After years of going on and on about vitamin D, I am still very happy to talk about it because there is so much that is new in many different areas. My paper called “My Top Five Recommendations to Improve Your Family’s Health” has a large section on it and there are others with much more detail than this. [Like all my nutrition papers it is available for free to anyone interested. Just ask.]

This paper was written because I regularly get questions about some of the confusing aspects about nutrition information in the news. Vitamin D issues can be especially complex and crazy-making. But there is a new understanding of the international epidemic nature of vitamin D deficiency.

Additionally, we have a rapidly-expanding understanding of its critical role as a key steroid hormone involved in the functioning of over 200 tissues and its role as a factor in an even increasing number of serious health problems (like cancer, heart disease, diabetes, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, lupus, fibromyalgia, immune compromise, parkinsonism, muscle weakness, falls, pain and more.)

Although serum vitamin D levels were rarely ordered until the last few years, they are now being ordered with increasing frequency because vitamin D inadequacy continues to be found so often when it is evaluated. In fact, a 25-hydroxy-vitamin D level is the number one separate vitamin assay now ordered in the US. This is primarily because when it is ordered, so many folks are surprisingly very low in vitamin D. Clinicians then check all their other patients and they are finding the same thing in many of them. In the near future it
will likely become an assay standardly done annually because identifying inadequacy and correcting it has such tremendous health benefits over a wide range of conditions. But until that happens, I will keep going on and on about it relentlessly. 😊

Health care professionals do need to have this sorted out more now than ever. This little paper evolved from a question emailed to me recently from a dietitian. As I was typing away with an answer, it occurred to me that other health professionals might find this information helpful as well. And so … a new handout is born!

Here was the original inspiring question:

“What are all those different forms of vitamin D, what factors affect absorption or utilization, what are the right tests to order and how should they be interpreted … etc. etc.”

My rambling response:

First, here are two areas of two big distinctions each in the vitamin D world.

(So what is NOT confusing about all this?!):

1. There are two major forms of vitamin D that come into the body as food or supplements:

   Cholecalciferol (D3) and Ergocalciferol (D2)

2. There are also two major forms of vitamin D floating around in the body:

   25-hydroxycholecalciferol (25-hydroxyD) and

   1, 25-dihydroxycholecalciferol (1,25-dihydroxyD)
Here’s a look at all four:

1. Food and Supplement Vitamin D Forms Coming in from Outside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ergocalciferol</th>
<th>Vitamin D-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in plants and some supplements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Forms of Vitamin D Floating Around in the Blood and/or Stored in the Body (i.e. lab tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25-hydroxycholecalciferol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>also called CalciDIol --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a storage form of circulating non-activated vitamin D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cholecalciferol</th>
<th>Vitamin D-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In animal foods and some supplements. This is also the kind one makes in the skin from exposure to ultraviolet light.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1,25-dihydroxycholecalciferol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>also called CalciTRIol --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the active steroid hormonal form of vitamin D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The difference between the plant source vs animal source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ergocalciferol (D2)</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>cholecalciferol (D3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The kind we make (out of 7-dehydrocholesterol in the skin + UV light) and the kind we use in the body are both the chole type (because we are animals.)

But we can make the “chole” form out of the “ergo” form, so the questions are NOT about ABSORPTION (i.e. getting it into the body from out there in the intestinal lumen) but about whether the same number of mg or iu’s of “ergo” is nutritionally equal to the same amount of “chole.”

At the moment there is no official differentiation, but there have been reports that the “chole” form may be superior in certain instances especially. For example,
in a study of elderly people with vitamin D deficiency, the cholecalciferol and ergocalciferol forms were compared as agents to correct the deficiency. They found that cholecalciferol was almost twice as potent as ergocalciferol in raising serum 25(OH)D, when administered either by mouth or as an injection. [Differences in outcomes between cholecalciferol and ergocalciferol supplementation in veterans with inflammatory bowel disease. Geriatr Gerontol Int. 2012 Jan 10. Endocrine. 2012 Jan 14. Short and Long Term Variations in Serum Calcitroropic Hormones after a Single Very Large Dose of Ergocalciferol (Vitamin D2) or Cholecalciferol (Vitamin D3) in the Elderly. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2008 May 20. ]

Other studies have shown correction of vitamin D deficiency using very high dose ergocalciferol supplements, but they generally are not studied in terms of efficacy in comparison with using “chole” … just whether or not they correct the deficiency. Since the ergocalciferol must first be converted to cholecalciferol, the simple solution -- in my non-opinionated opinion 😊 -- is to just get the “chole” type and quit worrying about that particular issue.

