Double-blind randomised controlled trial of vitamin D_3 supplementation for the prevention of acute respiratory infection in older adults and their carers (ViDiFlu)

Supplementary Information

Methods

Participants

Sheltered accommodation schemes in London, UK, were identified by searching the online directory at http://www.housingcare.org/ and assessed for their eligibility to host the trial: schemes offering care exclusively for clients with dementia, learning disability, mental health needs and alcohol or drug dependency were excluded. Housing associations responsible for potentially eligible sheltered accommodation schemes were then approached for permission to conduct the trial on their premises. Individual residents and their carers at sheltered accommodation schemes managed by participating housing associations were sent a letter inviting them to attend a screening visit. Respondents were excluded from participation in the trial if they had cognitive impairment or a communication problem precluding informed consent; if they had a medical record diagnosis of asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, active tuberculosis, sarcoidosis or any other condition causing chronic cough, hyperparathyroidism, nephrolithiasis, renal or hepatic failure, terminal illness or malignancy other than non-melanoma skin cancer not in remission at the time of recruitment; if they were taking a dietary supplement or prescribed therapy containing >10 μg (400 IU) vitamin D per day up to 2 months before first dose of study medication; if they were taking a cardiac glycoside, carbamazepine, phenobarbital, phenytoin, primidone or long-term immunosuppressant therapy, or

applying a medication containing a topical vitamin D analogue; if they were taking a benzothiadiazine derivative at a dose higher than that recommended in the British National Formulary (1), or in combination with a calcium supplement; if they were aged <16 years; if they had been treated with any investigational medical product or device up to 4 months before the first dose of study medication; if serum corrected calcium was >2.65 mmol/L; if serum creatinine was >125 μmol/L; or if they failed to complete the symptom diary during the run-in period. Female carers who were breastfeeding, pregnant or planning a pregnancy at screening were excluded; other female carers of child-bearing potential were also excluded from the study unless a) they were sexually abstinent, or b) they had a negative pregnancy test within 7 days of recruitment and agreed to use a reliable form of contraception until they had completed the study. The trial was approved by East London and The City Research Ethics Committee 1 (ref 09/H0703/112) and written informed consent was obtained from all participants before enrolment.

Procedures

Screening visit

Participants attending the screening visit completed the EuroQoL EQ-5D questionnaire (2). They also underwent a baseline clinical assessment including measurement of height and weight and collection of a blood sample for determination of serum concentrations of calcium, albumin and total 25-hydroxyvitamin D (25[OH]D). A urine sample was collected from women of childbearing potential for a pregnancy test (SA Scientific, San Antonio, TX USA).

Participants fulfilling eligibility criteria then entered a run-in period of at least 2 weeks, during which they were asked to complete a study diary on a daily basis. This diary (Figure S1) recorded the presence or absence of cough, cold or 'flu symptoms for each day of participation in the trial. When symptoms were present, participants were also asked to record the severity of the following symptoms, scored from 0 (no symptoms) to 3 (symptoms severe enough to interfere with activity or sleep): headache, sneezing, rhinorrhoea, nasal congestion, sore throat, dyspnoea, wheeze, chest pain, cough, sputum production, sensation of fever or chilliness, myalgia and general malaise. The diary also recorded details of time off work (for carers only), health care use, medication use and out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of acute respiratory infections.

Randomisation

As soon as compliance with diary completion was demonstrated and serum concentrations of corrected calcium and creatinine were available for at least one participant at a given sheltered accommodation scheme, this scheme was randomly assigned to active or control arms of the trial with a 1:1 ratio. Individual participants at randomised schemes then received one of the regimens detailed in Table 1, according to a) the allocation of the scheme at which they were enrolled, and b) whether they were a resident or a carer at that scheme. All participants in the intervention arm received a total dose of 3 mg vitamin D_3 over a two-month period: for carers this was given as a single bolus of 3 mg once every two months, while for residents this was given as a daily dose of 10 µg plus a bolus dose of 2.4 mg once

every two months. This regimen was designed to accommodate recommendations from the Department of Health that adults aged 65 years or more should receive a daily dose of 10 µg vitamin D in order to meet their Reference Nutrient Intake (9).

