Interventions to manage intolerance among patients prescribed statins for primary prevention of cardiovascular diseases: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Shagoofa Rakhshanda [1], Jitendra Jonnagaddala [2,], Siaw-Teng Liaw [1], Joel Rhee [2] and Kerry-Anne Rye [3]*

[1] School of Population Health, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052 Australia

[2] Discipline of General Practice, School of Clinical Medicine, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052 Australia

[3] School of Biomedical Sciences, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052 Australia

* *Corresponding author*

Shagoofa Rakhshanda, s.rakhshanda@unsw.edu.au; ORCID: 0000-0001-9172-7042

Jitendra Jonnagaddala, jitendra.jonnagaddala@unsw.edu.au; ORCID: 0000-0002-9912-2344

Siaw-Teng Liaw, siaw@unsw.edu.au; ORCID: 0000-0001-5989-3614

Joel Rhee, J.Rhee@unsw.edu.au; ORCID: 0000-0002-5233-2758

Kerry-Anne Rye, k.rye@unsw.edu.au; ORCID: 0000-0002-9751-917X

Word count: 266 (abstract); 4,103 (main text excluding references and tables)

Abstract

The objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to identify the interventions used to manage intolerance in patients receiving statins for primary prevention of CVD and to determine the effectiveness of these interventions. This study was conducted according to the PRISMA checklist. The electronic databases MEDLINE (PubMed), SCOPUS, EMBASE, and CINAHL were searched for studies published until June 2025. Based on the NLA definition of statin intolerance, the outcomes were split into adverse effects caused by statins and statin discontinuation. In total, 1,238 studies were identified and screened. Nine studies were eligible for systematic review, and six studies were eligible for meta-analysis. The identified intervention strategies were adjuvant therapy, statin titration, replacing statins with other lipid-lowering agents and switching to different statin. The meta-analysis showed that the pooled risk ratio (RR) relative to control was 0.97 (95% CI, 0.86–1.08) in randomized controlled trials and 0.94 (95% CI, 0.63–1.42) in overall, with point estimates in favour of intervention arms. Moderate to substantial heterogeneity was observed, with I^2 between 27% to 57%. Due to the smaller number of studies, no clear conclusions can be drawn regarding how the implemented interventions may affect statin discontinuation. This study showed no strong evidence that the implemented interventions reduced statin intolerance.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42024587573

Keywords: Statin, intolerance, primary prevention, interventions, cardiovascular diseases

Highlights

This study found that the intervention strategies used to manage intolerance in patients receiving statins for the primary prevention of cardiovascular diseases were adjuvant therapy, statin titration, replacing statins with other lipid-lowering agents and switching to different statin.

- This study showed no strong evidence that the implemented interventions reduced statin intolerance
- Due to the smaller number of studies, no clear conclusions can be drawn regarding how the implemented interventions may affect statin discontinuation

1 Introduction

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a condition that causes high rates of morbidity and mortality worldwide. In 2019 32% of deaths worldwide were caused by CVD. Atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) is a type of CVD that occurs due to the formation of cholesterol-rich plaques on the inner walls of arteries (intima), which narrow the lumen (1, 2, 3, 4). Statins are lipid-lowering drugs that lower cholesterol levels and are widely used as first-line pharmacological agents for the primary and secondary prevention of CVD, primarily ASCVD (5). Primary prevention measures seek to prevent the development of CVD before it occurs, whereas secondary prevention measures seek to prevent the future occurrence of CV events in patients with established disease (6). The effectiveness of statins as a preventive measure depends greatly on the level of tolerance of patients towards statins, which in turn is associated with patients' adherence to statins (7).

Intolerance to statins is a clinical issue that is characterised by muscle symptoms and other adverse effects such as myopathy and rhabdomyolysis. Statin intolerance attenuates cholesterol lowering and increases cardiovascular risk (7). The estimated incidence rate of statin intolerance varies between 7% and 29%, leading to statin discontinuation (8). This estimation variation is partly attributed to different definitions of intolerance including statin-associated muscle symptoms (SAMS) (9, 10). Other definitions include the inability to tolerate a statin dose or two or more statins at any dose, limiting the effectiveness of the treatment (11, 12, 13). One of the most commonly used definitions of statin intolerance by the National Lipid Association (NLA) is the adverse effect of statins that improves with dose reduction or discontinuation (14, 15). However, in clinical practice, it is difficult to differentiate muscle symptoms caused by statin intolerance from those caused by other factors, such as vitamin D deficiency, hypothyroidism, and drug interactions, which can also cause muscle symptoms (16, 17).

Evidence suggests that there are several approaches for the management of statin intolerance, including changing dosages, switching to different statins, or substituting or adding non-statin lipid-lowering agents (18). However, owing to the complexity of statin intolerance in terms of adverse effects caused by statins (such as adverse events, muscle symptoms and myalgia) and statin discontinuation, there is a need for a comprehensive and deeper understanding of the management strategies that will provide fundamental insights into statin adherence and CVD

risk reduction. Therefore, the aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to identify and assess the effect of interventions used to manage statin intolerance for the primary prevention of CVD in patients receiving statins for primary prevention of CVD.

2 Methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist **(Supplement 1)**. The protocol registration number for PROSPERO is CRD42024587573 (19). Previous publications reflect the initial findings based on this protocol (20, 21).

2.1 Eligibility criteria

This systematic review and meta-analysis included studies on patients prescribed statins for primary prevention of CVD. The included population were adults aged ≥ 18 years, who were prescribed statins for primary prevention at a primary healthcare facility. The included studies consisting of interventions that managed statin intolerance among patients prescribed statins for primary prevention of CVD. The included interventions had to target patients receiving only statins or multiple medications including statins for primary prevention of CVD. The included controls were placebo, statin monotherapy, or usual care groups (with no intervention or change in usual care activities). The outcomes of interest in the included studies were any data or statistics related to tolerance outcomes, such as the number of patients with adverse events, adverse effects, serious adverse events, muscle-related symptoms, myalgia, and creatine kinase (CK) levels > 10 upper limit of normal (ULN). The included studies were clinical trials, intervention studies and cohort studies investigating any intervention that managed statin intolerance, that were published in English language in peer-reviewed journals until June 2025. Due to the better understanding of the studies by the authors, articles that were not published in English language were not included. Further details on the eligibility criteria are provided in **Supplement 2**.

