Predictors of statin adherence in primary care using real-world data

*Shagoofa Rakhshanda[1], Jitendra Jonnagaddala[1, *], 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

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.

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.

Ethics statement: This study and the use of data was approved by the UNSW Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel (HC230066; 23 June 2023).

Word count in abstract: 245; **Word count in full text:** 3,560

Abstract

Purpose: The objective of this study was to identify predictors of statin adherence in the primary and secondary prevention of CVD among patients in the first two years after the date of first prescription using real-world data.

Methods: The Electronic Practice Based Research Network Linked Dataset was used in this study. Statin adherence was calculated using a modified proportion of days covered (PDC) formula. Individuals with PDC ≥ 80% during the two years of observation period were considered as adherent. All analyses were performed with R software. Descriptive and multivariate logistic regression analyses were performed. Sensitivity analysis was performed using the Akaike Information Criterion model selection method.

Results: Overall, 3,432 patients accounting for 57,227 visits met the selection criteria. The mean PDC was 91.6% (±22.2%), and 72.0% of the patients were adherent to statins (PDC ≥ 80%) in the first two years after the date of first prescription. After adjusting for all other variables, statin adherence was positively associated with age (AOR 1.7, 95% CI 1.4 – 2.0), SEIFA index (AOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.2 – 2.6), polypharmacy (AOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.3 – 2.5) and comorbidities (AOR 1.4, 95% CI 1.1 – 1.7), and negatively associated with the number of statin types (AOR 0.6, 95% CI 0.5 – 0.9) and smoking status (AOR 0.7, 95% CI 0.6 – 0.9). The sensitivity analysis showed similar results as the regression model.

Conclusions: Statin adherence is influenced by an aging, multimorbid population, who are exposed to polypharmacy, multiple statin options and socioeconomic diversity.

Keywords: Statin, adherence, primary care, real-world data, cardiovascular diseases

Key points:

- Adherence in the first two years after the first date of statin prescription was measured as proportion of days covered (PDC)
- The mean PDC was 91.6% (±22.2%)
- 72.0% of the patients were adherent to statins, with PDC ≥ 80%
- Statin adherence was positively associated with age, area-based social advantage and disadvantage index, polypharmacy and comorbidities
- Statin adherence was negatively associated with the number of statin types prescribed to the patients and the smoking status of patients

1. Introduction

Nearly one in six Australians live with cardiovascular diseases (CVDs), that are responsible for over 1,500 hospitalisations per year (1). In 2022, CVDs contributed to about 12% of the total burden of disease in Australia, and over 57,000 acute coronary events, such as angina or heart attack, were reported. Moreover, about 24% of all deaths in 2022 were caused by CVD (1, 2). Statins, a group of lipid-modifying drugs, are widely prescribed as primary and secondary prevention of CVD in Australia (3). The 2023 Australian Guideline for assessing and managing CVD risk recommends that healthcare providers prescribe statins to anyone with ≥10% estimated 5-years CVD risk, and to consider prescribing a statin to patients with 5% to <10% risk. A statin is also recommended for patients with total cholesterol >7.5 mmol/L (1). The predictors for statin prescriptions in Australia include age, education, and the presence of comorbidities (4).

Statin adherence is essential for reducing the risk of CVD and preventing adverse health outcomes. Statins can significantly reduce risk of cardiovascular events by reducing plasma cholesterols levels. However, up to 30% of patients that are prescribed a statin are not adherent (5). A previous systematic review found that some studies reported statin adherence rates, across clinical settings, at 20% to 60% (6). Statin adherence is higher for secondary prevention of CVD compared to primary prevention (7, 8). Inconsistent adherence was found to be lower than the recommended threshold among acute coronary syndrome (ACS) patients (9). Lower adherence to statins has also been associated with higher morbidity and mortality, specifically in CVD patients (10, 11).

Several demographic factors contribute to low adherence to statin therapy. Younger patients, especially those aged less than 65 years, exhibit poorer statin adherence than those aged 65 years or above. This may be because older adults consider themselves to be at a higher risk of CV events, which drives them to take prescribed medications more regularly, than younger patients (7, 12, 13, 14). Gender is also a predictor of statin adherence, with females showing poorer adherence that males (7, 15, 16). However, gender was not found to be a predictor of statin adherence in other studies (17, 18). Unemployed people are also less likely to be adherent to statins than their employed counterparts (19, 20, 21, 22, 23). However, some studies contradict this (7), which highlights the necessity for further studies on this topic.

Statin adherence is also poorer among patients without comorbidities, such as diabetes or hypertension, than those with comorbidities that do not have to manage multiple medical conditions, which makes them less vigilant about treatment regimens (24, 25). Smoking and alcohol consumption have been associated with poorer adherence to statins (7, 26). This could be due to psychological aspects, such as smokers who justify their habit by considering themselves at low risk of CV events, or physiological aspects, such as interactions between alcohol and statin drugs which may cause adverse reactions among drinkers (16, 27).

Ethnicity as well as socioeconomic factors are also predictors for statin adherence. For example, statin adherence is lower in minorities including African Americans and Asians (28, 29, 30). Barriers to statin adherence include the economic burden of out-of-pocket costs and lower co-payments (7, 31, 32, 33, 34). However, this is a vicious cycle whereby higher economic burden leads to poorer statin adherence, which in turn contributes to increased CVD risk, disease progression and hospitalizations, leading to higher healthcare costs (9, 35). High intensity statins have also been associated with lower statin adherence, possibly due to increased side effects (36, 37, 38, 39). Conversely, moderate intensity statins are associated with higher statin adherence (37, 40). In light of the diverse factors that influence statin adherence, the objective of this study was to identify predictors of statin adherence in the primary and secondary prevention of CVD among patients in the first two years after the date of first prescription using real-world data, with a view to generating insights for improving adherence across all groups.