The randomisation process was performed as follows. Before the start of recruitment, Nova Laboratories Ltd. prepared kits of study medication for the trial, according to Good Manufacturing Practice. The contents of each kit varied according to a) the allocation of the sheltered accommodation scheme where the participant was recruited, and b) whether the participant was a resident or a carer at that scheme (Table 1). Kits prepared for residents of schemes allocated to the active arm of the study comprised 6 bottles each containing 4.8 ml Vigantol® Oil (2.4 mg [96,000 IU] vitamin D_3) plus 6 dropper bottles each containing sufficient Vigantol oil to dispense a daily drop of 20 µl Vigantol® Oil (10 µg [400 IU] vitamin D_3) for two months. Kits prepared for residents of schemes allocated to the control arm of the study comprised 6 bottles each containing 4.8 ml Miglyol Oil (placebo) plus 6 dropper bottles each containing sufficient Vigantol oil to dispense a daily drop of 20 µl Vigantol® Oil (10 µg [400 IU] vitamin D_3) for two months. Kits prepared for carers at schemes allocated to the intervention arm of the study comprised 6 bottles each containing 6 ml Vigantol® Oil (3 mg [120,000 IU] vitamin D_3). Kits prepared for carers at schemes allocated to the control arm of the study comprised 6 bottles each containing 6 ml Miglyol Oil (placebo). Kits were packed into 108 batches: 54 batches contained sufficient kits for residents and carers of a single scheme allocated to the active arm of the study, and 54 batches contained sufficient kits for residents and carers of a single scheme allocated to the control arm of the study. Each batch of kits was allocated a batch number from 001 to 108 using a computer-generated

random sequence. Individual kits within a given batch were then labelled with a unique randomisation number, composed of the batch number and a kit number separated by a decimal point. Nova Laboratories Ltd were responsible for generation of the random batch number sequence and for packing and labelling kits and batches as above. Nova Laboratories Ltd also provided a copy of the batch randomisation code to the participating pharmacy, members of the Data Monitoring Committee, and to a statistician not involved in analysis of trial results. This statistician randomised units using minimisation software and maintaining allocation concealment and blinding from the Chief Investigator and other researchers. Minimisation criteria were a) number of eligible residents per unit (<30 *vs.* ≥ 30); b) season of randomisation (November to April *vs.* May to October); and c) type of scheme, defined according to the level of care provided (no care or scheme manager only *vs.* housing with care). Once this statistician had assigned a batch number to the unit, study staff were informed of the batch number, and consecutive kit numbers were assigned to participants according to whether they were residents or carers. This process continued until a total of 108 schemes had been randomised. Treatment allocation was concealed from participants and study staff. Randomised participants were invited to attend a subsequent study visit, at which the first dose of study medication was administered under direct supervision, and a new symptom diary was provided.

Follow-up

Participants were asked to complete study diaries daily for the 12 months of study participation. Each diary accommodated up to 12 weeks of data; participants

completing follow-up filled 6 diaries in total. Five further bolus doses of study medication were administered at 2-monthly intervals following the first dose under direct supervision. Repeat blood samples were taken at 2 and 12 months, and serum was separated by centrifugation and frozen for subsequent assay of concentrations of 25(OH)D, albumin and calcium. Completion of the EQ5D questionnaire was repeated at 2, 6 and 12 months of follow-up. On completion of the 12-month visit, final diaries were collected and participants were discharged from the study. Details of adverse events arising during the course of the trial and use of concomitant medications were recorded throughout.

Data management and study definitions

All case report form (CRF) and diary data were entered into a database in Microsoft Access 2010. Diary data were then imported into Stata and episodes of ARI (categorised as either URI or LRI) were identified using algorithms based on the following definitions. URI was defined as a) influenza-like illness, as indicated by the presence of cough, feeling of fever/chilliness and muscle pain (3) or b) a cold, defined as follows using the Jackson criteria (4). Scores (from 0-3) for each of 8 Jackson symptoms (sneezing, sore throat, headache, subjective sensation of fever or chilliness, malaise, nasal discharge, nasal obstruction, cough) were summed for each day to generate a total Jackson score. A cold was defined as i) total Jackson symptom score of ≥14 + subjective impression of having a cold, or ii) total Jackson symptom score of ≥14 + increased nasal discharge for at least 3 days, or iii) total Jackson symptom score <14 + subjective impression of having a cold + increase in nasal discharge score above median run-in nasal discharge score for ≥ 3 days (4).

