Effects of statin therapy on coronary plaque volume by decreasing CRP/hsCRP levels: A meta-regression of randomized controlled trials

Darui Gao[1,2,3,*], Rong Hua[1,2,3,*], Dina Jiesisibieke[4], Yanjun Ma[1,2,3], Chenglong Li[1,2,3], Sijing Wu[5], Qian Ma[5], Wuxiang Xie[1,2,3]

[*]There authors contributed equally to this work.

Affiliations:

[1]Peking University Clinical Research Institute, Peking University First Hospital, Beijing, China;

[2]PUCRI Heart and Vascular Health Research Center at Peking University Shougang Hospital, Beijing, China;

[3]Key Laboratory of Molecular Cardiovascular Sciences (Peking University), Ministry of Education, Beijing, China;

[4]School of Basic Medical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, China;

[5]Department of Cardiology, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University,

Beijing, China.

Address for correspondence:

Qian Ma, MD, Department of Cardiology, Beijing Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, No. 2 Anzhen Road, Chaoyang District, 100029, Beijing, China; E-mail: fsmaqian@163.com.

Wuxiang Xie, PhD, Peking University Clinical Research Institute, Peking University First Hospital, No. 8 Xishiku Street, Xicheng District, 100034, Beijing, China; E-mail: xiewuxiang@hsc.pku.edu.cn.

Abstract

Background and aims: Several clinical trials have indicated that statins stabilize and reverse atherosclerotic plaque. However, different studies have provided inconsistent findings regarding mechanisms and influencing factors of plaque regression under statin therapy. In this study, meta-analysis and meta-regression were used to determine the effect of statin medication on coronary plaque volume as determined by intravenous ultrasound. Meanwhile, the impact of statins on CRP/hsCRP reduction on plaque regression was discussed.

Methods: Up to May 28, 2021, a systematic PubMed, EMBASE, and Cochrane search was performed for randomized controlled trials that assessed treatment effect using total atheroma volume (TAV), percent atheroma volume (PAV), or plaque volume (PV). Only CRP/hsCRP and LDL-C values reported before and after treatment were considered.

Results: 12 studies fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were included in the systematic review. Compared with control groups, meta-analysis of 15 statin-treated arms reported change of TAV/PV showed standardized mean difference (SMD) at -0.27 (95% confidence intervals [CI]: -0.42, -0.12). Meta-analysis of 7 studies reported change of PAV revealed SMD at -0.16 (95% CI: -0.29, -0.03). Meta-regression analysis revealed percent change of CRP/hsCRP statistically influences SMD in change of TAV/PVafter adjusting for percent change of LDL-C, age and gender. Meta-regression analysis showed that percent change of CRP/hsCRP statistically influences SMD in change of PAV.

Conclusion: In conclusion, statin therapy is beneficial for plaque regression. Statins promote plaque regression through their anti-inflammatory ability while lowering LDL-C is unaffected.

Keywords: Statins; Reduction of atherosclerosis; C-reactive protein; Randomized controlled trial; Meta-analysis

1 Introduction

Cardiovascular diseases are considered the leading causes of death worldwide. Among them, coronary heart disease (CHD) has garnered considerable attention due to its high prevalence and burden. The pathological basis of CHD is atherosclerosis, which is characterized by accumulation of lipid and cholesterol in the artery's subintima and progressive chronic inflammation of the fibrotic plaque on the wall of great and medium arteries [1]. Coronary atherosclerosis is a complex, progressive disease.

At present, the main mechanisms of plaque formation include vascular endothelial dysfunction, intimal hyperplasia, lipid accumulation, and inflammatory response. Currently, statin has become an important preventive drug for cardiovascular disease. Initially, statin drugs were used primarily to reduce blood lipids. Numerous clinical trials have established that the advantages of statins are based on their pleiotropic properties, such as reducing inflammation, stabilizing plaque, improving vascular endothelial function, suppressing vascular smooth muscle proliferation, and so on [2]. In other words, statin therapy is effective at delaying coronary atherosclerosis progression. In addition to its lipid-lowering effect, its non-lipid-lowering effect significantly benefits CHD patients [3].

The lipid-lowering and anti-inflammatory effects of statin on the coronary plaque volume have become the focus of recent studies. Both basic studies and clinical trials confirmed that the anti-inflammatory ability of statins was beneficial to the prognosis of coronary plaque volume. Basic research shows that atherosclerotic plaques express C-reactive protein (CRP), induce macrophage activation. CRP and type oxidized low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (oxLDL - C) after being converted into foam cells stimulate tissue factor before thrombus formation, endothelial cell expression of adhesion molecules, and vascular endothelial dysfunction, all of which contribute to unstable atherosclerotic plaque. Simultaneously, the expression and release of inflammatory factors are regulated to accelerate atherosclerotic plaque formation [4,5]. Statins block CRP production and inhibit its pro-inflammatory effects, whereas macrophages in atherosclerotic plaques produce oxygen free radicals that prevent blood vessel inflammation [6]. CRP is a primary acute phase reactant, typically produced by

