# UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *The effect of supplementation with alkaline potassium salts on bone metabolism: a meta-analysis*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/148133/

Version: Accepted Version

## Article:

Lambert, H, Frassetto, L, Moore, JB orcid.org/0000-0003-4750-1550 et al. (4 more authors) (2015) The effect of supplementation with alkaline potassium salts on bone metabolism: a meta-analysis. Osteoporosis International, 26 (4). pp. 1311-1318. ISSN 0937-941X

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-014-3006-9

© 2015, International Osteoporosis Foundation and National Osteoporosis Foundation. This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Osteoporosis International. The final authenticated version is available online at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-014-3006-9

#### Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

#### Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

#### Title:

The effect of supplementation with alkaline potassium salts on bone metabolism: a metaanalysis

## Authors:

Helen Lambert PhD, Lynda Frassetto MD, J. Bernadette Moore PhD, David Torgerson PhD, Richard Gannon PhD, Peter Burckhardt PhD and Susan Lanham-New PhD

#### Institutional affiliations:

Nutritional Sciences Department, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH (HL, BM, RG, SLN)

Department of Medicine, University of San Francisco, California 94143, US (LF)

Department of Health Sciences, Seebohm Rowntree Building

University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK (DT)

Clinique Bois Cerf, Avenue Ouchy 31, CH-1006 Lausanne, Switzerland (PB)

#### Corresponding author:

Dr Helen Lambert, Nutritional Sciences Department, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH.

Tel: +44(0)1483 689222. Fax: +44(0)1483 686401.

Email: h.lambert@surrey.ac.uk.

1

#### Abstract

Purpose: the role of acid-base homeostasis as a determinant of bone health, and the
contribution of supplemental alkali in promoting skeletal integrity, remain a subject of
debate.

5 The objective of this study was, therefore, to conduct a meta-analysis to assess the effects of 6 supplemental potassium bicarbonate (KHCO<sub>3</sub>) and potassium citrate (KCitr) on urinary 7 calcium and acid excretion, markers of bone turnover and bone mineral density (BMD) and 8 to compare their effects with that of potassium chloride (KCl).

9 Methods: a total of 14 studies of the effect of alkaline potassium salts on calcium metabolism
10 and bone health, identified by a systematic literature search, were analysed with Review
11 Manager (Version 5; The Cochrane Collaboration) using a random effects model. Authors
12 were contacted to provide missing data as required. Results are presented as the standardised
13 (SMD) or unstandardized mean difference (MD) (95% confidence intervals).

Results: urinary calcium excretion was lowered by intervention with both KHCO<sub>3</sub> (P=0.04) and KCitr (P=0.01), as was net acid excretion (NAE) (P=0.002 for KHCO<sub>3</sub> and P=0.0008 for KCitr). Both salts significantly lowered the bone resorption marker NTX (P<0.00001). There was no effect on bone formation markers or BMD. KHCO3 and KCitr lowered calcium excretion to a greater extent than did KCl.

19 Conclusions: this meta-analysis confirms that supplementation with alkaline potassium salts 20 leads to significant reduction in renal calcium excretion and acid excretion, compatible with 21 the concept of increased buffering of hydrogen ions by raised circulating bicarbonate. The 22 observed reduction in bone resorption indicates a potential benefit to bone health

23 Key words: Potassium, alkali, markers of bone turnover; bone mineral density

#### 24 Mini Abstract

The role of acid-base metabolism in bone health is controversial. In this metaanalysis, potassium bicarbonate and potassium citrate lowered urinary calcium and acid excretion, and reduced the excretion of the bone resoption marker NTX. These salts may thus be beneficial to bone health by conserving bone mineral.

29

#### 30 Introduction

The role of acid-base balance as a determinant of bone health, and the potential contribution of potassium, abundant in fruit and vegetables, in promoting skeletal integrity is contentious.

33 Acid-base homeostasis in the body is tightly controlled (pH 7.35 -7.45) by buffering or neutralization by plasma proteins and other tissues, including bone, the excretion of protons 34  $(H^{+})$  and reabsorption of bicarbonate by the kidneys, and the excretion of carbon dioxide in 35 the lungs. Acid loading in healthy subjects which exceeds the capacity of these systems leads 36 to higher levels of H<sup>+</sup> and lower levels of plasma bicarbonate, within the range considered to 37 38 be normal, increasing the requirement for buffering/neutralization. This is known as lowgrade metabolic acidosis. Diet contributes to acid-base balance according to the type of acid 39 or alkaline precursors which it provides, with fruit and vegetables amongst the contributors of 40 41 alkaline precursors [1]. Long-term consumption of a high acid-generating diet, typical of "Western" diets, promotes a chronic state of low grade metabolic acidosis. This is 42 43 compounded by the decline in renal function with aging that leads to the decreased ability of the kidney to excrete  $H^+$  ions [2], [3]. 44

45 Severe acute and chronic metabolic acidosis have well-established physiological effects on 46 bone [4], which provides a large reserve of alkaline calcium salts. These are released in

47 response to the increased acid load. While bicarbonate and other anions buffer the increased 48 circulating H<sup>+</sup>, the excess calcium and other cations released are excreted in the urine. In 49 vitro, and in disease states with severe metabolic acidosis, the rise in extracellular acid-50 concentrations promotes an increase in osteoclastic activity [5], [6] and decrease in osteoblast 51 activity [7] [8], [9]. What is less clear is whether a milder diet-induced chronic state of 52 metabolic acidosis has similar detrimental effects on bone and calcium homeostasis in the 53 long term.

A meta-analysis was therefore undertaken to assess the effect of alkaline potassium salts on calcium metabolism and bone health. The specific objective was to investigate the effects of potassium bicarbonate (KHCO<sub>3</sub>) and potassium citrate (KCitr), compared with placebo, on urinary calcium and acid excretion, markers of bone turnover and bone mineral density. A secondary objective was to examine the role of KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr compared with potassium chloride (KCl) on the same outcome measures, in order to attempt to clarify the respective roles of the potassium cation and the basic anions.

