

The effect of calcium supplementation in people under 35 years old: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Yupeng Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Siyu Le<sup>2\*</sup>, Yi Liu<sup>2</sup>, Huinan Jiang<sup>2</sup>, Binye Ruan<sup>2</sup>, Yufeng Huang<sup>2</sup>, Xuemei Ao<sup>2</sup>, Xudong Shi<sup>2</sup>, Xiaoyi Fu<sup>2#</sup>, Shuran Wang<sup>2#</sup>

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

YPL, <sup>1</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health and Management, Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou 325000, China.

SYL, HNJ, YL, BYR, YFH, XMA, XDS, XYF and SRW, <sup>2</sup>Department of Nutrition and Food Hygiene, School of Public Health and Management, Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou 325000, China.

<sup>#</sup>Correspondence to: ShuRan Wang, Ph.D., Department of Nutrition and Food Hygiene, School of Public Health and Management, Wenzhou Medical University, 112# Nanliu Road, Chashan High Education Zone, Wenzhou 325000, Zhejiang Province, China; Tel: +86-0577-8668 9901; Fax: +86-0577-8668 9901; E-mail: shuranwang@wmu.edu.cn

Xiaoyi Fu, Ph.D., Department of Nutrition and Food Hygiene, School of Public Health and Management, Wenzhou Medical University, 112# Nanliu Road, Chashan High Education Zone, Wenzhou 325000, Zhejiang Province, China; Tel: +86-0577-8668 9901; Fax: +86-0577-8668 9901; E-mail: fuxiaoyi@wmu.edu.cn

Keywords: calcium; peak bone mass; calcium supplementation; osteoporosis

Word count: Main text, 4366 words; 65 references; 3 tables; 4 figures

## ABSTRACT

**Background and objective:** The effect of calcium supplementation on bone mineral accretion in people under 35 years old is inconclusive. To comprehensively summarize the evidence for the effect of calcium supplementation on bone mineral accretion in young populations ( $\leq 35$  years).

**Design:** This is a systematic review and meta-analysis.

**Data sources:** The Pubmed, Embase, ProQuest and CENTRAL databases were systematically searched from database inception to April 25, 2021.

**Eligibility:** Randomized clinical trials assessing the effects of calcium supplementation on bone mineral density (BMD) or bone mineral content (BMC) in people under 35 years old.

**Results:** This systematic review and meta-analysis identified 43 studies involving 7382 subjects. Moderate certainty of evidence showed that calcium supplementation was associated with the accretion of BMD and BMC, especially on femoral neck (SMD 0.627, 95% CI 0.338 to 0.915; SMD 0.364, 95% CI 0.134 to 0.595; respectively) and total body (SMD 0.330, 95% CI 0.163 to 0.496; SMD 0.149, 95% CI 0.006 to 0.291), also with a slight improvement effect on lumbar spine BMC (SMD 0.163, 95% CI 0.008 to 0.317), no effects on total hip BMD and BMC and lumbar spine BMD were observed. Very interestingly, subgroup analyses suggested that the improvement of bone at femoral neck was more pronounced in the peri-PBM population (20-35 years) than the pre-PBM population (<20 years).

**Conclusion:** Our findings provided novel insights and evidence in calcium supplementation, which showed that calcium supplementation significantly improves bone mass, implying that preventive calcium supplementation before or around achieving PBM may be a shift in the window of intervention for osteoporosis.

**Funding** This work was supported by Wenzhou Medical University grant [89219029].

**Conflict of interest statement**

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

## Introduction

Osteoporosis is an imperative public health problem, particularly in elderly women.<sup>1-3</sup> Low bone mass and a fast rate of bone loss at menopause are equal risk factors for future fracture.<sup>4</sup> A low bone mineral content (BMC) or bone mineral density (BMD) in an elderly person implies a suboptimal bone mass in young adulthood -- related to peak bone mass (PBM), greater bone loss in later life, or both. A number of studies have concluded that increasing calcium intake in older people is unlikely to translate into clinically meaningful reductions in fractures or produce progressive increases in bone mass.<sup>5-8</sup> It seems that calcium supplementation is meaningless in the elderly. On the other hand, intervention before the achievement of PBM to maximize PBM might have a significant influence on bone health and further prevent osteoporosis later in life. Several clinical trials have shown positive effects of calcium supplementation on BMD or BMC in children.<sup>9 10</sup> However, several clinical trials have concluded that calcium supplementation may not be associated with calculated bone mass or strength.<sup>11 12</sup> Narrative reviews have also concluded that calcium supplementation may have small nonprogressive effects on BMD or BMC.<sup>13 14</sup> To summarize the studies above, there have been considerable debates about whether calcium supplementation has effects on bone health among young people.

Very recently, a study using cross-sectional data from NHANES 2005-2014 concluded that the age at attainment of peak femoral neck BMD, total hip BMD and lumbar spine BMD was 20-24 years old in males and 19-20 years old in females.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, a plateau is achieved in PBM at approximately 30 years old.<sup>16</sup> Based on the literature above, we decided to limit the threshold to 35 years old in a conservative manner. Since the results of studies in young people are controversial, we carried out a comprehensive meta-analysis to determine the effectiveness of calcium supplementation for improving BMD or BMC in young people before the age of 35. We also aimed to determine whether any effect would vary by sex, baseline calcium intake, ethnicity, age or sources, duration, and doses of calcium supplementation.

## Methods

This meta-analysis was reported according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses guidelines.<sup>17</sup> The protocol for this meta-analysis is available in PROSPERO (CRD42021251275).

### *Literature search*

We applied search strategies to the following electronic bibliographic databases: PubMed, EMBASE, ProQuest, and CENTRAL (Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials) in April 2021 and updated the search using PubMed in October 2021 for eligible studies addressing the effect of calcium or calcium supplementation, milk or dairy products with BMD or BMC as endpoints. Detailed search strategies are provided in the **Supplementary file 1**. Only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were included in this study. We also hand-searched conference abstract books. The reference sections and citation lists of the retrieved literature, including original research articles, reviews, editorials, and letters, were reviewed for potentially relevant articles.

### *Inclusion criteria*

We selected trials based on the following criteria: (1) RCTs comparing calcium or calcium plus vitamin D supplements with a placebo or no treatment; (2) trials involving participants aged under 35 years at baseline; (3) trials providing BMD ( $\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ ) or BMC (g) data measured by dual energy X ray absorptiometry (DXA) as estimates of bone mass. Exclusion criteria: (1) observational studies, such as cohorts, case-control studies, or cross-sectional studies; (2) participants aged over 35 years; (3) trials of participants who were pregnant or in the lactation period; (4) trials without a placebo or control group; (5) trials supplied with only vitamin D; (6) trials that had essential data missing. Two authors (YPL and SYL) independently screened titles and abstracts, and then full-texts of relevant articles according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. By thoroughly reading full-texts, the reasons for excluded trials are provided in **Supplementary file 2**.

### *Risk-of-bias assessments*

The quality of the included RCTs was assessed independently by 2 reviewers (SYL, HNJ) based on the

Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2),<sup>18</sup> and each item was graded as low risk, high risk and some concerns. The five domains included the randomization process, deviations from intended interventions, missing outcome data, measurement of the outcome, and selection of the reported result. A general risk conclusion can be drawn from the risk assessment of the above five aspects. We defined the included trials as low quality, high quality and moderate quality based on the overall bias, which is consistent with the RoB 2 tool algorithm. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

#### *Data extraction and synthesis*

Two researchers (YPL, SYL) independently used a structured data sheet to extract the following information from each study: authors, publication year, participant characteristics, doses of the supplements, baseline dietary calcium intake, duration of trials and follow-up. The absolute changes in BMD or BMC at the lumbar spine, femoral neck, total hip and total body were the primary outcomes we extracted. We categorized the studies into two groups by duration: <18 months and  $\geq 18$  months. For studies that presented the percentage change rather than absolute data, we calculated the absolute change value using baseline data, and the standard deviation and percentage change from baseline were consistent with the approach described in the Cochrane Handbook.<sup>18</sup> If there was missing information, we contacted the corresponding author and obtained the data. (If no reply was received for over three months, we would exclude the article.)

