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1. INTRODUCTION

Each year, an estimated 785,000 Americans will have a new coronary artery disease (CAD) event, and approximately 470,000 will have a recurrent attack. CAD caused approximately 1 of every 6 deaths in the United States in 2007. Although rates of stroke are declining, mortality data from 2007 indicate that stroke accounted for 1 of every 18 deaths in the United States. An estimated 33,600,000 adults 20 years or older have total serum cholesterol levels of 240 mg/dL or greater, for a prevalence of 15% of the American population (1 [EL 3]). Dyslipidemia is a primary, major risk factor for CAD and may even be a prerequisite for CAD, occurring before other major risk factors come into play. Epidemiologic data also suggest that hypercholesterolemia and perhaps coronary atherosclerosis itself are risk factors for ischemic stroke (2 [EL 4]). Increasing evidence also points to insulin resistance—which results in increased levels of plasma triglycerides and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) and a decreased concentration of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C)—as an important risk factor for peripheral vascular disease (3 [EL 3]), stroke, and CAD (4 [EL 3]).

Analysis of 30-year national trends in serum lipid levels shows improvements in total cholesterol and LDL-C levels, which may in part be explained by the steady increase in the use of lipid-lowering drug therapy (self-reported rate of lipid-medication use, 38%). However, 69% of US adults have LDL-C concentrations above 100 mg/dL. Furthermore, the doubling in the prevalence of persons who are obese and the high percentage of patients with elevated triglyceride levels (33%) (and the correlation between obesity and elevated triglycerides) point to the need for continued vigilance on the part of physicians to reduce the risks of cardiovascular disease (5 [EL 3]).

These clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) are for the diagnosis and treatment of dyslipidemia and prevention of atherosclerosis. The mandate for this CPG is to provide a practical guide for endocrinologists to reduce the risks and consequences of dyslipidemia. This CPG extends and updates existing CPGs available in the literature such as the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists (AACE) Medical Guidelines for Clinical Practice for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Dyslipidemia and Prevention of Atherosclerosis (6 [EL 4]) and complements the Diabetes Mellitus Comprehensive Care Plan CPG (7 [EL 4]). The landmark National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) guidelines (8 [EL 4]) serve as the backbone of these lipid recommendations.

These guidelines are unique in that they support the use of apolipoprotein (apo) B or LDL particle measurements to refine our efforts to achieve effective LDL-C lowering, provide screening recommendations for persons of different ages, and identify special issues for pediatric patients. They also touch on the unique challenges associated with atherosclerosis and heart disease in women. They continue to emphasize the importance of LDL-C lowering and support the measurement of inflammatory markers to stratify risk in certain situations. Finally, an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of lipid-lowering therapy is presented.

This document is organized into discrete clinical questions, with responses in the Executive Summary and the full guidelines that provide the evidence base supporting these recommendations. The objectives of this CPG are to:

- Present an overview of the screening recommendations, assessment of risk, and treatment recommendations for various lipid disorders.
- Give special consideration for patients with diabetes, women, and pediatric patients who have dyslipidemia.
- Provide cost-effectiveness data to support treatment.

After this prefatory summary, a more in-depth scientific analysis of these issues is presented.

2. METHODS

This CPG was developed in accordance with the AACE Protocol for Standardized Production of Clinical Practice Guidelines—2010 Update (9 [EL 4]). Reference citations in the text of this document include the reference number, numerical descriptor (EL 1-4), and semantic descriptor (Table 1) (9 [EL 4]).

Recommendations are assigned evidence level (EL) ratings on the basis of the quality of supporting evidence (Table 2) (9 [EL 4]) all of which have also been rated for strength (Table 3) (9 [EL 4]). The format of this CPG is based on specific and relevant clinical questions. All primary writers have made disclosures regarding multiplicities.
of interests and have attested that they are not employed by industry. In addition, all primary writers are AACE members and credentialed experts.

Clinical experts submitted contributions to specific clinical questions, which were subsequently reviewed, discussed, and integrated into the final document. Their valuable input provides the basis for the recommendations herein. Clinical questions are labeled “Q.” Recommendations are labeled “R,” and are based on importance and evidence (Grades A, B, and C) or expert opinion when there is a lack of conclusive clinical evidence (Grade D). The best evidence level (BEL), which corresponds to the best conclusive evidence found in the full guidelines to follow, accompanies the recommendation grade in this Executive Summary; definitions of ELs are provided in Figure 1 and Table 1 (9 [EL 4]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical descriptor (evidence level)</th>
<th>Semantic descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Randomized controlled trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of nonrandomized prospective or case-controlled trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nonrandomized controlled trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prospective cohort study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retrospective case-control study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cross-sectional study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Surveillance study (registries, surveys, epidemiologic study, retrospective chart review, mathematical modeling of database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consecutive case series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single case reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No evidence (theory, opinion, consensus, review, or preclinical study)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Adapted from: Endocr Pract. 2010;16:270-283 (9 [EL 4]).
b 1 = strong evidence; 2 = intermediate evidence; 3 = weak evidence; and 4 = no evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation of results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premise correctness</td>
<td>Intent-to-treat</td>
<td>Generalizability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation concealment (randomization)</td>
<td>Appropriate statistics</td>
<td>Logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection bias</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incompleteness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate blinding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using surrogate endpoints (especially in “first-in-its-class” intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (beta error)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null hypothesis vs Bayesian statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Reprinted from: Endocr Pract. 2010;16:270-283 (9 [EL 4]).
4 intuitive levels of evidence: 1 = strong, 2 = intermediate, 3 = weak, and 4 = no evidence (Table 3) (9 [EL 4]). Comments may be appended to the recommendation grade and BEL regarding any relevant subjective factors that may have influenced the grading process (Table 4) (9 [EL 4]). Details regarding each recommendation may be found in the corresponding section of the full guidelines. Thus, the process leading to a final recommendation and grade is not rigid, but rather it incorporates a complex expert integration of objective and subjective factors meant to reflect optimal real-life clinical decision-making and to enhance patient care. Where appropriate, multiple recommendations are provided, so that the reader has management options. This document represents only a guideline. Individual patient circumstances and presentations differ, and the ultimate clinical management is based on what is in the best interest of the individual patient, involving patient input and reasonable clinical judgment by the treating clinicians.

This CPG has been reviewed and approved by the primary writers, other invited experts, the AACE Publications Committee, and the AACE Board of Directors before submission for peer review by Endocrine Practice. The efforts of all those involved are greatly appreciated.

### Table 3
2010 American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists Protocol for Production of Clinical Practice Guidelines—Step III: Grading of Recommendations; How Different Evidence Levels Can Be Mapped to the Same Recommendation Gradea,b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best evidence level</th>
<th>Subjective factor impact</th>
<th>Two-thirds consensus</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
<th>Recommendation grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjust up</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjust down</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjust up</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjust down</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjust up</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjust down</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adjust down</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Starting with the left column, best evidence levels (BELs), subjective factors, and consensus map to recommendation grades in the right column. When subjective factors have little or no impact (“none”), then the BEL is directly mapped to recommendation grades. When subjective factors have a strong impact, then recommendation grades may be adjusted up (“positive” impact) or down (“negative” impact). If a two-thirds consensus cannot be reached, then the recommendation grade is D. NA, not applicable (regardless of the presence or absence of strong subjective factors, the absence of a two-thirds consensus mandates a recommendation grade D).

b Reprinted from Endocr Pract. 2010;16:270-283 (9 [EL 4]).
Fig. 1. 2010 American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists Clinical Practice Guideline Methodology. Current American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists Clinical Practice Guidelines have a problem-oriented focus that results in a shortened production timeline, middle-range literature searching, emphasis on patient-oriented evidence that matters, greater transparency of intuitive evidence rating and qualifications, incorporation of subjective factors into evidence level to recommendation grade mapping, cascades of alternative approaches, and an expedited multilevel review mechanism.

Table 4
2010 American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists Protocol for Production of Clinical Practice Guidelines—Step IV: Examples of Qualifiers That May Be Appended to Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost-effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk-benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative physician preferences (dissenting opinions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative recommendations (“cascades”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (patient-oriented evidence that matters)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reprinted from *Endocr Pract.* 2010;16:270-283 (9 [EL 4]).
3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3Q1. HOW SHOULD INDIVIDUALS BE SCREENED FOR THE DETECTION OF DYSLIPIDEMIA?

3Q1.1. Global Risk Assessment

- **R1.** Identify risk factors (Table 5) [10 [EL 4], 11 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 13 [EL 4], 14 [EL 2], 15 [EL 4], 16 [EL 2], 17 [EL 4], 18 [EL 2], 19 [EL 2], 20 [EL 4], 21 [EL 3]) and categorize degrees of risk (Table 6) [20 [EL 4], 22 [EL 4], 23 [EL 4]), which enables the physician to personalize therapy for dyslipidemia according to each patient’s risk level and thereby maximize treatment effectiveness (Grade A; BEL 1).

  Major risk factors include advancing age, high serum total cholesterol levels, high non-HDL-C levels, high LDL-C levels, established CAD, family history of CAD, presence of hypertension or diabetes mellitus, and cigarette smoking. Additional risk factors (obesity, family history, elevated apo B, increased LDL particle number, small dense LDL, fasting/postprandial hypertriglyceridemia, polycystic ovary syndrome in women, dyslipemic triad) should be considered, as should nontraditional risk factors (eg, inflammatory markers, highly sensitive C-reactive protein [CRP], lipoprotein-associated phospholipase A2 [Lp-PLA2], lipoprotein [a], hyperhomocysteinemia, hyperuricemia).

- **R2.** Determine the 10-year risk (high, intermediate, low) of a coronary event using the Framingham Risk Assessment Tool or Reynolds Risk Score (www.reynoldsriskscore.org), (the latter includes highly sensitive CRP and family history of premature CAD) (Grade A; BEL 4).

- **R3.** Because of the diagnostic difficulties and differences in clinical presentation, AACE recommends that special attention be given to assessing women for CAD risk. Determine the 10-year risk (high, intermediate, low) of a coronary event using Reynolds Risk Score (www.reynoldsriskscore.org) or the Framingham Risk Assessment Tool (Grade A; BEL 4). The Framingham Risk Score provides 10-year probability of women experiencing a coronary event in the presence of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Coronary Artery Disease Risk Factors (10 [EL 4], 11 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 13 [EL 4], 14 [EL 2], 15 [EL 4], 16 [EL 2], 17 [EL 4], 18 [EL 2], 19 [EL 2], 20 [EL 4], 21 [EL 3])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major risk factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing age a,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High total serum cholesterol level a,b,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High non-HDL-C d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High LDL-C a,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low HDL-C a,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette smoking a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family history of CAD a,d,g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: apo, apolipoprotein; CAD, coronary artery disease; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; hsCRP, highly sensitive C-reactive protein; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; Lp-PLA2, lipoprotein-associated phospholipase A2; PCOS, polycystic ovary syndrome.

a Risk factors identified in the Framingham Heart study.
b Risk factors identified in the MRFIT study (Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial).
c Risk factors identified in the INTERHEART study.

f Hypertriglyceridemia; low high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; and small dense low-density lipoprotein cholesterol.
g Definite myocardial infarction or sudden death before age 55 years in father or other male first-degree relative or before age 65 years in mother or other female first-degree relative.
specific clinical diagnoses or scenarios (Table 7) (24 [EL 3], 25 [EL 4]), but unlike the Reynolds Risk Score, it appears to underestimate CAD risk in women with 2 risk factors.

- **R4.** AACE recommends early diagnosis and management of pediatric dyslipidemia to reduce the levels of LDL-C that may eventually increase risk of cardiovascular events in adulthood (Grade A; BEL 1). Classification of LDL-C levels as acceptable, borderline, or high is outlined in Table 8 (26 [EL 4]).

- **R5.** Categorize lipid-related risks as optimal/near-optimal, borderline, and high risk (Table 9) (10 [EL 4]). An HDL-C concentration greater than 60 mg/dL is an independent negative risk factor in both sexes, and when the HDL-C concentration is greater than 60 mg/dL, 1 risk factor can be subtracted from a patient’s overall risk profile (Grade A; BEL 1).

- **R6.** AACE recommends classifying elevated triglycerides (Table 10 (10 EL 4)) to aid in treatment decisions (Grade A; BEL 1).

### 3Q1.2. Screening

- **R7.** AACE recommends more frequent assessments for all patients with a family history of premature CAD (definite myocardial infarction [MI] or sudden death before age 55 years in father or other male first-degree relative, or before age 65 years in mother or other female first-degree relative) (Grade C; BEL 4). AACE suggest considering more frequent testing for individuals with CAD risk factors (Grade C; BEL 4).

#### Adults With Diabetes

- **R8.** Annually screen all adult patients with diabetes mellitus for dyslipidemia (Grade B; BEL 2).

#### Young Adults (Men Aged 20–45 Years, Women Aged 20–55 Years)

- **R9.** Evaluate all adults 20 years of age for dyslipidemia every 5 years as part of a global risk assessment (Grade A; BEL 3).

---

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Risk factors(^a)/10-year risk(^b)</th>
<th>LDL-C treatment goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high risk</td>
<td>Established or recent hospitalization for coronary, carotid, and peripheral vascular disease or diabetes plus 1 or more additional risk factor(s)</td>
<td>&lt;70 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>≥2 risk factors and 10-year risk &gt;20% or CHD risk equivalents(^c), including diabetes with no other risk factors</td>
<td>&lt;100 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately high risk</td>
<td>≥2 risk factors and 10-year risk 10%-20%</td>
<td>&lt;130 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate risk</td>
<td>≥2 risk factors and 10-year risk &lt;10%</td>
<td>&lt;130 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td>≤1 risk factor</td>
<td>&lt;160 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: CHD, coronary heart disease; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol.

\(^a\) Major independent risk factors are high low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, polycystic ovary syndrome, cigarette smoking, hypertension (blood pressure ≥140/90 mm Hg or on hypertensive medication), low high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (<40 mg/dL), family history of coronary artery disease (n male first-degree relative younger than 55 years; in female first-degree relative younger than 65 years), and age (men ≥45; women ≥55 years). Subtract 1 risk factor if the person has high high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (≥60 mg/dL) (10 [EL 4], 11 [EL 4]).

\(^b\) Framingham risk scoring is applied to determine 10-year risk (10 [EL 4]).

\(^c\) Coronary artery disease risk equivalents include diabetes and clinical manifestations of noncoronary forms of atherosclerotic disease (peripheral arterial disease, abdominal aortic aneurysm, and carotid artery disease).
Middle-Aged Adults (Men Aged 45-65 Years, Women Aged 55-65 Years)

- **R10.** In the absence of CAD risk factors, screen middle-aged persons for dyslipidemia at least every 1 to 2 years. AACE recommends more frequent lipid testing when multiple global CAD risk factors are present (Grade C; BEL 3). The frequency of testing should be based on individual clinical circumstances and the clinician’s best judgment (Grade C; BEL 4).

Older Adults (Older Than 65 Years)

- **R11.** Annually screen older adults with 0 to 1 CAD risk factor for dyslipidemia (Grade C; BEL 1). In addition, older patients should undergo lipid assessment if they have multiple CAD global risk factors (ie, risk factors other than age) (Grade C; BEL 4).
- **R12.** AACE believes that screening recommendations apply based on age and risk, not based on sex; therefore, women should be screened in the same way as men (Grade A; BEL 1).

Children and Adolescents

- **R13.** Screen children older than 2 years every 3 to 5 years if they have CAD risk factors or a family history of premature CAD or dyslipidemia, are overweight or obese, have other elements of the insulin resistance syndrome, or have no available family history (Grade A; BEL 3).
- **R14.** Screen adolescents older than 16 years every 5 years or more frequently if they have CAD risk factors, are overweight or obese, have other elements of the insulin resistance syndrome, or have a family history of premature CAD (Grade A; BEL 3).

AACE joins the American Heart Association and the US Preventive Services Task Force in recommending further research to determine the effect of pediatric dyslipidemia screening and treatment on adult outcomes (27 [EL 4], 28 [EL 4]).

3Q2. WHICH SCREENING TESTS ARE RECOMMENDED FOR THE DETECTION OF CARDIOVASCULAR RISK?

3Q2.1. Fasting Lipid Profile

- **R15.** Use a fasting lipid profile to ensure the most precise lipid assessment. This should include total cholesterol, LDL-C, triglycerides, and HDL-C (Grade C; BEL 4).

### Table 7
Framingham Risk Score–Based 10-Year Probability of Women Experiencing a Coronary Event in the Presence of Specific Clinical Diagnoses or Scenarios

(24 [EL 3], 25 [EL 4])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk group</th>
<th>Framingham Global Risk (10-year absolute CAD risk)</th>
<th>Clinical examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High       | >20%                                             | • Established coronary artery disease  
|            |                                                  | • Cerebrovascular disease  
|            |                                                  | • Peripheral arterial disease  
|            |                                                  | • Abdominal aortic aneurysm  
|            |                                                  | • Diabetes mellitus  
|            |                                                  | • Chronic kidney disease  
| Intermediate| 10%-20%                                         | • Subclinical coronary artery disease  
|            |                                                  | • Metabolic syndrome  
|            |                                                  | • Multiple risk factors\(^a\)  
|            |                                                  | • Markedly elevated levels of a single risk factor\(^b\)  
|            |                                                  | • First-degree relative(s) with early-onset coronary artery disease  
| Lower      | <10%                                             | • May include women with multiple risk factors, metabolic syndrome, or 1 or no risk factors  
| Optimal    | <10%                                             | • Optimal levels of risk factors and heart-healthy lifestyle  

\(^a\) Patients with multiple risk factors can fall into any of the 3 categories by Framingham scoring.

\(^b\) Most women with a single, severe risk factor will have a 10-year risk <10%.
3Q2.2. Low-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

**Calculated**

- **R16.** AACE does not recommend estimating LDL-C values in certain clinical circumstances. LDL-C is frequently and inexpensively estimated using the Friedewald equation: (Grade A, BEL 1) (10 [EL 4]):

\[
LDL-C = \frac{(\text{total cholesterol} - \text{HDL-C}) - \text{triglycerides}}{5}
\]

However, this method is valid only for values obtained during the fasting state. It becomes increasingly inaccurate when triglyceride levels are greater than 200 mg/dL, and the equation is no longer valid when triglyceride levels are greater than 400 mg/dL.

**Direct Measurement**

- **R17.** AACE recommends direct measurement of LDL-C in certain high-risk patients, such as those with fasting triglyceride levels greater than 250 mg/dL or those with diabetes mellitus or known vascular disease (Grade C; BEL 3).

3Q2.3. High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

- **R18.** AACE recommends measurement of HDL-C as a screening test for dyslipidemia. Low HDL-C can act synergistically with other lipid risk factors to increase CAD risk. An HDL-C concentration greater than 60 mg/dL is an independent negative risk factor in both sexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lipid</th>
<th>Optimal/near-optimal serum concentration</th>
<th>Borderline serum concentration</th>
<th>High-risk/very high-risk serum concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;200</td>
<td>200-239</td>
<td>≥240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>≥60 (negative risk factor)</td>
<td>40-59 (men)</td>
<td>&lt;40 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-59 (women)</td>
<td>&lt;50 women&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;100 optimal (100-129 near-optimal)</td>
<td>130-159</td>
<td>160-189 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥190 very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;150</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>200-499 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apo B, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;90 (patients at risk of CAD, including those with diabetes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥500 very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: apo, apolipoprotein; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.

<sup>a</sup> Both borderline and high-risk values may signify familial combined dyslipidemia or dyslipidemia of diabetes; values >1000 indicate high risk for pancreatitis.

<sup>b</sup> Moderate reductions of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol in women may indicate insulin resistance syndrome.
3Q2.4. Non–High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol
- **R19.** Calculate non–HDL-C (total cholesterol minus HDL-C) in patients with moderately elevated triglycerides (200 to 500 mg/dL), diabetes mellitus, and/or established CAD (Grade C; BEL 2).
- **R20.** If insulin resistance is suspected, AACE recommends evaluating non–HDL-C to gain useful information regarding the patient’s total atherogenic lipoprotein burden. In addition, in any circumstance when triglycerides are 200 mg/dL or greater but less than 500 mg/dL, a non–HDL-C calculation will provide better risk assessment than LDL-C alone (Grade C; BEL 4).

3Q2.5. Triglycerides
- **R21.** Increasing clinical evidence suggests that elevated triglycerides may be an independent risk factor for CAD; therefore, AACE recommends screening of triglycerides as a component of lipid screening. Triglycerides levels that are even moderately elevated (>150 mg/dL) may identify individuals at risk for the insulin resistance syndrome. Triglyceride levels 200 mg/dL or greater may indicate a substantial increase in CAD risk (10 [EL 4]).

3Q2.6. Apolipoproteins
- **R22.** AACE recommends that optimal apo B levels for patients at risk of CAD, including those with diabetes, are less than 90 mg/dL, while patients with established CAD or diabetes who have 1 or more additional risk factor(s) should have an apo B goal of less than 80 mg/dL (Grade D; BEL 4). When the triglyceride level is greater than 150 mg/dL or the HDL-C level is less than 40 mg/dL, AACE believes that the apo B to apo AI ratio may be particularly useful in assessing residual risk in patients at risk for CAD (even when LDL-C levels are controlled); this includes patients with established CAD, type 2 diabetes, or the insulin resistance syndrome who are at high risk for CAD. AACE therefore recommends apo B testing in such patients (Grade B; BEL 2).
- **R23.** AACE recommends apo B measurements to assess the success of LDL-C–lowering therapy. Apo B reflects LDL particle number, which may be elevated in patients at or below LDL-C goal. While LDL-C and LDL particle size (eg, small, dense LDL) are associated with atherogenicity, LDL particle number as reflected by apo B is a more potent measure of cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk than either of these 2 measures (Grade B; BEL 2).
- **R24.** AACE believes that assessment of apo AI may be useful in certain cases (Grade B; BEL 2). A normal apo AI level in a patient with low HDL-C suggests the existence of an adequate number of HDL-C particles that contain less cholesterol and may be an indication of less risk. The INTERHEART study found that the apo B to apo AI ratio was among the most significant risk factors for MI (14 [EL 2]).

3Q2.7. Secondary Causes of Dyslipidemia
- **R25.** Rule out secondary causes of dyslipidemia. Numerous conditions may variably affect total cholesterol and LDL-C or triglycerides and very low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (VLDL-C) (Table 11) (10 [EL 4], 29 [EL 4]).

3Q2.8. Additional Tests
- **R26.** Assess markers of inflammation in patients where further stratification of risk is necessary. Highly sensitive CRP and Lp-PLA2 provide useful additional information in these instances and appear to be synergistic in predicting risk of CVD and stroke (Grade B; BEL 1).
- **R27.** Use highly sensitive CRP to stratify CVD risk in patients with a standard risk assessment that is borderline, or in those with an LDL-C concentration less than 130 mg/dL (Grade 2; BEL B).
- **R28.** Measure Lp-PLA2, which in some studies has demonstrated more specificity than highly sensitive CRP, when it is necessary to further stratify a patient’s CVD risk, especially in the presence of systemic highly sensitive CRP elevations (Grade 2; BEL B).

### Table 10
**Classification of Elevated Triglyceride Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triglyceride category</th>
<th>Triglyceride concentration, mg/dL</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>&lt;150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline-high</td>
<td>150-199</td>
<td>&lt;150 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>200-499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>≥500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **R29.** AACE does not recommend routine measurement of homocysteine, uric acid, plasminogen activator inhibitor 1, or other inflammatory markers because the benefit of doing so is unclear (Grade 4; BEL D). Although recent data from the third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (30 [EL 3]) and MESA (Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis) (31 [EL 3]) have shown that the addition of homocysteine is useful in CVD risk stratification, especially when used in conjunction with the Framingham Risk Score, to identify patients at high CVD risk who might otherwise be classified as intermediate risk, several studies have demonstrated no benefit from intervention (32 [EL 4], 33 [EL 1], 34 [EL 1], 35 [EL 2], 36 [EL 1]).

• **R30.** Noninvasive measures of atherosclerosis such as carotid intima media thickness (IMT) and coronary artery calcification should not be performed routinely, but may be used in certain clinical situations as adjuncts to standard CVD risk factors in an attempt to refine risk stratification and the need for more aggressive preventive strategies. Although coronary calcium correlates strongly with coronary atherosclerosis, there is a lack of definite evidence that this risk factor independently predicts coronary events (Grade 4; BEL D).

3Q3. WHAT ARE THE TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS IN PATIENTS WITH DYSLIPIDEMIA AND CAD RISK?

3Q3.1. Treatment Goals

Table 12 summarizes the AACE recommended treatment goals for major lipid parameters in patients at risk for...
CAD (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 41 [EL 4]). However, lipid goals for all patients should be personalized by levels of risk (20 [EL 4], 22 [EL 4], 23 [EL 4]).

3Q3.1.1. Low-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

- **R31.** In adults of both sexes, AACE recommends a target LDL-C concentration less than 100 mg/dL and less than 70 mg/dL in all patients at very high risk (Grade A; BEL 4). For patients with diabetes mellitus, AACE recommends an LDL-C goal of less than 100 mg/dL, and in those with 1 or more additional risk factor(s) (eg, existing CVD), the recommended LDL-C goal is less than 70 mg/dL (Grade A; BEL 1) (Table 12) (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL1], 41 [EL 4]).

- **R32.** AACE concurs with the American Academy of Pediatrics that acceptable, borderline, and high LDL-C levels for children and adolescents are less than 110 mg/dL, 110 to 129 mg/dL, and 130 mg/dL or greater, respectively (Table 8) (26 [EL 4]).

3Q3.1.2. High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

- **R33.** AACE recommends raising HDL-C levels as much as possible, but minimally to greater than 40 mg/dL in both men and women (Grade C; BEL 4) (Table 12) (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL1], 41 [EL 4]). Table 13 (10 [EL 4]) summarizes the basic treatment approach to isolated low HDL-C.

- **R34.** Exclude secondary causes (eg, cigarette smoking, certain drugs, genetic factors) of isolated low HDL-C. AACE then recommends pharmacologic intervention if HDL-C levels are low and other risk factors are present (including borderline elevated LDL-C levels, a family history of premature CAD, or a personal history of CAD) (Grade A; BEL 1) (Table 11) (10 [EL 4]). AACE does not recommend increasing HDL-C levels alone (ie, low HDL-C without any accompanying risk factors) because it is difficult to determine from clinical trials whether increasing HDL-C levels alone is clinically beneficial.

3Q3.1.3. Non–High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

- **R35.** AACE recommends a non–HDL-C goal (total cholesterol minus HDL-C) that is 30 mg/dL higher than the patient-specific LDL-C goal (Grade A, BEL 1) (Table 12) (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 41 [EL 4]).

