1	Manuscript on
2	Calcium and Vitamin D for Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis –
3	A Further In-depth Review Using Finite Element Analysis (FEA) for a
4	Randomized Double-blinded Placebo-controlled Trial
5	
6	
7	Authors:
8	Tsz Ping LAM ^{1,2,4} , FHKAM
9	Benjamin Hon Kei YIP ¹ , PhD
10	Elisa Man Shan TAM ¹ , PhD
11	Gene Chi Wai MAN ¹ , PhD
12	Wayne YW LEE ¹ , PhD
13	Kwong Man LEE ^{2,3} , PhD
14	Fiona Wai Ping YU ¹ , MPH
15	Yong QIU ^{2,5} , MD
16	Bobby Kin Wah NG ^{1,2,4} , FHKAM
17	Jack Chun Yiu CHENG ^{1,2,4} , MD
18	
19	
20	¹ Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese
21	University of Hong Kong
22	² Joint Scoliosis Research Center of the Chinese University of Hong Kong and Nanjing
23	University

- ³Lee Hysan Clinical Research Laboratory, Faculty of Medicine, the Chinese University 24
- 25 of Hong Kong
- ⁴ SH Ho Scoliosis Research Laboratory, the Chinese University of Hong Kong 26
- " derators ⁵ Spine Surgery, The Affiliated Drum Tower Hospital of Nanjing University Medical 27
- 28 School, Nanjing, China
- 29
- 30
- 31
- Correspondence to the Presenting Author: 32
- Tsz Ping LAM 33
- Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology 34
- 5/F., Lui Che Woo Clinical Sciences Building, 35
- Prince of Wales Hospital, 36
- Shatin, NT, 37
- Hong Kong SAR, 38
- 39 China.
- Phone: 852-35052724 40
- Fax: 852-26377889 41
- Email address: tplam@cuhk.edu.hk 42

44

Introduction

47	Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis (AIS) is a complex three-dimensional spinal
48	deformity mostly affecting girls during the peri-pubertal period. The prevalence ranges
49	from 2 to 4% depending on gender and ethnicity. The higher the latitude, the higher the
50	prevalence of AIS [1]. When the deformity becomes severe, serious morbidities can occur
51	including early back degeneration, cardiopulmonary compromise, grossly deformed torso
52	and associated psychosocial issues which could pose serious health threats for these young
53	subjects [2].
54	One important health threat that deserves special attention is osteopenia as defined by
55	Bowden et al. for children having a bone mineral density age and gender-adjusted Z-score
56	< -1 [3]. Thirty to 38% of AIS girls were osteopenic as compared to 16% in the general
57	population [4]. Osteopenia could persist across puberty [4] and was found to be an
58	independent and significant prognostic factor for curve progression in AIS [5]. Osteopenia
59	was also found to be associated with low dietary calcium (Ca) intake at a median of
60	400mg/day among AIS girls. The low Ca intake was significantly correlated with age-
61	adjusted peripheral volumetric bone mineral density (vBMD) measured by peripheral
62	quantitative computed tomography (pQCT), as well as axial and peripheral areal BMD
63	(aBMD) measured by Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (DXA) [6].
64	Low Ca intake when coupled with low Vitamin D (Vit-D) status can seriously affect

a child's bone health. Without Vit-D, only 10 to 15% of dietary Ca is absorbed [7]. 1,25(OH)₂Vit-D can increase intestinal Ca absorption to 30 to 40% [7], and prevent muscle
weakness [8]. Likewise, Vit-D insufficiency or disturbance in Vit-D physiology is
associated with osteopenia, deranged muscle function [8] and ligamentous laxity [9] which

69 could potentially predispose AIS subjects to curve progression. Vit-D and AIS also share 70 other similarities. First, it has been reported that higher latitude is associated with higher 71 prevalence of both Vit-D insufficiency [10] and AIS [1]. Second, Vit-D insufficiency or 72 dysfunction is associated with raised serum bone-alkaline-phosphatase (bALP) [9] and our 73 group has reported bALP level was elevated in AIS subjects [11].

Given that serum 25(OH)Vit-D level was also found to be low at a mean level of 41-6 nmol/L among AIS subjects [12], it will be logical to evaluate whether Ca plus Vit-D (Ca+Vit-D) supplementation could improve bone health and prevent curve progression in AIS. To the best of our knowledge, no study in this area has been reported in the literature. This study aimed at evaluating the therapeutic effect and its determinants of Ca+Vit-D supplementation on improving bone health and preventing curve progression in immature AIS patients with low bone mass.

