PREVALENCE OF STATIN INTOLERANCE: A META-ANALYSIS
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Aims Statin intolerance (SI) represents a significant public health problem for which precise estimates of prevalence are needed. Statin intolerance remains an important clinical challenge, and it is associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular events. This meta-analysis estimates the overall prevalence of SI, the prevalence according to different diagnostic criteria and in different disease settings, and identifies possible risk factors/conditions that might increase the risk of SI.

Methods and results We searched several databases up to 31 May 2021, for studies that reported the prevalence of SI. The primary endpoint was overall prevalence and prevalence according to a range of diagnostic criteria [National Lipid Association (NLA), International Lipid Expert Panel (ILEP), and European Atherosclerosis Society (EAS)] and in different disease settings. The secondary endpoint was to identify possible risk factors for SI. A random-effects model was applied to estimate the overall pooled prevalence. A total of 176 studies [112 randomized controlled trials (RCTs); 64 cohort studies] with 4,143,517 patients were ultimately included in the analysis. The overall prevalence of SI was 9.1% (95% confidence interval 8.0–10.0%). The prevalence was similar when defined using NLA, ILEP, and EAS criteria [7.0% (6.0–8.0%), 6.7% (5.0–8.0%), 5.9% (4.0–7.0%), respectively]. The prevalence of SI in RCTs was significantly lower compared with cohort studies [4.9% (4.0–6.0%) vs. 17% (14–19%)]. The prevalence of SI in studies including both primary and secondary prevention patients was much higher than when primary or secondary prevention patients were analysed separately [18% (14–21%), 8.2% (6.0–10%), 9.1% (6.0–11%), respectively]. Statin lipid solubility did
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not affect the prevalence of SI [4.0% (2.0–5.0%) vs. 5.0% (4.0–6.0%)]. Age [odds ratio (OR) 1.33, \( P = 0.04 \)], female gender (OR 1.47, \( P = 0.007 \)), Asian and Black race (\( P < 0.05 \) for both), obesity (OR 1.30, \( P = 0.02 \)), diabetes mellitus (OR 1.26, \( P = 0.02 \)), hypothyroidism (OR 1.37, \( P = 0.01 \)), chronic liver, and renal failure (\( P < 0.05 \) for both) were significantly associated with SI in the meta-regression model. Antiarrhythmic agents, calcium channel blockers, alcohol use, and increased statin dose were also associated with a higher risk of SI.

**Conclusion**

Based on the present analysis of >4 million patients, the prevalence of SI is low when diagnosed according to international definitions. These results support the concept that the prevalence of complete SI might often be overestimated and highlight the need for the careful assessment of patients with potential symptoms related to SI.

**Key question**

What is the overall prevalence of statin intolerance (SI) worldwide? What are the main risk factors of SI?

**Key finding**

The overall prevalence of SI is 9.1% and even lower using the international definitions: National Lipid Association, International Lipid Expert Panel, European Atherosclerosis Society (7.0, 6.7, 5.9%). Female gender, hypothyroidism, high statin dose, advanced age, antiarrhythmics, and obesity are the main factors that increase the risk of SI.

**Take-home message**

Clinicians should use these results to encourage adherence to statin therapy in the patients they treat.

---

**Structured Graphical Abstract**

The worldwide prevalence of statin intolerance and risk factors/conditions that effect or do not effect the risk of statin intolerance.
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Introduction

