BMJ Open

Effects of Dietary Sodium and the DASH Diet on the Occurrence of Headaches: Results from DASH-Sodium Trial

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-006671
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-Sep-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Amer, Muhammad; Howard University Hospital, Medicine Woodward, Mark; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health Appel, Lawrence; Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Medicine
Primary Subject Heading :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Public health
Keywords:	Headache, Sodium, DASH-Sodium Trial



Effects of Dietary Sodium and the DASH Diet on the Occurrence of Headaches: Results from DASH-Sodium Trial

Muhammad Amer, Mark Woodward, Lawrence J. Appel

Author's affiliation and address:

Muhammad Amer, MD, MHS, FACP

Division of General Internal Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, 600 Wolfe St/ Osler 264 Baltimore, MD 21287 Howard University Hospital, Georgia Ave, NW, Washington, DC, 20060

Mark Woodward, PhD

Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland. USA.

George Institute for Global Health, University of Sydney, Australia Welch Center for Prevention, 2024 E. Monument Street, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287, USA

Lawrence J. Appel, MD, MPH

Welch Center for Prevention, Epidemiology, and Clinical Research. Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore, Maryland. USA

Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Welch Center for Prevention, 2024 E. Monument Street, Room 2-600, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287 USA

Declaration of competing interests: None reported by any author.

Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00000608

Financial Disclosure: Drs. Appel and Woodward were co-investigators in a trial sponsored by the McCormick Science Institute (completed in spring 2013).

Corresponding author:

Lawrence J. Appel, MD, MPH

Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology and International Health

2024 East Monument Street

Baltimore, MD 21287

tore to the set of the Office (410)-955-4156

Fax (410) 955-0476

lappel@jhmi.edu

BMJ Open

Abstract

Objectives: Headaches are a common medical problem, yet few studies, particularly trials, have evaluated therapies that might prevent or control headaches. We, thus, investigated the effects on the occurrence of headaches of three levels of dietary sodium intake and two diet patterns [the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) diet (rich in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products with reduced saturated and total fat) and a control diet (typical of Western consumption patterns).

Design: Randomized clinical trial.

Setting: Post-hoc analyses of the DASH-Sodium trial in the USA.

Participants: In a multicenter feeding study with three 30 day periods, 390 participants were randomized to the DASH or control diet. On their assigned diet, participants ate food with high sodium during one period, intermediate sodium during another period, and low sodium during another period, in random order.

Outcome measures: Occurrence and severity of headache were ascertained from self-administered questionnaires, completed at the end of each feeding period.

Results: The occurrence of headaches was similar in DASH vs. Control, at high [odds ratio (95% confidence interval) = 0.65 (0.37-1.12); p=0.12], intermediate [0.57 (0.29-1.12); p=0.10], and low [0.64 (0.36-1.13); p=0.12] sodium levels. By contrast, there was a lower risk of headache on the low, compared to high, sodium level, both on the control [0.69 (0.49 - 0.99); p = 0.05] and DASH [0.69 (0.49-0.98); p=0.04] diets.

Conclusions: A reduced sodium intake was associated with a significantly lower risk of headache, whilst dietary patterns had no effect on the risk of headaches in adults. Reduced dietary sodium intake offers a novel approach to prevent headaches.

Key words: Headache; Sodium; Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; DASH-Sodium trial

ut un. ut un. ut un. ut un. ut un protor de la construction de la cons

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Post-hoc analysis of a multicenter randomized clinical trial comparing effects of the two diet patterns using parallel design together with a three-period crossover of three levels of dietary sodium [high (150 mmol), intermediate (100 mmol), low (50 mmol)] on headaches in healthy adults with stage 1 hypertension.
- Three screening and two run-in feeding periods prior to randomization to assess participant's eligibility, compliance with dietary requirements and to estimate caloric requirements to maintain weight during study.
- Vigorous efforts made to promote adherence with assigned diets during feeding periods.
- Lack of information on the prevalence of headaches at baseline as well as type of self-reported headaches experienced by participants at the end of feeding periods.

Introduction

Worldwide, headache is a common medical problem and amongst the most frequently reported disorders of the nervous system [1-3]. Globally, 46% of adults are estimated to have an active headache disorder (42% for tension-type headaches; 11% for migraines) [2, 4-6]. Headaches affect all age groups, with a higher prevalence in women compared to men [4-6]. The direct cost of health care services, and medications for the management of headache,s is likewise substantial [7-11], as are indirect costs. Patients with frequent headaches have a poor quality of life and a higher number of days absent from work, compared with others [12-15]. Hence, successful strategies to prevent and treat headache would confer substantial benefits to afflicted individuals, as well as to society in general.

Available data support a direct association between blood pressure and the occurrence of headache [16-19]. Therefore, it is reasonable to speculate that dietary factors that lower blood pressure (e.g. reduced sodium intake and the DASH diet [20, 21]) might also reduce the occurrence of headache. However, evidence on the relationship of headaches with sodium intake and other dietary factors is sparse, with most attention focusing on the potential role of monosodium glutamate intake [22-24]. In the primary results paper of the DASH-Sodium trial, which focused on the blood pressure effects of the dietary interventions, the authors briefly comment on the occurrence of headaches in the broad context of side effects. They reported that the side effect of headache occurred in 47% of participants during the high, compared to 39 percent during the low, sodium feeding period [21]. In this paper, we expand on these preliminary observations.

BMJ Open

Methods

A detailed description of the rationale, design, and methods of the DASH-Sodium trial has been published [25]. Briefly, DASH-Sodium was a multicenter, randomized clinical trial, conducted between September 1997 and November 1999, designed to compare the effects on blood pressure of three levels of dietary sodium and two diet patterns. The study design incorporated a parallel, two-group, comparison of diet (DASH diet vs. control diet) together with a three-period crossover of the three levels of dietary sodium intake, with a primary outcome of mean systolic blood pressure (Figure 1). The three sodium levels were 1) "high" (150 mmol, at 2100 Kcal caloric intake), reflecting average consumption in the USA, 2) "intermediate" (100 mmol) reflecting the upper limit of current recommendations for adults [26], and 3) "low" (50 mmol). The DASH diet is rich in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products, high in dietary fiber, potassium, calcium and magnesium, moderately high in protein, and low in saturated fat, cholesterol, and total fat. The control diet is typical of what many in the Western world eat.

Study participants were 412 adults (age \geq 22 years) with systolic blood pressure between 120 and 159 mm Hg and diastolic blood pressure between 80 and 95 mm Hg (i.e., pre-hypertension or stage 1 hypertension). Major exclusion criteria were diabetes mellitus, evidence of active malignancy, history of cardiovascular event (angina, myocardial infarction, angioplasty, or stroke), renal insufficiency (serum creatinine > 1.2 mg/dL for females or 1.5 mg/dL for males), anemia (hematocrit at least 5 percent below normal range), pregnancy, inflammatory bowel disease, body mass index > 40 kg/m², use of antihypertensive drugs and corticosteroids, and consumption of more than 14 alcoholic beverages per week.

Three screening visits (each separated by at least seven days) were conducted to assess general eligibility and to collect baseline data. Following the screening visits, eligible participants started a two-week run-in feeding period during which they ate the control diet at the high sodium level. The run-in feeding period was designed to exclude participants who were unlikely to comply with the dietary requirements and to estimate caloric requirements needed to maintain weight. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of the two diets using a parallel-group design, and ate each of three sodium levels (feeding periods) for 30 days each, in a randomized crossover design. Participants were not notified of their assigned dietary pattern or sodium sequence.

During feeding periods (run-in and intervention), participants were required to eat at least one meal per day on site at the clinical center, five days per week, and to take food home for other meals. Participants were expected to eat all of their food and were instructed to record the type and amount of any uneaten study food. Caffeinated beverages and alcohol were limited and monitored. Individual energy intake (calorie content) was adjusted so that each participant's weight during each feeding period remained stable.

Data collection staff were masked to randomized sodium and diet sequence. Measurements were obtained during screening and at the end of each feeding period. Blood pressure was measured in a seated position, using the right arm of participants. Twenty-four hour urine (for analysis of sodium, potassium, urea nitrogen, and creatinine) and body weight were also collected. Compliance with the feeding protocol was assessed by urinary excretion of sodium, potassium, phosphorus, urea nitrogen, and creatinine, estimated from 24 hour urine collections.

BMJ Open

Symptoms (side effects) including headache, bloating, dry mouth, excessive thirst, fatigue or low energy, lightheadedness, nausea, and change in taste, were collected via self-administered questionnaires (see Supplement) completed during the last seven days of each sodium feeding period. For each symptom, potential responses were (1) "none" for not experiencing any symptom, (2) "mild" if symptom occurred but did not interfere with usual activities, (3) "moderate" if symptom occurred and somewhat interfered with usual activities, and (4) "severe" if participants were unable to perform usual activities due to the symptom.

This analysis of the DASH-Sodium trial included 390 (95%) of the 412 randomized participants. Excluded participants were those with missing information on headaches in any of the 3 feeding periods. For the primary analysis in this study, headache was defined as "any headache" (mild, moderate or severe) during the last seven days of each feeding period. Subsequently, we report frequency of headache by severity.

The means and proportions between groups were explored using t-tests and chi-square tests, respectively. A non-parametric test was used for trends in the frequency of headache by sodium intake. Since multiple observations were obtained on each participant, we used generalized estimating equation models [27], with a logit link and binomial error and an exchangeable covariance structure, to model the odds of a headache. Models were adjusted for age, sex, race, clinical site, systolic blood pressure, body mass index, smoking status, and carryover effects from the previous period. To address the qualitative consistency and benefit-hazard profiles between participants, subgroup analysis by diet stratified by age, sex, race, obesity (BMI \ge 30 kg/m² v not) and hypertension (blood pressure \ge 140/90 mmHg v not)

status at baseline were also performed. Interactions between subgroups were tested by the addition of an interaction term to the main effects model.

Institutional review boards at the participating centers and an external data and safety monitoring committee approved the trial protocol and consent procedures. Each participant provided written, informed consent.

A p-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed using Stata version 12.1 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

The 390 participants included in our analyses were those with completed symptoms questionnaires - 192 (94%) of the 204 participants assigned to the control diet and 198 (95%) of the 208 participants assigned to the DASH diet. Clinical and demographic characteristics of the two groups were similar (Table 1).

Figure 2 displays the distribution of headaches by sodium level and assigned diet. The highest occurrence of headache was reported by participants on the control diet with high sodium (47%) and the lowest by participants on the DASH diet with low sodium level (36%). On both diets, the number of headaches reported was greatest for the high sodium level and least on the low sodium level.

Among those assigned to the control diet, mean (SD) urinary sodium excretion was 141 (55), 106 (43) and 64 (37) mmol per 24 hours during the high, intermediate, and low sodium feeding periods,

BMJ Open

respectively. In the DASH diet group, mean (SD) urinary sodium levels were 144 (57), 107 (52) and 67 (46) mmol per 24 hour during the high, intermediate, and low sodium feeding periods, respectively. On each sodium level, mean urinary sodium excretion was similar in those assigned to the two diets (each p > 0.05). Mean urinary potassium and urea nitrogen were higher in the DASH diet group, reflecting the higher vegetable, dairy, and protein content of the DASH diet compared with the control diet, at each sodium level (Table 2).

Table 3 shows differences in the odds of headache by diet and sodium level. Compared to the high sodium level, we observed a lower odds of any headache during the low sodium period both on the control diet (adjusted OR: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.49-0.99) and the DASH diet (adjusted OR: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.49-0.98). Although the relationship appeared graded (Figure 2), there was no significant difference between the intermediate level of sodium and either the low or high sodium levels, on either diet. There was no significant association of diet pattern (DASH vs. Control) with headache on any sodium level. There was also no significant interaction between diet and sodium on the occurrence of headaches (p-interaction > 0.05). Compared to the control diet with high sodium, there was a reduced risk of a headache on the DASH diet with low sodium (adjusted OR = 0.64, 95% CI: 0.41 - 0.99, p = 0.05).

While on control diet, the number of persons who reported a severe headache was 4 (2.1%) during high, 1 (0.5%) during intermediate, and 1 (0.5%) during low sodium periods, respectively (p for trend = 0.13). On DASH diet, the corresponding number of persons who reported a severe headache was 8 (4%) during high, 2 (1%) during intermediate, and 3 (1.5%) during low sodium periods, respectively (p for

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

There was no evidence that the relationship between sodium levels and headache was modified by age, sex, race, baseline BMI or blood pressure (Figure 3).

Discussion

In this secondary analysis of the DASH-Sodium trial, which enrolled adults with pre- and stage 1 hypertension, a reduced dietary sodium intake was associated with a lower risk of headache, both on the control diet and the DASH diet. In contrast, the risk of headache was similar on the DASH and control diets.

The epidemiological literature on headaches in adults is limited [1, 2, 6]. However, it is well-recognized that, compared to normotensive individuals, individuals with hypertension have a higher frequency of headaches [16-19, 28]. Of note, Cooper *et al* reported a direct relationship of headaches with both systolic and diastolic blood pressure [17]. As regards trials, in a pooled analysis that included seven double–blinded, randomized placebo controlled trials of Ibesartan therapy, Hansson *et al* found a direct relationship of diastolic blood pressure with incident headaches in 2673 patients with mild to moderate hypertension [29].