81

82

83

Methods

This was a randomized double-blinded placebo-controlled trial recruiting AIS girls (11-14 years old, Tanner stage < IV) with femoral neck areal bone mineral density (aBMD) Z-scores < 0 and Cobb angle $\geq 15^{\circ}$. 330 subjects were randomly allocated to either Group1 (placebo), Group2 (600mg Calcium+400 IU Vit-D3/day) or Group3 (600mg Calcium+800 IU Vit-D3/day). The subjects, their guardians, the investigators and the caring orthopaedic surgeon were all blinded to the grouping throughout the entire study. The treatment period was two years. Regular clinic follow up for the scoliosis and 91 assessment were conducted with bracing prescribed and weaned according to a standard92 clinical protocol [2].

93	At baseline and the 24-month time-point, serum 25(OH)Vit-D level was assayed
94	with liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry. Dietary calcium intake was
95	assessed with validated Food Frequency Questionnaire. Areal bone mineral density
96	(aBMD) and bone mineral content (BMC) at bilateral femoral necks were measured with
97	Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry (DXA). Volumetric BMD (vBMD), gross bone
98	morphometry and trabecular bone micro-architecture were measured with High
99	Resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography (XtremeCT or HR-pQCT) at
100	the non-dominant distal radius.
101	Finite Element Analysis (FEA) on HR-pQCT images was conducted using the
102	software provided by the manufacturer (µFE Element Analysis Solver v.1.15; Scanco
103	Medical, Switzerland) [13]. The subject-specific Finite Element Model (FEM) was
104	constructed from a three-dimensional (3D) segmented bone image in form of a number of
105	small elements. Cube and tetrahedron are commonly used as the element shape in three-
106	dimensional bone structure. In this study, the FEM contained eight-node brick elements
107	with an element size of $82\times82\times82~\mu m^3$ which was the same as the voxel size of HR-
108	pQCT images. It was assumed that bone tissue is an isotropic and linear material with a
109	Young's modulus of 10 GPa and a Poisson's ratio of 0.3 [13]. Poisson's ratio is calculated
110	as the ratio of transverse strain to strain along the loading direction. After establishment
111	of the FEM, the amount and direction of the loads and the boundary conditions were
112	assigned [14]. In this linear FEM, uniaxial compression test with 1% strain along the
113	axial direction was performed. Stiffness, failure load and apparent modulus were

calculated in simulation. Failure load was determined when 1 mm³ elements in the model
had an effective strain greater than 7000 microstrain [15].

To evaluate spinal deformity, Cobb angle was measured using the standard method on whole spine standing postero-anterior radiographs taken at routine clinic visits once every 6 months before skeletal maturity and brace weaning, followed by once every 8 to

119 12 months thereafter.

120 For the first study objective, changes in bone parameters during the 2-year treatment

121 period were compared between the study groups to evaluate the treatment effects of

122 Ca+Vit-D supplementation on bone health.

123 For the second objective, Cobb angle taken without brace at baseline and at the

124 latest follow-up were evaluated for the entire cohort and the SRS (Scoliosis Research

125 Society) guideline on scoliosis outcome study [16] was followed for inclusion of subjects

126 who have completed the 2-year treatment into the latest follow-up analysis. Hence, those

127 who satisfied the followings were included in the latest follow-up curve outcome

128 analysis:

- 129 1. they have completed the 2-year treatment and
- 130 2. Cobb angle of the major curve at baseline $\leq 40^{\circ}$ and

131 3. brace was already stopped or never been braced and

132 4. Risser sign \geq 4 and YSM > 2 years at the latest follow-up

- 133 Curve outcome analysis at the latest follow-up was made with reference to the
- 134 modified SRS bracing outcome criteria [16]:
- 135 1. Percentage of patients with Cobb increase $\geq 6^{\circ}$

136 2. Percentage of patients with Cobb reaching surgical levels (Cobb $> 55^{\circ}$ at our institute) 137 3. Percentage of patients with final Cobb $> 45^{\circ}$ 138 139 140 The spread of data was tested for normality. For data that was normally distributed, 141 the numerical data was expressed as "mean \pm standard deviation (SD)". Otherwise, 142 medians and inter-quartile ranges were given with specification. Subject baseline 143 144 characteristics were compared between groups with ANOVA. Analysis on changes in bone parameters between groups was conducted with ANCOVA using the corresponding 145 baseline value as a covariate. Analyses on blood and curve severity parameters were 146 conducted using the same approach. McNemar test was used for paired comparison on 147 Vit-D status between baseline and the 2-year time-point. Chi-square test was used to 148 compare curve progression between groups with reference to the modified SRS bracing 149 outcome criteria mentioned earlier [16]. To further validate the treatment effect, logistic 150 regression was conducted to adjust for known determinants of curve progression namely 151 152 YSM at baseline, initial Cobb angle and bracing treatment. SPSS 20 for Windows was used for all statistical analyses. P value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. 153 The "Intention To Treat" principle was followed for data analysis on those who have 154 155 completed the 2-year treatment. 156

