

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

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

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

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

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

10 *** Correspondence:**

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

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

13 **Abstract**

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

35 **1. Introduction**

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

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

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

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

81 Natural foods are very limited sources of vitamin D; the most notable sources are oil-rich fish and egg
82 yolks. Consequently, the dietary intake of vitamin D is low in most countries, except in those where
83 oily fish are consumed in high quantities and those with mandatory fortification of foods with vitamin


84 D (Lanham-New & Wilson, 2016). A large European survey, which included several countries,
85 revealed that the mean daily intake of vitamin D is in most cases below 5 μg (200 IU) (Freisling et al.,
86 2010) and such low intakes were confirmed in other studies (Hilger et al., 2014; Spiro & Buttriss, 2014;
87 Wahl et al., 2012). Systemic food fortification has been implemented in many countries in order to
88 increase dietary intake of vitamin D, for example, in the USA, Canada, Australia, and Finland (Pilz et
89 al., 2018). On the contrary, most European countries do not have formal public health fortification or
90 supplementation policies (Spiro & Buttriss, 2014). Slovenia is also an example of a European country
91 that does not have any formal advice or policies regarding the enrichment of food products with this
92 vitamin, and vitamin D supplementation (10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{day}$) is advised routinely only for infants up to 1 year.
93 Our recent study revealed the penetration of vitamin D supplementation in Slovenian adults (18–74
94 years) reached about 10% (Hribar et al., 2020), but the design of that study did not enable additional
95 analyses, for example, about insights on the seasonal variations in practices of vitamin D
96 supplementation.

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

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

126
127
128
129

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



132
133 Notes: Figure 1 was constructed using the press coverage data of Klipping media agency (Slovenia), which collects full texts of
134 publications from all relevant mass media channels in Slovenia (covering major television and radio stations (transcripts), print
135 media, and internet portals). Press coverage peaks correspond with:
136 ① Media communication of physician D. Siuka about 10-steps in the fight against COVID-19 (Siuka, 2020);
137 ② Release of recommendations for supplementation with vitamin D for physicians (Pfeifer et al., 2020);
138 ③ Mass media intervention: Press release about the prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in Slovenia by the Nutrition Institute
139 (NUTRIS, 2020), followed by series of interviews and media reports.

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

152 2. Materials and Methods

153 2.1. Data collection

154 This study was conducted in Slovenia. Sampling was done using an online panel survey in two periods.
155 Frist (pre-intervention) sampling period was between 22nd and 27th April 2020, during the first
156 COVID-19 lockdown, while the second (post-intervention) sampling (N=606) was between 11th and
157 30th December 2020, during the second COVID-19 lockdown.

158 Educational intervention (press release to mass media) was done between both collections, on 2nd
159 November 2020 (details provided in Section 2.4). The survey was conducted in the Slovenian language
160 as an amendment to the international Food-COVID-19 survey. Participants provided their informed
161 consent to participate using an online form. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the

162 Bioethical Committee of the Higher School of Applied Sciences in Ljubljana, Slovenia (VIST ET-
163 6/2020).

164 Participants were recruited via a consumer panel marketing research institute with quota sampling for
165 age groups, gender, and region. The selected on-line panel (about 35.000 subjects from Slovenia) was
166 used to generate random invitations in the selected quotas. Participants completed the online survey
167 upon invitation. The international Food-COVID-19 questionnaire (Janssen et al., 2021) was amended
168 with additional socio-demographic details (self-reported financial and health status; see details in
169 Section 2.2), with questions about individual vitamin D supplementation practices before and during
170 the COVID-19 pandemic (detail provided in Section 2.2), and vitamin D-related knowledge (detail
171 provided in Section 2.3). Only valid responses for subjects that passed two attention check questions
172 and provided responses to all survey questions are included.

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

179 2.2. Variables

180 Respondents provided information about their age, which, for the purpose of the analysis, was
181 transformed into a categorical variable with four levels: 18–35, 36–49, 50–65, and ≥ 66 years. Using
182 participants' postal codes and the classification proposed by the European Commission (EUROSTAT,
183 2020), respondents were classified into three categories: urban, intermediate, and rural. Educational
184 status was also collected using EUROSTAT categorisation (Primary school; Upper secondary –
185 vocational school; Upper secondary – high school; Vocational post-secondary school; First cycle
186 Bologna degree; University or second cycle Bologna degree; Scientific MSc or PhD). For statistical
187 analyses, these categories were joined into three larger education categories—lower (primary school),
188 medium (vocational school or high school), and higher (beyond high school). Self-reported financial
189 status was also measured (“How you would assess financial status of your household”: 1-Very below
190 average; 2-Below average; 3-Average; 4.Above average; 5-Very above average). For statistical
191 analyses, respondents were then classified into three categories: the below average income category
192 (includes respondents indicating very below and below average financial status); the average group
193 (indicates average financial status); and the above average category (indicates above and very above
194 average self-reported financial status). Respondents also reported the size of their household, which
195 was classified into three categories: household with children, single person household, household with
196 2+ adults without children living together. Self-assessed health condition was surveyed with a question
197 “How you would assess your general health condition (1-very low, 2-low, 3-medium, 4-high, 5-very
198 high). For statistical analyses we created three categories: The first included those with very low- and
199 low health condition, the second included respondents with average health condition and the third
200 included participants indicating high and very high self-reported health condition. Moreover,
201 participants were asked to report if they were supplementing their diet with vitamin D (a) before and
202 (b) during the COVID-19 pandemic. If supplementation was reported, the participant was asked to
203 provide the dosage of vitamin D. As we needed details about the supplementation to enable a
204 calculation of individual daily vitamin D dosage, we used following wording of the question: “Provide
205 the dosage of vitamin D that you used (for example: 1000 IU per day, 100 micrograms per week, 5
206 drops of Plivit D® per day, etc.). Please provide as much details as possible, to enable us calculation

207 of your daily vitamin D dosage. If possible, check intake of vitamin D on the labelling of the product
208 that you used for supplementation of vitamin D”. Questions were also asked about the extent to which
209 their household had been afflicted with COVID-19 using three questions that asked about infection,
210 isolation or quarantine, and hospitalized members. For the purpose of the analysis, these categories
211 were further joined by one variable with two levels. The participants who responded positively to any
212 of the three questions were classified in the “COVID-19 afflicted households” group, and the remaining
213 respondents in the “COVID-19 not afflicted households” group. The following three questions
214 measured respondents’ perceived risk in relation to the disease: (1) the likelihood of any member of
215 your household becoming infected by the virus; (2) the likely severity of the virus for any member of
216 your household; and (3) the level of your anxiety concerning the potential impact of the virus on your
217 household. Participants were asked to score these on a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).

218 *2.3. Vitamin D-related knowledge*

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

224 (1) Translation to Slovenian language.