#### *Statistical analysis*

The association of calcium with or without vitamin D supplements with BMD and BMC was assessed. We pooled the data (study-level) from each study using random-effects models in a conservative manner. The standardized mean difference (SMD) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were reported. We performed predesigned subgroup analyses based on the following aspects: sex (female vs. male) and age at baseline (<20 vs.  $\geq 20$  years, representing the prepeak and peripeak subgroups, respectively); all analysed trials were divided into two groups by the age of achieving PBM (determined as 20 years old), regions (Asian and Western), sources of calcium supplementation (dietary vs. calcium supplements), and bias risk of each individual trial. We further conducted some post hoc subgroup analyses according to the level of calcium intake at baseline (< 714 vs.  $\geq 714$

mg/day, based on the median value) and the calcium supplementation dose (<1000 versus  $\geq$ 1000 mg/day, based on the median value). To assess how long the beneficial effect would be maintained, we performed post hoc subgroup analyses according to the duration, taking into account different calcium supplementation periods and different follow-up periods across the trials. Sensitivity analyses included evaluations using fixed-effect models and excluding low-quality trials. In these aforementioned subgroup analyses, if the number of eligible studies in subgroups was less than three, we conducted a sensitivity analysis by excluding the subgroup with fewer than three studies. An effect size of  $\geq 0.20$  and  $< 0.50$  was considered small,  $\geq 0.50$  and  $< 0.80$  was considered medium, and  $\geq 0.80$  was considered large using Cohen's criteria.<sup>19</sup>

We assessed heterogeneity between studies using the  $I^2$  statistic. We performed meta-regression for sample size, age, sex, and supplementation differences to explain the heterogeneity between studies. We performed cumulative meta-analyses based on the sample size to compare with the primary outcomes. We assessed publication bias by examining funnel plots when the number of trials was 10 or more and used Begg's rank correlation and Egger's linear regression tests.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, we robustly adjusted for the summarized results by applying Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill method<sup>21</sup> All analyses were performed by Comprehensive Meta Analysis (version 2.0, Biostat, Englewood, NJ). All tests were 2-tailed, and  $P < .05$  was considered statistically significant. Two reviewers (SYL, YL) independently applied the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system to assess the overall quality of evidence. The quality of evidence for each outcome was classified as either high, moderate, low, or very low based on the evaluation for study design, bias risk, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, publication bias, and confounding bias. GRADE pro version 3.6 was used to grade the overall quality of evidence and prepare the summary-of-findings table. Every decision to downgrade or upgrade the studies was labeled using footnotes. Any disagreements were resolved by consensus.

### **Role of the funding source**

The funders had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

## Results

### *Study characteristics*

Of the 5518 references screened, we identified 43 eligible RCTs (**Figure 1**) involving 7382 subjects.<sup>9-12 22-60</sup> **Table 1** shows the baseline characteristics of the included studies. Of the 43 RCTs, 20 used dietary sources of calcium,<sup>11 12 22 23 25 27-29 40 43-46 48 49 53 54 56 60</sup> and 23 used calcium supplements (including calcium, calcium citrate malate and calcium phosphate).<sup>9 10 24 26 30-39 41 42 47 50-52 55 57 59</sup> The median baseline dietary calcium intake was 714 mg/day; the duration of calcium supplementation intervention did not exceed 2 years in most trials (38/43); and the dose of calcium intervention did not exceed 1000 mg/day in most trials (38/43). Of all the included trials, 23 trials were categorized as low risk of bias; 16, as moderate risk; and 4, as high risk (**Supplementary file 3**).



**Table 1 Characteristics of included studies**

Study	Supplement and Ca dose ( mg/d)	Duration of supplement/ follow up (years)	No. of subjects	Ethnicity	Female(%)	Mean (SD or range) age (years)	Mean baseline serum calcium level(mg/d)	Site measured
Bonjour 1997	Milk extract, 850	1/2	144	White	100	7.94±0.1	12±42	Radius, hip, LS
Cadogan 1997	Whole or reduced fat milk, 1125	1.5/1.5	82	White	100	12.2±0.3	746	TB
Cameron 2004	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 1200	2/2	128	White	100	10.3 ±0.2	715	LS, forearm, hip, TB
Cheng 2005	CaCO <sub>3</sub> or dairy products, 1000	2/2	181	White	100	11(10-12)	<900	LS, FN, TB
Chevalley 2005	CaPO <sub>4</sub> , 850	1/2	235	White	0	7.4±0.4	750	Radius, hip, LS
Du 2004	Milk, 245	2/2	757	Chinese	100	11(10-12)	418	Forearm, TB
Gibbons 2004	Dairy drink, 1200	1.5/2.5	154	White	51	9(8-10)	934	TB, hip, LS
Lau 2004	Milk powder, 650 or 1300	1.5/1.5	344	Chinese	45	8(9–10)	463	Hip, LS, TB
Lee 1995	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 300	1.5/1.5	109	Chinese	42	Age 7	567	Radius,LS, FN
Lee 1994	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 300	1.5/1.5	162	Chinese	46	Age 7	280	Radius
Lloyd 1994	CaCM, 500	2/2	94	White	100	11.9±0.5	960	LS, TB
Lloyd 1996	CaCM, 500	2/2	112	White	100	11.9±0.5	983	LS, TB
Matkovic 2005	CaCM, 1000	7/7	354	White	100	Age 11	830	Radius, TB
Moyer-Mileur 2003	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 800	1/1	71	White	100	Age 12	900	TB, trabecular
Prentice 2005	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 1000	1/1	143	White	0	16.8(16-18)	1190	TB, LS, hip, forearm
Rozen 2003	Elemental calcium, 1000	1/1	112	76% Jewish girls,24% Arab	100	14±0.5	580	TB, LS, FN
Specker 2003	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 1000	1/1	178	White	47	4(3–5)	900	TB, arm, leg
Stear 2003	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 1000	1.3/1.3	144	White	100	17.3 ± 0.3	938 ± 411	TB, LS, hip, forearm
Courteix 2005	CaPO <sub>4</sub> , 800	1/1	113	White	100	10(8-13)	980	TB, LS, hip, radius
Sandra 2003	Food products fortified by milk minerals, 400	0.7/0.7	75	85% White, 15% Asian	100	8.8±0.1	673	TB, LS, leg, arm
Johnston 1992	CaCM, 1000	3/3	140	White	61	10±2	908	Radius, hip, LS

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.14.22273724>; this version posted April 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Molgaard 2004	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 500	1/1	113	White	100	13.2(12.6-13.7)	1307	TB
Nowson 1997	CaCO <sub>3</sub> /Ca lactate gluconate, 1000	1.5/1.5	84	White	100	14±2.6	750	LS, hip, forearm, TB
Ho 2005	Calcium-fortified soymilk supplementation ,600	1/1	210	Chinese	100	14.5±0.39	510	LS, hip
Lu 2019	Milk powder, 300/600/900	1.5/ 1.5	232	Chinese	50	13(12–15)	370	TB, LS, hip
Vogel 2017	Dairy products, 900	1.5/1.5	240	61% Black, 35% White,4% NS	66	11.8 ±1.5	700	TB, hip
Ma 2014	Milk powder, 300/600/900	1/1	220	Chinese	50	12.9±0.3	700	TB, LS, hip
Zhang 2014	Milk powder or additional Calcium, 300/600/900	2/2	220	Chinese	50	12.9±0.3	700	TB, LS, hip
Ward 2014	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 1000	1/ 12	80	Black	0	12.5±0.1	338	LS, hip
Khadilkar 2012	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 500	1/1	210	Indian	100	9.9±1.0	250	TB
Arab 2012	Milk, 250	0.75/0.75	54	White	0	10.3±2.2	570	FN
Ekbote 2011	Calcium fortified laddoo, 405 mg	1/1	60	Indian	50	2.7±0.52	188	TB
Hemayattalab 2010	Milk, 230	0.5/0.5	40	White	0	8.6±1.1	480	FN
Islam 2010	Ca-lactate, 600	1/1	200	White	100	22.9±3.9	<500	LS, hip
Yin 2010	Calcium, 85/230/500	2/2	257	Chinese	47	13.5±0.5	300	TB, LS
Lambert 2008	Calcium-fortified fruit drink, 792	1.5/3.5	89	White	100	11.41±0.54	636	TB, LS, hip
Zhu 2008	Milk, 650	2/2	757	Chinese	100	10.1±0.4	436	TB
Ward 2007	Elemental calcium, 500	1/1	75	White	60	9.8±1.6	850	TB, LS
Bass 2007	Ca-fortified foods using milk minerals, 392 ± 29	0.7/0.7	88	White	0	9.0±0.3	900	TB, LS
Barger-Lux 2005	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 500	3/3	121	White	100	23.1±2.7	605	TB, LS, hip
Chevalley 2005	Milk calcium-phosphate salt extract, 850	1/ 8	149	White	100	7.9±0.5	900	Radius, hip, LS
Winters-Stone 2004	CaCO <sub>3</sub> , 1000	1/1	23	White	100	23.7±4.7	1100	Hip, LS, femoral mid-shaft
Volek 2003	Milk, 1723±274	0.25/0.25	28	White	0	13 to 17	1000	TB