We hypothesised that supplementary KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr would decrease urinary excretion of calcium and net acid excretion (NAE), as well as reducing bone turnover as observed by a decrease in urine and serum markers of bone formation and resorption. The supplements would also lead to an increase in bone mineral density (BMD).

#### 66 Methods

#### 67 Search strategy and study selection

68 A systematic search of the literature was conducted to identify randomised controlled trials in which the effects of either potassium bicarbonate or potassium citrate on a number of 69 indicators of bone health were investigated. ISI Web of Knowledge (which includes Web of 70 71 Science, BIOSIS, Scientific Web Plus and Medline) and PubMed were used for electronic 72 searches of studies published between 1959 and February 2013. In addition, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) and the International Randomised 73 74 Controlled Trials Number Register were searched for unpublished trials. Reference lists from relevant papers were also searched. 75

Studies eligible for inclusion were randomised, controlled studies and metabolic studies in human adult men or women. Parallel or cross-over design, metabolic or community-based intervention studies were eligible for inclusion. Administration of KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr at all dosages and for any duration was considered. Outcome measures were: urinary calcium excretion, markers of bone resorption and formation, BMD, and NAE. Studies were also included if supplementation was combined with other forms of dietary or pharmaceutical manipulation, such as high protein or salt intake, or diuretic administration.

Studies were not eligible if they did not fulfil the above criteria, if they were conducted in patients with kidney disease, metabolic bone disease or following renal, bariatric or other surgery, or in pregnant or lactating women. Studies were also excluded from the main analysis if the control group received a treatment other than placebo or "no-treatment". However, a secondary analysis was conducted comparing the effects of alkaline potassium salts with that of potassium chloride.

89 Search terms used for the electronic searches were "potassium" or "potassium citrate" or 90 "potassium bicarbonate" or "alkali", and "bone", "bone mineral density", "bone turnover 91 markers", "fracture" or "bone health", then filtered by "clinical trials" or "randomised trials" 92 and "human".

93 Publications meeting the relevant criteria were assessed for inclusion by SLN and HL.

94

#### 95 Data extraction

96 Information extracted from eligible studies included: first author, year of publication, study 97 design, characteristics of study participants, type and dose of supplementation, frequency of 98 supplementation, duration of study, method of randomisation, type of control, extent of 99 blinding, outcome measures, results.

In studies using multiple parallel interventions, (for example comparing KHCO<sub>3</sub> with
NaHCO<sub>3</sub>) only data relating to the KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr and placebo (or KCl, for the secondary
analysis) arms of the study were used.

103 Mean, standard deviation and number of participants were obtained for all outcome measures. 104 Where means were presented with the SE, this was converted to the SD (SE=SD/ $\sqrt{n}$ ). Where 105 possible, both final measurements and change scores were extracted. For studies using 106 different doses of supplement, outcomes for the highest dose was used. For studies 107 measuring outcomes at multiple time-points, data for the final time-point was used.

108 For studies where the required data was not reported, authors were contacted for further109 information or clarification.

#### 111 Quality analysis

Studies that met the inclusion criteria were assessed for risk of bias by HL using the Cochrane Collaboration criteria [10], on the basis of five domains: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data and selective reporting.

116

#### 117 Meta-analysis

118 Analysis was conducted using Review Manager (Version 5; The Cochrane Collaboration).

119 The comparisons investigated were: KHCO<sub>3</sub> versus placebo, KCitr versus placebo and either

120 KCitr or KHCO<sub>3</sub> versus placebo or KCl, for all relevant outcome measures.

121 A random effects model was chosen to account for heterogeneity of the included studies, and the inverse variance method used, in which the intervention effects of individual studies are 122 multiplied by 1/SE<sup>2</sup>, so that larger studies are given more weight than smaller studies. 123 Results are presented as standardised mean differences (SMD), for outcomes other than BMD 124 and NTx, as measurement of these outcomes differed across studies. The observed 125 differences between means are standardised by dividing by the standard deviation (SD), and 126 127 thus presented as units of SD. For BMD and NTx, units of measurement did not differ across studies and therefore the unstandardized mean differences are reported. Mean differences are 128 129 reported with 95% confidence intervals.

130

131

133 Sensitivity Analysis

Sub-group analyses were carried out to ensure that results of the meta-analysis were not affected by decisions relating to study inclusion, such as study design, or data extraction, such as choice of dose or time-points used.

137 Reporting

- 138 The meta-analysis is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
- 139 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [11].

#### 141 **Results**

#### 142 Study selection

143 The process of selection of studies for meta-analysis is shown in the PRISMA flow diagram144 (Figure 1).

#### 145 Characteristics of included studies/included data

146 The characteristics of included studies are shown in supplemental table 1. A total of 14 studies met the criteria for inclusion in the main meta-analysis (intervention vs placebo). Of 147 these, 7 studies used potassium bicarbonate as a supplement [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], 148 149 [18], and 7 used potassium citrate [19], [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25]. Seven studies were 150 randomised, placebo-controlled intervention studies (4 weeks -3 years) with a parallel design, [19,13], [14,15], [21], [22], [25], and seven were metabolic cross-over studies of short 151 duration ( $\leq$  4weeks). Four of these were randomised, placebo-controlled [12,16], [20,24], 152 153 and three used the "treatment-free" phase as the control, [17], [18], [23]. Two of the studies used in the main meta-analysis were included in the secondary analysis (intervention vs KCl), 154 both of which used KHCO<sub>3</sub> [14], [16]. Two additional randomised, double-blind studies were 155 156 included in this secondary analysis, one comparing KHCO<sub>3</sub> with KCl [26], and one using KCitr [27]. 157

158 Authors of eight studies were contacted for clarification of their data, and all responded by 159 providing the information requested.