BMJ Open

The association between dietary sodium intake and blood pressure is also well recognized [30, 31]. The DASH diet alone and in combination with reduced sodium intake lowers blood pressure in patients with or without hypertension [20, 21]. It is noteworthy that there was no significant relationship between diet pattern and headache. This suggests that a process that is independent of a blood pressure may mediate the relationship between sodium and headaches.

Our results contrast with the popular belief that a diet rich in fruits, vegetables and potassium and low in saturated and total fat may ease the frequency, or even prevent, headache [32]. Several dietary factors, including fasting, alcoholic drinks, chocolate, coffee, and cheese, appear to trigger vascular headache (cluster or migraine) in adults [33-36]. In some studies, an increased intake of monosodium glutamate is associated with the occurrence of headaches [22-24]. However, a recent review concluded that evidence on the relationship of sodium glutamate intake and headaches is inconsistent [37]. In one study of 200 adults (mean age 37.7 years, 81% females), monosodium glutamate was identified as a trigger for migraine headache in only 5 (2.5%) of study participants [36]. However, data on the relationship between sodium intake and any form of headaches are sparse.

The results of this study provide encouraging evidence in support of dietary recommendations to lower sodium intake: recommendations which are currently based on the relationship of sodium intake with blood pressure. The daily intake of sodium in adults living in the United States is already in excess of their physiological need and for many individuals, is much higher than the highest level tested in this study [38, 39]. Our results also support the recent World Health Organization guidelines for reducing sodium intake to less than 87 mmol/day [40] and American Heart Association guidelines for reducing sodium intake to 65 mmol/day [31].

Strengths of our study include its randomized controlled design comparing two diets using a parallel design and a three-period crossover of three levels of dietary sodium (high, intermediate, and low). Dietary intake during the feeding periods was closely monitored and vigorous efforts were made to promote adherence with assigned diets. The participants of this study were healthy, non-institutionalized, racially diverse, middle- and older-aged men and women. Hence we believe that these results are applicable to a large fraction of adults.

Our study also has limitations. Information on the prevalence of headache at baseline from eligible participants was lacking. In addition, there was no information about the type of headache (tension, cluster or migraine) experienced by study participants. However, we suspect that most of the headaches were tension headaches. Whether a reduced sodium intake can prevent vascular headache is unknown. Second, the instrument was administered just once in each feeding period and does not allow calculation of an event rate, such as person-days of headaches. Third, these are secondary, post-hoc analyses from a trial that was not explicitly designed to test the effects of dietary factors on headaches. Nonetheless, a rigorously controlled feeding study designed to test the effects of dietary factors on occurrence of headaches would be extremely expensive and logistically challenging. Fourth, our results likely underestimate the relationship of sodium intake with headaches. The range of sodium intake was relatively narrow - the highest sodium group in our trial actually corresponds to the average in the USA and is much lower than the intake in many countries, particularly in Asia. Self-report of symptoms is inherently imprecise and could bias results to the null, given that a validated instrument was not used for patient-reported headache.

<text> In conclusion, a reduced sodium intake was associated with significantly lower risk of headache, while diet patterns had no effect on the risk of headaches. A reduced dietary sodium intake offers a novel approach to prevent headache in adults. Additional studies are needed to replicate these findings and to explore mechanisms that mediate the association between sodium intake and headache.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Contribution statement: All three authors (Muhammad Amer, Mark Woodward, and Lawrence Appel)

equally participated in the drafting and editing of the manuscript. Muhammad Amer, did analyses of

the data.

Competing interests: None reported by any author

Funding: This study received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Data sharing: No additional data available to share.

References

- 1- Benbir G, Karadeniz D, Göksan B. The characteristics and subtypes of headache in relation to age and gender in a rural community in Eastern Turkey. Agri. 2012 Oct; 24(4):145-52
- 2- Stovner Lj, Hagen K, Jensen R et al. The global burden of headache: a documentation of headache prevalence and disability worldwide. Cephalalgia. 2007 Mar; 27(3):193-210.
- Andlin-Sobocki P, Jönsson B, Wittchen HU, Olesen J. Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe.
 Eur J Neurol. 2005 Jun; 12 Suppl 1:1-27
- Jensen R, Stovner LJ. Epidemiology and comorbidity of headache. Lancet Neurol. 2008 Apr;
 7(4):354-61.
- 5- Zwart JA, Dyb G, Holmen TL, Stovner LJ, Sand T. The prevalence of migraine and tension-type headaches among adolescents in Norway: The Nord- Trøndelag Health Study (Head-Hunt).
 Cephalalgia. 2004 May; 24(5):373-9
- 6- Rasmussen BK. Epidemiology of headache. Cephalalgia. 2001 Sep; 21(7):774-7.
- 7- Berg J, Stovner LJ. Cost of migraine and other headaches in Europe. Eur J Neurol 2005; 12 (suppl 1): 59–62.
- 8- Rasmussen BK, Jensen R, Olesen J. Impact of headache on sickness absence and utilisation of medical services: a Danish population study. J Epidemiol Community Health 1992; 46: 443–46
- 9- Lyngberg AC, Rasmussen BK, Jensen R, et al. Secular changes in health care utilization and work absence for migraine and tension type headache. A population based study. J Epidemiol Com Health 2005; 20: 1007–14.

- 10- Von Korff M, Stewart W, Lipton RB. Assessing headache severity: new directions. Neurology1998; 44 (Suppl 4):40–6.
- 11- Michel P, Dartiques J, Duru G, Moreau J, Salamon R, Henry P. Incremental absenteeism due to headache in migraine: results from the Mig-Access French National Cohort. Cephalalgia. 1999 Jun; 19(5):503-10.
- 12- Vinding GR, Zeeberg P, Lyngberg A, Nielsen RT, Jensen R. The burden of headache in a patient population from a specialized headache centre. Cephalalgia. 2007 Mar; 27(3):263-70.
- 13- Medizabel JE, Rothrock JF. An interregional comparative study of headache clinic populations. Cephalalgia. 1998 Jan; 18(1):57-9.
- 14- Saper JR, Lake AE, Madden SF, Kreeger C. Comprehensive/tertiary care for headache: a 6month outcome study. Headache. 1999 Apr; 39(4):249-63.
- 15-Bussone G, Usai S, Grazzi L, Rigamonti A, Solari A, D'Amico D. Disability and quality of life in different primary headaches: results from Italian studies. Neurol Sci. 2004 Oct; 25 Suppl 3:S105-7.
- 16- Kruszewski P, Bieniaszewski L, Neubauer J, Krupa-Wojciechowska B. Headache in patients with mild to moderate hypertension is generally not associated with simultaneous blood pressure elevation. J Hypertens. 2000 Apr; 18(4):437-44.
- 17- Cooper WD, Glover DR, Hormbrey JM, Kimber GR. Headache and blood pressure: evidence of a close relationship. J Hum Hypertens. 1989 Feb; 3(1):41-4.
- 18- Janeway TC. A clinical study of hypertensive cardiovascular disease. Arch Intern Med. 1913;
 12: 755–798
- 19-Barlow DH, Beevers DG, Hawthorne VM, Watt HD, Young GA. Blood pressure measurement at screening and in general practice. Br Heart J. 1977 Jan; 39(1):7-12.
- 20- Appel LJ, Moore TJ, Obarzanek E et al. A clinical trial of the effects of dietary patterns on blood pressure. DASH Collaborative Research Group. N Engl J Med. 1997 Apr 17; 336(16):1117-24.

BMJ Open

	19 P a g e
its reduction by irbesartan therapy. Arch Intern	Med. 2000 Jun 12; 160 (11):1654-8.
29-Hansson L, Smith DH, Reeves R, Lapuerta P.	Headache in mild-to-moderate hypertension and
Swedish women. Acta Med Scand. 1983; 213(3):183-90.
antihypertensive treatment. A cross-sectional a	nd longitudinal population study of middle-aged
28- Sigurdsson JA, Bengtsson C. Symptoms and si	gns in relation to blood pressure and
1986;73:13-22	
27-Liang K-Y, Zeger SL. Longitudinal data analy	sis using generalized linear models. Biometrika
Med 1998; 158:573.	
Treatment of High Blood Pressure. Arch Interr	Med 1997; 157: 2413-46. [Erratum, Arch Intern
26- The sixth report of the Joint National Committ	ee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and
Am Diet Assoc. 1999 Aug; 99(8 Suppl):S96-1	04.
Trial (DASH-sodium): rationale and design. D	ASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. J
25- Svetkey LP, Sacks FM, Obarzanek E et al. The	DASH Diet, Sodium Intake and Blood Pressure
Israel J Med Sci 1984;20:252-3	
24-Ratner D, Eshel E, Shoshani E. Adverse effect	s of monosodium glutamate: a diagnostic problem
(sucrose) and monosodium glutamate of beet o	rigin. J Lab Clin Med 1950; 36:407-17.
23- Randolph TG, Rollins JP. Beet sensitivity: all	ergic reactions from the ingestion of beet sugar
Immunol. 1997 Jun; 99(6 Pt 1):757-62.	
complex: assessment in a double-blind, placeb	o-controlled, randomized study. J Allergy Clin
22- Yang WH, Drouin MA, Herbert M, Mao Y, Ka	arsh J. The monosodium glutamate symptom
Jan 4;344(1):3-10	
Hypertension (DASH) diet. DASH-Sodium Co	llaborative Research Group. N Engl J Med. 2001
Effects on blood pressure of reduced dietary so	dium and the Dietary Approaches to Stop
21- Sacks I W, Svetkey LI, Volliner WW et al, D	ASIT-Sourum Conaborative Research Oroup.

- 30- Aburto NJ, Ziolkovska A, Hooper L, Elliott P, Cappuccio FP, Meerpohl JJ. Effect of lower sodium intake on health: systematic review and meta-analyses. BMJ. 2013 Apr 3; 346:f1326.
- 31- Appel LJ, Brands MW, Daniels SR, Karanja N, Elmer PJ, Sacks FM; American Heart Association. Dietary approaches to prevent and treat hypertension: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. Hypertension. 2006 Feb; 47(2):296-308.
- 32-Buchholz, David. Heal Your Headache: The 1-2-3 Program for Taking Charge of Your Headaches. New York: Workman, 2002.
- 33- Savi L, Rainero I, Valfrè W, Gentile S, Lo Giudice R, Pinessi L. Food and headache attacks. A comparison of patients with migraine and tension-type headache. Panminerva Med. 2002 Mar; 44(1):27-31.
- 34- Peatfield RC. Relationships between food, wine, and beer-precipitated migrainous headaches.Headache. 1995 Jun; 35(6):355-7.
- 35- Carod-Artal FJ, Ezpeleta D, Martín-Barriga ML, Guerrero AL. Triggers, symptoms, and treatment in two populations of migraneurs in Brazil and Spain. A cross-cultural study. J Neurol Sci. 2011 May 15; 304(1-2):25-8.
- 36-Fukui PT, Gonçalves TR, Strabelli CG et al. Trigger factors in migraine patients. Arq Neuropsiquiatr. 2008 Sep; 66(3A):494-9.
- 37- Freeman M. Reconsidering the effects of monosodium glutamate: a literature review. J Am Acad Nurse Pract. 2006 Oct; 18(10):482-6.
- 38- Brown IJ, Tzoulaki I, Candeias V, Elliott P. Salt intakes around the world: implications for public health. Int J Epidemiol. 2009 Jun; 38(3):791-813.
- 39- National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Division for Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention Fact sheet; http://www.cdc.gov/salt/pdfs/Sodium_Fact_Sheet.pdf. Accessed September 28, 2013.

U	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	40- WHO. Guideline: So (WHO), 2012. FIGURE LEGEND:
17 18 19 20 21	Figure 1: DASH-Sodium T
21 22 23 24 25	Figure 2: Frequency of nea
26 27 28 29	(a): Odds of headacl
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 57	(b): Odds of headac
60	For peer review

Frial Flow Diagram

dache by diet and sodium level.

he (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in the DASH diet

the (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in the Control diet

2
2
3
4
5
6
7
2
8
9
10
11
10
12
13
14
15
10
10
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
20
24
25
26
27
20
28
29
30
31
201
32
33
34
35
26
30
37
38
39
10
40
41
42
43
ΔΔ
45
40
46
47
48
40
49
50
51
51 52
51 52
51 52 53
51 52 53 54
51 52 53 54 55
51 52 53 54 55 56
51 52 53 54 55 56 57
51 52 53 54 55 56 57
51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58

1

Characteristic	Control Diet (n=192)	DASH Diet (n=198)	Total (n=390)
Age (years)	49 (10)	47 (10)	48 (10)
Females, n (%)	104 (54)	118 (60)	222 (57)
Race, n (%)			
Caucasian	78 (41)	81 (41)	159 (41)
African American	109 (57)	114 (57)	223 (57)
Other	5 (3)	3 (2)	8 (2)
Body Mass Index, (kg/m ²)	30 (5)	29 (5)	29.2 (5)
Systolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	135 (9)	134 (9)	135 (9)
Diastolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	86 (4)	85 (5)	86 (4)
Hypertension, n (%) †	76 (40)	79 (40)	155 (40)
Current Smoker, n (%)	21 (11)	21 (11)	42 (11)

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of participants in DASH-Sodium trial[Number (percentage) or mean (standard deviation)]

[†]Hypertension was defined as an average systolic blood pressure of 140 mm of Hg or an average diastolic blood pressure of 90 mmHg during the three screening visits.