2. Methods

2.1 Data source:

The Electronic Practice Based Research Network (ePBRN) Linked Dataset, a comprehensive electronic health records (EHR) derived from general practice facilities in the Fairfield and Wollondilly regions of the South-west Sydney Local Health District (SWS LHD) was used in this study. This dataset consists of about 249,345 patients spread across 11 general practice sites, who had at least one visit between 2012 and 2019 (41, 42).

The ePBRN dataset consists of 76 tables, 39 of which were sourced from Best Practice, and 37 tables were sourced from Medical Director. A meticulous selection of data from these tables was employed to ensure enhanced precision and relevance. The research objective of this study requires the extraction of data on statin adherence. This is associated with information related to patient diagnosis, conditions, visit details, and demographics, which could be extracted from six tables (Careplan Goal, Current Rx, Visit Reason, Visits, Past History, and Patients) from Best Practice and 5 tables (Diagnosis, Prescription, History, Consultations, and Patients) from Medical Directors.

2.2 Selection criteria

For implementation of the study, a Master table was developed which consisted of patients who were prescribed statins. Patients in the ePBRN dataset who initiated statins, were aged 18 years or above at the index date (the date when a statin is prescribed for the first time), had no prior history of statin use, and those that had three or more visits to a general practitioner for any reason or any medication prescription for at least two years after index date (active patients) were included in the study. Patients with no gender or birth year recorded, aged more than 80 years, who were not observed for 2 years after index date, or who did not survive during the observation period were excluded. Moreover, patients who suffered any CVD event before the index date or during the 2-years observation period after the index date and patients with proportion of days covered (PDC) ≥ 130% were also excluded, because such high values may result in misclassification.

2.3 Outcome

We calculated 2-years statin adherence using a modified PDC. Individuals with PDC ≥ 80% during the two years of observation period were considered as adherent (43, 44), and those with PDC < 80% during observation period is considered as non-adherent (44, 45).

The ePBRN dataset consists of prescription data, including the number of repeats of each prescription (repeats), the number of medicines dispensed per prescription or per medication

box (quantity), the dose at which the medicine was prescribed (dose), and the number of times per day the patient is meant to take the prescribed medicine (frequency). The numerator used to calculate the PDC in the first two years after the index date used the data on the repeats, quantity, dose and frequency from the second last statin prescription in the first two years (as the medicines prescribed at the second last visit is expected to continue until the last visit). The formula for calculating the numerator was:

$$\frac{repeats \times quantity}{dose \times frequency}$$

For calculating the denominator, the total number of days between the index date and the last visit date in the first two years was used. So, the combined formula for calculating the PDC was:

$$\frac{repeats \times quantity}{dose \times frequency \times total\ number\ of\ days\ in\ 2\ years} \times 100\%$$

2.4 Exposures

We included patients who were prescribed any type of statin, under any brand name. The five statin types found in the ePBRN dataset are atorvastatin, rosuvastatin, simvastatin, pravastatin, and fluvastatin. The list of statin brand names included in the ePBRN dataset is provided in **Supplement 1**.

2.5 Covariates

Patients who were adherent or non-adherent were characterized by age (<30, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69 and ≥70), gender, ethnicity, area-based social advantage and disadvantage index, employment status, smoking status, statin intensity at index date (classified as per **Supplement 2**), statin type at index date, number of statin types during the first two years, change in statin intensity between the index date and last visit in two years, number of polypharmacy and number of comorbidities. Area-based social advantage and disadvantage

was classified using the Socio-Economic Indexes for Australia (SEIFA) 2021 Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage (IRSAD) which is based on suburbs and localities (46). The categories for polypharmacy included anti-diabetic drugs, anti-hypertensive drugs, anti-coagulant drugs and any other drugs. The categories for comorbidities included diabetes, hypertension, chronic respiratory disease and cancer.

2.6 Statistical analyses

The descriptive analyses of adherence and non-adherence of statins were performed based on age, gender, ethnicity, SIEFA index, employment status, smoking status, statin intensity, statin type, polypharmacy and comorbidities. We used a multivariate logistic regression analysis via a backwards stepwise approach (44, 47) to examine the association of statin adherence with various factors. This means that variables were removed iteratively until all remaining variables had a p-value < 0.05. A bootstrap simulation approach (48, 49) with 1000 simulations was used to confirm the selection of the statistically significant predictor variables. The assumptions of regression were checked for the model. The OR and 95% Cis were presented for the predictors of statin adherence. All analyses were performed with R software. The sensitivity analysis was performed using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) model selection method that guides the addition and removal of predictor variables from a statistical model. The MASS package of the R is used to implement this. It is implemented as a stepwise algorithm that assesses competing sub-models and retains the one that minimizes AIC (50, 51, 52). This study and the use of data from ePBRN was approved by the UNSW Human Research Ethics Advisory Panel (HC230066; 23 June 2023).

3. Results

3.1 Patient selection

In the ePBRN dataset, 18,377 patients accounting for 110,147 visits were prescribed statins, drawn from a total cohort of 249,345 patients with 3,103,072 visits. After removing patients based on the exclusion criteria (14,945 patients with 52,920 visits), 3,432 patients with

57,227 visits were included for analysis. The details of patient selection are shown in **Figure 1.**

Figure 1: Selection of eligible patients

3.2 Distribution of statin adherence

The distribution of statin adherence is shown in **Figure 2**. Overall, 2,471 patients (72.0%) were adherent (PDC ≥ 80%) in the first two years after the index date. The mean PDC was 91.6% (±22.2%).

