

4. Muldoon M, Manuck S, Matthews K. Lowering cholesterol concentrations and mortality: a quantitative review of primary prevention trials. *BMJ*. 1990;301:309-314.
5. Davey Smith G, Pekkanen J. Should there be a moratorium on the use of cholesterol lowering drugs? *BMJ*. 1992;304:431-434.
6. Newman TB, Browner WS, Hulley SB. Childhood cholesterol screening: contraindicated. *JAMA*. 1992;267:100-101.
7. Law MR, Thompson SG, Wald NJ. Assessing possible hazards of reducing serum cholesterol. *BMJ*. 1994;308:373-379.
8. Strandberg TE, Salomaa VV, Naukkarinen VA, Vanhanen GT, Sarna SJ, Miettinen TA. Long-term mortality after 5-year multifactorial primary prevention of cardiovascular diseases in middle-aged men. *JAMA*. 1991;266:1225-1229.
9. Jacobs DR. Why is low blood cholesterol associated with risk of nontherosclerotic disease death? *Annu Rev Public Health*. 1993;14:95-114.
10. Frick MH, Heinonen OP, Huttunen JK, Koskinen P, Manttari M, Manninen V. Efficacy of gemfibrozil in dyslipidaemic subjects with suspected heart disease: an ancillary study in the Helsinki Heart Study frame population. *Ann Med*. 1993;25:41-45.
11. Huttunen JK, Heinonen OP, Manninen V. The Helsinki Heart Study: an 8.5 year safety and mortality followup. *J Intern Med*. 1994;235:31-39.
12. Heady JA, Morris JN, Oliver MF. WHO clofibrate/cholesterol trial: clarifications. *Lancet*. 1992;340:1405-1406.
13. Bradford RH, Shear CL, Chremos AN, Dujovne C, Downton M, Franklin FA, Gould AL, Hesney M, Higgins M, Hurley DP, Langendorfer A, Nash DT, Pool JL, Schnaper H. Expanded clinical evaluation of lovastatin (EXCEL) study results. *Arch Intern Med*. 1991;151:43-49.
14. Davey Smith G, Pekkanen J. The cholesterol controversy. *BMJ*. 1992;304:913. Letter.
15. Davey Smith G, Song F, Sheldon TA. Cholesterol lowering and mortality: the importance of considering initial level of risk. *BMJ*. 1993;306:1367-1373.
16. Duffy MA. *Physicians' Desk Reference*, 48th ed. Montvale, NJ: Medical Economics Data; 1994.
17. Hulley SB, Newman TB, Grady D, Garber AM, Baron RB, Browner WS. Should we be measuring blood cholesterol levels in young adults? *JAMA*. 1993;269:1416-1419.
18. US Preventive Services Task Force. *Guide to Clinical Preventive Services*. Baltimore, Md: Williams & Wilkins; 1989:xix-xxxviii.
19. Eddy DM. Practice policies: where do they come from? *JAMA*. 1990;263:1265-1268.
20. Toronto Working Group. Asymptomatic hypercholesterolemia: a clinical policy review. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1990;43:1029-1121.
21. Expert Panel. Summary of the second report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on detection, evaluation, and treatment of high blood cholesterol in adults. *JAMA*. 1993;269:3015-3023.
22. Canadian Task Force. Periodic health examination, 1993 update, II: lowering the blood total cholesterol level to prevent coronary heart disease. *Can Med Assoc J*. 1993;148:521-538.
23. Sox HC. Screening for lipid disorders under health system reform. *N Engl J Med*. 1993;328:1269-1271.
24. Garber A, Littenberg B, Sox H, Wagner J, Gluck M. Costs and health consequences of cholesterol screening for asymptomatic older Americans. *Arch Intern Med*. 1991;151:1089-1095.
25. Criqui MH. Cholesterol, primary and secondary prevention, and all-cause mortality. *Ann Intern Med*. 1991;115:973-976.
26. Brett AS. Psychologic effects of the diagnosis and treatment of hypercholesterolemia: lessons from case studies. *Am J Med*. 1991;91:642-647.
27. Ramsay LE, Yeo WW, Jackson PR. Dietary reduction of serum cholesterol concentration: time to think again. *BMJ*. 1991;303:953-957.
28. Hunninghake DB, Stein EA, Dujovne CA, Harris WS, Feldman EB, Miller VT, Tobert JA, Laskargewski PM, Quiter E, Held J, Taylor AM, Hopper S, Leonard SB, Brewer BK. The efficacy of intensive dietary therapy alone or combined with lovastatin in outpatients with hypercholesterolemia. *N Engl J Med*. 1993;328:1213-1219.
29. Giles WH, Anda RF, Jones DH, Serdula MK, Merritt RK, DeStafano F. Recent trends in the identification and treatment of high blood cholesterol by physicians: progress and missed opportunities. *JAMA*. 1993;269:1133-1138.
30. Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Manson JE, Colditz GA, Speizer FE, Rosner BA. Intake of trans fatty acids and risk of CHD among women. *Lancet*. 1993;341:581-585.
31. Jacobs DR, Blackburn H. Models of effects of low blood cholesterol on the public health: implications for practice and policy. *Circulation*. 1993;87:1033-1036.
32. Sackett DL, Haynes RB, Guyatt GH, Tugwell P. *Clinical Epidemiology: A Basic Science for Clinical Medicine*. Boston, Mass: Little, Brown; 2nd ed. 1991:163-167.

