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Abstract

Background: We have shown in a randomized controlled trial that vitamin D increases bone mass, lean mass and bone area in adolescent girls, but not boys. These increments may translate into improvements in bone geometry and therefore bone strength. This study investigated the impact of vitamin D on hip geometric dimensions from DXA-derived hip structural analyses in adolescents who participated in the trial.

Methods: 167 girls (mean age 13.1 years) and 171 boys (mean age 12.7 years) were randomly assigned to receive weekly placebo oil or vitamin D3, at doses of 1400 IU or 14,000 IU, in a double blind placebo-controlled 1-year trial. DXA images were obtained at baseline and one year, and hip images were analyzed using the hip structural analysis (HSA) software to derive parameters of bone geometry. These include outer diameter (OD), cross sectional area (CSA), section modulus (Z), and buckling ratio (BR) at the narrow neck (NN), intertrochanteric (IT), and shaft (S) regions. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to examine group differences for changes of bone structural parameters.

Results: In the overall group of girls, vitamin D supplementation increased aBMD (7.9% and 6.8% in low and high doses, versus 4.2% in placebo) and reduced the BR of NN (6.1% and 2.4% in low and high doses, versus 1.9% in placebo). It also improved aBMD (7.9% and 5.2% versus 3.6%) and CSA (7.5% and 5.1% versus 4.1%) of the IT and OD of the S (2.4% and 2.5% versus 0.8% respectively). Significant changes in the OD and BR of the NN, in the overall group of girls remained, after adjusting for lean mass, and were unaffected with further adjustments for lifestyle, pubertal status, and height measures. Conversely, boys did not exhibit any significant changes in any parameters of interest. A dose effect was not detected and subgroup analyses revealed no beneficial effect of vitamin D by pubertal stage.

Conclusions: Vitamin D supplementation improved bone mass and several DXA-derived structural bone parameters, in adolescent girls, but not boys. This occurred at a critical site, the femoral neck, and if maintained through adulthood could improve bone strength and lower the risk of hip fractures.

© 2013 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Introduction

The amount of bone mass acquisition during adolescence is a determining factor for the risk of developing fractures later in life [1]. Although genetic factors play an important role in defining the individual’s bone mineral density and content, environmental factors also exert an important influence on bone mass acquisition and its maintenance [2–4]. Several studies have shown that modifiable lifestyle factors such as dietary intake of calcium and vitamin D, and physical activity, with high impact weight bearing activities, can enhance bone mass accrual during growth [5–13]. Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) technology is commonly used to assess bone mass and density in a highly precise, safe, and non-invasive way. However, the conventional analysis of the DXA data does not capture bone geometric and structural parameters that can be considered more appropriate for understanding the impact of any therapeutic intervention on bone mechanical integrity. It is also more difficult to assess the relationship between bone strength and body anthropometric measures when using BMD [14–16].

As a result, Beck et al. developed a program, known as the hip structural analysis (HSA) software, to estimate bone geometric properties and thus strength using the conventional DXA image data, based on principles that were first described by Martin and Burr [17]. Many...
investigators have used the HSA program to characterize bone geometry and strength [15,16,18–20]. This method can allow an assessment of the biomechanical basis for fracture risk reduction of various established interventions, through an understanding of their influence on bone geometry [21]. Indeed, high impact physical activities, and the age at which these activities are practiced, have been shown to have an effect not only on bone mineralization, but also on its geometric properties [19,22–25].

The effect of vitamin D supplementation on bone density has been extensively studied in adults, but much less in children and adolescents [10,13,26–32]. Indeed, these and numerous other studies demonstrate that the crucial role vitamin D plays in normal bone physiology in children is an important determinant of skeletal health in adults. It plays an important role in calcium homeostasis and skeletal mineralization through its endocrine effects on its target organs, bone, kidney, and intestine, and maintenance of normal circulating calcium and phosphate levels. The presence of the vitamin D receptor within the skeletal muscle suggests as well a role for vitamin D in muscle function [33,34].

