

Lipid-lowering therapy in patients with coronary heart disease: an Italian real-life survey. Results from the Survey on Risk Factors and Cardiovascular secondary prevention and drug strategies (SOFOCLES) in Italy

Caterina Oriana Aragona,¹ Andrea Bianco,² Roberto Caruso,³ Massimo Cerulli,⁴ Nicola Cosentino,⁵ Antonio Cittadini,⁶ Michele Gabriele,⁷ Mario Mallardo,⁸ Roberto Marini,⁹ Bruna Miserrafiti,¹⁰ Pietro Palermo,¹¹ Alfonso Galati¹²

¹Internal Medicine Unit, Medical Area Department, Papardo Hospital, Messina; ²Cardiology Unit, "G. Brotzu" Hospital, Cagliari; ³Division of Cardiac Rehabilitation, I.O.M.I. Franco Scalabrino, Messina; ⁴Villa Pineta, Modena; ⁵"V. Cosentino" Civic Hospital, Cariati (CS); ⁶Department of Translational Medical Sciences, Federico II University, Naples; ⁷Cardiology Unit, "A. Aiello" Hospital, Mazara del Vallo (TP); ⁸Rehabilitation Unit, "San Gennaro" Hospital, ASL Napoli 1 Centro, Naples; ⁹Policlinico Triestino Salus, Trieste; ¹⁰Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation Unit, "T. Evoli" Hospital, Melito Porto Salvo (RC); ¹¹Cardiac Rehabilitation Unit, Centro Cardiologico Monzino, IRCSS, Milan; ¹²Cardiac Rehabilitation Unit, Villa Betania-Giomi, Rome, Italy

Correspondence: Mario Mallardo, Rehabilitation Unit, "San Gennaro" Hospital, ASL Napoli 1 Centro, Naples, Italy.
E-mail: mario-mallardo@virgilio.it

Key words: coronary heart disease, cholesterol, secondary prevention, statin.

Contributions: all the authors made a substantial intellectual contribution, read and approved the final version of the manuscript, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Conflict of interest: the authors have no competing interests to declare.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: the study was approved by the local ethics committee (NP 2822 – Studio SOFOCLES). This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Informed consent: all patients provided informed consent to participate in the study.

Patient consent for publication: the manuscript does not contain any individual person's data in any form.

Availability of data and materials: data and materials are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Funding: the study was supported by SANOFI; the sponsor had no role in the design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments: the authors thank all the SOFOCLES Investigators.

Received: 1 March 2024.

Accepted: 17 June 2024.

Early view: 10 September 2024.

Publisher's note: all claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article or claim that may be made by its manufacturer is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

©Copyright: the Author(s), 2024

Licensee PAGEpress, Italy

Monaldi Archives for Chest Disease 2025; 95:2972

doi: 10.4081/monaldi.2024.2972

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

Abstract

In patients at high cardiovascular risk, a low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) reduction of $\geq 50\%$ from baseline and an LDL-C goal of < 70 mg/dL (or < 55 mg/dL in very high-risk patients) are recommended. Multiple registry and retrospective studies have shown that patients with high atherosclerotic cardiovascular risk often do not reach the targets defined by the European Society of Cardiology guidelines as a result of suboptimal management of LDL-C. Here, we report the data on lipid-lowering therapy and lipid targets from the Survey on Risk Factors and Cardiovascular secondary prevention and drug strategies (SOFOCLES), an observational, prospective study designed to collect data on patients with ischemic heart disease treated at cardiac outpatient clinics across the Italian national territory. We included patients with known coronary heart disease (CHD) who underwent follow-up visits at various outpatient cardiology clinics. A total of 2532 patients were included (mean age: 67 ± 17 years, 80% male). Among patients with available laboratory data ($n=1712$), 995 (58%) had LDL-C < 70 mg/dL, 717 (42%) had LDL-C ≥ 70 mg/dL, and 470 (27%) had LDL-C < 55 mg/dL. Patients who more frequently achieved the recommended LDL-C levels were male, had diabetes, had a higher educational level, and performed intense physical activity. Statins were used in 2339 (92%) patients, high-intensity statins (e.g., rosuvastatin 20/40 mg or atorvastatin 40/80 mg) in 1547 patients (61% of the whole population and 66% of patients on statins), and ezetimibe in 891 patients (35%). Patients receiving high-intensity statins tended to be younger, not to have diabetes, and to have been included in a cardiac rehabilitation program. In a real-world sample of Italian patients with CHD, adherence to lipid-lowering therapy fell markedly short of optimal levels. Many patients did not achieve the LDL-C target of 70 mg/dL, and even fewer reached the LDL-C target of 55 mg/dL. Notably, patients with a lower educational level had a greater likelihood of being undertreated. Strategies aimed at improving preventive interventions for CHD and overcoming social disparities should be evaluated and optimized.