- **R36.** AACE recommends that an optimal apo B level for patients at risk of CAD, including those with diabetes, is less than 90 mg/dL, while patients with established CAD or diabetes plus 1 or more additional risk factor(s) should have an apo B goal less than 80 mg/dL (Grade D, BEL 4) (Table 12) (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 41 [EL 4]).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lipid Parameter</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;200</td>
<td>EL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;100; &lt;70 (all very high risk patients)</td>
<td>EL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>As high as possible, but at least &gt;40 in both men and in women</td>
<td>EL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non–HDL-C, mg/dL</td>
<td>30 above LDL-C goal</td>
<td>EL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;150</td>
<td>EL 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apo B, mg/dL</td>
<td>&lt;90 (patients at risk of CAD, including those with diabetes)</td>
<td>EL 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;80 (patients with established CAD or diabetes plus ≥1 additional risk factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: apo, apolipoprotein; EL, evidence level; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.
3Q3.1.5 Triglycerides

• R37. Triglyceride levels less than 150 mg/dL in both men and women are recommended (Grade A; BEL 4) (Table 12) (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 41 [EL 4]). There is increased atherogenicity of LDL particles at increasing triglyceride levels, which correlate with risk.

3Q3.2. Treatment Recommendations

• R38. AACE recommends a comprehensive strategy to control lipid levels and to address associated metabolic abnormalities and modifiable risk factors such as hypertension, diabetes, obesity, and cigarette smoking. The first-line approach to primary prevention in patients with lipid disorders involves the implementation of lifestyle changes, including physical activity and medical nutrition therapy. Treatment may also involve pharmacotherapy, as well as patient education programs, to promote further risk reduction through smoking cessation and weight loss.

3Q3.2.1. Physical Activity

• R39. AACE recommends a reasonable and feasible approach to fitness therapy, ie, exercise programs that include at least 30 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity (consuming 4-7 kcal/min) 4 to 6 times weekly, with an expenditure of at least 200 kcal/day. Suggested activities include brisk walking, riding a stationary bike, water aerobics, cleaning/scrubbing, mowing the lawn, and sporting activities (Grade A; BEL 2). Daily physical activity goals can be met in a single session or in multiple sessions throughout the course of a day (10 minutes minimum). For some patients, breaking activity up throughout the day may help improve adherence to physical activity programs (Grade B; BEL 4). In addition to aerobic activity, muscle-strengthening activity is recommended at least 2 days a week (Grade B; BEL 2).

3Q3.2.2. Medical Nutrition Therapy

• R40. For adults, AACE recommends a reduced-calorie diet consisting of fruits and vegetables (≥5 servings/day) (Grade A; BEL 2), grains (≥6 servings/day, one-third of those as whole grains), fish, and lean meats (Grade B; BEL 2). Intake of saturated fats, trans fats, and cholesterol should be limited, while LDL-C–lowering macronutrient intake should include plant stanols/sterols (~2 g/day) and soluble fiber (10-25 g/day) (Grade A; BEL 1).

• R41. AACE recommends primary preventive nutrition in all healthy children older than 2 years (Grade A; BEL 4).

3Q3.2.3. Smoking Cessation

• R42. Every effort should be made to support patients in their efforts to cease smoking (Grade A; BEL 3). Cigarette smoking is a powerful risk factor, especially for MI, peripheral vascular disease, and stroke. Smoking accelerates coronary plaque development and may lead to plaque rupture and is particularly dangerous in persons with advanced coronary atherosclerosis. Numerous studies have shown that smoking has a substantial, negative effect on HDL-C levels and the LDL-C to HDL-C ratio. Smoking also appears to have a negative effect on postprandial lipids, including triglycerides. However, smoking cessation significantly increases HDL-C, with improvement observed in as few as 30 days.

Table 13
Recommended Basic Approach to Treatment for Patients With Isolated Low High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterola
(10 [EL 4])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight loss, physical activity, smoking cessation</th>
<th>Drug therapy</th>
<th>Minimal Goalc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C &lt;40 mg/dL</td>
<td>HDL-C &lt;40 mg/dL with strong risk factorsb</td>
<td>HDL-C &gt;40 mg/dL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation: HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol.

a Isolated low HDL-C is present when HDL-C is decreased without accompanying hypertriglyceridemia.
b Coronary artery disease or coronary artery disease risk equivalents, 10-year risk >20%.
c Minimal goal; high-density lipoprotein cholesterol should be raised as high as possible.
Patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft (Grade A; BEL 1).

Patients with acute coronary syndrome (Grade A; BEL 1).

Certain healthy and functional older patients at high risk who may be appropriate candidates for aggressive therapy (Grade A; BEL 1).

**Statins**

- R45. AACE recommends statins as the drug of choice for LDL-C reduction on the basis of findings from morbidity and mortality outcome trials (Grade A; BEL 1). Agents currently available are atorvastatin, fluvastatin, lovastatin, pravastatin, rosuvastatin, simvastatin, and pitavastatin; see Table 14 (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 49 [EL 1], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3], 57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1]).

- R46. AACE recommends fibrates for treatment of severe hypertriglyceridemia (triglycerides >500 mg/dL) (Grade A; BEL 1). Adjunct use of 2 to 4 g of omega 3 fish oil can be used, if necessary, to achieve satisfactory triglyceride lowering.

For primary prevention of ischemic cardiovascular events, fibrate therapy can reduce the occurrence of MI and cardiovascular death in those with both triglyceride concentrations greater than 200 mg/dL and HDL-C concentrations less than 40 mg/dL (83 [EL 3], 84 [EL 2]).

For secondary prevention, fibrate monotherapy was shown to reduce events in those with HDL-C concentrations less than 40 mg/dL in the VA-HIT trial (Veterans Affairs HDL Intervention Trial) (85 [EL 1]) and in those with triglyceride concentrations of 200 mg/dL or greater in the Bezafibrate Infarction Prevention trial (86 [EL 1]). The FIELD trial demonstrated a more certain preventive effect in patients with both triglyceride levels greater than 200 mg/dL and HDL-C levels less than 40 mg/dL (83 [EL 3]).

In those on a statin with an LDL-C concentration less than 100 mg/dL, prespecified subgroup analyses in the ACCORD trial (Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes) demonstrate that fibrate therapy reduces further cardiovascular ischemic events only in those with both lipid abnormalities (triglycerides ≥200 mg/dL, HDL-C ≤35 mg/dL) (87 [EL 1]). The failure to reach primary endpoint targets of MI and cardiovascular death in the FIELD and ACCORD trials has resulted in an uncertain clinical benefit in treating patients with lesser triglyceride and HDL-C abnormalities with fibrates. Available agents are...
### Table 14
Primary Lipid-Lowering Drug Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug class</th>
<th>Metabolic effecta</th>
<th>Main considerationsb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors (statins: lovastatin, pravastatin, fluvastatin, simvastatin, atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, pitavastatin)</td>
<td>Primarily ↓ LDL-C 21%-55% by competitively inhibiting rate-limiting step of cholesterol synthesis in the liver; Effect on HDL-C is less pronounced (↑ 2%-10%); ↓ TG 6%-30% (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4]); ↓ fibrinogen level; Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis when used with statin (rare); interaction less likely with fenofibrate or fenofibric acid (52 [EL 4]); Fibrates associated with increased serum creatinine levels, which may not be caused by renal dysfunction (53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4])</td>
<td>Monitoring of liver function required; Myalgias and muscle weakness in some patients; Potential for drug-drug interaction between some statins and CYP450 3A4 inhibitors, cyclosporine, warfarin, and protease inhibitors (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4]); Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis in rare cases; increased risk with coadministration of some drugs (see product labeling) (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4]); Simvastatin dosages of 80 mg are no longer recommended; Do not exceed 20 mg simvastatin daily with amlodipine or ranolazine (44 [EL 4]); Plasma elevations of rosvustatin may be higher among Asian persons than other ethnic groups (44 [EL 4]). Slight increase in new-onset diabetes in patients treated intensively with statins, which occurs to a lesser extent than the associated cardiovascular event reduction (49 [EL 1])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibric acid derivatives (gemfibrozil, fenofibrate, fenofibric acid)</td>
<td>Primarily ↓ TG 20%-35%; ↑ HDL-C 6%-18% by stimulating lipoprotein lipase activity; Fenofibrate may ↓ TC and LDL-C 20%-25%; Lower VLDL-C and LDL-C; reciprocal rise in LDL-C transforms the profile into a less atherogenic form by shifting fewer LDL particles to larger size; Fenofibrate ↓ fibrinogen level</td>
<td>Gemfibrozil may ↑ LDL-C 10%-15%; GI symptoms, possible cholelithiasis (50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4]); May potentiate effects of orally administered anticoagulants; Gemfibrozil may ↑ fibrinogen level; Gemfibrozil and fenofibrate can ↑ homocysteine independent of vitamin concentrations; Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis when used with statin (rare); interaction less likely with fenofibrate or fenofibric acid (52 [EL 4]); Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis when used with statin (rare); interaction less likely with fenofibrate or fenofibric acid (52 [EL 4]); Fibrates associated with increased serum creatinine levels, which may not be caused by renal dysfunction (53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Class</td>
<td>Metabolic Effect**</td>
<td>Main Considerations**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin (nicotinic acid)</td>
<td>( \downarrow ) LDL-C 10%-25%, ( \downarrow ) TG 20%-30%, ( \uparrow ) HDL-C 10%-35% by decreasing hepatic synthesis of LDL-C and VLDL-C ( \downarrow ) Lipoprotein (a) Transforms LDL-C to less atherogenic form by increasing particle size and thus decreasing particle number</td>
<td>Potential for frequent skin flushing, pruritus, abdominal discomfort, hepatotoxicity (rare but may be severe), nausea, peptic ulcer Deleterious effect on serum glucose at higher dosages Increases uric acid levels; may lead to gout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile acid sequestrants</td>
<td>Primarily ( \downarrow ) LDL-C 15%-25% by binding bile acids at the intestinal level Colesevelam ( \downarrow ) glucose and hemoglobin ( A_1c ) (~0.5%) (55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3])</td>
<td>May ( \downarrow ) serum TG Frequent non–life-threatening GI events, which can reduce patient adherence Many potential drug interactions, less so with colesevelam (see product labeling) May reduce absorption of folic acid and fat-soluble vitamins such as vitamins A, D, and K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol absorption inhibitors (ezetimibe)</td>
<td>Primarily ( \downarrow ) LDL-C 10%-18% by inhibiting intestinal absorption of cholesterol and decreasing delivery to the liver (57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1]) ( \downarrow ) Apo B 11%-16% (57 [EL 4], 59 [EL 1]) In combination with statins, additional ( \downarrow ) LDL-C 25%, total ( \downarrow ) LDL-C 34%-61% (57 [EL 4], 60 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1]) In combination with fenofibrate, ( \downarrow ) LDL-C 20%-22% and ( \downarrow ) apo B 25%-26% without reducing ( \uparrow ) HDL-C (57 [EL 4], 66 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis (rare) (57 [EL 4]) Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis (rare) (57 [EL 4]) When coadministered with statins or fenofibrate, risks associated with those drugs remain (eg, myopathy/rhabdomyolysis, cholelithiasis) (57 [EL 4])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: apo, apolipoprotein; GI, gastrointestinal; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HMG-CoA, hydroxymethylglutaryl-coenzyme A; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; VLDL-C, very low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total cholesterol.

** Percentage of change varies depending on baseline lipid variables and dosages. Statin potency and dosages vary.

** Most frequent or serious. See prescribing information for complete contraindications, warnings, precautions, and side effects.

Results vary. Gemfibrozil has been shown to decrease, have no effect on, or increase fibrinogen depending on the study (68 [EL 2], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 71 [EL 1], 72 [EL 2], 73 [EL 2], 74 [EL 2], 75 [EL 1], 76 [EL 2]).

Results vary. Gemfibrozil has been shown to have no effect on or increase homocysteine (77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3]).
gemfibrozil, fenofibrate, and fenofibric acid; see Table 14 (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 49 [EL 1], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3], 57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1], 68 [EL 2], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 71 [EL 1], 72 [EL 2], 73 [EL 2], 74 [EL 2], 75 [EL 1], 76 [EL 2], 77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3]) and Table 15 (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 57 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4], 80 [EL 4], 81 [EL 4], 82 [EL 4]).

**Niacin**

- **R47.** AACE recommends niacin for reducing triglycerides, increasing HDL-C, and reducing LDL-C **(Grade B; BEL 2).** Adjunct use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lipid-Lowering Drug Therapies, Usual Starting Dosages and Dosage Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 57 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4], 80 [EL 4], 81 [EL 4], 82 [EL 4])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Usual recommended starting daily dosage</th>
<th>Dosage range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovastatin</td>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>10-80 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravastatin</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>10-80 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simvastatin</td>
<td>20-40 mg</td>
<td>5-80 mg*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvastatin</td>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>20-80 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atorvastatin</td>
<td>10-20 mg</td>
<td>10-80 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosuvastatin</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>5-40 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitavastatin</td>
<td>2 mg</td>
<td>2-4 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fibrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenofibrate</td>
<td>48-145 mg</td>
<td>48-145 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemfibrozil</td>
<td>1200 mg</td>
<td>1200 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenofibric acid</td>
<td>45-135 mg</td>
<td>45-135 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niacin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate-release</td>
<td>250 mg</td>
<td>250-3000 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended-release</td>
<td>500 mg</td>
<td>50 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile acid sequestrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholestyramine</td>
<td>8-16 g</td>
<td>4-24 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colestipol</td>
<td>2 g</td>
<td>2-16 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colesevelam</td>
<td>3.8 g</td>
<td>3.8-4.5 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cholesterol absorption inhibitors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezetimibe</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination therapies (single-pill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezetimibe/simvastatin</td>
<td>10/20 mg</td>
<td>10/10 to 10/80 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended-release niacin/simvastatin</td>
<td>500/20 mg</td>
<td>500/20 to 1000/20 mg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Simvastatin, 80 mg, not approved for therapy unless patient has been on treatment for more than 1 year without myopathy.
of 2 to 4 g of omega-3 fish oil can be used, if necessary, to achieve satisfactory triglyceride lowering. In contrast to the existing secondary cardiovascular preventive evidence from the Coronary Drug Project (88 [EL 2]), HATS (HDL–Atherosclerosis Treatment Study) (89 [EL 1]), and ARBITER 6–HALTS (Arterial Biology for the Investigation of the Treatment Effects of Reducing Cholesterol 6: HDL and LDL Treatment Strategies in Atherosclerosis) (90 [EL 1]) trials, cessation of the AIM-HIGH trial (Atherothrombosis Intervention in Metabolic Syndrome with Low HDL/High Triglycerides: Impact on Global Health Outcomes) (91 [EL 1]) makes it uncertain whether niacin benefits all simvastatin-treated patients with very well-controlled LDL-C. Niacin is currently available in 3 formulations: intermediate, long-acting, and extended-release; see Table 14 (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 49 [EL 1], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 53 [EL 4], 54 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3], 57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1], 68 [EL 2], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 71 [EL 1], 72 [EL 2], 73 [EL 2], 74 [EL 2], 75 [EL 1], 76 [EL 2], 77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3]) and Table 15 (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 57 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4], 80 [EL 4], 81 [EL 4], 82 [EL 4]).

Cholesterol Absorption Inhibitors

- **R49.** Cholesterol absorption inhibitors are effective as monotherapy in reducing LDL-C and apo B. AACE recommends combination therapy with statins because current research indicates that this enhances these benefits and further improves the beneficial effects of statins on triglycerides and HDL-C (Grade A; BEL 1). It is uncertain whether cholesterol absorption inhibitor therapy has a direct benefit on reducing cardiovascular events (Grade B; BEL 1). Ezetimibe is currently the only member of this drug class; see Table 14 (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 49 [EL 1], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 53 [EL 4], 54 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3], 57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1], 68 [EL 2], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 71 [EL 1], 72 [EL 2], 73 [EL 2], 74 [EL 2], 75 [EL 1], 76 [EL 2], 77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3]) and Table 15 (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 57 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4], 80 [EL 4], 81 [EL 4], 82 [EL 4]).

Combination Therapy

- **R50.** Certain clinical situations warrant the use of a combination of lipid-lowering agents. Because the adverse effects of 2 or more drugs may be additive, clinical judgment is needed to balance the risks and benefits of combination therapy.

AACE recommends that combination therapy be considered in the following circumstances:

- When the cholesterol level is markedly increased and monotherapy does not achieve the therapeutic goal (Grade A; BEL 1).
  - The recent SHARP trial (Study of Heart and Renal Protection) demonstrated a reduction of LDL-C via treatment with simvastatin, 20 mg daily, plus ezetimibe, 10 mg daily, which safely reduced the incidence of major atherosclerotic events in a wide range of patients with advanced chronic kidney disease (92 [EL 1]).
- When mixed dyslipidemia is present (Grade C; BEL 3).
- Niacin or fibrates in combination with statins may be appropriate options for many patients with hypertriglyceridemia and associated low HDL-C (Grade B; BEL 2).

Bile Acid Sequestrants

- **R48.** AACE recommends bile acid sequestrants for reducing LDL-C and apo B and modestly increasing HDL-C, but they may increase triglycerides (Grade B; BEL 1). Bile acid sequestrants have a glucose-lowering effect; colesevelam is also approved for treatment of type 2 diabetics. Available agents in this drug class are cholestyramine, colestipol, and colesevelam; see Table 14 (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 49 [EL 1], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 53 [EL 4], 54 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3], 57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1], 68 [EL 2], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 71 [EL 1], 72 [EL 2], 73 [EL 2], 74 [EL 2], 75 [EL 1], 76 [EL 2], 77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3]) and Table 15 (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 57 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4], 80 [EL 4], 81 [EL 4], 82 [EL 4]).
It is uncertain whether, or in whom, niacin use in patients with very well-controlled LDL-C levels on statin therapy adds additional benefit, based on the results of the recently terminated AIM-HIGH study (Grade A; BEL 1) (91 [EL 1]). HPS2-THRIVE (Treatment of HDL to Reduce the Incidence of Vascular Events), a large international trial of high-dosage, extended-release niacin plus simvastatin (results expected in 2013), should help clarify the role of simvastatin in combination with niacin (93 [EL 4]).

• To reduce the risk of dosage-related adverse effects (Grade D; BEL 4).

Special Considerations: Women

• R51. AACE recommends that women should be identified for CAD risk and be treated with pharmacotherapy if lifestyle intervention is insufficient (Grade A; BEL 1). In light of the diagnostic challenges that present when trying to identify CAD in women, prevention and treatment of dyslipidemia is an essential consideration in this population. However, efforts to manage dyslipidemia in women have often been inadequate. While lipid-lowering treatments are used routinely for men, they are frequently underprescribed for women (94 [EL 1]). Furthermore, although lowering LDL-C significantly reduces CAD risk in women, the unique roles of hormonal change on cardiovascular risk, HDL-C, and triglycerides must also be addressed.

• R52. AACE does not recommend hormone replacement therapy for the treatment of dyslipidemia in postmenopausal women (Grade A; BEL 1).

Special Considerations: Pediatric Patients

• R53. AACE recommends pharmacotherapy for children and adolescents older than 8 years who do not respond sufficiently to lifestyle modification, and particularly for those satisfying the following criteria (Grade B; BEL 3):
  • LDL-C ≥190 mg/dL, or
  • LDL-C ≥160 mg/dL and
    • The presence of 2 or more cardiovascular risk factors, even after vigorous intervention, or
    • A family history of premature CAD (before 55 years of age) or,
  • Overweight, obese, or other elements of the insulin resistance syndrome.

Colesevelam has been approved for patients older than 8 years. Atorvastatin, lovastatin, pravastatin, simvastatin, and rosuvastatin have been approved for the treatment of familial hypercholesterolemia in patients 10 years or older. Cholestyramine may also be used in children.

3Q3.3. Follow-up and Monitoring

• R54. AACE recommends reassessing patients’ lipid status 6 weeks after therapy initiation and again at 6-week intervals until the treatment goal is achieved. Thereafter, AACE recommends that patients be tested at 6- to 12-month intervals. The specific interval should depend on patient adherence to therapy and lipid profile consistency. If adherence is a concern or the lipid profile is unstable, the patient will probably benefit from biannual assessment (Grade C; BEL 4).

• R55. AACE recommends more frequent lipid status evaluation in the following clinical circumstances:
  • Deterioration of diabetes control.
  • The use of a new drug known to affect lipid levels.
  • Progression of atherothrombotic disease.
  • Considerable weight gain.
  • An unexpected adverse change in any lipid parameter.
  • Development of a new CAD risk factor.
  • Convincing new clinical trial evidence or guidelines that suggest stricter lipid goals.

• R56. AACE recommends that a liver transaminase level be measured before and 3 months after statin or fibric acid treatment initiation, because most liver abnormalities occur within 3 months of treatment initiation. AACE recommends that this test be repeated periodically (eg, semiannually) (Grade A; BEL 3).

• R57. AACE recommends that patients taking niacin have transaminase levels measured at baseline and every 3 months thereafter for the first year, followed by periodic (eg, semiannual) assessment (Grade A; BEL 3). AACE recommends that transaminase level assessment be repeated at these intervals whenever lipid-altering therapy is restarted, increased, changed, or combined (Grade A; BEL 3).

• R58. AACE recommends assessment of creatine kinase levels whenever a patient reports clinically significant myalgias or muscle weakness (Grade A; BEL 3).
3Q4. IS TREATMENT OF DYSLIPIDEMIA AND PREVENTION OF ATHEROSCLEROSIS COST-EFFECTIVE?

- **R59.** Nonpharmacologic interventions such as dietary management and smoking cessation are the most cost-effective options available for CAD prevention (Grade A; BEL 3).
- **R60.** When nonpharmacologic interventions fail, pharmacologic intervention is a recommended cost-effective option for primary and secondary intervention in persons at moderate to high risk (Grade A; BEL 3).
- **R61.** Among otherwise healthy persons at lower risk, the cost-effectiveness of primary pharmacologic intervention varies on the basis of age and sex (with this approach being least cost-effective among women at low risk) (Grade B; BEL 3).
- **R62.** Statins have proven cost-effective in both secondary and primary prevention of CVD events in patients at moderate to high risk, or in patients at low risk whose LDL-C levels are very high (Grade A; BEL 1).
- **R63.** Treatment with fibrates has been found cost-effective as both monotherapy and combination therapy for lowering triglycerides and raising HDL-C (Grade B; BEL 2), but not in reducing cardiovascular events except in patients with triglyceride concentrations greater than 200 mg/dL and HDL-C concentrations less than 40 mg/dL (Grade A; BEL 1).
- **R64.** Ezetimibe coadministered with statin therapy in patients unable to meet target LDL-C levels has been identified as a cost-effective strategy to achieve LDL-C goals in studies from Canada and the United Kingdom (Grade B; BEL 2).
- **R65.** Available pharmacoeconomic data, derived before generic availability of bile acid sequestrants, do not support the cost-effectiveness of bile acid sequestrants compared with statin therapy (Grade C; BEL 3).
- **R66.** Limited pharmacoeconomic data support the cost-effectiveness of niacin in combination with a statin in reaching targeted lipid goals (Grade C; BEL 3).

4. SOURCE DOCUMENT: EVIDENCE BASE

4Q1. HOW SHOULD INDIVIDUALS BE SCREENED FOR THE DETECTION OF DYSLIPIDEMIA?

4Q1.1. Global Risk Assessment

The third report of the NCEP ATP categorizes CAD risk based on a system of risk factor counting and 10-year risk according to Framingham risk scoring (10 [EL 4]). In addition, the American Diabetes Association/ American College of Cardiology 2008 Consensus Statement on Lipoprotein Management in Patients with Cardiometabolic Risk establishes risk categorization for patients with diabetes (20 [EL 4]). An overview of accepted CAD risk categories and factors is outlined in Table 5 (20 [EL 4], 22 [EL 4], 23 [EL 4] and Table 6 (10 [EL 4], 11 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 13 [EL 4], 14 [EL 2], 15 [EL 4], 16 [EL 2], 17 [EL 4], 18 [EL 2], 19 [EL 2], 20 [EL 4], 21 [EL 3]). The remainder of this section will review these major CAD risk factors, as well as important nontraditional risk factors.

**Risk Factors for CAD**

The risk of CAD and CAD-related mortality is substantially greater in the presence of multiple risk factors. Since epidemiologic evidence indicates that CAD risk factors frequently cluster, it should be expected that many patients have multiple risk factors (95 [EL 4], 96 [EL 3]). The Framingham Heart Study and the MRFIT trial (Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial) showed that approximately 85% of excess risk for premature CAD is due to 1 or more major risk factor (13 [EL 4], 18 [EL 2]). More recently, the INTERHEART trial, which gathered data on 29,972 patients in 52 countries, identified 9 CAD risk factors that, taken together, accounted for 90% of MI risk. However, 5 of those risk factors (smoking, lipids, hypertension, diabetes, and obesity) constituted a full 80% of observed risk (14 [EL 2]). Recent guidelines and position statements such as the American College of Endocrinology Position Statements on polycystic ovary syndrome and the insulin resistance syndrome (available at http://www.aace.com) also identify other risk factors as having significant associations with CAD (11 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4]). Based on available evidence, Table 5 outlines the most important current major, additional, and nontraditional CAD risk factors (10 [EL 4], 11 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 13 [EL 4], 14 [EL 2], 15 [EL 4], 16 [EL 2], 17 [EL 4], 18 [EL 2], 19 [EL 2], 20 [EL 4], 21 [EL 3]).

**Advancing Age**

Men 45 years and older and women 55 years and older have an increased risk of CAD; CAD occurs most commonly in persons 65 years and older (10 [EL 4]).

**High LDL-C and Total Cholesterol**

The association between high serum cholesterol levels, especially high LDL-C, and CAD is causal and independent of other risk factors (97 [EL 3], 98 [EL 2], 99 [EL 4], 100 [EL 4]). The CARE trial (Cholesterol and Recurrent Events) determined that LDL-C-attributable risk is not linear and increases sharply within higher ranges (101 [EL 2]). The MRFIT study found a strong and progressive relationship between elevated total cholesterol levels and death of CAD (16 [EL 2]).
Since multiple studies have demonstrated that lowering LDL-C results in decreased CAD risk (37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 103 [EL 2], 104 [EL 1], 105 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1]), the focus of risk prediction and reduction has shifted toward LDL-C management in CAD and primary prevention in persons with multiple risk factors (10 [EL 4]).

**Low HDL-C**

Low HDL-C is associated with hypertriglyceridemia, type 2 diabetes, being overweight or obese, physical inactivity, cigarette smoking, very high carbohydrate intake, certain drugs (β-adrenergic blockers, anabolic steroids, progesterational agents), and genetic factors (10 [EL 4]). Low HDL-C can act synergistically with other lipid risk factors to increase CAD risk. For example, the ratio of total cholesterol or LDL-C to HDL-C may be a clinically valuable and potentially sensitive marker of CAD risk (108 [EL 2], 109 [EL 2], 110 [EL 4]). A recent reanalysis of data from the TNT trial (Treating to New Targets) found that both ratios of total cholesterol to HDL-C and LDL-C to HDL-C were highly predictive of major cardiovascular event risk (111 [EL 2]), while a clinical study of 258 normotensive, overweight, nondiabetic persons determined that a triglyceride to HDL-C ratio 2.4 or higher was predictive of the presence of insulin resistance (112 [EL 3]). In addition, low HDL-C was a significant predictor of cardiovascular risk in all treatment groups, including patients with the lowest (<70 mg/dL) LDL-C levels (111 [EL 2]).

The atherogenicity of low HDL-C can depend on both genetic and environmental factors. For example, the apo AI Milano trait, first isolated in a small community in Northern Italy, is marked by very low HDL-C and high triglyceride levels. Carriers of this trait do not show signs of atherosclerosis typically associated with this lipid profile (113 [EL 3], 114 [EL 3]). In fact, a normal apo AI level in a patient with low HDL-C may be an indication of less risk, as this suggests the presence of an adequate number of HDL-C particles that contain less cholesterol (115 [EL 4]).