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

229 (3) The dietary needs (d) of the original questionnaire refer to the daily amount of vitamin D
230 recommended for adults by Health Canada. This question was changed to refer to recommendations
231 applicable in Slovenia, and responses were provided both in International Units and micrograms of
232 vitamin D (only IU in the original questionnaire). While, in the original questionnaire, the correct
233 response was 600 IU (according to Health Canada recommendations), responses of 600 IU/15µg and
234 800 IU IU/20 µg were considered as correct in our survey, because of the differences between regional
235 and EU-level recommendations (EFSA, 2016; GNS, 2012)

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

248 *2.4. Educational intervention*

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

257 2.5. Data analysis

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

281 3. Results

282 3.1. Socio-demographic and other characteristics of the sample

283 Socio-demographic and other characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. The
284 compositions of the pre-intervention (April 2020; N=602), the post-intervention (December 2020;
285 N=606), and the combined sample (April and December 2020; N=835) study samples are close to the
286 distribution in the population. Both sex and age distribution are quite comparable, with age groups 19–
287 35 and 36–49 slightly over-represented, while the 50+ age group is somewhat under-represented.
288 Regarding educational level, the sample is under-represented for the lower education group.
289 Nevertheless, as the study was done as an online survey, such data could not be considered
290 representative, because the population who do not have access to the internet cannot be included.

291 The results in Table 1 reveal that about 9% of participants were somehow affected by COVID-19 in
 292 April 2020, while the mean COVID-19 risk perception scores were below medium (3). While the
 293 proportion of participants from COVID-19-affected households was much higher in December (25%),
 294 all mean risk perception scores (rated from 1- very low to 5- very high) were still below scale medium
 295 (3). In April the mean score for the likelihood of a household member becoming infected with the virus
 296 (2.2 ± 0.9) was lower in comparison with the score for the likely severity of the virus for household
 297 members, and the score for the level of anxiety concerning the potential impact of the virus on the
 298 household (2.6 ± 1.2 and 2.7 ± 1.1 , respectively). This changed in December, when we observed
 299 significant increase ($p < 0.001$) in the reported likelihood of a household member becoming infected
 300 with the virus in comparison with April (score 2.7 vs. 2.2, respectively). We should also note that
 301 almost half of the sample (45.2 and 46.4% in April and December, respectively) was from a rural
 302 environment, which might have affected the COVID-19 risk perceptions of study participants.

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

Variables	Levels	April	December	Combined
		2020	2020	sample*
		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Sample size		602 (100)	606 (100)	835 (100)
Age	Mean age in years (SD)	44.1 (13.5)	42.94 (13.8)	41.92 (13.7)
Age groups	18–35 years of age	179 (29.7)	206 (34.0)	301 (36.1)
	36–49 years of age	202 (33.6)	184 (30.4)	273 (32.7)
	50–65 years of age	186 (30.9)	187 (30.9)	224 (26.8)
	66 years and above	35 (5.8)	29 (4.8)	37 (4.4)
Sex	Male	300 (49.8)	312 (51.5)	416 (49.8)
	Female	302 (50.2)	294 (48.5)	419 (50.2)
Place of living	Urban	125 (20.8)	123 (20.3)	169 (20.2)
	Intermediate	205 (34.1)	202 (33.3)	283 (33.9)
	Rural	272 (45.2)	281 (46.4)	383 (45.9)
Education	Primary school	24 (4.0)	22 (3.6)	32 (3.8)
	Upper secondary – vocational school	77 (12.8)	52 (8.6)	92 (11.0)
	Upper secondary – high school	231 (38.4)	227 (37.5)	320 (38.3)
	Vocational post-secondary school	69 (11.5)	84 (13.9)	107 (12.8)
	First cycle Bologna degree	94 (15.6)	107 (17.7)	132 (15.8)
	University or second cycle Bologna degree	95 (15.8)	100 (16.5)	133 (15.9)
Financial status	Scientific MSc or PhD	12 (2.0)	14 (2.3)	19 (2.3)
	Very below average	22 (3.7)	28 (4.6)	27 (3.2)
	Below average	115 (19.1)	119 (19.6)	157 (18.8)
	Average	363 (60.3)	361 (59.6)	505 (60.5)
	Above average	101 (16.8)	95 (16.7)	143 (17.1)
Health status	Very above average	1 (0.2)	3 (0.5)	3 (0.4)
	Very low	6 (1.0)	5 (0.8)	6 (0.7)
	Low	17 (2.8)	18 (3.0)	21 (2.5)
	Average	121 (20.1)	126 (20.8)	159 (19.0)
	High	326 (54.2)	330 (54.5)	460 (55.1)
Employment	Very high	132 (21.9)	127 (21.0)	189 (22.6)
	Full time employed	318 (52.8)	331 (54.6)	449 (53.8)
	Part time employed	26 (4.3)	29 (4.8)	37 (4.4)
	Unemployed	71 (11.8)	70 (11.6)	101 (12.1)
	Keeping house or home maker	8 (1.3)	8 (1.3)	10 (1.2)
	Self-employed	31 (5.2)	23 (3.8)	36 (4.3)
	Student	49 (8.1)	58 (9.6)	92 (11.0)
Retired	99 (16.5)	87 (14.4)	110 (13.2)	

Household composition	Household with children	247 (41.0)	286 (47.2)	389 (46.6)
	Single person household	53 (8.8)	54 (8.9)	70 (8.4)
	Household with 2+ adults without children	302 (50.2)	266 (43.9)	376 (45.0)
From COVID-19 affected households	Affected	53 (8.8)	151 (24.9)	N/A
	Not affected	549 (91.2)	455 (75.1)	N/A
COVID-19 risk perception: Mean score \pm SD	The likelihood of any member of your household becoming infected with the virus.	2.2 \pm 0.9	2.7 \pm 1.0	N/A
	The likely severity of the virus for any member of your household.	2.6 \pm 1.2	2.8 \pm 1.2	N/A
	The level of your anxiety concerning the potential impact of the virus on your household.	2.7 \pm 1.1	2.9 \pm 1.1	N/A

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

307 3.2. Vitamin D-related knowledge

308 The results of the measurements of vitamin D-related knowledge are presented in **Table 2** and **Figure**
 309 **2**. The maximum vitamin D-related knowledge score would be 6, but in the April 2020 pre-intervention
 310 study the highest observed score in our survey was 3.73, with a mean score of only 1.60 (95% CI:
 311 1.53–1.67). The specific dimensions of the vitamin D knowledge provide even more interesting results.
 312 Mean scores for dietary vitamin D sources (Q1) and vitamin D’s health impact (Q2) were 0.26 (95%
 313 CI: 0.25–0.28), while mean scores for factors affecting the biosynthesis of vitamin D (Q5) were
 314 somewhat lower (0.23; 95% CI: 0.21–0.24). The majority of the respondents (54.5%) were aware that
 315 the prevalence of vitamin D is above 20%, while the proportion of participants (Q3) knowing their
 316 recommended daily intake of vitamin D (15–20 μ g) and (Q4) the necessary sun exposure for an average
 317 fair-skinned person, when legs and arms are exposed (10–60 minutes per week), was 10% and 28%,
 318 respectively.

319 December 2020 measurements after conduction of educational intervention showed a statistically
 320 significant increase in vitamin-D related knowledge scores ($p < 0.001$). Mean total score significantly
 321 increased for 38% and notable differences were also observed in specific dimensions of the vitamin D
 322 knowledge (Table 2), particularly in scores for vitamin D’s health impact (Q2: +54%), and factors
 323 affecting the biosynthesis of vitamin D (Q5: +96%). As can be observed from knowledge distribution
 324 histograms in **Figure 2**, the educational intervention resulted in increase in knowledge on the tail of
 325 the distribution, with the population with poor pre-intervention vitamin D-related knowledge having
 326 most notable knowledge increase after the intervention.