LRI was defined according to the Macfarlane criteria as follows. Each of 5 Macfarlane symptoms (cough, sputum production, dyspnoea, wheeze, chest discomfort/pain) was scored from 0-3 as above, and a LRI was defined as presence of cough with symptom score at least one point over that recorded during the run-in period, plus at least one other Macfarlane symptom scoring at least one point over that recorded during the run-in period (5).

Validation of ARI definition

In order to validate the diary definition for ARI, we performed paired nasopharyngeal and throat swabs on study participants during 21 symptomatic events meeting ARI criteria, and on 145 occasions during which participants were asymptomatic. Patients were sampled using flocked nasopharyngeal swabs (Copan Diagnostics, Murietta, CA, USA). Swabs were transferred to the laboratory in Universal Transport Medium (Copan Diagnostics) and tested for the presence of nucleic acids for ten respiratory pathogens (adenovirus, enterovirus, influenza A, influenza B, metapneumovirus, parainfluenza 1, 2 and 3, rhinovirus and respiratory syncytial virus) using real-time polymerase chain reaction (6).

Sample size and statistical analysis

This trial was powered to detect a clinically significant difference in time to first ARI among participants enrolled in sheltered accommodation schemes allocated to active *vs.* control arms of the trial. The proportion of the population experiencing at least one ARI per year is variously reported to be between 68% and 92% (5, 7, 8). Employing the Xie and Waksman formula for sample size estimation in clinical trials

with clustered survival times as the primary endpoint (9) and assuming an average of 3 participants per unit, with intra-cluster coefficient of 0.05, equal numbers of units allocated to active and control arms of the study and 25% loss to follow-up of units, we calculated that a total of 108 units would need to be randomised to demonstrate a 20% reduction in proportion of participants experiencing at least one ARI in one year from 80% to 64%, with 80% power at the two-sided 5% significance level. This calculation was revised from the original power calculation, which indicated that we would need to randomise a total of 36 sheltered accommodation schemes, based on the assumption that 15 participants would be recruited in each scheme.

Pre-specified secondary endpoints were the time to first URI and first LRI; the proportion of participants experiencing at least one such episode; the rate of these episodes; the median duration of symptoms per episode; the peak symptom score per episode; mean serum concentrations of 25(OH)D and corrected calcium at 2 and 12 months; unscheduled health care attendance for ARI; use of antibiotics and over-the-counter medications for treatment of ARI; quality of life, as indicated by EQ5D scores; work absence (carers only); health economic outcomes (costs of ARI, quality-adjusted life years [QALY] and incremental net benefit over one year); and incidence of adverse events. Pre-specified sub-group analyses were conducted to determine whether the effect of vitamin D_3 supplementation on co-primary outcomes was modified by type of participant (resident *vs.* carer).

Analyses were performed using Stata/IC (versions 12.1, 2012 and 13, 2013), GraphPad Prism (version 4.03, 2005) and R (version 3.0.2, 2013) software packages. Analysis was by intention-to-treat (ITT), and significance was tested at the 5% level. A single pre-specified interim efficacy analysis of time to co-primary

outcomes (requiring P<0.001 to stop) was performed after enrolment of 58 schemes. Interim safety analyses (n=5) were conducted at 6-monthly intervals throughout the course of the trial. Results of interim analyses were reviewed by the Data Monitoring Committee, who recommended continuation of the trial following each review.

Time-to-event outcomes were analysed using Cox regression adjusted for minimisation variables (level of care, size of scheme and season of randomisation) and participant study group (resident *vs.* carer), allowing for a shared frailty within the same unit, with frailty following a gamma distribution. When Cox regression would not converge, these outcomes were analysed using fully-parametric time-to-event regression analysis. Effects of allocation on time-to-event outcomes are presented as hazard ratios, with the numerator being the hazard or chance of the outcome occurring in the intervention arm, and the denominator being the hazard or chance of the outcome occurring in the control arm; thus, a hazard ratio >1 represents an increased risk of the outcome occurring in the intervention arm, and vice versa. The assumption of proportional hazards for all survival analyses was confirmed using the methods proposed by Grambsch and Therneau (10).