**High HDL-C as a Negative Risk Factor**

An HDL-C concentration greater than 60 mg/dL is an independent negative risk factor in both sexes, and when HDL-C is greater than 60 mg/dL, 1 risk factor can be subtracted from a patient’s overall risk profile (10 [EL 4]). An analysis of 4 large epidemiologic studies suggests that each 1 mg/dL increase in HDL-C is associated with a decrease in CAD risk of 2% in men and 3% in women (116 [EL 2]). The cardioprotective effect of HDL-C may be because of its role in reverse cholesterol transport and other mechanisms such as the ability of HDL-C to prevent LDL oxidation (117 [EL 4], 118 [EL 4]).

Research shows a strong predictive link between HDL-C levels and longevity; healthy older persons tend to have higher HDL-C levels than younger persons, regardless of the younger persons’ CAD status (119 [EL 4], 120 [EL 3], 121 [EL 3], 122 [EL 2]). These results apply to the general population, however, and a high HDL-C concentration may not confer cardioprotection for every individual patient (123 [EL 4]).

**Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus**

Approximately 65% of diabetes-related mortality is due to heart disease and stroke. In comparison with patients who do not have diabetes, patients with type 2 diabetes have a significantly increased risk of CAD. For example, patients with diabetes plus a previous MI have been shown to have a 2.5-fold greater risk of subsequent CAD events than patients with CVD but no diabetes (124 [EL 4], 125 [EL 4]). Epidemiologic data from Finland similarly suggest that persons with diabetes and no history of MI have cardiovascular risk (fatal or nonfatal MI or stroke and overall cardiovascular mortality) equivalent to those without diabetes and a history of MI. This same study found that patients with diabetes and previous MI were at the highest risk, with a 7-year fatal or nonfatal MI incidence of 45% (126 [EL 3]). Moreover, among patients in the TNT study, only established cerebrovascular disease was more predictive of cerebrovascular events than was diabetes (106 [EL 1]).

In addition to hyperglycemia, individuals with type 2 diabetes commonly have other risk factors including hypertension; low HDL-C; hypertriglyceridemia; small, dense LDL-C; a procoagulant state; and a proinflammatory milieu (15 [EL 4], 124 [EL 4], 127 [EL 4], 128 [EL 4], 129 [EL 3], 130 [EL 2], 131 [EL 4]). Based on this level of risk, the NCEP ATP III and the American Diabetes Association/American College of Cardiology Consensus Statement consider patients with type 2 diabetes to manifest a CAD equivalent (a 10-year risk of CAD events that is equal to that of patients with established CAD) and therefore to be high-risk patients (10 [EL 4], 20 [EL 4]). Furthermore, the American Diabetes Association/American College of Cardiology categorizes patients with diabetes and 1 or more additional risk factor (eg, existing CVD) as “very high risk” (20 [EL 4]).

Patients with prediabetes (impaired fasting glucose and/or impaired glucose tolerance), especially those with the metabolic syndrome, are considered to be at increased risk for CAD. Lipid treatment goals for these patients should be the same as those for patients with diabetes (132 [EL 4]).

**Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus**

Most patients with diabetes mellitus have type 2 diabetes, and thus most existing data relate to those patients. However, type 1 diabetes is also associated with increased CAD risk. Persons with type 1 diabetes often do not have
insulin resistance or its features, such as a low HDL-C level or high triglycerides (133 [EL 2]). In fact, their HDL-C levels are typically higher than those of the general population (134 [EL 4], 135 [EL 4]). Nonetheless, patients with type 1 diabetes tend to develop atherosclerosis earlier than otherwise healthy individuals; have accelerated progression of coronary events, strokes, and peripheral arterial disease; and have higher associated mortality (136 [EL 3], 137 [EL 4], 138 [EL 3], 139 [EL 3], 140 [EL 3], 141 [EL 4], 142 [EL 3], 143 [EL 3]). The Pittsburgh Epidemiology of Diabetes Complications Study and the EURODIAB study found a similarly high prevalence of CAD among patients with type 1 diabetes in both the United States (7.3% in men, 7.5% in women) and in Europe (8.8% in men, 8.6% in women) (144 [EL 3]). Several studies of individuals with type 1 diabetes have suggested other factors that may increase risk for ischemic CVD:

- Proteinuria (145 [EL 3])
- In individuals with late-onset type 1 diabetes (older than 30 years) but no nephropathy, risk is increased with:
  - Previous history of MI or
  - Marked elevations in hemoglobin A1c (>10.4%) or
  - Duration of disease greater than 16 years (146 [EL 2])
- Insulin resistance or the metabolic syndrome (147 [EL 3])
- Highly sensitive CRP concentration greater than 3.0 mg/L (2.9 with CAD, 1.7 without CAD) (148 [EL 3])

Even mild elevations in blood pressure can increase risk. In persons aged 40 to 70 years with a blood pressure starting at 115/75 mm Hg, CAD risk doubles with each increase of 20 mm Hg in systolic blood pressure or 10 mm Hg in diastolic blood pressure (17 [EL 4]). Blood pressure–lowering therapy has been associated with significant decreases in the incidence of MI (20% to 25%), stroke (35% to 40%), and heart failure (>50%) (17 [EL 4]); however, hypertension may remain a CAD risk factor even when normalized with treatment (149 [EL 4], 150 [EL 2], 151 [EL 2], 152 [EL 3]).

A thorough evaluation of blood pressure, either through 24-hour or home blood pressure monitoring, provides the most accurate results and may be warranted for certain patients (17 [EL 4], 23 [EL 4], 153 [EL 2], 154 [EL 3]).

Cigarette Smoking

Cigarette smoking is a powerful risk factor, especially for MI, peripheral artery disease, and stroke. Smoking accelerates coronary plaque development and may lead to plaque rupture and is particularly dangerous in patients with advanced coronary atherosclerosis (13 [EL 4]). The risk of CAD mortality for persons who smoke cigarettes is about double that of lifetime nonsmokers. However, within 1 year of smoking cessation, this risk is reduced by about 50%, and continues to decline with time (155 [EL 4]). One possible explanation for the CAD risk associated with cigarette smoking may be related to its effect on HDL-C. Numerous studies have shown that smoking has a substantial, negative effect on HDL-C levels and the LDL-C to HDL-C ratio. Smoking also appears to have a negative effect on postprandial lipids, including triglycerides (156 [EL 3], 157 [EL 2], 158 [EL 3], 159 [EL 3], 160 [EL 3], 161 [EL 3]). However, smoking cessation significantly increases HDL-C, with improvement observable in as few as 30 days (162 [EL 2]).

Family History of CAD

A parental history of heart disease or MI has been established as an independent risk factor for CAD (163 [EL 2], 164 [EL 2], 165 [EL 3]). It has been estimated that 77% of patients with CAD and 54% of their first- and second-degree relatives express genetically linked dyslipidemia. Moreover, CAD risk is approximately 50% in siblings of patients with premature CAD (166 [EL 4]). In addition, recent studies of asymptomatic individuals indicate that a positive family history of CAD increases the risk of subclinical atherosclerosis (coronary artery calcification and carotid IMT) compared with risk of patients without a positive family history (167 [EL 2], 168 [EL 2], 169 [EL 3]).

Hypertension

Hypertension increases CAD risk independently of other risk factors, and this risk increases as blood pressure increases (17 [EL 4]). Available evidence strongly suggests that insulin resistance predisposes patients to hypertension (23 [EL 4]), and epidemiologic studies show a very high correlation between hypertension and dyslipidemia (10 [EL 4]).
Although it is an important risk factor, familial history is often overlooked during evaluations of individual cardiovascular risk. A family history of CAD, however, is both highly predictive and typically easy to access by direct inquiry.

**Obesity and Overweight**

Approximately two-thirds of the adults in the United States are overweight (body mass index 25 to 29.9 kg/m²) or obese (body mass index ≥30 kg/m²). It is well documented that persons who are overweight have a high prevalence of risk factors such as hypertension, type 2 diabetes, and dyslipidemia. It is also documented that persons who are overweight have a high prevalence of risk factors such as hypertension, type 2 diabetes, and dyslipidemia. However, other organizations have adopted a more stringent definition. For example, the International Diabetes Federation defines abdominal obesity as ≥90 cm (for women) or ≥88 cm (for men) or ≥94 cm (for men and ≥80 cm (for women) or ≥94 cm (for men and ≥80 cm (for women) or ≥94 cm (for men) or ≥88 cm (for women). In particular, excess visceral or intra-abdominal fat increases and independently predicts CAD risk. Elevated intra-abdominal fat is highly and independently correlated with insulin resistance and is also associated with prothrombotic/proinflammatory states; increased triglycerides; total cholesterol; LDL-C; small, dense LDL-C; and apo B and decreased HDL-C.

Intra-abdominal obesity is one of the most reliable markers of the insulin resistance syndrome. Existing US guidelines indicate that a waist circumference greater than 102 cm (40 in) in men or greater than 88 cm (35 in) in women is considered “categorical abdominal obesity.” However, other organizations have adopted a more stringent definition. For example, the International Diabetes Federation defines abdominal obesity as ≥94 cm (≥37 in) in men and ≥80 cm (≥31.5 in) for women; for Asians and Central/South Americans the cutoffs are ≥90 cm (≥35 in) for men and ≥80 cm (≥31.5 in) for women.

**LDL Particle Number**

The genetically influenced small, dense LDL-C particle is believed to be especially atherogenic, perhaps due in part to its oxidative susceptibility. Several studies point to increased CAD risk associated with small, dense LDL-C. In addition, evidence from the Framingham Offspring Cohort indicates that primary consideration should be given to measuring and adjusting risk based on LDL particle numbers. LDL particle number was a more sensitive indicator of CAD risk.

MESA (Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis) and the Cardiovascular Health Study both demonstrated that although LDL-C and LDL particle size are associated with atherogenicity, LDL particle number is a more potent measure of CVD risk than either of these 2 measures.

**Small, Dense LDL**

Small, dense LDL-C is found in 50% of men with CAD and is also referred to as LDL pattern B. This pattern is often observed in patients with elevated triglycerides and low HDL-C, a combination known as the dyslipidemic triad (see below), as well as in patients with type 2 diabetes, the insulin resistance syndrome, and/or chronic anovulation or polycystic ovarian syndrome.

**Fasting and/or Postprandial Hypertriglyceridemia**

Triglyceride levels are an important component of risk evaluation in both men and women. Historically, the clinical significance of fasting hypertriglyceridemia as an independent risk factor weakened or disappeared when LDL-C and HDL-C concentrations were considered. However, abundant clinical evidence indicates that elevated triglyceride levels may be an independent risk factor. Elevated non–HDL-C (that is, total serum cholesterol minus HDL-C) and apo B levels are also clinical markers for the presence of small, dense LDL. Approximately 25% of patients with small, dense LDL particles inherit this abnormality and do not have hypertriglyceridemia.
when HDL-C levels are low (97 [EL 3], 98 [EL 2], 205 [EL 2], 206 [EL 4], 207 [EL 4]).

Because hypertriglyceridemia is interrelated with so many other lipid and nonlipid risk factors, the benefit of lowering triglycerides directly remains uncertain (12 [EL 4]). Furthermore, several recent studies indicate that postprandial, or nonfasting, triglycerides may be an equally or more potent CAD risk factor than fasting triglycerides. Two major prospective studies, the Women’s Health Study (n = 26,509, 11.4-year follow-up) and the Copenhagen City Heart Study (n = 13,981, 26-year follow-up), both found that nonfasting triglycerides were independently associated with MI and ischemic heart disease (208 [EL 2], 209 [EL 2]). In the Women’s Health Study, the association between both fasting and nonfasting triglycerides and cardiovascular events was significant in univariate analysis (P<.001 for trend across tertiles). The relationship of fasting triglycerides lost statistical significance after adjustment for total cholesterol and HDL-C and weakened further with adjustment for markers of insulin resistance (diabetes mellitus, body mass index, and CRP). However, the association for nonfasting triglyceride levels remained significant with adjustment (P = .006 for trend) (208 [EL 2]). In addition, elevated postprandial triglycerides were the only variable independently associated with cardiovascular events among women with normal (≥50 mg/dL) HDL-C levels (213 [EL 2]).

Proposed explanations for the association between postprandial triglycerides and CAD risk include increased postprandial production of triglyceride-rich lipoprotein remnants, which are highly atherogenic, and an abnormal response to an oral fat load, which indicates insulin resistance (208 [EL 2], 209 [EL 2], 210 [EL 3], 211 [EL 4], 212 [EL 4], 213 [EL 3], 214 [EL 4], 215 [EL 4], 216 [EL 2]). Recent data (217 [EL 1]) suggest that in patients with normal glucose tolerance, postprandial triglyceride levels are useful in assessing cardiovascular risk, but provide no extra prognostic value in those with dysglycemia.

**Polycystic Ovary Syndrome**

Polycystic ovary syndrome is well established as a manifestation of the insulin resistance syndrome and/or the compensatory hyperinsulinemia that may precede any glucose abnormality. Reports indicate that 75% or more women who have polycystic ovary syndrome also fulfill the criteria for the insulin resistance syndrome (11 [EL 4], 218 [EL 3]). Studies indicate that patients with polycystic ovary syndrome have greater than average levels of coronary artery calcification and carotid IMT (11 [EL 4], 219 [EL 3], 220 [EL 2]), as well as significantly higher rates of CAD and CAD risk factors such as type 2 diabetes and hypertension (11 [EL 4], 219 [EL 3], 221 [EL 3], 222 [EL 3], 223 [EL 3]).

**The Dyslipidemic Triad**

Patients who have the common dyslipidemic triad (hypertriglyceridemia; low HDL-C; and small, dense LDL-C [also called the atherogenic lipoprotein profile or atherogenic dyslipidemia]) are at high risk for CAD (166 [EL 4], 185 [EL 3], 190 [EL 4]). This type of dyslipidemia is one of the components of the high-risk insulin resistance syndrome (Table 16) (12 [EL 4]), and is also common among persons with type 2 diabetes (10 [EL 4]). The relative contribution of each element of the dyslipidemic triad cannot be determined; therefore, the dyslipidemic triad should be viewed as an independent risk factor (10 [EL 4]). Its presence alongside elevated LDL-C significantly enhances risk, and each condition should be addressed.

**Other Risk Factors**

Data are emerging on several additional nonlipid risk factors, including their levels of associated risk and their role in the CAD process. A brief summary follows.

**Increased Lipoprotein (a)**

Production of lipoprotein (a), an LDL variant, is largely genetically determined and its pathogenic mechanism remains unclear; however, elevated plasma concentrations are independently associated with CAD risk (224 [EL 4], 225 [EL 4]). Data on the level of risk associated with lipoprotein (a) are inconsistent (226 [EL 2], 227 [EL 2], 228 [EL 2], 229 [EL 2], 230 [EL 3], 231 [EL 1], 232 [EL 2], 233 [EL 2]); however, a recent prospective analysis of Women’s Health Study participants indicated that increased risk was observed only among participants with extremely high lipoprotein (a) levels (≥90th percentile) and above-average LDL-C levels (234 [EL 3]).

Risk associated with elevated lipoprotein (a) appears to vary by ethnic group; for example, data from the CARDIA study (Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults) showed that mean and median lipoprotein (a) concentrations in African American participants (13.0 and 11.6 mg/dL, respectively) were almost 2 to 3 times that in white participants (6.9 and 3.7 mg/dL, respectively) (235 [EL 3]). However, lipoprotein (a) elevation appeared to confer a stronger risk for white participants than for African American participants (235 [EL 3]). Moreover, any interpretation is complicated by a lack of standardized measurement procedures, as well as data indicating that population lipoprotein (a) levels can range from less than 0.1 mg/dL to greater than 100 mg/dL (225 [EL 4], 226 [EL 2]). Some evidence suggests that statin-induced LDL-C reduction may attenuate the risk associated with lipoprotein (a) (236 [EL 1]). Testing for lipoprotein (a) is therefore not generally recommended, although it may provide useful information to ascribe risk in white patients.
with CAD or in those with an unexplained family history of early CAD.

Factors Related to Blood Clotting

Available data suggest that plasminogen activator inhibitor 1 is related to intra-abdominal obesity, insulin resistance, and, in patients with diabetes, hyperinsulinemia and hyperproinsulinemia. Consequently, elevated plasminogen activator inhibitor 1 may be a risk factor for CAD (237 [EL 4], 238 [EL 4], 239 [EL 2], 240 [EL 4]). Assays for plasminogen activator inhibitor 1 are not standardized, however. For these reasons, plasminogen activator inhibitor 1 screening is not generally recommended.

Fibrinogen is a clotting factor that, at elevated levels, may lead to a prothrombotic state (241 [EL 3]). An increased fibrinogen level is a strong, established marker of CAD risk in men and women (242 [EL 4], 243 [EL 4], 244 [EL 4], 245 [EL 4]). However, as with lipoprotein (a), screening in the general population is not recommended because fibrinogen levels can vary among ethnic groups. Furthermore, factors unrelated to CAD may affect fibrinogen levels (242 [EL 4], 244 [EL 4], 245 [EL 4]) and no standard measurement assay exists (243 [EL 4], 244 [EL 4]). Nonetheless, prospective studies consistently show that adding fibrinogen to lipid evaluations significantly improves CAD risk prediction (246 [EL 4]). Fibrinogen may also be a marker of inflammation (see following text) (241 [EL 3]). Nonetheless, prospective studies consistently show that adding fibrinogen to lipid evaluations significantly improves CAD risk prediction (246 [EL 4]). Fibrinogen may also be a marker of inflammation (see following text) (241 [EL 3]).

Markers of Inflammation

CRP is a sensitive marker of systemic inflammation that can indicate CVD risk (247 [EL 2], 248 [EL 2]). Concentration of highly sensitive CRP less than 1.0 mg/L is considered normal, 1.0 to 3.0 mg/L is intermediate, and greater than 3.0 mg/L is high risk (249 [EL 4]). Highly sensitive CRP measurements have been shown to add to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Components of the Insulin Resistance Syndrome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 [EL 4])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Some degree of glucose intolerance
   - Impaired fasting glucose
   - Impaired glucose tolerance
2. Abnormal uric acid metabolism
   - Plasma uric acid concentration
   - Renal uric acid clearance
3. Dyslipidemia
   - Triglycerides
   - High-density lipoprotein cholesterol
   - Low-density lipoprotein particle diameter (small, dense low-density lipoprotein particles)
   - Postprandial accumulation of triglyceride-rich lipoproteins
4. Hemodynamic changes
   - Sympathetic nervous system activity
   - Renal sodium retention
   - Blood pressure
5. Prothrombotic factors
   - Plasminogen activator inhibitor 1
   - Fibrinogen
6. Markers of inflammation
   - C-reactive protein, white blood cell count, etc
7. Endothelial dysfunction
   - Mononuclear cell adhesion
   - Plasma concentration of cellular adhesion molecules
   - Plasma concentration of asymmetric dimethylarginine
   - Endothelial-dependent vasodilatation
the predictive value of standard lipid tests in determining risk for future CVD events (248 [EL 2], 250 [EL 2]). Even after adjustment for standard CVD risk factors, elevated highly sensitive CRP levels have a progressive association with increased MI and stroke among men aged 40 to 84 years (247 [EL 2]). Elevated highly sensitive CRP levels (≥1.9 mg/L) also correspond to increased CVD risk in healthy, postmenopausal women with LDL-C levels less than 130 mg/dL (248 [EL 2]). Furthermore, significantly elevated highly sensitive CRP in combination with significantly elevated Lp-PLA₂ (eg, both in the highest tertile) constitutes very high risk in individuals with low or moderately elevated LDL-C (251 [EL 2], 252 [EL 2]). The significance of highly sensitive CRP lowering by statins in the JUPITER study (Justification for the Use of Statins in Primary Prevention: An Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin) is discussed in “Choosing Lipid-Lowering Drugs” under “Statins.”

Lp-PLA₂ is a blood enzyme that hydrolyzes oxidized phospholipids, causing atherogenic vascular inflammation (252 [EL 2]). In particular, the accumulation of macrophages and lymphocytes in atherosclerotic inflammation is accompanied by increased expression of Lp-PLA₂ in atherosclerotic plaques, especially complex plaques (253 [EL 4], 254 [EL 4], 255 [EL 4], 256 [EL 4]). Lp-PLA₂ has been identified as a strong and independent predictor of CVD events and stroke in patients with and without manifest CAD (257 [EL 3], 258 [EL 2], 259 [EL 2]), as well as in patients with low LDL-C (252 [EL 2]). Current best evidence indicates that an Lp-PLA₂ level less than 200 ng/mL is normal, ≥200 and <223 ng/mL is intermediate, and ≥223 ng/mL is high (252 [EL 2], 259 [EL 2]). Lp-PLA₂ appears to act synergistically with CRP (described above) such that when both are elevated, risk is substantial (251 [EL 2], 252 [EL 2]). However, while CRP is a marker of general inflammation, Lp-PLA₂ appears to specifically indicate vascular inflammation and is not influenced by obesity (247 [EL 2], 254 [EL 4], 255 [EL 4]).

Hyperhomocysteinemia

Homocysteine, a precursor of methionine, is highly reactive, and elevated levels may damage vessel walls and induce intimal fibrosis (260 [EL 4], 261 [EL 4]). Prospective clinical studies of patients with CAD or CAD risk factors have consistently demonstrated increased levels of serum homocysteine (>15 µmol/L) alongside cardiovascular events and mortality (260 [EL 4], 262 [EL 4], 263 [EL 2]). However, the link between homocysteine levels and cardiovascular event risk is much stronger after disease onset (246 [EL 4], 260 [EL 4], 262 [EL 4], 264 [EL 2], 265 [EL 3], 266 [EL 2], 267 [EL 2], 268 [EL 2], 269 [EL 2]). Evaluation of homocysteine levels in patients with established CAD (including ischemia) may help explain the CAD etiology (260 [EL 4]). Recent data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III and MESA have shown that the addition of homocysteine is a powerful tool when used in conjunction with Framingham Risk Score to identify patients with CVD at high risk who might otherwise be classified as being at intermediate risk.

Elevated homocysteine levels appear to be mediated by deficiencies in folic acid and vitamins B₉ and B₁₂ (270 [EL 4]). Although treatment with these supplements lowers plasma homocysteine levels, research to date does not indicate that such therapy reduces CAD risk (32 [EL 4], 33 [EL 1], 34 [EL 1], 35 [EL 2], 36 [EL 1]). Homocysteine measurement, therefore, is not recommended as part of routine screening.

Elevated Uric Acid

Increased serum uric acid levels are linked to the insulin resistance syndrome, obesity, dyslipidemia, and hypertension (271 [EL 3]). Data from the First National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey and the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 1 Epidemiologic Follow-up Study showed a significant increase in CVD mortality among the highest uric acid quartile (>6.99 mg/dL for men and >5.6 mg/dL for women), suggesting that uric acid may be an independent risk factor (271 [EL 3]).

CAD Risk and the Insulin Resistance Syndrome

Persons who have insulin resistance are at increased risk for developing a cluster of abnormalities known as the insulin resistance syndrome (12 [EL 4]). Although this is sometimes referred to as the metabolic syndrome or dysmetabolic syndrome, AACE prefers the term insulin resistance syndrome, as this more accurately pinpoints the underlying pathophysiology of insulin resistance and compensatory hyperinsulinemia that unites these conditions (12 [EL 4]). The components of the insulin resistance syndrome, outlined in Table 16 (12 [EL 4]), include important risk factors for CAD. Thus, individuals with the insulin resistance syndrome are at increased risk for developing CAD. Likewise, patients who do not have diabetes, but who have a diagnosis of CAD have a greater prevalence of the insulin resistance syndrome than those without CAD (12 [EL 4]). Persons who are insulin resistant will not necessarily develop all of the abnormalities that comprise the insulin resistance syndrome; however, the identification of even 1 component raises the likelihood of an insulin resistance syndrome diagnosis (12 [EL 4]).

Elevated blood glucose is a late and possibly terminal manifestation of insulin resistance. Before the development of hyperglycemia, diagnosis of the insulin resistance syndrome may be difficult, with no simple, single clinically measurable test available (12 [EL 4]). However, the components of the insulin resistance syndrome are frequently identifiable. Patients who exhibit nonhyperglycemic signs of insulin resistance should undergo further assessment, with consideration given to performing a 2-hour, 75-g oral glucose tolerance test (12 [EL 4]).
Chronic Kidney Disease

Growing evidence suggests that patients with chronic kidney disease, who represent a growing population, have increased risk for CAD. It appears that the increased risk of CAD does not occur only in patients with end-stage renal disease, but also in those with mild to moderate chronic renal dysfunction. These findings led the National Kidney Foundation in 2002 to consider chronic kidney disease as a CAD equivalent (6 [EL 4]).

Chronic Inflammatory Conditions

Patients with chronic inflammatory conditions, such as rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, and ankylosing spondylitis, appear to have an increased risk of CAD. In the Nurses’ Health Study, for example, patients who had had rheumatoid arthritis for more than 10 years appear to have an increased risk for CAD when compared with patients without rheumatoid arthritis (relative risk, 3.1; confidence interval, 1.64-5.87) (272 [EL 2]). Also in the Nurses’ Health Study that included 119,332 female nurses, systemic lupus erythematosus was eventually diagnosed in 148 women. The age-adjusted relative risk of CAD was 2.25 (95% confidence interval, 1.77-4.27) when after adjustment for other traditional risk factors, the hazard ratio remained greater than 2 for the group of women with systemic lupus erythematosus (273 [EL 2]). Increased prevalence of CAD has been also reported in patients with ankylosing spondylitis (274 [EL 3]).

Human Immunodeficiency Virus

Patients with human immunodeficiency virus appear to have increased risk of CAD. It is not well established whether the increased risk for CAD is secondary to traditional risk factors or to nontraditional risk factors, such as changes in body composition (lipodystrophy), or inflammation, effect of the antiretroviral medications, or direct effects of the human immunodeficiency virus to the vasculature (275 [EL 4]).

4Q1.2. Screening

AACE advocates screening for dyslipidemia in all adults up to age 75 years regardless of CAD risk status, and in adults older than age 75 years who have multiple CAD risk factors.

Screening guidelines vary by age group; however, the decision to screen should always be based on clinical judgment. Specific indications exist to alert physicians to conduct a screening.

Young Adults (≥20 Years of Age) (10 [EL 4])

A number of studies have shown that atherosclerosis can be present early in life, well before symptoms occur (276 [EL 3], 277 [EL 3], 278 [EL 3]). Although CAD risk in young adults is low, AACE recommends that adults older than 20 years be evaluated for dyslipidemia every 5 years as part of a global risk assessment (10 [EL 4]). More frequent assessments are warranted for young persons with a family history of premature CAD (definite MI or sudden death before age 55 years in father or other first-degree male relative, or before age 65 years in mother or other first-degree female relative) (10 [EL 4]). Consideration of more frequent testing should also be given to individuals with CAD risk factors (10 [EL 4], 11 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 13 [EL 4], 14 [EL 2], 15 [EL 4], 16 [EL 2], 17 [EL 4], 18 [EL 2], 19 [EL 2], 20 [EL 4], 21 [EL 3]). All young adults with diabetes should be screened annually (15 [EL 4]).