2.2 Search strategy

The electronic databases MEDLINE (PubMed), EMBASE, SCOPUS, and CINAHL were searched for studies published until June 2025. The search terms are presented in **Supplement 3**.

2.3 Data collection

Based on the eligibility criteria, two researchers (SR and JJ) independently screened the titles and abstracts of all the studies to identify relevant studies. The same two researchers (SR and JJ) conducted a full-text screening of relevant studies to identify eligible studies. An automated software package (Covidence) was used for this purpose (22, 23).

The researchers (SR and JJ) followed the data extraction sheet to independently enter data from each eligible study. The extracted data included details of the study, including the methods, patient characteristics, interventions, controls, and outcomes. Any discrepancies or differences in opinions were discussed and resolved during study identification and data extraction processes. The interventions identified in this study were categorised based on therapeutic options for the management of statin intolerance including switching to different statins, statin titration (dose alteration, frequency alteration or intensity alteration), replacing statins with other lipid-lowering agents (such as ezetimibe, evolocumab, bempedoic acids, and proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 [PCSK9] inhibitors), and adjuvant therapy (addition of other non-statin drugs or lipid-lowering agents along with statins) (24, 25, 26).

2.4 Risk of bias assessment

We used the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for randomised trials (ROBS 2) to assess risk of bias in randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and the Cochrane risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions (ROBINS-1) to assess risk of bias in non-randomised studies of the effects of interventions (NRSI). Both ROB 2 and ROBINS-1 included the following domains: bias due to deviations from intended interventions, bias due to missing outcome data, bias in measurement of outcome, and bias in selection of reported results. Additionally, ROB 2 included a domain for the bias arising from the randomization process, and ROBINS-1

included domains for the bias due to confounding, bias in selection of participants into the study and bias in classification of interventions.

Two researchers (SR and JJ) assessed the studies individually and any discrepancies or differences in opinions were discussed and resolved. Publication bias was assessed using funnel plots, through which asymmetry could be identified visually (27). Egger's test was not used since the number of studies eligible for meta-analysis did not meet the recommendations of a minimum of 10 studies for testing asymmetry in funnel plot, as defined in the Cochrane Handbook.

2.5 Data synthesis and analysis

Inconsistencies in the data were addressed through data synthesis, which reduced bias and increased generalisability, such as categorising all non-randomized trials, quasi experiments and cohort studies as NRSIs. The data synthesis was guided by the intervention strategies that were used during the data collection phase. Meta-analysis was conducted when sufficient and relevant data were available. The data analysis, which used baseline and endline measurements, was performed via the ‘meta’ package in R, where the overall effect size was estimated via a random effects model (28, 29). Intolerance outcomes were measured using various approaches, such as adverse events, adverse effects, muscle-related symptoms, myalgia, and CK levels > 10 ULN. The variability of outcome measures was addressed by standardising the measures where appropriate (e.g. the number of participants with adverse effects caused by statins such as adverse events, severe adverse events, muscle symptoms or myalgia were standardized as statin intolerance). Based on the NLA definition of statin intolerance, the outcomes were split into two variables, adverse effects caused by statins or statin intolerance (as described above) and statin discontinuation (when patient discontinued statins because of intolerance). The estimated overall effect size was reported as the relative risk (RR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). Cochrane’s Q test, I-square test, and chi-square test were used to assess heterogeneity between studies. To explore whether effect estimates differed according to outcome definitions, subgroup analyses by intolerance measurement type were performed. Several other subgroup analyses were performed based on study designs and included analysis of the effectiveness of intervention strategies, as well as mean ages and locations of the participants. All analyses were done as stratified by study design. Tables and narrative reports were used to present the results of the systematic review

and forest plots were used to present the results of the meta-analyses. A detailed analysis plan is available in a previously published protocol (19).

2.6 Ethics statement

This study is a systematic review and meta-analysis. It does not involve human participants.

3 Results

3.1 Selection of studies

The search of electronic databases yielded 1,238 studies, 190 of which were duplicates. Of the remaining 1,048 studies, 952 were excluded based on the eligibility criteria. This left 96 studies for full-text screening, of which 87 were excluded, and 9 were eligible for data extraction **(Figure 1)**. The full list of the 87 excluded studies is provided in **Supplement 4**.

Figure 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram showing the study selection process

3.2 Study characteristics

This systematic review and meta-analysis included nine studies, the details of which are shown in **Table 1.** Four studies were conducted in North America (30, 31, 32, 33), five in Asia (31, 34, 35, 36, 37), two in Europe (31, 38), one in Australasia (31), one in South America (31), and one in Africa (31). Among these studies, one included participants from 32 countries spanning over six continents (31). The studies included RCTs (n=5) and NRSIs including intervention and cohort studies (n=4). Both the intervention and control groups included participants whose mean ages ranged from 52.2 years to approximately 68 years. To measure statin intolerance, six studies used discontinuation of statins (30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38), five used adverse effects or events (30, 31, 34, 35, 36), three used muscle symptoms (30, 34, 35), three used myalgia (30, 31, 33), three used creatine kinase > 10 ULN or elevation (31,

37, 38), two used serious adverse events (30, 31), two used adverse drug reactions (30, 35), and one used statin intolerance (32). Of the nine included studies, three were not eligible for meta-analysis (32, 36, 38), as they included the same population in the intervention and control groups, or there were no data on statin intolerance stratified by intervention and control group.

The risk of bias assessment of the nine included studies are shown in **Supplement 5**. Overall, approximately 22.2% of the studies (n=2) were high-risk, 66.7% (n=6) were of some concern, and 11.1% (n=1) were low-risk.