Figure 2: Distribution of statin adherence among patients in first two years after index date (N= 3,432)

3.3 Socio-demographic and health-related characteristics of patients

The two most prevalent age groups were 50–59 years (31.7%) and 60–69 years (30.4%) **(Table 1)**. About half of the patients were males (50.4%). About 76.4% of the patients were non-Aboriginals and/or Torres Strait Islanders, and 30.6% were from SEIFA IRSAD category 8 (which is a relatively socio-economically advantageous population). Employment and smoking status were not recorded for 61.7% and 11.5% of the patients, respectively. Of the patients whose employment status was recorded, 17.9% were employed, and of the patients whose smoking status was recorded, 47.8% were non-smokers. At the index date, 46.4% of patients were prescribed atorvastatin, and 73.5% received it at a moderate intensity dosage. Over two years there was no change in statin type for 90.5% patients, and no change in statin intensity for 89.2% patients. Among patients prescribed anti-diabetic, anti-hypertensive, anti-coagulant, and other medications, 66.2% were concurrently taking at least one additional

drug alongside the statin. The majority (64.0%) of the patients presented without additional comorbid conditions other than CVD.

Table 1: Characteristics of patients, stratified by adherence status (N = 3,432)

Variable	**Total (N = 3,432)**	**Adherence status**		**P-value**
		Adherent (n = 2,471)	**Non-adherent (n = 961)**	
Socio-economic and demographic factors				
Age in years [mean (SD)]	58.4 (10.9)	59.4 (10.8)	55.9 (10.9)	< 0.01
Age in years [n (%)]				
< 30	20 (0.58)	12 (0.49)	8 (0.83)	< 0.01
30 – 39	148 (4.31)	81 (3.28)	67 (6.97)	
40 – 49	542 (15.79)	360 (14.57)	182 (18.94)	
50 – 59	1,089 (31.73)	747 (30.23)	342 (35.59)	
60 – 69	1,043 (30.39)	795 (32.17)	248 (25.81)	
≥ 70	590 (17.19)	476 (19.26)	114 (11.86)	
Gender				
Male	1,731 (50.44)	1,244 (50.34)	487 (50.68)	0.963
Female	1,698 (49.48)	1,225 (49.58)	473 (49.22)	
Other	< 5	< 5	< 5	
Ethnicity				
Non-ATSI	2,621 (76.37)	1,866 (75.52)	755 (78.56)	< 0.01
ATSI	29 (0.84)	17 (0.69)	12 (1.25)	
Not Recorded	782 (22.79)	588 (23.80)	194 (20.19)	
SEIFA IRSAD category (decile)				
1	595 (17.34)	428 (17.32)	167 (17.38)	< 0.01
2	361 (10.52)	221 (8.94)	140 (14.57)	
3	501 (14.60)	395 (15.99)	106 (11.03)	
4	924 (26.92)	676 (27.36)	248 (25.81)	
8	1,050 (30.59)	751 (30.39)	299 (31.11)	
9	< 5	< 5	< 5	
Employment status				
Unemployed	234 (6.82)	159 (6.43)	75 (7.80)	< 0.01
Employed	616 (17.95)	389 (15.74)	227 (23.62)	
Retired and/or pensioner	466 (13.58)	370 (14.97)	96 (9.99)	
Not recorded	2,116 (61.66)	1,553 (62.85)	563 (58.58)	
Health related factors				
Smoking status				
Non-smoker	1,641 (47.81)	1,186 (48.00)	455 (47.35)	< 0.05
Smoker	1,387 (40.41)	1,016 (41.12)	371 (38.61)	
Ex-smoker	10 (0.29)	5 (0.20)	5 (0.52)	
Not recorded	394 (11.48)	264 (10.68)	130 (13.53)	

Statin-related factors				
Statin intensity at index date				
High	732 (21.33)	514 (20.80)	218 (22.68)	0.345
Moderate	2,523 (73.51)	1,824 (73.82)	699 (72.74)	
Low	177 (5.16)	133 (5.38)	44 (4.58)	
Statin type at index date				
Atorvastatin	1,592 (46.39)	1,127 (45.61)	465 (48.39)	0.232
Rosuvastatin	1,106 (32.23)	796 (32.21)	310 (32.26)	
Simvastatin	573 (16.70)	423 (17.12)	150 (15.61)	
Fluvastatin	8 (0.23)	5 (0.20)	< 5	
Pravastatin	153 (4.46)	120 (4.86)	33 (3.43)	
Number of statin types				
1	3,105 (90.47)	2,260 (91.46)	845 (87.93)	< 0.01
2	316 (9.21)	203 (8.22)	113 (11.76)	
3	10 (0.29)	8 (0.32)	< 5	
4	< 5	< 5	< 5	
Change in statin intensity				
No change	3,062 (89.22)	2,201 (89.07)	861 (89.59)	0.258
High to Moderate	77 (2.24)	51 (2.06)	26 (2.71)	
High to Low	< 5	< 5	< 5	
Moderate to High	219 (6.38)	163 (6.60)	56 (5.83)	
Moderate to Low	20 (0.58)	13 (0.53)	7 (0.73)	
Low to High	< 5	< 5	< 5	
Low to Moderate	48 (1.40)	40 (1.62)	8 (0.83)	
Number of polypharmacy [1]				
1 [2]	230 (6.70)	141 (5.71)	89 (9.26)	< 0.01
2	2,272 (66.20)	1,595 (64.55)	677 (70.45)	
3	818 (23.83)	645 (26.10)	173 (18.00)	
4	107 (3.12)	86 (3.48)	21 (2.19)	
5	5 (0.15)	< 5	< 5	
Number of comorbidities [3]				
None	2,196 (63.99)	1,506 (60.95)	690 (71.80)	< 0.01
1	936 (27.27)	724 (29.30)	212 (22.06)	
2	277 (8.07)	224 (9.07)	53 (5.52)	
≥ 3	23 (0.67)	17 (0.69)	6 (0.62)	

[1] The categories for polypharmacy included anti-diabetic drugs, anti-hypertensive drugs, anti-coagulant drugs and other drugs;