160 Risk of Bias

161 Eight studies explicitly stated the method of randomisation. The majority of the studies (n=8) 162 were deemed to be at low risk of bias with respect to randomisation, blinding, analysis and 163 reporting (supplemental **table 2**). Separate meta-analysis of available baseline data showed no significant differences between treatment and control groups with respect to age, calcium
intake, urinary calcium excretion, BMD and N-terminal telopeptide of type 1 collagen
(NTX), suggesting adequate randomisation for these studies (data not shown). There was no
heterogeneity among studies in these analyses (I<sup>2</sup>=0%).

168

#### 169 **Results of main meta-analysis**

170 Urinary calcium excretion

Both KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr supplementation significantly reduced calcium excretion compared to a placebo (figure 2a). For KHCO<sub>3</sub>, the overall standardised mean difference (95% CI) in the change in calcium excretion was -1.03 SD (-2.03,-0.03), P=0.04. For KCitr the SMD was similar, -1.03 SD (-1.85, -0.21), P=0.01. When results for both KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr were combined, the overall effect of a potassium supplement on calcium excretion was -1.30 SD (-2.06, -0.54), P=0.0008 (data not shown). The results did not differ if crossover studies were excluded.

178 NAE

179 There was a clear effect of both KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr on NAE. The SMD was -5.73 SD (-9.30,

180 -2.16), P=0.002 for KHCO<sub>3</sub> and -4.88 SD (-7.73, -2.04), P=0.0008 for KCitr (figure 2b).

181 Bone turnover markers

182 The mean difference in the effect of a potassium supplement on the bone resorption marker

- 183 NTX was -7.62 nmolBCE/mmol creatinine (-14.97, -0.26), P= 0.04 for KHCO<sub>3</sub>, and -4.36
- 184 nmolBCE/mmol creatinine (-5.19, -3.53), P<0.00001 for KCitr (figure 2c). The effect on
- 185 markers of bone formation was not significant (figure 2d).

186 Bone mineral density

- 187 Two studies reported bone mineral density following supplementation, both of which
- supplemented with KCitr for 2 years [19,21]. The mean difference in BMD at the lumbar
- spine (LS2-4) was 0.05 g/cm<sup>2</sup> (-0.01, 0.11), P=0.09, and for the total hip (TH) 0.02 g/cm<sup>2</sup> (-
- 190 0.03, 0.07), P=0.43 (figure 3). Jehle et al reported a significant positive effect of KCitr
- 191 relative to placebo at both sites [21], whereas MacDonald et al did not observe any significant
- 192 differences at either site [19].

193 KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr vs KCl

194 Urinary calcium excretion and NAE were both lower following supplementation with

195 KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr than with KCl, and this difference was significant for NAE, with a SMD of
-5.27 SD (-10.30, -0.24), P=0.04 (figure 4).

197

198

199 Sensitivity analysis and heterogeneity

200 Sub-group analyses exploring the effect of study duration, study design and the inclusion of 201 pre-menopausal women on outcomes revealed no significant effects.

The reasons for the high heterogeneity among the included studies with respect to calcium excretion and NAE is not clear, but could be due to size of study groups, as well as age and bone health. Although the majority of studies (n=10) were in postmenopausal women and older men, two were in young men, one in young women and one covered ages 18-75 years in men and women; study group size ranged from n=5 to n=276. T-scores for baseline BMD were all > -1 in the four studies where this was reported, but this may not have been so for the other studies. Baseline calcium intakes were all in the range 650-1080 mg/d, and baseline urinary calcium excretion was in the range 100-240 mg/d. It is therefore unlikely that there were major differences in intakes of other nutrients (such as sodium and protein) that might affect calcium metabolism. Removing crossover studies from the analysis did not alter the heterogeneity. It should, however, be noted that heterogeneity with respect to bone turnover markers was low ( $I^2$  0-47%).

#### 214 **Discussion**

This meta-analysis of the effect of alkaline potassium salts on calcium and bone metabolism provides compelling evidence for a calcium- and bone-sparing effect of these salts.

The results strongly favour evidence for a reduction in bone resorption following supplementation with KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr, as well as a reduction in calcium and net acid excretion, in support of our hypothesis. Meanwhile, the proposed effects on bone formation and BMD are not supported by the present data.

While the effect of KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr on calcium and acid excretion is not widely disputed, 221 the implications of these effects for bone health have been debated. It has been argued that 222 223 the effects of alkaline potassium salts on calcium do not impact on bone as losses/gains are compensated for by changes in absorption [28]. However, none of the included balance 224 225 studies [17], [18], [22] found changes in calcium absorption. Moreover, our analysis also provides evidence for an inhibition of skeletal degradation with supplementation, with the 226 majority of studies that measured bone turnover markers showing a decrease in bone 227 228 resorption [18], [12], [14], [16]. In particular, we showed a significant overall reduction in NTX excretion with both KHCO3 and KCitr, with very low heterogeneity among these 229 studies. Thus there is clearly an effect of potassium or bicarbonate/citrate on osteoclastic 230 activity. On the other hand, few of the studies included in this analysis showed an effect on 231 markers of bone formation, and there was no overall effect. In one long term intervention 232 [21] there was a sustained increase in N-terminal propeptide of type 1 collagen, (but not bone 233 234 alkaline phosphatase,) after 2 years of KCitr. In another short-term metabolic study [18], there was an increase in osteocalcin after 18 days of KHCO<sub>3</sub>. In that study, NaHCO<sub>3</sub> had no 235 236 such effect, suggesting that potassium might work independently of the alkaline anion. Similarly, Sakhaee [23] found that KCitr but not NaCitr was effective in lowing urinary 237

238 calcium excretion. A plausible explanation is that the beneficial effect of the base could be mitigated by the negative effect of increased Na intake [17,23,29], with the resulting 239 increased Na excretion being accompanied by an increase in calcium excretion. This is 240 supported by the study by Lemann et al. in which 24-hour urinary Na excretion increased 241 following NaHCO<sub>3</sub> supplementation [17]. In that study, there was no effect on urinary 242 hydroxyproline excretion, possibly due to the change in calcium balance being too small. 243 Those authors also suggest that K, independent of HCO<sub>3</sub>, might have had a direct positive 244 effect on tubular reabsorption of Ca. However, the relative role of the cation and anion in 245 these KHCO3 or KCitr supplementation studies still remains unclear. Our analysis of studies 246 comparing KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr with KCl indicates that the alkaline salts are significantly more 247 effective than KCl in reducing urinary acid excretion and bone resorption markers [16],[26], 248 249 [30], [27]. One of these studies [27] also shows KCitr to have a significant beneficial effect on BMD compared with KCl. 250