CaCO<sub>3</sub>= calcium carbonate; Ca= calcium; CaCM=calcium citrate malate; CaPO<sub>4</sub>= calcium phosphate; LS= lumbar spine; TB= total body;FN= femoral neck; NS=not stated

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.14.22273724>; this version posted April 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

### *Primary analyses*

**Figure 2, Figure 2-figure supplement 1, Figure 3 and Figure 3-figure supplement 1** shows the summarized effect estimates. For total body, moderate evidence showed that calcium supplementation significantly improved BMD levels with an SMD of 0.330 (95% CI: 0.163 to 0.496,  $P < .001$ ) and slightly improved BMC levels with an SMD of 0.149 (95% CI: 0.006 to 0.291,  $P < .001$ ). At the femoral neck, we found a stronger and moderate protective effect on BMD (0.627, 95% CI: 0.338 to 0.915,  $P < .001$ ) and a small improvement effect on BMC (0.364, 95% CI: 0.134 to 0.595,  $P = 0.002$ ). Meanwhile, a slight but significant improvement in BMC was observed for the lumbar spine (0.163, 95% CI: 0.008 to 0.317,  $P = 0.039$ ). However, calcium supplementation did not improve the BMD levels at the lumbar spine (0.090, 95% CI: -0.044 to 0.224,  $P = 0.190$ ) or total hip (0.257, 95% CI: -0.053 to 0.566,  $P = 0.104$ ) or the BMC level at the total hip (0.116, 95% CI: -0.382 to 0.614,  $P = 0.648$ ).

### *Subgroup analyses*

**Table 2 and 3** shows the results of subgroup analyses. To explore whether the observed effect differed by the age of participants, we divided these participants into two subgroups: prepeak ( $< 20$  years) and peripeak ( $\geq 20$ -35 years), and the results were generally consistent with the findings from the primary analyses. Notably, the improvement effect on both BMD and BMC at the femoral neck (see **Figure 4**) tended to be stronger in the peripeak subjects than in the prepeak subjects (0.852, 95% CI: 0.257 to 1.446 vs. 0.600, 95% CI: 0.292 to 0.909 [for BMD] and 1.045, 95% CI: 0.701 to 1.39 vs. 0.249, 95% CI: 0.043 to 0.454 [for BMC], respectively).

Subgroup analyses by the duration of calcium supplementation showed that the improvement effects on both BMD and BMC of the femoral neck were stronger in the subgroup with  $< 18$  months than in the subgroup with  $\geq 18$  months. However, regarding total body BMD, the effect of calcium supplementation in the subgroup with  $\geq 18$  months duration was slightly greater than that in the other subgroup.

Regarding the sex of subjects, we found a stronger beneficial effect on femoral neck BMD and BMC in women-only trials (0.712, 95% CI: 0.149 to 1.275,  $P = 0.013$ ; 0.742, 95% CI: 0.267 to 1.217,  $P = 0.002$ , respectively) than in trials including men and women (0.556, 95% CI: 0.233 to 0.879,

P=0.001; 0.195, 95% CI: -0.027 to 0.418, P=0.086).

When considering the sources of participants, the improvement effects on femoral neck and total body BMD or on femoral neck and lumbar spine BMC were obviously stronger in Western countries than in Asian countries.

Subgroup analyses by the level of dietary calcium intake at baseline showed that, for femoral neck BMD, the beneficial effect was significant only in the lower subgroup receiving <714 mg/day (0.581, 95% CI: 0.266 to 0.896; P<.001); for total body BMD, the beneficial effect was slightly greater in the lower subgroup receiving <714 mg/day (0.363, 95% CI: 0.127 to 0.599; P=0.003); for total hip BMD and lumbar spine BMC, however, the beneficial effects were statistically significant in the higher subgroup receiving ≥714 mg/day (0.723, 95% CI: 0.245 to 1.201; P=0.003 and 0.2, 95% CI: 0.052 to 0.348; P=0.008, respectively).

Subgroup analyses based on calcium supplement dosages demonstrated a statistically significant effect on femoral neck and total body BMD in the lower dose subgroup receiving <1000 mg/day (0.717, 95% CI: 0.349 to 1.085; P<.001 and 0.392, 95% CI: 0.161 to 0.624; P=0.001, respectively) but not in the higher dose subgroup receiving ≥1000 mg/day.

When considering the different sources of calcium, both calcium sources from dietary intake and additional calcium supplements exerted significantly positive effects on femoral neck BMD (0.728, 95% CI: 0.311 to 1.144, P<.001; 0.510, 95% CI: 0.101 to 0.919, P=0.014) and total body BMD (0.290, 95% CI: 0.054 to 0.526, P=0.016; 0.405, 95% CI: 0.195 to 0.615, P<.001). For BMCs of the lumbar spine and femoral neck, only calcium supplements other than dietary intake had a significant improvement effect.

To explore the longevity of the beneficial effect, we performed subgroup analyses and found that calcium supplementation improved the BMD levels during the follow-up periods after the end of intervention, and the beneficial effect was maintained for at least 1 year after the intervention (0.933, 95% CI: 0.323 to 1.664, P=0.004). However, this beneficial effect seemed to disappear when the follow-up period exceeded 2 years.

**Table 2. Subgroup analysis of bone mineral density (BMD) between calcium supplementation and control for each variable at lumbar spine, femoral neck, total hip and total body**

Variable	No. of datasets	No. of participants	BMD difference(95% CI), P Value	Heterogeneity between		P Value <sup>a</sup>
				studies		
				I <sup>2</sup> (%)	P-value	
<b>Lumbar Spine</b>						
<b>age</b>						
pre-peak	31	3104	0.093 (-0.047 to 0.233), 0.192	71.54	<.001	0.866
peri-peak	4	344	0.078 (-0.471 to 0.627), 0.780	79.82	0.002	
<b>duration</b>						
<18 months	14	1420	0.066 (-0.069 to 0.202), 0.335	32.75	0.113	0.905
≥18 months	21	2178	0.106 (-0.104 to 0.316), 0.322	80.31	<.001	
<b>sex</b>						
women-only trials	13	1466	0.36 (0.067 to 0.653), 0.016	83.71	<.001	0.011
trials with men and women	22	2181	-0.057 (-0.162 to 0.048), 0.284	27.53	0.115	
<b>regions</b>						
Asian	18	1492	-0.012 (-0.117 to -0.094), 0.829	12.70	0.302	0.177
Western	17	1956	0.222 (-0.03 to 0.473), 0.084	83.62	<.001	
<b>baseline calcium intake, mg/d</b>						
<714	23	2014	0.062 (-0.109 to 0.234), 0.477	73.19	<.001	0.561
≥714	12	1434	0.145 (-0.080 to 0.370), 0.207	71.17	<.001	
<b>calcium dose, mg/d</b>						
<1000	26	2172	0.103 (-0.062 to 0.269), 0.222	75.30	<.001	0.806
≥1000	9	1056	0.050 (-0.177 to 0.276), 0.667	59.22	0.012	
<b>types of calcium supplement</b>						
dietary calcium	18	1690	0.104 (-0.104 to 0.311), 0.328	77.83	<.001	0.870
calcium supplementation	17	1758	0.075(-0.099-0.249), 0.396	63.66	<.001	
<b>Femoral Neck</b>						
<b>age</b>						
pre-peak	21	1795	0.600 (0.292 to 0.909), <.001	88.68	<.001	0.138
peri-peak	3	223	0.852 (0.257 to 1.446), 0.005	67.97	0.044	
<b>duration</b>						
<18 months	15	1457	0.824 (0.383 to 1.266), <.001	91.06	<.001	0.578
≥18 months	9	952	0.378 (0.047 to 0.709), 0.025	79.12	<.001	
<b>sex</b>						
women-only trials	8	840	0.712 (0.149 to 1.275), 0.013	90.89	<.001	0.963
trials with men and women	16	1262	0.560 (0.233 to 0.879), 0.001	85.41	<.001	
<b>regions</b>						
Asian	10	793	0.091 (-0.047 to 0.230), 0.197	0.00	0.441	0.115
Western	14	1309	1.078 (0.603 to 1.552), <.001	91.53	<.001	
<b>baseline calcium intake, mg/d</b>						
<714	17	1159	0.581 (0.266 to 0.896), <.001	84.10	<.001	0.57