[2] The number of polypharmacy = 1 are the people who are only on a statins;

[3] The categories for comorbidities included diabetes, hypertension, chronic respiratory disease, cancer, stroke, blood clots and Parkinson's disease;

ATSI: Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders; SEIFA IRSAD: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage

3.4 Factors affecting statin adherence

Table 2 shows the univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis for factors associated with medication adherence. After adjusting for all other variables, the factors that were positively associated with statin adherence were age (AOR 1.7, 95% CI 1.4 – 2.0), SEIFA index (AOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.2 – 2.6), polypharmacy (AOR 1.8, 95% CI 1.3 – 2.5), and comorbidities (AOR 1.4, 95% CI 1.1 – 1.7). Patients aged more than 65 years, those from SIEFA IRSAD category 3, those who took three other medications besides statins, and those with one other comorbidities beside CVDs had about 70%, 80%, 80% and 40% higher odds of adherence, respectively, compared to the reference categories.

Moreover, the factors that were negatively associated with statin adherence were number of statin types (AOR 0.6, 95% CI 0.5 – 0.9) and smoking status (AOR 0.7, 95% CI 0.6 – 0.9). Patients receiving 2 types of statins and those with unrecorded smoking status had about 40% and 30% lower odds of adherence, respectively, compared to the reference categories. However, “not recorded” status of smoking cannot be interpreted as a biological effect since it represents missing clinical information rather than a true exposure.

Table 2: Univariate and Multivariate logistic regression analysis for factors associated with medication adherence (*N* = 3,432)

Factors	n (%)	Unadjusted Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Socio-economic and demographic factors					
Age (years)					
≤ 65	2,503 (72.93)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
> 65	929 (27.07)	1.99 (1.66 – 2.40) ***	< 0.001	1.66 (1.37 – 2.04) ***	< 0.001
Gender					
Male	1,731 (50.44)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
Female	1,698 (49.48)	1.01 (0.87 – 1.17)	0.856	1.02 (0.86 – 1.20)	0.821
Other	< 5	0.78 (0.07 – 16.87)	0.842	0.78 (0.07 – 17.70)	0.846
Ethnicity					
Non-ATSI	2,621 (76.37)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
ATSI	29 (0.84)	0.57 (0.27 – 1.23)	0.142	0.51 (0.24 – 1.13)	0.088
Not recorded	782 (22.79)	1.23 (1.02 – 1.47) *	< 0.05	1.07 (0.82 – 1.40)	0.636
SEIFA IRSAD category (decile)					
1	595 (17.34)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
2	361 (10.52)	0.62 (0.47 – 0.81) ***	< 0.001	0.81 (0.60 – 1.09)	0.166
3	501 (14.60)	1.45 (1.10 – 1.93) **	< 0.01	1.77 (1.23 – 2.56) **	< 0.01
4	924 (26.92)	1.06 (0.84 – 1.34)	0.600	1.14 (0.89 – 1.46)	0.300
8	1,050 (30.59)	0.98 (0.78 – 1.22)	0.860	1.07 (0.84 – 1.35)	0.607
9	< 5	0.00 (N/A)	0.949	0.00 (NA)	0.969
Employment status					
Unemployed	234 (6.82)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
Employed	616 (17.95)	0.81 (0.58 -1.11)	0.192	0.76 (0.54 – 1.07)	0.123
Retired and/or pensioner	466 (13.58)	1.82 (1.27 – 2.59) ***	< 0.001	1.31 (0.89 – 1.91)	0.164
Not recorded	2,116 (61.66)	1.30 (0.97 – 1.73)	0.076	1.04 (0.74 – 1.43)	0.835

Health related factor					
Smoking status					
Non-smoker	1,641 (47.81)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
Smoker	1,387 (40.41)	1.09 (0.93 – 1.27)	0.286	1.05 (0.88 – 1.25)	0.592
Ex-smoker	10 (0.29)	0.38 (0.11 – 1.38)	0.131	0.47 (0.12 – 1.84)	0.268
Not recorded	394 (11.48)	0.78 (0.62 – 0.99) *	< 0.05	0.73 (0.56 – 0.95) *	< 0.05
Statin related factors					
Statin intensity at index date					
Moderate	732 (21.33)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
High	2,523 (73.51)	0.90 (0.75 – 1.08)	0.272	0.97 (0.79 – 1.20)	0.774
Low	177 (5.16)	1.16 (0.82 – 1.66)	0.413	0.84 (0.52 – 1.35)	0.459
Statin type at index date					
Atorvastatin	1,592 (46.39)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
Rosuvastatin	1,106 (32.23)	1.06 (0.89 – 1.26)	0.505	1.13 (0.94 – 1.37)	0.182
Simvastatin	573 (16.70)	1.16 (0.94 – 1.45)	0.168	1.01 (0.79 – 1.30)	0.926
Fluvastatin	8 (0.23)	0.69 (0.17 – 3.36)	0.609	0.45 (0.10 – 2.47)	0.310
Pravastatin	153 (4.46)	1.50 (1.02 – 2.27) *	< 0.05	1.47 (0.91 – 2.40)	0.120
Number of statin types					
1	3,105 (90.47)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
2	316 (9.21)	0.67 (0.53 – 0.86) **	< 0.01	0.65 (0.49 – 0.86) **	< 0.01
3	10 (0.29)	1.50 (0.37 – 9.92)	0.611	1.78 (0.41 – 12.49)	0.489
4	< 5	0 (N/A)	0.949	0.00 (NA)	0.968
Change in statin intensity					
No change	3,062 (89.22)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
Low to moderate	77 (2.24)	1.96 (0.96 – 4.52)	0.085	2.28 (0.97 – 5.91)	0.071
Low to high	< 5	0.78 (0.07 – 16.85)	0.841	0.91 (0.06 – 24.96)	0.948
Moderate to low	219 (6.38)	0.73 (0.30 – 1.94)	0.497	1.16 (0.44 – 3.26)	0.771
Moderate to high	20 (0.58)	1.14 (0.84 – 1.57)	0.417	1.30 (0.94 – 1.84)	0.119
High to low	< 5	0.20 (0.01 – 2.04)	0.183	0.43 (0.02 – 4.65)	0.497
High to moderate	48 (1.40)	0.77 (0.48 – 1.26)	0.278	1.14 (0.66 – 1.99)	0.651