In some cases the choice of using “chole” or “ergo” is related primarily to the relative cost or insurance reimbursement of the product. For a long time, only ergo was available, and it still tends to be cheaper. However, the cost picture is changing rapidly both in terms of treatment product and in the cost of the lab tests. Very high-dose ergocalciferol is effective for correcting vitamin D deficiency in children and young adults with cystic fibrosis. J Cyst Fibros. 2009 May 14.

One other concern would be the healthiness of the liver, since the conversion occurs there. If a person has a very sick liver or a very immature one (like preterm infants,) it would be prudent to provide the form that does not require conversion.

**Absorption is not usually the major problem with vitamin D unless a person has a condition that makes one have significant fat malabsorption** ... like steatorrhea in Cystic Fibrosis, as a major example. Anything that makes people poorly absorb fat will also make them malabsorb the fat soluble vitamins (A, D, E and K) as well, and it can also impair absorption of iron, zinc, calcium and magnesium. Some people who have had bariatric surgery also exhibit impaired absorption and/or inadequate intake of a wide range of nutrients including vitamin D, as can intestinal injury such as that seen with uncontrolled celiac disease (gluten-sensitive enteropathy.)

For other people, in some comparisons the gel caps and liquids have somewhat better absorption than solid tablets, and in general, taking the supplements daily appears to be more effective than weekly or monthly supplementation regimens. Taking the vitamin D supplements with the largest meal of the day also
appears to enhance absorption. Taking it with the highest fat meal also enhances absorption a bit, even if the meal is not especially large.

However, in general, if the amount provided is generous these last two issues become far less important. The biggest problem is not these gradations of efficiency of absorption but simply failure to provide a generous enough amount that is sufficient to truly assure adequacy.

The biggest problems with vitamin D supplementation regimens:

1. The amount of vitamin D being supplemented is often far too low to correct deficiency, let alone bring about rapid correction of deficiency. It is often even too low to prevent deficiency in the first place.

2) The amount currently added to milk in the US is only 100 iu/cup, but people (including health professionals) assume that drinking milk (at all) “takes care of” the vitamin D inadequacy problem. At present, few other foods are fortified with vitamin D. There will likely be big changes in this, but not for quite a while. So, while we wait ….

One would need to drink 4 cups of milk daily at current fortification levels just to get the old (and wildly inadequate) recommended amount of 400 iu.

Most people drink less than 2 cups per day … and often none. It would take 20-50 cups of fortified milk daily to get the amount that appears to be necessary for many people (about 2000-5000 iu/day.) This is clearly unrealistic … and it is also bad nutrition since there would be no room for eating any other foods. Additionally, it is clear that some people need an intake of 5000-7000 iu/day in order to maintain a healthy blood level of vitamin D. (Yow! That’s 50-70 cups of milk daily … better get started! 😊)

3) People simply don’t take the supplements reliably. Because of the poor adherence to therapeutic or maintenance regimens, some other approaches are being tried. For example, a one-time dose of 300,000 iu has been shown to be effective in correcting severe deficiency without negative
effects. Another approach would be to fortify many more foods with generous vitamin D … and in particular, not just dairy foods.

There are lots more references since I wrote the first version this paper. I haven’t had time to dump all the newer references in … in part because I type with one finger. But I have attached a few from some presentations I did recently related to specific medical conditions.

I am including an abstract below of a very important 2009 report that evaluated randomized double blind studies and addressed the question of how much vitamin D supplementation was needed to achieve health targets for risk of falls, fractures, cardiovascular disease and color cancer. It also addresses the issue of the safety of these levels. The authors are all very well known and respected researchers:

**Benefit-risk assessment of vitamin D supplementation.**

“Current intake recommendations of 200 to 600 IU vitamin D per day may be insufficient for important disease outcomes reduced by vitamin D.”