Graphical abstract

CENTRAL ILLUSTRATION: Results, clinical implications and future prospectives

The SOFOCLES survey involved 20 centers (selected based on availability) providing routine outpatient follow-up services, including cardiac rehabilitation (CR), acute cardiac care and outpatient cardiology services. From February 2016 to December 2021, 2532 patients were included (mean age 67 ± 17 years; 80% male).



Statins were used in 2339 (92%) patients, high-intensity statins (e.g., rosuvastatin 20/40 mg or atorvastatin 40/80 mg) in 1547 patients (61% of the whole population and 66% of patients on statins), and ezetimibe in 891 patients (35%). Patients receiving high-intensity statins tended to be younger, not to have diabetes and to have been included in a cardiac rehabilitation program.



In a real-world sample of Italian patients with CHD, adherence to lipid-lowering therapy fell markedly short of optimal levels.



Strategies aimed at improving the implementation of preventive intervention in CHD (overcoming social disparities) should be evaluated and optimized.

Introduction

Dyslipidemia, characterized by elevated levels of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), is a major risk factor for coronary artery disease (CAD) [1,2]. Lipid-lowering therapies play a crucial role in CAD management, aiming at decreasing LDL-C levels and improving cardiovascular outcomes [3]. Furthermore, no threshold below which lowering LDL-C is considered beneficial or harmful is known [4,5].

In the 2016 European Society of Cardiology/European Atherosclerosis Society (ESC/EAS) guidelines, an LDL-C reduction of $\geq 50\%$ from baseline and an LDL-C goal < 70 mg/dL are recommended [6], whereas in the 2019 ESC/EAS guidelines, an LDL-C goal < 55 mg/dL is suggested for very high-risk patients [7].

Multiple lipid-lowering agents have shown efficacy in lowering LDL-C and improving outcomes in patients with CAD. Statins, the mainstay of lipid-lowering therapy, have shown consistent benefits in reducing the risk for cardiovascular events and mortality. Large-scale trials have provided robust evidence supporting the use of statins in CAD management [8,9]. Ezetimibe, in combination with statins, incrementally lowers LDL-C levels and improves cardiovascular outcomes [10]. However, in patients at high cardiovascular risk treated with statins and ezetimibe, residual risk remains [11].

The introduction of proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 (PCSK9) inhibitors, a newer class of lipid-lowering agents, has revolutionized the treatment landscape for patients with CAD with persistently high LDL-C levels despite maximal statin therapy [12,13]. Combination therapies, including statins with ezetimibe or PCSK9 inhibitors, have shown additional LDL-C-lowering effects, thus leading to a further decrease in risk.

Inclisiran, a small interfering RNA molecule, is a first-in-class medication that inhibits PCSK9 synthesis. Treatment with inclisiran

has been shown to markedly decrease LDL-C [14], but its effects on cardiovascular outcomes have not been established yet.

Bempedoic acid is a novel lipid-lowering agent that acts upstream of statins by inhibiting the enzyme ATP citrate lyase [15]. Recently, treatment with bempedoic acid has been associated with a lower risk of major adverse cardiovascular events in statin-intolerant patients [16].

Despite this evidence, many studies based on registry or retrospective data have shown that patients with high atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) risk often do not reach the LDL-C targets recommended by the ESC/EAS guidelines and have suboptimal management of LDL-C [17,18].

In the present study, we report the data on lipid-lowering therapies and LDL-C targets recorded in the Survey on Risk Factors and Cardiovascular secondary prevention and drug strategies (SOFOCLES), an observational study designed to collect data on patients with coronary heart disease (CHD) treated at cardiac outpatient clinics across the Italian national territory.

Materials and Methods

The SOFOCLES survey involved 20 centers (selected based on availability) providing routine outpatient follow-up services, including cardiac rehabilitation (CR), acute cardiac care, and outpatient cardiology services.

