Review Article

Is vitamin C supplementation beneficial? Lessons learned from randomised controlled trials

Jens Lykkesfeldt¹* and Henrik E. Poulsen²

¹Department of Disease Biology, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Denmark ²Laboratory of Clinical Pharmacology Q7642, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Bispebjerg Hospital, Copenhagen, and Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

(Received 2 April 2009 - Revised 19 August 2009 - Accepted 28 October 2009 - First published online 15 December 2009)

In contrast to the promised 'antioxidant miracle' of the 1980s, several randomised controlled trials have shown no effect of antioxidant supplements on hard endpoints such as morbidity and mortality. The former over-optimistic attitude has clearly called for a more realistic assessment of the benefit:harm ratio of antioxidant supplements. We have examined the literature on vitamin C intervention with the intention of drawing a conclusion on its possible beneficial or deleterious effect on health and the result is discouraging. One of several important issues is that vitamin C uptake is tightly controlled, resulting in a wide-ranging bioavailability depending on the current vitamin C status. Lack of proper selection criteria dominates the currently available literature. Thus, while supplementation with vitamin C is likely to be without effect for the majority of the Western population due to saturation through their normal diet, there could be a large subpopulation with a potential health problem that remains uninvestigated. The present review discusses the relevance of the available literature on vitamin C supplementation and proposes guidelines for future randomised intervention trials.

Vitamin C: Supplementation: Randomised controlled trials

Vitamin C plays a role in numerous biological reactions, many of which are only known in little detail. Over the years, it has been suggested that vitamin C be used as a remedy against many diseases as different as common colds and cancers. Even today, there is considerable controversy about the exact role of the vitamin in human health and no agreement has been reached on the amount needed to be consumed for optimum wellbeing. Thus, as little as 10 mg/d will largely prevent development of the most well-known clinical and ultimately mortal manifestation of severe vitamin C deficiency: scurvy⁽¹⁾. Nevertheless, the RDA for vitamin C was recently increased from 60 mg/d to 75 mg/d for women and 90 mg/d for men in the US, primarily based on biochemical evidence⁽²⁾. Others have argued that the optimum plasma concentration is about the level of saturation (70 µmol/l), which would require a daily intake of about $200 \,\mathrm{mg}^{(2-4)}$, and still hypotheses on new specific roles of vitamin C in health and disease are being put forward⁽⁵⁻⁷⁾.

The potential benefit of vitamin C supplementation has been fueled in part by a considerable body of epidemiological literature suggesting a positive association between vitamin C status and health. Thus, several large cohort studies have shown an inverse relationship between plasma vitamin C status and risk of CVD and/or all-cause mortality⁽⁸⁻¹⁵⁾. In contrast, large randomised controlled trials using antioxidant supplements have been less promising. None of the major clinical studies using mortality or morbidity as endpoints has found significant positive effects of supplementation with vitamin $C^{(16-19)}$. However, the vast majority of these trials have examined the effect a multi-component supplement and consequently not the effect of vitamin C itself.

The results from clinical trials in the last decades have shifted public opinion and that of health authorities towards antioxidants, including vitamin C, being generally unimportant. This development is likely to obscure a public health risk from deficiency, as several large cross-sectional population studies have shown that a considerable proportion (up to 50%) of subpopulations of the Western world can have hypovitaminosis C, defined as a plasma concentration less than $23 \,\mu \text{mol}/l^{(20,21)}$. While the clinical significance of this condition remains to be clarified – beyond the increased risk of developing scurvy – it is obvious that large subpopulations, for example, smokers, do not achieve the RDA of vitamin C⁽²²⁾.

It has been shown that those individuals most likely to benefit from supplements also are those least likely to

^{*} Corresponding author: Dr Jens Lykkesfeldt, fax +45 35 35 35 14, email jopl@life.ku.dk

get them⁽²³⁻²⁵⁾. So far, this discouraging finding is unfortunately also valid for most of the randomised controlled trials using vitamin C in their intervention. One frequently overlooked problem is that vitamin C uptake is highly dose dependent^(3,26). Thus, subjects already saturated with vitamin C through their daily diet will efficiently excrete any surplus and are therefore highly unlikely to benefit from further vitamin C supplementation. This and several other issues should be taken into account when designing and drawing conclusions from randomised controlled trials with the purpose of studying the effects of vitamin C. In view of the pharmacology and kinetics of vitamin C, the present review examines the current knowledge of the effect of vitamin C supplementation, evaluates the lessons to be learned from the many trials that have been conducted, and provides guidelines for future randomised trials.

Clinical significance and prevalence of vitamin C deficiency in observational studies

The definition of optimal vitamin C status remains a matter of controversy. However, current opinions appear to agree on a dose that gives saturated uptake, i.e. a dietary intake resulting in a plasma concentration of approximately 70 µmol/1^(3,27-30) Defining vitamin C deficiency is also complex since considerable individual variation apparently exists in the relationship between the plasma concentration of vitamin C and the development of scurvy, the classic hallmark of severe vitamin C deficiency^(31,32). Moreover, the clinical significance of vitamin C deficiency - beyond that of scurvy - has not been clearly defined. Guidelines developed by the National Survey of Canada suggested categories of severe vitamin C deficiency (serum level $< 11 \,\mu$ mol/l) and marginal vitamin C deficiency (serum levels between 11 and 23 µmol/l) and have largely been adopted⁽²¹⁾. Since these categories were put forward in 1987, the RDA for vitamin C has been increased in an attempt to reflect the now-believed optimal vitamin C level in plasma of 70 µmol/l. Therefore a new category (for serum levels between 23 and, for example, 50 µmol/l) is needed, and we suggest it to be termed suboptimal vitamin C status.

Severe vitamin C deficiency

Scurvy typically constitutes the ultimate clinical manifestation of prolonged and severe vitamin C deficiency. In non-smokers, scurvy is prevented by a daily intake of as little as 10 mg of vitamin $C^{(1)}$. Clinical symptoms include follicular hyperkeratosis, petechiae, ecchymoses, coiled hairs, inflamed and bleeding gums, perifollicular haemorrhages, joint effusions, arthralgia and impaired wound healing⁽³³⁾. Other early symptoms include dyspnoea, weakness, fatigue and depression. Cases of scurvy are usually limited to the group of individuals with plasma concentrations lower than 11 µmol/l, i.e. those diagnosed with severe vitamin C deficiency. However, far from all individuals with plasma levels $< 11 \,\mu$ mol/l develop clinical scurvy^(31,32). Thus, other factors seem to be of importance and the relationship between plasma vitamin C status and scurvy is not entirely clear, when the diet is not totally depleted from the vitamin. However, older reports indicate that total deficiency over a prolonged time invariably leads to scurvy⁽²⁾.

While the basic symptoms and cure of the disease have been known for centuries⁽³⁴⁾, a significant part of the population in developed countries continues to suffer from severe vitamin C deficiency and thus have increased risk of experiencing scurvy-like symptoms (Table 1). But the clinical significance of severe vitamin C deficiency may extend beyond that of scurvy. In clinical studies in which subjects were made vitamin C deficient, common complaints such as gingival inflammation, fatigue and depression were among the most sensitive markers of deficiency^(3,35). In a prospective population study, Nyyssönen et al. found a higher risk of myocardial infarction (relative risk 3.5) among men with severe vitamin C deficiency, constituting about 6% of their Finnish cohort (1605 subjects)⁽¹²⁾. Moreover, Langlois et al. recently showed that 14% of patients with peripheral arterial disease suffered from severe vitamin C deficiency compared with none of the healthy controls and suggested a relationship between vitamin C status and severity of atherosclerosis⁽³⁶⁾. In a study with advanced cancer patients, 30 % had severe vitamin C deficiency and these patients had shorter survival $^{(37)}$.

Marginal vitamin C deficiency

As defined above, a plasma concentration between 11 and 23 μ mol/l is termed marginal vitamin C deficiency. Hypovitaminosis C has been characterised as having a plasma concentration of vitamin C < 23 μ mol/l⁽³⁸⁾, i.e. encompassing both severe and marginal vitamin C deficiency. As with severe vitamin C deficiency, smokers also have a markedly increased risk of marginal vitamin C deficiency (Table 1).