Number of polypharmacy [1]					
1 [2]	230 (6.70)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
2	2,272 (66.20)	1.49 (1.12 – 1.96) **	< 0.01	1.20 (0.90 – 1.61)	0.214
3	818 (23.83)	2.35 (1.72 – 3.22) ***	< 0.001	1.81 (1.30 – 2.52) ***	< 0.001
4	107 (3.12)	2.58 (1.52 – 4.55) ***	< 0.001	1.80 (1.03 – 3.23) *	< 0.05
5	5 (0.15)	2.52 (0.37 – 49.82)	0.411	1.32 (0.18 – 26.67)	0.810
Number of comorbidities [3]					
None	2,196 (63.99)	*Reference*		*Reference*	
1	936 (27.27)	1.56 (1.31 – 1.87) ***	< 0.001	1.40 (1.15 – 1.70) ***	< 0.001
2	277 (8.07)	1.94 (1.43 – 2.67) ***	< 0.001	1.59 (1.15 – 2.24) **	< 0.01
≥ 3	23 (0.67)	1.30 (0.54 – 3.61)	0.584	1.02 (0.41 – 2.88)	0.971

[1] The categories for polypharmacy included anti-diabetic drugs, anti-hypertensive drugs, anti-coagulant drugs and other drugs;

[2] The number of polypharmacy = 1 are the people who are only on statins;

[3] The categories for comorbidities included diabetes, hypertension, chronic respiratory disease, cancer, stroke, blood clots and Parkinson's disease;

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

ATSI: Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders; SEIFA IRSAD: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage; CI: Confidence interval; NA: Not Applicable

3.5 Sensitivity analysis

The logistic regression of the model met all key assumptions. The components of the regression model and their explanations are shown in **Supplement 3**. It consisted of independent observations and there was no evidence of problematic multicollinearity (GVIF < 5). Moreover, the model fits reasonably well, and there is no difference between predicted and observed values (Hosmer-Lemeshow test: p = 0.05654). However, the discriminative ability of the model was modest (AUC = 0.6465), indicating that the model had a limited ability to distinguish between adherent and non-adherent patients. These findings suggest that while the included predictors in the regression model explain some variation in adherence, additional factors may be necessary to improve the performance of the model. **Supplement 4** shows the details on the assumptions of regression of the model.

For the sensitivity analysis, stepAIC model selection procedure was used to remove selected predictor variables from the regression model to produce a parsimonious well-fitted reduced model **(Table 3)**. The estimates **(Supplements 5 and 6)** showed a similar direction of associations for the exposures as the regression model, though the magnitudes of effect were mixed. However, since the model with fewer variables was slightly simpler and the fit was very similar to the regression model and because addition of extra predictors in the regression model did not significantly improve the fit or discriminatory power, the reduced model is preferred. The components of the reduced model are explained in **Supplement 3**.

Table 3: Sensitivity analysis

Factors	n (%)	Adjusted Odds ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Socio-economic and demographic factors			
Age (years)			
≤ 65	2883 (71.79)	*Reference*	
> 65	1133 (28.21)	1.65 (1.36 – 2.01) ***	< 0.001
SEIFA IRSAD category (decile)			
1	595 (17.34)	*Reference*	
2	361 (10.52)	0.78 (0.58 – 1.05)	0.095
3	501 (14.60)	1.84 (1.37 – 2.47) ***	< 0.001
4	924 (26.92)	1.12 (0.87 – 1.42)	0.378
8	1,050 (30.59)	1.07 (0.84 – 1.35)	0.602

9	< 5	0.00 (N/A)	0.969
Employment status			
Unemployed	264 (6.57)	*Reference*	
Employed	697 (17.36)	0.77 (0.55 – 1.07)	0.126
Retired and/or pensioner	568 (14.14)	1.30 (0.89 – 1.89)	0.170
Not recorded	2487 (61.93)	1.03 (0.74 – 1.41)	0.867
Health related factor			
Smoking status			
Non-smoker	1891 (47.09)	*Reference*	
Smoker	1646 (40.99)	1.04 (0.88 – 1.23)	0.644
Ex-smoker	10 (0.25)	0.52 (0.13 – 1.98)	0.324
Not recorded	469 (11.68)	0.74 (0.58 – 0.95) *	< 0.05
Statin related factors			
Number of statin types			
1	3,105 (90.47)	*Reference*	
2	316 (9.21)	0.71 (0.55 – 0.91) **	< 0.01
3	10 (0.29)	1.85 (0.44 – 12.54)	0.449
4	< 5	0.00 (N/A)	0.968
Number of polypharmacy			
1	238 (5.93)	*Reference*	
2	2632 (65.54)	1.21 (0.90 – 1.62)	0.197
3	1008 (25.10)	1.79 (1.28 – 2.48) ***	< 0.001
4	131 (3.26)	1.77 (1.02 – 3.17) *	< 0.05
5	7 (0.17)	1.35 (0.19 – 27.12)	0.793
Number of comorbidities			
None	2563 (63.82)	*Reference*	
1	1104 (27.49)	1.38 (1.14 – 1.68) ***	< 0.001
2	324 (8.07)	1.56 (1.13 – 2.18) **	< 0.01
3	25 (0.62)	1.00 (0.40 – 2.81)	0.993