All patients with known CHD who underwent a follow-up visit at various outpatient cardiology clinics were included. The inclusion criteria were: i) patients with clinical and instrumental evidence of previous acute coronary syndrome and ii) patients with obstructive CAD with any of the following: a) previous coronary artery bypass graft (CABG); b) previous percutaneous coronary intervention $\pm$ stenting (bare metal stent, drug-eluting stent, or bio-active stent); or

c) previous coronary angiography findings of significant stenosis or evidence of ischemia at provocative tests.

According to the 2016 ESC/EAS guidelines, these patients are classified as being at very high cardiovascular risk and should achieve an LDL-C treatment goal of <70 mg/dL and/or a reduction of LDL-C $\geq 50\%$ from baseline.

Patients with one or more of the above clinical conditions were eligible for enrollment if the minimum length of time from the index event was ≥ 3 months, and the maximum length of time was < 5 years from the index event or initial diagnosis.

All patients provided signed informed consent. The study was approved by the relevant ethics committees.

The following variables were recorded: sex, age, history of diabetes, hypertension, smoking status, obesity, physical activity (none, mild, or intense), educational level (none or primary school, secondary school, high school, or bachelor's degree), heart rate, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, height, weight, waist circumference and medical therapy. Statin therapy was grouped into high-intensity (atorvastatin 40/80 mg or rosuvastatin 20/40 mg) or low-to-moderate intensity according to the 2013 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) guidelines [19].

Patients were asked to provide their most recent laboratory values of total cholesterol, LDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, blood glucose, and triglycerides; only laboratory results obtained in the previous 12 months were considered.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are reported as mean and standard deviation, and categorical variables are reported as numbers and percentages. An unpaired *t*-test was used to compare differences in continuous variables, and a chi-squared test was used to compare differences in categorical variables. A *p*-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Study population

Only patients from centers that completed the study were evaluated. From February 2016 to December 2021, 2532 patients were included (mean age 67 ± 17 years; 80% male). Patient characteristics are reported in Table 1. Among patients with available laboratory data ($n=1712$), 995 (58%) had LDL-C ≤ 70 mg/dL and 470 (27%) had LDL-C ≤ 55 mg/dL.

A comparison of clinical characteristics between patients who reached or did not reach the LDL-C target of < 70 mg/dL is shown in Table 2. Patients who reached the LDL-C target were more frequently male, had diabetes, and a higher educational level, and performed intense physical activity.

An LDL-C target of < 70 mg/dL was used as recommended by the 2016 ESC/EAS guidelines available at the time when the study was carried out.

Lipid-lowering therapy

Statins were used in 2339 (92%) patients. Of 193 patients not on statins, 61 patients had intolerance, 3 patients had contraindications, and no reason was reported for 101 patients. Statin use was as follows: Pravastatin 10 patients (0.42%); Simvastatin 190 patients (8.12%); Atorvastatin 1551 patients (66.3%); Rosuvastatin 570

patients (24.3%); other statin 18 patients (0.76%); and no statin 165 patients (6.56%). High-intensity statins (*e.g.*, rosuvastatin 20/40 mg or atorvastatin 40/80 mg) were used in 1547 patients (61% of the whole population and 66% of patients on statins).

Ezetimibe was used in 891 (35%) patients. Differences between patients with vs. without high-intensity statin use are shown in Table 3. Patients on high-intensity statins tended to be younger, not to have diabetes, and to have participated in a CR program. A total of 26 (1.03%) patients were on a PCSK9 inhibitor.

Discussion

In the present study, in a large sample of Italian patients with CHD, the target LDL-C levels were achieved in slightly more than half of the patients. A substantial proportion of patients (42%) had LDL-C ≥ 70 mg/dL. Furthermore, in this Italian cohort, drug treatment was far from optimal in many patients, with 40% of participants not receiving high-intensity treatment despite their high-risk level.

Table 1. Patient characteristics.