Table 1: Characteristics of the included studies that assessed strategies to manage statin intolerance

Study	Country	Study design	Study duration	Sample size	Study participants				Intolerance measure	Meta-analysis
					Intervention		Control			
					Number of participants	Mean age	Number of participants	Mean age		
Malekzadeh et al., 2010	Iran	RCT	12 months	475	241	59.0	234	59.1	Creatine kinase > 10x ULN	Eligible
Kennedy et al., 2011	USA	RCT	4 months	17	15	64.5	17	64.5	Myalgia	Eligible
Meek et al., 2012	UK	NRSI	79 months	224	90	63	134	63	Discontinuation and creatine kinase elevation	Ineligible
Laufs et al., 2019	USA and Canada	RCT	16 months	345	234	65.2	111	65.1	Adverse drug reactions, adverse events, serious adverse events, muscle symptoms, myalgia and discontinuation	Eligible
Thongtang et al., 2020	Thailand	RCT	10 months	150	74	58.8	76	58.9	Adverse events, muscle symptoms and discontinuation	Eligible
Hong et al., 2022	Korea	NRSI	24 months	700	525	60.58	175	61.06	Adverse events, muscle symptoms and adverse drug reactions	Eligible

Iqbal et al., 2022	UAE	NRSI	46 months	81	81	52.2	81	52.2	Adverse events and discontinuation	Ineligible
Solomon et al., 2022	USA	NRSI	60 months	169	169	65	169	65	Statin intolerance and discontinuation	Ineligible
Nissen et al., 2023	32 countries spanned over 6 continents	RCT	33 months	4206	2100	67.9	2106	68	Serious adverse events, adverse events, myalgia, creatine kinase > 10x ULN and discontinuation	Eligible

USA: United States of America; NRSI: Nonrandomized studies of the effects of interventions; RCT: Randomized controlled trial; ULN: Upper limit of normal

3.3 Intervention characteristics and key findings

Table 2 shows that there were three adjuvant therapy interventions (35, 36, 37) of which one was a multicomponent intervention including adjuvant therapy, three interventions of statin titration (33, 34, 38), two interventions of replacing statins with other lipid-lowering agents (30, 31) and one intervention of switching to different statins (32). Three of the interventions took place in primary care settings (33, 35, 36), three took place in multicentre settings including primary care (30, 31, 38), one took place in a clinical trial setting (34), one took place in tertiary care setting (32) and the settings of one study was unclear (37). Three studies (32, 36, 37) included interventions delivered by general practitioners (GPs) and family doctors, and six studies (30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 38) did not specify the intervention deliverer, but it was most likely general practitioners. The objectives of all studies were to investigate or assess the tolerability or safety of an intervention in statin intolerant patients.

The key findings of this systematic review are summarised in **Table 2**. Overall, five studies (30, 31, 32, 35, 36) reported better outcomes for statin intolerance in the intervention group compared to the control group. Three studies (33, 34, 37) did not demonstrate better outcomes in the intervention group compared to the control group. One study (38) did not show any difference between the intervention group and the control group.

Table 2: Characteristics of the interventions used and the key findings of the included studies that assessed strategies to manage statin intolerance

Study	Objectives	Intervention			Comparators or controls	Main findings
		Setting	Delivered by	Strategy		
Malekzadeh et al. 2010	To investigate the effects and tolerability of fixed-dose combination therapy	Unclear (rural setting likely primary care)	GPs	Multi-component interventions: education-based (information letter, pamphlets) & adjuvant therapy (combination therapy including statins)	Patients receiving placebo	CK > 10x ULN were observed in nine intervention and two control participants (p = 0.063).
Kennedy et al., 2011	To assess the efficacy and tolerability of once-weekly rosuvastatin in patients with documented myalgias on statins	Primary care	Not specified (likely GPs)	Statin titration (frequency titrated down to once-weekly)	Patients receiving once-weekly placebo	Two of the 17 patients (11.8%) in the placebo treatment phase and three of the 15 patients (20%) in the rosuvastatin treatment phase experienced myalgias requiring cessation of therapy.
Meek et al., 2012	To assess the tolerability and efficacy of alternate dosing of rosuvastatin	Multicentre including primary care	Not specified (likely GPs)	Statin titration (frequency titrated down from once-daily to alternated dosing regimen of rosuvastatin)	Daily dosing regimen of rosuvastatin	Of all the patients, 11.0% patients discontinued
Laufs et al., 2019	To evaluate the efficacy, safety, and	Multicentre including	Not specified	Replacing statins with other lipid-lowering	Patients receiving	12.8% in the intervention group and 16.2% in the

	tolerability of bempedoic acid in statin-intolerant patients	primary care	(likely GPs)	agents (bempedoic acid)	placebo	control group had muscle-related adverse events
Thongtang et al., 2020	To investigate the efficacy and safety of switching from low-dose statin to high-intensity statin	Clinical trial	Not specified (likely GPs)	Statin titration (changing of low intensity statin to high intensity statin)	Patients receiving low-dose statins	Discontinuation of statin due to adverse effects was more frequent in intervention group compared to control group (5.4% vs. 1.3%, p=0.38 for atorvastatin 40 mg/day, and 12.2% vs. 1.3%, p=0.03 for atorvastatin 80 mg/day). No serious adverse events were observed in either group
Hong et al., 2022	To analyze the efficacy and safety of fixed-dose rosuvastatin and ezetimibe (R + E) combination therapy	Primary care	Not specified (likely GPs)	Adjuvant therapy (fixed-dose combination therapy including rosuvastatin and ezetimibe)	Patients receiving statin monotherapy	Fixed-dose rosuvastatin and ezetimibe combination therapy was associated with fewer adverse events compared with statin monotherapy at 12 months of follow-up
Iqbal et al., 2022	To explore the safety profile and clinical effectiveness of evolocumab	Primary care	GPs	Adjuvant therapy (combination of statin and evolocumab)	Patients receiving only statin therapy	Adverse events occurred in 4.9% patients in intervention and 14.8% patients in control
Solomon et al., 2022	To determine whether transition from lipophilic statin	Tertiary care	GPs	Switching to different statins (switching from a lipophilic to a hydrophilic	Patients receiving lipophilic	Correction of subclinical hypothyroidism and/or vitamin D

	to hydrophilic statin improved statin tolerance			statin and Vitamin D supplementation)	statin, without any Vitamin D supplementation	insufficiency/deficiency or transition from a lipophilic statin to water-soluble statin (or lipophilic statin with minimal systemic exposure) improved statin tolerance
Nissen et al., 2023	To determine the effects of bempedoic acid on cardiovascular outcomes in statin intolerant primary prevention patients	Multicentre including primary care	Not specified (likely GPs)	Replacing statins with other lipid-lowering agents (bempedoic acid)	Patients receiving placebo	Serious treatment emergent adverse events was 19.9% in intervention group and 20.8% in control group