## Doing the Right Thing: Stop Worrying About Cholesterol

To the Editor:

Stamler et al<sup>1</sup> argue that a low cholesterol level is not the cause of the increased mortality seen in population studies but is a marker for causative factors. They are probably right, but they disregard that a high cholesterol level may also be a marker only. Smoking,<sup>2</sup> obesity,<sup>3</sup> lack of exercise,<sup>4</sup> and psychological stress,<sup>5</sup> for instance, increase blood cholesterol but may cause coronary heart disease by other mechanisms.

The crucial point is that lowering cholesterol actively increases noncoronary mortality, and this increase is not balanced by a decrease of coronary mortality.<sup>6,7</sup> Stamler et al<sup>1</sup> claim that the increased mortality found in the meta-analyses is due to selection of trials. They are wrong, because the excluded trials were mostly unrepresentative.<sup>8</sup>

Stamler et al<sup>1</sup> are skeptical of meta-analysis and use instead the results from only three trials to argue for a "healthier" level of serum cholesterol. The effects of the two largest trials were pathetic, however, and as all of them were multifactorial, their effect, if any, may have been due to other causes than cholesterol lowering.

In a recent meta-analysis of 35 cholesterol-lowering trials, mortality decreased in a subgroup of trials including 5116 individuals.<sup>7</sup> But mortality increased in a much larger subgroup of 27 918 individuals. The first subgroup was called a high-risk group and the other one a low-risk group, according to the mortality of the control subjects. But how should we classify before treatment?<sup>9</sup> Several trials in the so-called low-risk group were secondary preventive, and the mean cholesterol level was higher (7.15 mmol/L) than in the so-called high-risk group (6.72 mmol/L). Thus, when Stamler et al say that only those at highest risk should be treated, they impose an impossible mission on physicians. The risk is greater that we will shorten the lives of our patients instead of prolonging them.

Stamler et al<sup>1</sup> think that the increased mortality after drug treatment should be prevented by careful monitoring. However, I am confident that the trial directors monitored their patients carefully, probably more carefully than we physicians do, and yet mortality increased. There are also obvious methodologic problems connected with the prevention of cancer, violence, and other unexpected causes of death.

Finally, Stamler et al<sup>1</sup> stress the importance of diet. It is true that trials using an extreme diet or trials on patients in mental hospitals have lowered the cholesterol level significantly, but it is unrealistic to think that healthy people should accept these rigorous diets during many years. In trials where a more palatable diet was used, the effect on blood cholesterol has been trivial despite intensive counseling. In MRFIT,<sup>10</sup> for instance, cholesterol was lowered by 2%, in the WHO study<sup>11</sup> by 1%, and in the Gothenburg trial<sup>12</sup> by even less. In the Helsinki study,<sup>13</sup> the control group was treated by diet, but their cholesterol increased. Note also that a significant reduction of nonfatal coronary heart disease has not been achieved in dietary trials.<sup>8</sup>

The right thing to do is to stop the cholesterol campaign. The evidence for a causal relation among atherogenic diet, high serum cholesterol, and coronary disease is far from overwhelming. On the contrary, a host of studies have shown many inconsistencies with this idea.<sup>14-18</sup>