158

Results

160	From April-2010 to November-2012, a total of 1037 consecutive AIS subjects noted to be
161	eligible at initial screening were evaluated and finally, 330 suitable subjects were
162	randomised. Details of the trial profile are depicted in Figure 1. The baseline
163	characteristics of maturity, anthropometric, lifestyle, biochemical, HR-pQCT and FEA
164	parameters are shown in Table 1. No significant difference was noted between Group 1, 2
165	and 3 (all with $p>0.05$). Distribution of curve types for the three study groups is shown
166	in Table S1 (Appendix).
167	270 (81.8%) subjects completed the 2-year treatment (Figure 1). The overall
168	treatment compliance was 83.3±12.9% (Group 1: 84.5±11.8%, Group 2: 82.5±14.0%,
169	and Group 3: 82·8±12·8%, p=0·519).
170	Prevalence of Vit-D insufficiency at baseline and at the 2-year time-point, the
171	changes on serum 25(OH)Vit-D levels, HR-pQCT and FEA parameters from baseline to
172	the 2-year time-point are shown in Table 2. The gain in Average vBMD and all FEA
173	parameters of stiffness, failure load and apparent modulus at the non-dominant distal
174	radius were significantly greater in Group 3 than the placebo group (all with p<0.05,
175	Table 2). Changes in Trabecular vBMD, Trabecular Bone Volume to Tissue Volume
176	Ratio and Trabecular Number were different between groups demonstrating improvement
177	in bone health with Ca+Vit-D supplementation in both treatment groups (all with p<0.05,
178	Table 2). Likewise, the increase in Trabecular Separation was significantly greater in the
179	placebo group than the treatment groups ($p < 0.05$).
180	Outcome on curve deformity was assessed according to the modified SRS bracing
181	outcome criteria at the latest follow-up as mentioned earlier (N=132, Table 3). Outcome

182 analysis with respect to curve progression in Cobb angle $> 6^{\circ}$ showed that 21.7% in Group 3 and 24.4% in Group 2 progressed as compared with 46.7% in Group 1. Logistic 183 regression analysis was conducted to control confounding from curve severity (Cobb 184 angle of the major curve at baseline), maturity (YSM at baseline) and bracing history. 185 When Group 3 was compared with Group 1, the adjusted odds ratio for curve progression 186 $\geq 6^{\circ}$ was 0.343 (p=0.028). 187

Using the same logistic regression approach, within-group analysis showed that in 188

Group 3, increase in FEA parameters of failure load and apparent modulus during the 2-

190 year treatment were independent and significant protective factors against curve

189

progression (p=0.043 and 0.034 respectively) while that for stiffness reached borderline 191 statistical significance (p=0.054). 192

For the subgroup with baseline serum $25(OH)Vit-D \le 50 \text{ nmol/L} (N=103)$, 16.2% in 193 Group 3 (p=0.003 Vs Group 1) and 22.6% in Group 2 (p=0.028 Vs Group 1) had curve 194 progression $\geq 6^{\circ}$ as compared with 48.6% in Group 1. In contrast, for the subgroup with 195 baseline serum 25(OH)Vit-D > 50 nmol/L (N=29), no between-group difference was 196 noted on curve progression with 40% progressed in Group 1 as compared with 44.4% in 197 Group 3 (p>0.05) (Table 3). 198

Concerning dietary calcium level, for the subgroup with baseline dietary calcium 199 intake $\leq 1000 \text{ mg/day}$ (N = 109), 19.0% in Group 3 (p=0.001 Vs Group 1) and 15.6% in 200 Group 2 (p=0.001 Vs Group 1) had curve progression $\geq 6^{\circ}$ as compared with 54.3% in 201 Group 1. In contrast, for those with baseline dietary calcium intake > 1000 mg/day (N = 202 203 23), no between-group difference was noted on curve progression (Table 3).