The clinical significance of marginal vitamin C deficiency as different from severe vitamin C deficiency - has not been thoroughly investigated. In most studies, upper and lower tertiles, quartiles or quintiles are compared, making it difficult to compare groups between studies. Consequently, the category of marginal vitamin C deficiency can rarely be singled out from vitamin C deficiency or hypovitaminosis C. With respect to scurvy, clinical cases among individuals with marginal vitamin C deficiency are rare, but do occur^(39,40). Probably more important though, considerable epidemiological evidence suggests that there may be other clinical consequences of marginal vitamin C deficiency. Thus, in a recent re-examination of the Second National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES II) data combined with a follow up on vital status 12-16 years later, Loria *et al.* found that men in the lowest ($< 28.4 \mu mol/l$) compared with the highest (>73.8 µmol/l) serum ascorbate quartile had a 57 % higher risk of death from any cause and a 62 % higher risk of dying from cancer⁽¹¹⁾. A similar conclusion was reached by Simon et al. who also found that severe or marginal vitamin C deficiency was significantly associated with all-cause mortality while being weakly associated with death from $\text{CVD}^{(41)}$. In a 20-year follow-up study in Britain (730 subjects), a significantly higher risk of mortality from stroke was observed in elderly men and women with severe and marginal vitamin C deficiency separately compared with those with plasma concentrations of vitamin $C > 28 \,\mu mol/l^{(9)}$. The authors concluded that vitamin C status was as strong a predictor of death from

Table 1. Prevalence of vitamin C deficiency in larger cross sectional population studies

Study	Subjects (<i>n</i>)	Severe vitamin C deficiency (<11 µmol/l)	Marginal vitamin C deficiency (11–23 µmol/l)	Suboptimal vitamin C status (23–50 μmol/l)	Comment
NHANES III ⁽⁵⁰⁾	15769	14 % (M) 10 % (F)	20 % (M) 17 % (F)	NR	31 % (M) and 25 % (F) of the smokers alone were diagnosed with severe vitamin C deficiency
NHANES II ⁽⁵¹⁾	11 592	2%	8%	NR	7 and 20%, respectively, in smokers alone
NHANES II ⁽⁴¹⁾	8453	NR	9 % (NS) 30 % (S)	31 % (NS)* 35 % (S)	Subpopulation aged 30 years or older
CARDIA ⁽⁵²⁾	2637	NR	8 % (NS) 26 % (S)	33 % (NS)† 40 % (S)	Numbers with marginal vitamin C deficiency include those with severe vitamin C deficiency
Third Glasgow MONICA population survey ⁽⁵³⁾	1267	26 % (M) 14 % (F)	22 % (NSM) 16 % (NSF) 30 % (SM) 30 % (SF)	NR	36 % (M) and 23 % (F) of the smokers alone were diagnosed with severe vitamin C deficiency
French population study ⁽⁵⁴⁾	1039	7–12 % (M) 3–5 % (F)	10–46 % (M)‡ 3–15 % (F)	NR	Values are ranges of various age groups

NHANES III, Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; M, males; F, females; NR, not reported; NHANES II, Second National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; NS, non-smokers; S, smokers; CARDIA, Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults Study; MONICA, Monitoring of Trends and Determinants in Cardiovascular Disease; NSM, non-smoking males; NSF, non-smoking females; SM, smoking males; SF, smoking females.

* Range used: 23 to 55 µmol/l.

 $\dagger\, Range$ used: 23 to 45 $\mu mol/l$

‡Range used: 11 to 19 μmol/l.

stroke as diastolic blood pressure⁽⁹⁾. An inverse correlation between vitamin C status and stroke was also reported from a study (2121 subjects) in a rural Japanese population aged 40 years or older⁽⁴²⁾. In the 12-year follow up on the Basel Prospective Study, a significantly increased risk of IHD and stroke was found in individuals with plasma ascorbate < 22.7μ mol/l, corresponding to severe or marginal vitamin C deficiency⁽⁴³⁻⁴⁵⁾.

Suboptimal vitamin C status

Based on the increased RDA for vitamin C as well as the indication that a plasma concentration of vitamin C of about 70 μ mol/l is currently considered optimal for health, we suggest a new category of suboptimal vitamin C status for those individuals with plasma concentrations between 23 and 50 μ mol/l. An obvious rationale for this additional category could be that if 70 μ mol/l is optimal, for example, 35 μ mol/l is probably not, and therefore investigations into the clinical significance of a suboptimal vitamin C status are warranted. Moreover, a proper control group should be selected from individuals with optimal vitamin C status, i.e. excluding those with suboptimal status. However, limited data are available and need to be extracted from studies discriminating between the concentrations of suboptimal and optimal vitamin C status (Table 1).

As discussed above, several large prospective studies have shown an inverse relationship between plasma vitamin C status and risk of CVD and/or all-cause mortality⁽⁸⁻¹⁵⁾. However, no studies have investigated the specific clinical significance of suboptimal vitamin C status as compared with optimal. Thus, it remains to be established if the biochemical evidence pointing towards an optimal plasma level of about 70 μ mol/l can be backed up in larger epidemiological studies or ultimately in clinical trials. Clearly, the effects of suboptimal compared with optimal vitamin C status are likely to be at most moderate and presumably relevant only in the long term if at all. Thus, it is debatable if studies aimed at clarifying such a limited risk are feasible from a cost perspective. On the other hand, the problems potentially associated with suboptimal vitamin C status affect a large percentage of the population and can be readily and inexpensively cured⁽²²⁾.

Randomised controlled trials with vitamin C

Randomised clinical trials have evolved and been refined for testing drug effects. Their strength lies in eliminating or reducing bias by randomisation, blinding and control. In the case of drugs, this design is superior and regarded as the 'gold standard'. The design is particular strong for testing the effects of a chemical that is normally not present in the organism, has a relatively short pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic half-life, and is used in a relatively short dose regimen. In the case of intervention with dietary components in prevention trials, a number of problems arise that are not prominent in drug testing.

In the present context, we will particularly discuss the testing of proper biological hypotheses in relevant cohorts.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the epidemiological evidence pointed towards the importance of antioxidant intake (vitamin C, vitamin E and β -carotene) in the prevention of, for example, cancer and arteriosclerosis. This led to the initiation of a large number of clinical intervention studies. The first large study published was the Linxian study that showed an inspiring preventive effect⁽¹⁶⁾. The subsequent studies were all negative. At that time, the prevailing hypothesis was that dietary components were beneficial, without side effects, and the larger dose the better. Implicitly, it was also believed that cancer and arteriosclerosis were the result of 'high-level deficiency' of these substances. As a consequence, trials were mainly designed for the broad