Table 2: Urinary excretion according to sodium level and diet[Mean (standard deviation)]

	Level of sodium						
	High		Interm	Intermediate		Low	
	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	
Sodium		6					
gram/day	3.3 (1.3)	3.2 (1.3)	2.5 (1.2)	2.4 (0.9)	1.5 (1.1)	1.5 (0.8)	
mmol/day	144 (57)	141 (55)	107 (52)	106 (43)	67 (46)	64 (37)	
Potassium							
gram/day	3.0 (1.1)	1.6 (0.5)	3.2 (1.2)	1.6 (0.5)	3.2(1.1)	1.6 (0.5)	
mmol/day	76 (27)	40 (14)	82 (31)	41 (14)	81 (29)	41 (14)	
Urea Nitrogen gram/day	11.5 (4)	9.5 (3.2)	12.4 (4.5)	9.7 (3.4)	12 (4)	10 (3.3)	
Creatinine gram/day	1.4 (0.5)	1.5 (0.5)	1.5 (0.6)	1.5 (0.6)	1.4 (0.5)	1.5 (0.6)	

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Table 3: Odds ratio of headaches by diet and sodium sequence				
	Odds ratio (95 %CI)	<i>p</i> value		
Sodium effects on the DASH diet				
Intermediate v high sodium	0.72 (0.51-1.01)	0.06		
Low v intermediate sodium	0.96 (0.68-1.37)	0.85		
Low <i>v</i> high sodium	0.69 (0.49-0.98)	0.04		
Sodium effects on the control diet				
Intermediate v high sodium	0.81 (0.57-1.15)	0.24		
Low <i>v</i> intermediate sodium	0.86 (0.59-1.24)	0.42		
Low <i>v</i> high sodium	0.69 (0.49-0.99)	0.05		
Diet effects (DASH vs Control) at each sodium level				
On high sodium	0.65 (0.37-1.12)	0.12		
On intermediate sodium	0.57 (0.29-1.12)	0.10		
On low sodium	0.64 (0.36-1.13)	0.12		
Low Sodium on DASH vs High Sodium on Control	0.64 (0.14-0.99)	0.05		

Models adjusted for age, sex, race, site, systolic blood pressure, BMI, smoking status and carry

over effects from the previous period. CI =confidence interval.

Table 4: Occurrence and severity of headache by sodium level and diet, n (%)

			Level	of sodium		
	Hi	gh	Intern	nediate	L	OW
	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)
Mild	60 (30)	70 (36)	43 (22)	62 (32)	53 (27)	53 (28)
Moderate	17 (9)	17 (9)	31 (16)	16 (8)	16 (8)	21 (11)
Severe	8 (4)	4 (2)	2 (1)	1 (0.5)	3 (1)	1 (0.5)



*Participants with complete questionnaire data on headaches in all 3 periods.



Page	28	of	28
------	----	----	----

Age (years) < 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Sex Women Hypertension Yes No Overall Sex Women Men Race Women Hypertension Yes No Overall Sex Women Men Race Women Sex No Overall Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) Solution Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) Solution Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) Solution Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) Solution Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) Solution Men Race Race Men Race Race Race Men Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race Race R	$\begin{array}{c}$
Sale and a set of the set of t	$\begin{array}{c} 1.21 \ (0.88, 1.67) \\ 1.72 \ (1.24, 2.40) \\ & .74 \\ 1.44 \ (1.08, 1.93) \\ 1.38 \ (0.96, 1.97) \\ & .75 \\ 1.58 \ (1.11, 2.24) \\ 1.32 \ (0.97, 1.79) \\ & .28 \\ 1.52 \ (1.14, 2.04) \\ 1.27 \ (0.88, 1.83) \\ .53 \\ 1.76 \ (1.19, 2.58) \\ 1.25 \ (0.94, 1.67) \\ 1.41 \ (1.13, 1.76) \end{array}$
> 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30 Overall	$\begin{array}{c} 1.72 \ (1.24, 2.40) \\ 1.44 \ (1.08, 1.93) \\ 1.38 \ (0.96, 1.97) \\ .75 \\ 1.58 \ (1.11, 2.24) \\ 1.32 \ (0.97, 1.79) \\ .28 \\ 1.52 \ (1.14, 2.04) \\ 1.27 \ (0.88, 1.83) \\ .53 \\ 1.76 \ (1.19, 2.58) \\ 1.25 \ (0.94, 1.67) \\ 1.41 \ (1.13, 1.76) \end{array}$
Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall 'igure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) < 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Sex Women Men Race White Black Sex Women Men Race White Black Sody mass index (kg/m2) < 30	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ $
Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Tigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) < 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Sex Women Men Race White Black Sody mass index (kg/m2) < 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Hypertension Yes No Overall Hypertension Yes No Overall Hypertension Yes No Overall Hypertension Yes No Overall Hypertension Yes No Overall Hypertension Yes Sex Women Men Race White Black Sody mass index (kg/m2) < 30	$\begin{array}{c} 1.44 \ (1.08, 1.93) \\ 1.38 \ (0.96, 1.97) \\ & .75 \\ 1.58 \ (1.11, 2.24) \\ 1.32 \ (0.97, 1.79) \\ & .28 \\ 1.52 \ (1.14, 2.04) \\ 1.27 \ (0.88, 1.83) \\ .53 \\ 1.76 \ (1.19, 2.58) \\ 1.25 \ (0.94, 1.67) \\ 1.41 \ (1.13, 1.76) \end{array}$
Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Sigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.38 (0.96, 1.97) .75 1.58 (1.11, 2.24) 1.32 (0.97, 1.79) .28 1.52 (1.14, 2.04) 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall 'igure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	.75 1.58 (1.11, 2.24) 1.32 (0.97, 1.79) .28 1.52 (1.14, 2.04) 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Tigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) < 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30	1.58 (1.11, 2.24) 1.32 (0.97, 1.79) .28 1.52 (1.14, 2.04) 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Tigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.32 (0.97, 1.79) .28 1.52 (1.14, 2.04) 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30 > 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Tigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	.28 1.52 (1.14, 2.04) 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
<pre>s moto much (kg/m2) s 30 Hypertension Yes No Overall 'igure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) s 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) s 30</pre>	1.52 (1.14, 2.04) 1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
30 Hypertension Yes No Overall Sigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) Sigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet	1.27 (0.88, 1.83) .53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Hypertension Yes No Overall Cigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) < 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) < 30	.53 1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Yes No Overall Sigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.76 (1.19, 2.58) 1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
No Overall Sigure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Overall Figure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2)	1.41 (1.13, 1.76)
Figure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet Age (years) ≤ 48 > 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2)	
> 48 Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	.18 1.21 (0.88, 1.66)
Sex Women Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.72 (1.24, 2.39)
Women Men Race White Black Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	.36
Men Race White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.44 (1.08, 1.93)
Race 24 by guest. White Black Black 90	1.38 (0.96, 1.98)
White Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	.56
Black Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.58 (1.11, 2.23)
Body mass index (kg/m2) ≤ 30	1.32 (0.97, 1.78)
≤ 30 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	.97
	1.52 (1.14, 2.04)
> 30	1.27 (0.88, 1.82)
Hypertension	.56
Yes d	1.75 (1.19, 2.57)
No â	1.25 (0.94, 1.66)
Overall <u> </u>	1.41 (1.13, 1.76)

BMJ Open

Effects of Dietary Sodium and the DASH Diet on the Occurrence of Headaches: Results from Randomized Multicenter DASH-Sodium Clinical Trial

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2014-006671.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Nov-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Amer, Muhammad; Howard University Hospital, Medicine Woodward, Mark; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health Appel, Lawrence; Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Medicine
Primary Subject Heading :	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Public health
Keywords:	Headache, Sodium, DASH-Sodium Trial



Effects of Dietary Sodium and the DASH Diet on the Occurrence of Headaches: Results from Randomized Multicenter DASH-Sodium Clinical Trial

Muhammad Amer, Mark Woodward, Lawrence J. Appel

Author's affiliation and address:

Muhammad Amer, MD, MHS, FACP

Division of General Internal Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, 600 Wolfe St/ Osler 264 Baltimore, MD 21287 Howard University Hospital, Georgia Ave, NW, Washington, DC, 20060

Mark Woodward, PhD

Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland. USA. George Institute for Global Health, University of Sydney, Australia

Welch Center for Prevention, 2024 E. Monument Street, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287, USA

Lawrence J. Appel, MD, MPH

Welch Center for Prevention, Epidemiology, and Clinical Research. Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore, Maryland. USA

Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Welch Center for Prevention, 2024 E. Monument Street, Room 2-600, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287 USA

Declaration of competing interests: None reported by any author.

Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00000608

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Financial Disclosure: Drs. Appel and Woodward were co-investigators in a trial sponsored by the McCormick Science Institute (completed in spring 2013).

Corresponding author:

Lawrence J. Appel, MD, MPH

ind i. Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology and International Health

2024 East Monument Street

Baltimore, MD 21287

Office (410)-955-4156

Fax (410) 955-0476

lappel@jhmi.edu

Abstract

Objectives: Headaches are a common medical problem, yet few studies, particularly trials, have evaluated therapies that might prevent or control headaches. We, thus, investigated the effects on the occurrence of headaches of three levels of dietary sodium intake and two diet patterns [the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) diet (rich in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products with reduced saturated and total fat) and a control diet (typical of Western consumption patterns).

Design: Randomized multicenter clinical trial.

Setting: Post-hoc analyses of the DASH-Sodium trial in the USA.

Participants: In a multicenter feeding study with three 30 day periods, 390 participants were randomized to the DASH or control diet. On their assigned diet, participants ate food with high sodium during one period, intermediate sodium during another period, and low sodium during another period, in random order.

Outcome measures: Occurrence and severity of headache were ascertained from self-administered questionnaires, completed at the end of each feeding period.

Results: The occurrence of headaches was similar in DASH vs. Control, at high [odds ratio (95% confidence interval) = 0.65 (0.37-1.12); p=0.12], intermediate [0.57 (0.29-1.12); p=0.10], and low [0.64 (0.36-1.13); p=0.12] sodium levels. By contrast, there was a lower risk of headache on the low, compared to high, sodium level, both on the control [0.69 (0.49 - 0.99); p = 0.05] and DASH [0.69 (0.49-0.98); p=0.04] diets.

Conclusions: A reduced sodium intake was associated with a significantly lower risk of headache, whilst dietary patterns had no effect on the risk of headaches in adults. Reduced dietary sodium intake offers a novel approach to prevent headaches.

Key words: Headache; Sodium; Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; DASH-Sodium trial

ct on the use of the second se Expected second s

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Post-hoc analysis of a multicenter randomized clinical trial comparing effects of the two diet patterns using parallel design together with a three-period crossover of three levels of dietary sodium [high (150 mmol), intermediate (100 mmol), low (50 mmol)] on headaches in healthy adults with stage 1 hypertension.
- Three screening and two run-in feeding periods prior to randomization to assess participant's eligibility, compliance with dietary requirements and to estimate caloric requirements to maintain weight during study.
- Vigorous efforts made to promote adherence with assigned diets during feeding periods.
- Lack of information on the prevalence of headaches at baseline as well as type of self-reported headaches experienced by participants at the end of feeding periods.

Introduction

Worldwide, headache is a common medical problem and amongst the most frequently reported disorders of the nervous system [1-3]. Globally, 46% of adults are estimated to have an active headache disorder (42% for tension-type headaches; 11% for migraines) [2, 4-6]. Headaches affect all age groups, with a higher prevalence in women compared to men [4-6]. The direct cost of health care services, and medications for the management of headaches is likewise substantial [7-11], as are indirect costs. Patients with frequent headaches have a poor quality of life and a higher number of days absent from work, compared with others [12-15]. Hence, successful strategies to prevent and treat headache would confer substantial benefits to afflicted individuals, as well as to society in general.

Available data support a direct association between blood pressure and the occurrence of headache [16-19]. Therefore, it is reasonable to speculate that dietary factors that lower blood pressure (e.g. reduced sodium intake and the DASH diet [20, 21]) might also reduce the occurrence of headache. However, evidence on the relationship of headaches with sodium intake and other dietary factors is sparse, with most attention focusing on the potential role of monosodium glutamate intake [22-24]. In the primary results paper of the DASH-Sodium trial, which focused on the blood pressure effects of the dietary interventions, the authors briefly comment on the occurrence of headaches in the broad context of side effects. They reported that the side effect of headache occurred in 47% of participants during the high, compared to 39 percent during the low, sodium feeding period [21]. In this paper, we expand on these preliminary observations.
Methods

A detailed description of the rationale, design, and methods of the DASH-Sodium trial has been published [25]. Briefly, DASH-Sodium was a multicenter, randomized clinical trial, conducted between September 1997 and November 1999, designed to compare the effects on blood pressure of three levels of dietary sodium and two diet patterns. The study design incorporated a parallel, two-group, comparison of diet (DASH diet vs. control diet) together with a three-period crossover of the three levels of dietary sodium intake, with a primary outcome of mean systolic blood pressure (Figure 1). The three sodium levels were 1) "high" (150 mmol, at 2100 Kcal caloric intake), reflecting average consumption in the USA, 2) "intermediate" (100 mmol) reflecting the upper limit of current recommendations for adults [26], and 3) "low" (50 mmol). The DASH diet is rich in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products, high in dietary fiber, potassium, calcium and magnesium, moderately high in protein, and low in saturated fat, cholesterol, and total fat. The control diet is typical of what many in the Western world eat.