204	The number of subjects having Cobb angle $> 45^{\circ}$ for Group 1, 2 and 3 were 2 (4.4
205	%), 1 (2.4 %) and 0 (0%) respectively. No subject had Cobb angle > 55° at the latest
206	follow-up for all three study groups.
207	
208	
209	
210	
211	Discussion
212	In this 2-year randomised double-blinded placebo-controlled trial, we found strong
213	evidences of improvement in bone health and therapeutic control of curve progression
214	with Ca+Vit-D supplementation for AIS girls having Z-score of femoral neck BMD < 0.
215	After 2-year of treatment, the prevalence of Vit-D insufficiency was reduced to
216	30.8% in Group 2 (p<0.001) and 19.3% in Group 3 (p<0.001) whereas for Group 1, the
217	prevalence was 62.6% (p= 0.035). This improvement in Vit-D status was also reflected
218	in the rise in serum 25(OH)Vit-D levels with a mean increase of 20.4 nmol/L in Group 2
219	and 28.0 nmol/L in Group 3 as compared with 6.3 nmol/L in Group 1 (all with p<0.001)
220	(Table 2).
221	In alignment with the improvement in Vit-D status, increase in bone density, bone
222	quality and bone strength parameters were also demonstrable in the treatment group
223	(Table 2) providing strong evidences of improvement in bone health with Ca+Vit-D
224	supplementation. Improvement in HR-pQCT and FEA parameters could carry significant
225	clinical implication. Nikodem pointed out primary HR-pQCT parameters were correlated
226	with mechanical properties [17]. It has been a long-existing quest to investigate if

improvement in bone quality and bone strength is accompanied by improvement in curvecontrol in AIS.

Using the SRS bracing outcome criterion of Cobb increase $\geq 6^{\circ}$ at the latest follow-229 up, the rate of curve progression was 24.4% in Group 2 and 21.7% in Group 3 as 230 compared with 46.7% in Group 1 (p<0.05, Table 3). Logistic regression analysis further 231 232 showed the therapeutic effects of Ca+Vit-D supplementation to prevent curve progression was independent of YSM (maturity) at baseline, initial Cobb angle (curve severity) at 233 baseline and the bracing history. Using the same logistic regression model for within-234 group analysis in Group 3, the therapeutic effects of preventing curve progression was 235 correlated with increase in FEA parameters, namely failure load and apparent modulus, 236 thus providing strong evidences of the role of derangement in bone health on disease 237 progression in AIS. 238

Apart from FEA parameters, other determinants of the treatment effect of Ca+Vit-D supplementation were also noted in this study. Firstly, Ca+Vit-D supplementation was noted to be significantly more effective for those with low baseline serum 25(OH)Vit-D levels \leq 50 nmol/L (ie Vit-D insufficiency). Likewise, Ca+Vit-D supplementation was significantly more effective for those with low baseline dietary calcium intake \leq 1000 mg/day.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated improvement in bone health and control of curve progression with Ca+Vit-D supplementation for AIS girls having Z-score of femoral neck aBMD < 0. The recruitment criteria of confining those with Z-score of femoral neck aBMD < 0 should be considered when evaluating the external validity of this study. Given the suboptimal 25(OH)Vit-D levels detected in this study and the

250 association between AIS and low bone mass, Vit-D status, bone mineral density and 251 bone quality should be assessed for newly diagnosed AIS subjects. For those with low 252 BMD, Ca+Vit-D supplementation should be started early for achieving healthy bone 253 status and preventing curve progression from reaching bracing or surgical thresholds especially for those with low Vit-D levels and low dietary calcium intake at baseline. 254 and the mail and t Whether the same therapeutic effects can be achieved with enhanced Ca+Vit-D levels 255 through food fortification and lifestyle modification and the mechanism behind the therapeutic effects of Ca+Vit-D supplementation in AIS warrant further studies.

- , grant from Prizer

Abbreviation 263

- 264 AIS: Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis
- aBMD: areal bone mineral density 265
- BMC: bone mineral content 266
- BV/TV: Trabecular Bone Volume to Tissue Volume Ratio 267
- Ca+Vit-D supplementation: Calcium plus Vitamin D supplementation 268
- 269 DXA: Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry
- FEA: finite element analysis 270
- 271 FEM: finite element model
- HR-pQCT: High Resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography .t. .yev onthittee onthittee onthittee 272

278 Figure 1 The Trial Profile





281	Table 1: Baseline	characteristics	of maturity,	anthrop	ometric,	lifestyle,	biochemical	, HR-
-----	-------------------	-----------------	--------------	---------	----------	------------	-------------	-------