Analyses of binary outcomes used logistic regression adjusted for minimisation factors and participant study group (resident *vs.* carer), with a random effect of unit to account for clustering. Analyses of event rates (e.g. rate of infection per participant per year) used negative binomial regression adjusted for minimisation factors and participant study group (resident *vs.* carer), accounting for the appropriate length of follow-up, and with a random effect of scheme. Quantitative outcomes assessed more than once in the same participant, but not at fixed times (e.g. duration of

symptoms per episode of infection) were analysed using linear regression adjusted for minimisation factors and participant study group with random effects of scheme and individual. Data for a given episode were considered missing if that episode was incomplete at the end of follow-up. Quantitative outcomes assessed more than once in the same participant at fixed time-points in addition to a baseline assessment (e.g. serum 25[OH]D concentrations) were analysed using linear regression adjusted for minimisation factors and participant study group with random effects of scheme and individual, constrained so that there was no treatment effect at baseline, and with a treatment effect estimated at each subsequent time-point. A P-value for allocation-time interaction was used to evaluate evidence for an effect of allocation; where evidence was found ($P<0.05$), P-values for the effect of allocation at individual time-points are reported. Sub-group analyses were performed by repeating analyses of time to ARI, URI and LRI with the inclusion of the appropriate interaction term. Interaction effects were summarised as a ratio of hazard ratios with 95% confidence interval and P-value.

Analysis of health economic outcomes was undertaken from a societal perspective. Unit costs for general practitioner (GP) and nurse consultations, outpatient attendances and emergency department attendances were obtained from the Unit Costs of Health and Social Care (11). Unit costs for hospital admissions were obtained from the Reference Costs Database (12). Unit drug costs were calculated from the British National Formulary (1). Participants' costs were obtained from study diaries and included travel expenses and out-of-pocket expenses on prescription drugs and over-the-counter medication incurred as a result of ARI (all participants) and time lost from work due to ARI (carers only). Time lost from work due to ARI was valued using age- and sex-adjusted average daily wage rates from the Office for

National Statistics (13). Total health care costs calculated from diary data were validated against those calculated from GP records for 24 randomly selected participants: good correlation between the two estimates was observed (Spearman's r 0.78, 95% CI 0.54 to 0.90, P<0.0001).

EQ-5D quality of life data were combined with survival data to calculate QALY (2). Participants' EQ-5D profiles were combined with health state preference values from the UK general population(14) to derive EQ-5D utility index scores at 2, 6 and 12 months of follow-up on a scale anchored at 0 (death) and 1 (perfect health). QALY were calculated for each participant using the weighted average of time spent in the study and quality of life.

Cost effectiveness analysis (CEA) was undertaken to assess the relative cost effectiveness of vitamin D_3 supplementation *vs.* placebo for the prevention of ARI. The CEA used bivariate regression methods to allow for correlation between costs and outcomes to report mean values and 95% confidence intervals for incremental costs and QALY of active *vs.* control at one year, adjusted for minimisation variables and participant status (resident *vs.* carer).

Missing data for health economic analyses were addressed with multiple imputation. The imputation model included minimisation variables, participant status (resident *vs.* carer) and baseline covariates (sex, ethnicity, alcohol use and body mass index) as predictors. We applied analytical methods in each imputed dataset (n=5) and combined the resultant estimates with Rubin's rules (15). Incremental net monetary benefits were estimated by valuing incremental QALY at a threshold of £20,000 per

QALY and subtracting incremental costs. A cost-effectiveness acceptability curve was calculated by reporting the probability that the active intervention was cost-effective at different levels of willingness to pay for a QALY gain (£0 to £50,000 per QALY gained) (16).

Laboratory analyses

Serum concentrations of 25(OH)D_2 and 25(OH)D_3 were determined by isotope-dilution liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry (17) and summed to give values for total 25(OH)D concentration. Sensitivity for this assay was 10 nmol/l. Albumin and total serum calcium concentrations were determined using an Architect ci8200 analyser (Abbott Diagnostics, Chicago, IL, USA). Calcium concentration was corrected for serum albumin concentration using the formula: corrected calcium (mmol/l) = total calcium (mmol/l) + 0.02 × (40 – albumin [g/l]). Vitamin D_3 content of active medication was determined by high performance liquid chromatography.