327


328 **Table 2.** Vitamin D-related knowledge score in study samples (N=602; N=606).
 329

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

330 **Notes:** * Knowledge score consider sum of scores from two types of questions: three multiple choice questions scaled from
 331 0 to 1 and three single choice questions with two discrete options: correct and incorrect. Different letters next to numbers
 332 denote significant difference determined with independent sample t-test and z-test for proportions.
 333

334 **Figure 2.** Histograms of pre-intervention (N=602; April 2020) and post-intervention (N=606;
 335 December 2020) vitamin D-related knowledge in the study sample. The horizontal (x) scale uses the
 336 vitamin D-related knowledge score units, while the respondent’s knowledge distribution is represented
 337 by the vertical bars (Red color line depicts normal Gaussian distribution of pre-intervention knowledge
 338 score, while blue color line depicts normal Gaussian distribution of post-intervention knowledge
 339 score).

340



341
 342

343 To provide further insights, linear regression analyses were used to determine adjusted means of
 344 vitamin D-related knowledge, considering various socio-demographic and other factors – namely age,

345 sex, place of living, education, financial status, health, and employment status. Analyses were done
 346 separately for pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) sample (Table 3).
 347 The pre-intervention analysis shows that age, sex and financial status significantly affected vitamin D-
 348 related knowledge in different population groups. Older respondents with a higher financial status had
 349 significantly increased vitamin D-related knowledge, as shown by the groups' marginal means.
 350 Additionally, significantly higher vitamin D-related knowledge was observed for females compared to
 351 the male population. On the other hand, in the post-intervention analyses (December 2020), financial
 352 status and sex were not identified as significant factors affecting vitamin D-related knowledge
 353 anymore. However, the effect of age was still significant, and the effect of place of living also became
 354 significant, with the highest knowledge scores in participants from urban areas.
 355

356 **Table 3.** Pre-intervention (N=602; April 2020) and post-intervention (N=606; December 2020)
 357 adjusted mean (95% CI) levels of vitamin D-related knowledge by age, sex, place of living, education,
 358 financial status, health status, and employment.
 359

Variables	Levels	Pre-intervention (April 2020)		Post-intervention (December 2020)	
		N (%)	Adjusted	N (%)	Adjusted
Overall		602 (100)		606 (100)	
Age groups	18–35 years of age	179 (29.7)	1.43 (1.30–1.58) ^a	206 (34.0)	1.99 (1.83–2.15) ^a
	36–49 years of age	202 (33.6)	1.53 (1.39–1.67) ^{ab}	184 (30.4)	2.08 (1.92–2.24) ^a
	50–65 years of age	186 (30.9)	1.80 (1.66–1.95) ^b	187 (30.9)	2.52 (2.36–2.68) ^b
	66 years and above	35 (5.8)	1.86 (1.47–2.25) ^{ab}	29 (4.8)	2.53 (2.08–2.97) ^{ab}
Sex	Male	300 (49.8)	1.49 (1.39–1.60) ^a	312 (51.5)	2.15 (2.03–2.26)
	Female	302 (50.2)	1.71 (1.60–1.82) ^b	294 (48.5)	2.27 (2.15–2.39)
Place of living	Urban	125 (20.8)	1.65 (1.48–1.82)	123 (20.3)	2.41 (2.23–2.59) ^b
	Intermediate	205 (34.1)	1.60 (1.50–1.73)	202 (33.3)	2.18 (2.04–2.32) ^{ab}
	Rural	272 (45.2)	1.59 (1.49–1.70)	281 (46.4)	2.13 (2.02–2.26) ^a
Education	Lower	24 (4.0)	1.64 (1.25–2.03)	22 (3.6)	1.98 (1.54–2.42)
	Medium	308 (51.2)	1.56 (1.46–1.67)	279 (46.0)	2.11 (1.99–2.24)
	Higher	270 (44.9)	1.65 (1.53–1.77)	305 (50.3)	2.31 (2.19–2.42)
Financial status	Below average	137 (22.8)	1.36 (1.19–1.53) ^a	147 (24.3)	2.12 (1.94–2.77)
	Average	363 (60.3)	1.65 (1.55–1.75) ^b	361 (59.6)	2.22 (2.03–2.41)
	Above average	102 (16.9)	1.78 (1.59–1.98) ^b	98 (16.2)	2.26 (2.06–2.47)
Health status	Low	23 (3.8)	2.04 (1.64–2.44)	23 (3.8)	2.35 (1.93–2.77)
	Average	121 (20.1)	1.65 (1.47–1.83)	126 (20.8)	2.22 (2.03–2.41)
	High	458 (76.1)	1.57 (1.48–1.66)	457 (75.4)	2.19 (2.10–2.29)
Employment	Employed	375 (62.3)	1.63 (1.53–1.73)	383 (63.2)	2.16 (2.05–2.27)
	Unemployed	79 (13.1)	1.43 (1.19–1.68)	87 (14.4)	2.16 (1.88–2.43)
	Student	49 (8.1)	1.70 (1.40–2.01)	58 (9.6)	2.58 (2.26–2.88)
	Retired	99 (16.5)	1.64 (1.43–1.86)	78 (12.9)	2.19 (1.95–2.43)

360 **Note:** Identified factors based on contrast of marginal linear predictions accounting for vitamin D-related knowledge: (1)
 361 April 2020 sample: p<0.01 (age); p<0.01 (sex), p<0.01 (financial status), p<0.1 (health status); (2) December 2020 sample:
 362 p<0.01 (age); p<0.05 (place of living), p<0.1 (education), p<0.1 (employment). Predictor levels not sharing the same
 363 subscript are significantly different at p<0.05 using pairwise comparisons of predictive margins with Sidak's adjustment
 364 method.
 365

366 Intervention-related changes were additionally investigated using a sample of subjects, for which we
 367 had available two measurements of vitamin D-related knowledge. These were N=373 subjects, who
 368 collaborated in both pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) surveys. We
 369 investigated predictors of an increase in vitamin D-related knowledge using multivariable logistic

370 regression analysis, focusing on age, sex, place of living, education, financial, and health status (Table
 371 4). Altogether, 74% (N=274) of subjects had increased vitamin D-related knowledge scores in
 372 December, in comparison with their April 2020 knowledge scoring. Education of the respondents have
 373 shown to be the only significant predictor of increased knowledge score.
 374

375 **Table 4.** Assessment of intervention-related changes in vitamin D-related knowledge by age, sex, place
 376 of living, education, financial status, health status and employment (analyses on N=373 subjects,
 377 included in both April and December 2020 sampling).
 378

Variables	Levels	N (%)	Subjects with increase ¹ in vitamin-D related knowledge; N (%)	Odds Ratio (CI)
Overall		373 (100)	274 (73.5)	
Age groups	66 years and above	27 (7.2)	21 (77.8)	1.21 (0.40–3.60)
	50–65 years of age	144 (38.6)	109 (75.7)	1.10 (0.56–2.18)
	36–49 years of age	117 (31.4)	82 (70.1)	0.86 (0.44–1.68)
	18–35 years of age	85 (22.8)	62 (72.9)	1
Sex	Female	177 (47.4)	135 (76.3)	1.36 (0.83–2.23)
	Male	196 (52.6)	139 (70.9)	1
Place of living	Urban	79 (21.2)	60 (76.0)	1
	Intermediate	124 (33.2)	95 (76.6)	1.08 (0.54–2.16)
	Rural	170 (45.6)	119 (70.0)	0.82 (0.43–1.57)
Education	Higher	178 (47.7)	128 (71.9)	5.36 (1.61–17.78) ^b
	Medium	181 (48.5)	141 (77.9)	6.34 (1.93–20.78) ^b
	Lower	14 (3.8)	5 (35.7)	1 ^a
Financial status	Above average	60 (16.1)	40 (66.7)	0.71 (0.31–1.62)
	Average	225 (60.3)	170 (75.6)	1.08 (0.59–1.99)
	Below average	88 (23.6)	64 (72.7)	1
Health status	Low	13 (3.5)	10 (76.9)	1
	Average	81 (21.7)	55 (67.9)	0.46 (0.10–2.07)
	High	279 (74.8)	209 (74.9)	0.73 (0.17–3.14)