		mean \pm SD at baseline	
	Group 1, N=110	Group 2, N=110	Group 3, N=110
Age (year)	$13{\cdot}03\pm0{\cdot}86$	$12{\cdot}92\pm0{\cdot}91$	$12{\cdot}81\pm0{\cdot}89$
Tanner (breast)	$2{\cdot}88\pm0{\cdot}70$	$2{\cdot}84\pm0{\cdot}75$	2.75 ± 0.74
Risser sign	$2{\cdot}01\pm1{\cdot}60$	$1{\cdot}92\pm1{\cdot}65$	1.58 ± 1.68
Body mass (Kg)	$40{\cdot}41\pm 6{\cdot}14$	$40{\cdot}50\pm5{\cdot}73$	40.33 ± 5.80
Standing height (cm)	$153{\cdot}8\pm 6{\cdot}6$	$154{\cdot}0\pm 6{\cdot}1$	$153{\cdot}4\pm 6{\cdot}2$
Armspan (cm)	$153{\cdot}4\pm 6{\cdot}9$	$153{\cdot}0\pm7{\cdot}0$	$152{\cdot}5\pm7{\cdot}5$
Physical activity level (Baecke score)	$7{\cdot}30\pm0{\cdot}93$	$7{\cdot}08\pm0{\cdot}91$	$7 \cdot 14 \pm 0 \cdot 82$
Dietary Vit-D intake (IU/day)*	116.5 (125.6)	109.8 (138.4)	110.1 (132.9)
Dietary calcium intake (mg/day)*	603.9 (539.8)	618.6 (523.9)	578.1 (361.9)
Serum 25(OH)Vit-D (nmol/L)	$41{\cdot}4\pm13{\cdot}3$	$42 \cdot 3 \pm 14 \cdot 3$	$39{\cdot}4 \pm 15{\cdot}4$
Adjusted serum calcium (mmol/L)	$2 \cdot 28 \pm 0 \cdot 09$	$2{\cdot}29\pm0{\cdot}09$	$2{\cdot}28\pm0{\cdot}09$
Cobb angle of major curve (°)	$26{\cdot}0\pm9{\cdot}1$	$26{\cdot}3\pm8{\cdot}5$	$25{\cdot}8\pm9{\cdot}1$
Number of subjects treated with bracing (%)	85 (77.3%)	90 (81.8%)	86 (78.2%)
20		S	
HR-pQCT parameters	7		
Cortical Area in mm ²	23.067 ± 10.977	$21{\cdot}898 \pm 11{\cdot}300$	20.404 ± 11.075
Trabecular Area in mm ²	150.400 ± 29.557	$147{\cdot}664 \pm 29{\cdot}847$	$151{\cdot}595\pm27{\cdot}963$
Cortical Thickness in mm	$0{\cdot}417\pm0{\cdot}210$	$0{\cdot}414\pm0{\cdot}234$	0.368 ± 0.216
Cortical Perimeter in mm	$55{\cdot}039 \pm 4{\cdot}675$	$54{\cdot}425\pm 4{\cdot}582$	$54{\cdot}798\pm 4{\cdot}080$
Average vBMD in mg HA/cm ³	$243 \cdot 155 \pm 43 \cdot 719$	240.847 ± 52.171	233.448 ± 46.457
Cortical vBMD in mg HA/cm ³	$675 \cdot 261 \pm 79 \cdot 615$	$669{\cdot}159\pm84{\cdot}519$	$656{\cdot}724\pm82{\cdot}802$
Trabecular vBMD in mg HA/cm ³	143.225 ± 23.481	140.619 ± 25.299	140.204 ± 25.856
Trabecular Bone Volume to Tissue Volume Ratio	$0{\cdot}119\pm0{\cdot}020$	0.117 ± 0.021	0.117 ± 0.022
Trabeculae Number /mm	$1\!\cdot\!689\pm0\!\cdot\!215$	$1\!\cdot\!692\pm0\!\cdot\!229$	1.675 ± 0.233
Trabecular Thickness in mm	0.071 ± 0.008	$0{\cdot}069\pm0{\cdot}009$	$0{\cdot}070\pm0{\cdot}008$
Trabecular Separation in mm	$0{\cdot}531\pm0{\cdot}082$	$0{\cdot}535\pm0{\cdot}101$	$0{\cdot}539\pm0{\cdot}086$
Finite Element Analysis (FEA) parameters			
FEA: stiffness (kN/mm)	45198 ± 9421	43118 ± 9800	43901 ± 10302
FEA: failure load (N)	1895 ± 366	1825 ± 403	1849 ± 423
FEA: apparent modulus (MPa)	1666 ± 382	1644 ± 450	1648 ± 414

pQCT and Finite Element Analysis (FEA) parameters for the three study groups 282

284 HR-pQCT: High-resolution Peripheral Quantitative Computed Tomography (XtremeCT)

285 SD: standard deviation

286 *: median (inter-quartile range)

287 288 vBMD: volumetric bone mineral density

Between-group comparison on baseline characteristics: all with p>0.05

290 Table 2

291 Prevalence of Vit-D insufficiency and mean changes in serum 25(OH)Vit-D, HR-pQCT

- and Finite Element Analysis (FEA) parameters from baseline to 2-year time-point for
- 293 Group 1, Group 2 and Group $3^{\$}$
- 294