CK: Creatine kinase; ULN: Upper limit of normal; GPs: General practitioners

3.4 Reduction in adverse effects

Randomized controlled trials: Of the six eligible studies for meta-analysis, five were RCTs and one was an NRSI study. In the meta-analysis of these RCT studies that included 2,664 intervention participants and 2,544 control participants **(Figure 2a)**, the implemented interventions did not show any reduction in statin intolerance with a risk ratio (RR) of 0.97 (95% CI, 0.86–1.08), pooled across definitions of statin intolerance, relative to the control. Although the point estimate suggested potential reduction of statin intolerance relative to control, the confidence interval (CI) includes the possibility of no effect as it did not exclude 1.0, limiting the confidence in this finding. There was a moderate heterogeneity as depicted by an I-square of 27.4%.

For the RCT studies, there was mixed evidence of an effect on statin intolerance for different intervention strategies relative to controls, and no significant evidence overall for a difference among subgroups (χ_2^2=5.0; p=0.08), as shown in **Figure 2b**. The point estimate showed evidence of potential reduction in statin intolerance relative to control for interventions where statins were replaced with other lipid-lowering agents with RR 0.95 (95% CI, 0.84–1.07) although the CI crossed 1.0, limiting the confidence of this finding. Statin titration and adjuvant therapy showed no evidence of reduced intolerance relative to control, with RR 1.43 (95% CI, 0.69–2.94) and 4.37 (95% CI, 0.95–20.01), respectively. There was no heterogeneity for all the intervention strategies. However, only one study included an adjuvant therapy intervention, two studies included replacing statins, and the rest of the two studies included statin titration. Due to the smaller number of studies in each subgroup, no clear conclusions can be drawn regarding whether the implemented interventions affect statin intolerance. Moreover, the confidence interval includes the possibility of no effect as it did not exclude 1.0 which reduces the confidence in this finding.

Figure 2: Forest plot for randomized controlled trials highlighting the effects of interventions on statin intolerance, as depicted by risk ratio **(a)** overall **(b)** in terms of various intervention strategies. Individual study estimates are shown as squares, with the size reflecting study weight, and horizontal lines represent 95% confidence intervals. Diamonds indicate pooled effect estimates derived using a random-effects model. An RR of 0.97 indicates 3% lower intolerance in the intervention group, while the 95% CI of 0.86–1.08 indicates weak

confidence in the evidence. Overall, the plots demonstrate no reduction in intolerance with moderate degree of heterogeneity across studies.

RR: Risk ratio; CI: Confidence interval

Further subgroup analyses were performed to determine whether participant age and study region were associated with statin intolerance in the RCT studies **(Supplement 6)**. For both studies in which the participants aged ≥65 years, the point estimates of interventions showed evidence of potential reduction in statin intolerance relative to control, with a RR of 0.95 (95% CI, 0.84–1.07). However, the confidence interval includes the possibility of no effect as it did not exclude 1.0. For participants aged <65 years, the interventions showed no evidence of reduced intolerance relative to control, with RR 1.75 (95% CI, 0.91–3.37). The point estimate showed evidence of potential reduction in intolerance relative to controls in studies conducted in North America and those conducted in more than one region, with RR 0.85 (95% CI, 0.51–1.42) and RR 0.96 (95% CI, 0.85–1.08). Nonetheless, the upper bound of the CI was above 1.0, showing that there is a possibility of no effect. There was no evidence of reduced intolerance in studies conducted in Asia relative to control, with RR 2.03 (95% CI, 0.69–5.95). Only one study was conducted in more than one region, and two studies conducted in each of North America and Asia. Due to the smaller number of studies in each subgroup, no clear conclusions can be drawn regarding how participant age and study region may affect statin intolerance.

Overall: The meta-analysis of all eligible studies, including the one NRSI study showed a RR of 0.94, relative to control, pooled across definitions of statin intolerance **(Supplement 7)**. However, the 95% confidence interval (0.63–1.42) crossed 1.0 in a substantial manner which means that there is a high possibility of no effect. There was a substantial heterogeneity as depicted by an I-square of 56.4%. The results of the subgroup analyses including all eligible studies were consistent with those obtained from the subgroup analysis of the RCT studies. The details on all outcomes (such as muscle-related symptoms, myalgia, creatine kinase levels > 10x ULN) is shown in **Supplement 8**.

3.5 Statin discontinuation

Three studies (all RCTs) provided data on statin discontinuation. The meta-analysis of these studies including 2,408 intervention participants and 2,293 control participants showed no evidence of reduced statin discontinuation for the implemented interventions relative to the control, with a pooled RR of 0.99 (95% CI, 0.83–1.18) where the confidence interval includes the possibility of no effect as it did not exclude 1.0 **(Supplement 9)**. There was a low degree of heterogeneity as depicted by an I-square of 19.8%. However, due to the smaller number of studies, no clear conclusions can be drawn regarding how the implemented interventions affected statin discontinuation.

3.6 Publication bias

The risk of publication bias of studies on effects of interventions on statin intolerance was evaluated using a funnel plot **(Figure 3)** where the RR was compared with the standard error (SE) in the RR. Visual inspection suggested asymmetrical distributions, which may indicate publication bias and should be interpreted cautiously, particularly when the number of included studies is small.