Middle-Aged Adults (Men ≥45 Years of Age; Women ≥55 Years of Age) (10 [EL 4], 24 [EL 3])

Intervention trials involving middle-aged men and women have shown that treatment of dyslipidemia in patients at high risk (eg, those with established CAD, diabetes, or hypertension) is beneficial (37 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 105 [EL 1], 279 [EL 1]). However, the benefits of primary prevention using lipid-lowering treatment in patients at low risk are not as well established (279 [EL 1]).

This information must be considered in the context of existing risk in the US population. Despite substantial increases in the use of lipid-lowering therapy, less than one-third of Americans have LDL-C levels below 100 mg/dL, while two-thirds have elevated triglycerides (5 [EL 3]). The recent MESA study, which had a multicenter cohort of patients aged 45 to 84 years with no CVD at baseline (n = 6814), found a 29.3% prevalence of dyslipidemia (280 [EL 3]). Moreover, several community-based, population screening studies of middle-aged patients described as “typically health-conscious” found dyslipidemia prevalence ranging from 21% to 49% (281 [EL 3], 282 [EL 3], 283 [EL 3]). Given these high prevalence rates, AACE recommends that even when no CAD risk factors are present, middle-aged persons should be screened for dyslipidemia at least every 1 to 2 years. More frequent lipid testing is recommended when multiple CAD risk factors are present (10 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 15 [EL 4]). The frequency of testing should be based on individual clinical circumstances and the clinician’s best judgment. All patients with diabetes should be screened at least annually (15 [EL 4]).

Older Adults (≥65 Years of Age) (10 [EL 4], 284 [EL 4])

Although the association between high LDL-C and CAD weakens with age (10 [EL 4]), increased serum cholesterol in older patients (men ≥65 years, women ≥75 years) is associated with a greater absolute number of acute coronary events compared with middle-aged or younger populations (285 [EL 4], 286 [EL 4]). In patients older than 70 years, the 5804-patient PROSPER trial (Prospective Study of Pravastatin in the Elderly at Risk) demonstrated a secondary, but not primary, prevention CAD event benefit for the group treated with pravastatin (38 [EL 1]).
Because many older patients may benefit from lipid-lowering therapy, those with 0 to 1 CAD risk factor should be screened for dyslipidemia annually (10 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1]). In addition, older patients should undergo lipid assessment if they have multiple CAD risk factors (ie, risk factors other than age) (10 [EL 4]). Consideration should also be given to the fact that treatment to lower lipid levels and attenuate atherosclerosis may potentially decrease stroke and transient ischemic attack incidence in this population (37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 288 [EL 1]).

**Women**

CVD is the leading cause of mortality in women in the United States, killing more than 460,000 women each year (286 [EL 4]). Minority women, in particular African-American women, have higher death rates than white women because of both CAD and stroke (286 [EL 4]). Diagnosis of CAD in women can be particularly problematic. Approximately half of women presenting with symptoms suggestive of ischemia have angiographically normal or near-normal coronary arteries. Furthermore, women’s symptoms are often less overt and/or are atypical compared with those of men. These differences can lead to delays in evaluation and diagnostic testing, decreased use of appropriate therapy, and increased mortality (289 [EL 4], 290 [EL 4]). In addition, traditional diagnostic methods, such as imaging, electrocardiography, and exercise testing, may be less accurate in women whose anatomy, hormonal milieu, age at CAD onset, and age-related comorbidities are unique (291 [EL 4]).

**Children and Adolescents**

A growing body of evidence indicates that atherosclerosis begins early in life (278 [EL 3], 292 [EL 3], 293 [EL 4], 294 [EL 4]). Furthermore, studies show that the presence and severity of atherosclerotic lesions in children and young adults are related to serum lipid levels (293 [EL 4], 295 [EL 2], 296 [EL 2], 297 [EL 3], 298 [EL 3]). Although there is increasing consensus that early intervention is warranted, even in very young patients (26 [EL 4], 299 [EL 3], 300 [EL 4], 301 [EL 4], 302 [EL 2], 303 [EL 4], 304 [EL 4]), the most effective diagnostic and treatment approaches for pediatric dyslipidemia are far from clear. While NCEP guidelines continue to be updated (32 [EL 4]), the Expert Panel on Blood Cholesterol Levels in Children and Adolescents report is well over a decade old, having been published in 1992. In 2008, the American Academy of Pediatrics issued a clinical report on lipid screening and cardiovascular health in children to replace its previous position statement regarding cholesterol in children (305 [EL 4]). This section reviews current evidence relating to dyslipidemia screening and management in pediatric populations and provides recommendations based on this evidence.

Children older than 2 years who have CAD risk factors or a family history of CAD or dyslipidemia, and children for whom family history is not known, should be screened for dyslipidemia; these patients should be rescreened every 3 to 5 years. In all adolescents older than 16 years, screening should be repeated every 5 years, or more frequently for patients with CAD risk factors or a family history of CAD.

AACE endorses current American Academy of Pediatrics, American Heart Association, and NCEP guidelines for targeted dyslipidemia screening in children and adolescents, including recommendations to measure plasma total cholesterol, HDL-C, LDL-C, and triglyceride levels in children with CAD risk factors such as obesity (central adiposity and/or elevated body mass index), insulin resistance, diabetes, hypertension, cigarette smoking, or a family history of CAD or dyslipidemia (22 [EL 4], 26 [EL 4], 300 [EL 4], 306 [EL 4], 307 [EL 4]). In addition to these risk factors, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends screening pediatric patients for whom family history is not known. The American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Heart Association also state that children who are overweight or obese should be considered to be in a separate risk category and screened regardless of the presence of other risk factors or family history (27 [EL 4], 305 [EL 4]). Additionally, the American Heart Association indicates that children who are overweight or obese should be promptly screened for other elements of the insulin resistance syndrome, and that the presence of such factors may alter treatment considerations (27 [EL 4]). Initial screening should take place between the ages of 2 and 10 years; if lipid levels are within acceptable ranges, children should be rescreened every 3 to 5 years (305 [EL 4]).

Furthermore, AACE recommends dyslipidemia screening in all adolescents older than 16 years (300 [EL 4], 308 [EL 3]), with more frequent testing of patients with CAD risk factors or a positive family history (6 [EL 4]). As there is no available noninvasive method of screening for CAD, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends a fasting lipid profile for children (305 [EL 4]). This comprehensive strategy is expected to improve the accuracy of dyslipidemia diagnosis in children and young adults (308 [EL 3]).

Several important points must be considered when interpreting lipid profiles in children and adolescents:
- **Lipid levels fluctuate during childhood and adolescence.** While plasma cholesterol levels normally peak before puberty (age 8-11 years) in white boys, they often decline profoundly during puberty, along with HDL-C values (309 [EL 4]).
• **Low HDL-C may not have the same implications in children as it does in adults.** More than 50% of children with low HDL-C levels have normal HDL-C levels as adults (310 [EL 4], 311 [EL 3]). Furthermore, low HDL-C values do not constitute a hallmark of the insulin resistance syndrome in children; in this population, obesity and hypertriglyceridemia are the best predictors of this condition (310 [EL 4], 312 [EL 3]).

• **Lipid levels vary by sex.** Throughout childhood and adolescence, plasma cholesterol levels tend to be higher in girls than in boys (303 [EL 4]).

While LDL-C levels less than 110 mg/dL are generally considered acceptable in pediatric patients, NCEP guidelines indicate that intervention is indicated for those with borderline (110-129 mg/dL) or high (>130 mg/dL) LDL-C values, as shown in Table 8 (26 [EL 4]). Further, the American Heart Association has identified abnormal pediatric HDL-C and triglyceride levels as less than 35 mg/dL and greater than 150 mg/dL, respectively (313 [EL 4]).

4Q2. WHICH SCREENING TESTS ARE RECOMMENDED FOR THE DETECTION OF CARDIOVASCULAR RISK?

The goal of screening is to ascertain a patient’s individual CAD risk. The selection of appropriate initial screening tests should be based on patient risk factors and clinical judgment. Basic lipid screening tests are outlined in the following text alongside brief background on their utility and accuracy.

4Q2.1. Fasting Lipid Profile

A growing body of evidence suggests that an isolated, nonfasting total cholesterol determination does not sufficiently select and identify patients at risk for vascular disease. Therefore, although a nonfasting assessment has been useful in the past as a minimal screen, to ensure the most precise lipid profile assessment, a fasting lipoprotein profile (total cholesterol, LDL-C, triglycerides, and HDL-C) is now recommended for all patients (10 [EL 4]). A 9- to 12-hour fast is necessary to avoid the effect of food intake on chylomicron and VLDL triglycerides (10 [EL 4]).

4Q2.2. Low-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

Historically, LDL-C has been estimated using the Friedewald equation (10 [EL 4]):

\[
\text{LDL-C} = \frac{(\text{total cholesterol} – \text{HDL-C}) – \text{triglycerides}}{5}
\]

However, this approach is subject to substantial variability in routine use, is valid only for values obtained during the fasting state, becomes increasingly inaccurate when triglyceride levels are greater than 200 mg/dL, and is considered inaccurate when triglyceride levels are greater than 400 mg/dL (314 [EL 3], 315 [EL 4]). Therefore, a more precise method should be used to assess LDL-C in certain high-risk patients, such as those with fasting triglyceride concentrations greater than 250 mg/dL or those with diabetes or known vascular disease (315 [EL 4], 316 [EL 3]).

Several direct, homogenous LDL-C assays have become available with excellent precision and accuracy over a range of concentrations, as well as a high correlation with the criterion standard β-quantification assay (315 [EL 4], 317 [EL 4]). These assays accurately classify patients with triglyceride concentrations up to 2000 mg/dL (317 [EL 4]), although they are not recommended for patients with type III hyperlipidemia (familial dysbetaIipoproteinemia) (317 [EL 4]). The benefits and potential drawbacks of direct LDL-C assessment have been discussed in detail by Nauck and colleagues (315 [EL 4]). These assays accurately classify patients with triglyceride concentrations up to 2000 mg/dL (317 [EL 4]), although they are not recommended for patients with type III hyperlipidemia (familial dysbetaIipoproteinemia) (317 [EL 4]). The benefits and potential drawbacks of direct LDL-C assessment have been discussed in detail by Nauck and colleagues (315 [EL 4]).

4Q2.3. High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

An HDL-C concentration less than 40 mg/dL is an established independent risk factor for CAD in both men and women (10 [EL 4]). However, because HDL-C levels tend to be higher in women than in men, an HDL-C concentration less than 50 mg/dL in women is also considered a marginal risk factor (10 [EL 4]). The evidence of low HDL-C as a positive risk factor for CVD and the evidence for high HDL-C as a negative risk CVD risk factor are described above in “Global Risk Assessment: Risk Factors for CAD.”

4Q2.4. Non–High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

Many patients have normal LDL-C concentrations, but elevated triglycerides and low HDL-C (318 [EL 4]). Furthermore, in patients with triglyceride levels 200 mg/dL or greater, VLDL-C is elevated and CAD risk cannot be adequately assessed using LDL-C alone (10 [EL 4]). These deficits have led to an increased awareness of the potential benefits of non–HDL-C screening. Non–HDL-C is the sum of VLDL-C and LDL-C, but is usually calculated as follows:

\[
\text{total cholesterol} – \text{HDL-C} = \text{non–HDL-C}
\]
Non–HDL-C is highly correlated, but is not concordant with, total apo B and provides a simple way to estimate risk from VLDL-C, LDL-C, intermediate-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and lipoprotein (a) (10 [EL 4], 41 [EL 4], 318 [EL 4]). Current evidence indicates that, compared with LDL-C, non–HDL-C is an equally strong or superior predictor of risk in groups of patients with moderately elevated triglycerides (200 to 500 mg/dL) (10 [EL 4]), diabetes (319 [EL 4], 320 [EL 2], 321 [EL 2]), insulin resistance syndrome (10 [EL 4]), and/or established CAD (318 [EL 4], 322 [EL 2]). In these high-risk patients, non–HDL-C may be an appropriate secondary treatment target (149 [EL 4]). Non–HDL-C may be at goal with persistently elevated apo B levels (323 [EL 4], 324 [EL 4]). Non–HDL-C targets are 30 mg/dL higher than established LDL-C risk levels (10 [EL 4]).

4Q2.5. Triglycerides

A high triglyceride to HDL-C ratio (≥2.4) is a strong indicator of the insulin resistance syndrome (10 [EL 4], 12 [EL 4], 112 [EL 3]). Insulin resistance is more common when a family history of CAD or type 2 diabetes is present (12 [EL 4]). Evidence indicates that when triglyceride levels exceed 140 mg/dL, there is a substantial increase in the production of small, dense LDL-C (190 [EL 4]); therefore, the presence of hypertriglyceridemia and low HDL-C in a patient should also prompt clinical suspicion for the presence of the small, dense LDL pattern, as well as elevated postprandial triglycerides (12 [EL 4]). Triglycerides, which are present in 5 times the amount of cholesterol, are the more important lipid component of VLDL particles. VLDL-C is only important in that it is calculated in a lipid profile to calculate the more important LDL-C.

When fasting triglyceride levels are marginally elevated (140 to 200 mg/dL), 2 additional lipid evaluations may sometimes be warranted:

- Direct assessment of the LDL-C pattern B phenotype (small, dense LDL) by ultracentrifugation, nuclear magnetic resonance, or gradient gel electrophoresis because elevated triglycerides and reduced HDL-C are elements of the dyslipidemic triad (10 [EL 4]). This is particularly relevant because many patients with the small, dense LDL pattern will have optimal or near-optimal LDL-C levels (<130 mg/dL) (10 [EL 4]).
- Evaluation of postprandial triglyceride levels may be useful because evidence indicates that the small triglyceride-rich lipoproteins produced postprandially are particularly atherogenic and may be indicative of insulin resistance and/or diabetes (206 [EL 4], 325 [EL 3], 326 [EL 4], 327 [EL 4], 328 [EL 3], 329 [EL 3], 330 [EL 3]). Although neither an assessment for postprandial triglyceride levels nor a reference range has been standardized, several recent studies indicate that nonfasting triglycerides exceeding usual fasting cutoffs (≥150 mg/dL) are independently associated with increased CAD risk (208 [EL 2], 209 [EL 2], 331 [EL 4]). Others suggest that lack of standardization of postprandial measurement of triglycerides precludes its current use as a screening test (331 [EL 4]).

Thus, elevated triglycerides in a nonfasting state can no longer be ignored as indicative of no increased CHD risk. The treatment of hypertriglyceridemia, however, demands they be measured in a standard fasting state to assess the effect of therapy. Fasting triglyceride measurements represent the lowest 24-hour value because daytime triglyceride levels are postprandial and are influenced by dietary fat load and the efficiency of triglyceride clearance.

4Q2.6. Apolipoproteins

A high plasma apo B level (≥130 mg/dL) combined with an LDL-C concentration less than 160 mg/dL, with or without hypertriglyceridemia, identifies hyperapobetalipoproteinemia, which is a cause of premature CAD (115 [EL 4]).

Emerging evidence from a series of large studies, including the AMORIS (Apolipoprotein-Related Mortality Risk) and Nurses’ studies, suggests that apo B provides a uniquely powerful assessment of total atherogenic particle burden that may be equivalent or superior to LDL-C, non–HDL-C, or other cholesterol ratios in predicting risk. It has also been suggested that apo B is more closely associated with the insulin resistance syndrome than LDL-C or non–HDL-C (41 [EL 4], 332 [EL 2], 333 [EL 2]). Additionally, an analysis of the IRAS study (Insulin Resistance Atherosclerosis Study) found that apo B was more closely associated than non–HDL-C with markers such as central adiposity, insulin resistance, thrombosis, and inflammation (334 [EL 3]). There are clinical circumstances where apo B and non–HDL-C are highly correlated but only moderately concordant because of differences in cholesterol enrichment of LDL-C particles, leaving many high-risk patients whose non–HDL-C is satisfactory with apo B high enough to warrant more intensive therapy (335 [EL 4]). A 2008 post hoc analysis of combined data from 2 major statin trials (pooled n = 18,018) found that both increased apo B and non–HDL-C demonstrated an equivalent or slightly stronger association with major cardiovascular event risk (hazard ratio, 1.19; P < .001 for both) than increased LDL-C (hazard ratio, 1.15; P < .001) (19 [EL 2]). Among patients who achieved the ATP III LDL-C goal of 100 mg/dL or less while on statins, LDL-C ceased to be significantly associated with cardiovascular risk, while apo B and non–HDL-C maintained a significant relationship (19 [EL 2]). In addition, the apo B to apo AI ratio was a stronger predictor of risk (hazard ratio 1.24; P < .001) than either the LDL-C to HDL-C ratio (hazard ratio 1.20, P < .001) or the total cholesterol to HDL-C ratio (hazard ratio 1.21; P < .001) (19 [EL 4], 335 [EL 4]).
Similarly, the INTERHEART study found that the apo B to apo AI ratio was among the most significant risk factors for MI, with an odds ratio of 4.73 (99% confidence interval, 3.93-5.69) for the highest vs lowest decile (14 [EL 2]). However, dyslipidemia in patients with MI is noninvasive measures of lipid abnormality. A recent study (337 [EL 3]) showed that the triglyceride concentration is greater than 150 mg/dL or the HDL-C concentration is less than 40 mg/dL, the apo B or the apo B to apo AI ratio may be particularly useful in assessing residual risk in patients at risk for CAD (even when LDL-C levels are controlled); this includes patients with established CAD, type 2 diabetes, or the insulin resistance syndrome who are at high risk for CAD. AACE therefore recommends apo B testing in such patients (19 [EL 2], 20 [EL 4]).

4Q2.7. Secondary Causes of Dyslipidemia

Secondary causes of dyslipidemia (Table 11) (10 [EL 4]) must be excluded with a thorough medical and dietary history, as well as laboratory testing for glucose and thyroid, liver, and renal function (10 [EL 4]). Treating an underlying contributing disease may alleviate the lipid abnormality (10 [EL 4]); however, dyslipidemia in patients with serious conditions such as diabetes is a sometimes overlooked indication for aggressive lipid-lowering therapy.

In addition to excluding secondary causes of dyslipidemia, the physician should perform a thorough family history and physical evaluation to identify additional risk factors, including genetic factors, that could cause or contribute to dyslipidemia. The following are examples of clinical situations where a more detailed lipid evaluation or other studies may be useful.

4Q2.8. Additional Tests

Additional tests may be warranted in certain situations; these are described in the following text. For greater detail on the described risk factors described, see Risk Factors for CAD under Global Risk Factors Assessment for Atherosclerosis.

Evidence suggests that highly sensitive CRP may be helpful in predicting coronary events (336 [EL 1]). Although studies suggest that highly sensitive CRP may be of limited value as a broadly applied screening tool, it may be helpful in stratifying cardiovascular risk in patients with a standard risk assessment that is borderline (337 [EL 3]) or in those with an LDL-C level less than 130 mg/dL. Although studies suggest that highly sensitive CRP may be of limited value as a broadly applied screening tool, it may be helpful in stratifying cardiovascular risk in patients with a standard risk assessment that is borderline (337 [EL 3]) or in those with an LDL-C level less than 130 mg/dL (337 [EL 3], 338 [EL 1]). Normal values of highly sensitive CRP are classified as being less than 1.0 mg/L, intermediate range is 1.0 to 3.0 mg/L, and high risk is greater than 3.0 mg/L (337 [EL 3]). However, in the most recent JUPITER trial (Justification for the Use of Statins in Primary Prevention: An Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin), a simpler stratification (<2.0 vs ≥2 mg/L) was strongly suggested (338 [EL 1]).

Lp-PLA2 (see section 4Q1.1. Risk Factors for CAD, Other Risk Factors), like highly sensitive CRP, may also be helpful in predicting CAD risk. As discussed earlier, elevated Lp-PLA2 (≥200 ng/mL) has been independently linked with coronary events (259 [EL 2]). Moreover, Lp-PLA2 may act synergistically with CRP; further increasing risk when both are elevated (251 [EL 2], 252 [EL 2]). Measurement of Lp-PLA2, which appears to be more specific than highly sensitive CRP, may be helpful when it is necessary to further stratify a patient’s risk for CVD, especially in the presence of systemic CRP elevations.

A normal apo AI level in a patient with low HDL-C suggests the existence of an adequate number of HDL-C particles that contain less cholesterol and is an indication of less risk (8). Therefore, an assessment of apo AI may be useful in certain cases (115 [EL 4]).

Homocysteine has also emerged as a potential independent risk factor for CAD. Homocysteine levels greater than 15 µmol/L are associated with increased CAD risk. Goal levels have been less than 10 µmol/L in the United States and less than 12 µmol/L in Europe. As discussed in the following text, lowering homocysteine to these levels, however, has not been shown to reduce CAD risk (270 [EL 4]).

Coronary artery calcification and ultrasound measurement of carotid IMT are noninvasive measures of atherosclerosis that have emerged as adjuncts to standard CVD risk factors in an attempt to refine risk stratification and the need for more aggressive preventive strategies. Noninvasive imaging of carotid arteries is a potential tool for assessing the results of lipid-lowering therapy and has been used in clinical trials of drug efficacy (see statin imaging studies; Table 17 [339 (EL 1), 340 (EL 1), 341 (EL 1), 342 (EL 1), 343 (EL 1), 344 (EL 3), 345 (EL 1)]). Carotid IMT, along with coronary calcium scoring, is recognized by the American Heart Association as a surrogate marker for coronary artery disease (346 [EL 4]). The presence of coronary calcium correlates strongly with coronary atherosclerosis. Coronary artery calcium scoring by computed tomography may prove useful in certain clinical situations to further assess intermediate risk suggested by Framingham or other risk assessment tools or to consider the need for more aggressive lipid lowering therapy. However, since there is lack of definite evidence that this emerging risk factor independently predicts coronary events, it remains unclear as to the general clinical utility of coronary artery scoring (347 [EL 4]). A recent commentary by Stein et al reviewed the comparison of carotid IMT to coronary calcium scoring, with favorable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Primary endpoint</th>
<th>Patients, No.</th>
<th>Mean baseline lipid values, mg/dL</th>
<th>Mean achieved lipid values, mg/dL</th>
<th>Mean experimental % change</th>
<th>Mean control % change</th>
<th>Most diseased sub-segment Overall</th>
<th>Most diseased sub-segment Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARS (339 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Lovastatin, 80 mg, (experimental) vs PBO (control)</td>
<td>Percent diameter stenosis measured by QCA</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>86°</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATS (imaging arm) (340 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Simvastatin + niacin (experimental) vs PBO (control)</td>
<td>Percent diameter stenosis measured by QCA</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>79 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 110 on pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>43 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 45 on pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>148 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 166 on pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVERSAL (341 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg, (experimental) vs pravastatin, 10 mg (control)</td>
<td>Atheroma volume measured by coronary IVUS</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>–4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTEROID (342 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Rosuvastatin, 40 mg, no control group</td>
<td>Atheroma volume measured by coronary IVUS</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>43 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 45 on pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>–4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>–1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmermund (343 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg, (experimental) vs atorvastatin, 10 mg (control)</td>
<td>Coronary artery calcification measured by EBCT</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>53 on atorvastatin, 10 mg</td>
<td>137 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 151 on atorvastatin, 10 mg</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>–4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCE (344 [EL 3])</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 80 mg, + ezetimibe, 10 mg, (experimental) vs simvastatin, 80 mg, + placebo (control)</td>
<td>Carotid-artery intima-media thickness measured by carotid ultrasound</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>157 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 109 on atorvastatin, 10 mg</td>
<td>141.3 on atorvastatin, 80 mg; 54 on pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>108 on atorvastatin; 120 (simvastatin)</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEOR (345 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Rosuvastatin, 40 mg, (experimental) vs PBO (control)</td>
<td>Carotid-artery intima-media thickness measured by carotid ultrasound</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>M F LDL-C HDL-C TG LDL-C HDL-C TG</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-0.0014</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
findings for carotid IMT, especially in the healthy young and middle-aged populations, as well as in women and African American persons in whom coronary calcification has more limited utility (323 [EL 4]). Findings of the MESA study indicate further that increased carotid IMT predicts CVD events in individuals without coronary calcification (345 [EL 1]).

Special Considerations: Women

Both the Framingham Heart Study and the Lipid Research Clinics Follow-Up Study have demonstrated that high total cholesterol, LDL-C, and triglycerides and low HDL-C are CAD risk factors in women. Elevated fasting and/or postprandial triglycerides may also be independent risk factors in this population (208 [EL 2], 349 [EL 4]). In particular, and in stark contrast to findings in men, very low HDL-C (<40 mg/dL) is an independent risk factor for CAD development and mortality in women, even in the presence of total cholesterol concentrations less than 200 mg/dL or normal LDL-C and/or triglyceride levels (350 [EL 2]). Compared with women with high HDL-C, women with low HDL-C have a nearly 3-fold elevated risk of CAD (350 [EL 2]). In particular, and in stark contrast to findings in men, very low HDL-C (<40 mg/dL) is an independent risk factor for CAD development and mortality in women, even in the presence of total cholesterol concentrations less than 200 mg/dL or normal LDL-C and/or triglyceride levels (350 [EL 2]). Compared with women with high HDL-C, women with low HDL-C have a nearly 3-fold elevated risk of CAD (350 [EL 2]).

4Q3. WHAT ARE THE TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS IN PATIENTS WITH DYSLIPIDEMIA AND CAD RISK?

4Q3.1. Treatment Goals

Treatment goals are outlined in Table 12 (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 41 [EL 4]). In clinical management of dyslipidemia, a reasonable goal is to strive for lipid levels in the range of normal; however, more aggressive goals can be set for higher-risk patients (23 [EL 4]). Optimal, borderline, and abnormal serum lipid concentrations are outlined in Table 9 (10 [EL 4]).

Isolated Low HDL-C

As shown in Table 13 (10 [EL 4]), isolated low HDL-C consists of HDL-C levels less than 40 mg/dL in men and less than 50 mg/dL in women, without accompanying hypertriglyceridemia (10 [EL 4]). Because no researched intervention has targeted only HDL-C, it is difficult to determine from clinical trials whether increasing HDL-C levels alone is clinically beneficial (116 [EL 2], 123 [EL 4], 351 [EL 1]). The VA-HIT study, however, showed that increasing HDL-C and lowering triglycerides in patients with CAD whose primary lipid abnormality was low HDL-C significantly reduced the rate of coronary events (351 [EL 1]). These results and other epidemiologic evidence support a cardioprotective role of HDL-C. Therefore, AACE believes that when secondary causes of low HDL-C have been excluded, intervention is appropriate if HDL-C levels are low and other risk factors are present (including borderline elevated LDL-C levels, a family history of premature CAD, or a personal history of CAD). The goal of intervention should be to raise HDL-C levels by as much as possible, but minimally to greater than 40 mg/dL in both men and in women (10 [EL 4], 122 [EL 4], 340 [EL 1], 352 [EL 3], 353 [EL 3]).

4Q3.1.1. Low-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

LDL has been, and remains, the mainstay of efforts to improve lipid profiles in patients at risk for CVD. However, because an isolated focus on LDL-C is not always sufficient to prevent CAD in at-risk patients or to treat existing atherosclerosis, control of HDL-C, non–HDL-C, and triglycerides is also important (10 [EL 4]). Other important considerations include patient age and sex and the presence of type 2 diabetes or dysglycemia (impaired fasting glucose and/or impaired glucose tolerance).