[1] The categories for polypharmacy included anti-diabetic drugs, anti-hypertensive drugs, anti-coagulant drugs and other drugs;
[2] The number of polypharmacy = 1 are the people who are only on statins;
[3] The categories for comorbidities included diabetes, hypertension, chronic respiratory disease, cancer, stroke, blood clots and Parkinson's disease;
* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$;

ATSI: Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders; SEIFA IRSAD: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage; CI: Confidence interval; NA: Not Applicable;

4. Discussion

In this study we found that the mean PDC was 91.6% (±22.2%), and that 72.0% of the patients were adherent with PDC ≥ 80% in the first two years after index date. Although the mean PDC value aligns with findings from some international studies, it is higher than what is reported in previous Australian studies (43, 44, 53). In contrast, the 72% adherence rate aligns with Australian studies (43, 44). Most of those studies included data on medication dispensation via beneficiary schemes such as Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) and Health Insurance Bureau (HIB), while this study assessed the data from an EHR derived from general practice facilities in South West Sydney (43, 44). As such, adherence may have been overestimated in this study as it used electronic prescription records, where early refilling, dose changes, or stockpiling could often be recorded as additional supply, thereby increasing the estimated adherence (54, 55). Moreover, South West Sydney includes a culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) population across various socioeconomic statuses, with documented health inequities, variable access to care, and a high prevalence of chronic diseases (41). In such settings, adherence to long-term lipid-management regimens or other statin-related therapies may be influenced by factors such as health literacy, language barriers, access to primary care, affordability, and perceived side effects (42, 56).

This study found that sociodemographic factors such as age and SEIFA index were positively associated with statin adherence. Patients aged > 65 years showed about 65% higher adherence compared to those who were ≤ 65 years, which aligns with the findings from other studies and systematic reviews (7, 12). Age-related adherence patterns have been noted across statins and other chronic medicines, but there is substantial variation based on setting, comorbidity burden, and access to care (57, 58). Studies show that older patients are more aware of their risks of CVD, making them conscious about their health and prescriptions, leading to greater adherence to prescribed therapies (13, 14). On the other hand, this study found that patients from a relatively disadvantaged area (SEIFA IRSAD category 3) had 80% higher odds of adherence compared to those from more disadvantaged areas (SEIFA IRSAD category 1). This suggests that the reporting, diagnosis, estimation, and management of statin adherence is multifactorial. In Australia, socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage as well as living in remote areas are often linked with lower adherence because of financial strain, health literacy, access barriers, and other social determinants (46, 59). This is attenuated by

the diverse population in SWS with widely varying rates of health literacy and burden of comorbidities (21, 46, 59).

Factors such as the number of polypharmacy and number of comorbidities were also positively associated with statin adherence. Contrary to this, many researchers found that higher medication burden is associated with statin non-adherence in elderly and multimorbid populations, likely due to competing priorities, cognitive load, and drug-interaction concerns (60, 61, 62). This is linked to comorbidity where higher comorbidity counts are associated with reduced likelihood of higher statin adherence, reflecting competing health priorities and more complex treatment regimens (61, 63). In South West Sydney, an aging and multimorbid population coupled with access barriers may influence this pattern, potentially affecting the age-adherence relationship depending on local service delivery (57, 58, 64). Tailored interventions, such as integrated care plans, closer follow-up, and explicit counselling, for patients with multiple chronic conditions, who are treated with polypharmacy and multiple statin options may help improve adherence.

Patients aged more than 65 years, those from SIEFA IRSAD category 3, those who took three other medications besides statins, and those with one other comorbidities beside CVDs had about 70%, 80%, 80% and 40% higher odds of adherence, respectively, compared to the reference categories. Patients receiving 2 types of statins and those with unrecorded smoking status had about 40% and 30% lower odds of adherence, respectively, compared to the reference categories. However, “not recorded” status of smoking cannot be interpreted as a biological effect since it represents missing clinical information rather than a true exposure.

This study also found that smoking status and the number of statin types were negatively associated with statin adherence. Multiple studies show that exposure to more statin options (for example, switching between statins or trying several statins) often accompanies challenges in maintaining consistent statin use or can lead to discontinuation, possibly due to adverse effects or regimen complexity (65, 66). Smoking is a marker for health behaviours and overall engagement with cardiovascular risk management. Evidence suggests that smoking is often linked to psychological distress which often influence the smokers to show lower adherence to preventive therapies, although this can differ based on comorbidity burden and healthcare engagement (7, 16, 26, 27). In primary care, smoking status is usually recorded in patients with higher cardiovascular risk, or chronic disease, while it may remain unrecorded in patients perceived to be at lower risk of cardiovascular diseases (67, 68, 69, 70,

71, 72). This aligns with this study which showed a negative association between unrecorded smoking status and statin adherence.

Limitations

This study used the prescription data in the ePBRN Linked Dataset from general practice facilities, where replacement prescriptions for lost or misplaced scripts could have been recorded as additional supply. However, we could not observe actual medication-taking behaviour since the data did not contain medication dispensation information from beneficiary schemes such as PBS, which too has similar problems such as over and under-dispensing. Furthermore, in this study, we could observe the days of medication supply in the patient's possession, which underpins PDC calculations. In EHR prescribing contexts, there is a risk of overestimating adherence, particularly in cases of stockpiling or repeated early refills. This study included a few unrecorded data on smoking and employment status, although this cannot be interpreted as a biological effect since it represents missing clinical information rather than a true exposure. Sensitivity analysis showed that the predictors of statin adherence were consistent with the regression model, supporting the robustness of the adherence findings. Another limitation of this study is that a single data source (ePBRN dataset) was used, with the incomplete recording of sociodemographic variables that is inherent to the EHR system, affects the generalizability of the findings, as the population characteristics may differ in other regions. Moreover, the selection of patients included those without CVD events before the index date or during the first 2 years after the index date. This may introduce selection bias by excluding patients at higher short-term CVD risk, further limiting the generalizability to primary care statin patients.