**Table 2. Subgroup analysis of bone mineral density (BMD) between calcium supplementation and control for each variable at lumbar spine, femoral neck, total hip and total body (continued)**

≥714	7	903	0.680 (0.036 to 1.323), 0.038	93.43	<.001	
calcium dose, mg/d						
<1000	18	1371	0.717 (0.349 to 1.085), <.001	89.52	<.001	0.488
≥1000	6	731	0.421 (-0.055 to 0.897), 0.083	85.12	<.001	
types of calcium supplement						
dietary calcium	15	1071	0.728 (0.311 to 1.144), 0.001	89.73	<.001	0.635
calcium supplementation	9	1031	0.510 (0.101 to 0.919), 0.014	86.60	<.001	
<hr/>						
Total Hip						
age						
pre-peak	16	1539	0.336 (0.031 to 0.642), 0.031	88.43	<.001	0.119
peri-peak	2	144	-0.465 (-1.409 to 0.479), 0.334	77.90	0.033	
duration						
<18 months	6	485	0.076 (-0.102 to 0.255), 0.402	0.00	0.963	0.935
≥18 months	12	1291	0.351 (-0.102 to 0.805), 0.129	93.24	<.001	
sex						
women-only trials	5	527	0.483 (-0.479 to 1.444), 0.325	95.75	0.000	0.932
trials with men and women	13	1070	0.181 (-0.103 to 0.465), 0.211	83.03	0.000	
regions						
Asian	13	1126	0.096 (-0.127 to 0.319), 0.399	73.92	0.000	0.579
Western	5	471	0.690 (-0.429 to 1.81), 0.227	96.33	0.000	
baseline calcium intake, mg/d						
<714	15	1336	0.179 (-0.148 to 0.507), 0.283	89.55	0.000	0.023
≥714	3	261	0.723 (0.245 to 1.201), 0.003	60.02	0.082	
calcium dose, mg/d						
<1000	14	1092	0.189 (-0.179 to 0.557), 0.314	90.28	0.000	0.329
≥1000	4	505	0.513 (-0.024 to 1.05), 0.061	84.04	0.000	
types of calcium supplement						
dietary calcium	15	1369	0.314 (-0.006 to 0.634), 0.054	88.89	0.000	0.421
calcium supplementation	3	228	-0.046 (-1.148 to 1.056), 0.935	92.84	0.000	
<hr/>						
Total Body						
age						
pre-peak	38	3883	0.330 (0.163 to 0.496), <.001	85.15	<.001	..
peri-peak	..	..	..	..	..	..
duration						
<18 months	12	986	0.324 (0.035 to 0.614), 0.028	79.55	<.001	0.775
≥18 months	26	2897	0.334 (0.129 to 0.539), 0.001	87.15	<.001	
sex						
women-only trials	18	2359	0.569 (0.328 to 0.810), <.001	87.66	<.001	0.036
trials with men and women	20	1558	0.104 (-0.089 to 0.296), 0.292	73.86	<.001	

**Table 2. Subgroup analysis of bone mineral density (BMD) between calcium supplementation and control for each variable at lumbar spine, femoral neck, total hip and total body (continued)**

ethnicity						
Asian	23	2008	0.274 (0.062 to 0.486), 0.011	85.67	<.001	0.544
Western	15	1469	0.422 (0.143 to 0.701), 0.003	85.28	<.001	
baseline calcium intake, mg/d						
<714	26	2356	0.363 (0.127 to 0.599), 0.003	89.23	<.001	0.140
≥714	12	1215	0.265 (0.136 to 0.394), <.001	22.28	0.225	
calcium dose, mg/d						
<1000	27	2612	0.392 (0.161 to 0.624), 0.001	88.51	<.001	0.484
≥1000	11	1285	0.189 (0.073 to 0.306), 0.001	11.81	0.332	
types of calcium supplement						
dietary calcium	24	2453	0.290 (0.054 to 0.526), 0.016	88.33	<.001	0.129
calcium supplementation	14	1464	0.405 (0.195 to 0.615), <.001	74.22	<.001	

<sup>a</sup> P value for heterogeneity between subgroups.

**Table 3. Subgroup analysis of bone mineral content (BMC) between calcium supplementation and control for each variable at lumbar spine, femoral neck, total hip and total body**

Variable	No. of datasets	No. of participants	BMD difference (95% CI), P Value	Heterogeneity		P Value <sup>a</sup>
				I <sup>2</sup> (%)	P-value	
Lumbar Spine						
age						
pre-peak	33	2465	0.173 (0.006 to 0.341), 0.043	75.06	<.001	0.678
peri-peak	3	321	0.047 (-0.291 to 0.384), 0.786	47.68	0.148	
duration						
<18 months	21	1485	0.063 (-0.063 to 0.190), 0.328	25.21	0.143	0.487
≥18 months	15	1296	0.293 (-0.015 to 0.602), 0.062	82.27	<.001	
sex						
women-only trials	14	1220	0.327 (-0.017 to 0.672), 0.062	86.55	<.001	0.496
trials with men and women	22	1566	0.076 (-0.054 to 0.207), 0.251	38.52	0.035	
regions						
Asian	15	1260	0.003 (-0.108 to 0.113), 0.962	0.00	0.704	0.112
Western	21	1199	0.319 (0.059 to 0.579), 0.016	82.06	<.001	
baseline calcium intake, mg/d						
<714	24	2030	0.137 (-0.075 to 0.349), 0.206	81.04	<.001	0.104
≥714	12	756	0.206 (0.059 to 0.354), 0.006	0.00	0.472	
calcium dose, mg/d						
<1000	29	2048	0.187 (-0.013 to 0.386), 0.067	78.79	<.001	0.938

≥1000	7	768	0.097 (-0.051 to 0.245), 0.198	0.00	0.992	
types of calcium supplement						
dietary calcium	17	1267	0.198 (-0.119 to 0.516), 0.221	86.46	<.001	0.447
calcium supplementation	19	1519	0.129 (0.024 to 0.234), 0.016	0.00	0.664	
Femoral Neck						
age						
pre-peak	13	1018	0.249 (0.043 to 0.454), 0.018	58.27	0.004	<.001
peri-peak	2	200	1.045 (0.701 to 1.390), <.001	0.00	0.348	
duration						
<18 months	9	648	0.569 (0.223 to 0.914), 0.001	75.38	<.001	0.194
≥18 months	6	570	0.107 (-0.062 to 0.276), 0.213	0.00	0.467	
sex						
women-only trials	5	397	0.742 (0.267 to 1.217), 0.002	74.47	0.004	0.129
trials with men and women	10	793	0.195 (-0.027 to 0.418), 0.086	57.60	0.012	
regions						
Asian	10	793	0.195 (-0.027 to 0.418), 0.086	57.60	0.012	0.129
Western	5	397	0.742 (0.267 to 1.217), 0.002	74.47	0.004	
types of calcium supplement						
dietary calcium	9	684	0.218 (-0.029 to 0.464), 0.083	60.89	0.009	0.367
calcium supplementation	6	506	0.609 (0.162 to 1.056), 0.008	78.02	0.000	
Total Hip						
age						
pre-peak	13	1194	0.273 (-0.150 to 0.696), 0.206	91.78	<.001	<.001
peri-peak	1	121	-1.936 (-2.346 to -1.525), <.001	0.00	1.000	
duration						
<18 months	6	542	-0.226 (-0.514 to 0.061), 0.123	61.79	0.023	0.083
≥18 months	8	773	0.385 (-0.495 to 1.264), 0.392	96.76	<.001	
sex						
women-only trials	3	420	-0.202 (-1.851 to 1.448), 0.81	98.13	0.000	0.499
trials with men and women	11	866	0.205 (-0.276 to 0.685), 0.404	91.70	0.000	
regions						
Asian	10	894	0.043 (-0.087 to 0.172), 0.516	0.00	0.691	0.914
Western	4	392	0.325 (-1.788 to 2.438), 0.763	98.71	0.000	
Total Body						
age						
pre-peak	50	3762	0.168 (0.029 to 0.308), 0.018	79.47	<.001	<.001
peri-peak	1	121	-0.716 (-1.086 to -0.347), <.001	0.00	1.000	
duration						
<18 months	26	1760	0.146 (-0.095 to 0.387), 0.235	83.36	<.001	0.902
≥18 months	25	2634	0.143 (-0.027 to 0.313), 0.100	77.82	<.001	
sex						
women-only trials	23	2139	0.227 (-0.021 to 0.476), 0.073	86.47	<.001	0.593