251

252 Of course, the key question is whether these results have implications for fracture risk. There is evidence that calcium excretion and NAE are negatively associated with BMD [31] [32], 253 254 and Shi et al have shown that high calcium excretion is particularly associated with lower BMD in children with higher dietary acid load [33]. Two of the studies included in our meta-255 analysis investigated BMD as an end-point [19], [21], a small number of studies with which 256 to detect an overall effect - indeed we failed to show an effect of supplementation on BMD. 257 However, in one of these studies [21], there was a marked increase in BMD at the lumbar 258 259 spine relative to the placebo after 2 years of KCitr supplementation, which was shown by pQCT to be predominantly due to increases in trabecular thickness, volume and number. As 260 a result, FRAX (fracture prediction score) was significantly reduced in both men and women. 261 262 A previous study by the same group, comparing KCitr with KCl also demonstrated a positive

effect of KCitr (but not KCl) on BMD [27]. Conversely, a similar 2 year study of KCitr 263 supplementation in healthy postmenopausal women failed to show any effect on BMD [19], 264 and thus no overall effect was seen in the meta-analysis. Why the two similar studies 265 produced such divergent results is not clear. The subjects in the former study [21] included 266 men and women, and were approximately 10 years older than those in the latter study[19]. 267 They also had slightly lower LS BMD at baseline (T-scores  $-0.61\pm1.54$  vs  $-0.08\pm1.33$  g/cm<sup>2</sup> 268 for placebo groups). It may be that the effect on bone is inversely related to baseline BMD. 269 The women in the study by Jehle et al cited above were osteopenic with LS T-scores of <-2270 271 [27]. Alternatively, the diets of the women in the Scottish study were not sufficiently acidogenic for a beneficial effect of alkaline potassium salts to be demonstrated [34]. It has 272 also been suggested that areal BMD measured by DEXA may not be the most appropriate 273 outcome for assessing the effects of nutritional factors on bone [35]. 274

275 Intervention studies using alkaline salts of potassium allow investigation of the effect of increasing dietary alkali without the confounding effects of other nutrients and dietary or 276 277 lifestyle patterns associated with fruit and vegetable intake, nor the well-established problems 278 with dietary assessment. In the present analysis, we show that, overall, administration of alkaline potassium salts, whether in the short- or long-term, leads to significant reduction in 279 renal calcium excretion and acid excretion, compatible with the concept of increased 280 buffering or neutralization of hydrogen ions by raised circulating bicarbonate. That this 281 282 neutralisation of dietary acid load has beneficial effects on bone is demonstrated by the 283 reduction in bone resorption that this analysis confirms.

The main limitation of this analysis is the heterogeneity of included studies in terms of study design, primary outcome measures and populations studied. Although all the studies included were randomised controlled trials, there were marked differences in dosage, duration and method of administration of the supplement, as well as age and gender of the

study populations. In addition, there were very few studies with BMD as the primary endpoint which fulfilled the inclusion criteria, which limits the applicability of our findings, particularly with respect to fracture risk. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the novel finding of an effect of alkaline potassium salts on bone resorption was seen among studies with little or no heterogeneity.

Thus the effect of alkaline potassium salts on calcium, acid-base and bone metabolism that has been demonstrated in this meta-analysis has the potential to translate into preventative measures for osteoporosis. In particular, dietary measures which include increasing intakes of fruit and vegetables, and thus alkaline precursors, should be considered as valuable contributors to bone health.

299	Conflict of Interest:
300	Helen Lambert, Lynda Frassetto, Bernadette Moore, David Torgerson, Richard Gannon,
301	Peter Burckhardt and Susan Lanham-New declare that they have no conflict of interest.
302	
303	
304	
305	
306	
307	

#### References

1. Remer T, Manz F (1995) Potential renal acid load of foods and itsinfluence on urine pH. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 95 (7):791-797. doi:10.1016/s0002-8223(95)00219-7

2. Berkemeyer S, Vormann J, Guenther ALB, Rylander R, Frassetto LA, Remer T (2008) Renal net acid excretion capacity is comparable in prepubescence, adolescence, and young adulthood but falls with aging. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 56 (8):1442-1448. doi:10.1111/j.1532-

#### 5415.2008.01799.x

3. Frassetto LA, Morris RC, Sebastian A (1996) Effect of age on blood acid-base composition in adult humans: Role of age-related renal functional decline. American Journal of Physiology-Renal Physiology 271 (6):F1114-F1122

4. Bushinsky DA (1994) Acidosis and bone. Mineral and Electrolyte Metabolism 20 (1-2):40-52
5. Arnett TR, Spowage M (1996) Modulation of the resorptive activity of rat osteoclasts by small changes in extracellular pH near the physiological range. Bone 18 (3):277-279. doi:10.1016/8756-3282(95)00486-6

 Muzylak M, Arnett TR, Price JS, Horton MA (2007) The invitro effect of pH on osteoclasts and bone resoription in the cat: Implications for the pathogenesis of FORL. Journal of Cellular Physiology 213 (1):144-150. doi:10.1002/jcp.21103

7. Krieger NS, Sessler NE, Bushinsky DA (1992) Acidosis inhibits osteoblastic and stimulates osteoclastic activity invitro American Journal of Physiology 262 (3):F442-F448

8. Bushinsky DA (1995) Stimulated osteoclastic and suppressed osteoblastic activity in metabolic but not respiratory acidosis. American Journal of Physiology-Cell Physiology 268 (1):C80-C88