5. Conclusion

This study found that the mean PDC was 91.6% (±22.2%), and that 72.0% of the patients were adherent with PDC ≥ 80% in the first two years after index date. Statin adherence was positively associated with age, SEIFA category, employment status (sociodemographic factors), number of polypharmacy and number of comorbidities (statin-related factors), and negatively associated with smoking status (health-related factor) and number of statin types

(statin-related factors). South-western Sydney consists of an aging and multimorbid population, who are exposed to polypharmacy and multiple statin options, which may influence adherence. The socioeconomically diverse communities in SWS driven by socioeconomic advantage and disadvantage as well as living in remote areas can also affect statin adherence. The results obtained in this study may not be fully generalizable, and the generalizability could be tested under alternative reference standards and in different populations. To ensure better management of CVD, clinicians and researchers need to consider these predictors while providing tailored interventions of integrated care plans and explicit counselling for patients at risk of non-adherence or intolerance.

Author contributions:

1. SR 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 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.

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.

References

1. Commonwealth of Australia as represented by the Department of Health and Aged Care. Australian Guideline for assessing and managing cardiovascular disease risk. 2023.

2. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare AIHW. Australian Burden of Disease Study 2022. 2022.

3. Talic S, Hernandez CM, Ofori-Asenso R, Liew D, Owen A, Petrova M, et al. Trends in the utilization of lipid-lowering medications in Australia: an analysis of national pharmacy claims data. Current Problems in Cardiology. 2022;47(7):100880.

4. Chalmers J, Clarke P, Jackson R, Kerr AJ, Knight J, Mortimer D, et al. Australian general practitioners initiate statin therapy primarily on the basis of lipid levels; New Zealand general practitioners use absolute risk. 2017.

5. Yao X, Shah N, Gersh B, Lopez-Jimenez F, Noseworthy P. Assessment of Trends in Statin Therapy for Secondary Prevention of Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease in US Adults From 2007 to 2016. JAMA Netw Open. 2020; 3 (11): e2025505. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen. 2020.25505.». 2020.

6. Diaz R, Li QH, Bhatt DL, Bittner VA, Baccara-Dinet MT, Goodman SG, et al. Intensity of statin treatment after acute coronary syndrome, residual risk, and its modification by alirocumab: insights from the ODYSSEY OUTCOMES trial. European journal of preventive cardiology. 2021;28(1):33-43.

7. Hope HF, Binkley GM, Fenton S, Kitas GD, Verstappen SM, Symmons DP. Systematic review of the predictors of statin adherence for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. PLoS One. 2019;14(1):e0201196.

8. 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.

9. Khalaf K, Johnell K, Austin PC, Tyden P, Midlöv P, Perez-Vicente R, et al. Low adherence to statin treatment during the 1st year after an acute myocardial infarction is associated with increased 2nd-year mortality risk—an inverse probability of treatment weighted study on 54 872 patients. European Heart Journal-Cardiovascular Pharmacotherapy. 2021;7(2):141-7.

10. Kristiansen O, Sverre E, Peersen K, Fagerland MW, Gjertsen E, Gullestad L, et al. The relationship between directly measured statin adherence, self-reported adherence measures and cholesterol levels in patients with coronary heart disease. Atherosclerosis. 2021;336:23-9.

11. Li H, Jia X, Min H, Zhang Y, Wang H, Zhai Y. Relationships between beliefs about statins and non-adherence in inpatients from Northwestern China: a cross-sectional survey. Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2023;14:1078215.

12. Huynh T, Lecca P, Montigny M, Gagnon R, Eisenberg MJ, Lauzon C, et al. Ten-Year Statin Adherence in Survivors of ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction. Journal of Population Therapeutics and Clinical Pharmacology= Journal de la Therapeutique des Populations et de la Pharmacologie Clinique. 2018;25(2):e63-e77.

13. Rodriguez F, Maron DJ, Knowles JW, Virani SS, Lin S, Heidenreich PA. Association of statin adherence with mortality in patients with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. JAMA cardiology. 2019;4(3):206-13.

14. Sigglekow F, Horsburgh S, Parkin L. Statin adherence is lower in primary than secondary prevention: A national follow-up study of new users. PLoS One. 2020;15(11):e0242424.

15. Rønning M, Hjellvik V, Sakshaug S, Blix HS, Midtvedt K, Reisæter AV, et al. Use of statins in kidney transplant recipients in Norway. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2022;19(3):1370.

16. Majd Z, Mohan A, Paranjpe R, Abughosh SM. Identifying adherent patients to newly initiated statins using previous adherence to chronic medications. Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy. 2021;27(2):186-97.

17. Alharbi MS, Alnasyan S, Almazroa G, Aldakheel FN, Albattah GA, AlHujilan AH. Adherence to Statin Among Diabetic Patients in Diabetic Centers in Qassim Region, Saudi Arabia. Cureus. 2023;15(10).

18. Lucas JE, Bazemore TC, Alo C, Monahan PB, Voora D. An electronic health record based model predicts statin adherence, LDL cholesterol, and cardiovascular disease in the United States Military Health System. PLoS One. 2017;12(11):e0187809.

19. Bohensky M, Tacey M, Brand C, Sundararajan V, Wicks I, Van Doornum S. Statin initiation and treatment non-adherence following a first acute myocardial infarction in patients with inflammatory rheumatic disease versus the general population. Arthritis research & therapy. 2014;16:1-9.

20. Korhonen MJ, Robinson JG, Annis IE, Hickson RP, Bell JS, Hartikainen J, et al. Adherence tradeoff to multiple preventive therapies and all-cause mortality after acute myocardial infarction. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2017;70(13):1543-54.