Our randomized controlled clinical trial in school children showed that vitamin D supplementation had a positive impact on bone musculoskeletal parameters in girls in general and at pre-menarcheal stages in particular. Lean mass significantly increased in both low dose and high dose groups, and so did other bone parameters such as lumbar spine BMD in low dose, and trochanter BMC of both treatment groups [13]. However, to our knowledge, no study has assessed the effect of vitamin D supplementation on bone geometry, in any age group, including adolescence, a critical time for bone mass accrual. The purpose of our investigation was to examine the relationship between baseline vitamin D levels and HSA parameters and the impact of vitamin D supplementation in pre- and post-pubertal children on bone geometry and structure.

Methods

The analyses of the current study are post-hoc exploratory analyses using data from a randomized double blind placebo controlled trial on adolescent healthy subjects. Full details on the study protocol, subject selection, evaluation, and data collection are available under Supplementary methods, and the CONSORT diagram as Supplementary Fig. 1.

Subjects

Subjects were those who completed the one year randomized double blind placebo controlled vitamin D trial [13]. The trial included 179 and 184 apparently healthy girls and boys respectively, recruited from 4 schools from the Greater Beirut area to ensure balanced representation geographically and socio-economically [35], between December 2001 and June 2002. Over 93% of the study participants (168 girls and 172 boys) returned for their scheduled one year assessment at baseline, dose selection, quality assurance and monitoring have been previously described in full detail [13]. The calculation of the sample size was performed based on the expected outcomes of the randomized clinical trial as detailed in the study by El-Haj Fuleihan et al. [13]. At 12 months, the number of subjects with HSA data included in the current analyses included 111 subjects (55 girls, 56 boys) in placebo group, 113 subjects (58 girls, 55 boys) in low dose, and 114 subjects (54 girls, 60 boys) in high dose groups. Each subject had a baseline physical examination, including height, weight, and Tanner stages. Standing height was measured in triplicate using a wall stadiometer and average value was reported. Weight was recorded while the subject was wearing light clothes without shoes using a standard clinical balance. Pubertal status was measured by one of three physicians who were contributing to the study, according to the established criteria of Tanner [37]. Menarcheal status was determined by these physicians by inquiring with the study subjects about their menarcheal status at study entry. Because of the small number of subjects in each Tanner stage subgroup, study subjects were divided into two discrete pubertal sub-groups for each gender, pre- (n = 33) and post-menarche (n = 134) in girls, and early (Tanner I (n = 45) and II (n = 47)) vs. late (Tanner III (n = 30), IV (n = 30), V (n = 19)) puberty in boys, as was implemented in the original reports of the trial [13, 38]. Assessment of calcium intake, exercise, sun exposure, and history of fractures were recorded at baseline and follow-up [35]. Exercise frequency was assessed based on a questionnaire inquiring about the average number of hours spent on sports per week. Calcium intake was evaluated through a food frequency questionnaire that stressed the consumption of dairy products by adolescents in the Lebanese population. Frequency of sun exposure was reported as the average number of hours spent in the sun for weekdays and weekends, and the prorated average was reported.

Measurement of serum 25-hydroxy vitamin D [25(OH)D] levels

Serum 25(OH)D was measured at baseline and 12 months by a competitive protein binding radio-immunoassay using the Incstar Kit (Diasorin, Incstar, Saluggia, Italy), with intra- and inter-assay CVs less than 13% at a serum concentration of 47 ng/mL. All samples were assayed together in the same run at the end of the study.

Areal bone mineral density (aBMD) measurements

BMD of the hip and total body compositions were determined at baseline and 1 year using a Hologic 4500A densitometer (Hologic, Bedford, MA; software version 11.2:3). In our center, the mean ± SD precision of the aBMD measurements, expressed as the CV, for 280 same-day duplicate scans performed during the study duration was less than 1.2 ± 0.9% for the spine, total hip, femoral neck, trochanter, and one third radius. Similar values were obtained for total body aBMD and BMC, lean mass, and fat mass.

