EDITORIAL

Statins for Primary Prevention
The Debate Is Intense, but the Data Are Weak

Rita F. Redberg, MD, MSc; Mitchell H. Katz, MD

This issue of *JAMA* contains the latest US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommendation statement on statins for prevention of cardiovascular disease in adults,[1] along with the accompanying evidence report and systematic review[2] on which the recommendations are based. The evidence report summarized data from 19 trials including a total of 71 344 patients and concluded that statin therapy was associated with reduced risk of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality and cardiovascular disease (CVD) events. Thus, the task force recommended "initiating use of low- to moderate-dose statins in adults aged 40 to 75 years without a history of CVD who have 1 or more CVD risk factors and a calculated 10-year CVD event risk of 10% or greater (B recommendation)" or "7.5% to 10% (C recommendation)."[1] Although the task force did their usual careful job of reviewing the evidence, the evidence for treating asymptomatic persons with statins does not appear to merit a grade B or even a grade C recommendation.

Related articles at jama.com

The task force evidence report estimated an absolute benefit for use of statins of 0.40% for all-cause mortality and 0.43% for cardiovascular mortality and indicated that the absolute benefit was greater for patients at greater baseline risk.[2] Notably, the evidence report did not exclude studies that included patients taking statins for secondary prevention, who have a higher baseline risk of cardiac events and death and thus are more likely to benefit from therapy that inflates the benefit attributed to a primary prevention population. The task force did perform a sensitivity analysis that excluded 3 trials with persons for whom there were prior "hard" cardiovascular events and obtained similar results of benefits (eTable 5 in the article by Chou et al[2]). This sensitivity analysis did not exclude WOSCOPS, which included patients receiving statins for secondary prevention—5% had angina and 3% had intermittent claudication,[3] accounting for 15% of the total weight in the meta-analysis. In contrast, a meta-analysis of 11 studies and 65 229 patients receiving statins for primary prevention, in which patients receiving statins for secondary prevention were excluded, found no benefit of statins for reducing all-cause mortality.[4] The confidence intervals of these 2 analyses overlap, and the difference between these findings likely reflects differences in studies included.

The USPSTF and authors of the evidence report did not have access to the primary data (clinical study reports and anonymized patient-level data) from the statin clinical trials. Rather, they had to rely on peer-reviewed published reports as the basis for these recommendations. Exacerbating the potential bias, all of the trials included in the task force evidence report[2] were industry-sponsored except 1 trial,[5] and that trial contributed 0.2% of the weight to the mortality calculation. Industry-sponsored studies have been shown to report greater benefit and lesser adverse effects than noncommercially sponsored trials of the same drugs.[6] Whether this is true for statins and primary prevention of CVD is unknown.

Among the 19 randomized clinical trials of statins vs placebo or no statin included in the evidence report for the task force recommendations, only 15 reported all-cause mortality, 10 reported cardiovascular mortality, 12 reported fatal and nonfatal myocardial infarction, and 13 reported fatal and nonfatal stroke.[2,7] Reliance on selective reporting of the most important outcomes, which are likely included in the clinical trial data, makes reporting bias possible. Furthermore, after all-cause mortality, the comparative incidence of serious adverse events between treatment and control groups is arguably the second most important measure of the effect of active therapy in randomized clinical trials.

Understanding the evidence base in evaluating harms of statin therapy is also critically important. Although the benefits of any preventive therapy accrue according to risk of disease (greater benefit in higher-risk patients), the harms of therapy usually distribute equally over all risk levels. Thus, persons at low risk have little chance of benefit but equal chance of harms and thus are more likely to have a net harm. The evidence base for harms of statins, despite the introduction of these drugs more than 20 years ago, is incomplete. Many of the trials did not ask about commonly reported statin effects, such as muscle pains and weakness, and only recorded myopathy, for which an increase in creatine kinase levels was required. Because most muscle problems do not involve an increase in creatine kinase levels, this leads to a significant underestimate of muscle problems. Other studies have estimated that closer to 20% of statin users have muscle problems.[8] Additionally, the actual trial data are largely held by the Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' Collaboration on behalf of the industry sponsor and have not been made available to other researchers, despite multiple requests over many years.[9]

Although reported rates of adverse events in clinical trials are low, this does not reflect the experience of clinicians who see patients who are taking statins. For instance, the experience of an NPR reporter with a calculated 2.9% risk of heart disease over 10 years using the recommended American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) risk calculator,[10] but still prescribed a statin, and experiencing adverse effects from the medication, is typical of what many

