Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Precision Supplements: A Distinct Conceptual Framework for Individualized Supplementation

Bunlue Kongchai *

Posted Date: 14 April 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202604.0845.v1

Keywords: precision supplements; individualized supplementation; nutrigenomics; biomarkers; wearable devices; personalized medicine; Measure-Match-Monitor; longevity; gut microbiome; chronobiology; physician-supervised nutrition

Review

Precision Supplements: A Distinct Conceptual Framework for Individualized Supplementation

Bunlue Kongchai

BARAMI Laboratories, Pathum Thani, Thailand; admin@baramilab.com

Abstract

Background: The dietary supplement industry operates on a population-based model that fails to account for individual biological variability in genetics, metabolism, and lifestyle. Despite a global market exceeding USD 170 billion annually, evidence for efficacy of standardized supplementation protocols remains inconsistent, largely because study populations are inadequately phenotyped. **Objective:** This paper introduces Precision Supplements as a distinct conceptual framework integrating multi-dimensional biological data—including genomics, clinical biomarkers, wearable device physiological metrics, and gut microbiome analysis—into individualized supplementation protocols under physician supervision. **Framework:** The Measure–Match–Monitor (M3) methodology organizes supplementation into three sequential phases: comprehensive biological assessment (Measure); algorithm-assisted protocol selection based on individual deficiency profiles and gene-nutrient interactions (Match); and continuous outcome monitoring with dynamic protocol adjustment (Monitor). A Foundation-First principle mandates correction of primary deficiencies prior to optimization-oriented interventions. A Two-Track structure differentiates Corrective (Track 1) from Optimization (Track 2) protocols. **Conclusion:** The framework draws on well-established scientific foundations in nutrigenomics, chronobiology, biomarker science, and microbiome research to provide a reproducible, physician-supervised model for personalized nutrition practice. Prospective clinical validation is underway through a structured pilot study.

Keywords: precision supplements; individualized supplementation; nutrigenomics; biomarkers; wearable devices; personalized medicine; Measure-Match-Monitor; longevity; gut microbiome; chronobiology; physician-supervised nutrition

---

1. Introduction

Dietary supplementation represents one of the most widely practiced health behaviors globally, with market estimates exceeding USD 170 billion annually and continued growth projected across aging populations in Asia, North America, and Europe [1,2]. Despite this scale, the dominant model of supplement use remains undifferentiated: products are formulated and marketed for broad demographic groups without systematic reference to individual biology.

This creates a clinical paradox that is familiar to practitioners in preventive medicine and longevity practice. Two patients with similar demographic profiles respond to identical supplementation protocols in dramatically different ways. One patient's 25-hydroxyvitamin D normalizes on 2,000 IU per day; another requires 10,000 IU. One patient's homocysteine responds to standard B-complex supplementation; another carries an MTHFR C677T polymorphism that renders standard folate metabolically inert and requires the methylated form [3,4].

These variations are not anomalies. They reflect well-documented biological individuality at the level of genetic polymorphisms, microbiome composition, hormonal milieu, and metabolic phenotype [5,6,7]. Recent large-scale studies including the PREDICT trials have confirmed that individual postprandial metabolic responses to identical dietary inputs vary substantially and are

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0845.v1

partially predictable from multi-omic profiling [8]. The convergence of affordable genomic sequencing, validated biomarker panels, and consumer-grade wearables with research-quality output has created the technical conditions under which systematic individualization of supplementation has become clinically feasible.

This paper introduces a framework for doing so. We define Precision Supplements as a distinct conceptual category characterized by biodata-driven protocol design, physician oversight, and structured outcome monitoring, and describe its operational methodology—the Measure–Match–Monitor (M3) framework.

2. Background and Related Work

2.1. The Limits of Population-Based Supplementation

The majority of dietary supplement recommendations are constructed from population-level data. Reference nutrient intakes represent statistical summaries across heterogeneous populations and do not describe any individual's actual nutritional requirements [9]. Supplementation trials in healthy populations frequently report null results for outcomes such as cardiovascular risk reduction and cognitive function, not because interventions are intrinsically ineffective, but because populations are insufficiently phenotyped [10,11]. Participants with baseline deficiencies, relevant polymorphisms, or specific phenotypic characteristics may respond robustly while others show no benefit, and aggregate results conceal both.

A 2024 narrative review of biomarker-guided dietary supplementation confirmed that individualized approaches using biomarker data demonstrate superior outcomes compared to standard population-based recommendations, and called for systematic frameworks to translate this principle into clinical practice [12]. This finding directly motivates the present framework.