Patients, n	2532
Age (years)	67 ± 17
Male sex, n (%)	2026 (80)
Cardiovascular disease history, n (%)	
Stable angina	313 (12.44)
Unstable angina	297 (11.80)
STEMI	984 (39.11)
NSTEMI	641 (25.48)
CABG	451 (17)
PCI	1972 (78)
Unknown	281 (11.17)
Medical history, n (%)	
Diabetes	673 (26)
Dyslipidemia	1720 (68)
Hypertension	1806 (71)
Obesity	556 (22)
Active smoker	374 (14)
Former smoker	1175 (47)
Physical activity ($n=1749$), n (%)	
None	725 (41)
Moderate	860 (49)
Intense	164 (9)
Cardiac rehabilitation, n (%)	1430 (56)
Clinical features	
Heart rate (bpm)	65 ± 11
SBP (mmHg)	127 ± 16
DBP (mmHg)	75 ± 9
Height (cm)	168 ± 10
Weight (kg)	79 ± 15
BMI (kg/m^2)	28 ± 13
Waist circumference (cm)	99 ± 12
Laboratory ($n=1712$)	
Total cholesterol (mg/dL)	136.2 ± 32
LDL-C (mg/dL), n (%)	70.7 ± 26
≤ 70 mg/dL	995 (58)
< 55 mg/dL	470 (27)
HDL-C (mg/dL)	45.8 ± 14
Triglycerides (mg/dL)	121.7 ± 64
Glycemia (mg/dL)	111.6 ± 33

BMI, body mass index; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; NSTEMI, non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; SBP, systolic blood pressure; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction.

Table 2. Differences between patients who reached or did not reach the low-density lipoprotein cholesterol target of 70 mg/dL.

	All		LDL-C $\geq$ 70 mg/dL		LDL-C<70 mg/dL		p
	n	n=1712	n	n=717	n	n=995	
Male sex, n (%)	1712	1398 (81.7)	717	553 (77.1)	995	845 (84.9)	0.000*
Age (years)	1712	66 $\pm$ 11	717	67 $\pm$ 11	995	66 $\pm$ 11	0.396§
Diabetes, n (%)	1712	452 (26.4)	717	157 (21.9)	995	295 (29.6)	0.000*
Dyslipidemia, n (%)	1712	1217 (71.1)	717	559 (78.0)	995	658 (66.1)	0.000*
Hypertension, n (%)	1712	1235 (72.1)	717	525 (73.2)	995	710 (71.4)	0.396*
Obesity, n (%)	1712	415 (24.2)	717	167 (23.3)	995	248 (24.9)	0.437*
Active smoker, n (%)	1527	805 (52.7)	645	344 (53.3)	882	461 (52.3)	0.680*
Former smoker, n (%)	1527	262 (17.2)	645	115 (17.8)	882	147 (16.7)	0.552*
Moderate PA, n (%)	1229	583 (47.4)	515	230 (44.7)	714	353 (49.4)	0.098*
Intense PA, n (%)	1229	141 (11.5)	515	30 (5.8)	714	111 (15.5)	0.000*
Educational level, n (%)							
None/primary school	1211	246 (20.3)	511	124 (24.3)	700	122 (17.4)	0.003*
Secondary school	1211	413 (34.1)	511	175 (34.2)	700	238 (34.0)	0.929*
High school	1211	455 (37.6)	511	185 (36.2)	700	270 (38.6)	0.401*
Bachelor's degree	1211	97 (8.0)	511	27 (5.3)	700	70 (10.0)	0.003*
Cardiac rehabilitation, n (%)	1492	997 (66.8)	621	399 (64.3)	871	598 (68.7)	0.075*
Heart rate (bpm)	1678	65 $\pm$ 11	699	66 $\pm$ 12	979	65 $\pm$ 11	0.198§
SBP (mmHg)	1678	128 $\pm$ 16	704	128 $\pm$ 16	974	127 $\pm$ 16	0.372§
DBP (mmHg)	1678	76 $\pm$ 9	704	76 $\pm$ 9	974	76 $\pm$ 9	0.437§
Weight (kg)	1535	80 $\pm$ 14	634	79 $\pm$ 14	901	80 $\pm$ 14	0.360§
Waist circumference (cm)	738	100 $\pm$ 12	260	100 $\pm$ 12	478	100 $\pm$ 12	0.685§
BMI (kg/m ²)	1498	27.7 $\pm$ 4.3	614	27.8 $\pm$ 4.3	884	27.7 $\pm$ 4.4	0.503§

BMI, body mass index; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; PA, physical activity; SBP, systolic blood pressure; *Chi-squared test; §analysis of variance.

Table 3. Differences between patients on high vs. low-to-moderate intensity statin.

