310	Control group n = 310
<b>Age</b>	Range	50 – 80	50 – 80	50 – 80
	Mean (SD)	60.7 (6.58)	60.3 (6.27)	60.8 (6.73)
<b>Sex</b>	Male n (%)	154 (25%)	75 (25%)	79 (25%)
	Female n (%)	466 (75%)	235 (75%)	231 (75%)
<b>Educational attainment</b>	Mean (SD)	3.17 (1.38)	3.19 (1.35)	3.14 (1.41)
<b>Ethnicity</b>	White n (%)	608 (98)	301 (97)	303 (98)
	Mixed n (%)	4 (<1)	3 (<1)	1 (<1)
	Asian n (%)	7 (<1)	3 (<1)	4 (<1)
	Black n (%)	1 (<1)	1 (<0.5)	0 (0)

253

254 **Fig 1. CONSORT chart showing the flow of participants through the VitaMIND trial**

255

256 *Impact of Vitamin D on cognitive outcomes*

257 Analysis showed no significant benefits to cognition in the Vitamin D intervention group compared  
 258 to placebo at 24 months. In the primary outcome of executive function measured by the Trail  
 259 making task, the ReaCT intervention conferred no significant benefit compared to the control task  
 260 (Cohen’s D Effect Size (ES) 0.11; P=0.16) (Table 3). In the secondary outcome measures, the  
 261 treatment group also showed no significant benefit compared to the control group in numerical  
 262 working memory (ES 0.08; P=0.38), spatial working memory (Paired Associate Learning P=0.84; Self-

263 Ordered Search P=0.64) or executive function (Switching Stroop P=0.86; Verbal Reasoning P=0.92)

264 (Table 3).

265

*Impact of the START intervention on function, wellbeing and behaviour*

In the non-cognitive secondary outcome measures, the treatment group also showed no significant benefit compared to the control group in function (P=0.86), behaviour (P=0.65) or wellbeing (P=0.92) (Table 3).

**Table 3: Impact of Vitamin D supplementation on executive function (primary outcome), cognition (Secondary outcomes), function, behaviour and wellbeing at 24 months**

	Vitamin D Group		Control Group		Between group difference*		Effect size
	Baseline	2-years	Baseline	2-years	Mean (95% CI),	P-value	
	N mean (SD)	N mean (SD)	N mean SD	N mean SD			
<b>Primary outcome</b>							
Trail making B	310 61869 (27299)	174 61388 (22976)	310 61421 (31949)	163 55954 (49506)	5770 (- 2189 to 13730)	0.16	0.116552
<b>Secondary cognitive outcomes</b>							
Baddeley Grammatical Reasoning	310 36.0 (11.7)	169 37.8 (11.4)	310 36.7 (11.8)	150 37.7 (10.8)	0.1 (-1.4 to 1.5)	0.92	0.009259
Switching Stroop	310 40.2 (17.6)	174 44.5 (17.2)	310 41.5 (17.0)	163 43.2 (18.6)	0.7 (-2.2 to 3.7)	0.63	0.037634
Paired Associate Learning	310 3.98 (1.02)	170 4.11 (0.92)	310 4.04 (1.18)	155 4.17 (0.95)	-0.02 (-0.21 to 0.17)	0.84	0.021053
Digit Span	310 7.32 (1.64)	166 7.51 (1.55)	310 7.23 (2.00)	149 7.39 (1.39)	0.11 (-0.14 to 0.38)	0.38	0.079137
Self-Ordered Search Task	310 7.54 (1.98)	172 7.62 (1.80)	310 7.59 (2.13)	157 7.59 (1.91)	0.09 (-0.28 to 0.45)	0.64	0.04712
<b>Secondary non-cognitive outcomes</b>							

Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale	302 0.44 (1.55)	177 0.38 (1.50)	302 0.45 (1.35)	177 0.42 (1.33)	0.02 (-0.18 to - 0.22)	0.86	0.015038
Mild Behaviour Impairment Scale	302 7.31 (15.31)	176 4.98 (13.61)	303 6.92 (11.70)	175 4.16 (7.11)	0.52 (-1.71 to 2.75)	0.65	0.073136
EQ-5D-5L scale	302 0.84 (0.16)	174 0.84 (0.18)	303 0.83 (0.16)	175 0.85 (0.13)	0.00 (-0.03 to 0.03)	0.92	0
EQ-5D-5L VAS	302 76.1 (19.8)	180 77.5 (18.1)	303 76.4 (19.4)	180 77.7 (18.1)	-0.7 (-3.7 to 2.4)	0.69	0.04

*Secondary analyses: Impact of supplementation in sub-groups of age, sex and vitamin D deficiency at baseline*

Sub-group analyses showed no significant impact on trial outcomes in sub-groups of participants defined by age (five-year age brackets), gender or vitamin D deficiency severity, with the exception of differences between age groups on Paired Associate Learning (P = 0.02) (Table 4).

**Table 4 Impact of vitamin D supplementation in sub-groups of age, sex and vitamin D deficiency severity (mild/moderate or severe)**

Subgroups	Age	Sex	Vitamin D deficiency
	50-59 vs. 60-69 vs. 70-79 vs. 80+ yrs	male vs. female	Mild/moderate <50nmol/l vs. severe <25 nmol
<b>Primary Outcome</b>			
Trail making B	P=0.69	P=0.79	P=0.97
<b>Secondary Cognitive Outcomes</b>			
Verbal reasoning	P=0.13	P=0.35	P=0.95
Paired Associate Learning	P=0.02	P=0.48	P=0.84
Digit span	P=0.21	P=0.83	P=0.15

Self-ordered search	P=0.13	P=0.73	Not estimable
Switching Stroop	P=0.42	P=0.58	Not estimable
<b>Secondary Non-Cognitive Outcomes</b>			
IADL helplessness	P=0.21	P=0.40	Not estimable
IADL difficulty	P=0.52	P=0.87	Not estimable
MBI	P=0.08	P=0.65	P=0.65
EQ-5D VAS	P=0.70	P=0.14	P=0.67
EQ-5D utility score	P=0.37	P=0.88	P=0.92

#### *Per protocol analysis*

Usable tablet count data were available in a subgroup of 256 participants. Adjusting for baseline versus follow-up tablet difference showed little or no impact on the treatment-control group effect of vitamin D at 24 months on the primary outcome (mean difference: -6174, 95% CI: -17095 to 4747, P=0.266).

#### *Compliance*

49 participants were selected to complete a blood test analysis of vitamin D levels for compliance. Of these, 24 returned blood tests at both baseline and 24 months. All participants with blood level data in the intervention group showed improvement in vitamin D deficiency status at 24 months (P<0.001). Of the 256 participants with detailed tablet count data, the median compliance was 98%, and 98% of people had over 80% compliance with the intervention.

#### **Discussion**

This study reports the findings from a remote randomised controlled trial of vitamin D supplementation in older adults with mild to moderate vitamin D deficiency and AACD. The results show that supplementation conferred no benefit to the primary outcome of executive function or to any secondary measures of cognition, function or well-being at the 24-month timepoint. The trial

applied an appropriate double-blinded design and reached sufficient power to answer the research question, so this outcome is reliable and statistically significant.

There is already robust evidence for the benefits of supplementation in people with severe Vitamin D deficiency, but this study clearly shows the absence of benefit in individuals with mild to moderate deficiency, which is more prevalent in the population and less likely to be detected and treated than severe deficiency. The findings suggest that while there is a need to address low vitamin D intake for other health risks, such as osteoarthritis and osteoporosis, there may not be an impact on cognition as a result. There is increasingly clear evidence regarding strategies for promoting cognitive health in ageing, including physical activity, cognitive training, maintaining a healthy weight and managing key medical conditions such as depression, hypertension, diabetes and hearing loss. However, this trial indicates that vitamin D supplementation need not be included in this guidance for the public or clinicians when considering cognitive risk in individuals with moderate deficiency. The important exception is in individuals with severe vitamin D deficiency since this trial did not include sufficient individuals with a deficiency of  $<25\text{nmol/l}$ , as this was not the primary research question.

