| Author Year | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Country | | | | | | | |
| PEDro Score | Methods | Outcomes | | | | | |
| Research Design | | | | | | | |
| Sample Size | | | | | | | |
| Amorim et al. | Population: Mean Age=47.0±10.6 yr; Gender: males=13, females=1; Time since injury=26.1±34.2 mo; Level of injury: C=3, T=6, L=5; Severity of injury: AIS A=4, B=0, C=5, D=5. Intervention: Participants were randomized to creatine (3g daily), vitamin D (25000 IU per two weeks) or placebo group and completed a double-blinded eight-week progressive resistance training program. Outcome Measures: Amount of 25-hydroxyvitamin D (25(OH)D), Sum four skinfolds, Arm muscle area, Manual wheelchair slalom test (MWST), Medicine ball throw, Handgrip strength, Chest press, Triceps, Pec deck, Lat pulldown. Effect Sizes: Forest plot of standardized mean of pre- and post-intervention data. | Over the 8-wk study, the amount of 25(OH)D improved significantly (p<0.05). The amount of 25(OH)D improved significantly (p<0.05) when compared to the control group. No significant improvements in any variable for the control group. All variables improved significantly (p<0.05) over time in the creatine group except for the MWST. In the vitamin D group, the correct arm muscle area, medicine ball throw, and chest press improved significantly (p<0.05) over time. Corrected arm muscle area improved significantly (p<0.05) over time. Gorrected arm functional group. | | | | | |
| Portugal RCT | | 0.52 (*0.82,1.85) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 | | | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test | 0.33 (+0.99/1.66) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test | 0.33 (*0.99,1.66) 0.51 (*0.83,1.84) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength | 0.33 (*0.99,1.66) 0.51 (*0.83,1.84) 0.01 (*1.30,1.33) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck | 0.33 (*0.99),1.66) 0.51 (*0.83,1.84) 0.01 (*1.30,1.33) 0.01 (*1.30,1.33) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck -1.5 -1 -0.5 Favours Control | 0.33 (0.99,1.66) 0.51 (0.83,1.84) 0.01 (41.30,1.33) 0.01 (41.30,1.33) 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 ol SMD (95%C.I.) Favours Creatine | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck -1.5 -1 -0.1 Favours Contro Amorim et al. 201 | 0.33 (10.99,1.66) 0.51 (10.83,1.84) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 5 0 SMD (95%C.I.) Favours Creatine 18; Control vs. Vitamin D | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck -1.5 -1 -0.1 Favours Contro Amorim et al. 201 Vitamin D (25(OH)D) | 0.33 (-0.99,1.66) 0.51 (-0.83,1.84) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 vol SMD (95%C.I.) Favours Creatine 18; Control vs. Vitamin D 2.05 (0.43,3.67) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck -1.5 -1 -0. Favours Contro Amorim et al. 201 Vitamin D (25(OH)D) 0.10 [1.] | 0.33 (0.99)1.66) 0.51 (0.83)1.84) 0.01 (4130)1.33) 0.01 (4130)1.33) 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 ol SMD (95%C.I.) Favours Creatine 18; Control vs. Vitamin D 2.05 (0.43)3.67) 21,1.42) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck -1.5 -1 -0.1 Favours Contro Amorim et al. 201 Vitamin D (25(OH)D) Arm Muscle Area 0.06 (-1.2 Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test | 0.33 (0.99),1.66) 0.51 (0.83,1.84) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 ol SMD (95%C.I.) Favours Creatine 18; Control vs. Vitamin D 2.05 (0.43,3.67) 21,1.42) :5,1.38) | | | | | |
| PEDro=9 N=14 | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw Handgrip Strength Pec Deck -1.5 -1 -0.1 Favours Contro Amorim et al. 201 Vitamin D (25(OH)D) Arm Muscle Area 0.00 (1.2 Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test Medicine Ball Throw | 0.33 (0.99,1.66) 0.51 (0.83,1.84) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 0.01 (-1.30,1.33) 5 0 0.5 1 1.5 2 ol SMD (95%C.I.) Favours Creatine 18; Control vs. Vitamin D 2.05 (0.43,3.67) 21,1.42) | | | | | |

| Author Year | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------|---------------|-----|
| Country | | | | | | | | | |
| PEDro Score | Methods | | Our | tcomes | | | | | |
| Dessarah | | | | | | | | | |
| Design | | | | | | | | | |
| Sample Size | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Amorim et al. 2018; Creatine vs. Vitamin D | | | | | | | | |
| | Vitamin D (25(OH)D) | | | 1 | .70 (0. | 26,3.15) | | | |
| | | 0.09 (| 1.15,1 | .33) | | - | | | |
| | Sum Four Skiniolas | | | 0.78 (-0.51,2.07) | | | | | |
| | Arm Muscle Area | 0 | .29 (-0.9 | 96,1.53) | | _ | | | |
| | Manual Wheelchair Slolem Test | | 0.45 | 0.81,1.70) | _ | | | | |
| | Medicine Ball Throw | 0.17 | 61 07 | 1 42) | | | | | |
| | Pec Deck | | | | • | | | | |
| | -1.5 | -1 -0.5 | 0 | 0.5 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 3.5 |
| | | Favours Creatin | e | SMD (95%C.I.) | | Favours | Vitamin D | 1 | |