	All		High-intensity statin		Low-to-moderate intensity statin		p
	n	n=2339	n	n=792	n	n=1547	
Male sex, n (%)	2339	1898 (81.1)	792	630 (79.5)	1547	1268 (82.0)	0.157*
Age	2339	67 $\pm$ 11	792	69 $\pm$ 11	1547	66 $\pm$ 11	0.000§
Diabetes, n (%)	2339	623 (26.6)	792	239 (30.2)	1547	384 (24.8)	0.006*
Dyslipidemia, n (%)	2339	1609 (68.8)	792	551 (69.6)	1547	1058 (68.4)	0.560*
Hypertension, n (%)	2339	1690 (72.3)	792	603 (76.1)	1547	1087 (70.3)	0.003*
Obesity, n (%)	2339	523 (22.4)	792	174 (22.0)	1547	349 (22.6)	0.746*
Former smoker, n (%)	2040	348 (17.1)	670	73 (10.9)	1370	275 (20.1)	0.000*
Current smoker, n (%)	2040	1091 (53.5)	670	375 (56.0)	1370	716 (52.3)	0.115*
Moderate PA, n (%)	1631	830 (50.9)	528	273 (51.7)	1103	557 (50.5)	0.649*
Intense PA, n (%)	1631	161 (9.9)	528	38 (7.2)	1103	123 (11.2)	0.012*
Educational level, n (%)							
None/primary school	1626	373 (22.9)	534	133 (24.9)	1092	240 (22.0)	0.187*
Secondary school	1626	557 (34.3)	534	174 (32.6)	1092	383 (35.1)	0.321*
High school	1626	568 (34.9)	534	185 (34.6)	1092	383 (35.1)	0.865*
Bachelor's degree	1626	128 (7.9)	534	42 (7.9)	1092	86 (7.9)	0.994*
Cardiac rehabilitation, n (%)	2000	1328 (66.4)	670	421 (62.8)	1330	907 (68.2)	0.017*
Heart rate (bpm)	2262	65 $\pm$ 11	764	66 $\pm$ 12	1498	65 $\pm$ 11	0.129§
SBP (mmHg)	2268	128 $\pm$ 16	764	129 $\pm$ 16	1504	127 $\pm$ 16	0.029§
DBP (mmHg)	2268	75 $\pm$ 9	764	76 $\pm$ 9	1504	75 $\pm$ 9	0.020§
Weight (kg)	2062	79 $\pm$ 15	686	79 $\pm$ 15	1376	79 $\pm$ 14	0.493§
Waist circumference (cm)	993	100 $\pm$ 12	297	100 $\pm$ 12	696	100 $\pm$ 12	0.842§
BMI (kg/m ²)	2009	27.5 $\pm$ 4.3	676	27.5 $\pm$ 4.4	1333	27.6 $\pm$ 4.3	0.646§
LDL-C (mg/dL)	1592	69 $\pm$ 25	548	71 $\pm$ 26	1044	68 $\pm$ 24	0.063§
LDL-C <70 mg/dL, n (%)	1592	959 (60.2)	548	313 (57.1)	1044	646 (61.9)	0.065*

BMI, body mass index; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; PA, physical activity; SBP, systolic blood pressure; *Chi-squared test; §analysis of variance.

Patients who reached the LDL-C target, compared with those who did not, tended to be male, to have diabetes and no history of dyslipidemia, to perform intense physical activity, and to have a higher educational level.

Some of these data may be explained by the use of high-intensity statins, which were more frequently prescribed to patients with higher levels of physical activity. Furthermore, patients participating in CR programs showed a trend toward better LDL-C control and significantly higher use of high-intensity statins.

Unexpectedly, in patients taking high-intensity vs. low/moderate intensity statins, no significant differences in LDL-C levels and the number of patients meeting the LDL-C target were observed. This finding might be explained by differences in LDL-C levels before therapy initiation: patients taking high-intensity statins might have had higher starting values, thus resulting in large relative decreases after therapy.

A previous report has shown that lipid-lowering treatment is far from optimal in several countries across Europe. In a real-world study from Germany in patients with ASCVD, 43.6% received statin therapy; their mean LDL-C was 117.8 mg/dL, and 8.5% achieved an LDL-C <70 mg/dL [20].