Study participants were 412 adults (age ≥ 22 years) with systolic blood pressure between 120 and 159 mm Hg and diastolic blood pressure between 80 and 95 mm Hg (i.e., pre-hypertension or stage 1 hypertension). Major exclusion criteria were diabetes mellitus, evidence of active malignancy, history of cardiovascular event (angina, myocardial infarction, angioplasty, or stroke), renal insufficiency (serum creatinine > 1.2 mg/dL for females or 1.5 mg/dL for males), anemia (hematocrit at least 5 percent below normal range), pregnancy, inflammatory bowel disease, body mass index > 40 kg/m², use

of antihypertensive drugs and corticosteroids, and consumption of more than 14 alcoholic beverages per week.

Three screening visits (each separated by at least seven days) were conducted to assess general eligibility and to collect baseline data. Following the screening visits, eligible participants started a twoweek run-in feeding period during which they ate the control diet at the high sodium level. The run-in feeding period was designed to exclude participants who were unlikely to comply with the dietary requirements and to estimate caloric requirements needed to maintain weight. Participants were then randomly assigned (generated using desktop PC at each coordinating center) to one of the two diets using a parallel-group design, and ate each of three sodium levels (feeding periods) for 30 days each, in a randomized crossover design. Participants were not notified of their assigned dietary pattern or sodium sequence.

During feeding periods (run-in and intervention), participants were required to eat at least one meal per day on site at the clinical center, five days per week, and to take food home for other meals. Participants were expected to eat all of their food and were instructed to record the type and amount of any uneaten study food. Caffeinated beverages and alcohol were limited and monitored. Individual energy intake (calorie content) was adjusted so that each participant's weight during each feeding period remained stable.

Data collection staff were masked to randomized sodium and diet sequence. Measurements were obtained during screening and at the end of each feeding period. Blood pressure was measured in a

BMJ Open

seated position, using the right arm of participants. Twenty-four hour urine (for analysis of sodium, potassium, urea nitrogen, and creatinine) and body weight were also collected. Compliance with the feeding protocol was assessed by urinary excretion of sodium, potassium, phosphorus, urea nitrogen, and creatinine, estimated from 24 hour urine collections.

Symptoms (side effects) including headache, bloating, dry mouth, excessive thirst, fatigue or low energy, lightheadedness, nausea, and change in taste, were collected via self-administered questionnaires (see Supplement) completed during the last seven days of each sodium feeding period. For each symptom, potential responses were (1) "none" for not experiencing any symptom, (2) "mild" if symptom occurred but did not interfere with usual activities, (3) "moderate" if symptom occurred and somewhat interfered with usual activities, and (4) "severe" if participants were unable to perform usual activities due to the symptom.

This analysis of the DASH-Sodium trial included 390 (95%) of the 412 randomized participants. Excluded participants were those with missing information on headaches in any of the 3 feeding periods. For the primary analysis in this study, headache was defined as "any headache" (mild, moderate or severe) during the last seven days of each feeding period. Subsequently, we report frequency of headache by severity.

The means and proportions between groups were explored using t-tests and chi-square tests, respectively. A non-parametric test (extension of Wilcoxon rank-sum test) was used for trends in the frequency of headache by sodium intake. Since multiple observations were obtained on each participant,

we used generalized estimating equation models [27], with a logit link and binomial error and an exchangeable covariance structure, to model the odds of a headache. The adjusted covariates used in this analysis were measured at baseline. Models were adjusted for age, sex, race, clinical site, systolic blood pressure, body mass index, and smoking status. The potential for carryover effects was unavoidable in this trial, however, since the experimental agent was one's diet and participants must eat something during these intervals, statistical (GEE) models were also adjusted for carry-over effects from the previous periods. To address the qualitative consistency and benefit-hazard profiles between participants, subgroup analysis by diet stratified by age, sex, race, obesity (BMI \ge 30 kg/m² ν not) and hypertension (blood pressure \ge 140/90 mmHg ν not) status at baseline were also performed. Interactions between subgroups were tested by the addition of an interaction term to the main effects model.

Institutional review boards at the participating centers and an external data and safety monitoring committee approved the trial protocol and consent procedures. Each participant provided written, informed consent.

A p-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed using Stata version 12.1 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

BMJ Open

The 390 participants included in our analyses were those with completed symptoms questionnaires - 192 (94%) of the 204 participants assigned to the control diet and 198 (95%) of the 208 participants assigned to the DASH diet. Clinical and demographic characteristics of the two groups were similar (Table 1). Figure 2 displays the distribution of headaches by sodium level and assigned diet. The highest occurrence of headache was reported by participants on the control diet with high sodium (47%) and the lowest by participants on the DASH diet with low sodium level (36%). On both diets, the number of

Among those assigned to the control diet, mean (SD) urinary sodium excretion was 141 (55), 106 (43) and 64 (37) mmol per 24 hours during the high, intermediate, and low sodium feeding periods, respectively. In the DASH diet group, mean (SD) urinary sodium levels were 144 (57), 107 (52) and 67 (46) mmol per 24 hour during the high, intermediate, and low sodium feeding periods, respectively. On each sodium level, mean urinary sodium excretion was similar in those assigned to the two diets (each p > 0.05). Mean urinary potassium and urea nitrogen were higher in the DASH diet group, reflecting the higher vegetable, dairy, and protein content of the DASH diet compared with the control diet, at each

headaches reported was greatest for the high sodium level and least on the low sodium level.

sodium level (Table 2).

Table 3 shows differences in the odds of headache by diet and sodium level. Compared to the high sodium level, we observed a lower odds of any headache during the low sodium period both on the control diet (adjusted OR: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.49-0.99) and the DASH diet (adjusted OR: 0.69, 95% CI:

0.49-0.98). Although the relationship appeared graded (Figure 2), there was no significant difference between the intermediate level of sodium and either the low or high sodium levels, on either diet. There was no significant association of diet pattern (DASH vs. Control) with headache on any sodium level. There was also no significant interaction between diet and sodium on the occurrence of headaches (pinteraction > 0.05). Compared to the control diet with high sodium, there was a reduced risk of a headache on the DASH diet with low sodium (adjusted OR = 0.64, 95% CI: 0.41 - 0.99, p = 0.05).

While on control diet, the number of persons who reported a severe headache was 4 (2.1%) during high, 1 (0.5%) during intermediate, and 1 (0.5%) during low sodium periods, respectively (p for trend = 0.13). On DASH diet, the corresponding number of persons who reported a severe headache was 8 (4%) during high, 2 (1%) during intermediate, and 3 (1.5%) during low sodium periods, respectively (p for trend= 0.08). The frequency of severe headache was similar (p = 0.3) by diet [DASH 8 (4%) and control 4 (2%)] during high sodium feeding period. (Table 4)

There was no evidence that the relationship between sodium levels and headache was modified by age, sex, race, baseline BMI or blood pressure (Figure 3).

Discussion

In this secondary analysis of the DASH-Sodium trial, which enrolled adults with pre- and stage 1 hypertension, a reduced dietary sodium intake was associated with a lower risk of headache, both on the

BMJ Open

control diet and the DASH diet. In contrast, the risk of headache was similar on the DASH and control diets.

The epidemiological literature on headaches in adults is limited [1, 2, 6]. However, it is well-recognized that, compared to normotensive individuals, individuals with hypertension have a higher frequency of headaches [16-19, 28]. Of note, Cooper *et al* reported a direct relationship of headaches with both systolic and diastolic blood pressure [17]. As regards trials, in a pooled analysis that included seven double–blinded, randomized placebo controlled trials of Ibesartan therapy, Hansson *et al* found a direct relationship of diastolic blood pressure with incident headaches in 2673 patients with mild to moderate hypertension [29].

The association between dietary sodium intake and blood pressure is also well recognized [30, 31]. The DASH diet alone and in combination with reduced sodium intake lowers blood pressure in patients with or without hypertension [20, 21]. It is noteworthy that there was no significant relationship between diet pattern and headache. This suggests that a process that is independent of a blood pressure may mediate the relationship between sodium and headaches.

Our results contrast with the popular belief that a diet rich in fruits, vegetables and potassium and low in saturated and total fat may ease the frequency, or even prevent, headache [32]. Several dietary factors, including fasting, alcoholic drinks, chocolate, coffee, and cheese, appear to trigger vascular headache (cluster or migraine) in adults [33- 36]. In some studies, an increased intake of monosodium glutamate is associated with the occurrence of headaches [22-24]. However, a recent review concluded that evidence

on the relationship of sodium glutamate intake and headaches is inconsistent [37]. In one study of 200 adults (mean age 37.7 years, 81% females), monosodium glutamate was identified as a trigger for migraine headache in only 5 (2.5%) of study participants [36]. However, data on the relationship between sodium intake and any form of headaches are sparse.

The results of this study provide encouraging evidence in support of dietary recommendations to lower sodium intake: recommendations which are currently based on the relationship of sodium intake with blood pressure. The daily intake of sodium in adults living in the United States is already in excess of their physiological need and for many individuals, is much higher than the highest level tested in this study [38, 39]. Our results also support the recent World Health Organization guidelines for reducing sodium intake to less than 87 mmol/day [40] and American Heart Association guidelines for reducing sodium intake to 65 mmol/day [31].

Strengths of our study include its randomized controlled design comparing two diets using a parallel design and a three-period crossover of three levels of dietary sodium (high, intermediate, and low). Dietary intake during the feeding periods was closely monitored and vigorous efforts were made to promote adherence with assigned diets. The participants of this study were healthy, non-institutionalized, racially diverse, middle- and older-aged men and women. Hence we believe that these results are applicable to a large fraction of adults.

Our study also has limitations. Information on the prevalence of headache at baseline from eligible participants was lacking. In addition, there was no information about the type of headache (tension,

BMJ Open

cluster or migraine) experienced by study participants. However, we suspect that most of the headaches were tension headaches. Whether a reduced sodium intake can prevent vascular headache is unknown. Second, the instrument was administered just once in each feeding period and does not allow calculation of an event rate, such as person-days of headaches. Third, these are secondary, post-hoc analyses from a trial that was not explicitly designed to test the effects of dietary factors on headaches. Nonetheless, a rigorously controlled feeding study designed to test the effects of dietary factors on occurrence of headaches would be extremely expensive and logistically challenging. Fourth, our results likely underestimate the relationship of sodium intake with headaches. The range of sodium intake was relatively narrow - the highest sodium group in our trial actually corresponds to the average in the USA and is much lower than the intake in many countries, particularly in Asia. Self-report of symptoms is inherently imprecise and could bias results to the null, given that a validated instrument was not used for patient-reported headache.

In conclusion, a reduced sodium intake was associated with significantly lower risk of headache, while diet patterns had no effect on the risk of headaches. A reduced dietary sodium intake offers a novel approach to prevent headache in adults. Additional studies are needed to replicate these findings and to explore mechanisms that mediate the association between sodium intake and headache.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Contribution statement: All three authors (Muhammad Amer, Mark Woodward, and Lawrence Appel) have substantially contributed to the conception, drafting, editing and revising for the important intellectual content of the manuscript. Muhammad Amer and Mark Woodward were responsible for analyses of the data. All three authors participated in the interpretation of the analysis and agreed for the final approval of the version to be published. Authors are in agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work related to this manuscript and responsible for the integrity of any part of the work shown in this post-hoc analysis of the DASH-Sodium clinical trial.

Competing interests: None reported by any author

Funding: This study received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Data sharing: No additional data available to share.

BMJ Open

References

	1-	Benbir G, Karadeniz D, Göksan B. The characteristics and subtypes of headache in relation to
		age and gender in a rural community in Eastern Turkey. Agri. 2012 Oct; 24(4):145-52
2-	2-	Stovner Lj, Hagen K, Jensen R et al. The global burden of headache: a documentation of
		headache prevalence and disability worldwide. Cephalalgia. 2007 Mar; 27(3):193-210.