Table 2. Randomised, controlled trials with vitamin C

Instruction (n) Design bias period (years) (years) (years) (%s women) (mg) (mg) (U)*									Intervention used				
Penn al. (1961)30PanallelH0.077PA801060006000Chandra (1962)255422584 $(2x \geq x \geq x \geq x)$ H5.25NA5512015500033Under al. (1963)56ParallelH0.0820.082482018012842ter Riet al. (1963)66ParallelH0.0230.083NANA10010842ter Riet al. (1963)1662.x 2H0.230.23NANA1001520015200Girodon et al. (1965)1612.x 2H0.255.5NA49500152003022Bonelli et al. (1966)3182.x 2H3.253.25NANA18060003022Let al. (1963)304ParallelH55NANA18060003022Let al. (1964)318ParallelH55NANA18060003022Let al. (1964)318ParallelL11615100060606Girodon et al. (1964)318ParallelL1.57.27750200002006665154005140051400104666515	Reference		Design				•						Se (µg)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	McKeown-Eyssen <i>et al.</i> (1988) ⁽⁵⁵⁾	185	Parallel	н	2	2	58	32	400			400	
Chandra (1982) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ 96 Parallel H 1 1 74 55 80 16 1333 44 Wenzel et al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 255 x2 x2 H 0.082 48 20 180 12 894 2 Venzel et al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 88 2 x 2 H 0.082 0.43 NA NA 100 - 8000 10 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 20	Penn et al. (1991) ⁽⁵⁶⁾	30	Parallel	н	0.077	0.077	84	80	100		8000	50	
Wenzel et al. (1993) ⁽⁸⁾ 56 Parallel H 0.082 0.082 48 20 180 12 684 2 Hogarth et al. (1995) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 106 2×2 H 0.083 83 56 500 8000 15 100 You et al. (2001) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 3411 2×2×2 H 3.25 3.25 NA 49 500 15 500 500 15 1000 600 20 20 84 75 500 15 1000 600 600 30 2 2 44 51 55 57 65 100 60		96	Parallel	н	1	1	74	55	80	16	1333	44	20
Wencel et al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 56 Parallel H 0.082 0.082 48 20 180 12 694 2 Hogath et al. (1995) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 106 2×2 H 0.083 0.083 83 56 500 800 500 Grad et al. (1997) ⁽⁶¹⁾ 81 2×2 H 3.25 3.25 NA 49 500 15 200 16 Saaszuki et al. (2003) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 3411 2×2×2 H 5 5 57 65 500 15 200 6000 30 2 2 14 4 61 21 1000 600 600 30 2 640 600 </td <td>Blot et al. (1993)⁽¹⁶⁾</td> <td>29584</td> <td>$\frac{1}{2}(2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2)$</td> <td>Н</td> <td>5.25</td> <td>5.25</td> <td>NA</td> <td>55</td> <td>120</td> <td>15</td> <td>5000</td> <td>33</td> <td>50</td>	Blot et al. (1993) ⁽¹⁶⁾	29584	$\frac{1}{2}(2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2)$	Н	5.25	5.25	NA	55	120	15	5000	33	50
ter Riet al. (1995) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ 88 2 × 2 H 0.23 0.23 NA NA 1000 Girodon at al. (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 16 2 × 2 H 0.23 0.23 NA 47 120 6 15 1 You at al. (2001) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 3411 2 × 2 × 2 H 3 25 3 25 NA 49 500 15 200 200 Bonelli et al. (1994) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 3418 Parallel H 5 5 NA NA 180 6000 30 2 Bicker (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 318 Parallel H 5 5 NA NA 180 6000 30 2 Bicker (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 318 Parallel L 1 160 72 90 2666 45 16 Bicker (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 71 Parallel L 1.5 1.5 72 7 750 20000 200 Jacobson at al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ 976 2.× 2 L	Wenzel et al. (1993) ⁽⁵⁸⁾	56	Parallel	н	0.082	0.082	48	20	180	12		894	200
	ter Riet et al. (1995) ⁽⁵⁹⁾	88	2×2	н	0.23	0.23	NA	NA	1000				
Girodon et al. (1997) ⁽⁶¹⁾ 81 2 × 2 H 2 2 84 75 120 6 15 15 Saaszuki et al. (1990) ⁽⁶¹⁾ 311 2 × 2 × 2 H 5 5 57 65 500 15 200 Bonelli et al. (1998) ⁽⁶¹⁾ 318 Parallel H 5 5 57 65 500 15 200 Let al. (1998) ⁽⁶¹⁾ 318 Parallel L 6 6 54 56 180 15 10000 60 2440 Girodon et al. (1999) ⁽⁶¹⁾ 864 2 × 2 L 4 61 21 1000 25 440 Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 71 Parallel L 1 1 67 2 20000 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 2000 200 200 200 200 200 200 2000 200 27 <	Hogarth et al. (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾	106	2×2	н	0.083	0.083	83	56	500		8000		
You atd 2 × 2 × 2 H 3.25 3.25 NA 49 500 15 200 Basazuki atd (2003) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ 439 2 × 2 H 5 5 57 65 500 15 Bonelli et al. (1998) ⁽⁶⁴⁾ 304 Parallel L 6 6 54 56 100 50 440 Greenberg et al. (1994) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 84 2 × 2 L 4 4 61 21 1000 25 440 Ficher (1996) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 71 Parallel L 1 1 69 72 90 2666 45 Girodon et al. (1999) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 71 Parallel L 1.5 1.5 72 7 750 20000 200 200 200 200 200 2000 200 200 200 200 200 200 2000 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200		81	2×2	н	2	2	84	75	120	6		15	100
Bonelli et al. (1998) ⁶⁶⁾ 304 Parallel H 5 5 NA NA 180 6000 30 2 Li et al. (1994) ⁶⁶⁾ 3318 Parallel L 6 6 54 56 180 15 10000 60 Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁶⁷⁾ 47 Parallel L 1 16 69 72 90 2666 45 Richer (1996) ⁶⁶⁾ 71 Parallel L 1.5 7.2 7 750 20000 200 Girdon et al. (1999) ⁶⁶⁰⁾ 725 2.×2 L 6 6 51 54 2000 30 - - Jacobsen et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ 976 2.×2.×2 L 6.3 63 68 500 15 400 - Storty Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾ 100 2.×2 L 6.3 63 59 750 18 660 Chylack et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 297 Parallel L 3.3		3411	$2 \times 2 \times 2$	н			NA	49	500	15		200	75
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Sasazuki et al. (2003) ⁽⁶³⁾	439	2×2	н	5	5	57	65	500	15			
Li et al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁵⁾ 3318 Parallel L 6 6 54 56 180 15 1000 60 Greenberg et al. (1994) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 864 2×2 L 4 4 61 21 1000 25 440 Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ 77 Parallel L 1 16 61 21 1000 25 440 Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁸⁾ 71 Parallel L 1.5 1.5 72 7 750 2000 200 200 200 200 2000 200 2000 30 20000 70 16.5 1.6 6 51 54 2000 30	Bonelli <i>et al.</i> (1998) ⁽⁶⁴⁾	304	Parallel	н	5	5	NA	NA	180		6000	30	200
Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ 47 Parallel L 1 1 69 72 90 2666 45 Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁸⁾ 71 Parallel L 1.5 1.5 72 7 750 2000 2000 Gircohor <i>et al.</i> (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ 976 2 × 2 × 2 L 6 6 51 54 2000 30 Jacobson <i>et al.</i> (2000) ⁽⁷¹⁾ 112 Parallel L 0.5 0.5 42 42 500 12 400 Age Related Eye Disease 4757 2 × 2 L 6.3 6.3 6.8 55 500 15 400 Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ 160 2 × 2 L 3 3 53 13 1000 25 800 1 Graat <i>et al.</i> (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ 652 2 × 2 L 1 1 NA 50 60 1.2 2000 272 Heart Protection Study 20.53 2 × 2 L 3 3 65 100 1000 223 223 25 25	Li et al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁵⁾	3318	Parallel	L	6	6	54	56	180	15	10 000	60	50
Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ 47 Parallel L 1 1 69 72 90 2666 45 Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁸⁾ 71 Parallel L 1.5 1.5 72 7 750 2000 2000 Gircohor <i>et al.</i> (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ 976 2 × 2 × 2 L 6 6 51 54 2000 30 Jacobson <i>et al.</i> (2000) ⁽⁷¹⁾ 112 Parallel L 0.5 0.5 42 42 500 12 400 Age Related Eye Disease 4757 2 × 2 L 6.3 6.3 6.8 55 500 15 400 Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ 160 2 × 2 L 3 3 53 13 1000 25 800 1 Graat <i>et al.</i> (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ 652 2 × 2 L 1 1 NA 50 60 1.2 2000 272 Heart Protection Study 20.53 2 × 2 L 3 3 65 100 1000 223 223 25 25	Greenberg et al. (1994) ⁽⁶⁶⁾	864	2×2	L	4	4	61	21	1000	25		440	
Richer (1996) (1996)71ParallelL1.51.57277502000200Girodon et al. (1999)7252 × 2L228474120616.51Jacobson et al. (2000)9762 × 2 × 2L6.36.5515420003030Jacobson et al. (2000)112ParallelL0.50.5424250012400Age Related Eye Disease4752 × 2L6.36.36.85650015400Study Research Group (2001)731602 × 2L3353131000258001Chylack et al. (2002)1602 × 2L11NA50601.22000272Heart Protection Study205362 × 2L55NA2525020660Collaborative Group (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾ 100ParallelL0.230.2363421000223223Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ 4232 × 2L33651001000223224Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ 100ParallelL0.230.255892150374.5Salonen et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ 100ParallelL0.250.255892150374.5Alloy et al. (2004) ⁽¹⁰⁾ 164		47	Parallel	L	1	1	69	72	90		2666	45	
Girodon et al. (1999) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ 725 2 × 2 L 2 2 84 74 120 6 16.5 1 Correa et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ 976 2 × 2 × 2 L 6 6 51 54 2000 30 400 Age Related Eye Disease 4757 2 × 2 L 6.3 6.3 68 56 500 12 400 Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ Braulel L 3 3 53 13 1000 25 800 1 Chylack et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 297 Parallel L 3 3 53 13 1000 25 800 1 Giradt et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 297 Parallel L 3 3 68 59 750 18 660 Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 296 2 × 2 L 5 5 NA 25 250 20 200 272 Heart Protection Study 2053 2 × 2 L 3 3 65 100 1000 223 245 243 <td>Richer (1996)⁽⁶⁸⁾</td> <td>71</td> <td>Parallel</td> <td>L</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>1.5</td> <td></td> <td>7</td> <td>750</td> <td></td> <td>20 000</td> <td>200</td> <td>50</td>	Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁸⁾	71	Parallel	L	1.5	1.5		7	750		20 000	200	50
Correa et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ 976 2 × 2 × 2 L 6 6 51 54 2000 30 Jacobson et al. (2000) ⁽⁷¹⁾ 112 Parallel L 0.5 0.5 42 42 500 12 400 Age Related Eye Disease 4757 2 × 2 L 6.3 6.3 6.8 56 500 15 400 Age Related Eye Disease 4757 2 × 2 L 6.3 6.3 6.8 56 500 15 400 Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ Brown et al. (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾ 160 2 × 2 L 3 3 53 13 1000 25 800 1 Chylack et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 297 Parallel L 3 3 68 59 750 18 660 Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 2053 2 × 2 L 5 NA 25 250 20 223 2000 272 Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ 423	Girodon et al. (1999) ⁽⁶⁹⁾	725	2×2	L	2	2		74	120	6		16.5	100
