



Less is More Unless it's Sleep or Toilet Paper: Non-traditional lipoproteins for cardiovascular risk

CLINICAL QUESTION

In patients without established cardiovascular disease (CVD), can lipoprotein(a) or apolipoprotein B meaningfully improve standard CVD risk estimation?

BOTTOM LINE

Adding lipoprotein(a) or apolipoprotein B does not meaningfully improve cardiovascular risk prediction above standard risk factors (age, sex, blood pressure, total cholesterol/HDL, diabetes, smoking). Assess risk with CVD risk calculators and offer proven therapies as appropriate.

EVIDENCE

- All evidence from cohort studies and statistically significant unless noted.
- Search focused on lipoproteins additive value above traditional risk factors on CVD risk estimation. C-statistic measures the predictive accuracy of a statistical model to distinguish between individuals with positive outcomes and those with negative outcomes.¹
 - Changes in C-statistic: ≥ 0.1 is large, 0.05-0.1 is moderate, 0.025-0.05 is small and <0.025 is very small.²
- Lipoprotein(a) [Lp(a)]

- Systematic review of 24 prospective studies (n=133,502, mean follow-up 10.6 years).³
 - C-statistic improvement=0.0016.
- Evidence since:
 - UK adults (n=340,339) without CVD not on statins, follow-up 8.9 years.⁴
 - C-statistic improvement=0.0017.
 - Swiss adults (n=4829), follow-up 9.9 years.⁵
 - C-statistic improvement=0.004.
- Apolipoprotein B (apoB)
 - Systematic review of 26 prospective studies (n=139,581, mean follow-up 10.5 years).³
 - C-statistic improvement=0.0001 (not statistically significant).
 - Evidence since:
 - UK adults (346,686) without CVD not on statins, follow-up 8.9 years.⁶
 - C-statistic improvement=0.0004.
 - Danish adults (8476) without CVD or diabetes, follow-up 18 years.⁷
 - C-statistic improvement not statistically different.
 - Other cohorts found similar results.⁸⁻⁹

CONTEXT

- Lp(a) and apoB individually are associated with CVD with relative risks of 1.00-2.21 and 1.03-2.87, respectively. Other non-traditional risk markers have similar associations (relative risk for leucocyte count=1.45; albumin=1.55; pro-insulin=2.23) but provide little additional value when combined with traditional risk factors (e.g., additive value of leukocyte count c-statistic=0.0036).¹⁰
- Other measures of diagnostic utility, including Net Reclassification Index, suggest Lp(A) and apo(B) generally provide no meaningful value above traditional risk prediction.³⁻⁶
- Simplified guidelines discourage testing lipoproteins.¹⁰
- Canadian Cardiovascular Society¹¹ recommends measuring:
 - Lp(a) once/lifetime for initial screening.
 - ApoB (or non-HDL-C) as preferred screening parameter if triglycerides>1.5mmol/L.

REFERENCES

1. Allan GM, Garrison S, McCormack J. *Curr Opin Lipidol* 2014; 25(4): 254-65.
2. Lin JS, Evans CV, Johnson E, *et al.* *JAMA* 2018; 320:281297.
3. Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration; Di Angelantonio E, Gao P, Pennells L, *et al.* *JAMA*. 2012 Jun 20; 307(23):2499-506.
4. Welsh P, Welsh C, Celis-Morales CA, *et al.* *Eur J Prev Cardiol.* 2022 Feb 9; 28(18):1991-2000.
5. Delabays B, Marques-Vidal P, Kronenberg F, *et al.* *Eur J Prev Cardiol.* 2021 Jul 23; 28(8):e18-e20.
6. Welsh C, Celis-Morales CA, Brown R, *et al.* *Circulation.* 2019; 140:542-552.
7. Graversen P, Abildstrom SZ, Jespersen L, *et al.* *Eur J Prev Cardiol.* 2016; 23(14):1546-1556.

AUTHORS

Betsy Thomas, BSc Pharm,
Jen Potter, MD CCFP,
Allison Paige, MD CCFP, G
Michael Allan, MD CCFP

Authors do not have any conflicts of interest to declare.

8. Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB, Zdrojewski T, *et al.* Eur J Prev Cardiol. 2015; 22(10):1321-1327.
9. Vasquez-Oliva G, Zamora A, Ramos R, *et al.* Rev Exp Cardiol. 2018; 71(11):910-916.
10. Allan GM, Lindblad AJ, Comeau A, *et al.* Can Fam Physician. 2015 Oct; 61(10):857-67.
11. Pearson GJ, Thanassoulis G, Anderson TJ, *et al.* Can J Cardiol. 2021; 37:1129-1150.

**TOOLS FOR PRACTICE
PROVIDED BY**



IN PARTNERSHIP WITH



Tools for Practice are peer reviewed and summarize practice-changing medical evidence for primary care. Coordinated by **Dr. G. Michael Allan** and **Dr Adrienne Lindblad**, they are developed by the Patients, Experience, Evidence, Research (PEER) team, and supported by the College of Family Physicians of Canada, and the Alberta, Ontario, and Saskatchewan Colleges of Family Physicians. Feedback is welcome and can be sent to toolsforpractice@cfpc.ca. Archived articles can be found at www.toolsforpractice.ca

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