379 **Note:** ¹Increase in December 2020 vitamin D-related knowledge score, in comparison with April 2020 scoring. Three
 380 respondents showed no change in vitamin D related knowledge. Identified factors based on contrast of marginal linear
 381 predictions accounting for increase in vitamin D-related knowledge: p<0.01 (education). Predictor levels not sharing the
 382 same subscript are significantly different at p<0.05 using pairwise comparisons of predictive margins with Sidak's
 383 adjustment method. Area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve: 0.62.

384 3.3. Vitamin D-supplementation practices

385 The penetration of the pre-COVID-19 vitamin D supplementation was 33.7%, and very similar also in
 386 the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic in April 2020 (33.2%). Among those participants who
 387 reported the amount of vitamin D supplementation they took before the COVID-19 pandemic or during
 388 the pandemic in April, 58% did not report any change in their vitamin D supplementation practice,
 389 while 21% reported increased vitamin D dosage, and the same percentage (21%) reported reduced
 390 vitamin D dosage. Only few subjects reported using daily doses above 100 µg, exceeding the Tolerable
 391 Upper Intake Level (UL) of vitamin D (EFSA, 2012). The mean pre- and -mid pandemic daily vitamin
 392 D supplementation, calculated after the exclusion of these subjects, was 31.0 µg and 32.2 µg,
 393 respectively. Median intake was 25 µg in both cases. Pre- and post-intervention distribution histograms
 394 of daily vitamin D dosages are presented in **Figure 3**. It should be noted that we excluded subjects,
 395 which did not report daily vitamin D dosage (N=41 in pre-intervention and N=58 in post-intervention),
 396 and that first bar represent subjects taking less than 5 µg daily (including those not taking vitamin D).
 397 As expected, the distribution is not normal; subjects were typically supplementing vitamin D with
 398 standardized pharmaceutical formulations, where most common vitamin D content is 25 µg (1000 IU)

399 per dosage (capsule, tablet,...)(Žmitek, Krušič, & Pravst, 2021). More exact daily dosages are however
 400 also achievable if liquid formulations (such as oil drops) are used.


401

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

Variables	Before COVID 19	During COVID-19 Pre-intervention	During COVID-19 Post-intervention
Number of subjects N (%)	602 (100)	602 (100)	606 (100)
Reporting Vitamin D supplementation N (%)	203 (33.7) ^a	200 (33.2) ^a	337 (55.6) ^b
Reporting daily vitamin D dosage N (%)	168 (27.9)	159 (26.4)	279 (46.0)
Daily vitamin D dosage [μg/day] (95% CI)*	31.0 (27.3–34.7) ^a	32.2 (28.1–36.2) ^a	41.1 (37.5-44.7) ^b
<i>Std. Err.</i>	1.9	2.1	1.8
<i>Median</i>	25	25	25
Subjects with vitamin D dosage above 15 μg/day; N (%)	125 (74.4)	124 (95.0)	231 (82.8)
Subjects with vitamin D dosage above 100 μg/day; N(%)	4 (2.4)	8 (5.0)	14 (5.0)

403 **Note:** Before COVID-19 pandemic data were collected in April 2020 survey (N=602); *daily vitamin D dosage was
 404 calculated based on the responses of participants who reported the amount of vitamin D supplementation they took before,
 405 and during the COVID-19 pandemic (April, December 2020). Different letters next to numbers denote significant difference
 406 determined with independent sample t-test and z-test for proportions.
 407
 408

Figure 3. Histogram of pre-intervention (N=573; April 2020: blue) and post-intervention (N=548; December 2020: red) daily vitamin D dosage (μg). The horizontal (x) scale uses daily vitamin D dosage, while the distribution in the population (% of the sample) is represented by the vertical bars. We excluded subjects reporting vitamin D supplementation, which did not report daily vitamin D dosage (N=41 in pre-intervention and N=58 in post-intervention).



409

410 On the other hand, notably different supplementation practices were observed in the later phase of the
411 COVID-19 pandemic, after the educational intervention. Analyses of the post-intervention dataset
412 showed significantly higher penetration of vitamin D supplementation, in comparison to both April
413 and pre-COVID-19 data. Post-intervention proportion of vitamin D supplementation in December
414 2020 increased considerably for 65%, in comparison to pre-COVID data. While median intake of
415 vitamin D was not changed (25 µg), daily vitamin D supplementation dosage significantly increased
416 to 41.1 µg. Among participants who reported the amount of vitamin D supplementation before the
417 pandemic, or during the December COVID-19 lockdown, 63% reported increased vitamin D dosage,
418 while 20% and 17% reported no change or decrease of daily vitamin D dosage, respectively. The
419 proportion of supplement users exceeding the UL of 100 µg Vitamin D was comparable with April
420 2020 (5%).

421
422 Further we investigated predictors of vitamin D supplementation using multivariable logistic
423 regression analysis, focusing on age, sex, place of living, education, financial and health status (Table
424 6). Analyses were done separately for pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December
425 2020) samples. In the model, respondents were classified into two categories (respondents
426 supplementing and not supplementing with vitamin D), while model parameters were estimated by the
427 maximum likelihood method. The only two significant predictors were financial and health status. In
428 April 2020, the likelihood for supplementing vitamin D was higher for population with higher financial
429 status and lower health status. Situation changed considerably after the educational intervention, in the
430 December 2020 dataset. Health status was not a significant predictor for vitamin D supplementation
431 anymore, while the financial status was marginally significant ($p=0.07$). On the other hand, age appear
432 as significant predictor, with the highest vitamin D supplementation rates in elderly subjects.


433
434 To provide further insights into the connection between vitamin D supplementation practices and
435 vitamin D-related knowledge, we used a modeling approach based on the logistic regression method
436 (Figure 4). Two models were constructed to investigate the probability of vitamin D supplementation,
437 using all six investigated dimensions of vitamin D-related knowledge. Model 1 examined pre-
438 intervention vitamin D supplementation practices (April 2020), while Model 2 referred to post-
439 intervention supplementation practices in December 2020. The analysis shows that the increase in
440 vitamin D-related knowledge in three of the six dimensions significantly predicted the likelihood of
441 vitamin D supplementation. The increase in knowledge about dietary sources of vitamin D was found
442 significant predictor in post-intervention Model 2 (OR 2.88, 95% CI: 1.20–6.91, $p=0.02$), while it was
443 close to significant in pre-intervention model (OR 2.55, 95% CI: 0.98–6.65, $p=0.05$). On the other hand
444 knowledge about the health-related impact of vitamin D (OR 6.16, 95% CI: 2.89–16.56, $p<0.001$ in
445 pre-intervention, and OR 4.22, 95% CI: 2.36–7.56, $p<0.001$ for post-intervention) and knowledge about
446 prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the population (OR 1.64, 95% CI: 1.10–2.44, $p=0.02$ before the
447 pandemic, and OR 1.56, 95% CI: 1.06–2.29, $p<0.03$ during the pandemic) significantly increase the
448 probability of vitamin D supplementation in both models.

