a rigorous analysis of available efficacy data from randomised controlled trials from different settings, which informed the delivery of vitamin A in deficient populations.1,4

Members of our three agencies attended a 2 day consultation in 2008, in Oxford, UK, which reviewed the DEVTA study, provided constructive comments, and discussed globally relevant lessons on the challenges facing large delivery programmes and their assessment, in terms of design, implementation, and resources needed. Many concerns were raised that, in our opinion, have not been fully addressed, either in the Article1 or in the Comment.5

It was agreed that these proceedings would be made publically available and so we call on the authors to share the proceedings in order to have a fully informed and ethical public debate.

We concur with the authors of the Comment1 that science should inform policy. We therefore call on the appropriate normative bodies to take account of both the DEVTA study and the Oxford proceedings when assessing what, if any, adjustments should be made in the estimation of the expected effect of vitamin A supplementation on child mortality, and to provide any appropriate changes to vitamin A supplementation policy. As representatives of agencies dedicated to saving children’s lives, we are gravely concerned by the call in the Comment1 for new controlled trials of such supplementation. Any further controlled trials would inherently deprive those children assigned to control groups of a proven, life-saving intervention.

We urge decision makers in national governments and donor agencies to continue to provide strong support for vitamin A supplementation as a core, evidence-based child survival intervention that has been used so effectively in the past decade in combination with other proven interventions to address underlying determinants of vitamin A deficiency, including food-based approaches.

VM is President of the Micronutrient Initiative, which has been supporting the inclusion of vitamin A supplementation in child survival programming for 20 years. WS is the Chief of Nutrition at UNICEF, which has been supporting the scale-up of vitamin A supplementation in more than 70 countries around the world for the past 20 years. KS is President and Chief Executive Officer of Helen Keller International, which has been supporting vitamin A supplementation delivery for decades.
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The results of the DEVTA study5 of vitamin A supplementation delivered through an Indian Government programme show that this particular programme did not reduce mortality. This could be a worthwhile finding if the reasons for the failure were elucidated—eg, were supply chains properly set up and implemented and was the supplement delivered to those who could most benefit? Sommer and colleagues3 addressed the methodological shortcomings of the trial, but in our view the most important issue is that programme assessments need more complex designs than do biological efficacy trials.

Causal chains in large-scale programmes are long and complex, and therefore careful documentation of what takes place at all levels in such chains is essential.3 These questions were only partly addressed in a non-random opportunistic subsample of 2106 of the million children in the study, who were likely to be easily reached and therefore received both the supplement and the validation visits. There is thus no plausible evidence that the intervention was or was not given to those who could most benefit.

Programme assessments must address complex causal pathways, including bottlenecks to delivery and use.4 By contrast, biological efficacy studies must concentrate on establishing that vitamin A is actually ingested by most, if not all, children. As a consequence, these different types of study should never be included together in meta-analyses, no matter how well they are done.

Both biological efficacy and programme studies are important, so we heartily concur with the recommendation that “funders should invest—and invest heavily—in such studies.”
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