9. Arnett TR (2008) Extracellular pH regulates bone cellfunction. Journal of Nutrition 138(2):415S418S

10. Higgins JPTAD, Stern JAC (2011) Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration,

 Moher D LA, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009) Preferred Reporting Itmes for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. Annals of Internal Medicine 151 (4):264-269

12. Buehlmeier J, Frings-Meuthen P, Remer T, Maser-Gluth C, Stehle P, Biolo G, Heer M (2012) Alkaline salts to counteract bone resorption and protein wasting induced by high salt intake: results of a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 97 (12):4789-4797. doi:10.1210/jc.2012-2857

13. Ceglia L, Harris SS, Abrams SA, Rasmussen HM, Dallal GE, Dawson-Hughes B (2009) Potassium bicarbonate attenuates the urinary nitrogen excretion that accompanies an increase in dietary protein and may promote calcium absorption. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 94 (2):645-653

14. Dawson-Hughes B, Harris SS, Palermo NJ, Castaneda-Sceppa C, Rasmussen HM, Dallal GE (2009) Treatment with potassium bicarbonate lowers calcium excretion and bone resorption in older men and women. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 94 (1):96-102

15. Frassetto L, Morris RC, Sebastian A (2005) Long-term persistence of the urine calcium-lowering effect of potassium bicarbonate in postmenopausal women. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 90 (2):831-834. doi:10.1210/jc.2004-1350

16. He FJ, Marciniak M, Carney C, Markandu ND, Anand V, Fraser WD, Dalton RN, Kaski JC,
MacGregor GA (2010) Effects of potassium chloride and potassium bicarbonate on endothelial
function, cardiovascular risk factors, and bone turnover in mild hypertensives. Hypertension 55
(3):681-688. doi:10.1161/hypertensionaha.109.147488

17. Lemann J, Gray RW, Pleuss JA (1989) Potassium bicarbonate, but not sodium bicarbonate,
reduces urinary calcium excretion and improves calcium balance in healthy men Kidney International
35 (2):688-695. doi:10.1038/ki.1989.40

 Sebastian A, Morris RC (1994) Improved mineral balance and skeletal metabolism in postmenopausal women treated with potassium bicarbonate. New England Journal of Medicine 330:1176-1181. doi:10.1056/nejm199407283310421

19. Macdonald HM, Black AJ, Aucott L, Duthie G, Duthie S, Sandison R, Hardcastle AC, New SAL, Fraser WD, Reid DM (2008) Effect of potassium citrate supplementation or increased fruit and vegetable intake on bone metabolism in healthy postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled trial. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 88 (2):465-474

20. Karp HJ, Ketola ME, Lamberg-Allardt CJE (2009) Acute effects of calcium carbonate, calcium citrate and potassium citrate on markers of calcium and bone metabolism in young women. British Journal of Nutrition 102 (9):1341-1347

21. Jehle S, Hulter HN, Krapf R (2013) Effect of potassium citrate on bone density, microarchitecture, and fracture risk in healthy older adults without osteoporosis: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 98 (1):207-217. doi:10.1210/jc.2012-3099

22. Moseley KF, Weaver CM, Appel L, Sebastian A, Sellmeyer DE (2013) Potassium citrate supplementation results in sustained improvement in calcium balance in older men and women. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research 28 (3):497-504. doi:10.1002/jbmr.1764

23. Sakhaee K, Nicar M, Hill K, Pak CYC (1983) Contrasting effects of potassium citrate and sodium citrate therapies on urinary chemistries and crystallization of stone -forming salts Kidney International 24(3):348-352. doi:10.1038/ki.1983.165

24. Sakhaee K, Maalouf NM, Abrams SA, Pak CYC (2005) Effects of potassium alkali and calcium supplementation on bone turnover in postmenopausal women. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 90 (6):3528-3533. doi:10.1210/jc.2004-2451

25. Sellmeyer DE, Schloetter M, Sebastian A (2002) Potassium citrate prevents increased urine calcium excretion and bone resorption induced by a high sodium chloride diet. Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism 87 (5):2008-2012. doi:10.1210/jc.87.5.2008

26. Frassetto LA, Nash E, Morris RC, Sebastian A (2000) Comparative effects of potassium chloride and bicarbonate on thiazide-induced reduction in urinary calcium excretion. Kidney International 58 (2):748-752. doi:10.1046/j.1523-1755.2000.00221.x

27. Jehle S, Zanetti A, Muser J, Hulter HN, Krapf R (2006) Partial neutralization of the acidogenic western diet with potassium citrate increases bone mass in postmenopausal women with osteopenia. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology 17 (11):3213-3222.

doi:10.1681/asn.2006030233

28. Rafferty K, Heaney RP (2008) Nutrient effects on the calcium economy: Emphasizing the potassium controversy. Journal of Nutrition 138 (1):166S-171S

29. Frassetto LA, Lanham-New SA, Macdonald HM, Remer T, Sebastian A, Tucker KL, Tylavsky FA (2007) Standardizing terminology for estimating the diet-dependent net acid load to the metabolic system. Journal of Nutrition 137 (6):1491-1492

30. Maurer M, Muser J, Riesen WF, Hulter HN, Krapf R (2002) Alkali-induced neutralization of the acidogenic western diet inhibits bone resorption independent of potassium intake and red uces cortisol secretion in humans. Journal of the American Society of Nephrology 13:387A-387A 31. Vezzoli G, Soldati L, Arcidiacono T, Terranegra A, Biasion R, Russo CR, Lauretani F, Bandinelli S, Bartali B, Cherubini A, Cusi D, Ferrucci L (2005) Urinary calcium is a determinant of bone mineral density in elderly men participating in the InCHIANTI study. Kidney International 67 (5):2006-2014. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1755.2005.00302.x

32. New SA, MacDonald HM, Campbell MK, Martin JC, Garton MJ, Robins SP, Reid DM (2004) Lower estimates of net endogenous noncarbonic acid production are positively associated with indexes of bone health in premenopausal and perimenopausal women. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 79 (1):131-138