449 **Table 6.** The proportion of the population using vitamin D supplements during COVID-19 pandemic by age, sex, place of living, education,
 450 financial status, and health status: pre-intervention (April 2020) and post-intervention (December 2020) data
 451

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

452 Note: Surveying was done during the first (April 2020) and second (December 2020) COVID-19 lockdown period. Vitamin D-related educational intervention was done
 453 between both measurements in November 2020. We identified predictors based on the contrast in marginal linear predictions accounting for vitamin D supplementation:
 454 $p = 0.01$ (financial status), $p = 0.03$ (health status) for pre-intervention sample; $p < 0.01$ (age), $p = 0.07$ (financial status) for post-intervention sample. Predictor levels
 455 not sharing the same subscript are significantly different using pairwise comparisons of predictive margins with Sidak’s adjustment method. Area under receiver
 456 operating characteristic (ROC) curve: Pre-intervention: 0.60; post-intervention: 0.62.

457 **Figure 4.** Logistic regression analysis for distinct dimensions of vitamin D-related knowledge in pre-
458 intervention (Model 1: April 2020) and post-intervention (Model 2: December 2020) prevalence of
459 vitamin D supplementation
460



461 Note: Area under receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve: 0.66 (pre-intervention) and 0.67 (post
462 intervention)
463

464 4. Discussion

465 Due to previously established high prevalence of wintertime vitamin D deficiency in populations not
466 taking vitamin D supplements (Calvo et al., 2005; Hribar et al., 2020; Pilz et al., 2018; Spiro & Buttriss,
467 2014), an educational intervention was conducted in Slovenia in November 2020, during COVID-19
468 pandemic. Objectives of this study were to investigate the voluntarily vitamin D supplementation
469 practices, factors, that are affecting these practices, and to evaluate the effects of the educational
470 intervention on vitamin D supplementation practices during the COVID-19 pandemic.

471 Interestingly, despite the very high prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in many countries, very few
472 studies investigated the penetration of supplementation practices. While some countries introduced
473 policies to implement vitamin D supplementation in specific and more at-risk groups (i.e., children up
474 to 12 months of age in Slovenia), supplementation is typically voluntary in the general population.
475 Spiro et al. (2014) highlighted major differences in the use of food supplements across Europe, with a
476 clear north–south gradient. Typically, intake of food supplements is higher in northern countries.
477 Greater use of food supplements is also commonly reported in women in comparison with men (Skeie
478 et al., 2009). It has been established that, globally, dietary supplementation contributes 6–47% of the
479 mean intake of vitamin D (Calvo et al., 2005). In a recent UK study, 43% of participants (adults) used
480 vitamin D supplements (O'Connor et al., 2018); however, the study sample mostly included females
481 and was not representative. Nevertheless, similar penetration of vitamin D supplementation was
482 reported in Pakistani students (Tariq et al., 2020). On the other hand, a nationally representative French
483 study reported the use of vitamin D supplements at a much lower level of 11% (Deschasaux et al.,
484 2016). Similarly, only about 9% of adults reported year-round vitamin D supplementation in a

485 Slovenian nationally representative dietary Si.Menu/Nutrihealth survey, conducted in 2017/2018
486 (Hribar et al., 2020). The same study also identified an alarmingly high prevalence of vitamin D
487 deficiency (about 80%) in adults between the beginning of October and the end of April (extended
488 wintertime), but the study design did not allow insights into the seasonal use of food supplements to
489 be captured.

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

503 A very different situation was observed during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, which
504 affected Slovenia much harder. It should be noted that at the launch of the April 2020 survey, there
505 were cumulatively 1,366 COVID-19 cases and 79 deaths reported in Slovenia, while in December there
506 were already had 95,479 COVID-19 cases and 2,041 deaths (SIGOV, 2021). This also affected our
507 study. In April 2020 survey, about 9% of participants reported that their household was somehow
508 affected by COVID-19 (i.e. due to illness or quarantine of household member), while in December
509 2020 this was the case in 25% of subjects (Table 1). Furthermore, April 2020 mean score for the
510 reported likelihood of a household member becoming infected with the virus was notably lower (score
511 2.2/5) in comparison with December 2020 measurement (score 2.7/5). Also, the December 2020 survey
512 was conducted after the educational intervention. A press release (NUTRIS, 2020) about the wide
513 prevalence of vitamin D deficiency in the Slovenian population (Hribar et al., 2020) was sent to all
514 major mass media at the beginning of November 2020, which received a lot of media attention (Figure
515 1).

516 Analyses of the December 2020 dataset showed that penetration of dietary supplementation with
517 vitamin D increased to 55.6% (from 33.7% in April), with the majority of supplement users taking a
518 daily dosage of at least 25 µg vitamin D. The proportion of subjects with very high vitamin D intakes
519 (above UL level of 100 µg/day (EFSA, 2012) increased during the pandemic, however about 95% of
520 those supplementing vitamin D were still within safe intake levels (<100 µg/day). Nevertheless, the
521 observation that, in some subjects, vitamin D intakes increased drastically during the pandemic
522 highlights the need for very careful communication of vitamin D supplementation practices in relation
523 to specific health-related events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. It should be also noted that we
524 recently investigated most commonly consumed Vitamin D supplements in the population (Žmitek,
525 Krušič, & Pravst, 2021). We analyzed 24 food supplements, which were purchased on the regular
526 market on the market. Median labelled vitamin D (cholecalciferol) content was 25 µg and results of
527 laboratory analyses confirmed expected amount of vitamin in majority (92%) of samples.

528 Vitamin D supplementation in the general population is likely to stay voluntarily in most countries. To
529 use dietary supplementation as a strategy for lowering the risk of vitamin deficiency in such

530 circumstances, very efficient public awareness programs would need to be implemented. In this study,
531 we therefore focused on the identification of predictors of vitamin D supplementation practices. In
532 April 2020 the most important predictors of vitamin D supplementation were the financial and health
533 status of the participants, and specific dimensions of individual vitamin D-related knowledge.
534 Multivariable logistic regression analysis highlighted the highest odd ratios for vitamin D
535 supplementation in participants with a lower health status and in those with a higher financial status.
536 In April 2020, only 33% of subjects used vitamin D supplements, while in the low health status group
537 this was the case in 52%, and in the below-average financial status group in 25%. This indicates that
538 the lowest supplementation rates were observed in those, who would probably need the
539 supplementation the most. These observations are in line with our expectations that wealthier persons
540 can more easily afford to purchase food supplements and that those with a lower self-reported health
541 status more commonly used supplements. Interestingly, we did not observe significant differences
542 between different sexes and age groups, although we would expect a higher penetration of
543 supplementation in older adults (where vitamin D deficiency is commonly more pronounced (Spiro &
544 Buttriss, 2014)), and in women, who are typically more frequent users of food supplements (Tariq et
545 al., 2020). But the situation changed after the educational intervention; in December 2020 dataset age
546 became the only strongly significant ($P=0.01$) parameter, with the highest supplementation rates in
547 elderly subjects (72%). It should be also noted, that 52% of participants in the lower financial status
548 group reported vitamin D supplementation. Study results indicate that we managed to considerably
549 increase vitamin D supplementation across different population groups, including in the most
550 vulnerable groups, such as the elderly population.