This study successfully delivered a fully remote randomised placebo-controlled clinical trial in 620 participants. It provides proof of concept for the innovative remote approach to trial delivery.

Participants were recruited, treated, assessed and retained using fully remote methodology.

Recruitment was achieved at the height of the Covid-19 pandemic in the UK when most clinical trials were halted and in a seven-month timescale that is unprecedented for traditional in-clinic trials. This was particularly successful due to the PROTECT-UK infrastructure, which allows targeted recruitment from the large ageing cohort with full consent for contact. The remote protocol for dispensing and tracking of study tablets was accurate and well-received by participants, and the study achieved good retention of participants across the 24-month period. Participants showed good compliance with the study protocol, as confirmed by the vitamin D blood level results, tablet count data and the completeness of the data. The online safety reporting approach enabled rapid, real-time collation and responsiveness to this low-risk intervention. Furthermore, the online and computerised



assessment platform provided by the PROTECT-UK infrastructure facilitated high-quality data capture and depth of cognitive data without the need for in-person assessments. This study, therefore, provides important proof of concept for the remote trial design approach for low-risk interventions such as dietary supplements, nutraceutical products or repositioned drugs that do not require in-person physiological monitoring.

The study did, however, have some limitations. Recruitment was achieved through the online PROTECT-UK cohort, resulting in a self-selection bias towards females of Caucasian ethnicity with high educational attainment. The online nature of the trial also meant that participants were already fully digitally engaged. These design factors meant that the cohort was not fully representative of the UK population so caution should be taken in translating the findings to a population level, particularly considering the association of vitamin D and differing melatonin levels in different ethnic minority groups. This study was run for 24 months and showed no benefit to cognition so it is possible that a longer duration trial may have shown a more favourable outcome, although this would raise issues regarding the implementability of a long-term supplementation programme for public health.

This study provides robust evidence that Vitamin D supplementation does not result in cognitive benefits in individuals with mild to moderate deficiency. The findings indicate that while supplementation may be of value for other clinical indications and in people with severe deficiency, guidance does not need to include vitamin D supplementation for this patient group. Furthermore, the study provides robust proof of concept for remote clinical trial delivery using recruitment and engagement through the PROTECT-UK cohort platform and integrated computerised cognitive testing. This methodology should be considered for low-risk clinical trials.

## **Acknowledgements**

This work was funded by the Jon Moulton Charitable Foundation. This paper represents independent research part-funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research Exeter Biomedical Research Centre. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. It was also supported by the NIHR Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care South-West Peninsula. JR receives funding from Alzheimer's Research UK. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. No funding has been provided by a pharmaceutical company or other agency to write this article. Authors have not been precluded from accessing data, and all authors accept responsibility for publication.