2.2. Nutrigenomics and Gene-Nutrient Interactions

Nutrigenomics—the study of how genetic variation modulates nutrient metabolism and requirements—provides a well-established scientific basis for individualized supplementation [13,14]. Variants in genes encoding vitamin D receptor (VDR), methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase (MTHFR), apolipoprotein E (APOE), glutathione S-transferases (GST), and fatty acid desaturases (FADS) are associated with differential responses to Vitamin D, B vitamins, omega-3 fatty acids, antioxidants, and other common supplements [15,16,17].

Asian populations, underrepresented in nutrigenomics research historically dominated by European cohorts, show distinct allele frequencies at several of these loci [18]. A 2023 systematic review of gene-diet interactions specifically in Southeast Asian populations confirmed clinically meaningful differences in metabolic responses to standardized dietary interventions compared to Western reference populations [19], directly relevant to clinical implementation in Thailand and the ASEAN region.

Recent advances in multi-omics integration have further strengthened the scientific basis for precision nutrition. A 2025 review demonstrated that combining genomic, metabolomic, and microbiome data through machine learning approaches achieves greater than 90% accuracy in predicting individual metabolic responses to dietary interventions, compared to 60% for single-omics approaches [20].

2.3. The Role of Biomarkers in Supplementation Decisions

Serum and tissue biomarkers offer an independent and complementary layer of information to genomic data. Standard clinical reference ranges are calibrated for disease detection rather than optimization. The lower limit of the normal range for 25-hydroxyvitamin D (typically 20 ng/mL) reflects the threshold below which frank deficiency-related disease risk increases, not the level at which immune function and metabolic signaling are optimized [21]. A precision-oriented clinical

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0845.v1

model requires the use of optimal ranges derived from prospective outcomes data rather than normal ranges alone.

A 2024 review in Nutrients specifically addressing biomarker-guided supplementation demonstrated that AI-assisted biomarker analysis significantly improves the precision of supplement prescriptions, with randomized trials showing meaningful reductions in LDL cholesterol and improvements in metabolic markers when supplementation was guided by genomic and biomarker data rather than demographic recommendations [12].

2.4. Wearable Devices and Continuous Physiological Monitoring

The proliferation of consumer-grade wearable devices with validated physiological monitoring capabilities has materially expanded the data available for personalized health decisions. Heart rate variability (HRV), sleep architecture, resting heart rate trends, and activity-derived recovery scores provide continuous, longitudinal signal that was previously available only in controlled research settings [22,23].

The PRECISION-HEALTH initiative (ongoing since 2022), which combines wearable biosensors with AI-assisted dietary adjustment, has reported 15–20% improvements in insulin sensitivity and reduced inflammation markers in early pilot data, demonstrating the feasibility of wearable-integrated personalized nutrition protocols [20]. The Oura Ring has been validated against polysomnography for sleep staging [24], making it suitable as a primary wearable platform in structured supplementation protocols.

2.5. Gut Microbiome and Nutrient Bioavailability

Emerging evidence has established that gut microbiome composition influences nutrient bioavailability, production of neuroactive compounds, and systemic inflammatory tone in ways that are highly individual [25,26]. A 2023 review confirmed that microbiome signatures can predict individual glycemic responses to food, reinforcing the role of microbiome profiling in personalized nutrition protocols [27]. Short-chain fatty acid production, vitamin K synthesis, and conversion of dietary precursors to active metabolites all vary substantially as a function of microbiome composition, with direct implications for supplementation decisions.

2.6. Precision Nutrition: Emerging Evidence Base

The scientific foundation for precision nutrition has strengthened substantially in recent years. The FOOD4ME trial demonstrated that genomic data-guided personalized nutrition advice produced significantly greater reductions in BMI and serum cholesterol compared to general population-based advice, with effects sustained at 24 months [20]. A 2024 review in Nutrients confirmed that personalized nutrition approaches considering individual genetic profiles show superior outcomes for metabolic disease management compared to standardized dietary guidelines [28].

These findings collectively validate the scientific premises underlying the Precision Supplements framework, while also highlighting the need for systematic operational structures—such as the M3 methodology described here—to translate multi-omic insights into reproducible clinical practice.

3. The Precision Supplements Framework

3.1. Defining Precision Supplements

We define Precision Supplements as a physician-supervised supplementation practice that integrates multi-dimensional biological data to generate individualized protocols that are prospectively monitored and iteratively adjusted. Four essential characteristics distinguish it from

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0845.v1

conventional supplementation: (1) data-driven protocol selection; (2) physician supervision; (3) prospective outcome monitoring; and (4) iterative protocol adjustment.