smooth muscle and fat cells in the liver in response to interleukin-6 (IL-6). It is part of the innate immune response and performs various immune functions. Previous studies have indicated that increased CRP/high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hsCRP) levels may be a by-product of inflammation in atherosclerosis. As the mechanism of vascular inflammation is gradually elucidated, numerous evidences demonstrate that CRP/hsCRP may play a direct pathogenic role in atherosclerosis [7,8]. Randomized trials data demonstrate that hsCRP is critical for understanding the anti-inflammatory effects of statins and suggest that hsCRP and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) levels are equally predictive of cardiovascular events after treatment [9]. Ridker et al. discovered that rosuvastatin (20 mg/d) and placebo were administered to randomly selected healthy people with elevated hs-CRP but no evidence of hyperlipidemia. After an average follow-up of 1.9 years, hs-CRP level in the treatment group decreased by 37% compared with the control group, implying that statins may have anti-atherosclerosis functions via anti-inflammatory mechanisms [10]. Numerous clinical trials, such as the Air Force/Texas Coronary Atherosclerosis Prevention (AFCAPS/TexCAPS) study, the Reversal of Atherosclerosis with Aggressive Lipid Lowering (REVERSAL) trial, and the Pravastatin or Atorvastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy-Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction 22 (PROVE IT) study, have demonstrated that statins reduce hsCRP levels independently of lowering LDL levels. In a trial with canakinumab for atherosclerotic disease, the rate of cardiovascular event recurrence was significantly lower in the treated group than in the placebo group, implying that reducing inflammation without affecting lipid levels can reduce cardiovascular disease risk [11]. Although the anti-inflammatory effects of statins on plaque regression have been shown to be beneficial. However, the interaction between the lipid-lowering and anti-inflammatory effects of statins has not been clarified. Studies have speculated that the anti-inflammatory effects of statins may depend heavily on their LDL-C lowering effect[12]. Therefore, the item that whether the effect of statins in reducing plaque through anti-inflammatory is affected by its lipid-lowering ability has attracted our attention. In recent years, there have been multiple clinical trials using intravenous ultrasound (IVUS) to evaluate arterial plaque changes after

statin therapy. There are also meta-analysis studies to analyze the effects of LDL-C changes on plaque [13]. However, few meta-analyses have attempted to investigate the relationship between the degree of CRP/hsCRP reduction associated with changes in coronary plaque volume during the statin treatment. In particular, no meta-analysis has attempted to link anti-inflammatory and lipid-lowering to analyze plaque regression.

The aim of the present study was to provide a systematic review and meta-regression analysis to examine the impact of statins on CRP/hsCRP reduction on coronary plaque volume. At the same time, we analyzed the joint effects of LDL-C and CRP/hsCRP changes on plaques.

2 Methods

This work followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) and amendment to the Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses (QUOROM) statement [14,15].

2.1 Search strategy and study selection

For this meta-analysis, we have conducted a search in PubMed, EMBASE and Cochrane Library to identify studies relevant to this topic from their beginning to May 28, 2021. The study selection was performed independently by 2-group investigators (CLL, YJM as group 1, and RH, DJ as group 2) using highly sensitive strategy. Disagreements were resolved by consensus with a senior author (WXX). Here we shown the search strategy of PubMed: "((statin) OR (hydroxy-methyl-glutaryl-CoA) OR (HMG-COA) OR (pravastatin) OR (lovastatin) OR (simvastatin) OR (Atorvastatin) OR (fluvastatin) OR (Rosuvastatin) OR (Pitavastatin)) AND ((intravascular ultrasound) OR (IVUS) OR (plaque) OR (atheroma)) AND ((intravascular ultrasound) OR (IVUS) OR (coronary)) AND (Clinical Trial[ptyp])." Appendix 1 shows details of search syntax.

2.2 Selection criteria

Studies were included according to the following criteria: (a) randomized controlled trials (RCTs); (b) investigating the impact of statin therapy on plaque volume using IVUS; (c) reporting at least one of the following data: total atheroma volume (TAV), plaque volume (PV) and percent atheroma volume (PAV); (d) with a follow-up

longer than or equal to six months; (e) reporting LDL-C at baseline and the end of the study or reporting data of percent change of LDL-C; (d) reporting CRP or hsCRP before and after statin treatment (or percent change of CRP/hs-CRP) ;

Exclusion criteria included the following: (a) non-randomized control trial; (b) duplicate publication or secondary analyses of the same study population; (c) lack of sufficient information on baseline or follow-up IVUS data, LDL-C data and CRP/hsCRP data.

2.3 Data extraction quality appraisal

The data were extracted from each study using standard tables. The extracted data included the following: study characteristics (the first author, title, publication time, number of patients, country, and study duration), patient characteristics (age and sex), intervention, control, method characteristics (randomization, blind implementation, and follow-up loss), and patient outcomes. For patient outcomes, we extracted TAV, PAV, or PV data as measured using IVUS technique, LDL-C data, CRP, hsCRP data (including values at baseline and endpoint) and other useful information.

After data extraction, we conducted statistical processing to calculate change of TAV, change of PV, change of PAV, percent change of LDL-C, percent change of CRP and percent change of hsCRP. Articles reported mean values and standard deviation (SD) of change of TAV/PV/PAV, the original number was entered. Some studies [16-19] did not report SD values, which were filled by using the SD of the baseline data of control group. 1 study [20] provided SE rather than SD, and then SD value was calculated based on SE value. IVUS efficacy endpoints were reported as medians, with distribution-free 95% confidence intervals (CI) in 2 articles (Nicholls, 2011, Nissen, 2004), the median reported in the original text was extracted, and SD was calculated by formula.

In terms of LDL-C, if the article reported percent change of LDL-C, the original number was entered; otherwise, percent change of LDL-C was calculated using the following formula:

$$percent\ change\ of\ \ LDL-C\ (\%)\ =\ \frac{follow\ up\ value\ \ -\ \ baseline\ value}{baseline\ value}\times 100\%$$

Percent change of CRP and percent change of hsCRP were calculated using the same approach. Appendix 2 shows details of data extraction.