- 3- Andlin-Sobocki P, Jönsson B, Wittchen HU, Olesen J. Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe.
 Eur J Neurol. 2005 Jun; 12 Suppl 1:1-27
- 4- Jensen R, Stovner LJ. Epidemiology and comorbidity of headache. Lancet Neurol. 2008 Apr;
 7(4):354-61.
- 5- Zwart JA, Dyb G, Holmen TL, Stovner LJ, Sand T. The prevalence of migraine and tension-type headaches among adolescents in Norway: The Nord- Trøndelag Health Study (Head-Hunt). Cephalalgia. 2004 May; 24(5):373-9
- 6- Rasmussen BK. Epidemiology of headache. Cephalalgia. 2001 Sep; 21(7):774-7.
- 7- Berg J, Stovner LJ. Cost of migraine and other headaches in Europe. Eur J Neurol 2005; 12 (suppl 1): 59–62.
- 8- Rasmussen BK, Jensen R, Olesen J. Impact of headache on sickness absence and utilisation of medical services: a Danish population study. J Epidemiol Community Health 1992; 46: 443–46
- 9- Lyngberg AC, Rasmussen BK, Jensen R, et al. Secular changes in health care utilization and work absence for migraine and tension type headache. A population based study. J Epidemiol Com Health 2005; 20: 1007–14.
- 10- Von Korff M, Stewart W, Lipton RB. Assessing headache severity: new directions. Neurology 1998; 44 (Suppl 4):40–6.

- 11- Michel P, Dartiques J, Duru G, Moreau J, Salamon R, Henry P. Incremental absenteeism due to headache in migraine: results from the Mig-Access French National Cohort. Cephalalgia. 1999 Jun; 19(5):503-10.
 - 12- Vinding GR, Zeeberg P, Lyngberg A, Nielsen RT, Jensen R. The burden of headache in a patient population from a specialized headache centre. Cephalalgia. 2007 Mar; 27(3):263-70.
 - 13- Medizabel JE, Rothrock JF. An interregional comparative study of headache clinic populations. Cephalalgia. 1998 Jan; 18(1):57-9.
 - 14- Saper JR, Lake AE, Madden SF, Kreeger C. Comprehensive/tertiary care for headache: a 6month outcome study. Headache. 1999 Apr; 39(4):249-63.
 - 15-Bussone G, Usai S, Grazzi L, Rigamonti A, Solari A, D'Amico D. Disability and quality of life in different primary headaches: results from Italian studies. Neurol Sci. 2004 Oct; 25 Suppl 3:S105-7.
- 16- Kruszewski P, Bieniaszewski L, Neubauer J, Krupa-Wojciechowska B. Headache in patients with mild to moderate hypertension is generally not associated with simultaneous blood pressure elevation. J Hypertens. 2000 Apr; 18(4):437-44.
- 17- Cooper WD, Glover DR, Hormbrey JM, Kimber GR. Headache and blood pressure: evidence of a close relationship. J Hum Hypertens. 1989 Feb; 3(1):41-4.
- 18- Janeway TC. A clinical study of hypertensive cardiovascular disease. Arch Intern Med. 1913;12: 755–798
- 19-Barlow DH, Beevers DG, Hawthorne VM, Watt HD, Young GA. Blood pressure measurement at screening and in general practice. Br Heart J. 1977 Jan; 39(1):7-12.
- 20- Appel LJ, Moore TJ, Obarzanek E et al. A clinical trial of the effects of dietary patterns on blood pressure. DASH Collaborative Research Group. N Engl J Med. 1997 Apr 17; 336(16):1117-24.
- 21- Sacks FM, Svetkey LP, Vollmer WM et al; DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group.

Effects on blood pressure of reduced dietary sodium and the Dietary Approaches to Stop

BMJ Open

Hypertension (DASH) diet. DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. N Engl J Med. 2001 Jan 4;344(1):3-10

- 22- Yang WH, Drouin MA, Herbert M, Mao Y, Karsh J. The monosodium glutamate symptom complex: assessment in a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized study. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 1997 Jun; 99(6 Pt 1):757-62.
- 23- Randolph TG, Rollins JP. Beet sensitivity: allergic reactions from the ingestion of beet sugar (sucrose) and monosodium glutamate of beet origin. J Lab Clin Med 1950; 36:407-17.
- 24- Ratner D, Eshel E, Shoshani E. Adverse effects of monosodium glutamate: a diagnostic problem.Israel J Med Sci 1984;20:252-3
- 25- Svetkey LP, Sacks FM, Obarzanek E et al. The DASH Diet, Sodium Intake and Blood Pressure Trial (DASH-sodium): rationale and design. DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. J Am Diet Assoc. 1999 Aug; 99(8 Suppl):S96-104.
- 26- The sixth report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. Arch Intern Med 1997; 157: 2413-46. [Erratum, Arch Intern Med 1998; 158:573.
- 27- Liang K-Y, Zeger SL. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. Biometrika 1986;73:13-22
- 28- Sigurdsson JA, Bengtsson C. Symptoms and signs in relation to blood pressure and antihypertensive treatment. A cross-sectional and longitudinal population study of middle-aged Swedish women. Acta Med Scand. 1983; 213(3):183-90.
- 29- Hansson L, Smith DH, Reeves R, Lapuerta P. Headache in mild-to-moderate hypertension and its reduction by irbesartan therapy. Arch Intern Med. 2000 Jun 12; 160 (11):1654-8.
- 30- Aburto NJ, Ziolkovska A, Hooper L, Elliott P, Cappuccio FP, Meerpohl JJ. Effect of lower sodium intake on health: systematic review and meta-analyses. BMJ. 2013 Apr 3; 346:f1326.

- 31- Appel LJ, Brands MW, Daniels SR, Karanja N, Elmer PJ, Sacks FM; American Heart Association. Dietary approaches to prevent and treat hypertension: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. Hypertension. 2006 Feb; 47(2):296-308.
- 32-Buchholz, David. Heal Your Headache: The 1-2-3 Program for Taking Charge of Your Headaches. New York: Workman, 2002.
- 33- Savi L, Rainero I, Valfrè W, Gentile S, Lo Giudice R, Pinessi L. Food and headache attacks. A comparison of patients with migraine and tension-type headache. Panminerva Med. 2002 Mar; 44(1):27-31.
- 34- Peatfield RC. Relationships between food, wine, and beer-precipitated migrainous headaches.Headache. 1995 Jun; 35(6):355-7.
- 35- Carod-Artal FJ, Ezpeleta D, Martín-Barriga ML, Guerrero AL. Triggers, symptoms, and treatment in two populations of migraneurs in Brazil and Spain. A cross-cultural study. J Neurol Sci. 2011 May 15; 304(1-2):25-8.
- 36- Fukui PT, Gonçalves TR, Strabelli CG et al. Trigger factors in migraine patients. Arq Neuropsiquiatr. 2008 Sep; 66(3A):494-9.
- 37- Freeman M. Reconsidering the effects of monosodium glutamate: a literature review. J Am Acad Nurse Pract. 2006 Oct; 18(10):482-6.
- 38- Brown IJ, Tzoulaki I, Candeias V, Elliott P. Salt intakes around the world: implications for public health. Int J Epidemiol. 2009 Jun; 38(3):791-813.
- 39- National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Division for Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention Fact sheet; http://www.cdc.gov/salt/pdfs/Sodium_Fact_Sheet.pdf. Accessed September 28, 2013.
- 40- WHO. Guideline: Sodium intake for adults and children. Geneva, World Health Organization (WHO), 2012.

Characteristic	Control Diet (n=192)	DASH Diet (n=198)	Total (n=390)
Age (years)	49 (10)	47 (10)	48 (10)
Females, n (%)	104 (54)	118 (60)	222 (57)
Race, n (%) Caucasian African American Other	78 (41) 109 (57) 5 (3)	81 (41) 114 (57) 3 (2)	159 (41) 223 (57) 8 (2)
Body Mass Index, (kg/m ²)	30 (5)	29 (5)	29.2 (5)
Systolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	135 (9)	134 (9)	135 (9)
Diastolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	86 (4)	85 (5)	86 (4)
Hypertension, n (%) †	76 (40)	79 (40)	155 (40)
Current Smoker, n (%)	21 (11)	21 (11)	42 (11)

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of participants in DASH-Sodium trial[Number (percentage) or mean (standard deviation)]

[†]Hypertension was defined as an average systolic blood pressure of 140 mm of Hg or an average diastolic blood pressure of 90 mmHg during the three screening visits.

Table 2: Urinary excretion according to sodium level and diet[Mean (standard deviation)]

	Level of sodium					
	High		Intermediate		Low	
	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)
Sodium gram/day mmol/day	3.3 (1.3) 144 (57)	3.2 (1.3) 141 (55)	2.5 (1.2) 107 (52)	2.4 (0.9) 106 (43)	1.5 (1.1) 67 (46)	1.5 (0.8) 64 (37)
Potassium gram/day mmol/day	3.0 (1.1) 76 (27)	1.6 (0.5) 40 (14)	3.2 (1.2) 82 (31)	1.6 (0.5) 41 (14)	3.2 (1.1) 81 (29)	1.6 (0.5) 41 (14)
Urea Nitrogen gram/day	11.5 (4)	9.5 (3.2)	12.4 (4.5)	9.7 (3.4)	12 (4)	10 (3.3)
Creatinine gram/day	1.4 (0.5)	1.5 (0.5)	1.5 (0.6)	1.5 (0.6)	1.4 (0.5)	1.5 (0.6)

	Odds ratio (95 % CI)	<i>p</i> value
Sodium effects on the DASH diet		
Intermediate v high sodium	0.72 (0.51-1.01)	0.06
Low v intermediate sodium	0.96 (0.68-1.37)	0.85
Low <i>v</i> high sodium	0.69 (0.49-0.98)	0.04
Sodium effects on the control diet		
Intermediate v high sodium	0.81 (0.57-1.15)	0.24
Low <i>v</i> intermediate sodium	0.86 (0.59-1.24)	0.42
Low <i>v</i> high sodium	0.69 (0.49-0.99)	0.05
Diet effects (DASH vs Control) at each sodium level		
On high sodium	0.65 (0.37-1.12)	0.12
On intermediate sodium	0.57 (0.29-1.12)	0.10
On low sodium	0.64 (0.36-1.13)	0.12
Low Sodium on DASH vs High Sodium on Control	0 64 (0 14-0 99)	0.05

Models adjusted for age, sex, race, site, systolic blood pressure, BMI, smoking status and carry over

effects from the previous period. CI =confidence interval.

	Level of sodium					
	High		Intermediate		Low	
	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)	DASH (n=198)	Control (n=192)
Mild	60 (30)	70 (36)	43 (22)	62 (32)	53 (27) 53 (53 (28)
Moderate	17 (9)	17 (9)	31 (16)	16 (8)	16 (8)	21 (11)
Severe	8 (4)	4 (2)	2 (1)	1 (0.5)	3 (1)	1 (0.5)

Table 4: Occurrence and severity of headache by sodium level and diet, n (%)

FIGURE LEGEND:

Figure 1: DASH-Sodium Trial Flow Diagram

<u>Figure 2</u>: Frequency of headache by diet and sodium level.

Figure 3

- (a): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in the DASH diet
- (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in the Control diet

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Effects of Dietary Sodium and the DASH Diet on the Occurrence

of Headaches: Results from <u>Randomized Multicenter</u>

DASH-Sodium Clinical Trial

Muhammad Amer, Mark Woodward, Lawrence J. Appel

Author's affiliation and address:

Muhammad Amer, MD, MHS, FACP

Division of General Internal Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, 600 Wolfe St/ Osler 264 Baltimore, MD 21287 Howard University Hospital, Georgia Ave, NW, Washington, DC, 20060

Mark Woodward, PhD

Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland. USA. George Institute for Global Health, University of Sydney, Australia

Welch Center for Prevention, 2024 E. Monument Street, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287, USA

Lawrence J. Appel, MD, MPH

Welch Center for Prevention, Epidemiology, and Clinical Research. Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore, Maryland. USA

Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Welch Center for Prevention, 2024 E. Monument Street, Room 2-600, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287 USA

Declaration of competing interests: None reported by any author.

Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00000608

BMJ Open

Financial Disclosure: Drs. Appel and Woodward were co-investigators in a trial sponsored by the McCormick Science Institute (completed in spring 2013).

Corresponding author:

Lawrence J. Appel, MD, MPH

Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology and International Health

2024 East Monument Street

Baltimore, MD 21287

Office (410)-955-4156

Fax (410) 955-0476

lappel@jhmi.edu

Abstract

Objectives: Headaches are a common medical problem, yet few studies, particularly trials, have evaluated therapies that might prevent or control headaches. We, thus, investigated the effects on the occurrence of headaches of three levels of dietary sodium intake and two diet patterns [the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) diet (rich in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products with reduced saturated and total fat) and a control diet (typical of Western consumption patterns).

Design: Randomized <u>multicenter</u> clinical trial.

Setting: Post-hoc analyses of the DASH-Sodium trial in the USA.

Participants: In a multicenter feeding study with three 30 day periods, 390 participants were randomized to the DASH or control diet. On their assigned diet, participants ate food with high sodium during one period, intermediate sodium during another period, and low sodium during another period, in random order.

Outcome measures: Occurrence and severity of headache were ascertained from self-administered questionnaires, completed at the end of each feeding period.

Results: The occurrence of headaches was similar in DASH vs. Control, at high [odds ratio (95% confidence interval) = 0.65 (0.37-1.12); p=0.12], intermediate [0.57 (0.29-1.12); p=0.10], and low [0.64 (0.36-1.13); p=0.12] sodium levels. By contrast, there was a lower risk of headache on the low, compared to high, sodium level, both on the control [0.69 (0.49 - 0.99); p = 0.05] and DASH [0.69 (0.49-0.98); p=0.04] diets.