Role of the funding source

The National Institute of Health Research was not involved in study design; in the collection, analysis or interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

References

1. Joint Formulary Committee. British National Formulary 66: Pharmaceutical Press; 2013.
2. EuroQol. EuroQol--a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. The EuroQol Group. Health Policy. 1990;16(3):199-208.
3. Payne L, Kuhlmann-Berenzon S, Ekdahl K, Giesecke J, Hogberg L, Penttinen P. 'Did you have flu last week?' A telephone survey to estimate a point prevalence of influenza in the Swedish population. Euro Surveill. 2005;10(12):241-4.
4. Jackson GG, Dowling HF, Spiesman IG, Boand AV. Transmission of the common cold to volunteers under controlled conditions. I. The common cold as a clinical entity. AMA Arch Intern Med. 1958;101(2):267-78.
5. Macfarlane J, Holmes W, Gard P, Macfarlane R, Rose D, Weston V, et al. Prospective study of the incidence, aetiology and outcome of adult lower respiratory tract illness in the community. Thorax. 2001;56(2):109-14. Epub 2001/02/24.
6. Bibby DF, McElarney I, Breuer J, Clark DA. Comparative evaluation of the Seegene Seeplex RV15 and real-time PCR for respiratory virus detection. J Med Virol. 2011;83(8):1469-75. Epub 2011/06/17.
7. Meydani SN, Leka LS, Fine BC, Dallal GE, Keusch GT, Singh MF, et al. Vitamin E and respiratory tract infections in elderly nursing home residents: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2004;292(7):828-36. Epub 2004/08/19.
8. Fendrick AM, Monto AS, Nightengale B, Sarnes M. The economic burden of non-influenza-related viral respiratory tract infection in the United States. Arch Intern Med. 2003;163(4):487-94.
9. Xie T, Waksman J. Design and sample size estimation in clinical trials with clustered survival times as the primary endpoint. Stat Med. 2003;22(18):2835-46. Epub 2003/09/04.
10. Grambsch PM, Therneau TM. Proportional hazards tests and diagnostics based on weighted residuals. Biometrika. 1994;81(3):515-26.
11. Curtis L. Unit Costs of Health and Social Care. Canterbury: Personal Social Services Research Unit; 2012.
12. Department of Health. NHS reference costs 2011-2012. London: Department of Health; 2012.
13. Office of National Statistics. Annual Survey of Hours & Earnings. London; 2012.
14. Dolan P, Gudex C, Kind P, Williams A. A Social Tariff for EuroQOL of Life: Results from a General UK General Population Survey. CHE Discussion Paper 138. York: Centre for Health Economics, University of York, 1999.
15. Rubin DB. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. New York: J Wiley & Sons; 1987.
16. Fenwick E, O'Brien BJ, Briggs A. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves--facts, fallacies and frequently asked questions. Health Econ. 2004;13(5):405-15.
17. Maunsell Z, Wright DJ, Rainbow SJ. Routine Isotope-Dilution Liquid Chromatography–Tandem Mass Spectrometry Assay for Simultaneous Measurement of the 25-Hydroxy Metabolites of Vitamins D_2 and D_3. Clin Chem. 2005;51(9):1683-90.

Supplementary Table 1: Health service and medication use by allocation

		Active (n=137)	Control (n=103)	Adjusted hazard ratio / odds ratio / incidence rate ratio (95% CI)[1]	P
Unscheduled healthcare attendance for ARI	Median time to first attendance, days (IQR)	107 (41 to 229)	152 (77 to 296)	1.31 (0.72 to 2.41)	0.38
	Proportion of participants with ≥1 attendance (%)[2]	34/123 (28%)	22/88 (25%)	1.10 (0.59 to 2.07)	0.76
	Rate of attendances per participant-year	51/130.0 = 0.39	42/93.6 = 0.45	0.79 (0.43 to 1.44)	0.44
Antibiotic use for ARI	Median time to first course of antibiotics for ARI, days (IQR)	107 (49 to 203)	173 (152 to 296)	1.57 (0.82 to 3.03)	0.18
	Proportion of participants taking ≥1 course of antibiotics for ARI (%)[2]	29/123 (24%)	16/87 (18%)	1.33 (0.66 to 2.69)	0.42
	Rate of antibiotic courses per participant-year	38/130.0 = 0.29	22/93.6 = 0.23	1.23 (0.68 to 2.22)	0.50
Use of OTC medication for ARI	Median time to first course of OTC medication for ARI, days (IQR)	109 (35 to 204)	168 (64 to 234)	1.33 (0.93 to 1.95)	0.12
	Proportion of participants taking ≥1 course of OTC medication for ARI (%)[2]	77/123 (63%)	49/90 (54%)	1.43 (0.82 to 2.50)	0.21
	Rate of courses of OTC medication for ARI per participant-year	206/130.0 = 1.59	139/93.6 = 1.48	1.18 (0.83 to 1.68)	0.37

CI, confidence interval; ARI, acute respiratory infection; IQR, inter-quartile range; OTC, over-the-counter.