Figure 3: Publication bias of all studies on statin intolerance

4 Discussion

This systematic review revealed that, out of the nine included studies, interventions in five studies reduced statin intolerance in patients prescribed statins for primary prevention of CVD. Among the four studies in which the interventions did not reduce statin intolerance, three were statin titration (changing statin frequency or intensity) interventions and one was a multi-component intervention consisting of adjuvant therapy (combination therapy including statins). One study did not show any difference between the intervention and control groups.

The objectives of all the studies were to investigate or assess the tolerability or safety of an intervention in statin intolerant patients. While the point estimates of pooled RR suggested a possible slight reduction in statin intolerance, the wide confidence interval (0.6–1.4) indicates a high level of imprecision as the true effect could range from a meaningful reduction to a meaningful increase in intolerance. Several subgroup analyses were performed based on intervention strategies, mean ages of the participants, and study locations, which showed similar results. There was no strong evidence that the interventions involving replacement of statins with other lipid-lowering agents, likely delivered at primary care by GPs, reduced statin intolerance and discontinuation. A common approach for managing statin intolerance is a statin rechallenge strategy involving temporary discontinuation of statins, followed by the reintroduction of a lower statin dose or switching to a different statin after a washout period (39, 40). Another common strategy is the use of non-statin lipid-lowering therapies, including PCSK9 inhibitors and ezetimibe (24, 26). Furthermore, education-based interventions and the utilisation of mobile health applications for tracking symptoms can help patients understand statin intolerance, which may lead to improved management (41, 42, 43).

All six of the eligible studies were mostly delivered by GPs at primary care settings, emphasizing that interventions are delivered by the GPs or physicians. The effectiveness of the interventions depended on the relationship between patients and their healthcare providers, which serves to highlight the importance of intervention setting and delivery. Studies have shown that primary care physicians (PCPs) and GPs, who are usually the first points of contact for statin-intolerant patients, play important roles in the management of statin intolerance (39). Some studies show that patients with muscle symptoms, myalgia, or adverse effects can be identified and flagged by PCPs and GPs using electronic health records (EHRs) to provide targeted interventions to these patients (44). Furthermore, clinics serve as an important setting for the management of statin intolerance, as they can distinguish between patients that cannot tolerate statins at all and those that require alternative treatment options (15, 45, 46, 47). However, the challenges associated with EHRs include inconsistency and variability in the classification and definition of statin intolerance. The electronic phenotyping of statin intolerance is complex and encompasses several characteristics, such as risk factors, diagnostic criteria, and management strategies, along with symptom types, genetic predisposition, and pharmacological properties of statins (48, 49, 50). Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of the taxonomy of statin intolerance is crucial for the advancement of research on managing statin intolerance to reduce CVD risk.

This meta-analysis showed no strong evidence of reduced intolerance relative to control for participants aged ≥65 years. Statin intolerance is particularly challenging in older adults and the elderly because of age-related physiological changes, and the complexities of comorbidities and polypharmacy. However, the age at which interventions are most effective in managing statin intolerance requires further research. Studies have shown that tailored interventions work well in managing statin intolerance in patients aged ≥ 65 years (51, 52). Older populations have been found to have improved tolerance after statin rechallenge or dose alterations (52, 53). Moreover, there are physiological (such as genetic) and psychological (such as nocebo effects) aspects of statin intolerance in older populations that can be targeted to reduce it (51, 54, 55).

This meta-analysis did not provide any evidence that, compared to controls, the implemented interventions reduced statin discontinuation. This suggests that statin discontinuation is the cumulative effect of the intervention and participant characteristics. Interventions that manage statin intolerance may eventually improve statin adherence and reduce statin discontinuation, but only to a small extent, which would improve patients' health (56). Factors such as patients' education level and perception of adverse effects of statins can influence the association between different intervention strategies and statin discontinuation, resulting in the inconclusive results of statin discontinuation (9, 56). Studies show that patients experiencing adverse effects of statins exhibit low adherence rates or discontinuation (57). Patient-centred interventions may have a potential impact on statin adherence and discontinuation, although this effect may vary across patient demographics (58, 59).

Limitations

Most of the studies included in this systematic review and meta-analysis consisted of moderate (some concerns) to high risk of bias, reflecting issues such as incomplete outcome reporting and potential confounding in non-randomized designs, which reduces the overall confidence in the pooled effect estimates and underscores the need for cautious interpretation. Limitations of this study also includes the increased risk of Type I error (finding false positives) due to performing many subgroup analyses. Moreover, the funnel plot suggested the presence of publication bias. However, Egger's test could not be used to check for the presence of publication bias since the number of eligible studies in this meta-analysis did not

meet the recommended number to test for asymmetry in funnel plots as defined by the Cochrane Handbook.

Another limitation of the study was that to narrow the search, the search syntax included only the term “primary prevention”, which may have caused the exclusion of studies that mentioned “primary and secondary prevention” **(Supplement 3)**. However, since these studies included both primary and secondary prevention patients, it may have been difficult to obtain data for only primary prevention patients. The various definitions of statin intolerance, including adverse effects, statin-associated muscle symptoms and myalgia make it a complex subject matter. As such, the definition of NLA that was used in this study was one of the broader ones which encompasses any adverse effects as a condition including adverse events, muscle symptoms, myalgia and so on. However, a more specific definition was not within the scope of this study. Since there is currently no specific taxonomy for statin intolerance, and due to the limited number of eligible studies, it was not feasible to stratify the studies based on their definitions, which has limited the overall robustness of the findings of this study. Furthermore, due to the lack of a standardized taxonomy for statin intolerance, some of the eligible studies did not assess the more clinically relevant end point of the development of cardiovascular disease in patients who have undergone interventions for the management of statin intolerance (although this end point could be attributed to factors beyond statin intolerance, such as statin adherence). Finally, the included studies did not report social factors such as education, nor did they report how nocebo/drucebo effects may have influenced intolerance which limits the results.