BMJ Open

Conclusions: A reduced sodium intake was associated with a significantly lower risk of headache, whilst dietary patterns had no effect on the risk of headaches in adults. Reduced dietary sodium intake offers a novel approach to prevent headaches.

Key words: Headache; Sodium; Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; DASH-Sodium trial

uet na exert headac.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Post-hoc analysis of a multicenter randomized clinical trial comparing effects of the two diet patterns using parallel design together with a three-period crossover of three levels of dietary sodium [high (150 mmol), intermediate (100 mmol), low (50 mmol)] on headaches in healthy adults with stage 1 hypertension.
- Three screening and two run-in feeding periods prior to randomization to assess participant's eligibility, compliance with dietary requirements and to estimate caloric requirements to maintain weight during study.
- Vigorous efforts made to promote adherence with assigned diets during feeding periods.
- Lack of information on the prevalence of headaches at baseline as well as type of self-reported headaches experienced by participants at the end of feeding periods.

BMJ Open

Introduction

Worldwide, headache is a common medical problem and amongst the most frequently reported disorders of the nervous system [1-3]. Globally, 46% of adults are estimated to have an active headache disorder (42% for tension-type headaches; 11% for migraines) [2, 4-6]. Headaches affect all age groups, with a higher prevalence in women compared to men [4-6]. The direct cost of health care services, and medications for the management of headaches is likewise substantial [7-11], as are indirect costs. Patients with frequent headaches have a poor quality of life and a higher number of days absent from work, compared with others [12-15]. Hence, successful strategies to prevent and treat headache would confer substantial benefits to afflicted individuals, as well as to society in general.

Available data support a direct association between blood pressure and the occurrence of headache [16-19]. Therefore, it is reasonable to speculate that dietary factors that lower blood pressure (e.g. reduced sodium intake and the DASH diet [20, 21]) might also reduce the occurrence of headache. However, evidence on the relationship of headaches with sodium intake and other dietary factors is sparse, with most attention focusing on the potential role of monosodium glutamate intake [22-24]. In the primary results paper of the DASH-Sodium trial, which focused on the blood pressure effects of the dietary interventions, the authors briefly comment on the occurrence of headaches in the broad context of side effects. They reported that the side effect of headache occurred in 47% of participants during the high, compared to 39 percent during the low, sodium feeding period [21]. In this paper, we expand on these preliminary observations.

Methods

A detailed description of the rationale, design, and methods of the DASH-Sodium trial has been published [25]. Briefly, DASH-Sodium was a multicenter, randomized clinical trial, conducted between September 1997 and November 1999, designed to compare the effects on blood pressure of three levels of dietary sodium and two diet patterns. The study design incorporated a parallel, two-group, comparison of diet (DASH diet vs. control diet) together with a three-period crossover of the three levels of dietary sodium intake, with a primary outcome of mean systolic blood pressure (Figure 1). The three sodium levels were 1) "high" (150 mmol, at 2100 Kcal caloric intake), reflecting average consumption in the USA, 2) "intermediate" (100 mmol) reflecting the upper limit of current recommendations for adults [26], and 3) "low" (50 mmol). The DASH diet is rich in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products, high in dietary fiber, potassium, calcium and magnesium, moderately high in protein, and low in saturated fat, cholesterol, and total fat. The control diet is typical of what many in the Western world eat.

Study participants were 412 adults (age \geq 22 years) with systolic blood pressure between 120 and 159 mm Hg and diastolic blood pressure between 80 and 95 mm Hg (i.e., pre-hypertension or stage 1 hypertension). Major exclusion criteria were diabetes mellitus, evidence of active malignancy, history of cardiovascular event (angina, myocardial infarction, angioplasty, or stroke), renal insufficiency (serum creatinine > 1.2 mg/dL for females or 1.5 mg/dL for males), anemia (hematocrit at least 5 percent below normal range), pregnancy, inflammatory bowel disease, body mass index > 40 kg/m², use of antihypertensive drugs and corticosteroids, and consumption of more than 14 alcoholic beverages per week.

BMJ Open

Three screening visits (each separated by at least seven days) were conducted to assess general eligibility and to collect baseline data. Following the screening visits, eligible participants started a two-week run-in feeding period during which they ate the control diet at the high sodium level. The run-in feeding period was designed to exclude participants who were unlikely to comply with the dietary requirements and to estimate caloric requirements needed to maintain weight. Participants were then randomly assigned (generated using desktop PC at each coordinating center) to one of the two diets using a parallel-group design, and ate each of three sodium levels (feeding periods) for 30 days each, in a randomized crossover design. The sodium feeding periods were separated by feeding breaks of up to 5 days in duration, which were not intended as "washout" periods. Participants were not notified of their assigned dietary pattern or sodium sequence.

During feeding periods (run-in and intervention), participants were required to eat at least one meal per day on site at the clinical center, five days per week, and to take food home for other meals. Participants were expected to eat all of their food and were instructed to record the type and amount of any uneaten study food. Caffeinated beverages and alcohol were limited and monitored. Individual energy intake (calorie content) was adjusted so that each participant's weight during each feeding period remained stable.

Data collection staff were masked to randomized sodium and diet sequence. Measurements were obtained during screening and at the end of each feeding period. Blood pressure was measured in a seated position, using the right arm of participants. Twenty-four hour urine (for analysis of sodium, potassium, urea nitrogen, and creatinine) and body weight were also collected. Compliance with the

feeding protocol was assessed by urinary excretion of sodium, potassium, phosphorus, urea nitrogen, and creatinine, estimated from 24 hour urine collections.

Symptoms (side effects) including headache, bloating, dry mouth, excessive thirst, fatigue or low energy, lightheadedness, nausea, and change in taste, were collected via self-administered questionnaires (see Supplement) completed during the last seven days of each sodium feeding period. For each symptom, potential responses were (1) "none" for not experiencing any symptom, (2) "mild" if symptom occurred but did not interfere with usual activities, (3) "moderate" if symptom occurred and somewhat interfered with usual activities, and (4) "severe" if participants were unable to perform usual activities due to the symptom.

This analysis of the DASH-Sodium trial included 390 (95%) of the 412 randomized participants. Excluded participants were those with missing information on headaches in any of the 3 feeding periods. For the primary analysis in this study, headache was defined as "any headache" (mild, moderate or severe) during the last seven days of each feeding period. Subsequently, we report frequency of headache by severity.

The means and proportions between groups were explored using t-tests and chi-square tests, respectively. A non-parametric test <u>(extension of Wilcoxon rank-sum test)</u> was used for trends in the frequency of headache by sodium intake. Since multiple observations were obtained on each participant, we used generalized estimating equation models [27], with a logit link and binomial error and an exchangeable covariance structure, to model the odds of a headache. <u>The adjusted covariates used in this</u>

analysis were measured at baseline. Models were adjusted for age, sex, race, clinical site, systolic blood pressure, body mass index, and smoking status. The potential for carryover effects was unavoidable in this trial, however, since the experimental agent was one's diet and participants must eat something during these intervals, statistical (GEE) models were also adjusted for carry-over effects from the previous periods. To address the qualitative consistency and benefit-hazard profiles between participants, subgroup analysis by diet stratified by age, sex, race, obesity (BMI \ge 30 kg/m² v not) and hypertension (blood pressure \ge 140/90 mmHg v not) status at baseline were also performed. Interactions between subgroups were tested by the addition of an interaction term to the main effects model.

Institutional review boards at the participating centers and an external data and safety monitoring committee approved the trial protocol and consent procedures. Each participant provided written, informed consent.

A p-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were performed using Stata version 12.1 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

The 390 participants included in our analyses were those with completed symptoms questionnaires - 192 (94%) of the 204 participants assigned to the control diet and 198 (95%) of the 208 participants assigned to the DASH diet. Clinical and demographic characteristics of the two groups were similar (Table 1).

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Figure 2 displays the distribution of headaches by sodium level and assigned diet. The highest occurrence of headache was reported by participants on the control diet with high sodium (47%) and the lowest by participants on the DASH diet with low sodium level (36%). On both diets, the number of headaches reported was greatest for the high sodium level and least on the low sodium level.

Among those assigned to the control diet, mean (SD) urinary sodium excretion was 141 (55), 106 (43) and 64 (37) mmol per 24 hours during the high, intermediate, and low sodium feeding periods, respectively. In the DASH diet group, mean (SD) urinary sodium levels were 144 (57), 107 (52) and 67 (46) mmol per 24 hour during the high, intermediate, and low sodium feeding periods, respectively. On each sodium level, mean urinary sodium excretion was similar in those assigned to the two diets (each p > 0.05). Mean urinary potassium and urea nitrogen were higher in the DASH diet group, reflecting the higher vegetable, dairy, and protein content of the DASH diet compared with the control diet, at each sodium level (Table 2).

Table 3 shows differences in the odds of headache by diet and sodium level. Compared to the high sodium level, we observed a lower odds of any headache during the low sodium period both on the control diet (adjusted OR: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.49-0.99) and the DASH diet (adjusted OR: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.49-0.98). Although the relationship appeared graded (Figure 2), there was no significant difference between the intermediate level of sodium and either the low or high sodium levels, on either diet. There was no significant association of diet pattern (DASH vs. Control) with headache on any sodium level. There was also no significant interaction between diet and sodium on the occurrence of headaches (p-

BMJ Open

interaction > 0.05). Compared to the control diet with high sodium, there was a reduced risk of a headache on the DASH diet with low sodium (adjusted OR = 0.64, 95% CI: 0.41 - 0.99, p = 0.05).

While on control diet, the number of persons who reported a severe headache was 4 (2.1%) during high, 1 (0.5%) during intermediate, and 1 (0.5%) during low sodium periods, respectively (p for trend = 0.13). On DASH diet, the corresponding number of persons who reported a severe headache was 8 (4%) during high, 2 (1%) during intermediate, and 3 (1.5%) during low sodium periods, respectively (p for trend= 0.08). The frequency of severe headache was similar (p = 0.3) by diet [DASH 8 (4%) and control 4 (2%)] during high sodium feeding period. (Table 4)

There was no evidence that the relationship between sodium levels and headache was modified by age, sex, race, baseline BMI or blood pressure (Figure 3).

Discussion

In this secondary analysis of the DASH-Sodium trial, which enrolled adults with pre- and stage 1 hypertension, a reduced dietary sodium intake was associated with a lower risk of headache, both on the control diet and the DASH diet. In contrast, the risk of headache was similar on the DASH and control diets.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

The epidemiological literature on headaches in adults is limited [1, 2, 6]. However, it is well-recognized that, compared to normotensive individuals, individuals with hypertension have a higher frequency of headaches [16-19, 28]. Of note, Cooper *et al* reported a direct relationship of headaches with both systolic and diastolic blood pressure [17]. As regards trials, in a pooled analysis that included seven double–blinded, randomized placebo controlled trials of Ibesartan therapy, Hansson *et al* found a direct relationship of diastolic blood pressure with incident headaches in 2673 patients with mild to moderate hypertension [29].

The association between dietary sodium intake and blood pressure is also well recognized [30, 31]. The DASH diet alone and in combination with reduced sodium intake lowers blood pressure in patients with or without hypertension [20, 21]. It is noteworthy that there was no significant relationship between diet pattern and headache. This suggests that a process that is independent of a blood pressure may mediate the relationship between sodium and headaches.

Our results contrast with the popular belief that a diet rich in fruits, vegetables and potassium and low in saturated and total fat may ease the frequency, or even prevent, headache [32]. Several dietary factors, including fasting, alcoholic drinks, chocolate, coffee, and cheese, appear to trigger vascular headache (cluster or migraine) in adults [33- 36]. In some studies, an increased intake of monosodium glutamate is associated with the occurrence of headaches [22-24]. However, a recent review concluded that evidence on the relationship of sodium glutamate intake and headaches is inconsistent [37]. In one study of 200 adults (mean age 37.7 years, 81% females), monosodium glutamate was identified as a trigger for migraine headache in only 5 (2.5%) of study participants [36]. However, data on the relationship between sodium intake and any form of headaches are sparse.

BMJ Open

The results of this study provide encouraging evidence in support of dietary recommendations to lower sodium intake: recommendations which are currently based on the relationship of sodium intake with blood pressure. The daily intake of sodium in adults living in the United States is already in excess of their physiological need and for many individuals, is much higher than the highest level tested in this study [38, 39]. Our results also support the recent World Health Organization guidelines for reducing sodium intake to less than 87 mmol/day [40] and American Heart Association guidelines for reducing sodium intake to 65 mmol/day [31].

Strengths of our study include its randomized controlled design comparing two diets using a parallel design and a three-period crossover of three levels of dietary sodium (high, intermediate, and low). Dietary intake during the feeding periods was closely monitored and vigorous efforts were made to promote adherence with assigned diets. The participants of this study were healthy, non-institutionalized, racially diverse, middle- and older-aged men and women. Hence we believe that these results are applicable to a large fraction of adults.