Cardiovascular (CV) disease (CVD) is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide, despite continuous improvement of medical treatment, diagnosis, and risk factor control. It has been clearly demonstrated that statin therapy confers significant mortality and morbidity benefits in both the primary and secondary prevention of CVD. Although statins are among the most commonly prescribed drugs, non-adherence and discontinuation of statin therapy is an ongoing problem worldwide. The most common cause of discontinuation of statin therapy is statin-associated muscle symptoms (SAMS). Other possible statin-related adverse effects include neurocognitive disorders, hepatotoxicity, haemorrhagic stroke, and renal toxicity. These conditions may lead to discontinuation, but causality has been confirmed only for SAMS, temporary elevation of aminotransferase alanine, and newly diagnosed diabetes. According to the International Lipid Expert Panel (ILEP), statin intolerance (SI) is an inability to tolerate a dose of statin required to sufficiently reduce an individual’s CV risk, limiting the effective treatment of patients at risk of, or with, CVD. The National Lipid Association (NLA) has a wider definition, including any adverse effects relating to the quality of life and leading to the decision to decrease or stop the use of an otherwise beneficial drug. The Luso-Latin American Consortium (LLAC) definition of SI is similar to that of the Canadian Consensus Working Group (CCWG). It refers to an inability to tolerate ≥2 statins at any dose or an inability to tolerate increasing doses. The symptoms must not be attributable to drug–drug interactions or conditions known to increase SI. They indicate that symptomatic criteria include intolerable muscle symptoms [pain, weakness, or cramps with or without creatine kinase (CK) changes] or severe myopathy, and they must appear in the first 12 weeks after initiating treatment or following an increase in dose.

The prevalence of SI is widely debated, in part because of difficulties in identification and diagnosis, possible interaction of different risk factors, different diseases, drugs, and other clinical and demographic indices. In contrast with randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (prevalence usually 5–7%), cohort studies suggest that SI occurs in as many as 30% of treated patients. However, this is likely to be an overestimate or underestimate and in many cases, the symptoms are likely to be attributable to the nocebo/druccebo effect.

Because of these inconsistent findings, the present meta-analysis aimed to estimate the overall prevalence of SI, its prevalence according to various diagnostic criteria, in different disease settings, and to identify possible risk factors for SI.

Methods

Search strategy and selection criteria

We followed the methods recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration and complied with the reporting standards of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guideline of 2020. A PECOS (population, exposure, comparison, outcomes, study design) model was used to shape the clinical question and to design the search strategy (see Supplementary material online, Table S1). The following databases were searched from inception through 31 May 2021: PubMed-Medline, EMBASE, Scopus, Google Scholar, the Cochrane Central Registry of Controlled Trials, and ClinicalTrials.gov. The following keywords were used: statin intolerance, statin toxicity, statin adverse effects, statin side effects, statin-associated muscle symptoms, SAMS, statin-related myopathy, statin-related side effects, statin-related myalgia, statin discontinuation, statin withdrawal, prevalence, occurrence rate, and frequency rate (see Supplementary material online, Table S2). In addition, the references from the selected articles and relevant review articles, and the abstracts from selected congresses: scientific sessions of the European Society of Cardiology, the American Heart Association (AHA), American College of Cardiology (ACC), NLA, and European Atherosclerosis Society (EAS) were screened for additional relevant articles. The wild-card term “*” was used to increase the sensitivity of the search strategy.

Articles were eligible if they reported the prevalence of SI either in primary or secondary prevention and met the following inclusion criteria: (i) trials or cohorts reporting SI, (ii) at least 100 participants included in the analysis, and (iii) available criteria for SI diagnosis. Exclusion criteria were as follows: (i) studies with unclear methodologies to obtain the estimates of SI frequency, (ii) studies that investigated a statin that has been withdrawn from the market, (iii) ongoing trials (unless they reported relevant interim results), (iv) studies only investigating statin discontinuation without specifying intolerance, and (v) short follow-up (<1.5 month/6 weeks).