		Gn 1	Gn 2	Gn 3	p-va	alue
		N=91	N=91	N=88	Gp 1 Vs Gp 2	Gp 1 Vs Gp 3
	Baseline (N=330)#	74.5%	70.0%	75.5%	0.274	0.500
Proportion	2-year time-point (N=270)#	62.6%	30.8%	19.3%	<0.001	<0.001
with Vit-D insufficiency	p-value for within- group comparison between Baseline Vs 2-year time- point ##	0.035^	<0.001^	<0.001^		
		+ 9				
		Changes fro	om baseline to 2-year mean ± SD	time-point [§]	F)
		Gp 1 N=91	Gp 2 N=91	Gp 3 N=88	Gp 1 Vs Gp 2	Gp 1 Vs Gp 3
Serum 25(OH	I)Vit-D (nmol/L) ###	6.3 ± 15.3	20.4 ± 19.6	$28{\cdot}0\pm23{\cdot}3$	<0.001	<0.001
	- 0					
HR-pQ0	CT parameters					
Cortical	Area in mm ^{2 ###}	$17{\cdot}698 \pm 4{\cdot}793$	19.175 ± 6.731	$19{\cdot}923\pm 6{\cdot}935$	0.244	0.050
Trabecular	r Area in mm ² ###	-9.370 ± 15.019	-10.030 ± 18.120	-10.031 ± 20.253	0.698	0.771
Cortical Th	ickness in mm ###	0.320 ± 0.100	$0{\cdot}339\pm0{\cdot}151$	$0{\cdot}361\pm0{\cdot}145$	0.442	0.098
Cortical Pe	rimeter in mm ###	0.819 ± 2.042	0.717 ± 2.481	0.814 ± 2.753	0.558	0.858
Average vBM	ID in mg HA/cm ³ ###	$59{\cdot}595\pm25{\cdot}897$	$69{\cdot}723\pm41{\cdot}090$	$70{\cdot}189\pm33{\cdot}286$	0.040^	0.032
Cortical vBM	D in mg HA/cm ³ ###	113.374 ± 36.436	126.563 ± 46.540	$124{\cdot}400\pm49{\cdot}758$	0.131	0.360
Trabecular vBN	MD in mg HA/cm ^{3 ###}	-6.224 ± 11.861	-0.673 ± 14.575	$0{\cdot}474\pm10{\cdot}929$	0.004^	0.001
Trabecular Bo Volui	ne Volume to Tissue me Ratio ###	-0.005 ± 0.010	-0.001 ± 0.012	$0{\cdot}000\pm0{\cdot}009$	0.004^	0.001^
Trabeculae	Number /mm ###	$-0{\cdot}133\pm0{\cdot}138$	-0.089 ± 0.161	-0.077 ± 0.157	0.035^	0.015
Trabecular T	hickness in mm ###	0.003 ± 0.007	$0{\cdot}004\pm0{\cdot}005$	$0{\cdot}004\pm0{\cdot}007$	0.495	0.348
Trabecular S	eparation in mm ###	$0{\cdot}052\pm0{\cdot}055$	$0{\cdot}033\pm0{\cdot}058$	$0{\cdot}029\pm0{\cdot}058$	0.027	0.008^
FEA	parameters					
S		Gp 1 N=83	Gp 2 N=78	Gp 3 N=72		
FEA: stiff	ness (kN/mm) ###	13455 ± 4670	15786 ± 5701	16520 ± 5563	0.048^	0.001^
FEA: fail	lure load (N) ###	533 ± 193	622 ± 243	658 ± 252	0.094	0.002^
FEA: apparen	t modulus (MPa) ###	465 ± 220	591 ± 353	588 ± 289	0.020^	0.028^