Our study also has limitations. Information on the prevalence of headache at baseline from eligible participants was lacking. In addition, there was no information about the type of headache (tension, cluster or migraine) experienced by study participants. However, we suspect that most of the headaches were tension headaches. Whether a reduced sodium intake can prevent vascular headache is unknown. Second, the instrument was administered just once in each feeding period and does not allow calculation of an event rate, such as person-days of headaches. Third, these are secondary, post-hoc analyses from a trial that was not explicitly designed to test the effects of dietary factors on headaches. Nonetheless, a BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

rigorously controlled feeding study designed to test the effects of dietary factors on occurrence of headaches would be extremely expensive and logistically challenging. Fourth, our results likely underestimate the relationship of sodium intake with headaches. The range of sodium intake was relatively narrow - the highest sodium group in our trial actually corresponds to the average in the USA and is much lower than the intake in many countries, particularly in Asia. Self-report of symptoms is inherently imprecise and could bias results to the null, given that a validated instrument was not used for patient-reported headache.

In conclusion, a reduced sodium intake was associated with significantly lower risk of headache, while diet patterns had no effect on the risk of headaches. A reduced dietary sodium intake offers a novel approach to prevent headache in adults. Additional studies are needed to replicate these findings and to explore mechanisms that mediate the association between sodium intake and headache.

Contribution statement: All three authors (Muhammad Amer, Mark Woodward, and Lawrence Appel) have -substantially contributed to the conception, equally participated in the drafting, and editing and revising for the important intellectual content of the manuscript. Muhammad Amer and Mark Woodward were responsible for , did analyses of the data. All three authors participated in the interpretation of the analysis and agreed for the final approval of the version to be published. Authors are in agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work related to this manuscript and responsible for the integrity of any part of the work shown in this post-hoc analysis of the DASH-Sodium clinical trial.

Competing interests: None reported by any author

Funding: This study received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Data sharing: No additional data available to share.

References

- 1- Benbir G, Karadeniz D, Göksan B. The characteristics and subtypes of headache in relation to age and gender in a rural community in Eastern Turkey. Agri. 2012 Oct; 24(4):145-52
- 2- Stovner Lj, Hagen K, Jensen R et al. The global burden of headache: a documentation of headache prevalence and disability worldwide. Cephalalgia. 2007 Mar; 27(3):193-210.
- 3- Andlin-Sobocki P, Jönsson B, Wittchen HU, Olesen J. Cost of disorders of the brain in Europe.
 Eur J Neurol. 2005 Jun; 12 Suppl 1:1-27
- Jensen R, Stovner LJ. Epidemiology and comorbidity of headache. Lancet Neurol. 2008 Apr;
 7(4):354-61.
- 5- Zwart JA, Dyb G, Holmen TL, Stovner LJ, Sand T. The prevalence of migraine and tension-type headaches among adolescents in Norway: The Nord- Trøndelag Health Study (Head-Hunt). Cephalalgia. 2004 May; 24(5):373-9
- 6- Rasmussen BK. Epidemiology of headache. Cephalalgia. 2001 Sep; 21(7):774-7.
- 7- Berg J, Stovner LJ. Cost of migraine and other headaches in Europe. Eur J Neurol 2005; 12 (suppl 1): 59–62.
- 8- Rasmussen BK, Jensen R, Olesen J. Impact of headache on sickness absence and utilisation of medical services: a Danish population study. J Epidemiol Community Health 1992; 46: 443–46
- 9- Lyngberg AC, Rasmussen BK, Jensen R, et al. Secular changes in health care utilization and work absence for migraine and tension type headache. A population based study. J Epidemiol Com Health 2005; 20: 1007–14.
- 10- Von Korff M, Stewart W, Lipton RB. Assessing headache severity: new directions. Neurology 1998; 44 (Suppl 4):40–6.
BMJ Open

11- Michel P, Dartiques J, Duru G, Moreau J, Salamon R, Henry P. Incremental absenteeism due to headache in migraine: results from the Mig-Access French National Cohort. Cephalalgia. 1999 Jun; 19(5):503-10. 12-Vinding GR, Zeeberg P, Lyngberg A, Nielsen RT, Jensen R. The burden of headache in a patient population from a specialized headache centre. Cephalalgia. 2007 Mar; 27(3):263-70. 13- Medizabel JE, Rothrock JF. An interregional comparative study of headache clinic populations. Cephalalgia. 1998 Jan; 18(1):57-9. 14- Saper JR, Lake AE, Madden SF, Kreeger C. Comprehensive/tertiary care for headache: a 6month outcome study. Headache. 1999 Apr; 39(4):249-63. 15-Bussone G, Usai S, Grazzi L, Rigamonti A, Solari A, D'Amico D. Disability and quality of life in different primary headaches: results from Italian studies. Neurol Sci. 2004 Oct; 25 Suppl 3:S105-7. 16- Kruszewski P, Bieniaszewski L, Neubauer J, Krupa-Wojciechowska B. Headache in patients with mild to moderate hypertension is generally not associated with simultaneous blood pressure elevation. J Hypertens. 2000 Apr; 18(4):437-44. 17- Cooper WD, Glover DR, Hormbrey JM, Kimber GR. Headache and blood pressure: evidence of a close relationship. J Hum Hypertens. 1989 Feb; 3(1):41-4. 18- Janeway TC. A clinical study of hypertensive cardiovascular disease. Arch Intern Med. 1913; 12:755-798 19-Barlow DH, Beevers DG, Hawthorne VM, Watt HD, Young GA. Blood pressure measurement at screening and in general practice. Br Heart J. 1977 Jan; 39(1):7-12. 20- Appel LJ, Moore TJ, Obarzanek E et al. A clinical trial of the effects of dietary patterns on blood pressure. DASH Collaborative Research Group. N Engl J Med. 1997 Apr 17; 336(16):1117-24. 21- Sacks FM, Svetkey LP, Vollmer WM et al; DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. Effects on blood pressure of reduced dietary sodium and the Dietary Approaches to Stop 18 | Page

Hypertension (DASH) diet. DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. N Engl J Med. 2001 Jan 4;344(1):3-10

- 22- Yang WH, Drouin MA, Herbert M, Mao Y, Karsh J. The monosodium glutamate symptom complex: assessment in a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized study. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 1997 Jun; 99(6 Pt 1):757-62.
- 23- Randolph TG, Rollins JP. Beet sensitivity: allergic reactions from the ingestion of beet sugar (sucrose) and monosodium glutamate of beet origin. J Lab Clin Med 1950; 36:407-17.
- 24- Ratner D, Eshel E, Shoshani E. Adverse effects of monosodium glutamate: a diagnostic problem.Israel J Med Sci 1984;20:252-3
- 25- Svetkey LP, Sacks FM, Obarzanek E et al. The DASH Diet, Sodium Intake and Blood Pressure Trial (DASH-sodium): rationale and design. DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. J Am Diet Assoc. 1999 Aug; 99(8 Suppl):S96-104.
- 26- The sixth report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. Arch Intern Med 1997; 157: 2413-46. [Erratum, Arch Intern Med 1998; 158:573.
- 27-Liang K-Y, Zeger SL. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. Biometrika 1986;73:13-22
- 28- Sigurdsson JA, Bengtsson C. Symptoms and signs in relation to blood pressure and antihypertensive treatment. A cross-sectional and longitudinal population study of middle-aged Swedish women. Acta Med Scand. 1983; 213(3):183-90.
- 29- Hansson L, Smith DH, Reeves R, Lapuerta P. Headache in mild-to-moderate hypertension and its reduction by irbesartan therapy. Arch Intern Med. 2000 Jun 12; 160 (11):1654-8.
- 30- Aburto NJ, Ziolkovska A, Hooper L, Elliott P, Cappuccio FP, Meerpohl JJ. Effect of lower sodium intake on health: systematic review and meta-analyses. BMJ. 2013 Apr 3; 346:f1326.

BMJ Open

31- Appel LJ, Brands MW, Daniels SR, Karanja N, Elmer PJ, Sacks FM; American Heart
Association. Dietary approaches to prevent and treat hypertension: a scientific statement from
the American Heart Association. Hypertension. 2006 Feb; 47(2):296-308.
32-Buchholz, David. Heal Your Headache: The 1-2-3 Program for Taking Charge of Your
Headaches. New York: Workman, 2002.
33- Savi L, Rainero I, Valfrè W, Gentile S, Lo Giudice R, Pinessi L. Food and headache attacks. A
comparison of patients with migraine and tension-type headache. Panminerva Med. 2002 Mar;
44(1):27-31.
34- Peatfield RC. Relationships between food, wine, and beer-precipitated migrainous headaches.
Headache. 1995 Jun; 35(6):355-7.
35- Carod-Artal FJ, Ezpeleta D, Martín-Barriga ML, Guerrero AL. Triggers, symptoms, and
treatment in two populations of migraneurs in Brazil and Spain. A cross-cultural study. J Neurol
Sci. 2011 May 15; 304(1-2):25-8.
36-Fukui PT, Gonçalves TR, Strabelli CG et al. Trigger factors in migraine patients. Arq
Neuropsiquiatr. 2008 Sep; 66(3A):494-9.
37-Freeman M. Reconsidering the effects of monosodium glutamate: a literature review. J Am Acad
Nurse Pract. 2006 Oct; 18(10):482-6.
38-Brown IJ, Tzoulaki I, Candeias V, Elliott P. Salt intakes around the world: implications for
public health. Int J Epidemiol. 2009 Jun; 38(3):791-813.
39-National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Division for Heart
Disease and Stroke Prevention Fact sheet; http://www.cdc.gov/salt/pdfs/Sodium_Fact_Sheet.pdf.
Accessed September 28, 2013.
40-WHO. Guideline: Sodium intake for adults and children. Geneva, World Health Organization
(WHO), 2012.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of participants in DASH-Sodium trial[Number (percentage) or mean (standard deviation)]

	<u>Control</u>	DASH	<u>Total</u>
<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>Diet</u> (<u>n=192)</u>	<u>Diet</u> (<u>n=198)</u>	<u>(n=390)</u>
Age (years)	<u>49 (10)</u>	<u>47 (10)</u>	<u>48 (10)</u>
<u>Females, n (%)</u>	<u>104 (54)</u>	<u>118 (60)</u>	<u>222 (57)</u>
<u>Race, n (%)</u>			
Caucasian	<u>78 (41)</u>	<u>81 (41)</u>	<u>159 (41)</u>
African American	<u>109 (57)</u>	<u>114 (57)</u>	<u>223 (57)</u>
<u>Other</u>	<u>5 (3)</u>	<u>3 (2)</u>	<u>8 (2)</u>
Body Mass Index, (kg/m ²)	<u>30 (5)</u>	<u>29 (5)</u>	<u>29.2 (5)</u>
Systolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	<u>135 (9)</u>	<u>134 (9)</u>	<u>135 (9)</u>
Diastolic Blood Pressure (mm Hg)	<u>86 (4)</u>	<u>85 (5)</u>	<u>86 (4)</u>
<u>Hypertension, n (%) †</u>	<u>76 (40)</u>	<u>79 (40)</u>	<u>155 (40)</u>
Current Smoker, n (%)	<u>21 (11)</u>	<u>21 (11)</u>	<u>42 (11)</u>

<u>†Hypertension was defined as an average systolic blood pressure of 140 mm of Hg or an average</u> diastolic blood pressure of 90 mmHg during the three screening visits.

Table 2: Urinary excretion according to sodium level and diet
[Mean (standard deviation)]

		Level of sodium										
	Hi	<u>gh</u>	Intern	<u>nediate</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>Low</u>						
	<u>DASH</u> (n=198)	<u>Control</u> (n=192)	<u>DASH</u> (n=198)	<u>Control</u> (n=192)	<u>DASH</u> (n=198)	<u>Control</u> (n=192)						
<u>Sodium</u> gram/day mmol/day	<u>3.3 (1.3)</u> 144 (57)	<u>3.2 (1.3)</u> <u>141 (55)</u>	<u>2.5 (1.2)</u> <u>107 (52)</u>	<u>2.4 (0.9)</u> <u>106 (43)</u>	<u>1.5 (1.1)</u> <u>67 (46)</u>	<u>1.5 (0.8)</u> <u>64 (37)</u>						
Potassium gram/day mmol/day	<u>3.0 (1.1)</u> <u>76 (27)</u>	<u>1.6 (0.5)</u> <u>40 (14)</u>	<u>3.2 (1.2)</u> <u>82 (31)</u>	<u>1.6 (0.5)</u> <u>41 (14)</u>	<u>3.2 (1.1)</u> <u>81 (29)</u>	<u>1.6 (0.5)</u> <u>41 (14)</u>						
<u>Urea Nitrogen</u> gram/day	<u>11.5 (4)</u>	<u>9.5 (3.2)</u>	<u>12.4 (4.5)</u>	<u>9.7 (3.4)</u>	<u>12 (4)</u>	<u>10 (3.3)</u>						
<u>Creatinine</u> gram/day	<u>1.4 (0.5)</u>	<u>1.5 (0.5)</u>	<u>1.5 (0.6)</u>	<u>1.5 (0.6)</u>	<u>1.4 (0.5)</u>	<u>1.5 (0.6)</u>						
				0	2							

Table 3: Odds ratio of headaches by diet and sodium set	quence	
	Odds ratio (95 %CI)	<u>p value</u>
Sodium effects on the DASH diet		
Intermediate v high sodium	<u>0.72 (0.51-1.01)</u>	<u>0.06</u>
Low v intermediate sodium	<u>0.96 (0.68-1.37)</u>	<u>0.85</u>
Low v high sodium	<u>0.69 (0.49-0.98)</u>	<u>0.04</u>
Sodium effects on the control diet		
Intermediate v high sodium	<u>0.81 (0.57-1.15)</u>	<u>0.24</u>
Low v intermediate sodium	<u>0.86 (0.59-1.24)</u>	<u>0.42</u>
Low v high sodium	<u>0.69 (0.49-0.99)</u>	<u>0.05</u>
Diet effects (DASH vs Control) at each sodium level		
On high sodium	0.65 (0.37-1.12)	<u>0.12</u>
On intermediate sodium	<u>0.57 (0.29-1.12)</u>	<u>0.10</u>
On low sodium	<u>0.64 (0.36-1.13)</u>	<u>0.12</u>
Low Sodium on DASH vs High Sodium on Control	0.64 (0.14-0.99)	0.05

Models adjusted for age, sex, race, site, systolic blood pressure, BMI, smoking status and carry over

effects from the previous period. CI =confidence interval.