According to Cochrane's indications, unblinded, independent reviewers evaluated the quality of included studies using pre-specified forms, including seven examined fields: random sequence generation (selection bias); allocation sequence concealment (selection bias); blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias); blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias); incomplete outcome data (attrition bias); selective outcome reporting (reporting bias); and other potential sources of bias.

2.4 Data analysis and synthesis

Continuous variables were expressed as mean (standard deviation, SD) or median (range), whereas categorical variables were expressed as *n* (%). Heterogeneity was evaluated by the I^2 test. A random-effects model was utilized. Meta-analysis with continuous outcome variables was performed, and the effect of statin therapy (vs. control) on TAV, PV and PAV at the end of follow-up was estimated as standardized mean difference (SMD) and 95% CI. If $p<0.05$ and 95% CI did not include zero, the point estimate of SMD was considered statistically significant. To avoid double-counting of subjects and consequent unit-of-analysis error in trials with more than one treatment arm, the control group was evenly divided (where possible) [16]. Since the units (mm^3/L) of change of TAV and change of PV were the same, we combined these two indicators for data synthesis.

To explore the link between the dependent variable and the covariate, meta-regression is often used. We hypothesized that the included studies may have shown difference according to the percent change of CRP/hsCRP, percent change of LDL-C, age and gender of the patients. To evaluate the possible impact of these factors on the results of the meta-analysis, we established model with the change of TAV/PV or change of PAV as the dependent variable. In particular, change in TAV/PV was our primary outcome, and change in PAV was the secondary outcome.

Funnel plot analysis and Begg's and Egger's tests were performed to evaluate potential publication bias. Sensitivity analysis was conducted to assess the stability of studies. Sensitivity analysis was conducted using leave-one-out method, i.e. removing

one study each time and repeating the analysis. Statistical analyses were performed with *R* version 4.1.2 (2021-11-01) and risk of bias was evaluated with Review Manager (RevMan 5.3; Cochrane Collaboration).

3 Result

3.1 Flow of included studies

The initial literature search retrieved 1259 articles. After the removal of duplicates, the titles and abstracts of 765 articles were carefully checked, leading to the exclusion of 626 articles for failing to meet inclusion criteria. Initially, 139 articles were selected, and their full texts were evaluated. Of them, 124 articles were excluded: 22 because CRP/hsCRP levels were not reported, 12 because plaque evaluation (TAV, PAV, or PV) was not performed, 50 because they were not RCTs, 31 because statins were not used, and 9 because of repeated trials. A total of 15 articles entered the third round of evaluation. One was excluded due to a discrepancy between the number of participants receiving statins and the number of people participating in IVUS measurements, and two were excluded because of data quality. Overall, this analysis included 12 trials [16-27]. Fig. 1 summarizes the study selection process.

< Insert Fig. 1 about here >

3.2 Characteristics of included studies

The study characteristics are reported in Table 1. A total of 2812 subjects were included in the twelve eligible studies. Included studies were published between 2004 and 2016 and were reported from China, America, Korea and Japan. The largest study had a population size of 1039 subjects while the smallest study recruited 30 subjects. Included studies were published between 2004 and 2016 and the mean age of the participants ranged from 55.8 to 67 years. Seven studies used atorvastatin (dose range: 10-80 mg/day; duration of treatment: 24-104 weeks), 6 used rosuvastatin (dose range: 2.5-40 mg/day; duration of treatment: 44-104 weeks), 3 used pravastatin (dose range: 20-40 mg/day; duration of treatment: 24-72 weeks), 2 used pitavastatin (4 mg/day; duration of treatment: 32-48 weeks) and 1 used simvastatin (20 mg/day for 48 weeks).

IVUS was used in all studies to evaluate plaque volume. In addition to 1 study [27], 11 studies reported change of TAV/PV, and 7 studies reported change of PAV. As

described in the data extraction section, percent change of CRP/hsCRP and percent change of LDL-C were reported in all studies.

Overall, random sequence generation was observed in 6 studies, 4 of them reported allocation concealment. 3 trials were double-blinded, and 8 studies performed blinded assessments of the outcomes. Moreover, 2 studies existed incomplete outcome data because of high attrition rate. Appendix 3 shows details of risk of bias assessment.

< Insert Table 1 about here >

3.3 Quantitative data synthesis

3.3.1 Effect of statin therapy on change of TAV/PV

15 statin-treated arms (n=2696) of 11 studies reported change of TAV/PV. Heterogeneity test of data from 15 treatment arms shown moderate heterogeneity (Q=27.55, df=17, p=0.02, I^2=49.2%) and random effect model was adopted. Compared with control groups, meta-analysis of data from 15 treatment arms revealed a significant decrease in change of TAV/PV (SMD: -0.27, 95% CI: -0.42, -0.12, p<0.05). Fig. 2 presented the combined results of the 15 statin-treated arms in this meta-analysis. It indicates that stain therapy is beneficial to reduce the TAV/PV of patients.

< Insert Fig. 2 about here >

3.3.2 Effect of statin therapy on change of change of PAV

7 studies (n=2295) reported change of PAV. Heterogeneity test of data from 7 studies shown moderate heterogeneity (Q=10.19, df=6, p=0.12, I^2=41.1%) and random effect model was adopted. Compared with control groups, meta-analysis data from 7 studies indicated a significant reduction in change of PAV (SMD: -0.16, 95% CI: -0.29, -0.03, p<0.05). Fig. 3 presented the combined results of 7 studies in this meta-analysis. It suggests that stain therapy is beneficial to reduce PAV of patients.