	At late	st follow-up# (N =132)]
	Group 1, N=45	Group 2, N=41	Gro	oup 3, N=46	p-value*	
Cobb angle at	22.2 ± 6.3	24.0 ± 6.7	2	24.6 ± 7.2	0.230	1
Age at baseline						-
(year)	13.3 ± 0.8	13.3 ± 0.7	-	13.2 ± 0.8	0.897	
YSM at baseline (year)	0.95 ± 0.95	1.28 ± 0.94	1	18 ± 1.08	0.294	
Interval from baseline to latest follow-up (months)	43.2 ± 9.9	43.1 ± 11.0	4	1.7 ± 10.6	0.747	0
		. ())				
	At late	st follow-up* (N =132)	> < ?		-1**	
Group 1 N=4E	$1 \text{ Copp}^{\text{m}} \text{ progression } < 6^{\circ}$	CODD"" progression	120°	p-v	aiue	-
Group 2 $N=45$	24 (33'3%)	21 (40°7%) 10 (24.40%)		Group 2 Vs G	roun1: n=0.022^	-
Group 2, N=41	36 (78.3%)	10 (24.4%)		Group 2 Vs G	roup1: p=0.052	-
	30 (78 378)	10 (21 770)		010005 13 01	oup1. p=0 012	
	Logistic Regression An	alysis### at latest follow	/-up# (N	= 132)		
	Adjusted odds ratio***	95% CI for adjusted ratio	odds	p-value fo coefficient	r regression of the dummy riable	
Group 2 Vs Group 1	0.366	0.138 - 0.966		0.	042^	
Group 3 Vs Group 1	0.343	0.132 - 0.892		0.	028^	
At lates	t follow-up# for subjects with	baseline serum 25(OH)Vit-D ≤	50 nmol/L (N = 1	.03)	
	Cobb ^{##} progression < 6°	Cobb ^{##} progression	1 ≥ 6°	p-v	alue**	
Group 1, N=35	18 (51.4%)	17 (48.6%)				
Group 2, N=31	24 (77·4%)	7 (22.6%)		Group 2 Vs G	roup1: p=0.028^	
Group 3, N=37	31 (83.8%)	6 (16.2%)		Group 3 Vs G	roup1: p=0.003	
At lata				50 mm al /1 /N - /	20)	
At lates	Cobb## prograssion < C	Cobb## progression	1)VI(-U)	> 50 nm0l/L (N = .	23) 240°**	-
Group 1 N=10			120	p-v	aiue	-
Group 2, $N=10$		4 (40.0%) 3 (20.0%)		Group 2 Vc G	roun1: n=0 620	-
	5 (55 6 %)			Group 2 Vs G	roup1. p=0.039	-
Group 5, 14-9	5 (55.0 %)	4 (44.4 %)		Group 5 VS G		
At latest fo	ollow-up [#] for subjects with ba	seline dietary calcium	ntake ≤	1000 mg/day (N	= 109)	1
	Cobb ^{##} progression < 6°	Cobb ^{##} progression	1 ≥ 6°	p-v	, alue ^{**}	1
Group 1, N=35 🔍	16 (45.7%)	19 (54.3 %)				
Group 2, N=32	27 (84.4%)	5 (15.6%)		Group 2 Vs G	roup1: p=0.001^	1
Group 3, N=42	34 (81%)	8 (19.0 %)		Group 3 Vs G	roup1: p=0.001^]
At latest f	ollow-up# for subjects with b	aseline dietary calcium	intake >	> 1000 mg/day (N	= 23)	1
	Cobb ^{##} progression < 6°	Cobb ^{##} progressior	ı≥6°	p-v	alue**	1
Group 1, N=10	8 (80.0%)	2 (20.0%)				_
Group 2, N=9	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6 %)		Group 2 Vs G	roup1: p=0.170	_
Group 3, N=4	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)		Group 3 Vs G	roup1: p=0.520	

303 Table 3 Spinal deformity parameters and curve progression at the latest follow-up

- 306 #: Criteria for subjects to be included for analysis at the latest follow-up: (a) they have completed the 2-year treatment,
- 307 (b) Cobb angle of the major curve at baseline $\leq 40^{\circ}$, (c) brace was already stopped or never been braced and (d) Risser
- 308 sign ≥ 4 and YSM > 2 years at that follow-up.
- 309 *: p-value from 1-way ANOVA
- 310 ##: Cobb angle measured at the major curve
- 311 **: p-value from Chi-square
- 312 ^{###}: Logistic regression analysis was done with "Progression in Cobb angle $\geq 6^{\circ}$ " as the dichotomous dependent
- 313 variable while "Bracing History", "Cobb angle of the major curve at baseline" and "YSM at baseline" as the
- 314 independent variables. Exposure variable has three values, namely Group 1, Group 2 and Group 3. Two dummy
- 315 variables were created, namely DummyGroup_2_1 (Group 2 Vs Group 1 using Group 1 as the reference group) and
- ישיש. שומים שנמים ***: adjusted odds ratio for curve progression in Cobb angle $\geq 6^{\circ}$ from Baseline to the latest follow-up with Group 1 as