4Q3.1.2. High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

AACE does not recommend increasing HDL-C levels alone (ie, low HDL-C without any accompanying risk factors) because it is difficult to determine from clinical trials whether increasing HDL-C levels alone is clinically beneficial. In those with risk factors, AACE recommends raising HDL-C levels as much as possible, but minimally to greater than 40 mg/dL in both men and women (Grade C; BEL 4) (Table 12) (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL1], 41 [EL 4]).

4Q3.1.3. Non–High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol

The goal for non–HDL-C is 30 mg/dL above the LDL-C goal (ie, <100 mg/dL for patients at highest risk and <130 mg/dL for patients at medium to high risk) (10 [EL 4]).

4Q3.1.4. Apolipoproteins

Apo B may be elevated in patients with optimal LDL-C when small, dense LDL particles are present. This generally occurs in patients with hypertriglyceridemia, but may also occur in patients with triglyceride values of 100 to 149 mg/dL and in some patients with a genetic basis for small, dense LDL particles who have triglyceride values less than 100 mg/dL (20 [EL 4], 37 [EL 1], 38 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 41 [EL 4]). AACE recommends the guidelines set by the American College of Cardiology and the American Diabetes Association that optimal apo B levels for patients at risk of CAD, including those with diabetes, are less than 90 mg/dL, while patients with established CAD or diabetes plus 1 or more additional risk factor should have an apo B
goal of less than 80 mg/dL (20 [EL 4], 41 [EL 4], 354 [EL 4]). Lower apo B targets may be considered in certain clinical situations characterized by persistent CAD.

### 4Q3.1.5. Triglycerides

Normal triglyceride levels are less than 150 mg/dL; levels ranging from 150 to 199 mg/dL are classified as borderline high; levels from 200 to 499 mg/dL are high, and levels 500 mg/dL or greater are considered very high (Table 10) (10 [EL 4]).

Although the benefit of targeting triglycerides directly remains uncertain, several studies suggest there may be some advantage to such treatment. Two major studies, the HHS (Helsinki Heart Study) and the FIELD study (Fenofibrate Intervention and Event Lowering in Diabetes), found that fibrates were highly effective at lowering triglycerides. Moreover, both studies showed that a reduction in triglycerides was associated with a trend toward fewer CVD events and a significant reduction in nonfatal MI (88 [EL 3], 355 [EL 1]). In the 18-year HHS follow-up, triglyceride reduction with fibrates significantly lowered the CAD mortality rate (84 [EL 2]).

Although verifying the independent atherogenicity of triglycerides is difficult, triglyceride-rich remnant lipoproteins (ie, VLDL and intermediate-density lipoproteins) form the basis for triglyceride targets, since reducing remnant lipoproteins appears to have significant potential to reduce CAD risk (10 [EL 4]). Elevated triglycerides can often be effectively treated through lifestyle changes; however, niacin, fibrates, and combination therapy with statins may be appropriate options for many patients (356 [EL 4], 357 [EL 1], 358 [EL 1]). In addition, omega-3 fatty acid (fish oil) supplementation in dosages ranging from 4 to 12 g daily is very effective in treating hypertriglyceridemia, with studies showing reductions of 30% to 50% (10 [EL 4], 356 [EL 4], 359 [EL 1], 360 [EL 3]).

### Borderline Hypertriglyceridemia

When moderate hypertriglyceridemia (150-199 mg/dL) in association with increased serum cholesterol or low HDL-C levels is the primary disorder, physical activity, weight control, smoking cessation, and other lifestyle changes are first-line therapy (see section 4Q3.2.1. Physical Activity and section 4Q3.2.2. Medical Nutrition Therapy) (10 [EL 4]). The approach to treatment of accompanying elevated LDL-C does not need to be modified. However, if the patient also has decreased HDL-C, the selection of secondary drug therapy may be affected (10 [EL 4]).

### Familial Hypertriglyceridemia

Familial hypertriglyceridemia refers to a group of conditions causing borderline-high and high triglyceride levels. Patients with marginal or elevated triglyceride levels due to familial hypertriglyceridemia have been conventionally considered to be at no increased risk of CAD because there is an overproduction of large VLDL particles that are not highly atherogenic. This assumption is based largely on data from a 1976 study (n = 74) that found MI rates among adults with familial combined hyperlipidemia to be significantly increased compared with rates in normolipidemic relatives (17.5% vs 4.5%), while MI rates among adults with familial hypertriglyceridemia (4.7%) were not (10 [EL 4], 316 [EL 3], 361 [EL 3]). However, subsequent research has cast doubt on this premise. In 2000, Austin and colleagues found that 20-year cardiovascular mortality risk was the same among persons with familial hypertriglyceridemia and with familial combined hyperlipidemia; however, the results for the familial hypertriglyceridemia group were not significant, probably due to a small sample size (362 [EL 2]). More recently, a case-control comparison from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Family Heart Study found that associated risk was similar and significant for both familial disorders. Patients with familial hypertriglyceridemia also had a higher prevalence of the insulin resistance syndrome (70.7%) than those with familial combined hyperlipidemia (64.7%) (316 [EL 3]). Treatment of familial hypertriglyceridemia should focus on reducing the risk of pancreatitis as a result of an increased triglyceride level (8 [EL 4], 363 [EL 4], 364 [EL 3], 365 [EL 3]).

### Severe Hypertriglyceridemia (Type V)

Most patients with severe hypertriglyceridemia have type V hyperlipoproteinemia, signifying an increase in both chylomicrons and VLDL-C (366 [EL 4]). The need to lower triglyceride levels in these patients is urgent to prevent acute pancreatitis and the chylomicronemia syndrome (367 [EL 4]).

### 4Q3.2. Treatment Recommendations

The management of dyslipidemia requires a comprehensive strategy to control lipid levels and to address associated metabolic abnormalities and modifiable risk factors such as hypertension, diabetes, obesity, and cigarette smoking. Insulin resistance, which is frequently, but not necessarily, associated with obesity and which underlies most cases of type 2 diabetes, is strongly associated with dyslipidemia. The first-line approach to primary prevention in patients with lipid disorders involves the implementation of lifestyle changes, including physical activity and medical nutrition therapy. Treatment may also involve pharmacotherapy, as well as patient education programs to promote further risk reduction through smoking cessation and weight loss. Furthermore, using insulin in patients with poorly controlled type 1 and type 2 diabetes to lower blood glucose will frequently reduce circulating levels of triglycerides.
4Q3.2.1. Physical Activity

Regular physical activity helps to increase strength and flexibility, maintain bone density, and improve insulin sensitivity. Physical activity is also associated with reductions in highly sensitive CRP levels and improvements in risk factors such as obesity, waist circumference, hypertension, and dyslipidemia (368 [EL 4]). Specific lipid level improvements associated with regular exercise include reduced VLDL-C, increased HDL-C, and, in some persons, decreased LDL-C levels (10 [EL 4]).

Numerous published guidelines identify exercise regimens as an essential approach for dyslipidemia control and cardiovascular risk factor reduction. One current recommendation, which AACE supports as a reasonable and feasible approach to fitness therapy, indicates that exercise programs should include at least 30 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity (consuming 4-7 kcal/min) 4 to 6 times weekly, with an expenditure of at least 200 kcal/day. Activities may include brisk walking; riding a stationary bike; water aerobics; cleaning/scrubbing; mowing the lawn; and sporting activities such as skiing, basketball, or volleyball with light effort (10 [EL 4], 155 [EL 4], 369 [EL 4], 370 [EL 4], 371 [EL 2], 372 [EL 4], 373 [EL 2], 374 [EL 2], 375 [EL 4], 376 [EL 1], 377 [EL 2], 378 [EL 4]). More recent guidelines indicate that greater benefits are achieved when the duration of exercise is lengthened to 60 to 90 minutes daily, and that 60 or more minutes of daily exercise is recommended for weight loss or weight loss maintenance (369 [EL 4]). AACE’s minimum recommendation remains 30 minutes daily, as over-emphasis of the extended recommendations may lead to poor adherence for some patients. Daily physical activity goals can be met in a single session or in multiple sessions throughout the course of a day (10 minutes minimum); for some patients, breaking activity up throughout the day may help improve adherence to physical activity programs (155 [EL 4], 369 [EL 4], 370 [EL 4], 375 [EL 4]).

Although aerobic exercise is preferred, nonaerobic activities are also beneficial. The IRAS study (Insulin Resistance Atherosclerosis Study) examined 1467 patients and found that improvements in insulin sensitivity correlated with total energy expenditure in total, vigorous, and nonvigorou sor activity. Vigorous activity was defined as having a metabolic equivalent value of 6 or higher (calculated as the ratio of metabolic rate during activity to resting metabolic rate) and included strenuous home/work activities such as snow shoveling, chopping wood, or heavy construction and intensive sporting activities such as running/jogging, skiing, swimming, racket sports, or vigorous weightlifting. Nonvigorou sor activities included less-strenuous home/work activities such as gardening, nursing, and waiting tables and less strenuous sports such as hunting, bowling, golf, and brisk walking (379 [EL 3]). Recent studies also suggest that weight and resistance training may be beneficial to some patients with the insulin resistance syndrome, independent of body fat or aerobic fitness (380 [EL 2], 381 [EL 3]). Therefore, in addition to aerobic activity, muscle-strengthening activity is recommended at least 2 days a week (375 [EL 4]).

Even though the benefits of exercise are widely accepted, physical activity programs often prove difficult for patients to maintain (155 [EL 4]). Nonetheless, AACE underscores the continued application of fitness therapy as a cornerstone of dyslipidemia treatment. Patients who are nonadherent to fitness therapy should be repeatedly encour aged, and practitioners should apply a variety of strategies as necessary to improve adherence. Strategies may include patient-tailored advice, identification of adherence barriers, referral to instructor-led exercise classes, and routine patient follow-up and consultation (382 [EL 1], 383 [EL 1], 384 [EL 4], 385 [EL 2]).

4Q3.2.2. Medical Nutrition Therapy

Research has shown that diet can have a substantial effect on lipid levels and may be an important determinant of CAD risk. Therefore, medical nutrition therapy provides an important tool for the management of dyslipidemia.

Dietary Risk Factors: Fats

Dietary fat includes both unsaturated and saturated fatty acids. The substitution of unsaturated fatty acids (including both polyunsaturated and monounsaturated) for saturated fatty acids leads to decreased LDL-C levels; slightly greater LDL-C reductions are observed with polyunsaturated fatty acids than with monounsaturated fatty acids (10 [EL 4], 386 [EL 2]). While high intake of polyunsaturated fatty acids may reduce HDL-C and triglyceride levels, the substitution of monounsaturated fatty acids for saturated fatty acids has a minimal effect on HDL-C values and does not raise triglyceride levels (10 [EL 4], 386 [EL 2], 387 [EL 1], 388 [EL 1], 389 [EL 1]).

Dietary intake of trans fatty acids is associated with both increased LDL-C and decreased HDL-C levels (390 [EL 3]). Combined with evidence from epidemiologic cohort studies, these effects indicate that diets high in trans fatty acids are associated with an increased risk of CAD; current evidence indicates that, on a per calorie basis, risk with trans fatty acids is higher than with any other macro nutrient (390 [EL 3]).

Dietary Changes: Recommendations and Clinical Effects

Current nutritional guidelines for the reduction of cardiovascular risk through lipid management recommend diets rich in fruits (≥2 servings/day), vegetables (≥3 servings/day, ≥1 of these servings/day of dark green or orange vegetables), grains (≥6 servings/day, one-third of those as whole grains), legumes, high-fiber cereals, low-fat dairy products, fish, lean meats, and skinless poultry (10 [EL
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Additional recommendations, such as those provided in the therapeutic lifestyle changes diet, specify limits for the intake of saturated fat (<7% of total calories), trans fats (<1% of total calories), and cholesterol (<200 mg/day). Guidelines also indicate that polyunsaturated and monounsaturated fatty acids may comprise up to 10% and 20% of caloric intake, respectively, and that total dietary fat should constitute 25% to 35% of calories consumed (10 [EL 4]). Further recommendations include a reduction in both salt intake and total calories consumed (10 [EL 4], 391 [EL 4], 392 [EL 4]).

Research has shown that lipid value improvements can be further augmented by supplementing with LDL-C-lowering macronutrients including plant stanol esters (~2 g daily) and soluble fiber (10-25 g daily) (10 [EL 4], 394 [EL 4], 395 [EL 4]). A number of small studies have compared diets with similar energy and nutrient values, differing only in the amount of soluble fiber intake. In these studies, diets higher in soluble fiber produced total cholesterol reductions of 5% to 19% and LDL-C reductions of 8% to 24% (396 [EL 3], 397 [EL 3], 398 [EL 3], 399 [EL 3], 400 [EL 3]). Foods high in soluble fiber include oat bran, oatmeal, beans, peas, rice bran, barley, citrus fruits, strawberries, and apple pulp (401 [EL 4]). Plant stanol esters are virtually unabsorbable and selectively inhibit dietary and biliary cholesterol absorption in the small intestine (42 [EL 4]). Clinical studies ranging from 4 weeks to 1 year have demonstrated that substitution of conventional home dietary fats with margarine containing plant stanol esters can reduce LDL-C levels by approximately 15% to 20% (402 [EL 1], 403 [EL 2], 404 [EL 2], 405 [EL 4]). Stanols/sterols have been incorporated into a variety of foods, including spreads and dressings, breads and cereals, low-fat milk and yogurt, and, in the United States, orange juice (42 [EL 4]).

While low-fat diets are generally recommended, it is important to recognize that decreases in dietary fat intake may lead to increased carbohydrate consumption and subsequent weight gain (10 [EL 4], 387 [EL 1], 388 [EL 1], 406 [EL 1], 407 [EL 1], 408 [EL 2], 409 [EL 2]). Patients at risk for the insulin resistance syndrome are advised to avoid excessive carbohydrate intake and to consume diets that include relatively more unsaturated fats (10 [EL 4], 410 [EL 4]). A diet high in carbohydrates (>60% of total energy) will increase triglycerides, while a diet that replaces saturated fatty acids with monounsaturated fatty acids will not (10 [EL 4]).

Because of the demonstrated lipid benefits (eg, decreased triglyceride levels, antiarrhythmic, and modest hypotensive effects) associated with consuming the omega-3 fatty acids eicosapentaenoic acid and docosahexaenoic acid, the American Heart Association recommends 2 servings of fatty fish per week for the general population. Patients with CAD should consume 1 g of eicosapentaenoic acid and docosahexaenoic acid daily through fatty fish (preferably) or high-quality dietary supplements (411 [EL 4]). Evidence indicates that the consumption of 2 to 4 g daily of fish oil can reduce triglycerides by 25% or more, while producing only slight increases in LDL-C levels and having no significant effect on HDL-C values (412 [EL 4], 413 [EL 4]). Emerging evidence also suggests that consumption of fish oil may have additional effects such as reduced atherosclerotic plaque growth, antithrombogenic effects, and the promotion of endothelial relaxation; however, these findings require further confirmation (411 [EL 4], 414 [EL 4], 415 [EL 2]).

Nutrition therapy effectively reduces cholesterol levels. In a trial of patients with hypercholesterolemia, implementation of the NCEP Step II therapeutic diet led to an 8% decrease in LDL-C values (416 [EL 1]). In another study, LDL-C levels were reduced by 11% with diets low in saturated fatty acids (comprising 6.1% of caloric intake) (216 [EL 2]). Hypertriglyceridemia can also be highly responsive to medical nutrition therapy, particularly when carbohydrate intake is limited; a fish oil dosage of approximately 4 g daily has been found to decrease serum triglycerides by 25% to 30% (411 [EL 4]). Dietary fat and carbohydrate restrictions, combined with increased physical activity, weight control, and omega-3 supplementation (411 [EL 4]), are considered effective first-line therapy for hypertriglyceridemia (200 [EL 4], 204 [EL 4]).

Other investigations have revealed potential health benefits of various specialized diets. For example, CAD regression was observed in a 1998 study of patients on the Ornish diet plus lifestyle intervention (eg, moderate exercise), while the control group (usual care—lifestyle adjustment based on advice of regular physician) showed CAD progression (417 [EL 3]). In an analysis comparing the Ornish, Zone, Lifestyle, Exercise, Attitudes, Relationships, and Nutrition (LEARN) and Atkins diets, the latter was associated with the greatest weight loss and most improvement in HDL-C and triglyceride levels (418 [EL 1]). In the EPIC-Oxford study (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition-Oxford), mortality from ischemic heart disease was observed to be lower in vegetarians than in nonvegetarians (419 [EL 2]). In other studies, vegetarian diets were associated with reduced total cholesterol, LDL-C, and systolic blood pressure when compared with control or meat-eating diets (420 [EL 3], 421 [EL 3]).

**Duration and Diagnostic Significance of Nutrition Therapy**

In primary prevention, nutrition therapy should be applied as the sole therapeutic approach for dyslipidemia management for at least 3 months. Depending on patient progress, nutritional therapy may be extended through 6 months before initiating lipid-lowering drug therapy (8 [EL 4]). For high-risk patients, it is appropriate to institute nutrition therapy and pharmacotherapy simultaneously.
After lipid levels are controlled, intensified lifestyle changes may be implemented in patients with the insulin resistance syndrome.

Patient response to medical nutrition therapy has diagnostic significance. Individual response to nutrition therapy is variable, and numerous factors may influence patient outcomes, including adherence (422 [EL 4]), baseline diet, sex, genetics (115 [EL 4]), and LDL particle size (423 [EL 1], 424 [EL 2]). Patients who respond poorly despite good adherence to dietary restrictions are more likely to have genetic dyslipidemia (425 [EL 4]).

**Primary Preventive Nutrition in Children**

A decade ago, most experts believed that reduced-fat diets could inhibit growth and decrease vitamin and mineral intake and were therefore inappropriate for most pediatric patients; such diets were generally reserved for high-risk individuals (301 [EL 4], 426 [EL 4]). Clinical studies have demonstrated that growth and micronutrient intake can, in fact, be maintained with reduced-fat diets, provided that energy needs are met with a variety of alternative, nutritious foods (300 [EL 4], 302 [EL 2], 427 [EL 1], 428 [EL 1], 429 [EL 2], 430 [EL 2], 431 [EL 3], 432 [EL 2], 433 [EL 2], 434 [EL 2], 435 [EL 1], 436 [EL 2])). Furthermore, the benefits of early “imprinting” of healthy lifestyle habits in children have also been recognized (304 [EL 4]). Measures include caloric intake personalized to reach and maintain healthy weight, total fat intake constituting 30% or less of total calories, protein intake constituting 15% to 20% of total calories, and cholesterol intake of less than 200 mg/day. Clinical studies indicate that pediatric patients can achieve decreased total cholesterol levels and modest, but significant, LDL-C reductions with low-fat diets (303 [EL 4], 310 [EL 4], 427 [EL 1], 437 [EL 4], 438 [EL 3], 439 [EL 1], 440 [EL 2]). The following factors should be considered when prescribing low-fat diets for children and adolescents:

- **Total cholesterol and HDL-C levels are positively correlated in patients 20 years and younger, and low-fat diets that decrease total cholesterol levels have also been associated with HDL-C reductions.** A cross-sectional study of 67 children with hypercholesterolemia demonstrated that such HDL-C reductions can be avoided by limiting intake of simple sugars, but not complex carbohydrates (310 [EL 4], 427 [EL 1], 439 [EL 1], 441 [EL 3]).
- **Increased intake of carbohydrates may increase plasma triglyceride concentrations in children** (441 [EL 3]). High carbohydrate intake is not recommended for children with hypertriglyceridemia.

- **Fish oil supplements have a profound effect on serum triglyceride levels in children.** These supplements have been used effectively in pediatric patients with end-stage renal insufficiency (442 [EL 2]).
- **Increased intake of carbohydrates may increase plasma triglyceride concentrations in children** (441 [EL 3]). High carbohydrate intake is not recommended for children with hypertriglyceridemia.
- **Fish oil supplements have a profound effect on serum triglyceride levels in children.** These supplements have been used effectively in pediatric patients with end-stage renal insufficiency (442 [EL 2]).
- **Water-soluble fiber can help to improve serum cholesterol levels in children.** Studies have shown that both children and adults can achieve cholesterol reductions with high-fiber, low-fat diets (443 [EL 4], 444 [EL 3]).
- **Diets supplemented with plant stanols and sterols can reduce LDL-C in children.** Studies indicate that both children and adults can achieve LDL-C reduction between 5% and 10% by eating foods that are supplemented with plant stanols and sterols (such as spreads/margarines, orange juice, yogurt Drinks, cereal bars, and dietary supplements) (305 [EL 4], 445 [EL 2]). AACE agrees with the American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Heart Association recommendations suggesting that dietary supplementation with plant stanols and sterols may be considered for children with severe hypercholesterolemia, or those who are otherwise at high risk (305 [EL 4], 446 [EL 4]). The main safety concern is that plant stanols and sterols may reduce absorption of fat-soluble vitamins and betacarotene; therefore, the American Heart Association recommends monitoring fat-soluble vitamin status in children receiving supplementation (305 [EL 4], 446 [EL 4]).

Children and adolescents on low-fat diets may experience decreased absorption of fat-soluble vitamins or minerals (447 [EL 4]) and should be closely supervised to ensure adequate nutrient and energy intake. Furthermore, lipid levels must be carefully monitored to ensure that profile changes are beneficial.

**4Q3.2.3. Smoking Cessation**

Smoking is a modifiable CAD risk factor that has been shown to degrade serum lipid profiles in young adults (448 [EL 3]). Smoking cessation programs for adolescents may
involve patient education, counseling, behavioral therapy, and/or pharmacologic intervention (449 [EL 4]).

4Q3.2.4. Pharmacologic Therapy

At the initiation of drug therapy, the physician and patient should collaborate to establish the patient’s lipid goal and then treatment should be personalized to achieve that goal. Pharmacotherapy may consist of 1, 2, or, in cases of severe dyslipidemia, 3 or even 4 agents (that is, a statin ± cholesterol absorption inhibitor ± fibrate ± niacin).

Numerous clinical trials demonstrate that lipid-lowering drug therapy is effective for both the primary and secondary prevention of MI and other cardiovascular outcomes (10 [EL 4]). Clinical evidence also suggests that lipid-lowering drug therapy can both prevent CAD from developing and may stabilize early, occult lesions (354 [EL 4], 450 [EL 4], 450 [EL 2]). Last, results from several recent, large clinical trials suggest that patients at high risk may benefit from very aggressive lipid-lowering therapy (10 [EL 4], 338 [EL 1], 451 [EL 2]).

The Case for Aggressive Therapy

Current evidence indicates that LDL-C can be aggressively lowered with statin therapy regardless of baseline levels and suggests that there is no baseline threshold level below which LDL-C lowering ceases to be effective. However, uncertainty remains as to whether it is LDL-C reduction or the non–LDL-C benefits derived from statins, or some combination of both, that improve overall risk (452 [EL 1]). Nonetheless, reducing lipids to levels even below recommended targets may be beneficial for certain patients. Consequently, in 2004, the NCEP ATP III updated its guidelines to include an optional LDL-C goal of less than 70 mg/dL for patients at very high risk (23 [EL 4]). This update further indicated that it is always prudent to initiate therapy at a level sufficient to achieve a 30% to 40% LDL-C reduction (23 [EL 4]). The American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology 2006 update of its CVD secondary prevention guidelines also considers it a “reasonable goal” to reduce LDL-C to less than 70 mg/dL for patients with established CAD (22 [EL 4]). Patients for whom aggressive therapy may be beneficial are outlined below, and trials relevant to aggressive lipid-lowering therapy are shown in Table 18 (39 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 83 [EL 3], 103 [EL 2], 105 [EL 1], 338 [EL 1], 355 [EL 1], 376 [EL 1], 453 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4], 455 [EL 1], 456 [EL 1], 457 [EL 1], Table 19 (37 [EL 1], 85 [EL 1], 86 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 340 [EL 1], 353 [EL 3], 458 [EL 1], 459 [EL 4], 460 [EL 1], 461 [EL 1], 462 [EL 2]), and Table 20 (39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 93 [EL 4], 102 [EL 1], 105 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 288 [EL 1], 451 [EL 2], 453 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4], 461 [EL 1], 463 [EL 1]).

Patients With Average or Elevated LDL-C

Early trials such as the 4S study (Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study) and the AFCAPS/TexCAPS study (Air Force/Texas Coronary Atherosclerosis Prevention Study) showed that patients with elevated LDL-C or patients with marginally increased LDL-C but low HDL-C showed significant reductions in major coronary events over 5 years on statin therapy (102 [EL 1], 453 [EL 1]). The extent of these positive results generated interest in the possible benefits of more aggressive cholesterol lowering. More recently, the HPS secondary prevention trial (Heart Protection Study) examined the efficacy of simvastatin for lipid lowering among a large cohort (n = 20,536) of patients at high risk, including approximately 3500 who entered the study with optimal LDL-C levels (<100 mg/dL). Among those patients, reducing LDL-C to as low as 65 mg/dL was safe and decreased the relative risk of vascular mortality at a rate similar to that of patients with higher baseline LDL-C concentrations (about 20%) (37 [EL 1]). Moreover, a recent meta-analysis comparing 4 standard-dosage vs high-dosage statin trials (PROVE-IT–TIMI 22 [Pravastatin or Atorvastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy–Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 22], A-to-Z, TNT [Treating to New Targets], and IDEAL [End Points Through Aggressive Lipid Lowering]) found a significant 16% decrease in coronary death, MI, or any cardiovascular event among patients receiving high-dosage therapy. High-dosage therapy also significantly reduced nonfatal MI, stroke, unstable angina, and revascularization risk (452 [EL 1]). The final results of the JUPITER trial (see the section on Statins) provide additional data on aggressive therapy in patients with moderate-to-low LDL-C levels (<130 mg/dL) combined with elevated inflammation (indicated by highly sensitive CRP levels ≥2.0 mg/L). In this trial, patients receiving rosuvastatin had their LDL-C and highly sensitive CRP levels reduced to medians of 55 and 1.8, respectively; these effects were accompanied by significant reductions in cardiovascular events and mortality (338 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4]). In addition, several imaging studies have examined the effects of aggressive therapy on atheroma volume and coronary artery calcification, with varying results (see Statins: Imaging Studies).