(Note: At the time of this report (2009) the highest dose tested was 1000 iu … that amount is now widely regarded as very suboptimal for many health outcomes. As noted earlier, current recommendations fall in the 2000-7000 range for most folk.)

**INTRODUCTION:** This study assessed the benefit of higher-dose and higher achieved 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels [25(OH)D] versus any associated risk.

**METHODS AND RESULTS:** Based on double-blind randomized control trials (RCTs), eight for falls (n = 2426) and 12 for non-vertebral fractures (n = 42,279), there was a significant dose-response relationship between higher-dose and higher achieved 25(OH)D and greater fall and fracture prevention. Optimal benefits were observed at the highest dose tested to date for 700 to 1000 IU vitamin D per day or mean 25(OH)D between 75 and 110 nmol/l (30-44 ng/ml).
Prospective cohort data on **cardiovascular health and colorectal cancer prevention** suggested increased benefits with the highest categories of 25(OH)D (median between 75 and 110 nmol/l).

In 25 RCTs, mean serum calcium levels were not related to oral vitamin D up to 100,000 IU per day or achieved 25(OH)D up to 643 nmol/l. Mean levels of 75 to 110 nmol/l were reached in most RCTs with 1,800 to 4,000 IU vitamin D per day without risk.

**CONCLUSION:** Our analysis suggests that mean serum 25(OH)D levels of about 75 to 110 nmol/l provide optimal benefits for all investigated endpoints without increasing health risks. These levels can be best obtained with oral doses in the range of 1,800 to 4,000 IU vitamin D per day…”

“… further work is needed, including subject and environment factors, to better define the doses that will achieve optimal blood levels in the large majority of the population.”

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Special Forms of Vitamin D Supplements**

In the world of renal disease and chemotherapy adjuncts, however, there are other specialized vitamin D analogs available and questions in the professional literature about the relative efficacy of various injectable forms of D2 vs D3, etc. This is beyond the scope of this brief discussion about the most typical nutrition-related issues encountered by health professionals.

2. **The difference between the two lab values:**

   **25-hydroxy D vs 1,25-dihydroxy D.**

   This is not about any food forms or any of that business in #1 above. It is about what one does with vitamin D in the body.
The 25-hydroxy form is the non-activated-yet-but-stored-and-available-to-be-used form. (And that’s just its nickname!) It is made in the liver from cholecalciferol (obtained from any source: food, supplement, skin production) by attaching a hydroxyl group (an OH group) at the #25 carbon of the molecule.

This form (25-hydroxycholecalciferol or 25-hydroxyD or 25(OH)D,) is the storage form that we ordinarily test to check for plain old “deficiency vs adequacy” in the person's body. (I am using the simple letter D to stand for the word cholecalciferol in more and more of these descriptions because it is tedious to keep writing it out.)

As you know, we health professional types need to begin a habit of regularly checking this in everybody because just counting up the amount we think people took in misses the boat in most circumstances. I think an automatic 'standing order' scenario would be very informative and helpful. I just found eight more people this week who were overtly deficient in spite of taking what "should have been enough" vitamin D. You can only know for sure by checking their blood.

When we need the active hormonal form (the form that does the job for one of the >200 different tissues with vitamin D receptors that are looking for it,) the 25-hydroxyD storage form is sent to the kidney and another hydroxyl (OH) group is attached there at the #1 carbon on the molecule. The product ... the active hormonal form of vitamin D ... is 1,25-dihydroxycholecalciferol ... also called 1,25-dihydroxy vitamin D.

This (the 1,25 dihydroxy form) is not something one would ordinarily check as a blood test unless the person had some sort of potentially vitamin-D related symptoms in spite of a good intake of vitamin D. It would usually be done to identify people with kidney disease to recognize when people have lost the ability to make the active 1,25 vitamin D hormonal form.

There is also a much smaller group of people who have an inborn error of vitamin D metabolism that results in the same problem. While this is likely to be rare, I have found this situation to exist in five out of five people for whom I asked to have it checked. But only rarely do I ask for it because it is not at all as common as simple insufficiency of 25-hydroxyvitamin D.