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

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

569 Interestingly, some vitamin D knowledge dimensions were not significantly connected to
570 supplementation practices. For instance, knowledge about the (Q3) recommended daily amount of
571 vitamin D, about the (Q4) time needed in the sun to get enough vitamin D, and about (Q5) factors that
572 affect the skin's biosynthesis of vitamin D were not independent predictors of vitamin D
573 supplementation. This was noted both in pre- and post-intervention surveys. The above-mentioned

574 observations are very important for the preparation of key messages that need to be well communicated
575 if we want to increase vitamin D supplementation in the general population.

576 Our study also provides interesting insights into the overall knowledge about vitamin D in the
577 Slovenian population. Knowledge was scored using a tool developed by Boland et al. (Boland et al.,
578 2015). The original questionnaire was tested on Canadian students; the results showed poor knowledge
579 and highlighted the need for more efficient health promotion programs. The reported mean total score
580 in the Canadian study was 29%, while in our case it was 27% (1.60/6) before the intervention, and 37%
581 (2.21/6) after the educational intervention. Knowledge about factors affecting vitamin D levels were
582 also comparably low both in the Canadian study and in our pre-intervention April 2020 study (23%),
583 but in our case this score increased to 45% after the educational intervention. On the other hand, in
584 April 2020 we observed notably lower scores for vitamin D health impact than in the Canadian study
585 (26% vs 37%, respectively), but this factor also notably improved after the intervention (40%).
586 Contrary, about a quarter of our participants (both in pre- and post-intervention survey) correctly
587 identified the amount of time in the sun required to produce adequate vitamin D (only 14% in the
588 Canadian study), while, in both studies, less than 10% identified the correct recommended vitamin D
589 intakes. It should be noted that other studies also identified serious vitamin D-related knowledge gaps
590 in various other populations. Deschasaux et al. (2016) investigated vitamin D-related knowledge in a
591 very large study in France, highlighting several knowledge gaps related to vitamin D sources and (non-
592 skeletal) health effects. Tariq et al. recently investigated the vitamin D knowledge in Pakistani students
593 (2020). Only 9% of study subjects correctly identified dietary sources of vitamin D, while one third
594 were aware of the bone health-related effects of vitamin D, and only 36% identified sunlight exposure
595 as a factor influencing vitamin D production. Interestingly, they also observed that those with more
596 knowledge about the health functions of vitamin D were more likely to use vitamin D supplements.
597 We should note, however, that there were considerable differences in the tools used for measuring
598 vitamin D-related knowledge in these studies.

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

620 Another limitation is related to the vitamin D-related knowledge survey used. To provide some
621 international comparability, we used a tool that was previously tested on Canadian students (Boland et
622 al., 2015), but has not been validated or used in other subject groups. Despite the above-mentioned
623 limitations, the authors believe that the tool used provided reliable predictors of vitamin D
624 supplementation practices. We should also note that some of the study subjects participated both in
625 April and December 2020 data collections. While this strengthens our study, because enabled us to
626 investigate changes in the same subjects, such sampling could also present a limitation. Although study
627 surveys were not conducted in a way to increase vitamin-D related knowledge or to affect vitamin D
628 supplementation practices in study participants, survey questions brought vitamin D topic under
629 attention. A series of control checks were therefore performed to verify, if this had any meaningful
630 effect on the reported study results. For example, we have compared mean vitamin-D knowledge scores
631 in the second survey (December 2020) between new subjects (N=233), and those that already
632 participated in April 2020 survey (N=373), but no significant differences were observed. Furthermore,
633 we compared December 2020 vitamin D supplementation prevalence in both these two groups. No
634 meaningful differences were observed; in both groups vitamin D supplementation rates were above
635 50%, and median daily vitamin D intake was 25 μ . Therefore, we believe that the reported results were
636 not majorly affected by exposing subjects to vitamin D topics.

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

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

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

- 658 (a) Vitamin D can be biosynthesized by human skin when we are sufficiently exposed to sunlight,
659 but such biosynthesis is efficient only between May and September. (Note: this is geolocation-
660 related information reflecting the situation in Slovenia).
- 661 (b) In the absence of efficient biosynthesis, enough vitamin D needs to be provided by the diet.
662 However, only oily fish and a few other foods are notable natural dietary sources of vitamin D.
663 Therefore, the typical dietary intake of vitamin D with natural foods is much lower than
664 recommended intake for the normal functioning of the human body.

- 665 (c) Vitamin D has numerous health functions. It also contributes to the maintenance of normal
666 bones, muscle function, and the function of the immune system.
- 667 (d) In particular, between October and April, there is a very high prevalence of vitamin D
668 deficiency in the population. (Note: this is nationally specific information reflecting the
669 situation in Slovenia).

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

680 **Data Availability Statement**

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

683 **Ethics Statement**

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

689 **Author Contributions**

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

694 **Funding**

695 This study was conducted within the national research program “Nutrition and Public Health” (P3-
696 0395) and the research project “Challenges in achieving adequate vitamin D status in the adult
697 population” (L7-1849), funded by the Slovenian Research Agency and the Ministry of Health of the
698 Republic of Slovenia.

699 **Conflict of Interest**

700 The authors declare that this research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
701 relationships that could be construed as potential conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the
702 design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the
703 manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results. We acknowledge that I.P. has led and participated

704 in various other research projects in the areas of nutrition, public health, and food technology, which
705 were (co)funded by the Slovenian Research Agency, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Slovenia,
706 the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food of the Republic of Slovenia and, in cases of specific
707 applied research projects, also by food businesses. I.P. and K.Z. are members of a national workgroup
708 responsible for the development of recommendations for assuring adequate vitamin D status among
709 the Slovenian population.

710 **Acknowledgments**

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

717 **6. References**

- 718 Anderson, L. (2020). Providing nutritional support for the patient with COVID-19. *Br J Nurs*, 29(8),
719 458-459. doi:10.12968/bjon.2020.29.8.458
- 720 Annweiler, C., Hanotte, B., Grandin de l'Éprevier, C., Sabatier, J.-M., Lafaie, L., & Célarier, T. (2020).
721 Vitamin D and survival in COVID-19 patients: A quasi-experimental study. *The Journal of*
722 *Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 204, 105771.
723 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsbmb.2020.105771>
- 724 Annweiler, G., Corvaisier, M., Gautier, J., Dubée, V., Legrand, E., Sacco, G., & Annweiler, C. (2020).
725 Vitamin D Supplementation Associated to Better Survival in Hospitalized Frail Elderly
726 COVID-19 Patients: The GERIA-COVID Quasi-Experimental Study. *Nutrients*, 12(11).
727 doi:10.3390/nu12113377
- 728 Autier, P., Boniol, M., Pizot, C., & Mullie, P. (2014). Vitamin D status and ill health: a systematic
729 review. *Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 2(1), 76-89. doi:10.1016/s2213-8587(13)70165-7
- 730 Barazzoni, R., Bischoff, S. C., Breda, J., Wickramasinghe, K., Krznaric, Z., Nitzan, D., . . . Singer, P.
731 (2020). ESPEN expert statements and practical guidance for nutritional management of
732 individuals with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clinical Nutrition*, 39(6), 1631-1638.
733 doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2020.03.022
- 734 Benskin, L. L. (2020). A Basic Review of the Preliminary Evidence That COVID-19 Risk and Severity
735 Is Increased in Vitamin D Deficiency. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8.
736 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00513
- 737 Boland, S., Irwin, J. D., & Johnson, A. M. (2015). A survey of university students' vitamin D-related
738 knowledge. *J Nutr Educ Behav*, 47(1), 99-103. doi:10.1016/j.jneb.2014.08.013
- 739 Caccialanza, R., Laviano, A., Lobascio, F., Montagna, E., Bruno, R., Ludovisi, S., . . . Cereda, E.
740 (2020). Early nutritional supplementation in non-critically ill patients hospitalized for the 2019
741 novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Rationale and feasibility of a shared pragmatic
742 protocol. *Nutrition*, 74. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2020.110835
- 743 Calvo, M. S., Whiting, S. J., & Barton, C. N. (2005). Vitamin D intake: A global perspective of current
744 status. *Journal of Nutrition*, 135(2), 310-316.