< Insert Fig. 3 about here >

3.4 Meta-regression

3.4.1 Meta-regression for SMD in change of TAV/PV

Moderate heterogeneity was shown in the quantitative synthesis of data from 15 treatment arms. In order to further clarify the causes of heterogeneity, meta-regression analysis was then employed to test whether the percent change of CRP/hsCRP affect change of TAV/PV.

The results of the meta-regression analysis are given in table 2. Model 1 demonstrates that the impact of percent change of CRP/hsCRP on change of TAV/PV was statistically significant ($p<0.05$). The regression coefficient of this independent variable was $\beta=0.0064$. Model 2 analyzed the influence of percent change of LDL-C on change of TAV/PV. The results showed that percent change of LDL-C had no significant effect on change of TAV/PV ($p>0.05$). Model 3 incorporates percent changes of CRP/hsCRP and LDL-C. Only percent change of CRP/hsCRP was associated with change of TAV/PV ($\beta=0.0119$, $p<0.05$). In Model 4, we entered percent change of CRP/hsCRP, percent change of LDL-C, age, and gender. Among them, only percent change of CRP/hsCRP statistically influences the dependent variable.

< Insert Table 2 about here >

3.4.2 Meta-regression for SMD in change of PAV

Similarly, meta-regression analysis was employed to determine how the percent change of CRP/hsCRP affects change of PAV. Model 1 used the percent change of CRP/hsCRP as an independent variable. The results indicated that the percent change of CRP/hsCRP ($\beta=0.0086$) affects PAV change ($p<0.01$). When the percent change of CRP/hsCRP was higher, change of PAV was greater. In Model 2, the percent change of LDL-C was independently included as an independent variable and showed that the effect of percent change of LDL-C on PAV change was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). In Model 3 (both percent change of CRP/hsCRP and percent change of LDL-C were included as independent variables) and Model 4 (independent variables including percent change of CRP/hsCRP, percent change of LDL-C, age, and gender), multivariable meta-regression analysis did not reveal any significant between independent variables and SMD in change of PAV.

< Insert Table 3 about here >

3.5 Publication bias and Sensitivity analysis

Although Begg's rank correlation ($p=0.7290$) and Egger's linear regression ($p=0.2323$) tests were not significant, the funnel plot was asymmetric, implying potential publication bias in reporting the effect of statin therapy on change of TAV/PV. Regarding the impact of statin therapy on change of PAV, the number of studies was

insufficient to conduct Begg's test and Egger's tests. However, the funnel plot also indicated potential publication bias. Funnel plots were presented in Appendix 4.

Sensitivity analysis by excluding one study each time confirmed that the pooled estimate was consistent among studies with balanced weight. Additional sensitivity analyses were presented in Appendix 5.

4 Discussion

4.1 Effects of statins on coronary plaque volume

Statins are HMG-COA reductase inhibitors. They reduce CHD incidence due to their lipid-regulating and extra-lipid-regulating effects and are important drugs for the primary and secondary prevention of CHD [28,29]. The benefits of statins have been demonstrated to be based on stabilization and/or reversal of atherosclerotic plaque [30-33]. Particularly since the introduction of intravenous ultrasound technology, numerous studies have used it as an important tool for studying coronary plaque. IVUS has recently become the main tool to study the effects of statins on coronary atherosclerotic plaque, and the data obtained by IVUS (such as total plaque volume, plaque cross-sectional area, etc.) served as the primary endpoint in several studies [34,35]. This meta-analysis comprised randomized controlled trials using IVUS to measure coronary plaque volume and report TAV, PAV, or PV. Quantitative synthesis revealed a decrease in TAV/PV and PAV levels after statin treatment compared with baseline. In addition, all studies included in the meta-analysis were RCTs, further confirming that statins are effective drugs for reducing the volume of atherosclerotic plaque in coronary arteries.

4.2 Effects of statin therapy on TAV/PV by decreasing CRP/hsCRP levels

After statin treatment, quantitative synthesis revealed a decrease in TAV/PV and PAV levels with moderate heterogeneity. To further elucidate the source of heterogeneity, meta-regression analyses were performed for TAV/PV change and PAV change. In meta-regression analysis with TAV/PV change as a dependent variable, we found that after statin treatment, TAV/PV change of patients was affected by percent change of CRP/hsCRP. Simple linear regression results indicated that after statin treatment, the percent change of CRP/hsCRP increased by 0.0064% for each unit

increase of TAV/PV change. Recent studies suggest that LDL has been shown to accumulate abnormally in the vascular wall due to endothelial cell dysfunction. Besides, LDL can be converted into ox-LDL, eventually promoting plaque progression [36]. This implies that LDL change is a potential factor affecting plaque volume progression. As a result, we separately included percent change of LDL-C as an independent variable to establish a simple linear regression model, and the results showed that LDL-C change did not influence the result. Moreover, when the percent change of CRP/hsCRP, percent change of LDL-C, age, and gender were simultaneously taken as independent variables to establish the regression model, only the percent change of CRP/hsCRP had a significant impact on SMD for TAV/PV. Therefore, it can be concluded that in the included RCTs studies using statins as intervention drugs, the ability of statins to reduce TAV/PV depends on their effect of reducing CRP/hsCRP. The greater the reduction in CRP/hsCRP from baseline after statin treatment, the greater the reduction in TAV/PV. Furthermore, the effect of statins on TAV/PV reduction via their anti-inflammatory ability was unaffected by their lipid-regulating effect, nor by age or gender. Previous studies have disclosed that various factors influence the degree of plaque regression under statin therapy. For instance, the statin drug type [37,38], plaque composition [39], and patient's age and gender [40]. In addition, clinical trials using IVUS demonstrated a linear relationship between LDL-C levels and reductions in Atheroma Burden under statin treatment [41]. Despite the well-established causal role of LDL-C in the pathogenesis of atherosclerosis, our findings do not support a reduction in TAV/PV relying on LDL-C levels. Recent investigations have demonstrated that changes in LDL-C levels are unrelated to plaque progression/regression following ezetimibe treatment [42]. This is consistent with our research conclusions. Additionally, previous research has demonstrated that anti-inflammatory therapy alone is beneficial for plaque regression [43]. Considering the pleiotropic nature of statins, CRP/hsCRP is an important indicator of the anti-inflammatory effect of statins. Our findings imply that statins promote plaque regression due to their anti-inflammatory ability, independently of their ability to regulate LDL-C.