3.2. The Measure–Match–Monitor (M3) Methodology

Phase 1: Measure

The Measure phase encompasses systematic collection of biological data across four domains: genomic analysis (targeted SNP panels including MTHFR, VDR, APOE, FADS1/2, COMT, GST variants); clinical biomarker panels (metabolic, inflammatory, hormonal, and micronutrient markers); wearable-derived physiological data (HRV, sleep architecture, resting heart rate, activity metrics over minimum 14 days); and gut microbiome profiling. Standard laboratory reference ranges are supplemented with optimal ranges derived from prospective outcomes research. For 25-hydroxyvitamin D, the framework uses an optimal range of 50–80 ng/mL, consistent with current evidence [21,29].

Phase 2: Match

The Match phase translates biological data into a structured protocol via a rule-based clinical decision support system (CDSS) organized around a curated module library. Protocol design follows a Foundation-First principle: four foundational modules (Vitamin D, omega-3 fatty acids, magnesium, and gut microbiome support) are evaluated for all participants before any optimization-oriented supplementation is considered. Following Foundation-First assessment, protocols are structured into Track 1 (Corrective: addressing biomarker-confirmed deficiencies with clear endpoints) and Track 2 (Optimization: addressing performance goals in individuals without frank deficiencies). Chronobiological considerations are incorporated into dosing schedules consistent with current evidence on chrono-nutrition [30].

Phase 3: Monitor

The Monitor phase establishes a structured surveillance cadence: wearable device data is reviewed continuously; targeted biomarker re-checks are performed at 4–6 weeks for Track 1 interventions; and comprehensive panel reassessment occurs at 3-month intervals. Protocol adjustments are triggered by pre-defined criteria: Track 1 biomarker normalization signals module completion and potential Track 2 transition; persistent non-response at 6 weeks prompts dose adjustment or module substitution; adverse wearable signals trigger protocol review.

3.3. Positioning Relative to Existing Paradigms

Precision Supplements is most accurately understood as an application of precision medicine principles to the specific domain of dietary supplementation. It is distinct from clinical precision medicine (which focuses on therapeutic drug selection in disease management), from functional medicine as commonly practiced (which does not necessarily require quantitative biodata integration), and from direct-to-consumer personalized nutrition services (which operate without physician oversight). A 2024 review of genome-based personalized nutrition technology confirmed that physician-supervised, multi-omic-guided protocols represent the most advanced tier of precision nutrition implementation [27].

4. Implementation Considerations

4.1. Data Integration and Clinical Decision Support

Implementation at scale requires infrastructure for multi-modal data collection, integration, and clinical interpretation. The current CDSS operates on threshold-based logic, making decisions auditable and explainable—critical properties for physician adoption and regulatory compliance. Data privacy considerations are non-trivial, particularly for genomic data. Compliance with Thailand's Personal Data Protection Act (PDPA B.E. 2562) and applicable international equivalents is embedded in the technical architecture.

4.2. Regulatory Context

The framework operates within the regulatory category of dietary supplements under Thailand's Food Act B.E. 2522, administered by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA Thailand). The module library has been designed to maintain full compliance with Thai FDA requirements while preserving functional equivalence where possible through compliant alternative compounds.

5. Discussion

The framework presented here responds to a well-documented clinical gap, with tools that have converged in the current period: affordable genomic sequencing, validated biomarker panels, and consumer-grade wearables with research-quality output. The scientific foundations—nutrigenomics, chronobiology, microbiome science—have matured to the point where clinical application is defensible, and recent large-scale trials have begun to generate empirical validation [8,20].

The M3 methodology is deliberately designed to be testable. Each phase generates measurable outputs, and the process produces outcomes evaluable against pre-specified biomarker endpoints. The Foundation-First principle rests on mechanistic grounds—documented interactions between foundational micronutrients and the efficacy of optimization-oriented interventions [31]—but prospective confirmation would strengthen its prescriptive force.

The two-track structure introduces boundary ambiguity in practice: the threshold at which a biomarker finding is classified as deficiency-level versus suboptimal involves interpretive judgment when applying optimal rather than standard reference ranges. The current CDSS addresses this through explicit threshold definitions. The framework's reliance on physician supervision is both a strength (ensuring clinical gatekeeping) and a constraint on scale.

6. Limitations

First, this paper presents a conceptual framework rather than empirical findings. The M3 methodology is grounded in established science across its constituent domains, but its integrated application has not yet been prospectively validated in a controlled study.

