



A Call to Action: Pregnant Women In-Deed Require Vitamin D Supplementation for Better Health Outcomes

Michael F. Holick

The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism
Endocrine Society

Submitted: May 22, 2018

Accepted: September 13, 2018

First Online: September 18, 2018

Advance Articles are PDF versions of manuscripts that have been peer reviewed and accepted but not yet copyedited. The manuscripts are published online as soon as possible after acceptance and before the copyedited, typeset articles are published. They are posted "as is" (i.e., as submitted by the authors at the modification stage), and do not reflect editorial changes. No corrections/changes to the PDF manuscripts are accepted. Accordingly, there likely will be differences between the Advance Article manuscripts and the final, typeset articles. The manuscripts remain listed on the Advance Article page until the final, typeset articles are posted. At that point, the manuscripts are removed from the Advance Article page.

DISCLAIMER: These manuscripts are provided "as is" without warranty of any kind, either express or particular purpose, or non-infringement. Changes will be made to these manuscripts before publication. Review and/or use or reliance on these materials is at the discretion and risk of the reader/user. In no event shall the Endocrine Society be liable for damages of any kind arising references to, products or publications do not imply endorsement of that product or publication.

A Call to Action: Pregnant Women In-Deed Require Vitamin D Supplementation for Better Health Outcomes

Michael F. Holick¹

¹ Boston University School of Medicine, Boston Medical Center. Section Endocrinology, Diabetes and Nutrition, Department of Medicine, Boston, MA 02118

Received 22 May 2018. Accepted 13 September 2018.

ORCID numbers:

0000-0001-6023-9062

Holick

Michael F

Precis: The benefit of vitamin D consumption outweighs the risks. This manuscript describes in details the health benefits to taking vitamin D while pregnant. .

In the current issue of Journal Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism Rostami et al.(1) report on a study evaluating the effectiveness of a prenatal screening program for optimizing vitamin D status [serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D; 25(OH)D] during pregnancy. They related the outcome of this program to the prevention of pregnancy complications. They observed a more than 25-fold increase in the number of pregnant women who were able to achieve a 25(OH)D that was greater than 20 ng/mL if they were screened for their vitamin D status and provided vitamin D supplementation compared to pregnant women who were not screened and therefore were not advised to take a vitamin D supplement. They observed a remarkable decrease in adverse pregnancy outcomes for women who were screened and received vitamin D supplementation. These included some of the most serious adverse complications during pregnancy including 60, 50 and 40% decreases in preeclampsia, gestational diabetes and preterm delivery. This editorial begins with a brief summary of previous studies providing insight about the controversy associated with vitamin D supplementation recommendations prior to discussing this meritorious study and its health implications for pregnant women and their newborns.

There continues to be controversy regarding what the circulating levels of 25(OH)D should be for maximum health. The Institute of Medicine (now National Academy of Medicine) recommended that all children over the age of 1 year and all adults up to 70 years require 600 IU of vitamin D daily to maintain a blood level of 25(OH)D of at least 20 ng/mL.(2) A retrospective study of 40 mother-infant pairs who were documented to have ingested approximately 600 IU of vitamin D a day (prenatal vitamin containing 400 IU and average 2.3 classes of milk daily containing 230 IU of vitamin D) throughout their pregnancy, 50% of the mothers and 65% of the infants had a circulating level of 25(OH)D of less than 20 ng/mL at the time of birth. When using a circulating level of 25(OH)D less than 20 ng/mL as the cut off, 76% of the mothers and 81% of the newborns were vitamin D deficient.(3)

The study of Rostami et al. also found that preterm delivery was not only associated with vitamin D deficiency but that there was an indirect relationship with blood levels of 25(OH)D and increased risk. Women who had blood levels of 25(OH)D <10 ng/mL and received vitamin D supplementation decreased the risk of pre-term delivery by 67% and those who had levels

between 11-20 ng/mL had a 30% decline in premature births. These data are consistent with the post-hoc analysis by Wagner et al.(4) They not only demonstrated a 59% decrease in premature delivery in women who had blood levels of 25(OH)D >40 ng/mL compared to women who had blood levels <20 ng/mL but they also reported less of a decrease for those women who maintained a blood level of 20-40 ng/mL (41% versus 59% in women with a 25(OH)D >40 ng/mL). Equally impressive was the observation when taking into account all 3 adverse outcomes i.e. preeclampsia, gestational diabetes mellitus and preterm delivery, women who were screened and treated for the vitamin D deficiency decreased the odds of these adverse events by 55%.