4.3 Effects of statin therapy on PAV by decreasing CRP/hsCRP levels

When the percent change of CRP/hsCRP was included as an independent variable in the meta-regression analysis model, it significantly affected SMD in PAV change. When PAV change was utilized as an indicator to evaluate the plaque load, statins were still found to reduce the plaque load of patients via anti-inflammatory effects. The better the statin resistance, the greater the degree of plaque regression.

However, when the percent change of CRP/hsCRP was included with the percent change of LDL-C, age and gender, all variables were not significant in the regression model. This could be because only seven treatment arms data were included in the regression analysis. The instability of research outcomes is caused by insufficient research data and an excessive number of independent variables.

5 Limitations

This meta-analysis also has some limitations. First of all, we only searched 3 databases because of limited time. It is possible that some studies in other databases and gray literature are overlooked. Second, although the studies included in this meta-analysis are all RCTs and the quality of evidence is relatively higher, not all studies reported blinding of the outcome assessment process. It is possible that performance bias is introduced. The meta-regression analysis (change of PAV as the dependent variable) was performed with 7 treatment arms, when some authors suggest doing it with 10 or more.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, this meta-analysis included 12 studies with 2812 subjects who received statin therapy. A meta-analysis of 12 randomized controlled trials stated that statins could significantly reduce plaque load measured by TAV/PV and PAV with moderate heterogeneity. After statin treatment, meta-regression analysis revealed that the percent change of CRP/hsCRP was an important source of heterogeneity. The percent change of LDL-C had no effect on SMD for TAV/PV change or PAV change. According to these findings, we believe that statins promote plaque regression through their anti-inflammatory ability and that their ability to eliminate plaque is unaffected by

their ability to reduce LDL-C. This finding will provide new avenues for future research on plaque regression.

Funding:

The present study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (project no. 81974490) and 2019 Irma and Paul Milstein Program for Senior Health Research Project Award.

Disclosures:

None.

References

[1]McLaren, J. E., Michael, D. R., Ashlin, T. G., & Ramji, D. P. (2011). Cytokines, macrophage lipid metabolism and foam cells: Implications for cardiovascular disease therapy. Progress in Lipid Research, 50(4), 331 – 347. https://doi:10.1016/j.plipres.2011.04.

[2]Dupuis, J., Tardif, J.-C., Rouleau, J.-L., Ricci, J., Arnold, M., Lonn, E., Cannon, C. P. (2005). Intensity of lipid lowering with statins and brachial artery vascular endothelium reactivity after acute coronary syndromes (from the BRAVER Trial). The American Journal of Cardiology, 96(9), 1207–1213. https://doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2005.06.

[3]Koh, K. (2000). Effects of statins on vascular wall: vasomotor function, inflammation, and plaque stability. Cardiovascular Research, 47(4), 648 – 657. https://doi:10.1016/s0008-6363(00)00146-2.

[4]Avan, A., Tavakoly Sany, S. B., Ghayour-Mobarhan, M., Rahimi, H. R., Tajfard, M., & Ferns, G. (2018). Serum C-reactive protein in the prediction of cardiovascular diseases: Overview of the latest clinical studies and public health practice. Journal of Cellular Physiology. https://doi:10.1002/jcp.26791.

[5]Cicci, J. D., Iyer, P., Clarke, M. M., & Mazella, A. J. (2019). Aspirin for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. Cardiology in Review, 1. https://doi:10.1097/crd.00000000000002.

[6]Endres, M. (2006). Statins: Potential new indications in inflammatory conditions. Atherosclerosis Supplements, 7(1), 31–35. https://doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosiss.

[7]Salazar, J., Martínez, M. S., Chávez, M., Toledo, A., Añez, R., Torres, Y., Bermúdez, V. (2014). C-Reactive protein: clinical and epidemiological perspectives. Cardiology Research and Practice, 2014, 1-10. https://doi:10.1155/2014/605810.

[8]Sukegawa, H., Maekawa, Y., Yuasa, S., Anzai, A., Kodaira, M., Takei, M., Fukuda, K. (2016). Intensive statin therapy stabilizes C-reactive protein, but not chemokine in stable coronary artery disease treated with an everolimus-eluting stent. Coronary Artery Disease, 27(5), 405−411. https://doi:10.1097/mca.00000000000003.

[9]Cannon, C. P., Giugliano, R. P., Blazing, M. A., Harrington, R. A., Peterson, J. L., Sisk, C. M., Califf, R. M. (2008). Rationale and design of IMPROVE-IT (IMProved Reduction of Outcomes: Vytorin Efficacy International Trial): Comparison of ezetimbe/simvastatin versus simvastatin monotherapy on cardiovascular outcomes in patients with acute coronary syndromes. American Heart Journal, 156(5), 826−832. https://doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2008.07.023.