321 **References**

- 322
- 1. Grivas TB, Vasiliadis E, Savvidou O, et al. Geographic latitude and prevalence of
- adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2006;123:84-9.
- Weinstein SL, Dolan LA, Cheng JC, et al. Adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. Lancet.
 2008 May 3;371(9623):1527-37.
- 327 3. Bowden SA, Robinson RF, Carr R, et al. Prevalence of vitamin D deficiency and
- insufficiency in children with osteopenia or osteoporosis referred to a pediatric
 metabolic bone clinic. Pediatrics. 2008 Jun;121(6):e1585-90.
- 4. Cheng JC, Guo X, Sher AH. Persistent osteopenia in adolescent idiopathic
- scoliosis. A longitudinal follow up study. Spine. 1999 Jun 15;24(12):1218-22.
- 3325.Hung VW, Qin L, Cheung CS, et al. Osteopenia: a new prognostic factor of curve333progression in adolescent idiopathic scoliosis. The Journal of bone and joint

334 surgery. 2005 Dec;87(12):2709-16.

- Lee WTK, Cheung CSK, Tse YK, et al. Generalized Low Bone Mass of Girls with
 Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis is Related to Inadequate Calcium Intake and
 Weight Bearing Physical Activity in Peripubertal Period. Osteoporos Int.
- 338 2005;16(9):1024-35.
- Holick MF, Garabedian M. Vitamin D: photobiology, metabolism, mechanism of
 action, and clinical applications. In: Favus MJ, ed. *Primer on the metabolic bone diseases and disorders of mineral metabolism.* 6th ed. Washington, DC:

342 American Society for Bone and Mineral Research 2006:129-37.

8. McCarthy EK, Kiely M. Vitamin D and muscle strength throughout the life course:
a review of epidemiological and intervention studies. Journal of human nutrition
and dietetics : the official journal of the British Dietetic Association. 2014 Oct 3.

346	9.	Zaleske DJ, Doppelt SH, Mankin HJ. Metabolic and Endocrine Abnormalities of
347		the Immature Skeleton. In: Morrissy RT, ed. Lovell and Winter's Pediatric
348		Orthopaedics. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company 1990:203-61.
349	10.	Fraser DR. Vitamin D-deficiency in Asia. The Journal of steroid biochemistry and
350		molecular biology. 2004 May;89-90(1-5):491-5.
351	11.	Cheung CS, Lee WT, Tse YK, et al. Generalized osteopenia in adolescent
352		idiopathic scoliosisassociation with abnormal pubertal growth, bone turnover,
353		and calcium intake? Spine. 2006 Feb 1;31(3):330-8.
354	12.	Lam TP, Ng BKW, Lee KM, et al. Serum 25(OH)vitamin D level and Its
355		correlation with bone mineral density in girls with Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis
356		(AIS). Scoliosis. 2015;10(Suppl 1):07.
357	13.	Hansen S, Brixen K, Gravholt CH. Compromised trabecular microarchitecture
358		and lower finite element estimates of radius and tibia bone strength in adults with
359		turner syndrome: a cross-sectional study using high-resolution-pQCT. J Bone
360		Miner Res. 2012 Aug;27(8):1794-803.
361	14.	Taylor M, Prendergast PJ. Four decades of finite element analysis of orthopaedic
362		devices: where are we now and what are the opportunities? Journal of
363		biomechanics. 2015 Mar 18;48(5):767-78.
364	15.	Mueller TL, Christen D, Sandercott S, et al. Computational finite element bone
365		mechanics accurately predicts mechanical competence in the human radius of
366		an elderly population. Bone. 2011 Jun 01;48(6):1232-8.
367	16.	Richards BS, Bernstein RM, D'Amato CR, et al. Standardization of criteria for
368		adolescent idiopathic scoliosis brace studies: SRS Committee on Bracing and
369		Nonoperative Management. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2005 Sep 15;30(18):2068-75;
370		discussion 76-7.

Appendix

Table S1

Distribution of curve types for Group 1, 2 and 3

	Curve Type	Nu (% with	Study Group mber of subje nin the Study	cts Group)	Total	p-value##	
		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3			
	Single Thoracic Curve	24 (21.8%)	16 (14.5%)	19 (17.3%)	59 (17.9%)	A.	
	Double Thoracic Curve	10 (9.1%)	6 (5.5%)	6 (5.5%)	22 (6.7%)		
	Double Curve	44 (40.0%)	49 (44.5%)	46 (41.8%)	139 (42.1%)	0.751	
	Thoracolumbar Curve	16 (14.5%)	18 (16.4%)	24 (21.8%)	58 (17.6%)	0.751	
	Lumbar Curve	10 (9.1%)	15 (13.6%)	10 (9.1%)	35 (10.6%)		
	Triple Curve & Misc	6 (5.5%)	6 (5.5%)	5 (4.5%)	17 (5.2%)		
	Total	110	110	110	330		
	Total	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)		
381		(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)		
381		(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(100.0%)		