1, adjusted for study group (resident *vs.* carer) and minimisation variables (level of care, size of scheme and season of randomisation). **2**, these analyses exclude participants who withdrew from the trial without experiencing the relevant outcome prior to date of withdrawal.

Supplementary Table 2: Quality of life outcomes by allocation

		Active (2 mo: n=132 6 mo: n=128 12 mo: n=122)	Control (2 mo: n=98 6 mo: n=91 12 mo: n=87)	Adjusted odds ratio / mean difference / (95% CI)[1]	P
Mean EQ5D index score (s.d.)	2 mo	0.82 (0.22)	0.87 (0.18)	-0.30 (-1.16 to 0.59)[2]	0.64[2]
	6 mo	0.82 (0.24)	0.84 (0.26)	-0.20 (-1.08 to 0.69)[2]	
	12 mo	0.79 (0.27)	0.80 (0.25)	0.34 (-0.54 to 1.22)[2]	
Proportion reporting any mobility problem (%)	2 mo	45/132 (34%)	29/98 (30%)	0.79 (0.25 to 2.54)	0.27
	6 mo	39/128 (30%	26/91 (29%)	0.58 (0.17 to 1.94)	
	12 mo	42/122 (34%)	34/87 (39%)	0.31 (0.09 to 1.02)	
Proportion reporting any self-care problem (%)	2 mo	7/132 (5%)	2/98 (2%)	2.92 (0.37 to 23.18)	0.79
	6 mo	13/128 (10%)	7/91 (8%)	1.07 (0.25 to 4.68)	
	12 mo	19/122 (16%)	11/87 (13%)	1.04 (0.27 to 3.93)	
Proportion reporting any usual activity problem (%)	2 mo	24/132 (18%)	20/98 (20%)	0.62 (0.21 to 1.81)	0.33
	6 mo	20/128 (16%)	18/91 (20%)	0.43 (0.14 to 1.31)	
	12 mo	22/122 (18%)	20/87 (23%)	0.43 (0.14 to 1.30)	
Proportion reporting any pain / discomfort (%)	2 mo	56/132 (42%)	31/98 (32%)	1.47 (0.65 to 3.34)	0.54
	6 mo	51/128 (40%)	26/91 (29%)	1.50 (0.64 to 3.54)	
	12 mo	49/122 (40%)	33/87 (38%)	0.83 (0.35 to 1.93)	
Proportion reporting any anxiety / depression (%)	2 mo	22/132 (17%)	13/98 (13%)	1.68 (0.55 to 5.15)	0.76
	6 mo	22/128 (17%)	13/91 (14%)	1.25 (0.41 to 3.83)	
	12 mo	22/122 (18%)	16/87 (18%)	0.86 (0.29 to 2.55)	
Mean EQ5D VAS score (s.d.)	2 mo	76.0 (16.9)	77.2 (20.3)	-0.46 (-4.56 to 3.65)	0.73
	6 mo	78.1 (17.1)	78.3 (19.0)	0.68 (-3.53 to 4.89)	
	12 mo	78.3 (19.3)	76.9 (19.0)	2.14 (-2.14 to 6.43)	

s.d., standard deviation; mo, months; VAS, visual analogue scale.

1, adjusted for study group (resident *vs.* carer) and minimisation variables (level of care, size of scheme and season of randomisation). **2**, the distribution of EQ5D scores was bimodal, with the majority of the sample having a value of exactly 1, but with a subgroup with mode around 0.8. Results show adjusted odds ratios and overall P-value from a logistic regression with (EQ5D = 1) as the outcome.

Supplementary Table 3: Work absence by allocation

	Active (n=22)[1]	**Control (n=24)**[1]	**Adjusted hazard ratio / odds ratio / incidence rate ratio (95% CI)**[2]	**P**
Median time to first work absence due to ARI, days	-- (-- to --)	-- (339 to --)	0.82 (0.24 to 2.73)	0.74
Proportion of participants missing ≥ 1 day of work, (%)	5/21 (24%)	7/21 (33%)	0.62 (0.15 to 2.64)	0.52
Rate of days of missed work due to ARI per participant year	16/21.3 = 0.75	34/23.1 = 1.47	0.50 (0.09 to 2.87)[3]	0.44

1, this analysis was conducted for carers only, as the majority of residents were retired. **2**, unless otherwise stated, adjusted for study group (resident *vs.* carer) and minimisation variables (level of care, size of scheme and season of randomisation). **3**, the negative binomial regression in this case was performed ignoring clustering by scheme, as the regression with clustering failed to converge.