The search, screening, and data extraction were performed independently by two reviewers (I.B. and J.R.); any disagreements were resolved through discussion with senior investigators (M.B. and P.E.P.). Non-relevant articles were excluded on the basis of title and abstract screening. For each trial, the risk of bias was independently assessed by the same investigators using the revised Cochrane RoB2 tool involving five domains (randomization process, deviation from intended interventions, missing outcome data, outcome measurement, and selection of reported results). The risk of bias in each study was judged to be ‘low’, ‘high’, or ‘unclear’. For the assessment of the risk of bias in cohort studies, the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used. Three domains were evaluated with the following items: (i) selection, (ii) comparability, and (iii) exposure. The risk of bias in each study was judged to be ‘good’, ‘fair’, or ‘poor’.15

Outcome measures

The primary endpoint was the overall prevalence and the prevalence based on each of the international diagnostic criteria: NLA, EAS, and ILEP. The secondary endpoint was the prevalence of SI in groups of patients with different diseases and the analysis of the association between possible risk factors/conditions and the risk of SI. According to the NLA, SI is defined as adverse effects relating to the quality of life, leading to decisions to decrease or stop the use of an otherwise beneficial drug. The ILEP definition stated that SI is an inability to tolerate a dose of statin required to reduce a person’s CV risk sufficiently from their baseline risk and could result from different statin-related side effects. The EAS definition focused only on SAMS: the assessment of the probability of SAMS being due to a statin considering the nature of the muscle symptoms, the elevation in CK levels, and their temporal association with statin initiation, discontinuation, and re-challenge. As stated by the CCWG and LLAC, SI was defined as a clinical syndrome characterized by significant symptoms and biomarker abnormalities that is documented by challenge/dechallenge/re-challenge using ≥2 statins that is not due to drug interactions or untreated risk factors for intolerance (see Supplementary material online, Figure S1). Because
the main outcome was not limited by the type of statin, the CCWG and LLAC criteria were not used in further analyses.

**Data synthesis and statistical analyses**

The meta-analysis was conducted using R Statistical Software (v3.5.1, Boston, MA, USA), using the packages ‘meta’ and ‘metafor’ for meta-analysis. A random-effects model (DerSimonian and Laird method) was applied to estimate the pooled prevalence across the studies. The 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the prevalence reported in the individual studies (see Supplementary material online, Table S1) were estimated from the proportion of cases of SI and sample size using the binomial exact method (Clopper–Pearson method). An inverse variance method was used for weighting each study in the meta-analysis. For the difference of subgroup analysis, we employed post hoc analysis. To investigate the differences between groups, we used the significance test. An \( I^2 \) statistic was also computed for subgroup differences.\(^{14}\) With the inverse variance method, when the estimated probability of the condition of a single study approaches 0 or 1, the pooled mean, resulting in an over-contribution of the study in the final pooled estimation of the meta-analysis. Therefore, to avoid the over-estimated results, we conducted the Freeman–Tukey double arc sine. The final pooled result and 95% CIs were then back-transformed and expressed as percentages for ease of interpretation. The baseline characteristics are reported as the median and range. The mean and expressed as percentages for ease of interpretation. The baseline pooled estimation of the meta-analysis. Therefore, to avoid the over-estimated results, we conducted the Freeman–Tukey double arc sine. The final pooled result and 95% CIs were then back-transformed and expressed as percentages for ease of interpretation. The baseline characteristics are reported as the median and range. The mean and standard deviation values were estimated using the method described by Hozo et al.\(^{16}\) Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using Cochrane’s Q-test and the \( I^2 \) index. As a guide, \( I^2 < 25\% \) indicated low, \( 25–50\% \) moderate, and >50% high heterogeneity.\(^{17}\)

Potential demographic, clinical, and drugs as modifiers of SI were further explored by meta-regression. Meta-regression coefficients and corresponding \( P \)-values are reported. For summary estimates, \( P < 0.05 \) (two-tailed) was considered statistically significant.\(^{18}\)

**Results**

**Study selection and patient population**

A total of 3569 articles were retrieved from the search after duplicates from the different databases were discarded. These articles were first screened by title and abstract, leading to 271 articles that underwent full-text review. After a stringent selection process, a total of 176 studies with 4 143 517 patients and a mean follow-up of 19 ± 7.3 months were included in the analysis.\(^{19–194}\) Out of 176 articles, 112 were RCTs (195 575 patients) and the remaining 64 were cohort studies with 3 947 942 patients. The PRISMA flow diagram is shown in Figure 1 and the key characteristics of the included studies are presented in Supplementary material online, Table S3. The mean age of patients was 60.5 ± 8.9 and 40.9% were females. The White or Caucasian race made up a greater proportion of participants than Afro-American, Asian, Hispanic, or others (81.1, 82.5, 1.45, and 1.2%, respectively; \( P < 0.001 \); Table 1).