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Correa et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾	976	$2 \times 2 \times 2$	L	6	6	51	54	2000	30			
Age Related Eye Disease 4757 2 × 2 L 6.3 6.3 68 56 500 15 400 Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ Brown et al. (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾ 160 2 × 2 L 3 3 53 13 1000 25 800 1 Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ 297 Parallel L 3 3 68 59 750 18 660 Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ 652 2 × 2 L 1 1 NA 50 60 1-2 2000 272 Heart Protection Study 20 536 2 × 2 L 5 5 NA 25 250 20 660 Vaters et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ 100 Parallel L 0-23 0-23 63 42 1000 223 Prince et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁸⁾ 61 Cross-over L 0-25 0-25 58 92 150 3 74-5 Salone et al. (2004) ⁽¹⁹⁾ 13017 Parallel L 0-15 0-5 83 63 120 2666 <td< td=""><td></td><td>112</td><td>Parallel</td><td>L</td><td>0.5</td><td>0.5</td><td></td><td>42</td><td>500</td><td>12</td><td></td><td>400</td><td></td></td<>		112	Parallel	L	0.5	0.5		42	500	12		400	
Brown et al. $(2001)^{(73)}$ 160 2×2 L3353131000258001Chylack et al. $(2002)^{(74)}$ 297ParallelL33685975018660Graat et al. $(2002)^{(75)}$ 652 2×2 L11NA50601·22000272Heart Protection Study20 56 2×2 L55NA2525020660660Collaborative Group (2002)^{(76)}423 2×2 L33651001000800223Waters et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ 100ParallelL0·230·2363421000220223Prince et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 61Cross-overL0·250·255892150374-5Salone et al. $(2004)^{(60)}$ 164ParallelL0·150·58363120266660Hercberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ 13017ParallelL0·150·58363120266660Avenell et al. $(2004)^{(61)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0·232·6746100500400 <td></td> <td>4757</td> <td>2 × 2</td> <td></td> <td>6.3</td> <td>6.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		4757	2 × 2		6.3	6.3							
Brown et al. $(2001)^{(73)}$ 160 2×2 L3353131000258001Chylack et al. $(2002)^{(74)}$ 297ParallelL33685975018660Graat et al. $(2002)^{(75)}$ 652 2×2 L11NA50601·22000272Heart Protection Study20 56 2×2 L55NA2525020660660Collaborative Group (2002)^{(76)}423 2×2 L33651001000800223Waters et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ 100ParallelL0·230·2363421000220223Prince et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 61Cross-overL0·250·255892150374-5Salone et al. $(2004)^{(60)}$ 164ParallelL0·150·58363120266660Hercberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ 13017ParallelL0·150·58363120266660Avenell et al. $(2004)^{(61)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0·232·6746100500400 <td>Study Research Group (2001)⁽⁷²⁾</td> <td></td>	Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾												
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		160	2×2	L	3	3	53	13	1000	25		800	100
Graat et al. $(2002)^{(75)}$ 6522 × 2L11NA50601.22000272Heart Protection Study205362 × 2L55NA2525020660Collaborative Group (2002)^{(18)}800800800800Waters et al. (2002)^{(77)}100ParallelL0.230.2363421000223Prince et al. (2003)^{(78)}61Cross-overL0.250.255892150374-5Salonen et al. (2003)^{(79)}5202 × 2L66NA51250272Allsup et al. (2004)^{(80)}164ParallelL0.150.58363120266660Hercberg et al. (2004)^{(19)}13017ParallelL7.547.5449611206331Richer et al. (2004)^{(81)}61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. (2005)^{(82)}910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. (2005)^{(84)}39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800	Chylack et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾	297	Parallel	L		3		59	750			660	
Heart Protection Study20 536 2×2 L55NA2525020660Collaborative Group (2002)^{(18)}Waters et al. (2002)^{(76)}423 2×2 L33651001000800Waters et al. (2002)^{(77)}100ParallelL0.230.2363421000223Prince et al. (2003)^{(79)}61Cross-overL0.250.255892150374-5Salonen et al. (2003)^{(79)}520 2×2 L66NA51250272Allsup et al. (2004)^{(80)}164ParallelL0.150.58363120266660Hercberg et al. (2004)^{(81)}13017ParallelL7.547.5449611206331Richer et al. (2005)^{(82)}910ParallelL1175415001025005002Mooney et al. (2005)^{(83)}284ParallelL1.251.253745500400Tam et al. (2005)^{(84)}39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800		652	2×2	L	1	1	NA	50	60	1.2	2000	272	25
Collaborative Group (2002)^{(18)}Waters et al. $(2002)^{(76)}$ 4232 × 2L33651001000800White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ 100ParallelL0.230.2363421000223Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$ 61Cross-overL0.250.255892150374.5Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 5202 × 2L66NA51250272Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ 164ParallelL0.150.58363120266660Hercberg et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 13017ParallelL7.547.5449611206331Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ 284ParallelL1.251.253745500400Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800		20 5 36	2×2	L	5	5							
Waters et al. $(2002)^{(76)}$ 4232 × 2L33651001000800White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ 100ParallelL0.230.2363421000223Prince et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 61Cross-overL0.250.255892150374-5Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 5202 × 2L66NA51250272Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ 164ParallelL0.150.58363120266660Hercberg et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 13017ParallelL7.547.5449611206331Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL1.251.253745500400Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800													
White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ 100 Parallel L 0.23 0.23 63 42 100 223 Prince et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 61 Cross-over L 0.25 0.25 58 92 150 3 74-5 Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 520 2×2 L 6 6 NA 51 250 272 Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ 164 Parallel L 0.15 0.5 83 63 120 2666 60 Hercberg et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ 13017 Parallel L 7.54 7.54 49 61 120 6 33 1 Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61 Parallel L 1 1 75 4 1500 10 2500 500 2 Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910 Parallel L 1.25 1.25 37 45 500 400 Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39 Parallel L 0.23 2.67 46 100 500 800 <td>Waters <i>et al.</i> (2002)⁽⁷⁶⁾</td> <td>423</td> <td>2×2</td> <td>L</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>65</td> <td>100</td> <td>1000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>800</td> <td></td>	Waters <i>et al.</i> (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾	423	2×2	L	3	3	65	100	1000			800	
Prince et al. $(2003)^{(76)}$ 61 Cross-over L 0.25 58 92 150 3 74.5 Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 520 2×2 L 6 6 NA 51 250 272 Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ 164 Parallel L 0.15 0.5 83 63 120 2666 60 Heroberg et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ 13017 Parallel L 7.54 7.54 49 61 120 6 33 1 Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61 Parallel L 1 1 75 4 1500 10 2500 500 2 Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910 Parallel L 1.25 1.25 37 45 500 400 Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39 Parallel L 0.23 2.67 46 100 500 400	White et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾			L		0.23							
Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ 520 2×2 L 6 6 NA 51 250 272 Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(60)}$ 164 Parallel L 0.15 0.5 83 63 120 2666 60 Heroberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ 13017 Parallel L 7.54 7.94 49 61 120 6 33 1 Richer et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ 61 Parallel L 1 1 75 4 1500 10 2500 500 2 Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(81)}$ 910 Parallel L 1 1 75 4 1500 10 2500 500 2 Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910 Parallel L 1.25 1.25 37 45 500 400 Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39 Parallel L 0.23 2.67 46 100 500 800	Prince <i>et al.</i> $(2003)^{(78)}$			Ē						3			75
Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(60)}$ 164ParallelL0.150.58363120266660Hercberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ 13017ParallelL7.547.5449611206331Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ 284ParallelL1.251.253745500400Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800	Salonen <i>et al.</i> (2003) ⁽⁷⁹⁾			ī						-			
Hereberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ 13017ParallelL7.5449611206331Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ 284ParallelL1.251.253745500400Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800				L							2666		60
Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ 61ParallelL1175415001025005002Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ 910ParallelL11724760266610Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ 284ParallelL1.251.253745500400Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ 39ParallelL0.232.6746100500800				L						6			100
Avenell et al. (2005) ⁽⁸²⁾ 910 Parallel L 1 72 47 60 2666 10 Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ 284 Parallel L 1.25 37 45 500 400 Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ 39 Parallel L 0.23 2.67 46 100 500 800				L							2500		200
Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ 284 Parallel L 1.25 1.25 37 45 500 400 Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ 39 Parallel L 0.23 2.67 46 100 500 800				L	-	-							
Tam <i>et al.</i> (2005) ⁽⁶⁴⁾ 39 Parallel L 0.23 2.67 46 100 500 800				Ľ	1.25	1.25							
With et al (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ 32 Parallel I 0.75 0.75 NA NA 500 2666 400	Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$			-									
	Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾			-							2666		50
Cook et al. (2007) (17) 8171 $2 \times 2 \times 2$ L $9 \cdot 4$ $9 \cdot 4$ 61 100 500 $50/2$ nd d $600/2$ nd d				1						50/2nd d	2000		