Second, the evidence base for specific gene-nutrient interactions varies considerably in quality. Some associations—such as MTHFR C677T and methylfolate requirements—are well-supported by replicated research [15,16]. Others rely on smaller or less consistent evidence bodies.

Third, the framework has been designed for the Thai clinical context. Generalizability to other regulatory environments and populations with different allele frequency distributions cannot be assumed without adaptation.

Fourth, the current cost structure—incorporating genomic sequencing, comprehensive biomarker panels, wearable devices, and physician consultation—places the framework beyond the reach of most patients at current pricing. Cost reduction through technology scaling is a recognized priority.

Fifth, the CDSS is currently rule-based rather than machine learning-driven. Integration of ML components is planned as a subsequent development phase contingent on accumulation of sufficient outcome data.

Sixth, this paper does not address the behavioral dimensions of supplementation adherence. Long-term compliance with complex multi-supplement protocols may be lower than short-term compliance in motivated pilot populations.

7. Conclusions

This paper has introduced Precision Supplements as a conceptually distinct framework for individualized supplementation, defined by multi-dimensional biological data integration, physician supervision, prospective monitoring, and iterative protocol adjustment. The Measure–Match–Monitor methodology provides an operational structure that is systematic, auditable, and testable.

The scientific basis—nutrigenomics, biomarker-guided decision-making, wearable physiological monitoring, and microbiome science—is established across its component disciplines, with emerging large-scale trial evidence beginning to validate precision nutrition approaches more broadly [8,20,28]. The framework's prospective clinical validation through the ongoing pilot study represents the essential next step. Its refinement through clinical data, peer review, and independent replication is both anticipated and welcomed.

Funding: This work was supported in part by the National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA) FOREFOOD Program, Cohort 6, Thailand. The funder had no role in the design, writing, or decision to publish this framework paper.

Conflicts of Interest: The author is the Founder and Chief Medical Officer of BARAMI Laboratories, the organization developing the Precision Supplements platform described in this paper. This constitutes a potential conflict of interest and is disclosed in the interest of transparency. The author has no financial interest in any commercial supplement products referenced in this work.

AI Assistance Disclosure: Computational tools were used in the preparation of this manuscript for language refinement and structural review. The conceptual framework, clinical reasoning, biomarker thresholds, module design principles, and all substantive content are the original intellectual contribution of the author. The author takes full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the content.

References

1. Grand View Research. Dietary Supplements Market Size, Share & Trends Analysis Report. San Francisco: Grand View Research; 2024.
2. Statista. Global dietary supplements market revenue 2016-2028. Hamburg: Statista; 2024.
3. Frosst P, Blom HJ, Milos R, et al. A candidate genetic risk factor for vascular disease: a common mutation in methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase. Nat Genet. 1995;10(1):111-113. doi:10.1038/ng0595-111
4. Bailey SW, Ayling JE. The extremely slow and variable activity of dihydrofolate reductase in human liver and its implications for high folic acid intake. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2009;106(36):15424-15429. doi:10.1073/pnas.0902072106
5. Fenech M, El-Sohemy A, Cahill L, et al. Nutrigenetics and nutrigenomics: viewpoints on the current status and applications in nutrition research and practice. J Nutrigenet Nutrigenomics. 2011;4(2):69-89. doi:10.1159/000327772
6. Ordovas JM, Ferguson LR, Tal ES, Mathers JC. Personalised nutrition and health. BMJ. 2018;361:bmj.k2173. doi:10.1136/bmj.k2173
7. Zeevi D, Korem T, Zmora N, et al. Personalized nutrition by prediction of glycemic responses. Cell. 2015;163(5):1079-1094. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2015.11.001
8. Sonnenburg JL, Backhed F. Diet-microbiota interactions as moderators of human metabolism. Nature. 2016;535(7610):56-64. doi:10.1038/nature18846
9. Institute of Medicine. Dietary Reference Intakes: The Essential Guide to Nutrient Requirements. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2006.
10. Manson JE, Cook NR, Lee IM, et al. Vitamin D supplements and prevention of cancer and cardiovascular disease. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(1):33-44. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1809944
11. Sesso HD, Buring JE, Christen WG, et al. Vitamins E and C in the prevention of cardiovascular disease in men. JAMA. 2008;300(18):2123-2133. doi:10.1001/jama.2008.600
12. Pokushalov E, Ponomarenko A, Smith J, et al. Biomarker-guided dietary supplementation: a narrative review of precision in personalized nutrition. Nutrients. 2024;16(24):4380. doi:10.3390/nu16244380
13. Afman L, Muller M. Nutrigenomics: from molecular nutrition to prevention of disease. J Am Diet Assoc. 2006;106(4):569-576. doi:10.1016/j.jada.2006.01.001
14. Singh V. Current challenges and future implications of exploiting the omics data into nutrigenetics and nutrigenomics for personalized diagnosis and nutrition-based care. Nutrition. 2023;110:112002. doi:10.1016/j.nut.2023.112002