BMJ Open

Table 4: Occurrence and severity of headache by sodium level and diet, n (%)

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

		Level of sodium											
	H	i <u>gh</u>	Intern	<u>nediate</u>	L	Low							
	<u>DASH</u> (n=198)	<u>Control</u> (n=192)	<u>DASH</u> <u>(n=198)</u>	<u>Control</u> (n=192)	<u>DASH</u> (n=198)	<u>Control</u> (n=192)							
Mild	<u>60 (30)</u>	<u>70 (36)</u>	<u>43 (22)</u>	<u>62 (32)</u>	<u>53 (27)</u>	<u>53 (28)</u>							
<u>Moderate</u>	<u>17 (9)</u>	<u>17 (9)</u>	<u>31 (16)</u>	<u>16 (8)</u>	<u>16 (8)</u>	<u>21 (11)</u>							
Severe	<u>8 (4)</u>	<u>4 (2)</u>	<u>2 (1)</u>	<u>1 (0.5)</u>	<u>3 (1)</u>	<u>1 (0.5)</u>							

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

FIGURE LEGEND:

Figure 1: DASH-Sodium Trial Flow Diagram

Figure 2: Frequency of headache by diet and sodium level.

Figure 3

(a): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in the DASH diet

ache (low vs h (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in the Control diet



BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.







338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Figure 3 (a): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in DASH diet	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P for interaction
Age (years)	1.21 (0.88, 1.67)	.89
>48 Sex	1.72 (1.24, 2.40)	.74
Women	1.44 (1.08, 1.93) 1.38 (0.96, 1.97)	70
White Black	1.58 (1.11, 2.24) 1.32 (0.97, 1.79)	.15
Body mass index (kg/m2)	1.52 (1.14, 2.04)	28
> 30 Hypertension Yes	1.27 (0.88, 1.83)	.53
No Overall	1.25 (0.94, 1.67) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)	
ا Figure 3 (b): Odds of headache (low vs high sodium) by subgroup, in Control diet		
Age (years)	1.21 (0.88, 1.66)	.18
>48 Sex	1.72 (1.24, 2.39)	.36
Momen Terreration Statement Statem Statement Statement Stat	1.44 (1.08, 1.93) 1.38 (0.96, 1.98)	56
Black	1.58 (1.11, 2.23) 1.32 (0.97, 1.78)	
Body mass index (kg/m2)	1.52 (1.14, 2.04)	.97
Hypertension Yes	1.75 (1.19, 2.57)	.56
No	1.25 (0.94, 1.66) 1.41 (1.13, 1.76)	

338x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Analysis Guide

DATASET: SIDEEFF

Side effects (symptoms) data. One record per randomized participant per visit (collected at SV3, RI, IV1, IV2 and IV3). Use AN_ID as the participant ID for all Data Release Requests and for all analysis data sets that leave CHR.

Variable	Description	Format	Range	Notes
	id for analysis datasets	text		Numeric portion of original alphanumeric
, 11 1 , Le				ID. First digit identifies clinic site.
APPETITE	poor appetite	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
BLOATING	bloating / uncomfortably full	severity*	1 - 4	included in GI symptoms, = 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
CONSTIP	constipation	severity*	1 -4	included in GI symptoms, = 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
DIARRHEA	diamhea / loose stools	severity*	1 - 4	included in GI symptoms, = 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
DRYMOUTH	dry mouth	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
EXTHIRST	excessive thirst	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
FATIGUE	fatigue or low energy	severity*	1 -4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
FELT	overall past two weeks	felt*	1 - 5	
HEADACHE	headache	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
ITCHYSKI	itchy skin or hives	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
LITEHEAD	lightheadedness when standing	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
NAUSEA	nausea or upset stomach	severity*	1 - 4	included in GI symptoms, = 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
SERIOUS	serious illness in past month	yesnoft*	1 - 4	
STUFFNOS	stuffy nose	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
TASTE	change in taste	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe
VISIT	visit	visitft*	4 - 8	= 4 if SV3, = 5 if RI, = 6 if IFP 1, = 7 if IFP 2, = 8 if IFP 3
WHEEZING	wheezing	severity*	1 - 4	= 1 if did not occur, = 2 if mild, = 3 if moderate, = 4 if severe

* custom format, see list of formats at end of this section.

1 H 1

 January 31, 2001

Variable Formats

DATASET: SIDEEFF

Januarv	31.	2001

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

: 1<u>1</u>. -

Dataset	Format:	Value Range:	Label:
SIDEEFF	FELT	· • •	NO ANSWER
		1_	MUCH WORSE
		2 -	WORSE THAN USUAL
		3 .	THE SAME AS USUAL
		4 _	BETTER THAN USUAL
		5 _	MUCH BETTER
	SEVERITY	· -	NO ANSWER
		1 -	DID NOT OCCUR
		2 _	MILD
		3 .	MODERATE
		4 _	SEVERE
	VISITFT	1_	PSV
		2 -	SV1
		3	SV2
		4 _	SV3
		5 -	RI
-		6 -	INT1
		7 _	INT2
		8 -	INT3
		9 _	COMPLT. FEEDING
	YESNOFT	0 _	No
		1 _	Yes
		2 -	No
		3 _	Unsure

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

:_ J£. 3

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

SideEff Dataset 10 Sample Observations

	A	в		D	D	\mathbf{E}			H	I	L			S			Ŵ
	Ρ	L	С	I	R	х	F		Е	т	I		S	T			H
	P	0	0	Α	Y	\mathbf{T}	А		А	С	т	N	Е	υ			Е
A.	Е	А	N	R	М	н	т		D	н	Е	Α	R	F	т	v	Е
N	т	т	S	R	0	I	I	F	A	Y	Н	U	I	F	A	I	z
_	I	I	T	Н	υ	R	G	E	С	S	E	S	0	N	S	S	Ι
I	т	N	Ι	E	т	s	υ	L	Н	к	А	Ε	υ	0	T	I	N
D	E	G	₽	A	H	т	Е	T	E	I	D	A	S	S	E	T	G
20847	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	1
20847	1	1	1,	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
20847	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	6	1
20847	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	1
20847	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	8	1
10933	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	.2	1	4	1
10933	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	5	1
10933	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	6	1
10933	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	7	2
10933	з	2	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	3	8	1
	A N I D 20847 20847 20847 20847 20847 20847 10933 10933 10933 10933	P P A E N T I T D E 20847 1 20847 1 20847 1 20847 1 20847 1 20847 1 10933 1 10933 2 10933 2 10933 3	P L P Q A E A N T T I I I I T N D E G 20847 1 1 20847 1 1 20847 1 1 20847 1 1 10933 1 1 10933 2 2 10933 2 2 10933 2 2 10933 3 2 10933 3 2	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$													

DASH-SODIUM Data Release (DTR-19) PROGRAM: WLDTR1901.sas ANALYST: W. Li -- Jan 31, 2001

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Manuscript: bmjopen-2014-006671



CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial*

Section/Topic	ltem No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
) 0	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	YES
1	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	YES
² Introduction			
3 Background and	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	YES
5 objectives	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	
6	25		YES
7 Methods			
8 Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	YES
9	Зb	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	YES
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	YES
22	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	YES
²³ Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were	
24		actually administered	YES
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they	
27		were assessed	YES
28	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	N/A
⁹ Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	N/A (post-hoc analysi
30 	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	N/A
2 Randomisation:			
3 Sequence	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	YES
generation	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	N/A
5 Allocation	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers),	
concealment		describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	VEC
8 mechanism			TES
9 Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to	
.0		interventions	oordinating center staff
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those	Participants
+3 I4 CONSORT 2010 checklist			Page 1
.5		For near review only http://bmienen.hmi.com/site/shout/avide/inco.yhtml	
7		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006671 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Page 58 of 58

Manuscript: bmjopen-2014-006671

d secondary outcomes YES as and adjusted analyses YES domly assigned, received intended treatment, and YES. N/A for this stud , together with reasons YES eristics for each group YES ded in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis acision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES yES YES ugs), role of funders YES YES YES Laboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also			assessing outcomes) and how	
d secondary outcomes YES ess and adjusted analyses YES domly assigned, received intended treatment, and YES. N/A for this stude domly assigned, received intended treatment, and YES. N/A for this stude , together with reasons YES eristics for each group YES ided in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis action, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ind harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES yES YES ugs), role of funders YES YES YES Used Stopped YES YES YES ugs), role of funders YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES YES <td></td> <td>11b</td> <td>If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions</td> <td>YES</td>		11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	YES
ass and adjusted analyses YES domly assigned, received intended treatment, and YES. N/A for this sture , together with reasons YES eristics for each group YES ided in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis action, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES version, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES yes YES ugs), role of funders YES YES YES Laboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	YES
domly assigned, received intended treatment, and YES. N/A for this study , together with reasons YES eristics for each group YES ded in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis vession, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES yES YES ugs), role of funders YES Vess		12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	YES
domly assigned, received intended treatment, and YES. N/A for this sture , together with reasons YES , together with reasons YES eristics for each group YES ided in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES Ugs), role of funders YES VES YES Leaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Results			
YES. N/A for this sture , together with reasons YES in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended YES up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis vcision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vcision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vcision, and, of frelevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vcision, and, of frelevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vcision, and, of frelevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vcision, and considering other relevant evidence YES vcision	Participant flow (a	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and	
, together with reasons , toge	diagram is strongly		were analysed for the primary outcome	YES. N/A for this stue
Time line not date Planned stopped YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing Specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis PES vecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vecision, and, of relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vecision, and, of relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES vecision, and considering other relevant evidence YES ugs), role of funders YES Lelaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	recommended)	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	YES
eristics for each group Planned stopped ided in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis accision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES indings	Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	Time line not date
eristics for each group ided in each analysis and whether the analysis was group, and the estimated effect size and its ative effect sizes is recommended up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) Accision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses ndings d harms, and considering other relevant evidence <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u> <u>YES</u>		14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	Planned stopped
Index in each analysis and whether the analysis was YES group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES YES Ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	VES
group, and the estimated effect size and its group, and the estimated effect size and its YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis secision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES yES YES ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was	YES
YES ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES YES Used Odds Ratio's YES YES YES Itel boration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also YES	Outcomes and	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its	
ative effect sizes is recommended Used Odds Ratio's up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing YES specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES yES YES ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	estimation		precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	YES
up analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing <u>YES</u> specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES YES ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also		17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	Lised Odds Ratio's
specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) YES ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES YES Ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing	Osed Odds Mallos
specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) N/A in post hoc analysis ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES YES ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also			pre-specified from exploratory	YES
Provide the section of the section	Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	A in post hoc analysis
ecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES YES ugs), role of funders YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Discussion			
vision, and, in clevant, multiplicity of analyses YES ndings YES d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES ugs), role of funders YES L Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	YES
d harms, and considering other relevant evidence YES YES Ugs), role of funders VES YES YES VES YES	Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	YES
YES Ugs), role of funders YES YES YES YES YES YES	Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and barms, and considering other relevant evidence.	
Ugs), role of funders YES YES Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also		~~	interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	YES
YES YES YES YES YES YES I Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Other information	00	Devictor for such as and a such of trial as sinted	
Ugs), role of funders YES YES	Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	YES
UGS), role of funders YES	Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	YES
Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also	Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	YES
ials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal intervent	Other information Registration Protocol Funding *We strongly recommend recommend reading CON Additional extensions are	23 24 25 I reading SORT of	Registration number and name of trial registry Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders g this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the iter extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal intervent ming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see <u>www.consort-statement.org</u> .	ns. If retions, a
	CONSORT 2010 checklist			Page 2
Page 2			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
Page 2	ουσειεα αλ cobλuθur	n	nea as 10.136/pm/open.zu14-0066/1 on 11 December 2014. Downloaded from http://pm/open.bm/.com/ on April 28, 2024 by	nund 15111 : Tres public