H, high-bias design; NA, not available; L, low-bias design. * 1 IU vitamin A = $0.3\,\mu g.$ † 1 IU vitamin E = $0.667\,mg.$

Table 3. Compliance of randomised, controlled trials with the present set of guidelines*

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Reference	Low- or high-bias design†	Hypovitaminosis C at entry	Entry-level inclusion criterion	Plasma concentration measured at baseline and during study	Single supplement	Dietary intake controlled during study	Smoking status reported	Valid hypothesis or molecular mechanism proposed	Mechanism- related hard clinical endpoint	Inclusion and exclusion criteria reported
Paner al. (1991) ⁽⁶⁾ H + + + - + - + + + H (H) (1993) ⁽⁶⁾ H + + + + + + H (1993) ⁽⁶⁾ H + + + + + + + + + +	Penn at $d. (191)^{(60)}$ H – – – – + + – – – – – + + – + + + H – H –	<i>et al.</i> (1988) ⁽⁵⁵⁾	Н	_	_	(+)	_	_	+	+	+	_
Chandra (1992) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ H – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	Chandra (1992) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ H – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	Penn <i>et al.</i> (1991) ⁽⁵⁶⁾	н	-	_	+	_	_	_	+	-	+
Biot at al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁾ H + + - + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	Biot at al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁾ H + + - + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	Chandra (1992) ⁽⁵⁷⁾	Н	-	-	-	-	-	_	+	-	(+)
Wenzel al. (1995) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ H - +	Wenzel al. (1995) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ H - +	Blot <i>et al.</i> (1993) ⁽¹⁶⁾	Н	+	-	+	-	—	+	+	+	
ter Riet <i>al.</i> (1995) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ H – – – – + + + – – – – – – – + + + G Hogarth <i>at.</i> (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ H – – – – + + – – + – – – – – – – + + + S Saszuki <i>at.</i> (1095) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ H – – – – + + – – + – – – – – + + + + +	ter Riet <i>al.</i> (1995) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ H – – – + + + – – – – – – – + + + G Girodon <i>et al.</i> (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ H – – – – + + – – + – – – – – + + + + +	Wenzel <i>et al.</i> (1993) ⁽⁵⁸⁾	н	-	_	—	-	-	_	-	+	+
Hogarh et al. (1997) ⁽⁶¹⁾ H – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	Hogarh et al. (1997) ⁽⁶¹⁾ H - - - - - - - - - - + You et al. (2001) ⁽⁶²⁾ H - - + + - - - + + Bonelli et al. (1998) ⁽⁶⁴⁾ H - - +	ter Riet <i>et al.</i> (1995) ⁽⁵⁹⁾	н	-	-	+	+	-	_	-	_	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Girodon et al. (1997) ⁽⁶¹⁾ H – – – + + – – + – – – – – – – + + + Sasazuki et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ H – – – – + + + + – – – + + + + + + + +	Hogarth <i>et al.</i> (1996) ⁽⁶⁰⁾	н	-	-	_	_	-	_	-	-	
You <i>et al.</i> (2001) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ H + + + + + + + Bonelli <i>et al.</i> (1998) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ H + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	You <i>et al.</i> (2001) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ H + + + + + + + + Bonelli <i>et al.</i> (1998) ⁽⁶⁶⁾ H + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	Girodon <i>et al.</i> (1997) ⁽⁶¹⁾	н	-	-	+	-	+	_	-	_	
Saszuki et al. (2003) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ H - - +	Saszuki et al. (2003) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ H - - +	You et al. (2001) ⁽⁶²⁾		-	-		-	_	_	-	-	
Bonelli et al. (1998) ⁽⁶⁴⁾ H - - - - - - - +	Bonelli et al. (1998) ⁽⁶⁴⁾ H - - - - - - - +<	Sasazuki <i>et al.</i> (2003) ⁽⁶³⁾	н	_	_	+	+	_	+	+	_	+
Li <i>et al.</i> (1993) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ L – – – – + – – – + + + + + + + + + + +	Li <i>et al.</i> (1993) ⁽⁶⁵⁾ L – – – – + – – – + + + + + + + + + + +	Bonelli <i>et al.</i> (1998) ⁽⁶⁴⁾		-	_	_	_	_	_	+	+	+
Greenberg et al. (1994) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ L - - - - - - - + - + + Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ L - - - - - - + <td>Greenberg et al. (1994)⁽⁶⁰⁾ L - - - - - - - + - + Pike & Chandra (1995)⁽⁶⁷⁾ L - - - - - - +<td>Li et al. (1993)⁽⁶⁵⁾</td><td>i i</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>+</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td></td><td>+</td></td>	Greenberg et al. (1994) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ L - - - - - - - + - + Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ L - - - - - - + <td>Li et al. (1993)⁽⁶⁵⁾</td> <td>i i</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>+</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>+</td> <td>+</td> <td></td> <td>+</td>	Li et al. (1993) ⁽⁶⁵⁾	i i	_	_	+	_	_	+	+		+
Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	Greenberg <i>et al.</i> (1994) ⁽⁶⁶⁾	ī	_	_	_	_	_	_	+	_	+
Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ L - - - + - + + (+) Girodon et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ L - - + - - - +	Richer (1996) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ L - - - + - + + (+) Girodon et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ L - - - - - - - +	Pike & Chandra (1995) ⁽⁶⁷⁾	ī	_	_	_	_	_	_	+	_	
Girodon et al. (1999) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ L - - + - + + - - + + + - +	Girodon et al. (1999) ⁽⁶⁰⁾ L - - + - + + + - - +	Bicher (1996) ⁽⁶⁸⁾	ī	_	_	_	_	+	_	+	+	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Correa et al. (2000) ⁽⁷⁰⁾ L - - + - - + </td <td>Girodon <i>et al.</i> $(1999)^{(69)}$</td> <td>L</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>1</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Girodon <i>et al.</i> $(1999)^{(69)}$	L	_	_	1	_	_	_	-		
Jacobson et al. (2000) ⁽⁷¹⁾ L – – – + + – – – + + + – – + Age Related Eye Disease L – – – + + – – – + + + – – – + + Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ Brown et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ L – – – + + – – + + – – – – + + Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ L – – – + + – – – + + – – – – + + Heart Protection Study L – – – + + – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + Heart Protection Study L – – – – + + – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + Waters et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – + – – – + – – – + + – – – – + White set al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – + – – – + + – – – – + + + Prince et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – + – – – + + + Prince et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – + – – + + + Prince et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – + + – – + + Prince et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – + + – – + + Prince et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – + + + + – – + Prince et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – + + + +	Jacobson et al. (2000) ⁽⁷¹⁾ L – – – – + – – – + + + – – + Age Related Eye Disease L – – – – + + – – – – + + + – – – – – + + Age Related Eye Disease L – – – – + + – – – – – – – – – – + + – – – – – + + + – – – – – + + + – – – – – + + + – – – – – + + + – – – – – + + + – – – – + + + – – – – + + + – – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – + + – – – – – + + – – – – – + + – – – – – + + – – – – – + + – – – – – + + – – – – – + + + Heart Protection Study L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –	Corres at $21.(2000)^{(70)}$	L	_	_	-	1	_	_	1		
Age Related Eye Disease L - - + - - - - - + Study Research - - - - - - + - - + Brown et al. (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Chylack et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽¹⁶⁾ L - - - - - + + + White et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L - - - - - + + + Solonen et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁸⁾ L - - - - - + + + Allsup et al. (2004) ⁽⁶⁹⁾ L - - + + - + + + Roberge tal. (Age Related Eye Disease L - - + - - - - - + Study Research - - - - - - + - - + + Brown et al. (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Chylack et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L - - + - - + - - + + Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L - - - - - + + + White et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ L - - - - - - + + + Slonene et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁸⁾ L - - - - - + + + Allsup et al. (2004) ⁽¹⁹⁾ L - - + - - + + <td< td=""><td>$2000)^{(71)}$</td><td>L</td><td></td><td>_</td><td></td><td>- -</td><td>_</td><td></td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	$2000)^{(71)}$	L		_		- -	_		+		
Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ L - - + - + - - + Brown et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ L - - + - - + - + Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Heart Protection Study L - - - - - + - - + Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽¹⁶⁾ L - - - - - - + + + White et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ L - - - - - - + + Saloner et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁹⁾ L - - - - - + + + Allspet al. (2004) ⁽⁸⁰⁾ L - - + + - + + + Richer et al. (2004) ⁽⁸⁰⁾ L - - + - - + + + + + + +	Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾ L - - + - + - - + Brown et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Graat et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁵⁾ L - - + - - + - - + Heart Protection Study L - - - - - + - - + Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽¹⁶⁾ L - - - - - - + + + White et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L - - - - - - + + + Saloner et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ L - - - - - +<		L						Ŧ	Ŧ		
		Study Research Group (2001) ⁽⁷²⁾	L			Ŧ						Ŧ
	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Brown <i>et al.</i> (2001) ⁽⁷³⁾	L	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Chylack <i>et al.</i> (2002) ⁽⁷⁴⁾	L	-	_	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽¹⁸⁾ L - - - + - - + + - +	Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group (2002) ⁽¹⁸⁾ L - - - + - - + + Waters et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾ L - - - - - - + + + White et al. (2002) ⁽⁷⁷⁾ L - - - - - - + + + Salonen et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁸⁾ L - - - - - - + + + Allsup et al. (2003) ⁽⁷⁹⁾ L - - + + - +	Graat et al. (2002)(75)	L	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Waters et al. $(2002)^{(76)}$ L++White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ L++Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$ L++Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ L++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L++++Heroberg et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L+++Richer et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L++Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ L++Money et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L+-++-+Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L+++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L+++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++Witte et al.	Waters et al. $(2002)^{(76)}$ L++White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ L++Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$ L++Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ L++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L+++++Heroberg et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L++++Nooney et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L++Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L+-++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L+-++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++ <t< td=""><td>Collaborative Group</td><td>L</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>+</td><td>_</td><td>-</td><td>+</td></t<>	Collaborative Group	L	_	_	_	_	_	+	_	-	+
White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ L+-+Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$ L+Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ L+++Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ L++++Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L+++Nooney et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L++Money et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L+-+++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L+-++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++++	White et al. $(2002)^{(77)}$ L+-+Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$ L+Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ L+++Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ L++++Heroberg et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L+++Noney et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L++Money et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ L++Money et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L+++-+Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++-+Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++-+	Waters <i>et al.</i> (2002) ⁽⁷⁶⁾	L	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	+	+
Prince et al. $(2003)^{(76)}$ L - - - - - - - + + + <	Prince et al. $(2003)^{(76)}$ L - - - - - - - + + + <	White <i>et al.</i> $(2002)^{(77)}$	L	_	_	_	_	_	_	+	_	+
Salonen et al. $(2003)^{(79)}$ L-++-++-+Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L++-+Hereberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ L++++Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L++Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L++Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ L+++-+Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L+-++-+Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++	Salonen et al. (2003)L++-++-+Allsup et al. (2004)L++-+Hereberg et al. (2004)L++++Richer et al. (2004)L+++Richer et al. (2004)L++Avenell et al. (2005)L++Mooney et al. (2005)L+++-+Tam et al. (2005)L++-+Witte et al. (2005)L++-Hereberg et al. (2005)L++-+Witte et al. (2005)L++-+Hereberg et al. (2005)L+++++Hereberg et al. (2005)L+++++++++++++++++ <td< td=""><td>Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$</td><td>-</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>_</td><td>-</td><td>_</td><td>+</td></td<>	Prince et al. $(2003)^{(78)}$	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	+
Allsup et al. $(2004)^{(80)}$ L - - + - - + - + + + Heroberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ L - - + - - - - + + + Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L - - - - - - - + + + Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L - - - - - - - +	Allsup et al. (2004) ⁽⁸⁰⁾ L - - + - - + - + + + Heroberg et al. (2004) ⁽¹⁹⁾ L - - + - - - + + + Richer et al. (2004) ⁽⁸¹⁾ L - - + - - - - + + Avenell et al. (2005) ⁽⁸²⁾ L - - - - - - + + + Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ L - - - - - - - +	Salonen <i>et al.</i> (2003) ⁽⁷⁹⁾	-	_	_	+	+	_	+	+	_	+
Hereberg et al. $(2004)^{(19)}$ L+++Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L++Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L++Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ L++Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L+++-+Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L++-+	Hercberg et al. (2004) ⁽¹⁹⁾ L - - + + + + Richer et al. (2004) ⁽⁸¹⁾ L - - - - - - + + + Avenell et al. (2005) ⁽⁸²⁾ L - - - - - + + - (+) Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ L - - - - - - + + - + + Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - - + - + + - + + - +	Allsup $et al. (2004)^{(80)}$		_	_	г +	Г 	_		+ +	_	T +
Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L - - - - + - - (+) Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L - - - - - - + + + + + + Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ L - - + - +<	Richer et al. $(2004)^{(81)}$ L - - - - + - - (+) Avenell et al. $(2005)^{(82)}$ L - - - - - - + - - (+) Mooney et al. $(2005)^{(83)}$ L - - - - - - - + + - + Tam et al. $(2005)^{(84)}$ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L - - - - - - + + - + Witte et al. $(2005)^{(85)}$ L - - - - - - - + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + + - + +	Hercherg <i>et al.</i> $(2004)^{(19)}$		_	_		_	_	_	T _	+	
Avenell et al. (2005) ⁽⁸²⁾ L - - - - - - + + - + Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ L - - + - + + - + Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - - - + + - +	Avenell et al. (2005) ⁽⁸²⁾ L - - - - - - + + - + Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ L - - + - + + - + Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - - - + + - +	Richer <i>et al.</i> $(2004)^{(81)}$		_	_	T _	_	_	т.	_		
Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ L - - + - + + - + Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - + + - +	Mooney et al. (2005) ⁽⁸³⁾ L - - + - + + - + Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - + + - +	Δ_{v} and $\Delta_{t} = 1$ (2004) (82)	L I	_	_	_	_	_	- -	_	_	
Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - + - +	Tam et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁴⁾ L - - + - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - + + - + Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L - - - - - - + + - +	Moopov at al. $(2005)^{(83)}$	L 	_	_	-	_	_	-	-	_	+
Witte <i>et al.</i> (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – +	Witte et al. (2005) ⁽⁸⁵⁾ L – – – – – – – – – – – – – – +	Tom at al. $(2005)^{(84)}$	L 	-	_	+	_	—	+	+	—	+
VIIII = U I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Will et al. (2007) L - - - - - + Cook et al. (2007) L - - + + + +	$1 \text{ and } \mathcal{O}(2005)^{(85)}$	L	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+
	L - + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	$Ville et al. (2005)^{(17)}$	L	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	-	+