33. Shi L, Libuda L, Schoenau E, Frassetto L, Remer T (2012) Long term higher urinary calcium excretion within the normal physiologic range predicts impaired bone status of the proximal radius

in healthy children with higher potential renal acid load. Bone 50 (5):1026-1031.

doi:10.1016/j.bone.2012.01.026

34. Frassetto LA, Hardcastle AC, Sebastian A, Aucott L, Fraser WD, Reid DM, Macdonald HM (2012) No evidence that the skeletal non-response to potassium alkali supplements in healthy postmenopausal women depends on blood pressure or sodium chloride intake. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition 66 (12):1315-1322. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2012.151

35. Remer T, Shi L, Alexy U (2011) Potential renal acid load may more strongly affect bone size and mass than volumetric bone mineral density. Bone 48 (2):414-415. doi:10.1016/j.bone.2010.09.003

#### **Figures**



# Fig.1: Summary of study selection: PRISMA statement flow diagram

\*Studies included in secondary analysis of KHCO3 or KCitr vs KCl

#### Figure 2

#### KHCO3

#### KCitr

175 100.0%

23 5 154 85 18 180 14 26 42 15.0% 11.0% 15.1% 13.8% 95% CI

#### a Calcium excretion

		HCO3		p	lacebo			Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Diffe	rence	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Random, 9	5% CI	
Buehlmeier 2012	6.32	1.27	8	7.17	1.42	8	13.5%	-0.60 [-1.61, 0.41]				
Ceglia 2009	1.3	26.8	9	20.3	52.4	10	13.8%	-0.43 [-1.34, 0.48]		-+		
Dawson-Hughes 2009	-12.63	8.34	37	21.27	7.27	44	14.2%	-4.32 [-5.13, -3.51]				
Frassetto 2005	0.108	0.093	22	0.113	0.073	42	15.0%	-0.06 [-0.58, 0.45]		+		
He 2010	3.7	1.8	42	4.4	2.2	42	15.2%	-0.35 [-0.78, 0.09]		-		
Lemann 1989	3.5	1.9	9	4.4	2	9	13.7%	-0.44 [-1.38, 0.50]		-+		
Sebastian 1994	4.3	2.025	18	5.9	0.15	18	14.5%	-1.09 [-1.80, -0.38]		-		
Total (95% CI)			145			173	100.0%	-1.03 [-2.03, -0.03]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 1.	66; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 86.62	df = 6	(P < 0.0	00001);	1º = 939	X6					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.03 (F	= 0.04	5						-10	-5 0		10

#### b NAE

	KHCO3			pl	acebo			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Rande	om, 95% Cl	
Ceglia 2009	-23.1	22	9	33.9	8.2	10	25.2%	-3.36 [-4.85, -1.86]			
Dawson-Hughes 2009	-33.94	3.09	37	1.84	2.7	44	24.4%	-12.29 [-14.28, -10.30]			
Lemann 1989	6	13	9	55	9	9	24.7%	-4.17 [-5.97, -2.38]	-8-		
Sebastian 1994	12.8	21.8	18	70.9	10.1	18	25.8%	-3.34 [-4.39, -2.30]	*		
Total (95% CI)			73			81	100.0%	-5.73 [-9.30, -2.16]	+		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 12	2.58; Chi	2 = 65.1	77, df =	3 (P <	0.0000	D1); I <sup>2</sup> =	95%		100 40	4	
Test for overall effect: Z	-20 -10	Control	20								

	к	Citrate		Pl	aceb			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	I IV, Random, 95% CI	
Jehle 2013	-1.6	23	85	33.7	15	84	36.7%	-1.81 [-2.17, -1.45]		
Moseley 2012	-39.8	31.34	17	-5.6	14	18	36.0%	-1.39 [-2.14, -0.64]	e	
Sellmeyer 2002	-60	5	26	-3	3	26	27.3%	-13.62 [-16.39, -10.84]		
Total (95% CI)			128			128	100.0%	-4.88 [-7.73, -2.04]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	5.70; Cł Z = 3.36	$hi^2 = 70.$ (P = 0.	47, df = 0008)	2 (P <	0.000	001); I <sup>p</sup>	= 97%		-20 -10 0 10 KCitrate Control	20

#### c NTX

	KH	CO3		pl	acebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% CI	
Buehlmeier 2012	1,051.56	354	8	1,141.46	293.16	8	0.1%	-89.90 [-408.40, 228.60]	·	
Ceglia 2009	-2	5.8	9	-0.6	14	10	32.1%	-1.40 [-10.87, 8.07]	+	
Dawson-Hughes 2009	-8.21	1.97	37	2.28	1.72	44	67.9%	-10.49 [-11.30, -9.68]	B4	
Total (95% CI)			54			62	100.0%	-7.62 [-14.97, -0.26]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>e</sup> = 20 Test for overall effect: Z	0.60; Chi <sup>e</sup> = = 2.03 (P =	3.75, 0.04)	df = 2 (	P = 0.15);	12 = 47%				-200 -100 0 100 200 KHCO3 Control	

#### d Combined formation markers\*

	KHCO3			placebo				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Rar	dom, 9	5% CI	
Ceglia 2009	6.6	2.9	9	6.9	4.3	10	12.9%	-0.08 [-0.98, 0.82]			-		
He 2010	19	5.4	46	18.8	5.2	46	62.7%	0.04 [-0.37, 0.45]			雷		
Sebastian 1994	6.1	2.8	18	5.5	2.8	18	24.4%	0.21 [-0.45, 0.86]					
Total (95% CI)			73			74	100.0%	0.06 [-0.26, 0.39]			•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; CI	1i <sup>2</sup> = (	0.30, df	= 2 (P :	= 0.80	5); I <sup>2</sup> = 1	0%		-4	-2	6	2	4
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.39	(P =	0.70)							KHCC	13 Con	trol	

#### \*Specific bone formation markers used for comparisons

Ceglia	Osteocalcin ng/ml
He	$\Delta$ Osteocalcin $\mu/L$
Sebastian	Osteocalcin ng/ml