**Prevalence of statin intolerance**

The pooled prevalence of SI was 9.1% (95% CI 8.0–10%, see Supplementary material online, Figure S2). The prevalence based on NLA criteria was similar compared with using the ILEP or EAS definitions (7.0% (6.0–8.0%), \( I^2 = 98\% \); 6.7% (5.0–8.0%), \( I^2 = 98\% \); 5.9% (4.0–7.0%), \( I^2 = 93\% \); respectively; see Supplementary material online, Figures S3–S5). The prevalence of SI in RCTs was significantly lower compared with cohort studies (4.9% (4.0–6.0%), \( I^2 = 93\% \); vs. 17% (14–19%), \( I^2 = 98\% \); \( P < 0.001 \); see Supplementary material online, Figures S6 and S7).

In an analysis stratified by the type of disease prevention, SI was more common in pooled analyses of studies which included both primary and secondary prevention [18% (14–21%), \( I^2 = 99\% \);] patients than in either pooled analyses of studies which only included primary or secondary prevention patients [8.2% (6.0–10%, \( I^2 = 98\% \); 9.1% (6.0–11%, \( I^2 = 98\% \); respectively; Figures 2–4).

In the subgroup analysis according to disease states, in primary prevention patients with familial hypercholesterolaemia (FH), hypercholesterolaemia, dyslipidaemia, and Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), the prevalence of SI was 9.0% (6.0–13%, \( I^2 = 96\% \); 12% (11–13%, \( I^2 = 99\% \); 13% (7.0–18%, \( I^2 = 98\% \); and 6.0% (2.0–10%, \( I^2 = 99\% \); (see Supplementary material online, Figure S8), respectively. In secondary prevention: stable coronary artery disease (CAD), acute coronary syndrome (ACS), myocardial infarction (MI), and stroke/transient ischaemic attack were associated with SI prevalence of 8% (2.0–18%, \( I^2 = 98\% \); 13% (2.0–24%, \( I^2 = 98\% \); 13% (2.0–24%, \( I^2 = 98\% \); and 5.4% (3.9–9.1%, \( I^2 = 96\% \); respectively (see Supplementary material online, Figure S9).

We also compared the prevalence of SI in patients treated with lipophilic (atorvastatin, simvastatin, lovastatin, fluvastatin, and pitavastatin) and hydrophilic statins (pravastatin and rosuvastatin). The pooled prevalence was similar in these two types [4.0% (2.0–5.0%, \( I^2 = 97\% \); vs. 5.0% (4.0–6.0%, \( I^2 = 98\% \);, respectively; \( P = 0.33 \); see Supplementary material online, Figures S10 and S11]. A summary of SI prevalence is shown in Figure 5. Between-study heterogeneity was large (\( I^2 \geq 93\% \)). Tests assessing bias were non-significant (\( P > 0.28 \)).

**Interaction of demographic indices with statin intolerance**

In meta-regression analyses, age (as a continuous variable) was found to be significantly associated with the higher risk for SI [odds ratio (OR) 1.33, 95% CI 1.25–1.41; \( P = 0.04 \); see Supplementary material online, Figure S12A]. Likewise, the older age \( \geq 65 \) years (OR 1.31, 95% CI 1.22–1.45; \( P = 0.04 \); see Supplementary material online, Figure S12B) and female sex were associated with a higher risk of SI (OR 1.47, 95% CI 1.38–1.53; \( P = 0.007 \); see Supplementary material online, Figure S12C). Analysis of demographic indices revealed that the prevalence of SI was associated with the percentage of participants of Asian and African-American race (\( P < 0.05 \) for both, see Supplementary material online, Figure S12G and H). However, no association was observed with White, Caucasian, and Hispanic races with SI (\( P > 0.05 \) for all, see Supplementary material online, Figure S12D–F). A summary of the meta-regression of demographic indices on SI is shown in Figure 6A.