Hip structural analysis

Proximal femur scans were analyzed at Dr Beck’s laboratory, Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, MD, USA) using the HSA program [20,39,40]. The HSA program uses conventional DXA image data to derive geometric properties of transverse bone cross-sections that are 5 mm thick in three regions. These regions, as illustrated in Fig. 1, are: the narrow neck (NN) across the narrowest segment of the femoral neck, the intertrochanteric (IT) region along the bisector of the neck-shaft angle, and the shaft at a length equivalent to 1.5 times minimum neck diameter distal to the intersection of neck and shaft axes. For each region the distribution of bone mass across the bone was extracted and the outer diameter (cm), bone cross-sectional area exclusive of soft tissue (CSA, cm²), and cross-sectional moment of inertia (CSMI, cm⁴) were directly measured from the bone mass profile. The outer diameter (OD) is a direct descriptive measure that measures the distance
between the outer margins of the cross-section after correction for image blurring. CSA is an indicator of bone resistance to loads directed along the bone axis. Section modulus (Z), an indicator of bone bending and torsion strength, was calculated as \( Z = \frac{CSMI}{y} \), where \( y \) is the distance from the centroid to the lateral cortical margin \[18\]. Buckling ratio (BR) is a mechanical index of wall stability in thin walled tubes, calculated as the maximum distance between the center of mass and outer cortex over the average cortical thickness (e.g. \( NNBR = \frac{NN\ CSMI}{NN\ Sect\ Mod} / NN\ Average\ cortex \) \[41\]). High values of BR are evident in osteoporotic bone \[42\]. aBMD is also calculated in the conventional manner, although these regions of interest do not have their counterparts in the standard Hologic BMD analysis \[18\].

**Statistical analyses**

Variables of interest were summarized as means (± standard deviation) or medians [interquartile range; Q1, Q3] and compared with independent t-test or the Mann–Whitney test, as appropriate depending on normality of distribution. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) or the Kruskal–Wallis test was used as applicable for evaluating differences in the outcomes of interest between the three treatment groups (placebo, low dose, high dose). Percentage change in the bone parameters was evaluated using the Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) technique after accounting for possible confounders, firstly after adjusting for changes in lean mass, and then after adjusting for pubertal status, height at baseline, percent height change, physical activity, calcium intake, and sun exposure. The Bonferroni post-hoc test was used to perform the different subgroup comparisons (placebo vs. low-dose vitamin D, placebo vs. high-dose vitamin D, and low-dose vitamin D vs. high-dose vitamin D). Similar analyses were performed by puberty status (pre-menarcheal girls, post-menarcheal girls, early pubertal [Tanner I and II] boys, and late pubertal [Tanner III–V] boys). Repeated Measures ANOVA (RM-ANOVA) was performed on all parameters of interest using data at baseline and 12 months. Spearman correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the relationship between vitamin D levels and different bone parameters. As the relationship between covariates and change in bone structural parameters might differ between boys and girls, each group was analyzed separately. \( p \leq 0.05 \) was used to indicate significance of tests and \( p \) between 0.05 and 0.1 indicated borderline significance. Analyses were performed using SPSS version 19.0 (IBM, USA) and SigmaPlot 12.0 (Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA).