As significant as these observations are for the health of pregnant women and their newborns vitamin D deficiency in utero has long lasting negative health consequences for susceptibility of developing chronic debilitating illnesses in adult life.(5) Epigenetic fetal programming as a result of environmental events during pregnancy induces specific genes and genomic pathways that not only control fetal development but subsequent disease risk.(4) The placenta has the capacity, like the kidneys, to convert 25(OH)D to its active form, 1,25-dihydroxyvitamin D [1,25(OH)2D].(5) This hormonal form of vitamin D is known to modify histones by inducing acetylation of them.(5) It has been suggested that histone modifications have long lasting consequences on the genomic activities of 1,25(OH)2D.(5-7) This effect is not only on calcemic actions but also on non-calcemic actions including immunomodulation with the attendant decrease in autoantibody production and antimicrobial peptide gene activation.(5,8) This may help explain associations with vitamin D deficiency in utero and in infancy with increased risk for autoimmune diseases including multiple sclerosis, type 1 diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis and Crohn's disease in childhood and later in life.(5,9) Infants born of moms who were vitamin D deficient are also more likely to have wheezing disorders early in life.(9)

The authors used a somewhat complex methodology in their prospective study design. It was not a classic randomized controlled study since the study was conducted in 2 separate sites that were not randomized since participants at one site and those from the other site with blood levels of 25(OH)D>20ng/mL were considered as the control group. They instituted a treatment schedule for vitamin D deficiency based on the baseline screened levels of 25(OH)D. Although it would seem intuitively obvious that patients who have severe vitamin D deficiency i.e. 25(OH)D <10 ng/mL would require higher doses of vitamin D than patients with a blood level of 10-20 ng/mL to correct their vitamin D deficiency. This however it turns out not to be correct as was also appreciated by Rostami et al.(1) There are several vitamin D-25-hydroxylases in the liver that have different affinities and Michaelis constants (K_m; substrate concentration at one half the maximum velocity) for vitamin D. As a result whether the patient is severely vitamin D deficient or moderately vitamin D deficient giving them the same amount of vitamin D will achieve a similar blood level of 25(OH)D.(9,10) The maximum change for a given dose occurs approximately 6-8 weeks after initiating the therapy. Once a blood level of 25(OH)D reaches the threshold of approximately 20 ng/mL then 100 IU of vitamin D will increase blood level by ~1 ng/mL.(11)

There has been concern by obstetricians and pediatricians that high doses of vitamin D during pregnancy can increase risk for birth defects and neonatal hypercalcemia.(12) This study again demonstrates that there should be little concern about giving doses of 50,000 IU weekly for up to 12 weeks or a dose as high as two doses of 300,000 IU intramuscularly. This is especially important for patients who may only be seen infrequently or once during their pregnancy. The preferred route however is the oral administration of vitamin D. What still

needs to be determined is how much vitamin D is required during pregnancy to achieve a blood level of $25(\text{OH})\text{D} > 20 \text{ ng/mL}$ which decreased pregnancy adverse outcomes. (1) Although it is unlikely that 600 IUs of vitamin D daily can achieve these levels (3) studies are needed to determine the minimum amount of vitamin D requirements during pregnancy to achieve blood levels of $25(\text{OH})\text{D} > 20 \text{ ng/mL}$. Wagner and Hollis had reported that 4000 IUs of vitamin D daily throughout pregnancy not only corrected vitamin D deficiency but maintained serum blood levels of $25(\text{OH})\text{D}$ in the range of 40-50 ng/mL without any evidence of hypercalcemia or hypercalcemia.(12)