**Interaction of clinical indices with statin intolerance**

A range of potential factors was tested for possible interaction with SI. Positive associations were found for obesity (OR 1.30,
interaction of drugs and addiction diseases with statin intolerance

The percentage of smokers was not significantly associated with the prevalence of SI (OR 1.03, \( P = 0.60 \)), whereas the percentage of alcohol users used showed a significant association with the prevalence of SI (OR 1.22, \( P = 0.03 \)). Moreover, exercise (OR 1.23, \( P = 0.03 \)), calcium channel blockers (CCB) (OR 1.31, \( P = 0.03 \)), and antiarrhythmic agents (OR 1.35, \( P = 0.03 \)) were associated with higher risk of SI, whereas warfarin use was not (OR 1.04, \( P = 0.15 \)). In addition, increased statin dose was associated with a higher prevalence of SI (OR 1.37, \( P = 0.01 \)), whereas the duration of study follow-up was not associated with the occurrence of SI (OR 1.06, \( P = 0.48 \), see Supplementary material online, Figure S14). A summary of the results of meta-regression with respect to associations between risk factors and drugs on SI is shown in Figure 6B.

Risk of bias assessment

The assessment of the risk of bias in the included studies using RoB2 for RCTs and NOS for cohort studies showed that most studies had moderate to high-quality level in defining objectives and the main outcomes (see Supplementary material online, Tables S4 and S5).

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, the present meta-analysis is the first to evaluate the overall prevalence of SI worldwide, the prevalence based on different diagnostic criteria and in different disease settings. The results of our meta-analysis of 176 studies with 4,143,517 patients and a mean follow-up of 19 ± 7.3 months showed that the worldwide prevalence of SI is 9.1%, irrespective of the definition applied. Older age, female gender, Asian and
| Table 1. Summary of main characteristics of studies included in the present meta-analysis |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| All studies | RCT studies | Cohort studies | Primary prevention | Secondary prevention | Combined patients* |
|-------------------------------------------------|
| No. of studies | 176 | 112 | 64 | 93 | 54 | 29 |
| Overall prevalence, % (95% CI) | 9.1 (8.0–10) | 4.9 (4.0–6.0) | 17 (14–19) | 8.2 (6.0–10) | 9.1 (6.0–11) | 8.7 (5.9–11) | 16 (11–19) |
| NLA | 7.0 (6.0–8.0) | 4.8 (3.0–6.0) | 11 (6.0–17) | 7.5 (5.0–9.8) | 8.7 (5.9–11) | 16 (11–19) |
| ILEP | 6.7 (5.0–8.0) | 4.9 (3.5–6.2) | 10 (7.2–15) | 7.3 (5.0–9.1) | 8.1 (6.0–11) | 15.3 (10–18) |
| EAS | 5.9 (4.0–7.0) | 3.8 (2.4–5.4) | 8.4 (5.7–11) | 6.2 (4.8–8.9) | 5.5 (4.0–9.1) | 12 (9.1–17) |
| Sample size, n | 4143517 | 195575 | 3947942 | 1726384 | 1166745 | 1250388 |
| Female sex, % | 40.9 | 38.6 | 43.1 | 44.4 | 31.2 | 47.3 |
| Age, years, mean ± SD | 60.5 ± 8.88 | 59.2 ± 8.12 | 61.9 ± 7.89 | 58.3 ± 7.12 | 62.9 ± 9.1 | 62.9 ± 9.1 |
| Race, % | | | | | | |
| White or Caucasian | 81.1 | 78 | 80 | 81 | 85 | 82 |
| Black | 8.2 | 6.2 | 11 | 7.5 | 3.3 | 11.9 |
| Asian | 5.1 | 6.1 | 3.2 | 6.2 | 2.9 | 5.1 |
| Hispanic | 4.5 | 8 | 5.4 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 0.6 |
| Other | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