5 Conclusion

This systematic review identified that the interventions used to manage statin intolerance in the primary prevention of CVD were adjuvant therapy, statin titration, replacing statins with other lipid-lowering agents, and switching to different statins. The meta-analysis revealed that among patients who were prescribed statins for primary prevention of CVD, the implemented interventions showed no strong evidence of reduced statin intolerance. While the point estimates of the effect sizes were marginal (RR 0.97 in RCT studies and RR 0.94 in all studies) compared to the controls, the certainty of the evidence was limited since the

confidence interval crossed 1.0 and included the possibility of no effect. Due to the small number of studies, no clear conclusions can be drawn regarding how the implemented interventions may affect statin discontinuation. There is great uncertainty about the true effect of intervention strategies on statin intolerance. Clinicians might consider this when providing interventions to patients to manage statin intolerance for primary prevention of CVD. Several steps can be taken to facilitate the understanding of statin intolerance and to provide guidance for clinicians to determine the best interventions to manage the condition and to improve statin adherence, which are fundamental barriers to improving the overall health outcomes of patients at risk of CVD. Most importantly, there is a need to develop a taxonomy to better define and identify patients with statin intolerance. Furthermore, there is also a need to develop and establish an electronic phenotyping algorithm to identify statin intolerant patients from electronic health records. In summary, there is a clear need to focus more on research related to the role of general practitioners in delivering patient-centred interventions to manage statin intolerance in patients receiving statins for primary prevention of CVD.

Author contributions:

1. JR and JJ contributed to the conceptualization of this study.
2. JJ contributed to the funding acquisition
3. JR, KAR, STL and JJ contributed to the resources and supervision of this study
4. JR, KAR, STL and JJ contributed to the validation
5. All authors contributed to the reviewing and editing of this study
6. SR and JJ contributed to data curation
7. SR contributed to the formal analysis and the original drafting of this study
8. SR and JJ contributed to the methodology of the study

Data sharing statement: The corresponding author will make the data available upon request.

Competing Interests: Joel Rhee has received honorarium from Merck Sharpe & Dohme and Pfizer for providing advice, chairing and presenting at educational events for clinicians. Jitendra Jonnagaddala has served in a consulting or advisory capacity for WHO and UNICEF and he also received speakers' fees from the Ministry of Health, Indonesia. The Authors declare that they have no other competing interests.

Patient and public involvement: Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

Funding: This study was funded by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (Grant Number: GNT1192469). JJ also acknowledges the funding support received through the 296 Research Technology Services at UNSW Sydney, Google Cloud Research (Award Number: 297 GCP19980904), and the NVIDIA Academic Hardware grant programs.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the ePBRN Primary Care Health Informatics Working Group of the Secure Research Environment for Digital Health (SREDH) Consortium (www.sredhconsortium.org, accessed on 7 October 2024) for their assistance with access to the ePBRN dataset to investigate the findings from this review. We would also like to thank Stats Central, University of New South Wales, for their assistance during the data analysis.

References

1. Nicholson G, Gandra SR, Halbert RJ, Richhariya A, Nordyke RJ. Patient-level costs of major cardiovascular conditions: a review of the international literature. ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research. 2016:495-506.

2. World Health Organization WHO. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs). 2021.

3. World Health Organization WHO. Social determinants of health 2023 [Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/social-determinants-of-health#tab=tab_1.

4. Mocumbi AO. Cardiovascular Health Care in Low-and Middle-Income Countries. Circulation. 2024;149(8):557-9.

5. Kang DO, Park Y, Seo JH, Jeong MH, Chae SC, Ahn TH, et al. Time-dependent prognostic effect of high sensitivity C-reactive protein with statin therapy in acute myocardial infarction. Journal of cardiology. 2019;74(1):74-83.

6. Amiri M. Worldwide statins prescription pattern: is it similar. Biom Biostat Int J. 2020;9(6):194.

7. Bytyçi I, Penson PE, Mikhailidis DP, Wong ND, Hernandez AV, Sahebkar A, et al. Prevalence of statin intolerance: a meta-analysis. European heart journal. 2022;43(34):3213-23.

8. Barry AR, Beach JE, Pearson GJ. Prevention and management of statin adverse effects: A practical approach for pharmacists. Canadian Pharmacists Journal/Revue des Pharmaciens du Canada. 2018;151(3):179-88.

9. Stroes ES, Thompson PD, Corsini A, Vladutiu GD, Raal FJ, Ray KK, et al. Statin-associated muscle symptoms: impact on statin therapy—European Atherosclerosis Society consensus panel statement on assessment, aetiology and management. European heart journal. 2015;36(17):1012-22.

10. Penson PE, Mancini GJ, Toth PP, Martin SS, Watts GF, Sahebkar A, et al. Introducing the ‘Drucebo’effect in statin therapy: a systematic review of studies

comparing reported rates of statin associated muscle symptoms, under blinded and open label conditions. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle. 2018;9(6):1023-33.

11. Mancini GJ, Baker S, Bergeron J, Fitchett D, Frohlich J, Genest J, et al. Diagnosis, prevention, and management of statin adverse effects and intolerance: Canadian Consensus Working Group Update (2016). Canadian Journal of Cardiology. 2016;32(7):S35-S65.

12. Sposito AC, Faria Neto JR, Carvalho LSFd, Lorenzatti A, Cafferata A, Elikir G, et al. Statin-associated muscle symptoms: position paper from the Luso-Latin American Consortium. Current Medical Research and Opinion. 2017;33(2):239-51.

13. Banach M, Rizzo M, Toth PP, Farnier M, Davidson MH, Al-Rasadi K, et al. Statin intolerance–an attempt at a unified definition. Position paper from an International Lipid Expert Panel: This paper is also published in parallel in Archives of Medical Science [Banach M, Rizzo M, Toth PP, et al. Statin intolerance–an attempt at a unified definition. Position paper from an International Lipid Expert Panel. Arch Med Sci 2015; 11 (1): 1–23]. Expert opinion on drug safety. 2015;14(6):935-55.

