Tools for Practice is proudly sponsored by the Alberta College of Family Physicians (ACFP). ACFP is a provincial, professional voluntary organization, representing more than 4,000 family physicians, family medicine residents and medical students in Alberta. Established over fifty years ago, the ACFP strives for excellence in family practice through advocacy, continuing medical education and primary care research. <u>www.acfp.ca</u>

Reviewed: February 17, 2015 Evidence Updated: Systematic review added Bottom Line: Unchanged First Published: February 7, 2011



Does calcium supplementation increase the risk of MI?

Clinical Question: Do calcium supplements increase risk of myocardial infarction (MI) and other cardiovascular disease (CVD)?

Bottom-Line: Evidence suggests that calcium supplementation might slightly increase the risk of MI and perhaps other CVD. Although there are limitations to the evidence and the increased CVD risk is likely <1%, the benefit-to-harm ratio might not favour calcium supplementation.

Evidence:

- Five recent systematic reviews had differing conclusions:
 - The first reviewed 15 Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) comparing calcium supplementation (≥500 mg/day) vs. placebo.¹
 - Only one CVD outcome reached statistical significance:
 - Calcium increased MI risk, Relative Risk 1.27 (1.01-1.59).
 - Absolute risk was <1% and Number Needed to Harm (NNH) for one MI was 135 to 211 over four years.
 - Another examined 17 studies comparing vitamin D, calcium, or both vs. placebo:²
 - No comparisons reached statistical significance.
 - More than 99% of data for calcium and vitamin D vs. placebo were from the Women's Health Initiative (WHI),³ and 54% of participants were taking extra calcium.⁴
 - A subgroup (similar to per-protocol) analysis of WHI data⁵ excluding those taking extra calcium found borderline significant increases in hazard ratios for MI [1.22 (1.00-1.50)] and MI or Stroke [1.16 (1.00-1.35)].
 - Updating the previous meta-analysis¹ with this data, calcium (with or without vitamin D) significantly increased:⁵
 - MI NNH=240 over five years, p=0.004 and,
 - MI or stroke NNH=178 over five years, p=0.009.

- A systematic review on a variety of calcium-related topics concluded there is no interaction between calcium and CVD risk.⁶
- The newest systematic review of 11 RCTs (50,252 participants):7
 - Trends toward harm in odds ratios:
 - CVD [1.16 (0.97-1.68)],
 - MI [1.28 (0.97-1.68)],
 - Stroke [1.14 (0.90-1.46)].
- Limitations: Over-interpretation of data (including calculating NNH for non-statistically significant outcomes),¹ excluded relevant studies,^{2,7} small sample size,² no analysis of different outcomes,² large number of comparisons,⁵ sub-group analyses, ⁵ possible conflict of interest,⁵ absolute numbers not reported.⁷

Context:

- No RCT of calcium supplementation was designed to assess CVD outcomes.^{1,2}
 - These meta-analyses^{1-3,7} represent post-hoc analyses of secondary or unplanned outcomes, possibly inadequately reported.⁸
- Trials of vitamin D alone do not suggest CVD harm.⁹
- Calcium (88% with vitamin D) reduces fracture (any type), Number Needed to Treat of 63 over 3.5 years.¹⁰
 - Calcium alone just failed to reach statistical significance.
 - Other studies suggest calcium alone does not reduce non-vertebral fracture and might increase hip fracture.^{11,12}

Original Authors:

Christina Korownyk MD CCFP, G Michael Allan MD CCFP

Updated:

Reviewed:

Adrienne J Lindblad BSP ACPR PharmD G Michael Allan MD CCFP

References:

- 1. Bolland MJ, Avenell A, Baron JA, et al. BMJ. 2010; 341:c3691.
- 2. Wang L, Manson JE, Song Y, et al. Ann Intern Med. 2010; 152(5):315-23.
- 3. Hsia J, Heiss G, Ren H, et al. Circulation. 2007; 115(7):846-54.
- 4. Wactawski-Wende J, Kotchen JM, Anderson GL, *et al.* N Engl J Med. 2006; 354(7):684-96.
- 5. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Avenell A, et al. BMJ. 2011; 342:d2040.
- Institute of Medicine (US) Committee to Review Dietary Reference Intakes for Vitamin D and Calcium; Ross AC, Taylor CL, Yaktine AL, et al., editors. Dietary Reference Intakes for Calcium and Vitamin D. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2011.
- 7. Mao PJ, Zhang C, Tang L, et al. Int J Cardiol. 2013; 169:106-11.
- 8. Bolland MJ, Barber PA, Doughty RN, et al. BMJ. 2008; 336(7638):262-6.
- 9. Pittas AG, Chung M, Trikalinos T, et al. Ann Intern Med. 2010; 152(5): 307-14.
- 10. Tang BM, Eslick GD, Nowson C, et al. Lancet. 2007; 370(9588):657-66.
- 11. Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Dawson-Hughes B, Baron JA, *et al*. Am J Clin Nutr. 2007; 86(6):1780-90.
- 12. Reid IR, Bolland MJ, Grey A. Osteoporos Int. 2008; 19(8):1119-23.

Tools for Practice is a biweekly article summarizing medical evidence with a focus on topical issues and practice modifying information. It is coordinated by G. Michael Allan, MD, CCFP and the content is written by practicing family physicians who are joined occasionally by a health professional from another medical specialty or health

discipline. Each article is peer-reviewed, ensuring it maintains a high standard of quality, accuracy, and academic integrity.

The ACFP has supported the publishing and distribution of the Tools for Practice library since 2009. If you are not a member of the ACFP and would like to receive the TFP emails, please sign up for the distribution list at http://bit.ly/signupfortfp. Archived articles are available at no extra cost on the ACFP website.

You can now earn credits on Tools for Practice! In August 2014, the ACFP launched <u>GoMainpro, an online</u> accreditation tool to help facilitate MAINPRO® accreditation for the ACFP's Tools for Practice library which has been accredited for Mainpro-M1 credits by the College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC). The combination of the CFPC's Direct Entry Program and GoMainpro's tracking and reporting features provide an easy and convenient way to earn Mainpro-M1 credits.

This communication reflects the opinion of the authors and does not necessarily mirror the perspective and policy of the Alberta College of Family Physicians.