**Results**

**Baseline characteristics and post-therapy vitamin D levels**

The placebo and the two vitamin D supplemented groups had similar baseline characteristics including serum 25(OH)D levels, anthropometric and lifestyle variables, in addition to the different bone structural parameters \[13\] (Tables 1 & 2, Fig. 2). Baseline vitamin D level was below 10 ng/ml in 33.5% of girls and 13.5% of boys, below

---

**Fig. 1.** A schematic of the cross sectional geometric variables calculated from the HSA program showing the different positions measured across the femur, narrow neck, intertrochanteric region, and shaft regions.
20 ng/ml in 83.2% of girls and 80.1% of boys and below 30 ng/ml in 94.6% of girls and 94.7% of boys. There were substantial increments in serum 25(OH)D levels in response to therapy, in both genders, and in both vitamin D groups, that were significantly different from placebo. The mean increments were 3.2 ± 9.2 ng/ml (low dose), 23.8 ± 30.3 ng/ml (high dose), versus 1.5 ± 5.4 ng/ml (placebo) in girls, and 3.7 ± 5.0 ng/ml, 18.6 ± 9.4 ng/ml, versus 0.9 ± 5.1 ng/ml, respectively in boys (Fig. 2).

Correlations between baseline serum 25(OH)D level and HSA variables

In the overall group of girls, there was a significant correlation between baseline serum 25(OH)D level and aBMD of the NN and S (r = 0.16, p = 0.04 and r = 0.17, p = 0.03 respectively). In addition, baseline serum 25(OH)D levels were negatively correlated with the BMI of the NN (r = −0.22, p = 0.006). Subgroup analyses revealed a higher magnitude of these correlations among post-menarcheal girls.
girls, a sub-group in whom additional significant correlations were noted with $Z$ (an index of bending strength) of the NN and S regions ($r = 0.18$, $p = .046$ and $r = -0.20$, $p = .03$), and with CSA (an index of axial strength) and BR of the S region ($r = 0.22$, $p = 0.01$ and $r = -0.24$, $p = .007$ respectively). In pre-menarcheal girls, serum 25(OH)D levels also correlated with CSA and Z of the NN ($r = 0.36$, $p = 0.04$ and $r = 0.38$, $p = 0.03$ respectively), in addition to aBMD of the S ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.03$) (Supplementary Table 1).

In the overall group of boys, no significant correlations were detected between baseline 25(OH)D levels and the different hip structural parameters (data not shown).

Effect of vitamin D supplementation on the geometry changes

Unadjusted analyses

In the overall group of girls, and as shown in Supplementary Table 2, vitamin D supplementation significantly increased the aBMD at the NN (+7.85% (low dose), +6.79% (high dose), vs. +4.23% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and similarly at the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.20% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13]. It also increased the OD of the S region (+2.51% in low and high dose groups respectively vs. +0.83% in placebo, $p = 0.04$), and the CSA of the IT region (median +7.54 and +5.13% vs. +3.63% in placebo, $p = .02$), but not at the S; thus confirming the previously reported consistent increments in aBMD in the regions of interest routinely obtained on traditional DXA images [13].