[10]Ridker, P. M., Danielson, E., & Fonseca, F. A. H. (2009). Rosuvastatin to prevent vascular events in men and women with elevated C-reactive protein. Journal of Vascular Surgery, 49(2), 534. https://doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2008.12.037.

[11]Ridker, P. M., Everett, B. M., Thuren, T., MacFadyen, J. G., Chang, W. H., Ballantyne, C., Glynn, R. J. (2017). Antiinflammatory therapy with canakinumab for atherosclerotic disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 377(12), 1119−1131. https://doi:10.1056/nejmoa1707914.

[12]Sager, P. T., Capece, R., Lipka, L., Strony, J., Yang, B., Suresh, R., Veltri, E. (2005). Effects of ezetimibe coadministered with simvastatin on C-reactive protein in a large cohort of hypercholesterolemic patients. Atherosclerosis, 179(2), 361 − 367. https://doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2004.10.021.

[13]Li, Y., Deng, S., Liu, B., Yan, Y., Du, J., Li, Y., She, Q. (2021). The effects of lipid-lowering therapy on coronary plaque regression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Scientific Reports, 11(1). https://doi:10.1038/s41598-021-87528-w.

[14]Moher, D. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA Statement. Annals of Internal Medicine, 151(4), 264. https://doi:10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00135.

[15]Moher, D., Cook, D. J., Eastwood, S., Olkin, I., Rennie, D., & Stroup, D. F. (1999). Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. The Lancet, 354(9193), 1896 – 1900. https://doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(99)04149-5.

[16]Kawasaki, M., Sano, K., Okubo, M., Yokoyama, H., Ito, Y., Murata, I., Fujiwara, H. (2005). Volumetric quantitative analysis of tissue characteristics of coronary plaques after statin therapy using three-dimensional integrated backscatter intravascular ultrasound. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 45(12), 1946–1953. https://doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2004.09.081.

[17]Takayama, T., Komatsu, S., Ueda, Y., Fukushima, S., Hiro, T., Hirayama, A., & Saito, S. (2016). Comparison of the effect of rosuvastatin 2.5 mg vs 20 mg on coronary plaque determined by angioscopy and intravascular ultrasound in Japanese with stable angina pectoris (from the aggressive lipid-lowering treatment approach using intensive rosuvastatin for vulnerable coronary artery plaque [ALTAIR] Randomized Trial). The American Journal of Cardiology, 117(8), 1206 – 1212. https://doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2016.01.013.

[18]Zhang, X., Wang, H., Liu, S., Gong, P., Lin, J., Lu, J., Lu, X. (2012). Intensive-dose atorvastatin regimen halts progression of atherosclerotic plaques in new-onset unstable angina with borderline vulnerable plaque lesions. Journal of Cardiovascular Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 18(2), 119 – 125.https://doi:10.1177/1074248412465792.

[19]Guo, S., Wang, R., Yang, Z., Li, K., & Wang, Q. (2012). Effects of atorvastatin on serum lipids, serum inflammation and plaque morphology in patients with stable atherosclerotic plaques. Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine, 4(6), 1069–1074. https://doi:10.3892/etm.2012.722.

[20]Park, S.J., Kang, S.J., Ahn, J.M., Chang, M., Yun, S.C., Roh, J. H., Park, S.W. (2016). Effect of statin treatment on modifying plaque composition. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 67(15), 1772 – 1783. https://doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2016.02.014.

[21]Hiro, T., Kimura, T., Morimoto, T., Miyauchi, K., Nakagawa, Y., Yamagishi, M.,

Matsuzaki, M. (2009). Effect of intensive statin therapy on regression of coronary atherosclerosis in patients with acute coronary syndrome. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 54(4), 293−302. https://doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2009.04.033.

[22]Hong, M.K., Park, D.W., Lee, C.W., Lee, S.W., Kim, Y.H., Kang, D.H., Park, S.J. (2009). Effects of statin treatments on coronary plaques assessed by volumetric virtual histology intravascular ultrasound analysis. JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions, 2(7), 679−688. https://doi:10.1016/j.jcin.2009.03.015.

[23]Hong, Y. J., Jeong, M. H., Chung, J. W., Sim, D. S., Cho, J. S., Yoon, N. S., Kang, J. C. (2008). The effects of rosuvastatin on plaque regression in patients who have a mild to moderate degree of coronary stenosis with vulnerable plaque. Korean Circulation Journal, 38(7), 366. https://doi:10.4070/kcj.2008.38.7.366.

[24]Hong, Y. J., Jeong, M. H., Hachinohe, D., Ahmed, K., Choi, Y. H., Cho, S. H., Kang, J. C. (2011). Comparison of effects of rosuvastatin and atorvastatin on plaque regression in Korean patients with untreated intermediate coronary stenosis. Circulation Journal, 75(2), 398−406. https://doi:10.1253/circj.cj-10-0658.

[25]Nicholls, S. J., Ballantyne, C. M., Barter, P. J., Chapman, M. J., Erbel, R. M., Libby, P., Nissen, S. E. (2011). Effect of two intensive statin regimens on progression of coronary disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 365(22), 2078 − 2087. https://doi:10.1056/nejmoa1110874.