Uffe Ravnskov, MD  
Lund, Sweden

## References

1. Stamler J, Stamler R, Brown WV, Gotto AM, Greenland P, Grundy S, Hegsted M, Luepker RV, Neaton JD, Steinberg D, Stone N, Van Horn L, Wissler RW. Serum cholesterol: doing the right thing. *Circulation*. 1993;88:1954-1960.
2. Craig WE, Palomaki GE, Haddow JE. Cigarette smoking and serum lipid and lipoprotein concentrations: an analysis of published data. *BMJ*. 1989;298:784-788.
3. Dattilo AM, Kris-Etherton PM. Effects of weight reduction on blood lipids and lipoproteins: a meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1992;56:320-328.
4. Naito HK. Effects of physical activity on serum cholesterol metabolism. *Cleve Clin Q*. 1976;43:21-49.
5. Rosenman RH. Relationships of neurogenic and psychological factors to the regulation and variability of serum lipids. *Stress Med*. 1993;9:133-140.
6. Schmidt JG. Cholesterol lowering treatment and mortality. *BMJ*. 1992;305:1226-1227.
7. Smith GD, Song F, Sheldon TA. Cholesterol lowering and mortality: the importance of considering initial level of risk. *BMJ*. 1993;306:1367-1373.
8. Ravnskov U. Cholesterol lowering trials in coronary heart disease: frequency of citation and outcome. *BMJ*. 1992;305:15-19.
9. Weetman DF. Reducing serum cholesterol: confusion remains over whom to treat. *BMJ*. 1993;307:125.
10. Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial Research Group. Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial: risk factor changes and mortality results. *JAMA*. 1982;248:1465-1477.
11. WHO Cooperative Trial on primary prevention of ischaemic heart disease using clofibrate to lower serum cholesterol: mortality follow-up. *Lancet*. 1980;2:379-385.
12. Wilhelmssen L, Berglund G, Elmfeldt D, Tibblin G, Wedel H, Pennert K, Vedin A, Wilhelmsson C, Werkö L. The multifactor primary prevention trial in Göteborg, Sweden. *Eur Heart J*. 1986;7:279-288.
13. Frick MH, Elo O, Haapa K, Heinonen OP, Heinsalmi P, Helo P, Huttunen JK, Kaitaniemi P, Koskinen P, Manninen V, Mäenpää H, Mäkkönen M, Mänttari M, Norola S, Pasternack A, Pikkariainen J, Romo M, Sjöblom T, Nikkilä EA. Helsinki heart study: primary prevention trial with gemfibrozil in middle-aged men with dyslipidemia. *N Engl J Med*. 1987;317:1237-1245.
14. Stehens WE. Flaws in the lipid hypothesis of atherogenesis. *Pathology*. 1988;20:395-398.
15. Smith RL. Dietary lipids and heart disease: the contriving of a relationship. *Am Clin Lab*. 1989;11:26-33.
16. Ravnskov U. An elevated serum cholesterol level is secondary, not causal, in coronary heart disease. *Med Hypotheses*. 1991;36:238-240.
17. Gurr MI. Dietary lipids and coronary heart disease: old evidence, new perspective. *Prog Lipid Res*. 1992;31:195-243.
18. Rosenman RH. The questionable roles of the diet and serum cholesterol in the incidence of ischemic heart disease and its 20th century changes. *Homeostasis*. 1993;34:1-44.

## To the Editor:

Regarding the editorial in *Circulation* in October 1993, Stamler et al<sup>1</sup> seem to imply that the 50% reduction in coronary and cardiovascular disease death since the 1960s is significantly related to health policies, including reduced cholesterol, more physical activity, etc. In the same issue, however, Kaplan and Keil<sup>2</sup> document the increasingly apparent relation between cardiovascular disease and socioeconomic factors, including income, education, and occupation. Blue collar work, low income, lower education level, and high psychological stress relate to cardiovascular mortality. Since the 1960s, per capita income in the developed world has continued its phenomenal ascent, with the standard of living 3 times its level 60 years ago in the United States, 7 times in Germany, and 10 times in Japan. This has been accompanied by a relative reduction in blue collar jobs as well as a widespread increase in education levels. Kaplan et al cite the work of Williams et al,<sup>3</sup> who report a 5-year survival independent of all baseline invasive and noninvasive medical prognostic factors of 0.91 for patients with coronary artery disease and an annual

household income of \$40 000 or more as compared with a 5-year survival of 0.76 in patients with incomes of \$10 000 or less.