L, low-bias design; H, high-bias design.

+ indicates full compliance, (+) indicates partial compliance and - indicates that the criterion was not met by the study.
 + As defined by Bjelakovic *et al.* ⁽⁴⁸⁾.

1255

and little-selected population and doses were very high. Today, basic knowledge of the biological effects of the antioxidants has increased, and more importantly, their functions are no longer considered to be generally antioxidative, but rather as specific cofactors in biological reactions or direct signalling, signalling modifying, or gene-expression modifying compounds⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Epidemiological evidence is sometimes at great variance with the evidence from randomised controlled trials, particularly if control is not extensive⁽⁴⁷⁾. It should be acknowledged that in the epidemiological studies on the relationship between vitamin C concentrations and diseases, there is no evidence that the relationship is due to vitamin C tiself. Thus, it is possible that vitamin C concentrations in plasma are a proxy or surrogate for vegetable and/or fruit intake and it may be some other substance in these foods that provides the health benefit. It might even be that the individuals with a high vegetable and fruit intake have no or a reduced intake of other foods with deleterious health effects, in which case vitamin C is a marker of an absence of a negative factor.

Neither epidemiological studies nor randomised clinical intervention trials can test mechanisms, but randomised controlled intervention trials can confirm if the effect is due to a single substance.

Current knowledge based on randomised controlled trials and recommendations for future studies

A large number of randomised clinical studies on antioxidants are now available. They have recently been reviewed and tabulated for effect by Bjelakovic *et al.*⁽⁴⁸⁾. That review, however, was done with the purpose of estimating risk of mortality for any antioxidant treatment, alone or in combination. The authors categorised the studies as high or low risk of bias. Thus, trials with adequate generation of the allocation sequence, adequate allocation concealment, adequate blinding and adequate follow-up were considered low-bias risk trials (high methodological quality), while trials with one or more unclear or inadequate quality components were classified as high-bias risk trials (low methodological quality)⁽⁴⁹⁾.

We searched the literature by using identical criteria to those above⁽⁴⁸⁾ and reviewed the combined number of papers using vitamin C as an intervention (Table 2). We then added a new set of criteria specifically addressing vitamin C (Table 3). Thus, based on the well-established dose dependency of vitamin C pharmacokinetics, we believe that it is imperative that enrolled subjects have hypovitaminosis C at study entry and that this condition is used as an entry-level inclusion criterion in order to ensure a possibility of effect. To verify the vitamin C status at entry and during the study, plasma concentration needs to be measured before and during the study by a validated method. As discussed above, vitamin C needs to be used as a single supplement to be able to determine the effect of this supplement specifically. Major confounders are, for example, dietary vitamin C and smoking status, and these factors need to taken into account in the study design. A valid hypothesis or molecular mechanism should be proposed involving vitamin C and a mechanism-related hard clinical endpoint used as the primary outcome. Finally, inclusion and exclusion criteria should be reported.

Reviewing the extracted literature, it is striking that no study has used vitamin C deficiency as an inclusion criterion. In contrast, reviewing those studies that have included a baseline determination of plasma vitamin C, only one of thirty-five studies (3 (95 % CI 0, 5) %) rendered it probable in a small sample that the subjects were in fact insufficient in vitamin C at the study start. Moreover, only five studies out of thirty-five studies (14 (95 % CI 2, 11) %) were available with data on vitamin C as a single substance.

This means that information from clinical trials with defined and verified vitamin C deficiency from a practical point of view is not available. In contrast, large and longduration trials with β -carotene are available and show that 'hypervitaminosis' of β-carotene carries a risk for adverse effects on mortality (Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta-Carotene cancer prevention study, etc). It must therefore be concluded that at present we do not have the necessary scientific evidence to judge the effect on health - be that beneficial or deleterious - from vitamin C supplementation as a single substance. Dose-concentration relationships are largely available from pharmacokinetic evaluations, but no doseresponse relationships for pharmacodynamic evaluation are available. For most of the available studies, the population status at entry with regard to vitamin C is unclear and may have been severely or marginally deficient, suboptimal or optimal. For the evaluation of the possible effect of vitamin C supplementation on human health, these studies are therefore largely irrelevant.

We had hoped that it would be possible to perform a metaanalysis of high-quality trials with vitamin C as a single substance based on the criteria suggested in Table 3, but have found that at this point this is not possible because such trials have not been performed.

In conclusion, we find that from a public health point of view, there is a dire need to examine the effect of vitamin C as a single supplement in populations which have been carefully defined with inclusion criteria of different levels of vitamin C status and with variable demand for vitamin C, for example, smokers v. non-smokers. The outcome markers should be defined and achieved targets, including plasma vitamin C concentration and relevant clinical endpoints.

Acknowledgements

The manuscript was written by J. L. and the draft was discussed and revised by J. L. and H. E. P.