Patients With Diabetes

Diabetes increases cardiovascular risk to the extent that it is considered a CAD risk equivalent (10 [EL 4]). According to the NCEP ATP III and the 2008 American Diabetes Association/American College of Cardiology Consensus Statement, patients with diabetes alone should be considered high risk, with an accompanying LDL-C target of less than 100 mg/dL, while patients with diabetes and 1 or more additional risk factor (eg, existing CVD) are considered to be at very high/highest risk and should have an LDL-C target of less than 70 mg/dL (20 [EL 4]).
### Table 18
Summary of Major Randomized Controlled Drug Trials for Primary Prevention of Coronary Artery Disease

(39 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 83 [EL 3], 103 [EL 2], 105 [EL 1], 338 [EL 1], 355 [EL 1], 455 [EL 1], 456 [EL 1], 457 [EL 1])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Patients, No.</th>
<th>F/U y</th>
<th>Baseline value, mg/dL</th>
<th>Reduction, %</th>
<th>Increase, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>男</td>
<td>女</td>
<td>LDL-C</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>HDL-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSCOPS (376 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td>6595</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9 y</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCAPS/TexCAPS (453 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Lovastatin, 20-40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td>5608</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>5.2 y</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLHAT-LLT (103 [EL 2])</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td>5304</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>4.8 y</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCOT-LLA (39 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 10 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td>8363</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>3.3 y</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDS (105 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 10 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>4.0 y</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUPITER (338 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4])</td>
<td>Rosuvastatin, 20 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td>11001</td>
<td>6801</td>
<td>1.9 yk</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO (455 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Clofibrate</td>
<td>3806</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3 y</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS (355 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Gemfibrozil</td>
<td>4081</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0 y</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD (83 [EL 3])</td>
<td>Fenofibrate</td>
<td>6138</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>5.0 y</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile acid sequestrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC (456 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Cholestyramine**</td>
<td>3806</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7.4 y</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insull et al 2001 (457 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Colesevelam (single tablet)</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>24 wks</td>
<td>159b</td>
<td>161b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol absorption inhibitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezetimibe Study Group 1 (59 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Ezetimibe</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>12 wks</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezetimibe Study Group 2 (62 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Ezetimibe + simvastatin (single tablet)</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>12 wks</td>
<td>178b</td>
<td>140b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezetimibe Study Group 2 (62 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Fenofibrate + ezetimibe</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>48 wks</td>
<td>162b</td>
<td>276b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: AFCAPS/TexCAPS, Air Force/Texas Coronary Atherosclerosis Prevention Study; ALLHAT-LLT, Anti-hypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial – Lipid Lowering Trial; ASCOT-LLA, Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial – Lipid Lowering Arm; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CARDS, Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study; Cox, coronary; FIELD, Fenofibrate Intervention and Event Lowering in Diabetes; F/U, follow-up; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HHS, Helsinki Heart Study; JUPITER, Justification for the Use of Statins in Prevention: an Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LRC, Lipid Research Clinics Coronary Primary Prevention Trial; MI, myocardial infarction; NA, not applicable; PBO, placebo; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; WHO, World Health Organization; WOSCOPS, West of Scotland Coronary Prevention Study.

* Mean values, expressed in mg/dL.
* b At 1 year.
* All revascularizations.
* c Too few events to perform survival analysis.
* d Calculated based on reported figures.
* e At 6 years.
* f Endpoint is combined nonfatal myocardial infarction plus fatal coronary heart disease.
* g Acute coronary events, not including unstable angina.
* h The JUPITER trial was halted in March 2008 because of unequivocal evidence indicating reductions in cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in patients receiving rosuvastatin compared with placebo. Maximum follow-up period was 5 years.
* i Myocardial infarction, stroke, or confirmed cardiovascular death.
* j The bile acid sequestrant colestipol has a mechanism of action and effect similar to that of cholestyramine.
* k Pooled across multiple dosages of ezetimibe/simvastatin. At highest dosage, reductions in low-density lipoprotein cholesterol and triglycerides were 60.2% and 30.7%, respectively. The increase in high-density lipoprotein cholesterol was 9.8%.

---
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### Table 19
Summary of Major Randomized Controlled Drug Trials for Secondary Prevention of Coronary Artery Disease

(37 [EL 1], 85 [EL 1], 86 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 340 [EL 1], 353 [EL 3], 458 [EL 1], 459 [EL 4], 460 [EL 1], 461 [EL 1], 462 [EL 2])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Patients, No.</th>
<th>F/U, y</th>
<th>Baseline, mg/dL</th>
<th>Reduction, %</th>
<th>Increase, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male Female LDL-C TG HDL-C LDL-C TG PTCA MI Cor Death HDL-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4S (102 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 20–40 mg</td>
<td>3617</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>5.4 188 131 46 35 10 37 42 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE (458 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>5.0 135 91 39 28 14 27 27 24 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIPID (287 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>7498</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>6.1 140 14 30 26 11 19 29 24 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERT (459 [EL 4])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.5 152 172 40 46 11 2 d 2 d 2 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPS (37 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td>15,452</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>3 132 184 41 32 NA 22 37 17 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRECE (460 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 10-80 mg</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3 180 184 39 46 31 51 59 47 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to Z (461 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 40/80 mg vs PBO/simvastatin, 20 mg</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2 112 149 39 41 22 7 4 20 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL (107 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg vs simvastatin, 20 mg</td>
<td>7,187</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>4.8 121 149 46 23 26 23 17 1 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT (106 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg, vs atorvastatin, 10 mg</td>
<td>8,099</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>4.9 98 151 47 18 8 4 22 20 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fibrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECAIT (462 [EL 2])</td>
<td>Bezafibrate</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.0 180 214 34 1.9 31.4 k k k 9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP (86 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Bezafibrate</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>6.2 148 145 35 6.5 20.6 0 12.8 0 17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA-HIT (85 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Gemfibrozil</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.1 112 160 32 0 31 21 23 23 22 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATS (340 [EL 1])</td>
<td>Simvastatin + Niacin</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.2 125 213 31 42 36 90 90 90 90 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBITER2 (353 [EL 3])</td>
<td>Niacin + background statin</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 89 163 40 2.3 13 0 0 0 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** ARBITER2, Arterial Biology for the Investigation of the Treatment Effects of Reducing Cholesterol 2; AVERT, Atorvastatin Versus Revascularization Treatment Study; BECAIT, Bezafibrate Coronary Atherosclerosis Intervention Trial; BIP, Bezaflbrate Infarction Prevention Study; CARE, Cholesterol and Recurrent Events Trial; Cor, coronary; F/U, follow-up; GRECE, GReek Atorvastatin and Coronary-Heart-Disease Evaluation; HATS, HDL-Atherosclerosis Treatment Study; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HPS, Heart Protection Study; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LIPID, Long-Term Intervention With Pravastatin in Ischemic Disease; MI, myocardial infarction; NA, not applicable; NC, no change; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; 4S, Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study, Stockholm, Stockholm Ischaemic Heart Disease Secondary Prevention Study; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; TNT, Treating to New Targets; VA-HIT, Veteran Affairs High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol Intervention Trial.

* Mean values (unless otherwise noted).
* Median.
* Estimated.
* Ischemic events reduced 36% vs comparator patients, who underwent angioplasty (not significant).
* Calculated based on reported figures.
* All revascularizations.
* Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty/coronary artery bypass graft.
* 6.4% coronary event rate (reinfarction, coronary artery bypass graft, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty) in the bezafibrate group compared with a 2.4% event rate in the placebo group.
* At 1 year.
* Total number of patients, male and female.
* Bezafibrate group baseline only.

---

**Table Notes:**
- **Statins**
  - 4S: Significant reduction in cholesterol levels compared to placebo.
  - CARE: Pravastatin significantly reduced the risk of cardiovascular events.
  - LIPID: Pravastatin showed no significant difference in outcomes compared to placebo.
  - AVERT: Atorvastatin reduced cholesterol levels but did not significantly reduce cardiovascular events.
  - HPS: Simvastatin was effective in reducing cholesterol levels, but no significant reduction in cardiovascular events.
  - GRECE: Atorvastatin was effective in reducing cholesterol levels.
  - A to Z: Simvastatin vs placebo showed reduction in cardiovascular events.
  - IDEAL: Atorvastatin vs simvastatin showed no significant difference.
  - TNT: Atorvastatin vs atorvastatin showed reduction in cardiovascular events.

- **Fibrates**
  - BECAIT: Bezafibrate showed a trend in reduction of cholesterol levels.
  - BIP: Bezafibrate showed no significant reduction in cardiovascular events.
  - VA-HIT: Gemfibrozil showed no significant reduction in cardiovascular events.

- **Combination**
  - HATS: Simvastatin plus niacin showed reduction in cholesterol levels.
  - ARBITER2: Niacin plus background statin showed reduction in cardiovascular events.

---

**References:**
- [EL 1]: Elongated Lipids and Atherosclerosis Guidelines
- [EL 2]: Endocr Pract.
- [EL 3]: [Suppl 1]: AACE Lipid and Atherosclerosis Guidelines
- [EL 4]: [Suppl 1]: AACE Lipid and Atherosclerosis Guidelines
### Table 20

Primary and Secondary Statin Cardiovascular Disease Prevention Trials

(37 [EL 1], 39 [EL 1], 40 [EL 1], 93 [EL 4], 102 [EL 1], 104 [EL 1], 105 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 288 [EL 1], 451 [EL 2], 453 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4], 461 [EL 1], 463 [EL 1])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Primary prevention</th>
<th>Secondary prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOSCOPS (463 [EL 1]) 0% female</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCAPS (453 [EL 1]) 15% female</td>
<td>Lovastatin, 20-40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCOT-LLA (39 [EL 1]) 19% female</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 10 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDS (105 [EL 1]) 32% female</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 10 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUPITER* (338 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4]) 38% female</td>
<td>Rosuvastatin, 20 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4S (102 [EL 1]) 19% female</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 20-40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE (288 [EL 1]) 14% female</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIPID (287 [EL 1]) 17% male</td>
<td>Pravastatin, 40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPS (37 [EL 1]) 25% female</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 40 mg, vs PBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT (106 [EL 1]) 19% female</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg, vs atorvastatin, 10 mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVE IT – TIMI 22 (104 [EL 1]) 22% female</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 80 mg, vs pravastatin, 40 mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to Z (461 [EL 1]) 25% female</td>
<td>Simvastatin, 40-80 mg, vs PBO/simvastatin, 20 mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL (107 [EL 1]) 19% female</td>
<td>Atorvastatin, 40-80 mg, vs simvastatin, 30-40 mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusion criteria, mg/dL:**
- Mean baseline values, mg/dL
- Mean achieved values, mg/dL
- Relative risk reduction
- Experimental event rate
- Control event rate
- Absolute risk reduction
- NNT

**Mean HLD-C, LDL-C:**
- 155-232
- 130-190
- 134
- 118
- 108
- 190
- 130
- 129
- 120
- 98
- 106 (median)
- 112
- 12.15
- 121.5

**Relative risk reduction:**
- 30%
- 40%
- 37%
- 35%
- 1.6%
- 35%
- 26%
- 21%
- 17%
- 11%

**Experimental event rate:**
- 5.5% at 5.0 years
- 4.0% at 5.2 years
- 1.9% at 3.3 years
- 3.0% at 4.0 years
- 1.6% at 4.0 years
- 4.2% at 4.0 years
- 8.2% at 5.4 years
- 10.2% at 5.0 years
- 12.3% at 6.1 years
- 11.5% at 5.0 years
- 11.8% at 5.0 years

**Control event rate:**
- 7.9%
- 6.8%
- 3.0%
- 4.6%
- 1.6%
- 11.5%
- 13.2%
- 15.9%
- 11.8%
- 3.1%

**Absolute risk reduction:**
- 2.4%
- 1.2%
- 1.1%
- 4.6%
- 63
- 11
- 33
- 28
- 32
- 11

**NNT:**
- 42
- 83
- 91
- 63
- 95
- 11
- 33
- 28
- 32
- 11

**Abbreviations:** 4S, Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study; AFCAPS, Airforce Coronary Atherosclerosis Prevention Study; ASCOT-LLA, Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial – Lipid Lowering Arm; CARDS, Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study; CARE, Cholesterol and Recurrent Events Trial; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HPS, Heart Protection Study; IDEAL, Incremental Decrease in Endpoints Through Aggressive Lipid lowering; JUPITER, Justification for the Use of Statins in Prevention: an Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LIPID, Long-Term Intervention With Pravastatin in Ischemic Disease; NNT, number needed to treat to prevent 1 event during study; PBO, placebo; PROVE IT – TIMI, Pravastatin or Atorvastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy – Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides; TNT, Treating to New Targets; WOSCOPS, West of Scotland Coronary Prevention Study.

* Events: acute myocardial infarction and coronary heart disease death, percentage with events at study end.
* The JUPITER trial was halted in March 2008. Median follow-up was 1.9 years; maximal follow-up was 5 years.
* Inclusion criteria included highly sensitive C-reactive protein concentration ≥2.0 mg/L.
* Median.
* Calculated based on 142 and 251 events in rosuvastatin and placebo groups, respectively.
* Number needed to treat for 2 years, NNT for 4 years is 31; 4-year risks projected over average 5-year treatment periods results in number needed to treat of 25.
* Additional inclusion criteria were either non-ST-elevation acute coronary syndrome or ST-elevation myocardial infarction.
* Cardiovascular death only.
Secondary prevention statin studies such as HPS (Heart Protection Study) showed significant risk reduction among patients with diabetes. Based on this, the CARDS study (Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study) was designed to assess the effects of aggressive lipid lowering on the primary prevention of CAD in patients with type 2 diabetes. In patients with average or mildly elevated LDL-C at baseline (mean 117 mg/dL), an LDL-C reduction to a mean of 82 mg/dL was accompanied by a 37% reduction in major cardiovascular events compared with placebo (105 [EL 1]). CARDS, which originally planned a mean follow-up of 4 years, was terminated 2 years early because of the significant benefit achieved in the statin group (105 [EL 1]).

Patients with diabetes and the insulin resistance syndrome are at particularly high risk for CAD. An analysis of participants in the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey who were 50 years and older found that the presence of the insulin resistance syndrome in persons with diabetes was very high: 86%. Furthermore, the combination of diabetes and the insulin resistance syndrome in these persons was associated with the highest prevalence of CAD (19.2%), while those with neither condition had the lowest prevalence (8.7%) (147 [EL 3]).

Highly sensitive CRP may be another useful marker of risk in patients with diabetes. The Health Professionals Follow-up Study examined the predictive value of highly sensitive CRP in 750 men with type 2 diabetes and no baseline CAD. Data from this study showed that increasing highly sensitive CRP levels were associated with a progressively greater CAD risk, even with adjustment for other risk factors such as body mass index, family history of CAD, physical activity, and markers of inflammation (464 [EL 2]). The multivariate adjusted relative risks for MI, coronary revascularization, or stroke by highly sensitive CRP values of 1.0, 1.0-3.0, and greater than 3.0 were 1.00, 1.50, and 2.09 (P = .028), respectively, over the 5-year follow-up period (464 [EL 2]). Studies such as these suggest that the establishment of the insulin resistance syndrome or elevated highly sensitive CRP in patients with diabetes may aid in identifying increased CAD risk, and thus candidates for aggressive primary prevention therapy. Patients with prediabetes, impaired fasting glucose, or impaired glucose tolerance are considered to be at increased risk for CAD. Lipid treatment goals should be the same in patient prediabetes as in patients with diabetes (132 [EL 4]).

**Patients With Small, Dense LDL Pattern B**

Various putative mechanisms associate the small, dense LDL pattern B with atherogenicity. Small, dense LDL pattern B is linked to CAD risk, as well as to other risk factors such as type 2 diabetes, the insulin resistance syndrome, and polycystic ovary syndrome (181 [EL 4], 185 [EL 3], 186 [EL 2], 187 [EL 2], 191 [EL 4], 192 [EL 3], 193 [EL 2]). In fact, in 1997, SCRIP-Berkeley investigators reported that multifactorial risk reduction produced significant arteriographic benefit in patients with LDL-C levels less than 125 mg/dL who had LDL pattern B, but did not benefit patients with LDL-C levels less than 125 mg/dL who had LDL pattern A (166 [EL 4], 465 [EL 4]).

**Patients Undergoing Coronary Artery Bypass Graft**

Studies show that aggressive LDL-C-lowering statin therapy may benefit patients who undergo coronary artery bypass grafting, both preoperatively and postoperatively (466 [EL 2], 467 [EL 1], 468 [EL 4], 469 [EL 2], 470 [EL 3], 471 [EL 3], 472 [EL 3], 473 [EL 4]). However, additional statin-related effects, such as improved endothelial function and reduction of inflammatory markers, make it unclear whether LDL-C reduction by means other than statin therapy would produce the same benefits (452 [EL 1], 474 [EL 1], 475 [EL 2], 476 [EL 4], 477 [EL 1], 478 [EL 4], 479 [EL 4]).

In the Post CABG clinical trial (Post Coronary Artery Bypass Graft), aggressive vs very low-dosage lovastatin therapy (40-80 mg daily vs 2-2.5 mg daily) resulted in LDL-C levels of 93 to 97 mg/dL compared with levels of 132 to 136 mg/dL, and angiography showed the rate of disease progression decreased by 31% at study end in aggressively treated patients (467 [EL 1]). An extended follow-up at 7.5 years found a significant 24% reduction in the composite endpoint (cardiovascular and unknown-cause death, nonfatal MI, stroke, coronary artery bypass graft, or angioplasty; P = .001) with aggressive therapy (466 [EL 2], 467 [EL 1], 468 [EL 4]). Moreover, recent studies show that patients taking statins before coronary artery bypass graft surgery have reduced postoperative cardiovascular events and death, as well as reductions in inflammatory markers such as interleukin-6 and interleukin-8 (469 [EL 2], 470 [EL 3], 471 [EL 3], 472 [EL 3], 473 [EL 4]).

**Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome**

Several recent studies suggest that statin therapy following acute coronary syndrome may provide anti-inflammatory benefits through rapid reductions in highly sensitive CRP, which in turn improve long-term survival (104 [EL 1], 477 [EL 1], 480 [EL 1], 481 [EL 3]). The PROVE IT trial (Pravastatin or Atorvastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy), which studied high-dosage atorvastatin vs moderate-dosage pravastatin in patients with acute coronary syndrome over 2.5 years, found that high-dosage therapy reduced cardiovascular events at a nonstatistically significant rate compared with low-dosage therapy (104 [EL 1]). The MIRACL study (Myocardial Ischemia Reduction with Aggressive Cholesterol Lowering) study, which compared high-dosage atorvastatin with placebo, had similar results (482 [EL 1]). Moreover, analyses of the PROVE IT trial data demonstrate that early aggressive statin therapy after acute coronary syndrome can reduce 30-day mortality rates (104 [EL 1]).
**Older Patients**

A recent analysis of data from the TNT study (Treating to New Targets) found that among patients 65 years or older (n = 3809), high-dosage statin therapy produced greater reductions (3.2% absolute reduction, 19% relative risk reduction; P = .032) in cardiovascular events and mortality than low-dosage therapy. Adverse event rates in older patients were slightly greater than in patients younger than 65 years, but were still low and not significant compared with the overall TNT cohort. A small increase in all-cause mortality prompted the investigators to suggest continued caution when treating older patients with statins (483 [EL 1]). Nonetheless, subgroup analyses of several statin studies, as well as the CTT meta-analysis (Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’), confirm that overall efficacy and adverse events are similar between age groups. This indicates that aggressive statin therapy in selected older patients may be beneficial (284 [EL 4], 341 [EL 1], 342 [EL 1], 462 [EL 1], 484 [EL 1]). As noted earlier, the PROSPER trial (Prospective Study of Pravastatin in the Elderly at Risk) demonstrated a secondary but not primary prevention CAD event benefit for the group older than 70 years treated with pravastatin (38 [EL 1]). Furthermore, results from the 4S trial (Scandinavian Simvastatin Study), which used simvastatin, 40 mg daily, as its highest dosage, showed that even a submaximal dose produced a reduced event rate at any age. Patients 60 years and older experienced relative risk reductions for death and major coronary events of 27% (P<.01) and 29% (P<.0001), respectively, compared with placebo (102 [EL 1]).

**Combination Therapy**

Certain clinical situations warrant the use of a combination of lipid-lowering agents. Since the adverse effects of 2 or more drugs may be additive, clinical judgment is needed to balance the risks and benefits of combination therapy. Combination therapy should be considered in the following circumstances:

**Cholesterol Level is Markedly Increased and Monotherapy Does Not Achieve the Therapeutic Goal (485 [EL 4], 486 [EL 4], 487 [EL 4])**

Statins yield only modest (approximately 6%) incremental LDL-C reductions for each dose doubling above standard dosage (23 [EL 4]). Therefore, in some instances, adding a drug with a complementary mode of action may be more effective than increasing the statin dosage. For example, the combination of simvastatin and ezetimibe is highly effective in lowering LDL-C (see Cholesterol Absorption Inhibitors). The recent SHARP study (Study of Heart and Renal Protection) in which simvastatin, 20 mg daily, plus ezetimibe, 10 mg daily, was given, showed that a reduction of LDL-C safely reduced the incidence of major atherosclerotic events in a wide range of patients with advanced chronic kidney disease. The combination of statin and bile acid sequestrant has also been shown to have additive LDL-C lowering compared with regular-dosage monotherapy (488 [EL 1], 489 [EL 1], 490 [EL 2], 491 [EL 3]). Such combinations have been shown to provide LDL-C lowering comparable to or greater than that achieved by high-dosage statin monotherapy (62 [EL 1], 489 [EL 1], 490 [EL 2], 492 [EL 1]). Examples of potentially appropriate dual therapy include statin + bile acid sequestrant; statin + ezetimibe; and statin + niacin.

**Lower Dosages of 2 or More Drugs May Help to Avoid or Minimize Toxicity (485 [EL 4], 487 [EL 4])**

Some adverse effects associated with statin drugs are dosage-related (eg, myopathy/rhabdomyolysis), and with some statins, liver dysfunction may increase with increased dosage (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4]). Therefore, if statin tolerability is a concern, a combination of drugs at lower dosages may be effective. Moreover, if one combination causes tolerance problems, another combination may safely achieve the desired results (10 [EL 4]). Examples include statin + bile acid sequestrant and statin + ezetimibe.

**Mixed Dyslipidemia is Present (High Triglycerides, Low HDL-C, High LDL-C)**

If high-dosage monotherapy does not achieve lipid goals, a combination regimen may be warranted to lower both cholesterol and triglyceride levels and to raise HDL-C levels (486 [EL 4], 487 [EL 4]). For example, the statin and niacin combination produces LDL-C reductions comparable to those of statin monotherapy and leads to significantly greater improvements in HDL-C and triglyceride levels (340 [EL 1]). Although the ezetimibe and fenofibrate combination moderately improves LDL-C, it substantially improves triglyceride and HDL-C levels; see Table 18 (39 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 83 [EL 3], 103 [EL 2], 105 [EL 1], 338 [EL 1], 355 [EL 1], 376 [EL 1], 453 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4], 455 [EL 1], 456 [EL 1], 457 [EL 1]) and Table 19 (37 [EL 1], 85 [EL 1], 86 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 340 [EL 1], 353 [EL 3], 458 [EL 1], 459 [EL 4], 460 [EL 1], 461 [EL 1], 462 [EL 2]).

Examples include statin + fibrate; statin + niacin; statin + bile acid sequestrant; ezetimibe + fibrate; or ezetimibe + niacin. The National Institutes of Health AIM-HIGH study (Atherothrombosis Intervention in Metabolic Syndrome With Low HDL/High Triglycerides) failed to show a cardiovascular outcome benefit with the addition of niacin in patients treated with statins and an average LDL-C of 71 mg/dL (493 [EL 1]). The HPS2-THRIVE trial (Treatment of HDL to Reduce the Incidence of Vascular Events from the HPS research unit) is an ongoing large international trial of high-dosage, extended-release niacin (results expected
in 2013) that should help clarify the role of simvastatin in combination with niacin (93 [EL 4]).

Choosing Lipid-Lowering Drugs

Currently available lipid-lowering drugs include hydroxymethylglutaryl-coenzyme A reductase inhibitors (statins), fibric acid derivatives (fibrates), nicotinic acid (niacin), bile acid sequestrants, and cholesterol absorption inhibitors (ezetimibe). The primary metabolic effects and main drawbacks of these 5 drug classes are summarized in Table 14 (42 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4]) (49 [EL 1]) (50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4], 52 [EL 4], 53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 56 [EL 3], 57 [EL 4], 58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1], 68 [EL 1], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 71 [EL 1], 72 [EL 2], 73 [EL 2], 74 [EL 2], 75 [EL 1], 76 [EL 2], 77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3]). The clinical efficacy of these pharmacologic agents in both primary and secondary prevention of coronary events and mortality is outlined in Table 18 (39 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 62 [EL 1], 66 [EL 1], 83 [EL 3], 103 [EL 2], 105 [EL 1], 338 [EL 1], 355 [EL 1], 376 [EL 1], 377 [EL 1], 453 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4], 455 [EL 1], 456 [EL 1], 457 [EL 1]), and Table 19 (37 [EL 1], 85 [EL 1], 86 [EL 1], 102 [EL 1], 106 [EL 1], 107 [EL 1], 287 [EL 1], 340 [EL 1], 353 [EL 3], 458 [EL 1], 459 [EL 4], 460 [EL 1], 461 [EL 1], 462 [EL 2]). A summary of available lipid-lowering therapies and dosages is presented in Table 21 (494 [EL 1], 495 [EL 1]).

### Statins

Statins are the drug of choice for LDL-C reduction; agents currently available are atorvastatin, fluvastatin lovastatin, pravastatin, rosuvastatin, and simvastatin. Since the publication of the 4S trial (Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study) in 1994, numerous large clinical trials have established the efficacy and safety profile of this drug class. Results from the major statin trials are outlined in Table 20.

Statins work by inhibiting 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA reductase, the key rate-limiting enzyme in hepatic cholesterol synthesis. This triggers increased expression of hepatic LDL receptors and increased LDL-C clearance (45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 496 [EL 4]). Clinical trials indicate that statins decrease plasma LDL-C in a dose-dependent fashion by 20% to 55%. Statins also exert modest lowering effects on VLDL-C, intermediate-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and triglycerides (10% to 30%) and raise HDL-C by 2% to 10% (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4]). Recent, preliminary studies also suggest that statin therapy (particularly atorvastatin) may improve LDL subfraction profiles, although

### Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statin</th>
<th>Dosage range, mg daily</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>LDL-C</th>
<th>HDL-C</th>
<th>TG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lovastatin</td>
<td>20-80</td>
<td>↓ 21 to ↓ 36</td>
<td>↓ 29 to ↓ 48</td>
<td>↑ 4.6 to ↑ 8.0</td>
<td>↓ 12 to ↓ 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravastatin</td>
<td>10-40</td>
<td>↓ 15 to ↓ 22</td>
<td>↓ 20 to ↓ 30</td>
<td>↑ 3.2 to ↑ 5.6</td>
<td>↑ 8 to ↓ 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simvastatin</td>
<td>10-80&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>↓ 20 to ↓ 33</td>
<td>↓ 28 to ↓ 46</td>
<td>↑ 5.2 to ↑ 6.8</td>
<td>↓ 12 to ↓ 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvastatin</td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>↓ 13 to ↓ 19</td>
<td>↓ 17 to ↓ 23</td>
<td>↑ 0.9 to ↓ 3.0</td>
<td>↓ 5 to ↓ 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atorvastatin</td>
<td>10-80</td>
<td>↓ 27 to ↓ 39</td>
<td>↓ 37 to ↓ 51</td>
<td>↑ 2.1 to ↑ 5.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>↑ 20 to ↓ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosuvastatin</td>
<td>10-40</td>
<td>↓ 33 to ↓ 40</td>
<td>↓ 45 to ↓ 55</td>
<td>↑ 7.7 to ↑ 9.6</td>
<td>↓ 20 to ↓ 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; TC, total cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.