Supplementary Table 4: Total one-year costs, quality-adjusted life years and incremental net benefit per participant by allocation

		Active (n=137)[1]	**Control (n=103)**[1]	**Adjusted mean difference (95% CI)**[2]	**P**
Study medication, £		35.00 (0.00)	21.32 (11.81)	12.62 (11.22 to 14.02)	<0.001
ARI-related healthcare use, £	Hospitalisation	9.35 (94.99)	53.30 (388.31)	-49.09 (-116.50 to 18.31)	0.15
	Emergency department attendances	0.66 (7.77)	0.88 (8.97)	-0.11 (-2.39 to 2.17)	0.93
	Primary care consultations	15.47 (33.85)	14.57 (38.54)	0.97 (-8.18 to 10.13)	0.84
ARI-related prescriptions, £	Antimicrobials	0.50 (1.33)	0.35 (1.14)	0.18 (-0.13 to 0.49)	0.25
Out-of-pocket costs paid by participant, £	Travel	0.07 (0.85)	0.42 (2.50)	-0.38 (-0.82 to 0.07)	0.098
	Over-the-counter medication	3.99 (9.46)	3.49 (9.65)	0.30 (-2.14 to 2.73)	0.81
	Prescriptions	0.05 (0.62)	0.25 (1.78)	-0.12 (-0.43 to 0.19)	0.46
Productivity loss, £		11.08 (71.40)	15.25 (80.93)	1.04 (-17.50 to 19.57)	0.91
Total costs associated with ARI over 12 months, £		76.46 (130.47)	109.83 (401.31)	-34.72 (-107.34 to 37.90)	0.35
QALYs over 12 months		0.81 (0.20)	0.82 (0.22)	0.00 (-0.054 to 0.059)	0.93
Incremental Net Benefit, £[3]				82.89 (-1054.76 to 1220.54)	0.89

CI, confidence interval; ARI, acute respiratory infection; QALY, quality-adjusted life-years

1, mean (standard deviation) are presented. **2**, adjusted for study group (resident *vs.* carer) and minimisation variables (level of care, size of scheme and season of randomisation). **3**, incremental net benefit calculated by multiplying the mean QALY gain by £20,000 and subtracting the incremental cost.

Supplementary Table 5: Respiratory outcomes by allocation: residents *vs.* carers

	Residents (n=194)				Carers (n=46)				
	Active (n=115)	Control (n=79)	Adjusted ratio of hazard ratios (95% CI)[1]	P	Active (n=22)	Control (n=24)	Adjusted ratio of hazard ratios (95% CI)[1]	P	P for interaction
Median time to first ARI, days (IQR)	194 (58 to --)	213 (85 to --)	1.15 (0.79 to 1.68)	0.48	262 (55 to --)	284 (76 to --)	1.59 (0.52 to 4.88)	0.42	0.73
Median time to first URI, days (IQR)	227 (75 to --)	-- (125 to --)	1.58 (1.02 to 2.43)	0.039	266 (55 to --)	284 (76 to --)	1.24 (0.47 to 3.26)	0.67	0.48
Median time to first LRI, days (IQR)	-- (115 to --)	346 (114 to --)	0.96 (0.61 to 1.51)	0.85	313 (109 to --)	-- (284 to --)	2.24 (0.89 to 5.69)	0.09	0.054

CI, confidence interval; ARI, acute respiratory infection; IQR, inter-quartile range; URI, upper respiratory infection; LRI, lower respiratory infection.

1, adjusted for minimisation variables (level of care, size of scheme and season of randomization)

Supplementary Table 6: Serious Adverse Events by allocation[1]