J. L. has no conflicts of interest. H. E. P. is a consultant for the Danish company Ferrosan A/S that produces supplements.

References

- Weber P, Bendich A & Schalch W (1996) Vitamin C and human health – a review of recent data relevant to human requirements. *Int J Vitam Nutr Res* 66, 19–30.
- Institute of Medicine & National Academy of Sciences (2000) Dietary Reference Intakes for Vitamin C, Vitamin E, Selenium and Carotenoids. A Report of the Panel on Dietary

Antioxidants and Related Compounds, Subcommitties on Upper Reference Levels of Nutrients and of the Interpretation and Use of Dietary Reference Intakes, and the Standing Committee on the Scientific Evaluation of Dietary Reference Intakes, Food and Nutrition Board. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

- Levine M, Conry-Cantilena C, Wang Y, *et al.* (1996) Vitamin C pharmacokinetics in healthy volunteers: evidence for a recommended dietary allowance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 93, 3704–3709.
- 4. Lykkesfeldt J, Loft S, Nielsen JB, *et al.* (1997) Ascorbic acid and dehydroascorbic acid as biomarkers of oxidative stress caused by smoking. *Am J Clin Nutr* **65**, 959–963.
- Frikke-Schmidt H & Lykkesfeldt J (2009) The role of marginal vitamin C deficiency in atherogenesis: *in vivo* models and clinical studies. *Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol* 104, 419–433.
- Tveden-Nyborg P & Lykkesfeldt J (2009) Does vitamin C deficiency result in impaired brain development in infants? *Redox Rep* 14, 2–6.
- Tveden-Nyborg P, Johansen LK, Raida Z, et al. (2009) Vitamin C deficiency in early postnatal life impairs spatial memory and reduces the number of hippocampal neurons in guinea pigs. Am J Clin Nutr 90, 540–546.
- Eichholzer M, Stahelin HB, Gey KF, *et al.* (1996) Prediction of male cancer mortality by plasma levels of interacting vitamins: 17-year follow-up of the prospective Basel study. *Int J Cancer* 66, 145–150.
- Gale CR, Martyn CN, Winter PD, *et al.* (1995) Vitamin C and risk of death from stroke and coronary heart disease in cohort of elderly people. *BMJ* 310, 1563–1566.
- Khaw KT, Bingham S, Welch A, *et al.* (2001) Relation between plasma ascorbic acid and mortality in men and women in EPIC-Norfolk prospective study: a prospective population study. European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. *Lancet* 357, 657–663.
- 11. Loria CM, Klag MJ, Caulfield LE, *et al.* (2000) Vitamin C status and mortality in US adults. *Am J Clin Nutr* **72**, 139–145.
- Nyyssönen K, Parviainen MT, Salonen R, et al. (1997) Vitamin C deficiency and risk of myocardial infarction: prospective population study of men from eastern Finland. BMJ 314, 634.
- Riemersma RA, Wood DA, Macintyre CC, *et al.* (1991) Risk of angina pectoris and plasma concentrations of vitamins A, C, and E and carotene. *Lancet* 337, 1–5.
- Sahyoun NR, Jacques PF & Russell RM (1996) Carotenoids, vitamins C and E, and mortality in an elderly population. *Am J Epidemiol* 144, 501-511.
- 15. Singh RB, Ghosh S, Niaz MA, *et al.* (1995) Dietary intake, plasma levels of antioxidant vitamins, and oxidative stress in relation to coronary artery disease in elderly subjects. *Am J Cardiol* **76**, 1233–1238.
- Blot WJ, Li JY, Taylor PR, *et al.* (1993) Nutrition intervention trials in Linxian, China: supplementation with specific vitamin/ mineral combinations, cancer incidence, and disease-specific mortality in the general population. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 85, 1483–1492.
- Cook NR, Albert CM, Gaziano JM, *et al.* (2007) A randomized factorial trial of vitamins C and E and β carotene in the secondary prevention of cardiovascular events in women: results from the Women's Antioxidant Cardiovascular Study. *Arch Intern Med* 167, 1610–1618.
- Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group (2002) MRC/BHF Heart Protection Study of antioxidant vitamin supplementation in 20 536 high-risk individuals: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 360, 23–33.
- 19. Hercberg S, Galan P, Preziosi P, *et al.* (2004) The SU.VI.MAX Study: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial of the health

effects of antioxidant vitamins and minerals. *Arch Intern Med* **164**, 2335–2342.

- Jacob RA (1990) Assessment of human vitamin C status. J Nutr 120, Suppl. 11, 1480–1485.
- 21. Smith JL & Hodges RE (1987) Serum levels of vitamin C in relation to dietary and supplemental intake of vitamin C in smokers and nonsmokers. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **498**, 144–152.
- Lykkesfeldt J (2006) Smoking depletes vitamin C: should smokers be recommended to take supplements? In *Cigarette Smoke and Oxidative Stress*, pp. 237–260 [B Halliwell and HE Poulsen, editors]. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- 23. Kirk SF, Cade JE, Barrett JH, *et al.* (1999) Diet and lifestyle characteristics associated with dietary supplement use in women. *Public Health Nutr* **2**, 69–73.
- McNaughton SA, Mishra GD, Paul AA, et al. (2005) Supplement use is associated with health status and health-related behaviors in the 1946 British Birth Cohort. J Nutr 135, 1782–1789.
- Sinha R, Frey CM, Kammerer WG, et al. (1994) Importance of supplemental vitamin C in determining serum ascorbic acid in controls from a cervical cancer case–control study: implications for epidemiological studies. *Nutr Cancer* 22, 207–217.
- 26. Lykkesfeldt J, Christen S, Wallock LM, *et al.* (2000) Ascorbate is depleted by smoking and repleted by moderate supplementation: a study in male smokers and nonsmokers with matched dietary antioxidant intakes. *Am J Clin Nutr* **71**, 530–536.
- Carr AC & Frei B (1999) Toward a new recommended dietary allowance for vitamin C based on antioxidant and health effects in humans. *Am J Clin Nutr* 69, 1086–1107.
- Levine M, Dhariwal KR, Welch RW, et al. (1995) Determination of optimal vitamin C requirements in humans. Am J Clin Nutr 62, Suppl. 6, 1347S-1356S.
- 29. Levine M, Rumsey S & Wang Y (1997) Principles involved in formulating recommendations for vitamin C intake: a paradigm for water-soluble vitamins. *Meth Enzymol* **279**, 43–54.
- 30. Levine M, Padayatty SJ, Katz A, et al. (2004) Dietary allowances for vitamin C: recommended dietary allowances and optimal nutrient ingestion. In Vitamin C: Its Functions and Biochemistry in Animals and Plants, pp. 291–317 [H Asard, JM May and N Smirnoff, editors]. Oxford: BIOS Scientific Publishers Ltd.
- 31. Newton HM, Schorah CJ, Habibzadeh N, *et al.* (1985) The cause and correction of low blood vitamin C concentrations in the elderly. *Am J Clin Nutr* **42**, 656–659.
- Schorah CJ, Newill A, Scott DL, *et al.* (1979) Clinical effects of vitamin C in elderly inpatients with low blood-vitamin-C levels. *Lancet* i, 403–405.
- Chazan JA & Mistilis SP (1963) The pathophysiology of scurvy. A report of seven cases. Am J Med 34, 350–358.
- 34. Lind J (1753) A Treatise on the Scurvy. In Three Parts. Containing an Enquiry Into The Nature, Causes and Cure of That Disease, Together With a Critical and Chronological View of What Has Been Published on the Subject. Edinburgh: Sands, Murray, and Cochran.
- 35. Leggott PJ, Robertson PB, Rothman DL, *et al.* (1986) The effect of controlled ascorbic acid depletion and supplementation on periodontal health. *J Periodontol* **57**, 480–485.
- 36. Langlois M, Duprez D, Delanghe J, *et al.* (2001) Serum vitamin C concentration is low in peripheral arterial disease and is associated with inflammation and severity of atherosclerosis. *Circulation* **103**, 1863–1868.
- Mayland CR, Bennett MI & Allan K (2005) Vitamin C deficiency in cancer patients. *Palliat Med* 19, 17–20.
- Schectman G (1993) Estimating ascorbic acid requirements for cigarette smokers. Ann N Y Acad Sci 686, 335–345.
- Hodges RE, Hood J, Canham JE, *et al.* (1971) Clinical manifestations of ascorbic acid deficiency in man. *Am J Clin Nutr* 24, 432–443.