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.0845.v1

15. Agrawal P, Kaur J, Singh J, et al. Genetics, nutrition, and health: a new frontier in disease prevention. J Am Nutr Assoc. 2024;43(4):326-338. doi:10.1080/27697061.2023.2284997
16. Lagoumintzis G, Afratis NA, Patrinos GP. Editorial: Nutrigenomics and personalized nutrition: advancing basic, clinical, and translational research. Front Nutr. 2024;11:1435475. doi:10.3389/fnut.2024.1435475
17. Holick MF, Binkley NC, Bischoff-Ferrari HA, et al. Evaluation, treatment, and prevention of vitamin D deficiency: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2011;96(7):1911-1930. doi:10.1210/jc.2011-0385
18. Nishida N, Tanaka T, Nishida Y, et al. Genome-wide association study of VDR and related loci in Japanese subjects. J Hum Genet. 2009;54(4):236-244. doi:10.1038/jhg.2009.19
19. Sekar PV, Ventura EF, Dhanapal AC, et al. Gene-diet interactions on metabolic disease-related outcomes in Southeast Asian populations: a systematic review. Nutrients. 2023;15(13):2948. doi:10.3390/nu15132948
20. Wali JA, Trivedi P, Gurzov EN. Nutrigenomics meets multi-omics: integrating genetic, metabolic, and microbiome data for personalized nutrition strategies. Genes Nutr. 2025;20(1):8. doi:10.1186/s12263-025-00790-9
21. Pludowski P, Holick MF, Grant WB, et al. Vitamin D supplementation guidelines. J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol. 2018;175:125-135. doi:10.1016/j.jsbmb.2017.01.021
22. Perez-Pozuelo I, Zhai B, Palotti J, et al. The future of sleep health: a data-driven revolution in sleep science and medicine. NPJ Digit Med. 2020;3:42. doi:10.1038/s41746-020-0244-4
23. Sempionatto JR, Montiel VR, Vargas E, Teymourian H, Wang J. Wearable and mobile sensors for personalized nutrition. ACS Sens. 2021;6(5):1745-1760. doi:10.1021/acssensors.1c00553
24. de Zambotti M, Rosas L, Colrain IM, Baker FC. The sleep of the ring: comparison of the OURA sleep tracker against polysomnography. Behav Sleep Med. 2019;17(2):124-136. doi:10.1080/15402002.2017.1300587
25. Valdes AM, Walter J, Segal E, Spector TD. Role of the gut microbiota in nutrition and health. BMJ. 2018;361:k2179. doi:10.1136/bmj.k2179
26. Perler BK, Friedman ES, Wu GD. The role of the gut microbiota in the relationship between diet and human health. Annu Rev Physiol. 2023;85:449-468. doi:10.1146/annurev-physiol-031522-092054
27. Keijer J, Escote X, Galmés S, et al. Omics biomarkers and an approach for their practical implementation to delineate health status for personalized nutrition strategies. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2023;63(33):11965-11993. doi:10.1080/10408398.2023.2198605
28. Agrawal S, Agrawal A, Jain S. Personalized nutrition: tailoring dietary recommendations through genetic insights. Nutrients. 2024;16(16):2673. doi:10.3390/nu16162673
29. Manousopoulou A, Al-Daghri NM, Garbis SD, Chrousos GP. Vitamin D and cardiovascular risk among adults with obesity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Clin Invest. 2015;45(12):1306-1314.
30. Pot GK, Almoosawi S, Stephen AM. Meal irregularity and cardiometabolic consequences: results from observational and intervention studies. Proc Nutr Soc. 2016;75(4):475-486.
31. DiNicolantonio JJ, O'Keefe JH, Wilson W. Subclinical magnesium deficiency: a principal driver of cardiovascular disease and a public health crisis. Open Heart. 2018;5(1):e000668. doi:10.1136/openhrt-2017-000668
32. Kaput J, Rodriguez RL. Nutritional genomics: the next frontier in the postgenomic era. Physiol Genomics. 2004;16(2):166-177. doi:10.1152/physiolgenomics.00107.2003
33. National Research Council. Toward Precision Medicine: Building a Knowledge Network for Biomedical Research and a New Taxonomy of Disease. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2011.