

# Research on Cholesterol and Statins

## Introductory Explanation

My lack of concern about my “high LDL-C” and “high total cholesterol” and my decision not to take statins is based on many hours of reading and research. This research has led me to conclude that:

1. Lowering cholesterol may not be desirable [1 page]
2. High cholesterol is neutral or beneficial for the elderly [1 page]
3. There are valid challenges to the cholesterol hypothesis [1 page + table]
4. There are other surrogate markers than total cholesterol or LDL-C [1 page]
5. Statins offer minimal or no benefit for primary prevention [2 pages]

Each page includes quotes taken from medical journals with online links. It may be easier to read and follow online here:

<https://mbabco.netlify.com/cholesterol-2019/index.html>

(or, for less typing: [http://tinyurl.com/\\_y6byqsav](http://tinyurl.com/_y6byqsav) )

## Is Lowering Cholesterol Desirable?

### Studies With No Mortality or Minimal Cardiovascular Benefit

“Table 1 lists 44 cholesterol-lowering RCTs that reported no mortality benefit. Most reported no reduction in CV events, and several reported substantial harm . . .”

– From Cholesterol Paradox: A Correlate Does Not a Surrogate Make, Robert DuBroff, Evid Based Med, 2017;22(1):15-19.

<https://ebm.bmj.com/content/22/1/15>

---

“The table summarizes 29 major RCTs of cholesterol reduction reported after the publication of these regulations. Notably, only 2 of these 29 studies reported a mortality benefit, while nearly two-thirds reported no cardiovascular benefit at all.”

– A Reappraisal of the Lipid Hypothesis, by Robert DuBroff, MD, The American Journal of Medicine, September 2018, Volume 131, Issue 9, Pages 993–997.

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

### Framingham – Lowering Cholesterol Produced Harm

“There is a direct association between falling cholesterol levels over the first 14 years of the study and mortality over the following 18 years. 11% overall and 14% CVD death rate increase per 1mg/dl per year drop in cholesterol levels.”

– Cholesterol and mortality. 30 years of follow-up from the Framingham study, by Anderson KM, et. al., JAMA, 1987, Apr 24;257(16):2176-80.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3560398>

### Higher LDL-c Improved Outcomes, Lowest LDL-C Highest Mortality

“Patients with the highest baseline LDL-c levels had significantly improved outcome, whereas those with the lowest LDL-c levels had the highest mortality.”

– A longitudinal 20 years of follow up showed a decrease in the survival of heart failure patients who maintained low LDL cholesterol levels, by Charach G, et. al., QJM, 2018 May 1;111(5):319-325.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29733423>

# High Cholesterol is Neutral or Beneficial for the Elderly

## One Meta-analysis and One Study

“We identified 19 cohort studies including 30 cohorts with a total of 68 094 elderly people, where all-cause mortality was recorded in 28 cohorts and CV mortality in 9 cohorts. . . . **High LDL-C is inversely associated with mortality in most people over 60 years.**” [Emphasis added.]

– Lack of an association or an inverse association between low-density-lipoprotein cholesterol and mortality in the elderly: a systematic review, Ravnskov, et. al., BMJ Open Journal, Vol. 6, Issue 6.

<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/6/6/e010401.full.pdf+html>

---

“These associations indicate that high lipoprotein levels do not seem to be definitely harmful in the general population.”

– Association of lipoprotein levels with mortality in subjects aged 50 + without previous diabetes or cardiovascular disease: A population-based register study, Lisa Bathum et al., Scand J Prim Health Care, 2013 Sep; 31(3): 172–180.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3750440/>

## Framingham

“After age 50 years there is no increased overall mortality with either high or low serum cholesterol levels.”

– Cholesterol and mortality. 30 years of follow-up from the Framingham study, Andersn KM et. al., JAMA, 1987 Apr 24;257(16):2176-80.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3560398#>

## 18 Studies Showing Cholesterol Protective in Elderly

The following page has 18 studies from the most respected peer-reviewed journals. Here’s 1 example:

“Neither high-density lipoprotein cholesterol nor low-density lipoprotein cholesterol was associated with mortality.”

– Risk factors for 5-year mortality in older adults: the Cardiovascular Health Study, Fried LP et. al. JAMA, 1998 Feb 25;279(8):585-92.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/187277>

# 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 glycosylated, 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/)

## **Other Surrogate Markers than TC or LDL-C**

### **Triglycerides to HDL Ratio**

“Elevation in the ratio of TG to HDL-c was the single most powerful predictor of extensive coronary heart disease among all the lipid variables examined.”