I certainly ask the doctor to check this when their symptoms are unusual, such as extremely severe or rapidly progressing MS (e.g. in a 10-year-old.) Another
time I might ask to have it checked is when the person has vitamin D deficiency symptoms but it has already been shown that their blood 25-hydroxyD level is OK. In that situation I know it is not simple inadequacy that is contributing to any problems.

Additionally, there are certain genetic factors that impair the utilization of vitamin D. For example, there are “polymorphisms” (different forms) of vitamin D receptors found on some people’s cells that contribute to having vitamin D related problems in spite of a good vitamin D intake and normal ability to activate it to the active form.

In other words, vitamin D hormone knocks on the door of a cell with a message but nobody answers the door. But although scientists are finding that this kind of metabolism problem may not be as rare as we thought, it is only a tiny part of the problem of vitamin D adequacy. Most folks just aren’t getting enough sun or enough vitamin D supplementation, so that is where we need to look first in order to identify problems and do some serious good.

**So, a good order of thinking about this for a patient is:**

**First:**

Get a regular 25-hydroxy D level (for EVERYBODY!!!) --- ideally annually in the winter, but at least once -- and if it is low give them a therapeutic supplemental amount of vitamin D to get them up to normal. Then figure out a maintenance dose to switch to once subsequent tests show that the low level has been corrected.

Also, it is wise not to assume it has been corrected after some prescribed number of doses. We really need to re-check it. I have found that some individuals need a much higher maintenance level than expected. One was a lady who was subsequently found to have unrecognized celiac disease impairing vitamin D absorption (and other nutrients as well.)

Another was a lady for whom no explanation was ever determined, but after being treated with the therapeutic high-dose regimen that brought her up to a healthy vitamin D level, she was unable to maintain that vitamin D level taking in anything less than 5000 iu/day. The point is, our best guesses about what “should” be enough
can be quite erroneous, and we miss the chance to improve an individual’s health if we guess wrong. In this lady’s case, it made the difference between continuing to be able to work as a nurse or having to quit, because of vitamin D inadequacy-related muscle pain and weakness made her have trouble doing her job. She’s way better now!

My favorite motto:

ASSURE adequacy … do not just ASSUME adequacy.

For many people, getting the level during the winter is most likely to pick up any inadequacy issues. A level drawn any time of year will help identify problems for people who are not regularly in the sun even in the summer. This includes a large number of people, for a variety of reasons.

It also includes folks who ARE in the sun. A recent (2014) study of elderly men living near the equator in Brazil found that they had very poor vitamin D levels, presumably because like every other body part, the skin does not always operate like it used to as we get older. This vitamin D deficiency issue is a big player now in dealing with the problem of congestive heart failure among elderly people in particular. Inadequate vitamin D compromises all muscle strength significantly … and the heart and the diaphragm are muscles!

It is also now (FINALLY) known that inadequate vitamin D is a well-recognized player in the development of many autoimmune diseases, such as MS, Type 1 Diabetes, Rheumatoid Arthritis, Lupus, Parkinson’s Disease and many others. It also has a role to play in maintenance of optimal health in those who have already developed these conditions.

I continue to hear every week from a surprising number of health professionals (including dietitians, physicians, pharmacists and nurses) who have had their own levels checked after hearing me go on and on about the vitamin D deficiency problem. They had been startled to find that they were themselves vitamin D deficient. This is in spite of “eating right” and taking a multivitamin!
What would be the likelihood that people who were not health professionals might also have this kind of problem? Answer: Pretty darn high.

Second:

If the person has good blood levels of 25-hydroxyD but still looks very “suspicious” in terms of vitamin D-related conditions, then one might get a 1,25 D level to see if they have a metabolic defect in hydroxylation in the kidney or some other condition like kidney disease that is impairing production of the hormonal form. In that situation, one would utilize a special prescription form of supplemental vitamin D to get around the problem: the ready-to-go form of the active hormone 1,25-dihydroxyD which is usually ordered as calcitriol.

This problem is much less common than the problem of simple inadequacy of vitamin D, but I have found six adults with this as the unrecognized basis of some very severe neurologic symptoms including MS. These people were not kidney patients. But the fact that some lady in Fargo --Moi-- who mostly sees children has run across that many adults with this problem tells me that the problem is likely more common than we think but generally not looked for and so unrecognized.