	Active (n=137)	**Control (n=103)**
Cancer diagnosis / treatment		
Malignant melanoma	1[2]	0
Pancreatic carcinoma	0	1[2]
Prostatic carcinoma	1[2]	0
Emergency surgical admission		
Acute cholecystitis	1	0
Acute urinary retention	0	1
Diverticulitis	0	1
Hepatic cyst	0	1
Soft tissue injury following trauma	1	1
Elective surgery		
Knee replacement	4	2
Hip replacement	2	0
Hysterectomy for atypical endometrial hyperplasia	1	0
Interphalangeal joint replacement	1	0
Repair of incisional hernia	1	0
Emergency medical admission		
Atrial fibrillation with rapid ventricular response	0	1
Atypical / musculoskeletal chest pain	1	1
Cellulitis	2	0
Cerebrovascular accident	1	1
Community-acquired pneumonia	2	2
Fall	0	2
Focal seizure	0	2
Headache (cause undetermined)	0	1
Ischaemic optic neuropathy	0	1
Labyrinthitis	1	0
Metabolic acidosis due to metformin / ethanol overdose	0	1
Supra-ventricular tachycardia	0	1
Syncopal episode (cause undetermined)	1	1
Unstable angina pectoris	2	0
Urinary tract infection	2	1
Total number of SAEs	25	22
Number of SAEs leading to discontinuation of study medication	2	1
Death due to any cause during participation in trial	0	0
Number of participants experiencing any serious adverse event (%)	22 (16%)	17 (17%)

1, adverse events were classified as serious if they caused death or were life-threatening, or if they necessitated hospital admission or prolongation of hospital stay. **2**, these diagnoses led to discontinuation of study medication.

Supplementary Table 7: Non-Serious Adverse Events by allocation

	Active (n=137)	Control (n=103)
Number of non-serious adverse events by system		
Acute upper respiratory infection	218	194
Acute lower respiratory infection	49	44
Other respiratory infection	26	24
Allergic symptoms	8	9
Other ear / nose / throat adverse event	10	1
Hypercalcaemia	0	0
Other biochemical adverse event	15	14
Haematological adverse event	8	8
Cardiovascular adverse event	15	15
Endocrine / metabolic adverse event	9	5
Central nervous system / psychiatric adverse event	35	26
Dermatological adverse event	22	17
Fall	15	12
Fracture	2	2
Other musculoskeletal adverse event	57	59
Gastrointestinal adverse event	29	37
Genitourinary adverse event	18	12
Ophthalmic adverse event	14	19
Oral / dental adverse event	13	8
Other adverse event	33	30
Total number of non-serious adverse events	596	536
Number of non-serious adverse events by relatedness to study medication		
Not related	588	531
Doubtful	5	4
Possible	2[1]	1[2]
Probable	1[3]	0
Number of non-serious adverse events leading to discontinuation of study medication	4[4]	3[5]
Number of participants experiencing any non-serious adverse event (%)	127 (93%)	94 (91%)

1, one diarrhoea, one abdominal cramps; **2**, abdominal pain and vasovagal symptoms leading to discontinuation of study medication; **3**, rash after taking low-dose study medication; **4**, one palpitations, one 'dizzy spell', one diarrhoea, one nausea; **5**, one oral candidiasis, one abdominal pain and vasovagal symptoms, one diagnosis of vitamin D deficiency.

Supplementary Figure 1: Study Diary

	DAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY	SUNDAY
Please complete EVERY DAY	Date (day / month / year)							
	Did you have any cough, cold or flu symptoms today?	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes
	If yes, please complete <u>entire</u> column below, scoring symptoms 0 = none, 1 = mild, 2 = moderate, 3 = severe							
Please complete ENTIRE COLUMN only if you have a cough, a cold or flu symptoms	Headache	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Sneezing	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Runny nose	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Blocked nose	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Sore throat	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Shortness of breath	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Wheeze	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Chest pain	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Cough	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Coughing up phlegm	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Fever or chills	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Muscle aches	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Feeling generally unwell	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3	0 1 2 3
	Did you take a day off work today because of your symptoms?	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes	No Yes
	Did you see a doctor today for your symptoms?	No Yes If yes see p26	No Yes If yes see p26	No Yes If yes see p26	No Yes If yes see p26	No Yes If yes see p26	No Yes If yes see p26	No Yes If yes see p26
	Did you take antibiotics or other medicines today for your symptoms?	No Yes If yes see p27	No Yes If yes see p27	No Yes If yes see p27	No Yes If yes see p27	No Yes If yes see p27	No Yes If yes see p27	No Yes If yes see p27
	Did you incur any costs today as a result of cold, flu or chest infection?	No Yes If yes see p28	No Yes If yes see p28	No Yes If yes see p28	No Yes If yes see p28	No Yes If yes see p28	No Yes If yes see p28	No Yes If yes see p28

Supplementary Figure 2: **Probability that vitamin D_3 supplementation is cost effective at alternative levels of willingness to pay for a quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gain**