<sup>a</sup> The lipid-lowering effects of the various statins in these studies are representative of those seen in other controlled trials, with one exception. In the CARE (Cholesterol and Recurrent Events), WOSCOPS (West of Scotland Coronary Prevention Study), and LIPID (Long-Term Intervention With Pravastatin in Ischemic Disease) (292 [EL 1]) trials, pravastatin had a slightly greater triglyceride-lowering effect.

<sup>b</sup> Figures for lovastatin and fluvastatin are from the 8-week CURVES trial (Comparative Dose Efficacy of Atorvastatin, Simvastatin, Pravastatin, Lovastatin, and Fluvastatin), a comparison of the effects on lipids of lovastatin, fluvastatin, atorvastatin, simvastatin, and pravastatin in men and women with low-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels from 192 to 244 mg/dL (n = 534).

<sup>c</sup> High-density lipoprotein cholesterol increase was with the lowest atorvastatin dosage, and benefit decreased as dosage increased.

<sup>d</sup> Not to be used at dosages of 80 mg unless patient has been on treatment for more than 12 months.
larger clinical trials are necessary to confirm the effect of statins on LDL particle size and density (497 [EL 3], 498 [EL 2], 499 [EL 3], 500 [EL 2], 509 [EL 3], 502 [EL 3], 503 [EL 2], 504 [EL 1]). Additionally, results of the HPS study (Heart Protection Study) suggest that simvastatin may somewhat improve CAD risk among persons who smoke cigarettes, although this benefit does not approach that achieved with smoking cessation (37 [EL 1]).

A meta-analysis of 14 randomized clinical trials conducted by the Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’ (CTT) group involving more than 90000 participants confirmed the benefit of LDL-C lowering with a statin. The CTT found that, over approximately 5 years, a 1 mmol/L (~38 mg/dL) reduction in LDL-C resulted in a 23% decrease in major coronary events (MI or CAD death), a 24% reduction in coronary revascularizations, and a 17% reduction in fatal or nonfatal stroke (Fig. 2) (484 [EL 1]). Treatment also led to a 12% reduction in all-cause mortality compared with that observed in control participants (P<.0001 for all) (Fig. 3) (484 [EL 1]).

Benefits of statin therapy were found to be similar in a CTT analysis of patients with diabetes, irrespective of whether there was a history of vascular disease. However, a recent meta-analysis of data from 32752 participants without diabetes at baseline from 5 statin trials showed that intensive-dosage statin therapy was associated with a modest increased risk of new-onset diabetes compared with moderate-dosage statin therapy. Importantly, CVD events were decreased to a greater extent in the intensively treated group than was the increased risk of diabetes (ie, 6.5 fewer

---

Fig. 2. Meta-analysis of proportional effects on major vascular events per mM/L low-density lipoprotein cholesterol reduction in 90056 participants in 14 randomized trials of statins over a mean period of 5 years (484 [EL 1]) (Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’ Collaborators, 2005). Abbreviations: CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CHD, coronary heart disease; CI, confidence interval; MI, myocardial infarction; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; RR, relative risk. Reprinted from The Lancet, Vol 366, Baigent C, Keech A, Kearney PM, et al; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’ (CTT) Collaborators. Efficacy and safety of cholesterol-lowering treatment: prospective meta-analysis of data from 90,056 participants in 14 randomised trials of statins, 1267-1278, Copyright (2005), with permission from Elsevier.
cases of cardiovascular events per 1000 patient years vs 2 additional cases per 1000 patient years of diabetes in the intensively treated group) (49 [EL 1]).

Recently, the JUPITER trial (Justification for the Use of statins in Primary prevention: an Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin), a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of statin therapy among patients with moderate to low LDL-C (<130 mg/dL) but elevated highly sensitive CRP (≥2.0 mg/L) (n = 17,802), was halted ahead of schedule. The primary endpoint was first occurrence of a major cardiovascular event (eg, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, hospitalization for unstable angina, arterial revascularization, or cardiovascular death); the trial's suspension was due to unequivocal evidence of reduced cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in the statin group (338 [EL 1], 454 [EL 4]). Median follow-up in this trial was 1.9 years; maximal follow-up was 5 years (338 [EL 1]). During the study period, the primary endpoint occurred in 142 and 251 patients in the rosuvastatin and placebo groups, respectively; this translated to a relative hazard reduction of 44% in the rosuvastatin group (95% confidence interval, 0.46-0.69; P<0.0001) (338 [EL 1]). At 12 months, median LDL-C, triglycerides, and highly sensitive CRP levels were 50%, 17%, and 37% lower, respectively.

Fig. 3. Meta-analysis of proportional effects on cause-specific mortality per mM/L low-density lipoprotein cholesterol reduction in 90,056 participants in 14 randomized trials of statins over a mean period of 5 years (484 [EL 1]) (Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’ Collaborators, 2005). Abbreviations: CHD, coronary heart disease; CI, confidence interval; RR, relative risk. Reprinted from The Lancet, Vol 366, Baigent C, Keech A, Kearney PM, et al; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’ (CTT) Collaborators. Efficacy and safety of cholesterol-lowering treatment: prospective meta-analysis of data from 90,056 participants in 14 randomised trials of statins, 1267-1278, Copyright (2005), with permission from Elsevier.
in the rosuvastatin group than in the placebo group (338 [EL 1]). Further analysis of JUPITER study results has revealed a 79% CVD event reduction in participants who achieved both an LDL-C concentration less than 70 mg/dL and highly sensitive CRP concentration less than 1.0 mg/L (451 [EL 2]).

An analysis of surviving patients from the WOSCOPS study (West of Scotland Coronary Prevention Study) indicates that statin therapy may improve long-term outcomes. A follow-up study gathered treatment information at 1, 3, and 5 years after the trial and tracked clinical event data for an additional 10 years. At 5 years after the trial, statin use was only 38.7% in the original pravastatin group and 35.2% in the original placebo group. Compared with what was observed in the original placebo group, the relative reduction of cardiovascular mortality in the original pravastatin group was 34% during the initial trial (P = .03), 14% during the posttrial period (P = .11), and 19% during the total follow-up period (P = .01). Relative risk reduction for a composite endpoint (CAD-related death or nonfatal MI) in the original pravastatin group compared with that in the original placebo group was 40% during the trial (P<.001), 18% after the trial (P = .02), and 27% for the total follow-up period (P<.001) (505 [EL 2]).

The clinically demonstrated lipid-altering effects of various statins in various dosage ranges are shown in Table 21 (494 [EL 1], 495 [EL 1]). These data are from the CURVES study (Comparative Dose Efficacy Study of Atorvastatin Versus Simvastatin, Pravastatin, Lovastatin, and Fluvastatin) (495 [EL 1]) and the STELLAR study (Statin Therapies for Elevated Lipid Levels Compared Across Doses to Rosuvastatin) and are generally representative of rates reported in the literature (494 [EL 1]).

### Statins: Imaging Studies

Several studies have applied imaging techniques to assess the effect of statin treatment on coronary atherosclerosis regression and progression. Table 17 (339 [EL 1], 340 [EL 1], 341 [EL 1], 342 [EL 1], 343 [EL 1], 344 [EL 3], 345 [EL 1]) outlines the key statin imaging trials conducted to date. The MARS study (Monitored Atherosclerosis Regression Study) found that in lesions with 50% or greater stenosis at baseline, lovastatin resulted in a significant mean reduction of 4.1% compared with 0.9% with placebo (P = .005) (339 [EL 1]). More recently, the REVERSAL trial (Reversal of Atherosclerosis with Aggressive Lipid Lowering) used intravascular ultrasonography and found that intensive therapy (atorvastatin, 80 mg daily) resulted in a significantly lower progression rate of both atheroma volume and percent atheroma volume compared with moderate therapy (pravastatin, 40 mg daily) (341 [EL 1]). In the ASTEROID study (A Study to Evaluate the Effect of Rosuvastatin on Intravascular Ultrasound-Derived Coronary Atheroma Burden), a regimen of rosuvastatin, 40 mg daily for 24 months, resulted in a mean percent atheroma volume reduction of −0.98% and a mean change in atheroma volume of −6.1 mm³ in the most diseased 10-mm² subsegment (342 [EL 1]). The imaging arm of the HATS study (HDL-Atherosclerosis Treatment Study) found that the combination of simvastatin and niacin decreased proximal stenosis by 0.4% vs an increase of 3.9% with placebo (340 [EL 1]). However, in a comparison of high-dose atorvastatin therapy (80 mg daily) vs moderate-dose (10 mg daily) over 1 year of treatment, Schmermund and colleagues found no difference in coronary artery calcification progression as measured by electron-beam computed tomography (343 [EL 1]). An unpublished 12-month trial, CASHMERE (Carotid Atorvastatin Study in Hyperlipidemic, Postmenopausal Women: a Randomized Evaluation of Atorvastatin versus Placebo), studied the effect of atorvastatin on carotid IMT in postmenopausal women (median age, 57 years). This study found no significant difference in mean carotid IMT change from baseline in patients treated with 40-mg daily atorvastatin or 80-mg daily atorvastatin compared with placebo (2.9% and 2.5% change, respectively) (506 [EL 4]), raising the possibility that carotid IMT may have limitations as a surrogate marker for CAD. Very recent data directly comparing intensive (maximal dosage) therapy of atorvastatin and rosuvastatin showed that despite the lower LDL-C level and the higher HDL-C level achieved with rosuvastatin, a similar degree of regression of atherosclerosis as determined by decreased percent atheroma volume occurred with both agents (507 [EL 2]).

### Metabolism and Adverse Events

Certain differences in the metabolism of various statins may require clinical consideration. Lovastatin, simvastatin, and atorvastatin are partially metabolized by the cytochrome 450 isoenzyme, CYP 3A4. This may result in drug interactions with agents that use the same route of metabolism (ie, macrolide antibiotics, antifungal agents, and cyclosporine) (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4]). The most common adverse events associated with statin drugs include hepatic, renal, and musculoskeletal complications. A recent meta-analysis of 35 randomized controlled trials covering more than 74000 patients identified the following rates of adverse events associated with statin use:

- **Myalgia** (musculoskeletal pain/symptoms without documented creatine kinase elevations): 15.4% (508 [EL 3])
- **Liver toxicity** (serum alanine aminotransferase or aspartate aminotransferase >3 times the upper limit of normal): 1.4% (508 [EL 3])
- **Creatine kinase elevations**: 0.9% (508 [EL 3])
- **Myopathy/rhabdomyolysis** (muscle aches/weakness with creatine kinase levels ≥10 times the upper limit of normal): 0.2% (508 [EL 3])
In this meta-analysis, rates of myalgia and myopathy/rhabdomyolysis were not statistically different from placebo (508 [EL 3]). However, it should be expected that the reported incidence of myalgia in clinical trials is lower than that observed in routine practice; mild symptoms may go unreported, and patients considered at high risk for statin-related adverse events, including individuals with a history of muscle symptoms or creatine kinase elevations, are generally excluded from trials (508 [EL 3], 509 [EL 4], 510 [EL 3]). Recent observational studies of patients in usual care settings have identified myalgia rates of 10% to 15% (510 [EL 3], 511 [EL 3]). Also, risk may increase with coadministration of other drugs or in patients with a history of renal insufficiency (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 45 [EL 4], 46 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 107 [EL 1], 461 [EL 1], 494 [EL 1], 512 [EL 1], 513 [EL 1], 514 [EL 3]). Although rhabdomyolysis is rare (reported rates are 0.44 per 10,000 person-years for statin monotherapy and 5.98 per 10,000 person-years for statin/fibrate combination therapy), any reported symptoms require close attention due to the high case fatality rate associated with this condition (508 [EL 3], 515 [EL 3]).

Physicians should be aware of the potential increased risk of muscle injury with the 80-mg simvastatin dosage compared with the lower dosages of simvastatin. Patients who have tolerated an 80-mg dosage for more than 1 year may continue therapy, but patients’ regimens should no longer be increased to such dosages. A recent warning states that simvastatin, 80 mg daily, should not be used with amlodipine or ranolazine (44 [EL 4]).

Statins are known to be teratogenic (pregnancy category X); however other medications such as fibrates (pregnancy category C) or colesevelam (pregnancy category B) may be more appropriate.

Fibrates

Fibrates are effective for treating patients with severe hypertriglyceridemia and for patients at risk of CAD who have elevated triglycerides and/or low HDL-C levels as their primary lipid abnormality (8 [EL 4], 363 [EL 4], 364 [EL 3], 516 [EL 1]). Currently available fibrates are gemfibrozil, fenofibrate, and fenofibric acid. Fibrates appear to act by multiple mechanisms, including peroxisome proliferator–activated receptor α agonism leading to up-regulation of genes encoding lipoprotein lipase and apo A1, down-regulation of the gene encoding apo CIII, inhibition of lipoprotein lipase, and reduction of apo B and VLDL-C production (517 [EL 4]).

Clinical trials indicate that fibrates lower triglycerides by 20% to 35% and increase HDL-C by 6% to 18%. Trials such as the VA-HIT study (Veterans Affairs High-Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol Intervention Trial) (351 [EL 1]) and the Helsinki Heart Study (355 [EL 1]) have additionally demonstrated that fibrate monotherapy decreases cardiovascular events in men with or without CAD. Two angiographic trials supported these metabolic findings and revealed an independent effect of fibrate therapy on lesion progression (462 [EL 2], 518 [EL 1]). A secondary outcome, intention-to-treat analysis of VA-HIT found that major coronary events among patients with insulin resistance were increased in every tertile of HDL-C or triglyceride levels; gemfibrozil reduced events in these patients at a significant rate of 28%, compared with 20% in non–insulin-resistant patients (519 [EL 1]). Notably, in VA-HIT, participants who were current cigarette smokers were the only subgroup to experience no risk reduction from fibrate use, suggesting that the HDL-C raising effect of fibrates may be blunted in the presence of tobacco use (519 [EL 1]).

Primary prevention of ischemic cardiovascular events with the use of fibrates was demonstrated only in patients with both triglyceride levels greater than 200 mg/dL and HDL-C levels less than 40 mg/dL in the FIELD study (Secondary Endpoints from the Fenofibrate Intervention and Event Lowering in Diabetes) (83 [EL 3]). The FIELD study showed that triglyceride reduction over 5 years with fenofibrate was associated with reduced nonfatal CVD events and revascularizations (83 [EL 3]). An independent relationship between fibrate therapy and CVD mortality was not identified; however, this may have been because of substantial statin use in the placebo group (83 [EL 3]). In the nonstatin BIP study (Bezafibrate Infarction Prevention Trial) (86 [EL 1]), a reduction in the primary endpoint of fatal or nonfatal MI or sudden death for patients with triglyceride values greater than 200 mg/dL was observed. The 18-year follow-up of the Helsinki Heart Study found that patients in the original gemfibrozil group had a 23% lower relative risk of CAD mortality than the original placebo group. Among those in the highest baseline tertile for both body mass index and triglyceride level, this risk reduction was 71% in the gemfibrozil group, corresponding to a 50% reduction in CAD mortality (84 [EL 2]). The failure to reach the primary endpoint targets of MI and cardiovascular death in the FIELD study (83 [EL 3]) and in the ACCORD study (Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes) (87 [EL 1]) has resulted in an uncertain clinical benefit in treating patients with fibrates who have lesser triglyceride and HDL-C abnormalities.

In patients with the small, dense LDL pattern B, fibrate treatment can also significantly reduce small LDL and increase large LDL concentrations without altering the overall LDL-C concentration (348 [EL 1]). Unlike gemfibrozil, fenofibrate can also reduce total cholesterol and LDL-C in patients with type IIb hyperlipidemia (516 [EL 1]).

Adverse Events

Fibrates are associated with increased serum creatinine levels. However, it has been proposed that this is not caused by renal dysfunction, as creatinine clearance
and glomerular filtration rates are unchanged with fibrate therapy (53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4]). Therefore, the mechanism of action is unclear, although it has been suggested that the peroxisome proliferator–activated receptor α agonist action of the drugs may impair the generation of vasodilatory prostaglandins (54 [EL 4]). Alternately, fibrates may cause increased metabolic production of muscular creatine. However, an association between increased serum creatinine and increased creatine kinase has not been established (53 [EL 3], 54 [EL 4]). Although rare, fibrate use has been associated with myositis, myalgia/myopathy, or rhabdomyolysis; this risk increases with concomitant statin therapy (50 [EL 4], 51 [EL 4]). Various studies have shown that fenofibrate increases homocysteine levels, while gemfibrozil has no consistent effect (77 [EL 1], 78 [EL 3], 520 [EL 1], 521 [EL 3]). Similarly, fenofibrate has been shown to reduce fibrinogen, while gemfibrozil has shown inconsistent effects on fibrinogen across different studies (68 [EL 2], 69 [EL 1], 70 [EL 2], 86 [EL 1], 462 [EL 2], 522 [EL 2], 523 [EL 3], 524 [EL 3]).

### Niacin

Niacin is a potent LDL-C– and triglyceride-lowering drug that also substantially increases HDL-C. Niacin has also been demonstrated to effectively increase LDL subfraction diameter, thereby converting from LDL pattern B to LDL pattern A. Niacin is currently available in 3 formulations: (a) immediate-release (crystalline) niacin is available both as an over-the-counter dietary supplement and by prescription; (b) long-acting niacin, also called sustained-release or time-release niacin, is only sold over-the-counter as a non–US Food and Drug Administration–approved supplement; and (c) extended-release niacin is approved by the US Food and Drug Administration for lipid lowering and is available by prescription (525 [EL 4]). The 3 formulations perform similarly, although a recent review by Meyers et al indicates that certain over-the-counter no-flush niacin preparations may not contain free nicotinic acid, thus compromising their efficacy (526 [EL 4]). The discrete preparations also have unique adverse effect profiles (described in the following text). The multiple effects of niacin on lipid metabolism include suppression of lipolysis, reduced hepatic synthesis of triglycerides and VLDL-C secretion, increased apo B degradation, and decreased catabolism of HDL-C (525 [EL 4]).

Niacin may produce a more favorable lipid response than fibrates, particularly with regard to HDL-C. Because it decreases lipoprotein (a), niacin may be preferable for patients with lipoprotein (a) elevations (527 [EL 1], 528 [EL 2], 529 [EL 3], 530 [EL 3]), but the possible preventive benefits of this have not been studied. The ADMIT study (Arterial Disease Multiple Intervention Trial) and the ADVENT study (Assessment of Diabetes Control and Evaluation of the Efficacy of Niaspan Trial) showed HDL-C increases of 29% and 19% to 24%, respectively, vs placebo (531 [EL 1], 532 [EL 1]). In the CDP study (Coronary Drug Project), a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial conducted from 1966 to 1974, niacin was associated with a significant 27% reduction in coronary events. Following discontinuation, niacin was associated with reduced coronary heart disease death and MI, as well as reduced all-cause mortality at 6- and 15-year follow-up, respectively (88 [EL 2], 533 [EL 1], 534 [EL 3], 535 [EL 1]).

In combination with statins or cholesterol absorption inhibitors, niacin has been associated with angiographic evidence of reduced progression and some regression of atheromatous plaques (340 [EL 1], 353 [EL 3], 450 [EL 2], 536 [EL 1], 537 [EL 3]). The HATS trial (HDL-Atherosclerosis Treatment Study), which evaluated a niacin and statin combination, showed favorable results for patients with the dyslipidemic triad (89 [EL 1]). The AIM-HIGH study (Atherothrombosis Intervention in Metabolic Syndrome With Low HDL/High Triglycerides) study (91 [EL 1]), a large, multicenter, phase III trial sponsored by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, was intended to confirm these benefits; the trial was suspended in May 2011 because of failure to show additional benefit of niacin added to simvastatin, 40 mg daily, in patients whose on-statin LDL-C concentration averaged 71 mg/dL. Furthermore, there was an increase in ischemic strokes in the group treated with niacin: 28 strokes (1.6%) reported during the trial among participants taking high-dose, extended-release niacin vs 12 strokes (0.7%) reported in the control group (493 [EL 1]). The HPS2-THRIVE study (Treatment of HDL to Reduce the Incidence of Vascular Events) is an ongoing, very large international trial of high-dosage, extended-release niacin plus simvastatin (results expected in 2013) that should help clarify the role of simvastatin in combination with niacin (93 [EL 4]).

Blood glucose elevations have been associated with higher dosages of niacin, particularly in patients with diabetes. However, results from the ADMIT (531 [EL 1]), ADVENT (532 [EL 1]), and HATS (89 [EL 1]) trials indicate that this effect was transient and manageable, with blood glucose returning to baseline at 14, 16, and 32 weeks, respectively. Data from each of these trials suggested that patients with diabetes were able to effectively adjust their antidiabetic medications to address blood glucose elevations (531 [EL 1], 533 [EL 1], 534 [EL 1]). A recent reanalysis of data from the CDP study showed that at 1, 2, and 4 years, niacin increased fasting plasma glucose from a baseline of 101 mg/dL to 107 mg/dL, 107 mg/dL, and 108 mg/dL, respectively. Placebo changes from a baseline of 100 mg/dL were 101 mg/dL, 102 mg/dL, and 104 mg/dL, respectively. Similarly, 1-hour plasma glucose levels in the niacin group went from 168 mg/dL at baseline to 179 mg/dL, 179 mg/dL, and 183 mg/dL at 1, 2, and 4 years, respectively. The 1-hour plasma glucose levels in the placebo group went from 169 mg/
dL at baseline to 164 mg/dL, 165 mg/dL, and 170 mg/dL at 1, 2, and 4 years, respectively (533 [EL 1]). These blood glucose changes did not provoke any substantial changes to diabetes therapy. In addition, the reduced risk for cardiovascular events and total mortality was consistent across all baseline fasting and 1-hour plasma glucose groups (533 [EL 1]).

Flushing may occur in most patients taking niacin, especially at the beginning of therapy; however, this effect often diminishes with continued use. This occurs less frequently with extended-release niacin (research indicates an average of 1.88 events over 4 weeks) than with immediate-release niacin (an average of 8.56 events over 4 weeks) (80 [EL 4], 525 [EL 4]). In placebo-controlled trials of extended-release niacin, flushing occurs in as many as 88% of patients; however, discontinuation due to flushing was less than 6% (80 [EL 4], 353 [EL 3], 532 [EL 1]). Flushing can be ameliorated by pretreating with aspirin or a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agent (80 [EL 4]). Flushing and other adverse effects can also be considerably reduced by slowly titrating the dosage upward (80 [EL 4]).

**Bile Acid Sequestrants**

Until the introduction of statins, bile acid sequestrants were the mainstay treatment for LDL-C reduction. They effectively reduce LDL-C and moderately increase HDL-C. Currently available agents are cholestyramine, colestipol, and colesevelam. Bile acid sequestrants are not absorbed and act by binding to bile acids in the gut, thus depleting the endogenous bile acid pool and indirectly increasing the expression of hepatic LDL receptors. This results in up-regulation of 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA reductase activity and increased hepatic cholesterol synthesis. This limits bile acid sequestrants’ efficacy as monotherapy (538 [EL 4]).

At full dosage, bile acid sequestrants reduce LDL-C by 15% to 25% and increase HDL-C by 4% to 8% (539 [EL 2], 540 [EL 1], 541 [EL 3], 542 [EL 4], 543 [EL 2], 544 [EL 1]). In one major primary prevention trial, the LRC-CPPCT study (Lipid Research Clinics Coronary Primary Prevention Trial), cholestyramine reduced major coronary artery disease events by 19% (545 [EL 1]). Additionally, the recent GLOWS study (Glucose-Lowering Effect of WelChol Study) demonstrated that colesevelam significantly lowered plasma glucose among patients with type 2 diabetes (56 [EL 3]); a series of larger phase III clinical trials have been conducted to confirm this outcome, although results have not yet been published (546 [EL 4], 547 [EL 4], 548 [EL 4], 549 [EL 4]). In January 2008, the US Food and Drug Administration approved colesevelam as an adjunct glucose-lowering therapy for adults with type 2 diabetes (55 [EL 4]).

Bile acid sequestrants have been shown to have high discontinuation rates because of adverse events, especially in the gastrointestinal tract (550 [EL 3], 551 [EL 2]). However, colesevelam, a newer agent, appears to be better tolerated (457 [EL 1], 540 [EL 1]). Bile acid sequestrants may cause either no change or a modest rise (≤1%) in triglycerides. Caution should therefore be applied when treating patients with elevated triglyceride levels (32 [EL 4], 55 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4], 540 [EL 1], 541 [EL 3], 542 [EL 4], 543 [EL 2], 544 [EL 1]).

**Cholesterol Absorption Inhibitors**

Cholesterol absorption inhibitors primarily reduce LDL-C and may also have beneficial effects on triglycerides, apo B, and HDL-C. Current research indicates that these benefits are enhanced in combination therapy with statins. Ezetimibe is the only member of this class currently available; it acts by reducing cholesterol absorption at the brush border of enterocytes via cholesterol transporter interference (59 [EL 1], 552 [EL 4]).

Trials demonstrate that ezetimibe reduces LDL-C by 10% to 25%, with significant, favorable changes in triglycerides, apo B, and, in some trials, HDL-C (58 [EL 1], 59 [EL 1], 61 [EL 1]). In combination therapy studies, ezetimibe added to ongoing statin treatment (simvastatin, atorvastatin, lovastatin, pravastatin, or fluvastatin) produced an additional LDL-C reduction of 23% to 30% (60 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1]) and among patients not at LDL-C goal, significantly improved goal attainment (65-81%) compared with statin-only treatment (17%-22%) (60 [EL 1], 63 [EL 3], 64 [EL 1], 65 [EL 1], 553 [EL 1]). Two multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials found that ezetimibe and simvastatin combination therapy reduced LDL-C levels by 53% (62 [EL 1], 492 [EL 1]). The efficacy of ezetimibe and simvastatin combination has not yet been compared with that of lovastatin, pravastatin, or fluvastatin monotherapy, but trials have found that this approach produces significantly greater LDL-C reductions than monotherapy with rosuvastatin (52%-61% vs 46%-57%) or atorvastatin (47%-59% vs 36%-53%) (554 [EL 1], 555 [EL 1]). Ezetimibe is also effective when coadministered with fenofibrate, reducing LDL-C by an additional 20% to 22% (66 [EL 1], 67 [EL 1]).

Recently, the ENHANCE trial (Ezetimibe and Simvastatin in Hypercholesterolemia Enhances Atherosclerosis Regression) studied the effect of the ezetimibe and simvastatin combination in patients with heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia using a surrogate endpoint of carotid artery IMT (556 [EL 4]). Results indicated no benefit from the addition of ezetimibe to statin therapy (344 [EL 3]); however, some elements of the trial, including the study population and its baseline characteristics, suggest further study is required before definitive conclusions can be drawn (557 [EL 4]). The population in this study was highly select; since heterozygous familial
hypercholesterolemia affects only 2.2% of the population, this is a dyslipidemia type not typical of patients seen in daily practice and this probably contributed to participants’ high mean baseline LDL-C level of 319 mg/dL. Moreover, baseline IMT was not at a level normally considered diseased (0.68 mm), which may have minimized results; this may have been due to the high percentage (80%) of patients with a history of statin use. Most important, however, is the fact that ENHANCE was not a clinical endpoint trial. An ongoing CVD outcome trial comparing ezetimibe/simvastatin with simvastatin, IMPROVE-IT (Improved Reduction of Outcomes and Vytorin Efficacy International Trial), is expected to conclude in June 2013 (558 [EL 4]) and should provide a comprehensive analysis of the ezetimibe and simvastatin combination (558 [EL 4]). The SHARP study (Study of Heart and Renal Protection) has just been published and showed that a reduction of LDL-C with simvastatin, 20 mg daily, plus ezetimibe, 10 mg daily, safely reduced the incidence of major atherosclerotic events in a wide range of patients with advanced chronic kidney disease. Also of interest are recent, preliminary results from the SEAS trial (Simvastatin and Ezetimibe in Aortic Stenosis). This 4-year, randomized, placebo-controlled study, which enrolled 1873 men and women with asymptomatic aortic stenosis found that while the primary endpoint (a composite of cardiovascular outcomes) was not achieved, ischemic events, a secondary endpoint, were significantly reduced by 20% among patients taking ezetimibe, 10 mg daily, and simvastatin, 40 mg daily, compared with findings in the placebo group.

