Tools for Practice is proudly sponsored by the Alberta College of Family Physicians (ACFP). ACFP is a provincial, professional voluntary organization, representing more than 3500 family physicians, family medicine residents and medical students in Alberta. Established over fifty years ago, the ACFP strives for excellence in family practice through advocacy, continuing medical education and primary care research. <u>www.acfp.ca</u>

Reviewed: July 13, 2016 Evidence Updated: No new evidence Bottom Line: No change First Published: May 15, 2009



Bottom-line: hs-CRP is not useful at identifying patients at risk of a CV event or those who may benefit from primary prevention interventions.

Evidence:

JUPITER¹ is used by some to justify hs-CRP testing to guide intervention for primary prevention of CV disease:

- Randomized controlled trial (RCT) (~90,000 screened, 17,802 included) with LDL <3.4 mmol/L and hs-CRP ≥2 mg/L followed for median 1.9 years.
 - CV events: Rosuvastatin 1.6% vs. placebo 2.8%, Number Needed to Treat (NNT)=82.
 - All-cause mortality: Rosuvastatin 2.2% vs. placebo 2.8%, NNT=182.
 - Several limitations:²
 - Early study termination (which tends to exaggerate benefits³).
 - Poor generalizability due to strict eligibility criteria.
 - Sponsorship bias.
 - Incomplete outcome reporting.

No RCT exists where patients are randomized to hs-CRP testing or no testing to guide therapy initiation.

Context:

- Meta-analysis⁴ of 52 prospective studies (246,669 patients) found that adding hs-CRP to traditional CV risk factors (i.e. Framingham calculator) did not better identify those at risk of CV events.
- JUPITER added virtually nothing to statin management in primary prevention:
 - Statins reduce CV events by relative ~25-30% across the population⁵ (regardless of hs-CRP⁶), and absolute benefit depends on patient's individual CV risk.⁵

- $\circ~$ Mean CRP in JUPITER would change risk obtained from Framingham calculator by only ~1-3%, which has little/no effect on treatment benefits and therefore should not influence decisions.⁷
 - Example: Statin therapy reduces absolute risk by 4.5% (if baseline risk=18%) vs. 5.25% (if baseline risk=21%).
- hs-CRP varies widely from one measurement to the next,^{8,9} meaning single measurements are insufficient for decision-making.
- Reductions in hs-CRP are not consistently predictive of improved outcomes.
 - Vitamin A, rosiglitazone and rofecoxib reduced hs-CRP, but worsen clinical outcomes.⁷
- Updated Canadian dyslipidemia guidelines no longer recommend routine use of hs-CRP to stratify patients, including those at "intermediate" risk.¹⁰

Original Author:

G. Michael Allan MD CCFP

Updated:

Ricky D Turgeon BSc(Pharm) ACPR PharmD

Reviewed: G. Michael Allan MD CCFP

References:

- 1. Ridker PM, Danielson E, Fonseca FA, et al. N Engl J Med. 2008; 359:2195-207.
- 2. de Lorgeril M, Salen P, Abramson J, et al. Arch Intern Med. 2010; 170:1032-6.
- 3. Bassler D, Briel M, Montori VM, et al. JAMA. 2010; 303:1180-7.
- 4. The Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration. N Engl J Med. 2012; 367:1310-20.
- 5. Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' Collaborators. Lancet. 2012; 380:581-90.
- 6. Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group. Lancet. 2011; 377:469-76.
- 7. McCormack JP, Allan GM. PLoS Med. 2010; 7:e1000196.
- 8. Koenig W, Sund M, Frohlich M, et al. Am J Epidemiol. 2003; 158:357-64.
- 9. Bogaty P, Brophy JM, Boyer L, et al. Arch Intern Med. 2005; 165:221-6.
- 10. Anderson TJ, Gregoire J, Hegele RA, et al. Can J Cardiol. 2013; 29:151-67.

Tools for Practice is a biweekly article summarizing medical evidence with a focus on topical issues and practice modifying information. It is coordinated by G. Michael Allan, MD, CCFP and the content is written by practising family physicians who are joined occasionally by a health professional from another medical specialty or health discipline. If you are not a member of the ACFP and would like to receive the TFP emails, please sign up for the distribution list at http://bit.ly/signupfortfp to be added to the distribution list. Archived articles are available on the ACFP website.

This communication reflects the opinion of the authors and does not necessarily mirror the perspective and policy of the Alberta College of Family Physicians.