[26]Nissen, S. E., Tuzcu, E. M., Schoenhagen, P., Brown, B. G., Ganz, P., Vogel, R. A., for the REVERSAL Investigators. (2004). Effect of intensive compared with moderate lipid-lowering therapy on progression of coronary atherosclerosis. JAMA, 291(9), 1071. https://doi:10.1001/jama.291.9.1071.

[27]Nozue, T., Yamamoto, S., Tohyama, S., Umezawa, S., Kunishima, T., Sato, A., Michishita, I. (2012). Statin treatment for coronary artery plaque composition based on intravascular ultrasound radiofrequency data analysis. American Heart Journal, 163(2), 191−199.e1. https://doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2011.11.004.

[28]The LIPID Study Group. Long-term effectiveness and safety of pravastatin in 9014 patients with coronary heart disease and average cholesterol concentrations: the LIPID

trial follow-up. (2002). The Lancet, 359(9315), 1379 – 1387. https://doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(02)08351-4.

[29]Pedersen, T. R. (2004). Randomised trial of cholesterol lowering in 4444 patients with coronary heart disease: the Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study (4S). Atherosclerosis Supplements, 5(3), 81–87. https://doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosiss.

[30]Jensen, L. O. (2004). Regression of coronary atherosclerosis by simvastatin: A serial intravascular ultrasound study. Circulation, 110(3), 265 – 270. https://doi:10.1161/01.cir.0000135215.

[31]Yamada, T., Azuma, A., Sasaki, S., Sawada, T., Matsubara, H., & The REACH Study Group. (2007). Randomized evaluation of atorvastatin in patients with coronary heart disease. Circulation Journal, 71(12), 1845 – 1850. https://doi:10.1253/circj.71.1845.

[32]Böse, D., von Birgelen, C., & Erbel, R. (2007). Intravascular ultrasound for the evaluation of therapies targeting coronary atherosclerosis. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 49(9), 925–932. https://doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2006.08.067.

[33]Endo, H., Dohi, T., Miyauchi, K., Kuramistu, S., Kato, Y., Okai, I., Daida, H. (2019). Clinical significance of non-culprit plaque regression following acute coronary syndrome: A serial intravascular ultrasound study. Journal of Cardiology. doi:10.1016/j.jjcc.2018.12.023.

[34]Banach, M., Serban, C., Sahebkar, A., Mikhailidis, D. P., Ursoniu, S., Serruys, P. W. (2015). Impact of statin therapy on coronary plaque composition: a systematic review and meta-analysis of virtual histology intravascular ultrasound studies. BMC Medicine, 13(1). https://doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0459-4.

[35]D’Ascenzo, F., Agostoni, P., Abbate, A., Castagno, D., Lipinski, M. J., Vetrovec, G. W., Zoccai, G. B. (2013). Atherosclerotic coronary plaque regression and the risk of adverse cardiovascular events: A meta-regression of randomized clinical trials. Atherosclerosis, 226(1), 178–185. https://doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.

[36]Barua, R. S. (2003). Reactive oxygen species are involved in smoking-induced dysfunction of nitric oxide biosynthesis and upregulation of endothelial nitric oxide synthase: an in vitro demonstration in human coronary artery endothelial cells.

Circulation, 107(18), 2342−2347. https://doi:10.1161/01.cir.0000066691.

[37]Matsushita, K., Hibi, K., Komura, N., Akiyama, E., Maejima, N., Iwahashi, N., Kimura, K. (2016). Effects of 4 statins on regression of coronary plaque in acute coronary syndrome. Circulation Journal, 80(7), 1634 − 1643. https://doi:10.1253/circj.cj-15-1379.

[38]Qian, C., Wei, B., Ding, J., Wu, H., Cai, X., Li, B., & Wang, Y. (2015). Meta-analysis comparing the effects of rosuvastatin versus atorvastatin on regression of coronary atherosclerotic plaques. The American Journal of Cardiology, 116(10), 1521−1526. https://doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2015.08.010.

[39]Kwon, O., Kang, S.J., Kang, S. H., Lee, P. H., Yun, S.C., Ahn, J.M., Park, S.J. (2017). Relationship between serum inflammatory marker levels and the dynamic changes in coronary plaque characteristics after statin therapy clinical perspective. circulation: cardiovascular imaging, 10(7), e005934. https://doi:10.1161/circimaging.116.005934.

[40]Dai, J., Hou, J., Xing, L., Jia, H., Hu, S., Soeda, T., Jang, I.K. (2017). Is age an important factor for vascular response to statin therapy? A serial optical coherence tomography and intravascular ultrasound study. Coronary Artery Disease, 28(3), 209−217. https://doi:10.1097/mca.00000000000004.

[41]Nicholls, S. J., Puri, R., Anderson, T., Ballantyne, C. M., Cho, L., Kastelein, J. J. P., Nissen, S. E. (2016). Effect of evolocumab on progression of coronary disease in statin-treated patients. JAMA, 316(22), 2373. https://doi:10.1001/jama.2016.16951.

[42]Spence, J. D., & Solo, K. (2017). Resistant atherosclerosis. Stroke, 48(6), 1624−1629. https://doi:10.1161/strokeaha.117.0173.

[43]Ridker, P. M., Howard, C. P., Walter, V., Everett, B., Libby, P., Hensen, J. (2012). Effects of interleukin-1 inhibition with canakinumab on hemoglobin A1c, lipids, C-reactive protein, interleukin-6, and fibrinogen: A phase IIb randomized, placebo-controlled Trial. Circulation, 126(23), 2739 − 2748. https://doi:10.1161/circulationaha.112.122556.

Table1 Main characteristics and findings of included studies.