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% change in HSA parameters</th>
<th>PBO (n = 55)</th>
<th>Low dose (n = 58)</th>
<th>High dose (n = 54)</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% change in NN aBMD (g/cm²)</td>
<td>5.11 (0.98)</td>
<td>7.52 (0.95)</td>
<td>6.24 (1.00)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sectional area (cm²)</td>
<td>7.95 (0.96)</td>
<td>8.32 (0.93)</td>
<td>8.31 (0.98)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer diameter (cm)</td>
<td>2.73 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.79 (0.49)</td>
<td>2.03 (0.52)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section modulus (cm³)</td>
<td>11.33 (1.31)</td>
<td>11.12 (1.27)</td>
<td>11.72 (1.35)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckling ratio</td>
<td>-1.85 (1.31)</td>
<td>-6.60 (1.26)</td>
<td>-4.23 (1.34)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in S aBMD (g/cm²)</td>
<td>8.29 (0.91)</td>
<td>8.90 (0.92)</td>
<td>8.38 (0.91)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sectional area (cm²)</td>
<td>9.74 (0.91)</td>
<td>11.31 (0.92)</td>
<td>10.82 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer diameter (cm)</td>
<td>11.35 (0.44)</td>
<td>2.18 (0.44)</td>
<td>2.23 (0.44)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section modulus (cm³)</td>
<td>10.88 (1.21)</td>
<td>13.11 (1.22)</td>
<td>12.98 (1.21)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckling ratio</td>
<td>-8.94 (1.45)</td>
<td>-8.21 (1.47)</td>
<td>-7.28 (1.46)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change in IT aBMD (g/cm²)</td>
<td>5.09 (0.95)</td>
<td>8.00 (0.93)</td>
<td>6.04 (0.96)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sectional area (cm²)</td>
<td>6.97 (1.03)</td>
<td>9.41 (0.99)</td>
<td>8.74 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer diameter (cm)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.68)</td>
<td>1.34 (0.66)</td>
<td>2.54 (0.68)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section modulus (cm³)</td>
<td>10.06 (1.96)</td>
<td>12.92 (1.91)</td>
<td>12.86 (1.98)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckling ratio</td>
<td>-3.61 (1.22)</td>
<td>-5.37 (1.23)</td>
<td>-3.17 (1.22)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Post-hoc exploratory analyses from our large vitamin D randomized controlled trial demonstrate interesting findings regarding the effect of vitamin D supplementation on site specific bone structural parameters in adolescent girls. This study also confirms the sexual dimorphism in the impact of vitamin D supplementation on bone geometry, as we had previously observed for bone density, between the two genders. However, no difference in the beneficial effects of vitamin D supplementation by vitamin D dose received was shown in this study.

The positive correlations between 25(OH)D levels at study entry and various parameters of hip geometry are quite interesting and encouraging in view of the additional positive effect of vitamin D on various indices of bone structure observed at one year in girls. These correlations, however, were not present across all femur measurement sites, nor did they reach significance in subgroup analyses by pubertal status in girls. This is possibly explained by the relatively small sample size in sub-groups by pubertal stage and more importantly by the expected timing for changes in bone mass and geometry at the hip across puberty as previously described by Jackiwowski et al., in...
Table 4  
Effect of vitamin D supplementation on % change in HSA parameters in overall group of girls after adjusting for baseline height, percentage change in lean mass and height, sun exposure, physical activity, calcium intake, and menarcheal status using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% change in HSA parameters</th>
<th>PBO (n = 56)</th>
<th>Low dose (n = 56)</th>
<th>High dose (n = 60)</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| % change in NN  
abM (g/cm²) | 5.25 (0.96) | 7.50 (0.92) | 6.12 (0.98) | 0.72 |
| Cross sectional area (cm²) | 8.16 (0.88) | 8.31 (0.84) | 8.12 (0.90) | 0.99 |
| Outer diameter (cm) | 2.77 (0.50) | 0.80 (0.48) | 1.97 (0.51) | 0.02* |
| Section modulus (cm³) | 11.73 (1.19) | 11.31 (1.14) | 11.41 (1.22) | 0.97 |
| Buckling ratio | −1.98 (1.32) | −6.53 (1.26) | −4.16 (1.34) | 0.049* |
| % change in S  
abM (g/cm²) | 8.32 (0.84) | 9.10 (0.85) | 8.15 (0.84) | 0.70 |
| Cross sectional area (cm²) | 9.85 (0.77) | 11.62 (0.78) | 10.39 (0.78) | 0.26 |
| Outer diameter (cm) | 1.42 (0.42) | 2.27 (0.42) | 2.06 (0.42) | 0.33 |
| Section modulus (cm³) | 11.02 (1.04) | 13.51 (1.05) | 12.45 (1.05) | 0.25 |
| Buckling ratio | −8.86 (1.41) | −8.38 (1.42) | −7.18 (1.42) | 0.70 |
| % change in IT  
abM (g/cm²) | 5.18 (0.91) | 8.10 (0.88) | 5.84 (0.92) | 0.06 |
| Cross sectional area (cm²) | 7.13 (0.85) | 9.49 (0.83) | 8.48 (0.86) | 0.14 |
| Outer diameter (cm) | 1.88 (0.62) | 1.32 (0.61) | 2.51 (0.63) | 0.40 |
| Section modulus (cm³) | 10.12 (1.63) | 13.05 (1.50) | 12.66 (1.65) | 0.39 |
| Buckling ratio | −3.58 (1.21) | −6.60 (1.22) | −3.00 (1.22) | 0.29 |

NN: narrow neck; S: shaft; IT: intertrochanteric; aBMD: areal bone mineral density.

