Cholesterol is Inadequately Treated in Diabetic Patients from Buenos Aires: Independently from the Formula We Use Numbers Do Not Match

El tratamiento del colesterol es inadecuado en pacientes diabéticos de Buenos Aires: independientemente de la fórmula utilizada, las cifras no coinciden

RAUL D. SANTOS MD, PHD1,2,3

Type 2 diabetes (T2DM) is associated with at least a 2-fold risk of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) compared with the normal population. (1, 2) If risk factors are left uncontrolled up to 70% of T2DM subjects will die of cardiovascular diseases. (3) Among the different factors involved in atherosclerosis development in T2DM, atherogenic dyslipidemia plays a pivotal role. Not only low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL) but also cholesterol-rich remnants of chylomicrons and very low-density lipoproteins (VLDL) are causal of atherosclerotic plaque development and complications. This knowledge comes from robust evaluations of thousands of hundreds of individuals involved in classical prospective observational but most importantly from Mendelian randomization and interventional randomized controlled studies. (4,5)

Considering overwhelming and indisputable evidence, when serious science is concerned, there is consensus from medical societies that apolipoprotein B (ApoB) containing lipoproteins must be adequately reduced to prevent ASCVD in T2DM subjects. Either LDL-cholesterol or the much more intuitive concept of non-HDL-cholesterol (i.e. the cholesterol carried by pro-atherogenic ApoB containing lipoproteins) are used as surrogates of the latter and are targets for therapy. Indeed recent guidelines from Europe and the USA even recommend more aggressive reduction in LDL-cholesterol due to results of ezetimibe and/or PCSK9 inhibitors on top of statins. (6,7)

Implementation of risk factor control, including dyslipidemia, reduces cardiovascular complications in diabetics. (8,9) Unfortunately, despite this indisputable evidence most individuals at high and very high risk of ASCVD including secondary prevention diabetics are not being adequately treated. (10)

In this issue of the Journal Masson et al. (11) show inadequate treatment of dyslipidemia in high risk subjects from the Buenos Aires region, a fact that unfortunately does not vary much from Europe, USA or developing countries. (10,12). In their cross-sectional study, the authors clearly show that independently of the mathematical calculation used to estimate LDL-cholesterol (an unfortunately not well quantified parameter despite all advances in clinical chemistry) the latter is severely uncontrolled in T2DM patients at different levels of ASCVD risk. The same applies for non-HDL-cholesterol. In those with a previous ASCVD event, roughly 2/3 present LDL-cholesterol calculated by the Friedewald formula and non-HDL-cholesterol not in accord with Argentinian prevention guidelines (respectively <70 mg/dL and <100 mg/dL). When the formula developed by Martin et al. (13) to better estimate LDL-cholesterol, especially when triglycerides are >150mg/dL or when cholesterol carried by LDL is <100 mg/Dl (14), an additional 21% entered the uncontrolled LDL-cholesterol category. In those at primary prevention, but with high ASCVD risk (T2DM with other risk factors or target organ damage), approximately 80% were not at their respective LDL-cholesterol and non-HDL-cholesterol goals. When LDL-cholesterol was estimated by the Martin et al. formula, 28% of those whose LDL-cholesterol was calculated as <70 mg/dL using the Friedewald formula moved to out of goal category. As expected, discrepancy between estimated LDL-cholesterol was greater in those with higher triglyceride levels, where the classical 5:1 molar relationship of triglycerides/cholesterol is no longer valid.

Furthermore, and independently of biochemical and mathematical formulas, statins and doses of these medications that add on average an extra 20% reduction in cardiovascular events (15) are not prescribed
as recommended by evidence-based guidelines. In the study of Masson et al. (11), 23% and 67% of those on secondary prevention were not using any statin or high doses of the latter, respectively. In high risk primary prevention T2DM patients, 38% were not receiving statins, while only 15% were treated at high doses as recommended.

This study clearly shows that there is a gap between theory and practice, which widens by using the contemporary and robust Martin et al. formula for LDL-cholesterol estimation. (13). Certainly, the greatest explanation for the study findings is inadequate use of statins at correct doses. This phenomenon unfortunately occurs everywhere despite widespread availability, low cost and access to these lifesaving medications. The authors should be commended by their study since real world evidence is very important to plan programs to improve clinical practice. The study of Masson et al. (11) clearly shows that independently of the formula used the numbers unfortunately do not match where cholesterol control is concerned and as physicians we need to improve our mathematics.
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