It would seem plausible from the above that the 50% reduction in coronary and cardiovascular disease death since the 1960s in the developed world is most likely predominantly a result of the increasing wealth and accompanying lifestyle modifications resulting from this wealth rather than predominantly a result of more enlightened health policies, although such policies may well have made some contribution, as Stamler et al suggest.

G. Kessler, MD  
Caesarea, Israel

## References

1. Stamler J, Stamler R, Brown V, Gotto AM, Greenland P, Grundy S, Hegsted M, Luepker RV, Neaton JD, Steinberg D, Stone N, Van Horn L, Wissler RW. Serum cholesterol: doing the right thing. *Circulation*. 1993;88:1954-1960.
2. Kaplan GA, Keil JE. Socioeconomic factors and cardiovascular disease: a review of the literature. *Circulation*. 1993;88:1973-1998.
3. Williams RB, Barefoot JC, Califf RM, Haney TL, Saunders WB, Pryor DB, Hlatky MA, Siegler IC, Mark DB. Prognostic importance of social and economic resources among medically treated patients with angiographically documented coronary artery disease. *JAMA*. 1992;267:520-524.

## Reply

Our *Circulation* editorial emphasized that the cornerstone of US national health policy on serum cholesterol is a population-wide strategy to achieve by *dietary means* a downward shift in serum cholesterol level, first and foremost for the *primary prevention* of epidemic coronary heart disease (CHD).<sup>1</sup> It concluded: "The present national policy . . . has the added merit that the recommended healthier eating patterns can be beneficial in preventing or controlling other chronic diseases as well as coronary disease. There is no sound evidence that justifies a withdrawal from this policy. On the contrary, we need to expand and intensify efforts to achieve its goals."<sup>1</sup>

Our editorial assessed as unfounded all three concerns set down in the prior editorial by Hulley et al.<sup>2</sup> In the first paragraph of their letter above, Hulley et al note this and restate the three concerns but make no effort to reply to our reasons for concluding that concerns No. 1 and No. 2 were unsound. They focus solely on concern No. 3, related to meta-analyses of data from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of cholesterol lowering. Olson and Ravnskov also rely heavily on these meta-analyses as a basis for their critiques of our editorial and of US national policy on serum cholesterol.

Altogether, their three letters cite findings in 8 such meta-analyses (of 6 to 35 trials).<sup>3-10</sup> However, the fact is that all these meta-analyses are at best irrelevant or at worst misleading in regard to recommended dietary approaches for CHD primary prevention. Specifically, of the cited unifactorial trials on CHD primary prevention, only two were dietary trials. All others were drug trials, hence by definition unrelated to the main thrust, that is, the nutritional emphasis, of US national policy. Lumping diet and drug RCTs together is a flawed use of the meta-analysis method, and citing overall findings from such meta-analyses is inappropriate when the primary issue under discussion is national nutritional policy. Moreover, combining all these RCTs results in ignoring the details of their nature, design, procedure, and outcome that are critical for assessment of their soundness and policy relevance.

As to specifics, first on the two unifactorial diet trials,<sup>11,12</sup> both were actually combined primary and secondary prevention trials. Both had design features that make their findings uninformative in regard to public policy on reduction of coronary and all-cause mortality rates by population-wide improved nutrition. First, they

**Doing the right thing: stop worrying about cholesterol.**  
U Ravnskov

*Circulation*. 1994;90:2572-2573

doi: 10.1161/01.CIR.90.5.2572

*Circulation* is published by the American Heart Association, 7272 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, TX 75231

Copyright © 1994 American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved.

Print ISSN: 0009-7322. Online ISSN: 1524-4539

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the  
World Wide Web at:

<http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/90/5/2572.citation>

**Permissions:** Requests for permissions to reproduce figures, tables, or portions of articles originally published in *Circulation* can be obtained via RightsLink, a service of the Copyright Clearance Center, not the Editorial Office. Once the online version of the published article for which permission is being requested is located, click Request Permissions in the middle column of the Web page under Services. Further information about this process is available in the [Permissions and Rights Question and Answer](#) document.

**Reprints:** Information about reprints can be found online at:  
<http://www.lww.com/reprints>

**Subscriptions:** Information about subscribing to *Circulation* is online at:  
<http://circ.ahajournals.org/subscriptions/>