* Significant difference between low dose and placebo group.

The structural changes we noted in girls were present in unadjusted analyses and persisted after adjustment for lean mass first, but also after including pubertal status, height, physical activity, calcium intake and sun exposure, underscoring the additional independent positive effect of vitamin D on bone geometry, over and above that mediated through increased musculature (lean mass). In contrast, we previously noted the apparent absence of any positive effect of vitamin D on bone mass in boys [58]. And the lack of an apparent effect on bone geometry reported herein, may possibly be due to the higher 25(OH) levels at study entry in boys, and possibly the powerful effect on bone mass and structure of a larger lean mass and activity level than in girls [51]. Alternatively, other possible explanations for the observed sexual dimorphism may include the divergent effect of sex steroids on bone mass, micro-architecture, and muscle [48], the delayed timing of puberty in boys compared to girls, and the delay in changes in bone geometry in this gender compared to girls [43]. Indeed, in the latter study, the effect of exercise on bone geometry was in proportion to changes in lean mass, whereas in girls estrogen levels seemed to play an additional independent effect [43]. In a micro CT study of bone microarchitecture, Lawson et al. demonstrated a positive effect of leptin, IGF1, and androgen levels and bone microarchitecture, independent of BMI [48]. In the 10 years of longitudinal follow-up from Penn State Young Women’s Health Study, predictors of adult bone

Fig. 3. Effect of vitamin D supplementation on HSA parameters in the three different treatment groups of girls after adjusting for pubertal status, baseline height, percentage change in height and lean mass, sun exposure, calcium intake, and physical activity using Repeated Measures-Analysis of Variance (RM-ANOVA). There was a difference in the change in OD (panel A) and BR (panel B) at the NN between the three groups.
structural geometry and strength were explored, showing that bending strength depends primarily on mechanical loading (represented by lean mass and sports exercise score) and that sex steroids are associated with bone geometric structure [50].

Our study had a few limitations. These include the post-hoc nature of the analyses, the relatively small number of subjects in each group, and the large heterogeneity in a growing population which may have reduced the power to demonstrate the beneficial effects of vitamin D supplementation in the subgroup analysis by vitamin D dose received, and by pubertal status, especially in boys and early pubertal girls. Bone tissue mineral density cannot be measured from DXA data thus the HSA algorithm assumes that bones are fully mineralized at an average adult value of 1.05 g/cm³ when deriving CSA and Z. Since mineralization is incomplete in adolescents we cannot rule out an effect of treatment on mineralization given that vitamin D deficiencies are associated with the hypomineralization of osteomalacia. Furthermore our assumption of the adult value leads to underestimation of CSA and Z associated with the hypomineralization of osteomalacia. Moreover our study possible confounding factors were not controlled for if the subject's hip position is inconsistent between scans [18]. However, our QA program is quite rigorous and images were reviewed by the senior authors and it is unlikely that a systematic positioning error would be associated with treatment.

Despite these limitations, to our knowledge this is the first to demonstrate a measurable positive effect of vitamin D supplementation on bone geometry in girls but not boys, during a critical time of growth and peak bone mass accrual. It also provides insights into pathways for such effect, which may in part be explained by the beneficial effect of vitamin D supplementation on lean mass. If confirmed and sustained into adulthood, these observed changes would be anticipated to translate into a reduced risk of hip fractures in elderly years.
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