- Reuler JB, Broudy VC & Cooney TG (1985) Adult scurvy. JAMA 253, 805–807.
- Simon JA, Hudes ES & Tice JA (2001) Relation of serum ascorbic acid to mortality among US adults. J Am Coll Nutr 20, 255–263.
- Yokoyama T, Date C, Kokubo Y, *et al.* (2000) Serum vitamin C concentration was inversely associated with subsequent 20-year incidence of stroke in a Japanese rural community: The Shibata Study. *Stroke* 31, 2287–2294.
- 43. Gey KF, Stahelin HB, Puska P, *et al.* (1987) Relationship of plasma level of vitamin C to mortality from ischemic heart disease. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **498**, 110–123.
- 44. Gey KF, Moser UK, Jordan P, *et al.* (1993) Increased risk of cardiovascular disease at suboptimal plasma concentrations of essential antioxidants: an epidemiological update with special attention to carotene and vitamin C. *Am J Clin Nutr* **57**, 787S–797S.
- 45. Gey KF, Stahelin HB & Eichholzer M (1993) Poor plasma status of carotene and vitamin C is associated with higher mortality from ischemic heart disease and stroke: Basel Prospective Study. *Clin Invest* **71**, 3–6.
- Azzi A (2007) Molecular mechanism of α-tocopherol action. Free Radic Biol Med 43, 16–21.
- Poulsen HE, Andersen JT, Keiding N, et al. (2009) Why epidemiological and clinical intervention studies often give different or diverging results? *IUBMB Life* 61, 391–393.
- Bjelakovic G, Nikolova D, Gluud LL, *et al.* (2007) Mortality in randomized trials of antioxidant supplements for primary and secondary prevention: systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* 297, 842–857.
- Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J & Gluud C (2001) Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. *Ann Intern Med* 135, 982–989.
- Hampl JS, Taylor CA & Johnston CS (2004) Vitamin C deficiency and depletion in the United States: the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1988 to 1994. Am J Public Health 94, 870–875.
- Schectman G, Byrd JC & Gruchow HW (1989) The influence of smoking on vitamin C status in adults. *Am J Public Health* 79, 158–162.
- Simon JA, Murtaugh MA, Gross MD, *et al.* (2004) Relation of ascorbic acid to coronary artery calcium: The Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 159, 581–588.
- Wrieden WL, Hannah MK, Bolton-Smith C, *et al.* (2000) Plasma vitamin C and food choice in the third Glasgow MONICA population survey. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 54, 355–360.
- 54. Hercberg S, Preziosi P, Galan P, *et al.* (1994) Vitamin status of a healthy French population: dietary intakes and biochemical markers. *Int J Vitam Nutr Res* **64**, 220–232.
- McKeown-Eyssen G, Holloway C, Jazmaji V, et al. (1988) A randomized trial of vitamins C and E in the prevention of recurrence of colorectal polyps. *Cancer Res* 48, 4701–4705.
- 56. Penn ND, Purkins L, Kelleher J, *et al.* (1991) The effect of dietary supplementation with vitamins A, C and E on cell-mediated immune function in elderly long-stay patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 20, 169–174.
- Chandra RK (1992) Effect of vitamin and trace-element supplementation on immune responses and infection in elderly subjects. *Lancet* 340, 1124–1127.
- Wenzel G, Kuklinski B, Ruhlmann C, *et al.* (1993) Alcoholinduced toxic hepatitis – a 'free radical' associated disease. Lowering fatality by adjuvant antioxidant therapy (article in German). *Z Gesamte Inn Med* 48, 490–496.

- ter Riet G, Kessels AG & Knipschild PG (1995) Randomized clinical trial of ascorbic acid in the treatment of pressure ulcers. J Clin Epidemiol 48, 1453–1460.
- 60. Hogarth MB, Marshall P, Lovat LB, *et al.* (1996) Nutritional supplementation in elderly medical in-patients: a double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *Age Ageing* **25**, 453–457.
- Girodon F, Lombard M, Galan P, *et al.* (1997) Effect of micronutrient supplementation on infection in institutionalized elderly subjects: a controlled trial. *Ann Nutr Metab* 41, 98–107.
- 62. You WC, Chang YS, Heinrich J, *et al.* (2001) An intervention trial to inhibit the progression of precancerous gastric lesions: compliance, serum micronutrients and S-allyl cysteine levels, and toxicity. *Eur J Cancer Prev* **10**, 257–263.
- Sasazuki S, Sasaki S, Tsubono Y, et al. (2003) The effect of 5-year vitamin C supplementation on serum pepsinogen level and *Helicobacter pylori* infection. Cancer Sci 94, 378–382.
- Bonelli L, Camoriano A, Ravelli P, et al. (1998) Reduction of the incidence of metachronous adenomas of the large bowel by means of antioxidants. In Proceedings of International Selenium Tellurium Development Association, pp. 91–94 [Y Palmieri, editor]. Scottsdale, AZ: Selenium Tellurium Development Association.
- Li JY, Taylor PR, Li B, *et al.* (1993) Nutrition intervention trials in Linxian, China: multiple vitamin/mineral supplementation, cancer incidence, and disease-specific mortality among adults with esophageal dysplasia. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 85, 1492–1498.
- 66. Greenberg ER, Baron JA, Tosteson TD, *et al.* (1994) A clinical trial of antioxidant vitamins to prevent colorectal adenoma. Polyp Prevention Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 331, 141–147.
- 67. Pike J & Chandra RK (1995) Effect of vitamin and trace element supplementation on immune indices in healthy elderly. *Int J Vitam Nutr Res* **65**, 117–121.
- Richer S (1996) Multicenter ophthalmic and nutritional agerelated macular degeneration study – part 2: antioxidant intervention and conclusions. *J Am Optom Assoc* 67, 30–49.
- Girodon F, Galan P, Monget AL, et al. (1999) Impact of trace elements and vitamin supplementation on immunity and infections in institutionalized elderly patients: a randomized controlled trial. MIN. VIT. AOX. geriatric network. Arch Intern Med 159, 748–754.
- Correa P, Fontham ET, Bravo JC, et al. (2000) Chemoprevention of gastric dysplasia: randomized trial of antioxidant supplements and anti-Helicobacter pylori therapy. J Natl Cancer Inst 92, 1881–1888.
- Jacobson JS, Begg MD, Wang LW, et al. (2000) Effects of a 6-month vitamin intervention on DNA damage in heavy smokers. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 9, 1303–1311.
- 72. Age Related Eye Disease Study Research Group (2001) A randomized, placebo-controlled, clinical trial of high-dose supplementation with vitamins C and E and β carotene for age-related cataract and vision loss: AREDS report no. 9. *Arch Ophthalmol* **119**, 1439–1452.
- Brown BG, Zhao XQ, Chait A, *et al.* (2001) Simvastatin and niacin, antioxidant vitamins, or the combination for the prevention of coronary disease. *N Engl J Med* 345, 1583–1592.
- 74. Chylack LT Jr, Brown NP, Bron A, et al. (2002) The Roche European American Cataract Trial (REACT): a randomized clinical trial to investigate the efficacy of an oral antioxidant micronutrient mixture to slow progression of age-related cataract. Ophthalmic Epidemiol 9, 49–80.
- Graat JM, Schouten EG & Kok FJ (2002) Effect of daily vitamin E and multivitamin-mineral supplementation on acute respiratory tract infections in elderly persons: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 288, 715–721.
- 76. Waters DD, Alderman EL, Hsia J, *et al.* (2002) Effects of hormone replacement therapy and antioxidant vitamin

supplements on coronary atherosclerosis in postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 288, 2432-2440.

- White KL, Chalmers DM, Martin IG, *et al.* (2002) Dietary antioxidants and DNA damage in patients on longterm acid-suppression therapy: a randomized controlled study. *Br J Nutr* 88, 265–271.
- Prince MI, Mitchison HC, Ashley D, et al. (2003) Oral antioxidant supplementation for fatigue associated with primary biliary cirrhosis: results of a multicentre, randomized, placebocontrolled, cross-over trial. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 17, 137–143.
- Salonen RM, Nyyssonen K, Kaikkonen J, et al. (2003) Six-year effect of combined vitamin C and E supplementation on atherosclerotic progression: the Antioxidant Supplementation in Atherosclerosis Prevention (ASAP) Study. Circulation 107, 947–953.
- Allsup SJ, Shenkin A, Gosney MA, *et al.* (2004) Can a short period of micronutrient supplementation in older institutionalized people improve response to influenza vaccine? A randomized, controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 52, 20–24.
- 81. Richer S, Stiles W, Statkute L, et al. (2004) Doublemasked, placebo-controlled, randomized trial of lutein and

antioxidant supplementation in the intervention of atrophic age-related macular degeneration: the Veterans LAST study (Lutein Antioxidant Supplementation Trial). *Optometry* **75**, 216–230.

- Avenell A, Campbell MK, Cook JA, *et al.* (2005) Effect of multivitamin and multimineral supplements on morbidity from infections in older people (MAVIS trial): pragmatic, randomised, double blind, placebo controlled trial. *BMJ* 331, 324–329.
- Mooney LA, Madsen AM, Tang D, et al. (2005) Antioxidant vitamin supplementation reduces benzo(a)pyrene-DNA adducts and potential cancer risk in female smokers. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 14, 237–242.
- Tam LS, Li EK, Leung VY, *et al.* (2005) Effects of vitamins C and E on oxidative stress markers and endothelial function in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus: a double blind, placebo controlled pilot study. *J Rheumatol* 32, 275–282.
- 85. Witte KK, Nikitin NP, Parker AC, *et al.* (2005) The effect of micronutrient supplementation on quality-of-life and left ventricular function in elderly patients with chronic heart failure. *Eur Heart J* **26**, 2238–2244.

1259