0111000112000				00			0.070	0.00 [.0.00, 0.00]	
ellmeyer 2002	2	1.7	26	6.4	1.4	26	96.1%	-4.40 [-5.25, -3.55]	
otal (95% CI)		1	141			140	100.0%	-4.36 [-5.19, -3.53]	•
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0 est for overall effect: 2	0.00; Chi <sup>a</sup> = 1. : = 10.29 (P <	22, df = 3 ( 0.00001)	P = 0.75)	$I^{\pm}=0\%$					-20 -10 0 10 20 KCitr Control

	n 1	Citrate			lacebo			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
tudy or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IN IN	, Random, 95	% CI	
shle 2013	9.8	3.9	85	9.7	3.2	84	20.3%	0.03 [-0.27, 0.33]		+		
arp 2009	-0.1417	1.03607	12	0.5308	1.38326	12	13.5%	+0.53 [+1.35, 0.29]		+		
acdonald 2008	-2	15.4	50	-2.3	8.3	47	19.1%	0.02 [-0.37, 0.42]		+		
oseley 2012	-1.8	3.3	17	-0.95	3.39	18	15.5%	-0.25 [-0.91, 0.42]		-+-		
akhaee K 2005	6.9	2.3	18	7.1	2.8	18	15.6%	-0.08 [-0.73, 0.58]		-		
elimeyer 2002	-0.22	0.23	26	-0.57	0.21	26	16.0%	1.57 [0.94, 2.19]			-	
otal (95% CI)			208			205	100.0%	0.14 [-0.34, 0.62]		•		
eterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.27; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 24.94. 0	if = 5 (F	P = 0.000	1); I <sup>2</sup> = 80	%			-		1	+
est for overall effect :	Z = 0.57 (I	P = 0.57)								KCitr Cont	nal la	

Jehle	BAP µmol/L
Karp	∆BAP U/L
MacDonald	∆P1NP µg/L
Moseley	∆BAP ng/ml
Sakhaee	Osteocalcin ng/ml
Sellmeyer	∆Osteocalcin ng/ml

# Fig.2: Forest plots for effects of KHCO<sub>3</sub> and KCitr supplementation on calcium excretion, NAE and bone turnover markers

a, b, d: squares represent standardised mean difference (SMD) (95% CI), with total SMD represented by diamonds

c: squares represent mean difference (95% CI), with total mean difference represented by diamonds

T H T

# Effect of KCitr on BMD

#### a LS2-3

	KCitrate			P	lacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Jehle 2013	1.134	0.21	85	1.08	0.2	84	99.8%	0.05 [-0.01, 0.12]	
Macdonald 2008	-2.0924	3.33023	60	-1.8018	3.89853	66	0.2%	-0.29 [-1.55, 0.97]	
Total (95% Cl)			145			150	100.0%	0.05 [-0.01, 0.11]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Chi² Z = 1.69 (I		-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Control KCitr						

# b Total hip

	ĸ	Citrate		P	lacebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Jehle 2013	0.984	0.15	85	0.964	0.16	85	99.6%	0.02 [-0.03, 0.07]	
Macdonald 2008	-1.6211	2.04849	58	-1.2539	2.29547	65	0.4%	-0.37 [-1.13, 0.40]	← →
Total (95% CI)			143			150	100.0%	0.02 [-0.03, 0.07]	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect:	0.00; Chi² Z = 0.78 (I	= 0.97, df ⊃ = 0.43)	= 1 (P	= 0.32); l <sup>a</sup>	² = 0%				-0.1 -0.05 0 0.05 0.1 Control KCitr

# Fig.3: Forest plots for effect of KCitr supplementation on BMD

Squares represent mean difference (95% CI), with total mean difference represented by diamonds

#### Figure 4

#### Comparison of KHCO<sub>3</sub> or KCitr with KCI

#### a Calcium excretion

	KHCO	3 or cit	rate	KCI Std. Mean Difference		KCI		Std. Mean	Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Rando	om, 95% Cl	
Dawson-Hughes 2009	-12.63	8.34	37	14.93	7.61	40	33.1%	-3.42 [-4.14, -2.71]	-16-		
Frassetto 2000	-1.82	1.15	18	-0.8	1	13	32.9%	-0.91 [-1.66, -0.16]	-8-	-	
He 2010	3.7	1.8	42	4.3	2.3	42	34.1%	-0.29 [-0.72, 0.14]		f	
Total (95% CI)			97			95	100.0%	-1.53 [-3.41, 0.35]	-	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2.66; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 54.77, df = 2 (P < 0.00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 96% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.59 (P = 0.11)								-10 -5 KCO3 or KCitr	 0 5 KCI	10	

#### b NAE

	KHCO3 or citrate			KCI	I Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference						
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl		IV, Rar	ıdom, 9	5% CI	
Dawson-Hughes 2009	-33.94	3.09	37	0	2.81	40	32.6%	-11.40 [-13.30, -9.50]	-	0 <del>1</del>			
Frassetto 2000	-52	12	18	5	19	13	33.6%	-3.63 [-4.83, -2.43]		-8	F		
Jehle 2006	6	29.85	11	35	26.53	11	33.8%	-0.99 [-1.88, -0.09]			æ		
Total (95% CI)			66			64	100.0%	-5.27 [-10.30, -0.24]					
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 19.22; Chi² = 95.27, df = 2 (P < 0.00001); l² = 98% Test for overall effect: Z = 2.05 (P = 0.04)								-20 КСС	-10 03 or KC	0 itr KCI	10	20	

# Fig.4: Forest plots for comparison of effect of KHCO3 or KCitr with KCl

Squares represent standardised mean difference (SMD) (95% CI), with total SMD represented by diamonds