- 745 Cashman, K. D., Dowling, K. G., Skrabakova, Z., Gonzalez-Gross, M., Valtuena, J., De Henauw, S., .
746 . . Kiely, M. (2016). Vitamin D deficiency in Europe: pandemic? *American Journal of Clinical*
747 *Nutrition*, *103*(4), 1033-1044. doi:10.3945/ajcn.115.120873
- 748 Derbyshire, E. J., & Calder, P. C. (2021). Respiratory Tract Infections and Antibiotic Resistance: A
749 Protective Role for Vitamin D? *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *8*(84). doi:10.3389/fnut.2021.652469
- 750 Deschasaux, M., Souberbielle, J. C., Partula, V., Lécuyer, L., Gonzalez, R., Srouf, B., . . . Touvier, M.
751 (2016). What Do People Know and Believe about Vitamin D? *Nutrients*, *8*(11).
752 doi:10.3390/nu8110718
- 753 EFSA. (2012). Scientific Opinion on the Tolerable Upper Intake Level of vitamin D. *EFSA Journal*,
754 *10*(7), 2813. doi:doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2813
- 755 EFSA. (2016). Dietary reference values for vitamin D. *EFSA Journal*, *14*(10), e04547.
756 doi:doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4547
- 757 Entrenas Castillo, M., Entrenas Costa, L. M., Vaquero Barrios, J. M., Alcalá Díaz, J. F., López
758 Miranda, J., Bouillon, R., & Quesada Gomez, J. M. (2020). Effect of calcifediol treatment and
759 best available therapy versus best available therapy on intensive care unit admission and
760 mortality among patients hospitalized for COVID-19: A pilot randomized clinical study. *The*
761 *Journal of Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, *203*, 105751.
762 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsbmb.2020.105751>
- 763 EUROSTAT. (2020). Correspondence table for Local Administrative Units (LAU) - NUTS 2016/2021,
764 EU-27, UK and EFTA. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/local-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/local-administrative-units)
765 [administrative-units](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/local-administrative-units)
- 766 Freisling, H., Fahey, M. T., Moskal, A., Ocke, M. C., Ferrari, P., Jenab, M., . . . Slimani, N. (2010).
767 Region-specific nutrient intake patterns exhibit a geographical gradient within and between
768 European countries. *Journal of Nutrition*, *140*(7), 1280-1286. doi:10.3945/jn.110.121152
- 769 GNS. (2012). German Nutrition Society: New reference values for vitamin D. *Ann Nutr Metab*, *60*(4),
770 241-246. doi:10.1159/000337547
- 771 Grant, W. B., Lahore, H., McDonnell, S. L., Baggerly, C. A., French, C. B., Aliano, J. L., & Bhattoa,
772 H. P. (2020). Evidence that Vitamin D Supplementation Could Reduce Risk of Influenza and
773 COVID-19 Infections and Deaths. *Nutrients*, *12*(4), 19. doi:10.3390/nu12040988
- 774 Hilger, J., Friedel, A., Herr, R., Rausch, T., Roos, F., Wahl, D. A., . . . Hoffmann, K. (2014). A
775 systematic review of vitamin D status in populations worldwide. *Br J Nutr*, *111*(1), 23-45.
776 doi:10.1017/s0007114513001840
- 777 Holick, M. F., Binkley, N. C., Bischoff-Ferrari, H. A., Gordon, C. M., Hanley, D. A., Heaney, R. P., .
778 . . Weaver, C. M. (2011). Evaluation, treatment, and prevention of vitamin D deficiency: an
779 Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and*
780 *Metabolism*, *96*(7), 1911-1930. doi:10.1210/jc.2011-0385
- 781 Hribar, M., Hristov, H., Gregorič, M., Blaznik, U., Zaletel, K., Oblak, A., . . . Pravst, I. (2020).
782 Nutrihealth Study: Seasonal Variation in Vitamin D Status Among the Slovenian Adult and
783 Elderly Population. *Nutrients*, *12*(6). doi:10.3390/nu12061838
- 784 IOM. (2011). *Institute of Medicine: Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D*.
785 Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

- 786 Janssen, M., Chang, B., Hristov, H., Pravst, I., Profeta, A., & Millard, J. (2021). Changes in food
787 consumption during the COVID-19 pandemic: analysis of consumer survey data from the first
788 lockdown period in Denmark, Germany and Slovenia. *Frontiers in Nutrition, In press* (doi:
789 [10.3389/fnut.2021.635859](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2021.635859)). .
- 790 Kaufman, H. W., Niles, J. K., Kroll, M. H., Bi, C., & Holick, M. F. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 positivity
791 rates associated with circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels. *PloS One, 15*(9), e0239252.
792 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0239252
- 793 Koch, M. (2021). Vitamin D and COVID-19: why the controversy? *The Lancet Diabetes &*
794 *Endocrinology, 9*(2), 53. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00003-6
- 795 Lanham-New, S. A., & Wilson, L. R. (2016). Vitamin D - has the new dawn for dietary
796 recommendations arrived? *J Hum Nutr Diet, 29*(1), 3-6. doi:10.1111/jhn.12360
- 797 Laviano, A., Koverech, A., & Zanetti, M. (2020). Nutrition support in the time of SARS-CoV-2
798 (COVID-19). *Nutrition, 74*. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2020.110834
- 799 Li, L., Li, R. R., Wu, Z. X., Yang, X. H., Zhao, M. Y., Liu, J., & Chen, D. C. (2020). Therapeutic
800 strategies for critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Annals of Intensive Care, 10*(1).
801 doi:10.1186/s13613-020-00661-z
- 802 Liu, G. L., Zhang, S. W., Mao, Z. F., Wang, W. X., & Hu, H. F. (2020). Clinical significance of
803 nutritional risk screening for older adult patients with COVID-19. *European Journal of Clinical*
804 *Nutrition, 74*(6), 876-883. doi:10.1038/s41430-020-0659-7
- 805 Martineau, A. R., Jolliffe, D. A., Greenberg, L., Aloia, J. F., Bergman, P., Dubnov-Raz, G., . . . Goodall,
806 E. C. (2019). Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory infections: individual
807 participant data meta-analysis. *Health Technology Assessment, 23*(2), 1-44.
808 doi:10.3310/hta23020
- 809 Martineau, A. R., Jolliffe, D. A., Hooper, R. L., Greenberg, L., Aloia, J. F., & Bergman, P. (2017).
810 Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory tract infections: systematic review and
811 meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.), 356*, i6583.
812 doi:10.1136/bmj.i6583
- 813 McDonnell, S. L., Baggerly, C. A., French, C. B., Baggerly, L. L., Garland, C. F., Gorham, E. D., . . .
814 Lappe, J. M. (2018). Breast cancer risk markedly lower with serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D
815 concentrations ≥ 60 vs < 20 ng/ml (150 vs 50 nmol/L): Pooled analysis of two randomized trials
816 and a prospective cohort. *PloS One, 13*(6), e0199265. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0199265
- 817 Meltzer, D. O., Best, T. J., Zhang, H., Vokes, T., Arora, V., & Solway, J. (2020). Association of
818 Vitamin D Status and Other Clinical Characteristics With COVID-19 Test Results. *JAMA*
819 *Network Open, 3*(9), e2019722-e2019722. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19722
- 820 Merzon, E., Tworowski, D., Gorohovski, A., Vinker, S., Golan Cohen, A., Green, I., & Frenkel-
821 Morgenstern, M. (2020). Low plasma 25(OH) vitamin D level is associated with increased risk
822 of COVID-19 infection: an Israeli population-based study. *The FEBS Journal, 287*(17), 3693-
823 3702. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15495>
- 824 NUTRIS. (2020). Jeseni in pozimi vitamina D primanjkuje kar 80% prebivalcem Slovenije (Engl.
825 translation: During autumn and winter 80% of the Slovenian population has not enough vitamin
826 D). Retrieved from <https://www.nutris.org/sporocila-za-medije/jesen-in-pozimi-vitamina-d-primanjkuje-kar-80-prebivalcem-slovenije>

