

# Challenging the Cholesterol Hypothesis

## ACCELERATE Trial – Lowering LDL Ineffective

“The recently presented ACCELERATE . . . [failed] to demonstrate any cardiovascular benefit of evacetrapib despite dramatically lowering low-density lipoprotein cholesterol . . . This clinical trial adds to a growing volume of knowledge that challenges the validity of the cholesterol hypothesis and the utility of cholesterol as a surrogate end point.”

– Cholesterol paradox: a correlate does not a surrogate make, Robert DuBroff, Evidence-based medicine, 2(1) December 2016.

<http://ebm.bmj.com/content/22/1/15> Full text: <http://tinyurl.com/ydh9k2vn>

## As Many CAD Patients Have Low-LDL as Not

"In a large cohort of patients hospitalized with CAD [136,905], almost half have admission LDL levels <100 mg/dL." [Note: Almost 75 percent of heart attack patients fell within recommended targets for LDL cholesterol.]

– Lipid levels in patients hospitalized with coronary artery disease: An analysis of 136,905 hospitalizations in Get With The Guidelines, American Heart Journal, Volume 57, Issue 1, January 2009.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0002870308007175>

## LDL-C Does Not Cause CVD – A Comprehensive Review

“For half a century, a high level of total cholesterol (TC) or low-density-lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) has been considered to be the major cause of atherosclerosis and cardiovascular disease (CVD), . . . However, there is an increasing understanding that the mechanisms are more complicated, . . .”

LDL-C Does Not Cause Cardiovascular Disease: a comprehensive review of current literature, Uffe Ravnskov, et. al., Expert Review of Clinical, Volume 11, 2018, Issue 10.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17512433.2018.1519391>

## Lowering LDL-C Inconsistent Results

"...focusing almost exclusively on lowering LDL-C for everyone does not consistently work... Our LDL-C-centric approach to cardiovascular disease prevention may have distracted us from investigating other pathophysiologic mechanisms and treatment..."

– A Reappraisal of the Lipid Hypothesis, Robert DuBroff, MD, The American Journal of Medicine, September 2018, Volume 131, Issue 9.

[https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343\(18\)30404-2/fulltext](https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343(18)30404-2/fulltext)

## LDL-Hypothesis: Pro and Con

Issue Statement: Primary Root Causes and Solutions for Premature CVD and MI need to be Prioritised		
Hypothesis	For	Against
"Bad Cholesterol" or LDL (in and of itself) is a primary cause of CVD	COMPARATIVE/ASSOCIATIONAL evidence from prospective observational, epidemiological, ecological and other comparative studies indicates higher LDL, higher risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Hazard ratios weak and inconsistent.</li> <li>* Framingham and many others show HR's disappear when HDL etc. taken into account</li> <li>* Many studies show significant HR only for very, very high LDL levels</li> <li>* Case-control generally no sig LDL difference between diseased and well - ratios dominate</li> <li>* Even in FH, severely premature CVD have same LDL as those aging healthily - nearly all studies of note show this phenomenon               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- also FH now beginning to be viewed as dependent more on clotting phenomena - and early disease FH are strongly marked by many parameters relative to healthy FH (LDL is ironically the one that fails to maintain itself)</li> </ul> </li> <li>* In ~20 studies, calcification extent didn't correlate with LDL levels</li> <li>* In autopsies, atherosclerosis extent didn't correlate with LDL levels</li> <li>* Etc. etc. etc.</li> </ul>
	MECHANISTIC evidence from scientific literature - but conflicting with better mechanistic evidence?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* LDL lipoproteins glycated, damaged or modified would make sense               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- but latter due to effect of other genuine causes</li> </ul> </li> <li>* Hyperinsulin/IR/hyperglycemia dramatically stronger evidence base               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- and these stronger hypotheses in turn actually cause LDL dysfunction?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	EXPERIMENTAL evidence from various pharmaceutical RCT's which lower LDL - LDL drops in the population, event rates are lowered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Examples of pharmaceutical RCT's which lower cholesterol greatly, yet increase in event rates observed e.g. CETPI</li> <li>* Some analyses show that event-reduction extent...does not correspond to LDL-lowering extent in individuals               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- very few papers available with this particular individual-level data though - unfortunately?</li> </ul> </li> <li>* These analyses do show that the medication impacts on e.g. ferritin, CRP and other trial measures, DO actually track in dose-response fashion for individual's reduced risk rate</li> </ul>

This table was put together by and is used with the permission of Ivor Cummins.

You can access his excellent podcasts here:

[https://thefatemperor.com/\\_podcasts/](https://thefatemperor.com/_podcasts/)