14. Guyton JR, Bays HE, Grundy SM, Jacobson TA. An assessment by the Statin Intolerance Panel: 2014 update. Journal of clinical lipidology. 2014;8(3):S72-S81.

15. Cheeley MK, Saseen JJ, Agarwala A, Ravilla S, Ciffone N, Jacobson TA, et al. NLA scientific statement on statin intolerance: a new definition and key considerations for ASCVD risk reduction in the statin intolerant patient. Journal of Clinical Lipidology. 2022;16(4):361-75.

16. Stulc T, Ceška R, Gotto AM. Statin intolerance: the clinician's perspective. Current atherosclerosis reports. 2015;17:1-7.

17. Penson PE, Bruckert E, Marais D, Reiner Ž, Pirro M, Sahebkar A, et al. Step by step diagnosis and management of the nocebo/drucebo effect in statin associated muscle symptoms patients: a position paper from the International Lipid Expert Panel (ILEP). Journal of cachexia, sarcopenia and muscle. 2022;13(3):1596-622.

18. Moriarty PM, Jacobson TA, Bruckert E, Thompson PD, Guyton JR, Baccara-Dinet MT, et al. Efficacy and safety of alirocumab, a monoclonal antibody to PCSK9, in statin-intolerant patients: design and rationale of ODYSSEY ALTERNATIVE, a randomized phase 3 trial. Journal of clinical lipidology. 2014;8(6):554-61.

19. Rakhshanda S, Jonnagaddala J, Liaw S-T, Rhee J, Rye K-A. Protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis of assessing the effectiveness of various interventions to address statin intolerance and improve adherence among patients at risk of cardiovascular diseases. PROSPERO 2024 2024;CRD42024587573.

20. Rakhshanda S, Liaw S-T, Rhee J, Rye K-A, Jonnagaddala J. Strategies to Improve Statin Medication Adherence Among Patients at Risk of Cardiovascular Disease Identified Through Electronic Health Records: A Literature Review. MEDINFO 2023—The Future Is Accessible. 2024:986-90.

21. Rakhshanda S, Liaw S-T, Rhee J, Rye K-A, Jonnagaddala J. Strategies to Address Statin Medication Intolerance Among Patients at Risk of Cardiovascular Disease Identified Through Electronic Health Records: A Literature Review and Pooled Analysis. Digital Health and Informatics Innovations for Sustainable Health Care Systems. 2024:132-6.

22. Macdonald M, Misener RM, Weeks L, Helwig M. Covidence vs Excel for the title and abstract review stage of a systematic review. JBI Evidence Implementation. 2016;14(4):200-1.

23. Cleo G, Scott AM, Islam F, Julien B, Beller E. Usability and acceptability of four systematic review automation software packages: a mixed method design. Systematic reviews. 2019;8:1-5.

24. Raju SB, Varghese K, Madhu K. Management of statin intolerance. Indian journal of endocrinology and metabolism. 2013;17(6):977-82.

25. Alonso R, Cuevas A, Cafferata A. Diagnosis and management of statin intolerance. Journal of atherosclerosis and thrombosis. 2019;26(3):207-15.

26. Bosco G, Di Giacomo Barbagallo F, Spampinato S, Lanzafame L, Di Pino A, Piro S, et al. Management of statin intolerant patients in the era of novel lipid lowering therapies: A critical approach in clinical practice. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2023;12(6):2444.

27. Williamson GR, O'Connor A, Chamberlain C, Halpin D. mH ealth resources for asthma and pregnancy care: Methodological issues and social media recruitment. A discussion paper. Journal of advanced nursing. 2018;74(10):2442-9.

28. Dettori JR, Norvell DC, Chapman JR. Fixed-effect vs random-effects models for meta-analysis: 3 points to consider. Global Spine Journal. 2022;12(7):1624-6.

29. Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health. 2019;22(4):153-60.

30. Laufs U, Banach M, Mancini GJ, Gaudet D, Bloedon LT, Sterling LR, et al. Efficacy and safety of bempedoic acid in patients with hypercholesterolemia and statin intolerance. Journal of the American Heart Association. 2019;8(7):e011662.

31. Nissen SE, Menon V, Nicholls SJ, Brennan D, Laffin L, Ridker P, et al. Bempedoic acid for primary prevention of cardiovascular events in statin-intolerant patients. Jama. 2023;330(2):131-40.

32. Solomon R, Anne P, Swisher J, Nazeer B, Rosman H, Mehta RH, et al. Evaluating Statin Tolerability in Historically Intolerant Patients After Correcting for Subclinical Hypothyroidism and Vitamin D Insufficiency. High Blood Pressure & Cardiovascular Prevention. 2022;29(5):409-15.

33. Kennedy SP, Barnas GP, Schmidt MJ, Glisczinski MS, Paniagua AC. Efficacy and tolerability of once-weekly rosuvastatin in patients with previous statin intolerance. Journal of Clinical Lipidology. 2011;5(4):308-15.

34. Thongtang N, Piyapromdee J, Tangkittikasem N, Samaithongcharoen K, Srikanchanawat N, Sriussadaporn S. Efficacy and safety of switching from low-dose statin to high-intensity statin for primary prevention in type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. Diabetes, Metabolic Syndrome and Obesity. 2020:423-31.

35. Hong JH, Jeon U, Shin W-Y, Kim W, Seong K, Park S-H, et al. A Paradigm Shift in Dyslipidemia Management in Primary Care: A 12-Month Cohort Study. Clinical Therapeutics. 2022;44(5):698-709.

36. Iqbal S, Sabbour HM, Siddiqui MS, Al Tikriti A, Santos RD, Buckley A. The first report of a real-world experience with a PCSK9 inhibitor in a large familial hyperlipidemia and very-high-risk middle eastern population. Clinical Therapeutics. 2022;44(10):1297-309.

37. Malekzadeh F, Marshall T, Pourshams A, Gharravi M, Aslani A, Nateghi A, et al. A pilot double□blind randomised placebo□controlled trial of the effects of fixed□dose combination therapy (‘polypill’) on cardiovascular risk factors. International journal of clinical practice. 2010;64(9):1220-7.