Cl, confidence interval; NLA, National Lipid Association; ILEP, International Lipid Expert Panel; EAS, European Atherosclerosis Society; RCT, randomized controlled trial; SD, standard deviation.
*aCombined: primary and secondary prevention patients.
Prevalence and risk factors of statin intolerance

Figure 2 Prevalence of statin intolerance in primary prevention studies. Note: D–L random-effects model was used.
Figure 3 Prevalence of statin intolerance in secondary prevention studies. Note: D–L random-effects model was used.
meta-analysis, we have attempted to investigate what risk factors/conditions might be linked to SI prevalence using meta-regression. Pooled analysis demonstrated that many demographic, clinical, and other risk factors are associated with SI. Older age, female gender, Asian, and African-American races were associated with a higher incidence of SI, whereas White, Caucasian, and Hispanic races were not associated with higher SI risk. Many commonly observed risk factors and conditions may also be significantly associated with SI occurrence, including obesity, diabetes mellitus, hypothyroidism, chronic liver disease, and renal failure. Depression was negatively associated with SAMS, perhaps because of under-reporting in these patients. Smoking and anticoagulant drugs were not associated with SI; however, the use of alcohol, exercise, antiarrhythmic agents, and CCB was positively associated with SI. Finally, as previously reported, higher doses of statins were associated with a greater prevalence of SI.

Figure 4 Prevalence of statin intolerance in combined primary and secondary prevention studies. Note: D–L random-effects model was used.
Figure 5 Prevalence of statin intolerance—summary figure. NLA, National Lipid Association; ILEP, International Lipid Expert Panel; EAS, European Atherosclerosis Society; RCTs, randomized controlled trials; DM, diabetes mellitus; sCAD, stable coronary artery disease; ASC, acute coronary syndrome; MI, myocardial infarction; TIA, transient ischaemic attack; SI, statin intolerance.

Figure 6 Summary meta-regression of (A) demographic and (B) risk factors and drugs with statin intolerance. SI, statin intolerance; BMI, body mass index; CLD, chronic liver disease; CRF, chronic renal failure; CCB, calcium channel blockers.
Strength and limitations

Our meta-analysis has some limitations. Heterogeneity between studies was present in our analysis (I^2 = 93–99%; unknown confounding may have led to this), although this was anticipated because of the broad scope of this systematic analysis, and due to very large data, we could not test the influence analysis that would resolve the effect size of different weight across the studies. The statistical examination of potential publication bias through Egger and funnel plots is not appropriate because studies with <100 patients were excluded from this systematic review.

Our analysis depended upon data reported in published studies. Some potential risk factors for SI were not reported with ideal detail or precision, such as the amount of alcohol consumption, types of exercise, and physical activity endurance. In this line, race distribution was not similar with predominantly Caucasian/White race (81.1%). It is also important to emphasize the importance of the nocebo/drucebo effect that was not examined in the included studies and might have distorted the final results to some extent (it might be responsible even for >50% of SAMS).

However, besides the new effective one-of-trial approach that does not apply in clinical practice, we do not have suitable tools to exclude this phenomenon. Moreover, in most of the included trials, the diagnosis was based on the approved definition of drugs and/or the severity of the diseases when statins might be used to suggest appropriate management techniques (e.g. doses affecting the liver, kidney, and thyroid. Finally, our analysis cannot be used to suggest appropriate management techniques (e.g. doses of drugs and/or the severity of the diseases when statins might be used without increasing the risk of SI).

Conclusion

Based on the data from >4 million patients, we demonstrated that the overall prevalence of SI is relatively low, especially when SI is objectively determined using the recognized international definitions. These results support the concept that the prevalence of complete SI is often overestimated and highlights the need for a very careful assessment of patients with SI, to decrease the risk of unnecessary statin discontinuation, and suboptimal lipid-lowering therapy. Clinicians should use these results to encourage adherence to statin therapy in their patients.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available at European Heart Journal online.
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