trials with men and women	28	2089	0.082 (-0.076-0.240), 0.310	70.54	<.001	
regions						
Asian	22	2142	0.186 (-0.004 to 0.375), 0.055	79.98	<.001	0.569
Western	29	2086	0.120 (-0.094-0.334), 0.273	81.74	<.001	
baseline calcium intake, mg/d						
<714	30	2765	0.123 (-0.082 to 0.327), 0.239	86.14	<.001	0.307
≥714	21	1463	0.186 (0.014 to 0.358), 0.034	59.78	<.001	
calcium dose, mg/d						
<1000	37	2779	0.172 (-0.017 to 0.361), 0.074	84.50	<.001	0.895
≥1000	14	1314	0.090 (-0.075 to 0.255), 0.283	51.43	0.013	
types of calcium supplement						
dietary calcium	26	2087	0.084 (-0.109 to 0.277), 0.392	80.09	<.001	0.429
calcium supplementation	25	2141	0.215 (0.004 to 0.427), 0.046	81.58	<.001	

a P value for heterogeneity between subgroups.

### *Sensitivity analysis*

Sensitivity analyses including only trials with a low risk of bias (high quality, see **Supplementary file 4**) showed that the improvement effects on femoral neck BMD and BMC remained statistically significant and stable (0.356, 95% CI: 0.064 to 0.648, P=0.017; 0.249, 95% CI: 0.043 to 0.454, P=0.018). The result for total body BMD was also stable (0.343, 95% CI: 0.098 to 0.588, P=0.006). However, for lumbar spine and total body BMCs, the positive effect was not statistically significant. For other sites, the results were generally consistent with those of the primary analyses. Additional sensitivity analyses using fixed-effect models (see **Supplementary file 5**), performing cumulative meta-analysis (see **Supplementary file 6**) and excluding studies had been included in previous meta-analysis (see **Supplementary file 7**) showed generally consistent results with the primary analyses.

### *GRADE scoring*

**Supplementary file 8** shows a summary of the GRADE assessments of the overall certainty of the evidence for the effect of calcium supplementation on bone measurements. The evidence was graded as moderate for all sites. All of these outcomes were downgraded for inconsistency. For femoral neck BMD, it was downgraded because of strongly suspected publication bias, however, it was upgraded due to the effect size was over 0.5. In summary, the outcome of femoral neck BMD was graded as moderate.

### *Heterogeneity analysis*

In general, the heterogeneity between trials was obvious in the analysis for BMD ( $P < .001$ ,  $I^2 = 86.28\%$ ) and slightly smaller for BMC ( $P < .001$ ,  $I^2 = 79.28\%$ ). The intertrial heterogeneity was significantly distinct across the sites measured. Subgroup analyses and meta-regression analyses suggested that this heterogeneity could be explained partially by differences in baseline calcium intake levels, sex and region of participants (**Table 2, 3** and **Supplementary file 9**).

### *Publication bias*

Funnel plots, Begg's rank correlation and Egger's regression test for each outcome bias are presented in **Supplementary file 10**. Publication bias was obvious in the femoral neck BMD. The adjusted effect size analysed using the trim and fill method also showed a difference from the unadjusted value. Except for the outcome above, no evidence for publication bias was found. The adjusted summary effect size analysed using the trim and fill method did not show substantial changes as well, which also implies no evidence of publication bias.

## Discussion

This meta-analysis comprehensively summarized the evidence for the efficiency of calcium supplementation in young people before the peak of bone mass and at the plateau period. The findings indicated significant improvement effects of calcium supplements on both BMD and BMC, especially on the femoral neck. Due to the special anatomy of the femoral neck, rotation injuries are prone to occur after partial force is applied. It is more difficult for femoral neck fractures than it is for ordinary fractures to heal after injury because the blood supply of the femoral neck is relatively poor. Overall, hip fracture is a common presentation in elderly patients and yields a 30-day mortality of approximately 8-10%.<sup>61</sup> In addition, hip fracture patients are hard to care for and present a significant financial health care burden to society.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, femoral neck fracture is the most common hip fracture, accounting for 54% of hip fractures.<sup>63</sup> Increasing calcium intake is likely to improve bone mass at the femoral neck, and consequently, this effect may translate into clinically meaningful reductions in hip fractures.

Numerous recent systematic reviews have concluded that there is no evidence for associations between calcium supplements and reduced risk of fracture or improvement of bone density in people aged over 50 years.<sup>5-7 64</sup> Since calcium supplements are unlikely to translate into clinically meaningful reductions in fractures or improvement of bone mass in aged people, we wondered if it is possible to increase bone mass at the peak by administering calcium supplements before the age of reaching the PBM or at the plateau of this peak to prevent osteoporosis and reduce the risk of fractures in later life. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis to focus on age before achieving PBM or age at the plateau of PBM, at which the risk of fracture is extremely low. Why did we do such a meta-analysis? Instead of traditionally solving problems when they occurred, that is, treating osteoporosis after a patient has developed osteoporosis, our research attempted to explore the effects of preventive intervention before reaching the plateau and before osteoporosis development. Our study suggests that calcium supplementation can significantly boost peak bone content, which can improve bone mass. Since calcium supplementation in elderly individuals occurs late and has no influence, our findings have critical implications for the early prevention of fractures in the elderly population and provide better insights for the current situation of calcium supplementation. Preventive calcium supplementation in young populations is a shift in the window of intervention for osteoporosis, not

limited to a certain age group but involving the whole life cycle of bone health.

Is there any difference in supplementation of calcium before or after the achievement of the PBM? We found that calcium supplementation improved the bone mass at the femoral neck in both the prepeak and peripeak subjects; furthermore, it is worth noting that the improvement effect was obviously stronger in the peripeak population ( $\geq 20$ -35 years) than in the prepeak population ( $< 20$  years). Based on our findings and the negative associations of calcium supplements with bone outcomes in aged people from previous studies, one can conclude that young adulthood may be the best intervention window to optimize bone mass, especially the PBM; moreover, our study indicates the importance of calcium supplementation at this age instead of the often-mentioned age groups of children or elderly individuals. The findings of our study provide completely new insight into a novel intervention window in young adulthood to improve bone mass and further prevent osteoporosis and fractures in their late lifespan. To synthesize previously published studies in children, we found a meta-analysis conducted by Winzenberg et al<sup>13</sup> that included 19 studies involving 2859 children and found a small effect on total body BMC and no effect on lumbar spine BMD in children, which was in line with our finding. However, they found no effect on BMD at the femoral neck, which was inconsistent with our result. We therefore performed a sensitivity analysis, excluding all the literature they included, and found that the results of our newly included studies, 28 in total, were generally consistent with the primary results. We also performed a sensitivity analysis incorporating only the studies they pooled and found a statistically significant effect for BMD in the femoral neck and total body, while the results for total body BMC were nonsignificant. (see eTable 6 and 7) These slightly different findings can be interpreted as follows: first, we included more and updated literature; second, they used only endpoint data directly, whereas we used change data, taking into account the difference in baseline conditions; third, we used change data to represent the change before and after calcium supplementation more directly. Another meta-analysis conducted by Huncharek et al<sup>14</sup> included 21 studies involving 3821 subjects and pooled three reports involving subjects with low baseline calcium intake and reported a statistically significant summary of the mean BMC in children. Combining the above published literature with our conclusions, it can be concluded that calcium supplementation is more effective in young adults aged 20-35 years than in children. Although this issue needs to be confirmed in the future, our findings highlight the importance of this intervention window of

approximately 10-15 years at the peri-PBM period, which is better than the pre-PBM period.