– High Ratio of Triglycerides to HDL-Cholesterol Predicts Extensive Coronary Disease, Protasio Lemos da Luz, et. al., *Clinics*, 2008 Aug; 63(4): 427–432.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2664115/>

### **High HDL**

In a large cohort of patients hospitalized with CAD [136,905], . . . [m]ore than half the patients have admission HDL levels <40 mg/dL, whereas <10% have HDL ≥60 mg/dL.

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

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

### **IR: Insulin Resistance**

“Emerging evidence shows that insulin resistance is the most important predictor of cardiovascular disease and type 2 diabetes.”

– The cholesterol and calorie hypotheses are both dead — it is time to focus on the real culprit: insulin resistance, Maryanne Demasi, et. al, *Clinical Pharmacist*, 14 Jul 2017.

<http://tinyurl.com/yy6hsg49>

### **CAC (Coronary Artery Calcification) Score**

“A zero CAC score in patients undergoing CT scanning for suspected stable angina has a high negative predictive value for the exclusion of obstructive CAD and is associated with a good medium-term prognosis.”

– A zero coronary artery calcium score in patients with stable chest pain is associated with a good prognosis, despite risk of non-calcified plaques, Xue Wang, et. al., *BMJ Open Heart*, Vol. 6, issue 1.

<https://openheart.bmj.com/content/6/1/e000945>

## Statins and Primary Prevention (2 pages)

### **NNT – Number Needed to Treat: Statin Drugs Given for 5 Years for Heart Disease Prevention (Without Known Heart Disease) (Updated November 2017)**

#### **Benefits in NNT**

- 98% saw no benefit, no lives were saved
- None (0%) were helped (life saved)
- 1 in 104 (0.96%) were helped (preventing heart attack)
- 1 in 154 ( 0.65%) were helped (preventing stroke)

#### **Harms in NNT**

- 1 in 50 (2%) were harmed (develop diabetes)
- 1 in 10 (10%) were harmed (muscle damage)

<http://www.thennt.com/nnt/statins-for-heart-disease-prevention-without-prior-heart-disease-2/>

### **Little Benefit for Extending Life**

“**Results** 6 studies for primary prevention and 5 for secondary prevention with a follow-up between 2.0 and 6.1 years were identified. Death was postponed between –5 and 19 days in primary prevention trials and between –10 and 27 days in secondary prevention trials. The median postponement of death for primary and secondary prevention trials were 3.2 and 4.1 days, respectively.”

– The effect of statins on average survival in randomised trials, an analysis of end point postponement, Malene Lopez Kristensen, et. al., BMJ Open Journal, Volume 5, Issue 9.

<https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/9/e007118.full>

### **Statin Mechanism May Cause Harm**

“ . . .we present a perspective that statins may be causative in coronary artery calcification and can function as mitochondrial toxins that impair muscle function in the heart and blood vessels . . .”

– Statins stimulate atherosclerosis and heart failure: pharmacological mechanisms, Okuyama H, et. al., Expert Rev Clin Pharmacol, 2015 Mar;8(2):189-99.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25655639>

[See also: Statin Adverse Effects: A Review of the Literature and Evidence for a Mitochondrial Mechanism, Beatrice A. Golomb, et. al., Am J Cardiovasc Drugs, 2008; 8(6). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2849981/> ]

## **Study and 3 Analyses: Statins have No Benefit for Primary Prevention**

"No benefit was found when a statin was given for primary prevention to older adults."

– Effect of Statin Treatment vs Usual Care on Primary Cardiovascular Prevention Among Older Adults The ALLHAT-LLT Randomized Clinical Trial, by Benjamin H. Han, MD, MPH, et. al., JAMA Intern Med. 2017;177(7):955-965.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/article-abstract/2628971>

---

"Conclusions:. Therefore, statins have not been shown to provide an overall health benefit in primary prevention trials."

– Do Statins have a Role in Primary Prevention?" Therapeutics Letter #48, posted on October 16, 2003.

<http://www.ti.ubc.ca/pages/letter48.htm>

---

"Conclusion This literature-based meta-analysis did not find evidence for the benefit of statin therapy on all-cause mortality in a high-risk primary prevention set-up."

– Statins and All-Cause Mortality in High-Risk Primary Prevention: A Meta-analysis of 11 Randomized Controlled Trials Involving 65 229 Participants, Kausik K. Ray, et. al., Arch Intern Med, 2010;170(12):1024-1031.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/416105>

---

". . . statin treatment, in particular when used as primary prevention, is of doubtful benefit."

– 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>

---

## **Statin Benefits Overstated**

"We have described the deceptive approach statin advocates have deployed to create the appearance that cholesterol reduction results in an impressive reduction in cardiovascular disease outcomes."

– How statistical deception created the appearance that statins are safe and effective in primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease, Diamond DM, et. al., Expert Rev Clin Pharmacol, 2015 Mar;8(2):201-10.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25672965>