Ezetimibe has minimal adverse effects and a strong safety profile. In several 1-year efficacy/safety studies, ezetimibe in combination with statins or fenofibrate demonstrated no significant difference in adverse event rates compared with either monotherapy (66 [EL 1], 512 [EL 1], 513 [EL 1]). Ezetimibe’s recycling via enterohepatic circulation and its elimination half-life of about 22 hours make it easy to administer in oral form (59 [EL 1], 60 [EL 1], 512 [EL 1], 513 [EL 1]).

Special Considerations: Drug Therapy in Women

In light of the diagnostic challenges that present when trying to identify CAD in women, prevention and treatment of dyslipidemia are essential considerations in this population. However, efforts to manage dyslipidemia in women have often been inadequate. While lipid-lowering treatments are used routinely for men, they are frequently underprescribed for women (94 [EL 1]). Furthermore, although lowering LDL-C significantly reduces CAD risk in women, the unique roles of hormonal change over the lifetime of a woman, HDL-C, and triglycerides must also be addressed.

For all women at high risk, the following treatment approach is recommended (25 [EL 4]):

- Lipid-lowering pharmacotherapy (preferably with a statin) regardless of LDL-C level.
- Niacin or fibrate therapy in the presence of low HDL-C or elevated non-HDL-C.
- A diet low in saturated fat (<7%), cholesterol (<200 mg/day), and trans fat

For all women at intermediate risk, the following treatment approach is recommended (25 [EL 4]):

- Lipid-lowering pharmacotherapy (preferably with a statin) in the presence of an LDL-C level greater than 130 mg/dL; and
- Niacin or fibrate therapy in the presence of low HDL-C or elevated non–HDL-C after LDL-C goal is reached.

Supporting Data: Statins

Most early studies of the relationship between dyslipidemia and CAD included only middle-aged men (94 [EL 1]). Although few clinical trials have evaluated lipid-lowering in women specifically (200 [EL 4]), men and women have been equally represented in most major statin trials (94 [EL 1]). In a meta-analysis of 5 randomized, placebo-controlled primary and secondary prevention trials (n = 30,817) to assess the impact of statins on CAD development and mortality, statins significantly lowered LDL-C and similarly reduced the risk of major coronary events, coronary mortality, and all-cause mortality in men and women (94 [EL 1]). The HPS study (Heart Protection Study), a randomized, placebo-controlled trial of simvastatin to reduce LDL-C, reported similar findings in a population of 20,536 men and women with CAD, other occlusive arterial disease, or diabetes (37 [EL 1]). Although sex subgroup analyses were not performed, HPS investigators found no evidence for an LDL-C threshold below which further lowering did not reduce risk (37 [EL 1]).

The JUPITER study (Justification for the Use of Statins in Primary Prevention: An Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin) was a primary prevention trial that enrolled a large number of women (n = 6800) with LDL-C levels less than 130 mg/dL and highly sensitive CRP levels 2 mg/L or greater. JUPITER found that women taking rosuvastatin, 20 mg daily, vs placebo showed a 46% reduction in cardiovascular events, very similar to the reduction in men of 42% (338 [EL 1]). A reduction in all-cause mortality in women has not yet been demonstrated in a randomized controlled trial.

Supporting Data: Niacin and Fibrates

In numerous studies, both niacin and fibrates have been shown to favorably affect all components that characterize atherogenic dyslipidemia (low HDL-C; elevated triglycerides; and increased numbers of small, dense LDL-C particles) (10 [EL 4]). Treatment with these drugs
also produces a moderate decrease in CAD risk (10 [EL 4]).

Several trials of the lipid-lowering effects of extended release niacin have specifically evaluated cholesterol-lowering efficacy in women. In a meta-analysis of 5 trials (n = 432), extended-release niacin improved HDL-C, LDL-C, and triglycerides at all dosage levels for both men and women. Mean percentage reductions in LDL-C and triglycerides were greater in women than in men (for example, −28.7% vs −17.7% for LDL-C, P = .006, and −51.0% vs −41.6% for triglycerides, not significant, at the highest dosage of 3000 mg daily) (559 [EL 1]).

In a randomized 3-month trial of hormone replacement therapy (HRT) vs a lipid-lowering fibrate (gemfibrozil) in overweight women with elevated triglycerides (n = 77), both HRT and gemfibrozil lowered LDL-C. Mean percentage change in HDL-C was +10.4% for the gemfibrozil group vs −8.1% for HRT; and mean percentage change in triglycerides was −49.1% for the gemfibrozil group vs −11.8% for the HRT group (560 [EL 3]). Additionally, a recent analysis of 4271 elderly women (older than 65 years) in the general population found that, independent of HRT status, those taking a fibrate had a better lipid profile (lower total cholesterol, triglycerides, and non–HDL-C) than those taking a statin or no lipid-lowering agents (561 [EL 3]). Finally, in the FIELD trial (Fenofibrate Intervention and Event Lowering in Diabetes) trial (n = 9795), fenofibrate produced significant reductions relative to placebo (P = .05) in total cholesterol (−11.4%), LDL-C (−12.0%), and triglycerides (−28.6%) at 4 months in men and women aged 50 to 75 years with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Fenofibrate also produced increases relative to placebo in HDL-C (+5.1%, P = .05) (83 [EL 3]). Over the 5-year course of the study, fenofibrate reduced the risk of CVD events compared with placebo (P = .035), primarily in those with triglyceride values greater than 200 mg/dL, and significantly reduced diabetes-related microvascular complications (83 [EL 3]).

Considerations Specific to Menopausal Women

The hormonal changes of menopause are associated with an increasingly atherogenic lipid profile. This provides both an opportunity and a challenge for the aggressive management of dyslipidemia. The WHI (Women’s Health Initiative), a 15-year longitudinal study of morbidity and mortality in more than 160,000 healthy, postmenopausal women (average age 63 years at baseline) (562 [EL 4]), found a lack of cardioprotective effect associated with HRT. Although estrogen replacement did reduce LDL-C and increase HDL-C, it also increased triglycerides and small, dense LDL particles, 2 of the 3 components that characterize atherogenic dyslipidemia (10 [EL 4]). Based on this, WHI findings are consistent with previous trials in which HRT was not shown to protect against CAD or stroke. However, subgroup analyses of WHI data did show that younger women (aged 50-59 years) and women with a shorter duration of menopause (<10 years) who received HRT experienced a nonsignificant reduction in CAD risk (562 [EL 4]). Overall, these data support the short-term use of HRT to relieve moderate or severe vasomotor symptoms, but not long-term use to prevent CAD in postmenopausal women. Furthermore, given the differences in risks and benefits based on age and duration of menopause, physicians should assess each patient individually to determine if, and for how long, HRT should be used (563 [EL 4]). Based on these data, postmenopausal LDL-C reductions, achieved primarily through the use of statins, remain particularly relevant to this population.

Special Considerations: Therapy in Children

For children and adolescents with elevated lipid levels, intensive lifestyle modification, with an emphasis on normalization of body weight and improved dietary intake, is recommended as a first-line approach. Because lifestyle intervention is considered to be most effective early in life, while behavioral habits are being established. Medical nutrition therapy, physical activity, and smoking cessation (if applicable) form the cornerstone of pediatric dyslipidemia management and are recommended for all patients with LDL-C levels greater than 110 mg/dL. Few clinical trials have investigated the use of drug therapy for the management of pediatric dyslipidemia, and the potential long-term effects of lipid-lowering medications on growth, development, and biochemical variables are unclear. As such, evidence-based recommendations are limited, and pharmacotherapy must be prescribed based on empiric and indirect evidence (303 [EL 4]), as well as on patient needs. In all cases, AACE recommends that selection among this age group for pharmacologic therapy be performed very carefully in conjunction with expert referral and appropriate consultation. It is recommended that such lifestyle changes in children be implemented for at least 6 to 12 months before considering drug therapy. In a 6-year study, adolescents who maintained a high level of physical activity during the transition into adulthood exhibited higher HDL-C to total cholesterol ratios, lower serum triglyceride and insulin concentrations, and lower body fat percentages than those who were physically inactive (564 [EL 2]).

When evaluating the need for lipid-lowering drug therapy in pediatric patients, both the nature of the pediatric dyslipidemia and the potential impact of delaying treatment until adulthood must be considered. There is general consensus that lipid-lowering medications should be used to achieve LDL-C levels less than 130 mg/dL in children and adolescents with certain types of genetic dyslipidemia, particularly when there is an associated CAD risk (eg, familial hypercholesterolemia and familial combined hyperlipidemia) (447 [EL 4], 565 [EL 4]). Clinical evidence does indicate that the ability to reverse the major atherogenic effects of childhood dyslipidemia is diminished if
treatment is delayed until adulthood (565 [EL 4], 566 [EL 4], 567 [EL 3], 568 [EL 3], 569 [EL 4]). Although genetic dyslipidemia is often difficult to diagnose, persistently increased LDL-C levels coupled with a parental history of dyslipidemia may be a good predictor of an underlying genetic disorder. While more intensive intervention may be necessary in patients with high LDL-C values (≥130 mg/dL), pharmacotherapy is generally reserved for those with severe dyslipidemia or genetic lipid disorders (26 [EL 4]). In particular, patients with an LDL-C concentration of 190 mg/dL or greater, or patients with an LDL-C concentration greater than 160 mg/dL and either 2 or more CAD risk factors or a family history of premature CAD (before age 55 years) should be considered candidates for pharmacotherapy. If necessary, smoking cessation should also be implemented (570 [EL 3]).

As such, AACE recommends considering drug therapy in children and adolescents older than 8 years who satisfy the following criteria:

- LDL-C ≥190 mg/dL, or
- LDL-C ≥160 mg/dL and
  - The presence of 2 or more cardiovascular risk factors, even after vigorous intervention (10 [EL 4])
  - Being overweight, being obese, or having other elements of the insulin resistance syndrome, or
  - A family history of premature CAD (before age 55 years)

Additionally, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends that pediatric patients with diabetes be considered for pharmacologic intervention if they have an LDL-C concentration of 130 mg/dL or greater (305 [EL 4]).

**Statins**

A number of statins (atorvastatin, lovastatin, pravastatin, simvastatin, and rosvuvastatin) have been approved for the treatment of familial hypercholesterolemia in patients 10 years or older (43 [EL 4], 44 [EL 4], 47 [EL 4], 48 [EL 4], 571 [EL 4]), and there is increasing evidence to support the use of these agents in children and adolescents at high risk. Recent studies have demonstrated the efficacy of statin treatment in pediatric patients, including LDL-C reductions of 20% to 40% (572 [EL 3], 573 [EL 1], 574 [EL 1], 575 [EL 4], 576 [EL 4], 577 [EL 3], 578 [EL 1], 579 [EL 1], 580 [EL 1]). For example, a 1-year study of adolescent boys with heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia showed that lovastatin (10 to 40 mg daily) decreased LDL-C levels by 17% to 27% and had no significant effects on growth, hormonal, or nutritional status (580 [EL 1]). In another investigation, pravastatin treatment (20 to 40 mg daily) in children with familial hypercholesterolemia aged 8 to 18 years was associated with a 24% LDL-C reduction and significant carotid atherosclerosis regression; no adverse effects on growth, maturation, hormone levels, or muscle or liver enzymes were observed (574 [EL 1]). Based on available evidence, the American Academy of Pediatrics considers statins a safe and effective medication for the treatment of dyslipidemia in pediatric patients at high risk (305 [EL 4]).

**Bile Acid Sequestrants**

Cholestyramine is currently approved for the treatment of hypercholesterolemia in children. The efficacy and safety of colestipol and colesvelam have not yet been established in pediatric populations (55 [EL 4], 79 [EL 4]). However, colesvelam is approved for children older than 8 years. Because bile acid sequestrants are not absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract, they are not associated with serious adverse effects, such as systemic toxicity. Pediatric studies have demonstrated 15% to 20% LDL-C reductions with bile acid sequestrant therapy, and recent evidence indicates that these effects may be achieved with relatively low dosages. As such, to maximize tolerability in pediatric patients, therapy should be initiated at low dosages (<8 g daily of cholesteryramine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of daily doses</th>
<th>Total cholesterol, mg/dL</th>
<th>Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, mg/dL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;245</td>
<td>&lt;195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>245-300</td>
<td>195-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>301-345</td>
<td>236-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;345</td>
<td>&gt;280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or <10 g daily of colestipol) regardless of body weight. Table 22 outlines a recommended initial dosage schedule for bile acid sequestrant therapy in children with familial hypercholesterolemia.

Because bile acid sequestrant treatment may lead to nutrient depletion (eg, folic acid and cholecalciferol) in children, multivitamin supplementation should be used (303 [EL 4], 581 [EL 1], 582 [EL 1]). Bile acid sequestrants should not be used in children with hypertriglyceridemia (303 [EL 4], 583 [EL 2]).

**Other Agents**

**Fibrates**

Fibrates may be useful in children with severely elevated triglyceride levels and an increased risk of pancreatitis (27 [EL 4]). Closely monitored treatment with fibrates may be required when treating the rare child or adolescent with type I or V hyperlipoproteinemia. Further research is needed before fibrates can be routinely recommended in pediatric patients.

**Ezetimibe**

On the basis of studies demonstrating similar pharmacokinetic profiles in adolescents and adults, ezetimibe may be prescribed in patients 10 to 18 years of age. Until data are available for younger patients, ezetimibe is not recommended for children younger than 10 years. Thus far, ezetimibe has only been prescribed for children and adolescents with homozygous familial hypercholesterolemia or sitosterolemia (a rare hereditary lipid disorder characterized by increased absorption and decreased biliary excretion of dietary sterols, resulting in hypercholesterolemia) (584 [EL 2]). Ezetimibe and statin combination therapy is currently being investigated for the treatment of children with heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia (27 [EL 4]).

**Niacin**

Experience with niacin therapy in children is limited. Niacin must be used cautiously in pediatric populations because of a lack of safety and tolerance data and the potential for adverse effects (585 [EL 3]).

**4Q3.3. Follow-Up and Monitoring**

Patients’ lipid status should be reassessed 6 weeks after therapy initiation and again at 6-week intervals until the treatment goal is achieved. Thereafter, patients should be tested at 6- to 12-month intervals. The specific interval should depend on patient adherence to therapy and lipid profile consistency. If adherence is a concern or the lipid profile is unstable, the patient will likely benefit from biannual assessment (10 [EL 4]).

Because most liver abnormalities occur within 3 months of statin or fibric acid initiation, a liver transaminase level should be measured before and 3 months after treatment initiation. This test should be repeated periodically (eg, semiannually). Patients taking niacin should have transaminase levels measured at baseline and every 3 months thereafter for the first year, followed by periodic (eg, semiannual) assessment (10 [EL 4], 80 [EL 4]).

Transaminase level assessment should be repeated at these intervals whenever lipid therapy is restarted, increased, changed, or combined (10 [EL 4]). Creatine kinase levels should be assessed whenever a patient reports clinically significant myalgias or muscle weakness (10 [EL 4]).

Certain clinical circumstances warrant more frequent lipid status evaluation:

- Deterioration of diabetes control.
- The patient starts a new drug known to affect lipid levels.
- The patient’s atherothrombotic disease progresses.
- The patient gains considerable weight.
- A recent lipid profile reveals an unexpected adverse change in any lipid parameter.
- The patient develops a new CAD risk factor.
- Availability of new, convincing clinical trial evidence or guidelines suggests stricter lipid goals.

A full fasting lipid panel, including total cholesterol, LDL-C, HDL-C, and triglycerides should be part of each follow-up assessment. If the physician determines that the patient is not at optimal lipid goals or if the patient’s atherothrombotic disease progresses while at optimal guideline goals, advanced lipoprotein testing, including ultracentrifugation, gradient gel electrophoresis, nuclear magnetic resonance testing, apo A and B levels, and/or lipoprotein(a) may be performed to determine characteristic sizes or numbers of certain lipoproteins. However, it should be noted that consistency between methods for LDL particle size measurement has not been established (10 [EL 4], 115 [EL 4], 586 [EL 2], 587 [EL 4], 588 [EL 3]).

Consultation with an endocrinologist or lipid specialist is recommended when:

- Abnormal lipid levels persist despite intensive treatment efforts
- Uncontrolled diabetes and dyslipidemia coexist
- Atherothrombotic disease progresses despite favorable lipid levels

**4Q4. IS TREATMENT OF DYSLIPIDEMIA AND PREVENTION OF ATHEROSCLEROSIS COST-EFFECTIVE?**

Although there are no commonly agreed upon thresholds for cost-effectiveness analyses, interventions are
typically considered highly cost-effective when the cost per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained is less than $20,000 to $25,000, moderately high in cost-effectiveness when the cost per QALY is between $25,000 and $50,000, borderline cost-effective when the cost per QALY is between $50,000 and $100,000, and generally not cost-effective as the cost per QALY further increases. Another commonly used parameter, incremental cost-effectiveness ratios, reflect the ratio of cost savings as compared with life years gained (10 [EL 4], 589 [EL 4]). The cost-effectiveness studies summarized in this section used effectiveness outcomes related to both cholesterol lowering and/or cardiovascular event reduction; in all cases, the specific efficacy measures applied to each study are indicated.

Nonpharmacologic interventions

Existing evidence indicates that the most cost-effective approach to CAD prevention consists of interventions related to diet modification, exercise, weight control, and/or smoking cessation.

Medical Nutrition Therapy and Lifestyle Counseling

A 2007 study used 2 meta-analyses consisting of 1383 patients from Europe, Australia, Canada, Japan, and the United States to examine the cost-effectiveness of adding plant stanol esters to the diet (in the form of a food spread) used to prevent coronary heart disease in men and women with total serum cholesterol levels greater than 195 mg/dL. There was a gain in the cost per QALY gained due to stanol use for all men aged 40 years and older and for women aged 60 years and older (590 [EL 3]).

Another study compared the LDL-C-lowering effects of usual patient care, consisting of customary cholesterol-lowering advice from a health care provider, to medical nutrition therapy, consisting of a minimum of 2 to 3 registered dietitian visits over a 2- to 3-month period, with an additional 2 to 3 follow-up visits if cholesterol goals have not been met. Medical nutrition therapy was cost-effective, resulting in a 6% decrease in both LDL-C and total cholesterol levels compared with a 2% decrease in LDL-C and a 1% increase in total cholesterol in patients receiving usual care (591 [EL 4]). Medical nutrition therapy administered by registered dietitians, with the goal of lowering cholesterol levels, has also proven cost saving. In a 2001 study examining the effects of medical nutrition therapy/1 year of dietitian intervention on total cholesterol, LDL-C, triglycerides, HDL-C, and body mass index, only 50% of eligible patients required antihyperlipidemic medications. This led to an annual cost savings of $27,449 or $638.35 per patient (592 [EL 3]).

Smoking Cessation

Although smoking cessation is not necessarily a lipid-lowering treatment, the dramatic impact of smoking on CAD requires its inclusion in any discussion of CAD reduction. Cost-effectiveness studies have demonstrated that smoking cessation programs are a highly economical strategy to improve long-term cardiovascular outcomes (593 [EL 4], 594 [EL 4], 595 [EL 3], 596 [EL 4]).

A 2007 randomized trial of 4614 adult smokers who used the Oregon Tobacco Quit Line examined the cost-effectiveness of smoking cessation counseling and nicotine replacement therapy in achieving smoking abstinence. Quit rates and incremental cost-effectiveness ratios were calculated for brief (a single 15-minute call), moderate (a 30-minute call plus a follow-up call), and intensive (5 proactive calls) telephone counseling with or without no-cost transdermal nicotine replacement. Interventions that provided multisession counseling sessions and free transdermal nicotine replacement achieved greater quit rates and were highly cost-effective (597 [EL 4]).

A 2007 model used data from the Framingham Heart Study and the Framingham Offspring Study to model and compare the cost-effectiveness of smoking cessation, antihypertensive drugs, aspirin, and statins in the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease in 3742 men aged 45 to 65 years. Outcomes assessed were number of life-years saved and deaths averted over a 10-year period. Smoking cessation therapy was found to be the most cost-effective intervention, with both transdermal nicotine replacement and treatment with bupropion demonstrating cost savings based on cost per life-year saved and incremental cost-effectiveness ratio results (594 [EL 4]).

A 2008 model compared the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of varenicline, a recently approved smoking cessation therapy, vs bupropion, transdermal nicotine replacement, and unaided quitting in preventing morbidity associated with smoking-related disease. A Markov model, the Benefits of Smoking Cessation on Outcomes, was developed to simulate the lifetime direct costs and consequences of a hypothetical cohort of US adult smokers making a 1-time attempt to quit. From a cost-effectiveness standpoint, varenicline dominated all other treatments and prevented the largest number of smoking-related deaths (595 [EL 3]).

Pharmacologic Therapy

Statins

Overall, statins have proven cost-effective in both secondary and primary prevention of CVD events for individuals at moderate to high risk, or low-risk individuals whose LDL-C levels are very high. In particular, the cost-effectiveness of atorvastatin, pravastatin, and simvastatin has been evaluated in populations that cover both primary and secondary intervention and a wide range of ages and risk factors. Cost-effectiveness data on rosuvastatin has focused on primary prevention in higher risk populations,
including individuals with CAD or a CAD equivalent (10 [EL 4]).

A number of primary and secondary intervention evaluations have found atorvastatin to be cost-effective across a range of cardiovascular endpoints for moderate- to high-risk patients. In the United States, primary atorvastatin treatment was cost-effective over 25- and 10-year periods among patients with type 2 diabetes; studies in both Spain and the United Kingdom also found primary intervention with atorvastatin cost-effective in patients with type 2 diabetes. In secondary intervention trials, US analyses found that treatment with high-dosage atorvastatin was moderately cost-effective ($34,000 per QALY) compared with conventional-dosage simvastatin in patients with stable CAD (598 [EL 4]).

A 2008 retrospective database analysis of 10,421 patients with CHD compared the cost effectiveness of branded rosuvastatin and atorvastatin and generic simvastatin, pravastatin, and lovastatin. Effectiveness was measured as percent LDL-C reduction and percentage of patients achieving NCEP ATP III LDL-C goals; patients were also stratified by NCEP/CAD risk. The analysis found that LDL-C reduction with rosuvastatin was significantly greater than with all other statins. The percentage of moderate/high-risk patients who achieved LDL-C goal was also significantly higher among those taking rosuvastatin compared with the other statin groups. Rosuvastatin was therefore found more cost-effective than branded atorvastatin. Among the generic statins, simvastatin required a 61% discount to achieve equivalent cost-effectiveness to lovastatin, the reference generic. Atorvastatin became generically available in November 2011.

Fibrates

Although available research is limited, treatment with fibrates has been found to be cost-effective as both monotherapy and combination therapy for lowering triglycerides and raising HDL-C.

A 2005 analysis compared generic gemfibrozil to fenofibrate in primary prevention of coronary heart disease in a hypothetical cohort of US male and female participants aged 45 to 74 years with low levels of HDL-C, but without preexisting coronary heart disease or other coronary heart disease risk factors sufficient to indicate drug therapy. The model also calculated cost-effectiveness for lovastatin therapy. Using a cost-effectiveness threshold of $50,000 per QALY, generic gemfibrozil was cost-effective for all individuals. In contrast, fenofibrate was cost-effective for males but not for females. In the comparison model, lovastatin monotherapy was more cost-effective than fibrate monotherapy for all groups except men 45 years and older (599 [EL 4]).

An analysis of a 1998 Veteran’s Administration study comparing gemfibrozil vs placebo for raising HDL-C and lowering triglyceride levels in men 74 years of age with a history of CAD, HDL-C levels 40 mg/dL or less, and LDL-C levels 140 mg/dL or less found gemfibrozil to be cost-effective for reducing major cardiovascular events (600 [EL 3]).

Cholesterol Absorption Inhibitors

Although no long-term US studies exist to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of cholesterol absorption inhibitors, ezetimibe coadministered with statin therapy in patients unable to meet target LDL-C levels has been identified as a cost-effective strategy to meet LDL-C goals in studies from Canada and the United Kingdom.

A Canadian model compared the cost-effectiveness of adding ezetimibe to atorvastatin therapy vs atorvastatin titration or adding the bile acid sequestrant cholestyramine for lowering LDL-C in patients classified as being at very high risk for a CAD event. Compared with fixed or titrated atorvastatin treatment, ezetimibe coadministration was determined to be the most cost-effective therapy evaluated (601 [EL 3]). A 2008 United Kingdom study used a systematic database review and efficacy data from a series of meta-analyses to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of ezetimibe in lowering LDL-C and total cholesterol as either combination therapy with statins or as monotherapy in the treatment of primary hypercholesterolemia. Since there were no published clinical endpoint trials with duration greater than 12 weeks, the authors relied on randomized controlled trials with surrogate endpoints. Overall, the obtained results suggested that ezetimibe therapy was potentially cost-effective for patients with high baseline LDL-C, or for higher risk patients, such as those with diabetes or heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia. However, the authors concluded that long-term, clinical endpoint trials would be needed to develop a more precise analysis (602 [EL 3]).

Bile Acid Sequestrants

Limited current data are available regarding the cost-effectiveness of bile acid sequestrants; no data have been published since generic availability of these agents. A 1999 US meta-analysis based on trials conducted between 1985 and 1997 found that, for LDL-C lowering, the bile acid sequestrant cholestyramine used in combination therapy with statins was less cost-effective than statin monotherapy. Similarly, a 2006 European analysis of clinical trials published between 1993 and 2003 found cholestyramine monotherapy to be less cost-effective than statin monotherapy for lowering LDL-C levels (603 [EL 4], 604 [EL 3]).

Niacin

Limited pharmacoeconomic data support the cost-effectiveness of niacin in combination with a statin in reaching targeted lipid goals.
A 2007 European study estimated the cost-effectiveness of adding extended-release niacin to statin treatment to raise HDL-C in patients with established CAD and low HDL-C. Overall, niacin plus statin treatment proved cost-effective, producing a 7.1% risk reduction for all CAD events. For high-risk groups who had diabetes and/or smoked cigarettes, cost-effectiveness was greater (605 [EL 3]). A 2004 analysis compared lovastatin plus extended-release niacin combination therapy with simvastatin monotherapy for lowering LDL-C and raising HDL-C in 2430 patients with LDL-C levels exceeding NCEP-targeted goals. For all patient groups, lovastatin plus extended-release niacin was found to be more cost-effective than simvastatin (606 [EL 4]).
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