- 828 O'Connor, C., Glatt, D., White, L., & Revuelta Iniesta, R. (2018). Knowledge, Attitudes and
829 Perceptions towards Vitamin D in a UK Adult Population: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Int J*
830 *Environ Res Public Health*, 15(11). doi:10.3390/ijerph15112387
- 831 O'Neill, C. M., Kazantzidis, A., Ryan, M. J., Barber, N., Sempos, C. T., Durazo-Arvizu, R. A., . . .
832 Cashman, K. D. (2016). Seasonal Changes in Vitamin D-Effective UVB Availability in Europe
833 and Associations with Population Serum 25-Hydroxyvitamin D. *Nutrients*, 8(9), 15.
834 doi:10.3390/nu8090533
- 835 Özel, E., Cantarero-Arevalo, L., & Jacobsen, R. (2020). Vitamin D Knowledge, Attitudes, and
836 Behaviors in Young Danish Women with a Non-Western Ethnic Minority Background-A
837 Questionnaire Survey. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 17(21). doi:10.3390/ijerph17218053
- 838 Pfeifer, M., Siuka, D., Pravst, I., & Ihan, A. (2020). Priporočila za nadomeščanje vitamina D3 (Engl.
839 translation: Recommendations for supplementation with vitamin D). Retrieved from
840 <https://endodiab.si/2020/11/02/priporocila-za-nadomescanje-vitamina-d3/>
- 841 Pilz, S., Marz, W., Cashman, K. D., Kiely, M. E., Whiting, S. J., Holick, M. F., . . . Zittermann, A.
842 (2018). Rationale and Plan for Vitamin D Food Fortification: A Review and Guidance Paper.
843 *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, 9, 16. doi:10.3389/fendo.2018.00373
- 844 Rastogi, A., Bhansali, A., Khare, N., Suri, V., Yaddanapudi, N., Sachdeva, N., . . . Malhotra, P. (2020).
845 Short term, high-dose vitamin D supplementation for COVID-19 disease: a randomised,
846 placebo-controlled, study (SHADE study). *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, postgradmedj-
847 2020-139065. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2020-139065
- 848 Shen, H., Mei, Y., Zhang, K., & Xu, X. (2021). The Effect of Vitamin D Supplementation on Clinical
849 Outcomes for Critically Ill Patients: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized
850 Clinical Trials. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 8(166). doi:10.3389/fnut.2021.664940
- 851 SIGOV. (2021). Coronavirus disease COVID-19 in Slovenia. Retrieved from
852 <https://www.gov.si/en/topics/coronavirus-disease-covid-19/>
- 853 Siuka, D. (2020). Zdravnik svetuje: 10 korakov v boju proti koronavirusu (Engl. transl: Doctor advises:
854 10 steps in the fight against coronavirus). Retrieved from
855 [https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/zdravnik-opozarja-ko-bo-umrlo-med-20-in-40-ljudi-](https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/zdravnik-opozarja-ko-bo-umrlo-med-20-in-40-ljudi-dnevno-bo-prepozno.html)
856 [dnevno-bo-prepozno.html](https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/zdravnik-opozarja-ko-bo-umrlo-med-20-in-40-ljudi-dnevno-bo-prepozno.html)
- 857 Siuka, D., Pfeifer, M., & Pinter, B. (2020). Vitamin D Supplementation During the COVID-19
858 Pandemic. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 95(8), 1804-1805. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2020.05.036
- 859 Skeie, G., Braaten, T., Hjartåker, A., Lentjes, M., Amiano, P., Jakszyn, P., . . . Slimani, N. (2009). Use
860 of dietary supplements in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition
861 calibration study. *Eur J Clin Nutr*, 63 Suppl 4, S226-238. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2009.83
- 862 Spiro, A., & Buttriss, J. L. (2014). Vitamin D: An overview of vitamin D status and intake in Europe.
863 *Nutr Bull*, 39(4), 322-350. doi:10.1111/nbu.12108
- 864 STAT. (2019). Usage of internet in households and by individuals, Slovenia, 2019. Retrieved from
865 <https://www.stat.si/StatWeb/en/news/Index/8423>
- 866 Tariq, A., Khan, S. R., & Basharat, A. (2020). Assessment of knowledge, attitudes and practice towards
867 Vitamin D among university students in Pakistan. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 355.
868 doi:10.1186/s12889-020-8453-y

- 869 UK. (2020). Vitamin D and clinically extremely vulnerable (CEV) guidance. Retrieved from
870 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vitamin-d-for-vulnerable-groups/vitamin-d-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vitamin-d-for-vulnerable-groups/vitamin-d-and-clinically-extremely-vulnerable-cev-guidance)
871 [clinically-extremely-vulnerable-cev-guidance](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vitamin-d-for-vulnerable-groups/vitamin-d-and-clinically-extremely-vulnerable-cev-guidance)
- 872 Wahl, D. A., Cooper, C., Ebeling, P. R., Eggersdorfer, M., Hilger, J., Hoffmann, K., . . . Dawson-
873 Hughes, B. (2012). A global representation of vitamin D status in healthy populations. *Arch*
874 *Osteoporos*, 7, 155-172. doi:10.1007/s11657-012-0093-0
- 875 Zittermann, A. (2003). Vitamin D in preventive medicine: are we ignoring the evidence? *British*
876 *Journal of Nutrition*, 89(5), 552-572. doi:10.1079/bjn2003837
- 877 Zittermann, A., Pilz, S., Hoffmann, H., & Marz, W. (2016). Vitamin D and airway infections: a
878 European perspective. *European Journal of Medical Research*, 21, 10. doi:10.1186/s40001-
879 016-0208-y
- 880 Žmitek, K., Krušič, S., & Pravst, I. (2021). An Approach to Investigate Content-Related Quality of
881 Nutraceuticals Used by Slovenian Consumers: A Case Study with Folate and Vitamin D
882 Supplements. *Foods*, 10(4), 845.
- 883