To explore whether there is a difference between dietary calcium intake and calcium supplements, our subgroup analyses suggested that one can obtain this beneficial effect from both calcium sources, including dietary intake and calcium supplements. For BMD at the femoral neck, dietary calcium seemed to exert a better effect than calcium supplements. Similarly, we also found that the improvement effect was statistically significant only in subjects supplied with calcium dosages lower than 1000 mg/d. These findings support the hypothesis that there may be a threshold dose of calcium supplementation; when exceeded, the effect does not increase. Our findings are consistent with the previous research by Prentice et al, which is that no additional benefit is associated with an intake above the currently recommended dose at the population level.<sup>65</sup> The underlying mechanisms are unclear and need to be elucidated in future studies.

To determine the differences between high dietary intake and low dietary intake of calcium at baseline, our subgroup analyses showed that the improvement effect seemed to be stronger in subjects with high intake at baseline than in those in the lower subgroup. Interestingly, these results were in accordance with the findings of subgroup analyses by population area, which suggested that calcium supplementation was more effective in Western populations, whose level of baseline calcium intake is normally higher than that in Asian countries. However, these findings are likely to be contrary to our common sense, which is, that under normal circumstances, the effects of calcium supplementation should be more obvious in people with lower calcium intake than in those with higher calcium intake. Therefore, this issue needs to be tested and confirmed in future trials.

To investigate changes in the effect of calcium supplementation after cessation, our subgroup analysis showed that the effect remained significant 1 year after cessation, particularly at various sites of BMD. For studies with a follow-up period longer than one year, we included only two articles: one study<sup>53</sup> with two years of follow-up after calcium supplementation was stopped and another study<sup>58</sup> with seven years of follow-up. Their results were pooled and showed that the effects of calcium supplementation no longer persisted. The number of studies is too small for us to explore how long the effects of calcium supplementation will last, and well-designed cohort studies are needed in the future. In the meantime, we have found a point to ponder about whether gains can be made when calcium

supplementation is restarted after a period of withdrawal and what other changes in the organism remain to be discovered.

Several limitations need to be considered. First, there was substantial intertrial heterogeneity in the present analysis, which might be attributed to the differences in baseline calcium intake levels, regions and sexes according to subgroup and meta-regression analyses. To take heterogeneity into account, we used random effect models to summarize the effect estimates, which could reduce the impact of heterogeneity on the results to some extent. Second, our research failed to clearly compare the difference between males and females due to the limitation of existing data-- some studies provided merged data of males and females without males alone. Based on the existing data, the beneficial effect was more obvious when subjects were limited to women only, which needs to be validated in future trials. Third, we found that few of the existing studies focused on the 20-35-year age group, which was why there were only three studies of this age group that met our inclusion criteria; although the number was small, our evidence was of high quality, and the results were stable, especially in the femoral neck. We also tried to find mechanisms related to bone metabolism in the age group of 20-35 years, but few studies have focused on this age group; most studies have focused only on mechanisms related to older people or children. Therefore, more high-quality RCTs and studies on the exploration of mechanisms focusing on the 20-35-year age group are needed in the future. Finally, as some of the studies did not provide the physical activity levels of the participants, we failed to exclude the effect of physical activity on the results.

This study has several strengths. In this first systematic review by meta-analysis to focus on people at the age before achieving PBM and at the age around the peak of bone mass, we comprehensively searched for all of the currently eligible trials and included a total of 7382 participants (including 3283 calcium supplement users and 4099 controls), which added reliability to our findings. Another strength is the high consistency of the results across predesigned subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses. Additionally, we analysed both BMD and BMC separately for the different measurement sites rather than using the mean of all combined values to draw conclusions, which has the advantage of obtaining changes in bone indexes at different sites and drawing more accurate conclusions.

In conclusion, calcium supplementation can significantly improve BMD and BMC, especially at the femoral neck. Moreover, supplementation in people who are at the plateau of their PBM has a better effect. Although further well-designed RCTs with larger sample sizes are required to verify our findings, we provide a new train of thought regarding calcium supplementation and the evaluation of its effects. In terms of bone health and the full life cycle of a person, the intervention window of calcium supplementation should be advanced to the age around the plateau of PBM, namely, at 20-35 years of age.

### **Contributors**

SRW had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. SRW and YPL developed the initial idea for the study. SYL and YPL organised the study concept and design. YPL, SYL and YL acquired, analysed, and interpreted the data. YPL and SYL did statistical analysis. YPL, SYL, YL, HNJ, BYR, YFH, XMA, XDS, XYF and SRW drafted the manuscript.

### **Declaration of interests**

We declare no competing interests.

### **Data sharing**

All data in this analysis are based on published studies. Supplementary data files contain all raw tabulated data are provided in appendix.

### **Acknowledgments**

We thank all authors and participants of the original studies. We also thank American Journal Experts for English language polishing of the manuscript.

## What is already known on this topic

- A number of meta-analyses have demonstrated that calcium supplementation is not associated with lower fracture incidence or bone mineral accretion. The results of studies on the effectiveness of calcium supplementation in young populations were inconsistent. Most studies focused on children or adolescent, rather than young adults under 35 years old-- from the perspective of peak bone mass (PBM). Although each of these studies has contributed imperative findings to the field, the effect of calcium supplementation in people at the age before or around achieving PBM has remained unanswered.

## What are the findings

- Overall, moderate certainty evidence suggests that calcium supplementation can significantly improve the BMD levels of total body and femoral neck, slightly increase the BMC level of femoral neck, total body and lumbar spine. The findings were robust in extensive pre-specific sensitivity analyses and subgroup analyses. Additionally, the improvement in bone mass of femoral neck was more pronounced in the peri-PBM population (20-35 years) than the pre-PBM population (<20 years).

## How might it impact on clinical practice in the near future

- This study is a comprehensive and robust original evidence-based study that focused on calcium supplementation in young populations, which is important to an international general medical audience, to public health, or to policy decisions worldwide.
- Over the past decades, the intervention window for osteoporosis focused on the elderly population, however, in recent years, several studies have concluded that calcium supplementation in the elderly does not prevent osteoporosis or reduce risk of fracture. Our findings provided novel insights and evidence in calcium supplementation, which showed that calcium supplementation significantly improves bone mass, implying that preventive calcium supplementation before or around achieving PBM may be a shift in the window of intervention for osteoporosis.



## References

1. Consensus development conference: diagnosis, prophylaxis, and treatment of osteoporosis. *The American journal of medicine* 1993;94(6):646-50. doi: 10.1016/0002-9343(93)90218-e  
[published Online First: 1993/06/01]
2. Jones G, Nguyen T, Sambrook PN, et al. Symptomatic fracture incidence in elderly men and women: the Dubbo Osteoporosis Epidemiology Study (DOES). *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 1994;4(5):277-82. doi: 10.1007/bf01623352 [published Online First: 1994/09/01]
3. Si L, Winzenberg TM, Chen M, et al. Residual lifetime and 10 year absolute risks of osteoporotic fractures in Chinese men and women. *Current medical research and opinion* 2015;31(6):1149-56. doi: 10.1185/03007995.2015.1037729 [published Online First: 2015/04/09]
4. Riis BJ, Hansen MA, Jensen AM, et al. Low bone mass and fast rate of bone loss at menopause: equal risk factors for future fracture: a 15-year follow-up study. *Bone* 1996;19(1):9-12. doi: 10.1016/8756-3282(96)00102-0 [published Online First: 1996/07/01]
5. Tai V, Leung W, Grey A, et al. Calcium intake and bone mineral density: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2015;351:h4183. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h4183  
[published Online First: 2015/10/01]