38. Meek C, Wierzbicki AS, Jewkes C, Twomey PJ, Crook MA, Jones A, et al. Daily and intermittent rosuvastatin 5 mg therapy in statin intolerant patients: an observational study. Current medical research and opinion. 2012;28(3):371-8.

39. Tanner RM, Safford MM, Monda KL, Taylor B, O’Beirne R, Morris M, et al. Primary care physician perspectives on barriers to statin treatment. Cardiovascular drugs and therapy. 2017;31:303-9.

40. Toth PP, Patti AM, Giglio RV, Nikolic D, Castellino G, Rizzo M, et al. Management of statin intolerance in 2018: still more questions than answers. American Journal of Cardiovascular Drugs. 2018;18:157-73.

41. Cao W, Li L, Mathur P, Thompson J, Milks MW. A mobile health application for patients eligible for statin therapy: app development and qualitative feedback on design and usability. BMC medical informatics and decision making. 2023;23(1):128.

42. Rosenson RS, Baker S, Banach M, Borow KM, Braun LT, Bruckert E, et al. Optimizing cholesterol treatment in patients with muscle complaints. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2017;70(10):1290-301.

43. Fung V, Graetz I, Reed M, Jaffe MG. Patient-reported adherence to statin therapy, barriers to adherence, and perceptions of cardiovascular risk. PLoS One. 2018;13(2):e0191817.

44. Sarraju A, Coquet J, Zammit A, Chan A, Ngo S, Hernandez-Boussard T, et al. Using deep learning-based natural language processing to identify reasons for statin nonuse in patients with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. Communications Medicine. 2022;2(1):88.

45. Li JH, Joy SV, Haga SB, Orlando LA, Kraus WE, Ginsburg GS, et al. Genetically guided statin therapy on statin perceptions, adherence, and cholesterol lowering: a pilot implementation study in primary care patients. Journal of personalized medicine. 2014;4(2):147-62.

46. Barkas F, Adamidis P, Koutsogianni A-D, Liamis G, Liberopoulos E. Statin-associated side effects in patients attending a lipid clinic: evidence from a 6-year study. Archives of Medical Science-Atherosclerotic Diseases. 2021;6(1):182-7.

47. Koskinas K, Wilhelm M, Windecker S. Current treatment of dyslipidaemia: PCSK9 inhibitors and statin intolerance. Swiss medical weekly. 2016;146(w14333):w14333.

48. Chan S, Tham M, Tan S, Loke C, Foo B, Fan Y, et al. Development and validation of algorithms for the detection of statin myopathy signals from electronic medical records. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2017;101(5):667-74.

49. Cheeley MK, Clegg K, Lockridge C, Schubert TJ, Jones LK. Statin intolerance: an overview of US and international guidance. Current Atherosclerosis Reports. 2023;25(8):517-26.

50. Oni-Orisan A, Lu M, Peng JA, Krauss RM, Iribarren C, Medina MW. Development and application of an algorithm for statin-induced myopathy based on electronic health record-derived structured elements. medRxiv. 2023.

51. Katamesh BE, Mickow AA, Huang L, Dougan BM, Ratrout BM, Nanda S, et al. Overcoming patient reluctance to statin intolerance. Polish Heart Journal (Kardiologia Polska). 2024;82(5):485-91.

52. Mampuya WM, Frid D, Rocco M, Huang J, Brennan DM, Hazen SL, et al. Treatment strategies in patients with statin intolerance: the Cleveland Clinic experience. American heart journal. 2013;166(3):597-603.

53. Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, Brindle P, Hippisley-Cox J. Discontinuation and restarting in patients on statin treatment: prospective open cohort study using a primary care database. bmj. 2016;353.

54. Donnelly L, Doney A, Tavendale R, Lang C, Pearson E, Colhoun H, et al. Common nonsynonymous substitutions in SLCO1B1 predispose to statin intolerance in routinely treated individuals with type 2 diabetes: a go□DARTS study. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2011;89(2):210-6.

55. Bigossi M, Maroteau C, Dawed AY, Taylor A, Srinivasan S, Melhem AL, et al. Common and rare variants in SLCO1B1 are associated with statin intolerance. medRxiv. 2022:2022.08. 09.22278584.

56. Xie G, Myint PK, Sun Y, Li X, Wu T, Gao R-l, et al. Associated factors for discontinuation of statin use one year after discharge in patients with acute coronary syndrome in China. BMJ open. 2022;12(9):e056236.

57. Zhang H, Plutzky J, Skentzos S, Morrison F, Mar P, Shubina M, et al. Discontinuation of statins in routine care settings: a cohort study. Annals of internal medicine. 2013;158(7):526-34.

58. Jörntén-Karlsson M, Pintat S, Molloy-Bland M, Berg S, Ahlqvist M. Patient-centered interventions to improve adherence to statins: a narrative synthesis of systematically identified studies. Drugs. 2016;76(15):1447-65.

59. Frieden P, Gagnon R, Bénard É, Cossette B, Bergeron F, Talbot D, et al. Strategies aiming to improve statin therapy adherence in older adults: a systematic review. BMC geriatrics. 2024;24(1):444.



Figure 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram showing the study selection process



Figure 2: Forest plot for randomized controlled trials highlighting the effects of interventions on statin intolerance, as depicted by risk ratio **(a)** overall **(b)** in terms of various intervention strategies. Individual study estimates are shown as squares, with the size reflecting study weight, and horizontal lines represent 95% confidence intervals. Diamonds indicate pooled effect estimates derived using a random-effects model. An RR of 0.97 indicates 3% lower intolerance in the intervention group, while the 95% CI of 0.86–1.08 indicates weak confidence in the evidence. Overall, the plots demonstrate no reduction in intolerance with moderate degree of heterogeneity across studies.

RR: Risk ratio; CI: Confidence interval



Figure 3: Publication bias of all studies on statin intolerance