In the EUROASPIRE V study in 7824 hospitalized patients and healthy individuals in primary care at high risk of developing cardiovascular disease, an LDL-C <70 mg/dL was observed in 30% of the study population [17].

In the DA VINCI study, a 188-country cross-sectional observational study of patients treated for primary or secondary prevention across Europe, LDL-C <70 mg/dL was observed in 39% of patients [18]. In the same study, 54% of patients achieved their risk-based goal according to the 2016 ESC/EAS guidelines, and 33% achieved the goals according to the 2019 ESC/EAS guidelines. In secondary prevention, high-intensity statins were used in 38% of patients.

More recently, in the SANTORINI study, in participants at high or very high risk of ASCVD treated in different care settings, a treatment gap in LDL-C control was observed between high and very high-risk patients in Europe between 2020 and 2021. The median LDL-C was 78 mg/dL among patients with ASCVD receiving monotherapy or combination therapy, with 20.9% and 32.3% reaching their goals, respectively [21].

In our cohort, the prevalence of patients meeting their target LDL-C levels was higher than previously reported; more frequent use of ezetimibe and the participation of more than half of the study population in CR programs might account for this difference.

A central aspect of the success of secondary prevention programs is the opportunity for access to CR. In fact, a rehabilitation program may successfully improve adherence to evidence-based therapies, leading to a considerable reduction of the risk for cardiovascular events and recurrent infarction. Consequently, according to the AHA/ACC guidelines, comprehensive cardiovascular rehabilitation is a class I recommendation for all eligible patients with acute coronary syndrome, and patients immediately after CABG or percutaneous coronary intervention, either before hospital discharge or during the first follow-up office visit [22].

One hallmark of providing lipid-lowering therapy is matching the ASCVD status or risk to appropriate statin intensity. However, many patients are not treated with an appropriate statin intensity for their cardiovascular risk. Even patients on high-intensity statin therapy failed to reach the recommended LDL-C target, thus confirming the importance of larger implementation of lipid-lowering therapies with PCSK9 inhibitors or bempedoic acid.

Our data also demonstrated the existence of a gap associated with educational level: patients with higher levels of education more

often received adequate treatment and more often reached their LDL-C targets.

The SOFOCLES survey, including CR, acute cardiac care, and outpatient cardiology services, demonstrated that this gap is unfortunately evident at any level of intensity of care. Thus, substantial effort should be made to eradicate this disparity in care.

The Effectus Study also demonstrated that there exists heterogeneity in lipid-lowering treatment intensity and discrepancies in clinical management of CV risk in Italy, but its results are obtained only in patients involved in CR programs [23].

Study limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged. This study was performed in outpatient offices in a cardiological setting. Our results cannot be generalized to other medical settings or to primary care or internal medicine practices. Laboratory tests were not centralized. Because the intent of the study was to provide a real-world view, patient data from other laboratories in the 12 months before each visit were recorded. The physical activity level was evaluated on an individual basis. Laboratory values were available for 1712/2532 patients; however, the lack of laboratory surveillance in patients at high cardiovascular risk (who did not present any laboratory results during the visit) is in itself an issue that should be addressed and a major limitation of many follow-up programs.

Conclusions

In a real-world sample of Italian patients with CHD, we found that adherence to lipid-lowering therapy, as indicated by the ESC/EAS guidelines, falls markedly short of optimal levels. Many patients do not achieve the LDL-C target of 70 mg/dL, and even fewer reach the LDL-C target of 55 mg/dL. Consistent with previous reports, our study shows that attainment of the recommended LDL-C goals is unsatisfactory. Therefore, several adverse cardiovascular outcomes are preventable, and patients with a lower educational level have a greater likelihood of being undertreated. Lipid-lowering therapy plays a crucial role in CAD management by reducing LDL-C levels and improving cardiovascular outcomes. Statins continue to serve as the foundation of therapy, as supported by extensive evidence. Combination therapies and the emergence of PCSK9 inhibitors offer additional options for lowering LDL-C in high-risk patients with CAD. Strategies aimed at improving the implementation of preventive intervention in CHD (overcoming social disparities) should be evaluated and optimized.