# Supplemental data

# Table 1: Characteristics of included studies

Studies using KHCO<sub>3</sub> as supplement

Study	Population:	Ν	Dose/frequency	Duration	<b>Relevant Outcome</b>	Additional information:
	Gender; age				Measures	study design; study
						conditions; additional
						supplements
Buehlmeier 2012 (12)	Μ	8	90mmol/d	10 days	NTX, CTX	Randomised cross-over
	mean 26 yrs (SD 4)				BAP, P1NP	trial.
					UCaexcr	High Na-induced metabolic
						acidosis (2.6mmol NaCl/kg
						bm/d); 400IU/d vitamin D
Ceglia 2009 (13)	M & F	19	90mmol/d	41 days	UCaexcr	RCT
	54-82 yrs				NAE	High/low protein diet
					NTX	
					Osteocalcin	
Dawson-Hughes 2009	M & F	171	67.5mmol/d	84 days	UCaexcr	RCT
(14)	50 yrs+				NAE	600mg/d Ca triphospate;
					NTX	525IU/d vitamin D
					Osteocalcin	
Frassetto 2005 (15)	PM	170	30/60/90mmol/d	3yrs	UCaexcr	RCT
	64-70 yrs					

						400IU/d vitamin D; CaCO <sub>3</sub>
He 2010 (16)	M & F	42	64mmol/d	4 weeks	UCaexcr	Crossover RCT
	18-75 yrs				CTX, PYD, DPD	Subjects had mild
					Osteocalcin, BAP,	hypertension
					P1NP	
Lemann 1989 (17)	М	9	60mmol/d	12 days	UCaexcr	Metabolic balance study
	23-46yrs				NAE	6 subjects on low Ca diets,
					Hydroxyproline	of these 3 were
						supplemented with calcitriol
						0.5µg 6-hourly
Sebastian 1994 (18)	PM	18	60-120mmol/d	18 days	UCaExcr	Metabolic balance study
	51-77 yrs				NAE	
	-				Hydroxyproline	
					Osteocalcin	

Studies using KCitr as supplement

Study	Population	Ν	Dose/frequency	Duration	<b>Relevant Outcome</b>	Additional information
					Measures	Study design; study
						conditions; additional
						supplements
Karp 2009 (20)	F	12	57.5mmol/d	24 hrs	UCaExcr	Crossover study. Subjects
	20-30 yrs				NTX	were own controls
					BAP	
Jehle 2013 (21)	M & F	201	60 mEq/d	24 months	aLSBMD (DXA)	RCT
	65-80 yrs				vBMD (pQCT)	500mg Ca/d; 400IU
					UCaExcr	vitamin D
					NAE	
MacDonald 2008 (19)	PM	276	55.5mEq/d	24 months	BMD (DXA)	RCT
	55-65 yrs				UCaExcr	
					DPD	
					P1NP	
Moseley 2013 (22)	M & F	52	60/90mmol/d	6 months	UCaExcr	RCT
	55 yrs +				NAE	630mg/d calcium; 400IU
					CTX	vitamin D
					BAP	

Sakhaee 1983 (23)	Μ	5	60mEq/d	4 weeks	UCaExcr	Metabolic study.
	42-69 yrs					Subjects had uric acid
						lithiasis but adequate
						creatinine clearance.
Salahara 2005 (24)	DM	10	40mEn/d	14 down	UCaFran	Dandamiand anonanan
Saknaee 2005 (24)	PM	18	40mEq/a	14 days	UCaExcr	Randomised crossover
	48-76 yrs				NTX, CTX,	study
					Hydroxyproline	
					Osteocalcin	
					BAP	
Sellmeyer 2002 (25)	PM	60	90mmol/d	4 weeks	UCaExcr	RCT
					NAE	Subjects on high Na diet
					NTX	(225mmol/d)
					Osteocalcin	

Studies comparing KHCO3 or KCitr with KCl									
Study	Population	Ν	Dose/frequency	Duration	<b>Relevant Outcome</b>	Additional information			
					Measures	Study design; study			
						conditions; additional			
						supplements			
Dawson-Hughes 2009	M & F	77	67.5mmol/d KHCO3	84 days	UCaexcr	RCT			
(14)	50 yrs+		or KCl		NAE	600mg/d Ca triphospate;			
					NTX	525IU/d vitamin D			
					Osteocalcin				
Frassetto 2000 (26)	M & F	31	60mEq KHCO3 or	14 days	UCaexcr	RCT			
	50 yrs+		KCl		NAE	50mg/d HCTZ thiazide			
						diuretic given to all			
						subjects			
He 2010 (16)	M & F	42	64mmol/d KHCO3 or	4 weeks	UCaexcr	Crossover RCT			
	18-75 yrs		KCl		CTX, PYD, DPD	Subjects had mild			
					Osteocalcin, BAP,	hypertension			
					P1NP				
Jehle 2006 (27)	PM	161	30mmol/d KCitr or	12 months	LS BMD (DXA)	RCT			
	<70 yrs		KCl		PYR, DPD	500mg/d CaCO3; 400 IU/d			
					NAE	vitamin D <sub>3</sub>			

Abbr. M male; F female; PM postmenopausal women; UCaExcr urinary calcium excretion; aLSBMD arial lumbar spine BMD; DXA dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; vBMD volumetric BMD by pQCT; PYD pyridinoline; DPD deoxypyridinoline; HCTZ hydrochlorothiazide

# Table 2: Risk of bias summary for included studies according to Cochrane

# **Collaboration criteria** (11)

("Low": study report supports judgement of low risk of bias;: "unclear": insufficient information reported to indicate of low risk of bias)

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting
Buehlmeier 2012 (12)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low
Ceglia 2009 (13)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Dawson-Hughes 2009 (14)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Frassetto 2000 (26)	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low
Frassetto 2005 (15)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low
He 2010 (16)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Jehle 2006 (27)	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low
Jehle 2013 (21)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Karp 2009 (20)	Unclear	Low	Unclear	Low	Low

Lemann 1989 (17)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low
Macdonald 2008 (19)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Moseley 2013 (22)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Sakhaee 1983 (23)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low
Sakhaee 2005 (24)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Sebastian 1994 (19)	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low
Sellmeyer 2002 (27)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low