Copyright 2016 American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

Downloaded From: https://jamanetwork.com/ on 11/13/2016

clinicians see in practice. She reported that "going for a walk was like slogging through mud" until "I ditched the statin. The weakness evaporated. I could run again."[11]

Using shared decision making, including discussion of the actual data on risks and benefits, would be an important step forward. Decision aids, such as that available from the Mayo Clinic website,[12] can help promote shared decision making, and such decision aids should be integrated into the electronic health record to facilitate their clinical use.[13] Using the current data, the decision aid shows that of 100 people who take a statin for 5 years, only 2 of 100 will avoid a myocardial infarction, and 98 of the 100 will not experience any benefit. There will be no mortality benefit for any of the 100 people taking the medicine every day for 5 years. At the same time, 5 to 20 of the 100 will experience muscle aches, weakness, fatigue, cognitive dysfunction, and increased risk of diabetes. All will have to take a pill every day, and they and their health plans will pay for these medications. The association between use of statins and cognitive dysfunction is controversial, with studies indicating both an increased risk and no increased risk. Most but not all studies show an increased risk of diabetes with statin use. The diabetes risk is more common for high-dose compared with moderate-dose statins.[14] The US Food and Drug Administration issued safety label changes in 2012 stating that "Information about the potential for generally non-serious and reversible cognitive side effects (memory loss, confusion, etc.) and reports of increased blood sugar and glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) levels has been added to the statin labels."[15]

Even though the evidence may be insufficient to support statin treatment for asymptomatic patients, these new guidelines may have a beneficial effect. Many patients are treated with statins, even though their risk of a cardiovascular event in the next 10 years is less than 7.5%; in fact, the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations recommend statin treatment for patients with 10-year risk below this level, as well as persons who meet the risk level only because of age.[10] If physicians follow the task force recommendation and do not recommend treatment for primary prevention unless risk is greater than 10% in the presence of a risk factor, many patients would potentially avoid unnecessary treatment. In addition, the task force assigned a Grade C recommendation for statin use for persons between ages 40 and 75 years who have between a 7.5% and 10% 10-year CVD event risk and a risk factor and did not recommend for or against statins for any persons older than 75 years, many of whom are currently receiving statins. An analysis of the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey found that the rate of statin use for primary prevention among persons older than 79 years had increased from 8.8% in 2000 to 34.1% in 2012.[16]

There are unintended consequences of the widespread statin use in healthy persons. For example, people taking statins are more likely to become obese and more sedentary over time than nonstatin users, likely because these people mistakenly think they do not need to eat a healthy diet and exercise as they can just take a pill to give them the same benefit.[17]

The USPSTF recommendations for statin use for primary prevention of CVD are not likely to end the debate about the use of statins for asymptomatic persons. However, it is worth taking a step back and asking why this debate is so contentious. Although the estimates of the benefits of statins for primary prevention used by the task force may be inflated, even if these estimates are accurate, this is still a relatively weak intervention. The task force evidence report estimated that to prevent one death from any cause over a 5-year period, 244 patients would need to take a statin daily.[2] In that sense, whether a clinician concludes that the existing meta-analyses show that statins produce a statistically significant benefit or produce a statistically nonsignificant result, the benefit is relatively small. Certainly, one reason the debate is intense is because of the large market for statins if these drugs are recommended for primary prevention. The global market for statins has been estimated to be a staggering $20 billion annually in the last decade.[18,19] For that kind of investment, better data on risks and benefits should be required.

In deciding on any therapy, it is important to understand the risks and benefits, particularly for healthy people. It is incumbent on clinicians to be sure that before recommending that a patient take a daily pill that has multiple adverse effects, there is evidence that the medication will lead to a better quality of life, longer life, or both. Such evidence is lacking for statins in primary prevention. Thus, while the task force summarized the available evidence well, the limitations of the evidence were not considered sufficiently. Given the serious concerns about the harms of the reliance on statins for primary prevention, it is in the interest of public health and the medical community to refocus efforts on promoting a heart-healthy diet, regular physical activity, and not smoking.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Author Affiliations: Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco (Redberg); Editor, *JAMA Internal Medicine* (Redberg); County of Los Angeles, Department of Health Services, Los Angeles, California (Katz); Deputy Editor, *JAMA Internal Medicine* (Katz).

Corresponding Author: Rita F. Redberg, MD, MSc, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, 505 Parnassus, M1180, San Francisco, CA 94143-0124 (rita.redberg@ucsf.edu).