References

1. Kannel WB, Castelli WP, Gordon T, McNamara PM. Serum cholesterol, lipoproteins, and the risk of coronary heart disease. The Framingham study. *Ann Intern Med* 1971;74:1-12.
2. Borén J, Chapman MJ, Krauss RM, et al. Low-density lipoproteins cause atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease: pathophysiological, genetic, and therapeutic insights: a consensus statement from the European Atherosclerosis Society Consensus Panel. *Eur Heart J* 2020;41:2313-30.
3. Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaborators, Mihaylova B, Emberson J, et al. The effects of lowering LDL cholesterol with statin therapy in people at low risk of vascular disease: meta-analysis of individual data from 27 randomised trials. *Lancet* 2012;380:581-90.

4. Tobert JA. LDL cholesterol – how low can we go?. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 2022;51:681-90.
5. Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaboration, Baigent C, Blackwell L, et al. Efficacy and safety of more intensive lowering of LDL cholesterol: a meta-analysis of data from 170,000 participants in 26 randomised trials. *Lancet* 2010;376:1670-81.
6. Catapano AL, Graham I, De Backer G, et al. 2016 ESC/EAS guidelines for the management of dyslipidaemias. *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:2999-3058.
7. Mach F, Baigent C, Catapano AL, et al. 2019 ESC/EAS guidelines for the management of dyslipidaemias: lipid modification to reduce cardiovascular risk. *Eur Heart J* 2020;41:111-88.
8. Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study Group. Randomised trial of cholesterol lowering in 4444 patients with coronary heart disease: the Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study (4S). *Lancet* 1994;344:1383-9.
9. LaRosa JC, Grundy SM, Waters DD, et al. Intensive lipid lowering with atorvastatin in patients with stable coronary disease. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:1425-35.
10. Cannon CP, Blazing MA, Giugliano RP, et al. Ezetimibe added to statin therapy after acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:2387-97.
11. Yanai H, Adachi H, Hakoshima M, Katsuyama H. Molecular biological and clinical understanding of the statin residual cardiovascular disease risk and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor alpha agonists and ezetimibe for its treatment. *Int J Mol Sci* 2022;23:3418.
12. Schwartz GG, Steg PG, Szarek M, et al. Alirocumab and cardiovascular outcomes after acute coronary syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379:2097-107.
13. Sabatine MS, Giugliano RP, Keech AC, et al. Evolocumab and clinical outcomes in patients with cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:1713-22.
14. Ray KK, Wright RS, Kallend D, et al. Two phase 3 trials of inclisiran in patients with elevated LDL cholesterol. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:1507-19.
15. Pinkosky SL, Newton RS, Day EA, et al. Liver-specific ATP-citrate lyase inhibition by bempedoic acid decreases LDL-C and attenuates atherosclerosis. *Nat Commun* 2016;7:13457.
16. Nissen SE, Lincoff AM, Brennan D, et al. Bempedoic acid and cardiovascular outcomes in statin-intolerant patients. *N Engl J Med* 2023;388:1353-64.
17. De Backer G, Jankowski P, Kotseva K, et al. Management of dyslipidaemia in patients with coronary heart disease: results from the ESC-EORP EUROASPIRE V survey in 27 countries. *Atherosclerosis* 2019;285:135-46.
18. Ray KK, Molemans B, Schoonen WM, et al. EU-wide cross-sectional observational study of lipid-modifying therapy use in secondary and primary care: the DA VINCI study. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2021;28:1279-89.
19. Stone NJ, Robinson JG, Lichtenstein AH, et al. 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. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2014;63:2889-934.
20. März W, Dippel FW, Theobald K, et al. Utilization of lipid-modifying therapy and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol goal attainment in patients at high and very-high cardiovascular risk: real-world evidence from Germany. *Atherosclerosis* 2018;268:99-107.
21. Ray KK, Haq I, Bilitou A, et al. Treatment gaps in the implementation of LDL cholesterol control among high- and very high-risk patients in Europe between 2020 and 2021: the multinational observational SANTORINI study. *Lancet Reg Health Eur* 2023;29:100624.
22. Smith SC Jr, Benjamin EJ, Bonow RO, et al. AHA/ACCF secondary prevention and risk reduction therapy for patients with coronary and other atherosclerotic vascular disease: 2011 update: a guideline from the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology Foundation endorsed by the World Heart Federation and the Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2011;58:2432-46.
23. Tocci G, Ferrucci A, Guida P, et al. Global cardiovascular risk management in different Italian regions: an analysis of the evaluation of final feasible effect of control training and ultra sensitisation (EFFECTUS) educational program. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2012;22:635-42.