<https://www.exeter.ac.uk/>

## References

1. Alzheimer's Research UK. Dementia Statistics UK <https://www.dementiastatistics.org/statistics-about-dementia/prevalence-2/>: Alzheimer's Research UK; 2022
2. Prince M, Bryce R, Albanese E, Wimo A, Ribeiro W, Ferri CP. The global prevalence of dementia: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2013;9(1):63-75 e2.
3. US Federal Drugs Agency. Alzheimer's Disease: Developing Drugs for Treatment Guidance for Industry. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/alzheimers-disease-developing-drugs-treatment-guidance-industry2018>.
4. Ashwell M, Stone EM, Stolte H, Cashman KD, Macdonald H, Lanham-New S, et al. UK Food Standards Agency Workshop Report: an investigation of the relative contributions of diet and sunlight to vitamin D status. *Br J Nutr*. 2010;104(4):603-11.
5. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition. SACN vitamin D and health report <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sacn-vitamin-d-and-health-report>: GOV.UK; 2016 [
6. Crowe FL, Jolly K, MacArthur C, Manaseki-Holland S, Gittoes N, Hewison M, et al. Trends in the incidence of testing for vitamin D deficiency in primary care in the UK: a retrospective analysis of The Health Improvement Network (THIN), 2005-2015. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(6):e028355.
7. Anjum I, Jaffery SS, Fayyaz M, Samoo Z, Anjum S. The Role of Vitamin D in Brain Health: A Mini Literature Review. *Cureus*. 2018;10(7):e2960.
8. Miller BJ, Whisner CM, Johnston CS. Vitamin D Supplementation Appears to Increase Plasma A $\beta$ 40 in Vitamin D Insufficient Older Adults: A Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2016;52(3):843-7.
9. Durk MR, Han K, Chow EC, Ahrens R, Henderson JT, Fraser PE, et al. 1 $\alpha$ ,25-Dihydroxyvitamin D3 reduces cerebral amyloid- $\beta$  accumulation and improves cognition in mouse models of Alzheimer's disease. *J Neurosci*. 2014;34(21):7091-101.
10. Llewellyn DJ, Langa KM, Lang IA. Serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D concentration and cognitive impairment. *J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol*. 2009;22(3):188-95.
11. Ghahremani M, Smith EE, Chen HY, Creese B, Goodarzi Z, Ismail Z. Vitamin D supplementation and incident dementia: Effects of sex,. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2023;15(1):e12404.
12. Masoumi A, Goldenson B, Ghirmai S, Avagyan H, Zaghi J, Abel K, et al. 1 $\alpha$ ,25-dihydroxyvitamin D3 interacts with curcuminoids to stimulate amyloid-beta clearance by macrophages of Alzheimer's disease patients. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2009;17(3):703-17.
13. Llewellyn DJ, Lang IA, Langa KM, Muniz-Terrera G, Phillips CL, Cherubini A, et al. Vitamin D and risk of cognitive decline in elderly persons. *Arch Intern Med*. 2010;170(13):1135-41.
14. Littlejohns TJ, Henley WE, Lang IA, Annweiler C, Beauchet O, Chaves PH, et al. Vitamin D and the risk of dementia and Alzheimer disease. *Neurology*. 2014;83(10):920-8.
15. Navale SS, Mulugeta A, Zhou A, Llewellyn DJ, Hyppönen E. Vitamin D and brain health: an observational and Mendelian randomization study. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2022;116(2):531-40.
16. Balion C, Griffith LE, Striffler L, Henderson M, Patterson C, Heckman G, et al. Vitamin D, cognition, and dementia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurology*. 2012;79(13):1397-405.
17. PROTECT Study Website. Contract No.: 15th December.
18. Huntley J, Corbett A, Wesnes K, Brooker H, Stenton R, Hampshire A, et al. Online assessment of risk factors for dementia and cognitive function in healthy adults. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2018;33(2):e286-e93.
19. Huntley J, Corbett A, Wesnes K, Brooker H, Stenton R, Hampshire A, et al. Online assessment of risk factors for dementia and cognitive function in healthy adults. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*. 2018;33(2):e286-e93.

20. Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study of ageing. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2013;42(6):1640-8.
21. Arbutnott K, Frank J. Trail making test, part B as a measure of executive control: validation using a set-switching paradigm. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2000;22(4):518-28.
22. Owen AM, Hampshire A, Grahn JA, Stenton R, Dajani S, Burns AS, et al. Putting brain training to the test. *Nature*. 2010;465(7299):775-8.
23. Corbett A, Owen A, Hampshire A, Grahn J, Stenton R, Dajani S, et al. The Effect of an Online Cognitive Training Package in Healthy Older Adults: An Online Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2015;16(11):990-7.
24. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. *Gerontologist*. 1969;9(3):179-86.
25. Ismail Z, Smith EE, Geda Y, Sultzer D, Brodaty H, Smith G, et al. Neuropsychiatric symptoms as early manifestations of emergent dementia: Provisional diagnostic criteria for mild behavioral impairment. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2016;12(2):195-202.
26. EuroQolGroup. EuroQol—a new facility for the measurement of health related quality of life. *Health Policy (New York)*. 1990;16:199-208.
27. Corbett A, Owen A, Hampshire A, Grahn J, Stenton R, Dajani S, et al. The Effect of an Online Cognitive Training Package in Healthy Older Adults: An Online Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2015;16(11):990-7.

**Fig 1. CONSORT chart showing the flow of participants through the VitaMIND trial**