Published Online: November 13, 2016. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.7585

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Redberg reported participating in a US Food and Drug Administration mock trial for Amgen about PCSK9 drugs. No other disclosures were reported.

Note: This editorial is being published simultaneously in *JAMA*.

REFERENCES

1. US Preventive Services Task Force. Statin use for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease in adults: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA*. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.15450

2. Chou R, Dana T, Blazina I, Daeges M, Jeanne TL. Statins for prevention of cardiovascular disease in adults: evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.15629

3. Shepherd J, Cobbe SM, Ford I, et al; West of Scotland Coronary Prevention Study Group. Prevention of coronary heart disease with pravastatin in men with hypercholesterolemia. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;333(20):1301-1307.

4. Ray KK, Seshasai SRK, Erqou S, et al. Statins and all-cause mortality in high-risk primary prevention: a meta-analysis of 11 randomized controlled trials involving 65,229 participants. *Arch Intern Med*. 2010;170(12):1024-1031.

Copyright 2016 American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

Downloaded From: https://jamanetwork.com/ on 11/13/2016

5. Furberg CD, Adams HP Jr, Applegate WB, et al; Asymptomatic Carotid Artery Progression Study (ACAPS) Research Group. Effect of lovastatin on early carotid atherosclerosis and cardiovascular events. *Circulation*. 1994;90(4):1679-1687.

6. Lundh A, Sismondo S, Lexchin J, Busuioc OA, Bero L. Industry sponsorship and research outcome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;12:MR000033.

7. Chou R, Dana T, Blazina I, et al. *Statins for Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease in Adults: Systematic Review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force*. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2015. AHRQ publication 14-05206-EF-2.

8. Fernandez G, Spatz ES, Jablecki C, Phillips PS. Statin myopathy: a common dilemma not reflected in clinical trials. *Cleve Clin J Med*. 2011;78(6):393-403.

9. Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaboration. Protocol for a prospective collaborative overview of all current and planned randomized trials of cholesterol treatment regimens. *Am J Cardiol*. 1995;75(16):1130-1134.

10. Stone NJ, Robinson JG, Lichtenstein AH, et al; American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. 2013 ACC/AHA guideline on the treatment of blood cholesterol to reduce atherosclerotic cardiovascular risk in adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2014;129(25)(suppl 2):S1-S45.

11. Wolfson W. Playing the odds with statins: heart disease or diabetes? NPR website. http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2015/03/10/390944811/playing-the-odds-with-statins-heart-disease-or-diabetes. Accessed October 4, 2016.

12. Mayo Clinic Shared Decision Making National Resource Center. Should I take statins? a decision making tool. Mayo Clinic website. http://shareddecisions.mayoclinic.org/files/2011/08/Statin_DA_avg21.pdf. Accessed October 11, 2016.

13. Stine NW, Chokshi DA. Elimination of lipid levels from quality measures: implications and alternatives. *JAMA*. 2014;312(19):1971-1972.

14. Preiss D, Seshasai SR, Welsh P, et al. Risk of incident diabetes with intensive-dose compared with moderate-dose statin therapy: a meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2011;305(24):2556-2564.

15. US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA Drug Safety Communication: important safety label changes to cholesterol-lowering statin drugs. FDA website. http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm293101.htm. Accessed November 1, 2016.

16. Johansen ME, Green LA. Statin use in very elderly individuals, 1999-2012. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2015;175(10):1715-1716.

17. Sugiyama T, Tsugawa Y, Tseng C-H, Kobayashi Y, Shapiro MF. Different time trends of caloric and fat intake between statin users and nonusers among US adults: gluttony in the time of statins? *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014;174(7):1038-1045.

18. Herper M. As statins soar, use of other cholesterol medicines declines. *Forbes*. May 29, 2013. http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewherper/2013/05/29/as-statins-soar-use-of-other-cholesterol-medicines-declines/#2f08a4081186. Accessed October 13, 2016.

19. PRNewswire. Statins market to 2018—weak product pipeline and shift of focus towards combination therapies will lead to erosion of brand share. PRNewswire website. http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/statins-market-to-2018---weak-product-pipeline-and-shift-of-focus-towards-combination-therapies-will-lead-to-erosion-of-brand-share-217419941.html. July 29, 2013. Accessed October 13, 2016.

Copyright 2016 American Medical Association. All rights reserved.

Downloaded From: https://jamanetwork.com/ on 11/13/2016