Here is an example to illustrate why I think doing this in the order described above is potentially useful:

1. It was recently found in an observational study that pre-dialysis kidney patients who start earlier on calcitriol supplementation may have improved survival and quality of life, etc. (Arch Intern Med. 2008;168:397-403) compared with those who began to use it later. By “early,” they appeared to mean not waiting for severe deficiency symptoms to show up before providing it, or not waiting until the person had to go on dialysis because of kidney failure. This meshes nicely with another recent finding of an association between increased risk of death from all causes and low vitamin D status, including cardiovascular disease, and contribution of adequate vitamin D in decreasing the risk of progression to kidney disease in people with diabetes. [E.g.: Vitamin D and chronic kidney disease. Ethn Dis. 2009 Autumn;19(4 Suppl 5):S5-8-11. Vitamin D, proteinuria, diabetic nephropathy, and progression of CKD. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2009 Sep;4(9):1523-8. 25-hydroxyvitamin D and risk of myocardial infarction in men: a prospective study. Arch Intern Med. 2008 Jun 9;168 (11):1174-80. Low serum levels of 25-hydroxyvitamin D predict fatal cancer in patients referred to coronary angiography. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2008 May;17(5):1228-33. Vitamin D, cardiovascular disease, and survival in dialysis]
Interestingly, in the pre-dialysis study described above, apparently plain old 25-hydroxy D levels were not regularly evaluated, so although calcitriol was shown to be helpful in many ways for preventing deficiency consequences, it may NOT have been a kidney-related hydroxylation problem that needed the earlier calcitriol intervention. It may have been just the same old unrecognized common inadequacy of vitamin D intake that was the limiting factor for many of these folks.

For many people with serious kidney disease, foods like liver, milk and salmon are restricted. As these are about the only reliable and rich food sources of vitamin D in our diet, simple inadequacy of vitamin D should not be an unexpected finding … if we check for it. This possibility was not addressed in the study, but I think it has important implications for patient care:

**Although giving calcitriol** (a significantly more expensive and prescription-only potentially dangerous pharmacy product) **was clearly associated with benefit in this situation, assuring vitamin D adequacy with generous plain old cheap vitamin D supplementation may have done the trick just as well for many of the people involved.**

This is another argument for a regular planned 25-hydroxy D level check for everybody. We could save the big guns (calcitriol) for those who really need it. Additionally, as described in the report below, there is evidence that even folks for whom calcitriol IS actually needed, there are other roles for 25-hydroxy vitamin D (calcidiol) and therefore there is a good reason to maintain that level in the safe and adequate range at the same time as providing ready-made calcitriol.


“Vitamin D functions in the body through both an endocrine mechanism (regulation of calcium absorption) and an autocrine mechanism (facilitation of gene expression). The former acts through circulating calcitriol, whereas the latter, which accounts for more than 80% of the metabolic utilization of the vitamin each day, produces, uses, and degrades calcitriol exclusively intracellularly.”
In patients with end-stage kidney disease, the endocrine mechanism is effectively disabled; however, the autocrine mechanism is able to function normally so long as the patient has adequate serum levels of 25(OH)D, on which its function is absolutely dependent.

For this reason, calcitriol and its analogs do not constitute adequate replacement in managing vitamin D needs of such patients. **Optimal serum 25(OH)D levels are greater than 32 ng/mL (80 nmol/L).** The consequences of low 25(OH)D status include increased risk of various chronic diseases, ranging from hypertension to diabetes to cancer.

The safest and most economical way to ensure adequate vitamin D status is to use oral dosing of native vitamin D. (Both daily and intermittent regimens work well.) **Serum 25(OH)D can be expected to rise by about 1 ng/mL (2.5 nmol/L) for every 100 IU of additional vitamin D each day.** Recent data indicate that cholecalciferol (vitamin D3) is substantially more potent than ergocalciferol (vitamin D2) and that the safe upper intake level for vitamin D3 is 10,000 IU/d.”

The levels described as “normal” in many research studies set the level of insufficiency and deficiency at significantly lower levels than what appears to be needed for optimal health benefit. This accounts for some of the confusing research outcomes.