| | Population: Mean age=47.0±1 | 1.8 yr; Gender: | 2. | Total Vitamin | D int | ake sign | ificantly | differe | ent |
| | males=20, females=0; Time sin | ce | | (p=0.0001) be | twee | n group | s. | | |
| | injury=18.9±12.4 yr; Level of inj | 3. | Calcium intake | e sigr | nificantly | y differer | nt | | |
| | Intervention: Participants were | 4 | (p=0.0157) be Total caloric in | twee | n group signific | s. antly dif | ferent | | |
| | high vitamin D consumption gro | 1. | between group | ps (p | =0.02). | anery an | lerene | | |
| | vitamin D consumption group ba | ased on their | 5. | Vitamin D inta | ke p | ositively | related | to tota | l |
| | of the study and different body | | caloric intake | (p=0 d to l | .0001) a | ind total | caloric | 1 | |
| | were recorded based on their vi | itamin D | 6. | Vitamin D inta | ke ad | ljusted t | to total d | ietary | J. |
| | consumption. |) intel/e | | intake positive | ely re | lated to | Si adjust | ted to | |
| | Calcium intake Total caloric int | | body weight (| p=0.0 | 004) and | l Si adjus | ted to | | |
| | Percentage macronutrients, Total percent fat, | | | Vitamin D inta | 0.012 ke ad | 2). liusted t | to total d | ietarv | |
| | Region percent fat, Fat mass, L | | intake positive | ely re | lated to | Sg (p=0. | 016) a | nd | |
| | circumference, and metabolic p | | Sg adjusted to | body | v weight | (p=0.01 | 8). | , | |
| Beal et al. | glucose, Low density lipoproteir | 8. | different betw | een o | utrients | s not sign n>0.05) | ificant | ly | |
| 2018 | density lipoprotein (HDL), Total cholesterol, | | | No significant | diffe | rence in | total per | rcent fa | at, |
| Case-Control | Glucose effectiveness (Sg)) | ilivity (SI), | | region percent | t fat, | fat mass | , lean ma | ass, sitt | ing |
| N=20 | | | | waist circumfe | erenc | e, sitting | g abdomi | inal 0.05) | |
| | | | 10. | Insulin sensiti | vity 1 | iot signi | ficantly | differei | nt |
| | | | | between the g | roup | s (p=0.1 | 3). | | |
| | | | 11. | Glucose effecti | ivene | ess not si | ignifican | tly 1257) | |
| | | | 12. | Glucose effecti | ivene | ess still n | iot signif | icantly | , |
| | | | | different wher | ı con | trolled f | or body | weight | |
| | | 12 | (p=0.1337) or |). t | | | | | |
| | | 15. | between the groups ($p=0.0354$). | | | | | | |
| | | 14. | No significant | diffe | rence in | LDL (p= | 0.0654 | ł) | |
| | | | 4 - | or HDL (p=0.3 | 993) | betwee | n the two | o group | ps. |
| | | 15. | i otal cholester | roi to iffere |) HDL ra | tio not reen grou | ins | | |
| | | | 1 | (p=0.2645). | | | 2011 81 00 | -r~ | |
| | | | 16. | TG not signific | antly | v differei | nt betwe | en gro | ups |
| | | | | (p=0.3934). | | | | | |

| Author Year | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Country | | | | | | |
| PEDro Score | Methods | Outcomes | | | | |
| Research Design | | | | | | |
| Sample Size | | | | | | |
| Bauman et al. 2005 USA Pre-post N _{Study 1} =10; N _{Study 2} =40 | Population: <i>Study 1:</i> Mean age=53 yr; <i>Study 2:</i> Mean age=43 yr. Intervention: <i>Study 1:</i> All patients were given 50 μg (2000 IU) vitamin D ₃ 2x/wk and 1500 mg elemental calcium daily for 2 wk. <i>Study 2:</i> 10 μg (400 IU) vitamin D ₃ , a multivitamin with an additional 10 μg (400 IU) vitamin D ₃ , and 500 mg elemental calcium daily for 12 mo. Outcome Measures: Changes in serum 25(OH)D, calcium and parathyroid hormone (PTH), and urinary calcium. | Study 1: After 2 weeks, serum 25(OH)D increased (p<0.005) but 8 of 10 subjects still had values below the normal range (<16 ng/mL). Serum PTH decreased from 35 to 18 pg/mL (p<0.05), serum calcium was not significantly different, and urinary calcium increased from 103 to 239 mg/d (p=0.010). Study 2: At baseline, 33 subjects were vitamin D deficient (<16 ng/mL) compared to 9 after 12 months. After 6 and 12 months, serum 25(OH)D increased (p<0.0001). Serum PTH decreased (p<0.005), but serum calcium did not change. | | | | |
| Hummel et al. 2012 Canada Case Series N=62 | Population: Mean age=49±12 yr; Gender: males=51 male, females=14; Time since injury: >2 yr; Cause of injury= traumatic=62, non-traumatic=0. Intervention: Blood draw for serum sample. Outcome Measures: Serum 25(OH)D and PTH. | 39% of the cohort had suboptimal serum 25(OH)D levels. Factors associated with suboptimal vitamin D levels included having vitamin D assessed in the winter months (odds ratio (OR)=7.38, p=0.001), lack of calcium supplement (OR=7.19, p=0.003), lack of vitamin D supplement (OR=7.41, p=0.019), younger age (OR= 0.932, p=0.010), paraplegia (OR=4.22, p=0.016), and lack of bisphosphonate (OR=3.85, p=0.015). Significant associations were observed between serum PTH and 25(OH)D (r=-0.304, p=0.032) and between PTH and C- telopeptide of type I collagen (CTX-I) (r=0.308, p=0.025). | | | | |