6. Zhao JG, Zeng XT, Wang J, et al. Association Between Calcium or Vitamin D Supplementation and Fracture Incidence in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Jama* 2017;318(24):2466-82. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.19344 [published Online First: 2017/12/28]
7. Bolland MJ, Leung W, Tai V, et al. Calcium intake and risk of fracture: systematic review. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2015;351:h4580. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h4580 [published Online First: 2015/10/01]
8. Hu ZC, Tang Q, Sang CM, et al. Comparison of fracture risk using different supplemental doses of vitamin D, calcium or their combination: a network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ open* 2019;9(10):e024595. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024595 [published Online First: 2019/10/18]
9. Lloyd T, Andon MB, Rollings N, et al. Calcium supplementation and bone mineral density in adolescent girls. *Jama* 1993;270(7):841-4. [published Online First: 1993/08/18]
10. Khadiikar A, Kadam N, Chiplonkar S, et al. School-based calcium-vitamin D with micronutrient supplementation enhances bone mass in underprivileged Indian premenarchal girls. *Bone* 2012;51(1):1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2012.03.029 [published Online First: 2012/04/17]
11. Lu JX, Pan H, Hu XQ, et al. Effects of milk powder intervention on bone mineral density and indicators related to bone metabolism in Chinese adolescents. *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for*

- Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 2019;30(11):2231-39. doi: 10.1007/s00198-019-05105-4 [published Online First: 2019/08/04]
12. Vogel KA, Martin BR, McCabe LD, et al. The effect of dairy intake on bone mass and body composition in early pubertal girls and boys: a randomized controlled trial. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2017;105(5):1214-29. doi: 10.3945/ajcn.116.140418 [published Online First: 2017/03/24]
13. Winzenberg T, Shaw K, Fryer J, et al. Effects of calcium supplementation on bone density in healthy children: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2006;333(7572):775. doi: 10.1136/bmj.38950.561400.55 [published Online First: 2006/09/19]
14. Huncharek M, Muscat J, Kupelnick B. Impact of dairy products and dietary calcium on bone-mineral content in children: results of a meta-analysis. *Bone* 2008;43(2):312-21. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2008.02.022 [published Online First: 2008/06/10]
15. Xue S, Kemal O, Lu M, et al. Age at attainment of peak bone mineral density and its associated factors: The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2005-2014. *Bone* 2020;131:115163. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2019.115163 [published Online First: 2019/11/25]
16. Baxter-Jones AD, Faulkner RA, Forwood MR, et al. Bone mineral accrual from 8 to 30 years of age: an estimation of peak bone mass. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 2011;26(8):1729-39. doi: 10.1002/jbmr.412 [published Online First: 2011/04/27]

17. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2009;339:b2700. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700 [published Online First: 2009/07/23]
18. JPT H. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 [updated February 2021.] Available from: [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook) accessed 3 September 2021.
19. Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychological bulletin* 1992;112(1):155-9. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155 [published Online First: 1992/07/01]
20. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 1997;315(7109):629-34. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629 [published Online First: 1997/10/06]
21. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics* 2000;56(2):455-63. doi: 10.1111/j.0006-341x.2000.00455.x [published Online First: 2000/07/06]
22. Bonjour JP, Carrie AL, Ferrari S, et al. Calcium-enriched foods and bone mass growth in prepubertal girls: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The Journal of clinical investigation* 1997;99(6):1287-94. doi: 10.1172/jci119287 [published Online First: 1997/03/15]

23. Cadogan J, Eastell R, Jones N, et al. Milk intake and bone mineral acquisition in adolescent girls: randomised, controlled intervention trial. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 1997;315(7118):1255-60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7118.1255 [published Online First: 1997/12/09]
24. Cameron MA, Paton LM, Nowson CA, et al. The effect of calcium supplementation on bone density in premenarcheal females: a co-twin approach. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 2004;89(10):4916-22. doi: 10.1210/jc.2003-031985 [published Online First: 2004/10/09]
25. Cheng S, Lyytikäinen A, Kröger H, et al. Effects of calcium, dairy product, and vitamin D supplementation on bone mass accrual and body composition in 10-12-y-old girls: a 2-y randomized trial. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2005;82(5):1115-26; quiz 47-8. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/82.5.1115 [published Online First: 2005/11/11]
26. Chevalley T, Bonjour JP, Ferrari S, et al. Skeletal site selectivity in the effects of calcium supplementation on areal bone mineral density gain: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial in prepubertal boys. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 2005;90(6):3342-9. doi: 10.1210/jc.2004-1455 [published Online First: 2005/03/10]
27. Du X, Zhu K, Trube A, et al. School-milk intervention trial enhances growth and bone mineral accretion in Chinese girls aged 10-12 years in Beijing. *The British journal of nutrition* 2004;92(1):159-68. doi: 10.1079/bjn20041118 [published Online First: 2004/07/03]

28. Gibbons MJ, Gilchrist NL, Frampton C, et al. The effects of a high calcium dairy food on bone health in pre-pubertal children in New Zealand. *Asia Pacific journal of clinical nutrition* 2004;13(4):341-7. [published Online First: 2004/11/26]
29. Lau EM, Lynn H, Chan YH, et al. Benefits of milk powder supplementation on bone accretion in Chinese children. *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 2004;15(8):654-8. doi: 10.1007/s00198-004-1593-6 [published Online First: 2004/04/20]
30. Lee WT, Leung SS, Leung DM, et al. A randomized double-blind controlled calcium supplementation trial, and bone and height acquisition in children. *The British journal of nutrition* 1995;74(1):125-39. doi: 10.1079/bjn19950112 [published Online First: 1995/07/01]
31. Lee WT, Leung SS, Wang SH, et al. Double-blind, controlled calcium supplementation and bone mineral accretion in children accustomed to a low-calcium diet. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 1994;60(5):744-50. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/60.5.744 [published Online First: 1994/11/01]
32. Lloyd T, Martel JK, Rollings N, et al. The effect of calcium supplementation and Tanner stage on bone density, content and area in teenage women. *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 1996;6(4):276-83. doi: 10.1007/bf01623385 [published Online First: 1996/01/01]

33. Matkovic V, Goel PK, Badenhop-Stevens NE, et al. Calcium supplementation and bone mineral density in females from childhood to young adulthood: a randomized controlled trial. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2005;81(1):175-88. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/81.1.175 [published Online First: 2005/01/11]
34. Moyer-Mileur LJ, Xie B, Ball SD, et al. Bone mass and density response to a 12-month trial of calcium and vitamin D supplement in preadolescent girls. *Journal of musculoskeletal & neuronal interactions* 2003;3(1):63-70. [published Online First: 2005/03/11]
35. Prentice A, Ginty F, Stear SJ, et al. Calcium supplementation increases stature and bone mineral mass of 16- to 18-year-old boys. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 2005;90(6):3153-61. doi: 10.1210/jc.2004-2114 [published Online First: 2005/03/10]
36. Rozen GS, Rennert G, Dodiuk-Gad RP, et al. Calcium supplementation provides an extended window of opportunity for bone mass accretion after menarche. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2003;78(5):993-8. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/78.5.993 [published Online First: 2003/11/05]
37. Specker B, Binkley T. Randomized trial of physical activity and calcium supplementation on bone mineral content in 3- to 5-year-old children. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 2003;18(5):885-92. doi: 10.1359/jbmr.2003.18.5.885 [published Online First: 2003/05/08]

38. Stear SJ, Prentice A, Jones SC, et al. Effect of a calcium and exercise intervention on the bone mineral status of 16-18-y-old adolescent girls. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2003;77(4):985-92. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/77.4.985 [published Online First: 2003/03/29]
39. Courteix D, Jaffré C, Lespessailles E, et al. Cumulative effects of calcium supplementation and physical activity on bone accretion in premenarchal children: a double-blind randomised placebo-controlled trial. *International journal of sports medicine* 2005;26(5):332-8. doi: 10.1055/s-2004-821040 [published Online First: 2005/05/17]
40. Iuliano-Burns S, Saxon L, Naughton G, et al. Regional specificity of exercise and calcium during skeletal growth in girls: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 2003;18(1):156-62. doi: 10.1359/jbmr.2003.18.1.156 [published Online First: 2003/01/04]
41. Johnston CC, Jr., Miller JZ, Slemenda CW, et al. Calcium supplementation and increases in bone mineral density in children. *The New England journal of medicine* 1992;327(2):82-7. doi: 10.1056/nejm199207093270204 [published Online First: 1992/07/19]
42. Mølgaard C, Thomsen BL, Michaelsen KF. Effect of habitual dietary calcium intake on calcium supplementation in 12-14-y-old girls. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2004;80(5):1422-7. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/80.5.1422 [published Online First: 2004/11/09]
43. Nowson CA, Green RM, Hopper JL, et al. A co-twin study of the effect of calcium supplementation on bone density during adolescence. *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National*



*Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 1997;7(3):219-25. doi: 10.1007/bf01622292 [published

Online First: 1997/01/01]

44. Ho SC, Guldan GS, Woo J, et al. A prospective study of the effects of 1-year calcium-fortified soy milk supplementation on dietary calcium intake and bone health in Chinese adolescent girls aged 14 to 16. *Osteoporosis international : a journal established as result of cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA* 2005;16(12):1907-16. doi: 10.1007/s00198-005-1963-8 [published Online First: 2005/09/01]

45. Ma XM, Huang ZW, Yang XG, et al. Calcium supplementation and bone mineral accretion in Chinese adolescents aged 12-14 years: a 12-month, dose-response, randomised intervention trial. *The British journal of nutrition* 2014;112(9):1510-20. doi: 10.1017/s0007114514002384 [published Online First: 2014/09/19]

46. Zhang ZQ, Ma XM, Huang ZW, et al. Effects of milk salt supplementation on bone mineral gain in pubertal Chinese adolescents: a 2-year randomized, double-blind, controlled, dose-response trial. *Bone* 2014;65:69-76. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2014.05.007 [published Online First: 2014/05/23]

47. Ward KA, Cole TJ, Laskey MA, et al. The effect of prepubertal calcium carbonate supplementation on skeletal development in Gambian boys-a 12-year follow-up study. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 2014;99(9):3169-76. doi: 10.1210/jc.2014-1150 [published Online First: 2014/04/26]

48. Arab Ameri E, Dehkhoda MR, Hemayattalab R. Bone mineral density changes after physical training and calcium intake in students with attention deficit and hyper activity disorders. *Research in developmental disabilities* 2012;33(2):594-9. doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2011.10.017 [published Online First: 2011/12/14]
49. Ekbote VH, Khadilkar AV, Chiplonkar SA, et al. A pilot randomized controlled trial of oral calcium and vitamin D supplementation using fortified laddoos in underprivileged Indian toddlers. *European journal of clinical nutrition* 2011;65(4):440-6. doi: 10.1038/ejcn.2010.288 [published Online First: 2011/01/20]
50. Hemayattalab R. Effects of physical training and calcium intake on bone mineral density of students with mental retardation. *Research in developmental disabilities* 2010;31(3):784-9. doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2010.02.002 [published Online First: 2010/03/20]
51. Islam MZ, Shamim AA, Viljakainen HT, et al. Effect of vitamin D, calcium and multiple micronutrient supplementation on vitamin D and bone status in Bangladeshi premenopausal garment factory workers with hypovitaminosis D: a double-blinded, randomised, placebo-controlled 1-year intervention. *The British journal of nutrition* 2010;104(2):241-7. doi: 10.1017/s0007114510000437 [published Online First: 2010/03/03]
52. Yin J, Zhang Q, Liu A, et al. Calcium supplementation for 2 years improves bone mineral accretion and lean body mass in Chinese adolescents. *Asia Pacific journal of clinical nutrition* 2010;19(2):152-60. [published Online First: 2010/05/13]

53. Lambert HL, Eastell R, Karnik K, et al. Calcium supplementation and bone mineral accretion in adolescent girls: an 18-mo randomized controlled trial with 2-y follow-up. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2008;87(2):455-62. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/87.2.455 [published Online First: 2008/02/09]
54. Zhu K, Greenfield H, Du X, et al. *EAsia Pacific journal of clinical nutrition* 2008;17 Suppl 1:147-50. [published Online First: 2008/05/28]
55. Ward KA, Roberts SA, Adams JE, et al. Calcium supplementation and weight bearing physical activity--do they have a combined effect on the bone density of pre-pubertal children? *Bone* 2007;41(4):496-504. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2007.06.007 [published Online First: 2007/09/18]
56. Bass SL, Naughton G, Saxon L, et al. Exercise and calcium combined results in a greater osteogenic effect than either factor alone: a blinded randomized placebo-controlled trial in boys. *Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research* 2007;22(3):458-64. doi: 10.1359/jbmr.061201 [published Online First: 2006/12/22]
57. Barger-Lux MJ, Davies KM, Heaney RP. Calcium supplementation does not augment bone gain in young women consuming diets moderately low in calcium. *The Journal of nutrition* 2005;135(10):2362-6. doi: 10.1093/jn/135.10.2362 [published Online First: 2005/09/24]
58. Chevalley T, Rizzoli R, Hans D, et al. Interaction between calcium intake and menarcheal age on bone mass gain: an eight-year follow-up study from prepuberty to postmenarche. *The*

*Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism* 2005;90(1):44-51. doi:  
10.1210/jc.2004-1043 [published Online First: 2004/10/28]

59. Winters-Stone KM, Snow CM. One year of oral calcium supplementation maintains cortical bone density in young adult female distance runners. *International journal of sport nutrition and exercise metabolism* 2004;14(1):7-17. doi: 10.1123/ijsnem.14.1.7 [published Online First: 2004/05/08]

60. Volek JS, Gómez AL, Scheett TP, et al. Increasing fluid milk favorably affects bone mineral density responses to resistance training in adolescent boys. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 2003;103(10):1353-6. doi: 10.1016/s0002-8223(03)01073-3 [published Online First: 2003/10/02]

61. National Hip Fracture Database 2020 Report [Available from:  
<https://www.nhfd.co.uk/20/hipfractureR.nsf/docs/2021Report>.

62. White SM, Griffiths R. Projected incidence of proximal femoral fracture in England: a report from the NHS Hip Fracture Anaesthesia Network (HIPFAN). *Injury* 2011;42(11):1230-3. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2010.11.010 [published Online First: 2010/12/25]

63. Davidovitch RI, Jordan CJ, Egol KA, et al. Challenges in the treatment of femoral neck fractures in the nonelderly adult. *The Journal of trauma* 2010;68(1):236-42. doi: 10.1097/TA.0b013e3181c428ce [published Online First: 2010/01/13]

64. Bristow SM, Bolland MJ, Gamble GD, et al. Dietary calcium intake and change in bone mineral density in older adults: a systematic review of longitudinal cohort studies. *European journal*

*of clinical nutrition* 2021 doi: 10.1038/s41430-021-00957-8 [published Online First:


2021/06/17]

65. Prentice A. What are the dietary requirements for calcium and vitamin D? *Calcified tissue*

*international* 2002;70(2):83-8. doi: 10.1007/s00223-001-0035-0 [published Online First:


2002/03/01]

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.14.22273724>; this version posted April 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




**Figure 1: Study selection**

**Figure 2. Effect of calcium supplementation on bone mineral density (BMD) in each sites**




**Figure 2-figure supplement 1A. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of lumbar spine bone mineral density (LSBMD)**







**Figure 2-figure supplement 1B. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of femoral neck bone mineral density (FNBMd)**




**Figure 2-figure supplement 1C. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of total hip bone mineral density (THBMD)**




**Figure 2-figure supplement 1D. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of total body bone mineral density (TBBMD)**




**Figure 3. Effect of calcium supplementation on bone mineral content (BMC) in each sites**




**Figure 3-figure supplement 1A. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of lumbar spine bone mineral content (LSBMC)**




**Figure 3-figure supplement 1B. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of femoral neck bone mineral content (FNBMC)**



**Figure 3-figure supplement 1C. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of total hip bone mineral content (THBMC)**



**Figure 3-figure supplement 1D. Forest plots for the association between calcium supplementation and the accretion of total body bone mineral content (TBBMC)**





**Figure 4. Comparison of the effect of calcium supplementation between pre-peak and peri-peak participants**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.14.22273724>; this version posted April 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