The results from this study are monumental when considering all of the healthcare ramifications and health care costs associated with the 3 most serious complications of pregnancy. If a pharmaceutical company had developed a drug to reduce risk by even 10% they would have a multi-billion dollar business. The cost associated with correcting and preventing vitamin D deficiency is minuscule when compared to a newly developed medication. Should we be screening all pregnant women for their vitamin D status? This is problematic at several levels including availability of a reliable test to determine the blood level of $25(\text{OH})\text{D}$ as well as the cost. It is much more cost effective to give all pregnant women vitamin D supplementation. How much is still not well established. Six hundred IUs daily was not demonstrated to be effective in achieving a $25(\text{OH})\text{D}$ of at least 20 ng/mL.(3) A daily intake of 1500-2000 IUs or its equivalent, as recommended by the Endocrine Society, will achieve the desired level of a $25(\text{OH})\text{D}$ of at least 20 ng/mL. Whether taking 4000 IUs daily and raising blood levels of $25(\text{OH})\text{D} > 30 \text{ ng/mL}$ during pregnancy provides additional benefits requires further investigation. Vitamin D supplementation should be a required standard of care recommendation for all women, especially women of childbearing age and those who are pregnant.

Michael F Holick Section Endocrinology, Diabetes and Nutrition, Department of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston Medical Center. Boston, MA 02118

I certify that I, MFH, do not have a conflict of interest that is relevant to the subject matter or materials included in this Work.

References

1. Rostami M, Tehrani FR, Simbar M, Yarandi RB, Minooee S, Hollis BW, Hosseinpahah F. Effectiveness of prenatal vitamin D deficiency screening and treatment program: A stratified randomized field trial. *J Clin Endocrinol and Metab* 2018; DOI 10. 1210/jc 2018-00109
2. Ross AC, Manson JE, Abrams SA, et al. The 2011 Report on Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D from the Institute of Medicine: What Clinicians Need to Know. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2011;96(1):53-58.
3. Lee, J.M., Smith, J.R., Philipp, B.L., Chen, T.C., Mathieu, J., and Holick, M.F. Vitamin D Deficiency in a Healthy Group of Mothers and Newborn Infants. *Clin Pediatr*. 2007. 46(1):42-44.
4. Wagner C.L., Baggerly C., McDonnell S., Baggerly K.A., French C.B., Baggerly L., Hamilton S.A., Hollis B.W. *Journal of Steroid Biochemistry & Molecular Biology* 2016. 155:245–251
5. Hossein-nezhad, A and Holick, MF. Optimize dietary intake of vitamin D: an epigenetic perspective. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care*. 2012. 15:567–579.

6. Novakovic B, Sibson M, Ng HK, et al. Placenta-specific methylation of the vitamin D 24-hydroxylase gene: implications for feedback autoregulation of active vitamin D levels at the fetomaternal interface. *J Biol Chem* 2009;284:14838–14848.
7. Ramagopalan SV, Heger A, Berlanga AJ, et al. A ChIP-seq defined genomewide map of vitamin D₃ receptor binding: associations with disease and evolution. *Genome Res* 2010; 20:1352–1360.
8. Wjst M. Is vitamin D supplementation responsible for the allergy pandemic? *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol* 2012; 12:257–262
9. Hossein-nezhad A, Holick MF. Vitamin D for health: a global perspective. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2013;88:720-755.
10. Pietras, SM, Obayan, BK, Cai, MH and Holick MF. Research Letter: Vitamin D₂ Treatment for Vitamin D Deficiency and Insufficiency for Up to 6 Years. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009. 169(19):1806-1808.
11. Holick MF, Binkley NC, Bischoff-Ferrari HA, et al. Evaluation, treatment, and prevention of vitamin D deficiency: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2011;96,1911-1930.
12. Hollis BW, Johnson D, Hulsey TC, Ebeling M, Wagner CL. Vitamin D supplementation during pregnancy: Double-blind, randomized clinical trial of safety and effectiveness. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2011;26(10):2341-57