First author, published year	Country	Study duration	Therapy (mg/d)	Participants (n)	Age (years)	Male (%)	CRP /hsCRP	Percent change of CRP/hsCRP (%)	Percent change of LDL-C (%)	Change of TAV/PV (mm^3/L)	Change of PAV (%)
Hong, 2008	Korea	12 months	Ros 20	16	60±8	75	hsCRP	−94.35	−46.38	−5.62±7.71	−0.80±1.27
			Ato 40	14	62±90	43		−93.85	−43.31	−4.74±8.51	−0.57±1.15
Hong, 2011	Korea	11 months	Ros 20	65	59±10	75	hsCRP	−80	−49.18	−4.4±7.3	−0.73±2.05
			Ato 40	63	58±10	73		−89.25	−40.17	−3.6±6.8	−0.19±2.10
Kawasaki, 2005		6 months	Ato 20	18	66±8.7	70.6	CRP	−65	−39	−3.8±32.2	/
			Pra 20	17	67±7.8	72.2		−18	−32	−1.6±32.1	/
			Diet	17	66±6.4	82.4		17	−2	0±29.9	/
Nicholls, 2011	America, et al	104 weeks	Ros 40	520	57.4±8.6	72.9	CRP	−35.29	−47.83	−6.39±13.96	−1.22±3.61
			Ato 80	519	57.9±8.5	74.4		−33.33	−41.45	−4.42±15.81	−0.99±3.49
Nissen, 2004	America	18 months	Ato 80	253	55.8 ±9.8	71	CRP	−36.4	−46.3	−0.9±20.69	0.2±3.25
			Pra 40	249	56.6±9.2	73		−5.2	−25.2	4.4±23.75	1.6±4.03
Nozue, 2012	Japan	8 months	Pit 4	58	66±9	90	hsCRP	−75	−41	/	−0.2±3.4
			Pra 20	61	67±11	77		−75	−29	/	0.2±4.8

[a] Ros: rosuvastatin; Ato: atorvastatin; Pra: pravastatin; Pit: pitavastatin; Sim: simvastatin.

Table1 (continued)

First author, published year	Country	Study duration	Therapy (mg/d)	Participants (n)	Age (years)	Male (%)	CRP /hsCRP	Percent change of CRP/hsCRP (%)	Percent change of LDL-C (%)	Change of TAV/PV (mm^3/L)	Change of PAV (%)
Park, 2016	Korea	12 months	Ros 40	152	62.6±9.3	71	hsCRP	−52.38	−43.87	−14.72±29.59	−0.88±4.93
			Ros 10	73	61.8±8.9	77		−47.83	−27.90	−13.63±21.87	−0.85±3.25
Takayama, 2016	Japan	48 weeks	Ros 20	18	65.1±10.1	72	hsCRP	−65	−50	−3.1±33.5	/
			Ros 2.5	19	63.8±8.5	83		−60	−30	1.2±33.5	/
Hiro, 2009	Japan	8-12 months	Ato 20	127	62.4±10.6	81.1	hsCRP	−95.4	−35.8	−10.6±10.6	−6.3±6.1
			Pit 4	125	62.5±11.5	82.4		−97.3	−36.2	−8.2±8.9	−5.7±6.3
Hong, 2009	Korea	12 months	Ros 10	50	59±9	74	CRP	−57.14	−44.83	−3.6±7.2	/
			Sim 20	50	58±10	80		−29.41	−34.45	−1.8±5.7	/
Zhang, 2013	China	9 months	Ato 80	50	64.5±13.8	62	hsCRP	−66.36	−40.91	−1.5±9.33	/
			Ato 20	50	65.5±6.2	58		−37.41	−24.58	8.36±9.33	/
Guo, 2012	China	6 months	Ato 10	47	62.64±12.00	85.1	hsCRP	11.59	−22.11	−0.02±13.76	/
			Ato 20	45	59.18±8.48	80.0		0.39	−31.16	2.29±13.76	/
			Ato 40	43	58.91±12.90	95.3		−13.94	−36.21	−6.37±13.76	/
			Ato 80	39	58.95±9.68	87.2		−41.15	−36.04	−11.48±13.76	/
			Placebo	54	62.07±8.51	88.9		35.50	1.02	2.63±13.76	/

[a] Ros: rosuvastatin; Ato: atorvastatin; Pra: pravastatin; Pit: pitavastatin; Sim: simvastatin.

Table 2 meta-regression analysis for SMD in change of TAV/PV

Variables	Model 1 β	Model 2 β	Model 3 β	Model 4 β
Intercept	−0.1463	−0.1513	**−0.2419***	0.768
Percent change of CRP/hsCRP	**0.0064***	——	**0.0119***	**0.0124****
Percent change of LDL-C	——	0.0075	−0.0129	−0.0137
Age	——	——	——	−0.0248
Gender	——	——	——	0.0063

[a] *p<0.05; and **p<0.01

Table 3 meta-regression analysis for SMD in percent change of PAV

Variables	Model 1 β	Model 2 β	Model 3 β	Model 4 β
Intercept	−0.0833	−0.0217	−0.0735	−0.6353
Percent change of CRP/hsCRP	**0.0086****	——	0.0079	0.0045
Percent change of LDL-C	——	0.0127	0.0015	0.0038
Age	——	——	——	0.0158
Gender	——	——	——	−0.0052

[a] **p*<0.05; and ***p*<0.01



Fig. 1. Flowchart for study



Fig. 2. Forest plot of change of TAV/PV



Fig. 3. Forest plot of change of PAV