For example, a study finding no benefit of supplemental vitamin D on some outcome in a population would not be surprising if only low levels of supplementation were tested. This was typical of many of the initial studies in which people in nursing homes were given the RDA for vitamin D (400 iu, at the time) but it failed to have any effect on risk of fractures. Researcher’s conclusion: “Vitamin D supplementation is not helpful in old people.”

It also misses the boat when the only outcome measured in research studies is bone related, and when they are also measuring only a severe and late-appearing bone-related outcome (e.g. fractures.) For example, benefits of **correcting vitamin D deficiency** (not “giving the RDA”) are seen in many areas in this population besides decreasing fractures. These include improving muscle strength, immune competence and mood, and decreasing falls, pain and congestive heart failure. What’s not to like?

In most cases, blood levels were most often not evaluated to determine the success of the supplementation for achieving “adequacy.” Additionally, the ranges perceived to be “normal” were often set too low so that true comparisons of adequacy vs inadequacy did not take place…only “gradations of inadequacy.”
In fact, one of the old books in my collection actually had two sets of “normal values” to evaluate vitamin D adequacy. The cut-off to use as an indicator of normal vitamin D in winter was much lower because it was “average” and “expected” to have a much lower level during those months. It is a classic illustration that just because something is average or expected does not mean it is good or safe. Live and learn …

**Important bit about interpreting vitamin D serum levels:**

Note that some people refer to vitamin D levels in terms of \( \text{ng/mL} \) (which is the same as \( \text{mg/dL} \)) and others use \( \text{nmol/L} \). They are not the same so it is important to be sure which units you are using when setting goals, etc.

For example, 30 mg/dL = 30 ng/mL = 75 nmol/L.

That means that the lower end of the adequate range of vitamin D in the blood could be expressed as 30 mg/dL (which is the form I have in my head) but may be expressed in some other report as 75 nmol/L. If you don’t notice the different unit label this can be extremely confusing.

Here is the conversion factor:

\[
1 \text{ ng/mL (or mg/dL)} = 2.496 \text{ nmol/L} \\
1 \text{ nmol/L} = 0.4006 \text{ ng/ml (or mg/dL)}
\]

Here’s another (2008) report from the original paper with some information about what serum vitamin D levels might be better indicators of adequacy:

**Optimal serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels for multiple health outcomes.**


“Recent evidence suggests that higher vitamin D intakes beyond current recommendations may be associated with better health outcomes. In this chapter, evidence is summarized from different studies that evaluate threshold levels for serum 25(OH)D levels in relation to bone mineral density (BMD), lower extremity function, dental health, risk of falls, admission to nursing home, fractures, cancer prevention and incident hypertension.”
For all endpoints, the most advantageous serum levels for 25(OH)D appeared to be at least 75 nmol/l (30 ng/ml) and for cancer prevention, desirable 25(OH)D levels are between 90-120 nmol/l (36-48 ng/ml).

An intake of no less than 1000 IU (25 mcg) of vitamin D3 (cholecalciferol) per day for all adults may bring at least 50% of the population up to 75 nmol/l. Thus, higher doses of vitamin D are needed to bring most individuals into the desired range.

While estimates suggest that 2000 IU vitamin D3 per day may successfully and safely achieve this goal, the implications of 2000 IU or higher doses for the total adult population need to be addressed in future studies.

CB Note: This report was in 2008 and the amount needed to assure adequacy in some folks is now known to be considerably more than that. There are MANY more reports since then, but this one came out at a time where the whole issue of checking blood levels was still pretty new … and now a 25-hydroxy vitamin D level is the most frequently individual lab test ordered by physicians in the US. They keep ordering it because they keep finding it to be too low in all kinds of patients. Hopefully it will be ordered automatically like a hemoglobin level when one sees their provider … but it isn’t automatic yet so one needs to request it if the provider does not yet order it automatically for you.

The risk of injury from overdose in an individual is much higher if the active hormone form is given instead of just a precursor form. This is analogous to the higher potential for injury from giving high dose retinol (an active hormonal form of vitamin A primarily in liver and some supplements) compared with high doses of the pre-cursor form of vitamin A, the orange pigment beta-carotene in fruits, vegetables and some supplements. You just can’t eat enough carrots to kill you … although your skin may have a nice orange-y glow.)

[Remember that the upper level of known safety of “regular” vitamin D is now described as a chronic intake of over 10,000 iu/day. It is WAY less toxic than most of us were taught.

“Therapeutic” levels to correct deficiency are often something like 50,000 iu/week for 8 weeks (comparable to about 7000 iu/day,) or as described earlier, a one-time dose of 300,000 iu.]
Regularly monitoring 1,25-dihydroxyD levels would be a reasonable plan for folks with kidney disease so we can catch them when production just starts to decrease. That way we can intervene BEFORE they suffer the multiple severe consequences associated with inadequacy of this vital steroid hormone.

I would also like to see a one-time-only 1,25-dihydroxy D level for people with autoimmune diseases like MS, arthritis, lupus, diabetes, etc., for reasons beyond the scope of this paper. (Details are available in the other handouts listed earlier.)

For more information, please see my 2014 collection below of references from the scientific literature specifically about vitamin D and kidney disease (which I put together for Kidney Dialysis and Kidney Transplant conferences) and a similar collection specifically about vitamin D and congestive heart failure.

The lists of references follow this section. References that also include the abstracts are also available if anyone would like to have them. Just ask.

Additionally, my paper called “My Current Top Five Easy Ways to Improve Your Family’s Nutrition (subject to change at any moment! 😊)” is also available and likely more useful than reams of references. This paper addresses vitamin D as one of the Top Five issues, but in much less detail than the Vitamin D paper described above. It is designed for those who want just a cut-to-the-chase version of why this matters so much and what are we supposed to do about it.

As always, my handouts are intended to provide some summarizing of interesting nutrition information in the news. They are not intended to take the place of the guidance and recommendations of an individual’s health care providers.

And of course everything is way more complicated than my descriptions suggest, but this is just an attempt at a nice simplified discussion trying to sort things out sufficiently to give direction in thinking about functional applications and doing some good.
SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT VITAMIN D and LATITUDE

I first started going on and on about vitamin D inadequacy in 1998 when a report came out that included this map. The dark area was known as “The Rickets Belt” because many children had overt bone deformity before vitamin D supplementation was introduced. It is now being identified the “belt” of a number of diseases like Type I diabetes, multiple sclerosis, breast cancer and prostate cancer. Hmmm …

https://www.health.harvard.edu/newsweek/images/latitude-vitaminD.jpg

“Except during the summer months, the skin makes little if any vitamin D from the sun at latitudes above 37 degrees north (in the United States, the shaded region in the map) or below 37 degrees south of the equator. People who live in these areas are at relatively greater risk for vitamin D deficiency.”

(Actually, that’s where I live … but you can see why it’s a really big deal “Up North!”)

Since 1998 there is WAY more known about vitamin D … one can literally be crushed by all the stacks of research papers published since then on this topic. The fact is that the latitude is definitely not the only known vitamin D player like it was initially.
In spite of this, I regularly talk with people whom I have met in my travels around the US who have turned out to be seriously vitamin D deficient in spite of actually live in the South. Why is this? How is this possible? Here are a few contributing factors:

1. It’s hot out there and people like to stay in their nice air-conditioned homes, offices and shopping malls.

2. People are cautious about sun exposure because of melanoma risk, and some have medical conditions (such as MS) that make them tolerate heat poorly.

3. People use sunscreen because of concerns about melanoma and also to avoid the even more dreaded “premature wrinkles.”

4. People’s skin becomes much less able to make vitamin D as we age, so some of us old folks are just not very good at making vitamin D even if we ran around in the buff (… which we won’t … I promise.)

5. Many of us keep covered up due to modesty, for religious reasons … and some of us just stay covered up as a public service.

---

**Bottom line …**

EVERYBODY (not just those of us way up north) needs to assure vitamin D adequacy and not just assume it.

…

---

Some recent references:

**Cardiovascular Disease x Vitamin D Search 2013 to 2/2014**

Cathy Breedon


Renal health x Vitamin D searches as of 10/2014: 

Cathy Breedon

Vitamin D supplementation & total mortality: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Arch Intern Med. 2007 10;167:1730-7;
Sex-specific association of serum vitamin D levels with physical function in older adults. Osteoporos Int. 2009 May;20(5):751-60;