21. Warren JR, Falster MO, Fox D, Jorm L. Factors influencing adherence in long□term use of statins. Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety. 2013;22(12):1298-307.

22. Aarnio EJ, Martikainen JA, Helin-Salmivaara A, Huupponen RK, Hartikainen JE, Peura PK, et al. Register-based predictors of adherence among new statin users in Finland. Journal of clinical lipidology. 2014;8(1):117-25.

23. Alfian SD, Worawutputtapong P, Schuiling-Veninga CC, van der Schans J, Bos JH, Hak E, et al. Pharmacy-based predictors of non-persistence with and non-adherence to statin treatment among patients on oral diabetes medication in the Netherlands. Current Medical Research and Opinion. 2018;34(6):1013-9.

24. Alwhaibi M, Altoaimi M, AlRuthia Y, Meraya AM, Balkhi B, Aldemerdash A, et al. Adherence to statin therapy and attainment of LDL cholesterol goal among patients with type 2 diabetes and dyslipidemia. Patient preference and adherence. 2019:2111-8.

25. Mann DM, Woodward M, Muntner P, Falzon L, Kronish I. Predictors of nonadherence to statins: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Annals of Pharmacotherapy. 2010;44(9):1410-21.

26. Ruokoniemi P, Korhonen MJ, Helin Salmivaara A, Lavikainen P, Jula A, Junnila SY, et al. Statin adherence and the risk of major coronary events in patients with diabetes: a nested case–control study. British journal of clinical pharmacology. 2011;71(5):766-76.

27. Chee YJ, Chan HHV, Tan NC. Understanding patients' perspective of statin therapy: can we design a better approach to the management of dyslipidaemia? A literature review. Singapore medical journal. 2014;55(8):416.

28. Thomson A, Morgan S, O'Mara P, Tapley A, Henderson K, van Driel M, et al. Clinical encounters of Australian general practice registrars with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health. 2016;40:S75-S80.

29. Nanna MG, Navar AM, Zakroysky P, Xiang Q, Goldberg AC, Robinson J, et al. Association of patient perceptions of cardiovascular risk and beliefs on statin drugs with racial differences in statin use: insights from the patient and provider assessment of lipid management registry. JAMA cardiology. 2018;3(8):739-48.

30. Lai EJ, Grubisic M, Palepu A, Quan H, King KM, Khan NA. Cardiac medication prescribing and adherence after acute myocardial infarction in Chinese and South Asian Canadian patients. BMC cardiovascular disorders. 2011;11:1-8.

31. Urbonas G, Vencevičienė L, Valius L, Krivickienė I, Petrauskas L, Lazarenkienė G, et al. Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Risk in Lithuania—Results from EUROASPIRE V Survey. Medicina. 2020;56(3):134.

32. Wawruch M, Wimmer Jr G, Murin J, Paduchova M, Petrova M, Tesar T, et al. Non-adherence to statin treatment in older patients with peripheral arterial disease depending on persistence status. Biomedicines. 2020;8(10):378.

33. Seamon K, Sanfilippo F, Bulsara M, Roughead L, Kemp-Casey A, Bulsara C, et al. Predictors of ceasing or reducing statin medication following a large increase in the

consumer copayment for medications: a retrospective observational study. Public Health Res Pract. 2020;30(1):1-9.

34. Adedinsewo D, Taka N, Agasthi P, Sachdeva R, Rust G, Onwuanyi A. Prevalence and factors associated with statin use among a nationally representative sample of US adults: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2011–2012. Clinical cardiology. 2016;39(9):491-6.

35. Cutler RL, Torres-Robles A, Wiecek E, Drake B, Van der Linden N, Benrimoj SI, et al. Pharmacist-led medication non-adherence intervention: reducing the economic burden placed on the Australian health care system. Patient preference and adherence. 2019:853-62.

36. Grover A, Rehan HS, Gupta LK, Yadav M. Correlation of compliance to statin therapy with lipid profile and serum HMGCoA reductase levels in dyslipidemic patients. Indian heart journal. 2017;69(1):6-10.

37. Virani SS, Woodard LD, Akeroyd JM, Ramsey DJ, Ballantyne CM, Petersen LA. Is high intensity statin therapy associated with lower statin adherence compared with low to moderate intensity statin therapy? Implications of the 2013 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Cholesterol Management Guidelines. Clinical cardiology. 2014;37(11):653-9.

38. Chung J, Kim H-L, Lim W-H, Seo J-B, Zo J-H, Kim M-A, et al. New onset diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular outcomes according to statin intensity in patients after drug-eluting stent implantation in Asian patients. Scientific Reports. 2023;13(1):16061.

39. Yu S, Jin J, Chen Z, Luo X. High-intensity statin therapy yields better outcomes in acute coronary syndrome patients: a meta-analysis involving 26,497 patients. Lipids in Health and Disease. 2020;19:1-14.

40. Colantonio LD, Huang L, Monda KL, Bittner V, Serban M-C, Taylor B, et al. Adherence to high-intensity statins following a myocardial infarction hospitalization among Medicare beneficiaries. JAMA cardiology. 2017;2(8):890-5.

41. Secure Research Environment for Digital Health SREDH. ePBRN 2019 GP + Hospital linked Dataset 2024 [Available from: https://www.sredhconsortium.org/sredh-datasets/epbrn-2019-gp-hospital-linked-dataset.

42. Kadappu P, Jonnagaddala J, Liaw S-T, Cochran BJ, Rye K-A, Ong KL. Statin prescription patterns and associations with subclinical inflammation. Medicina. 2022;58(8):1096.

43. Tichopád A, Donin G, Žigmond J, Ráfl J, Rybář M, Šedová P, et al. Statin adherence improves with age and subsequent treatment sequences: A retrospective cohort study using Proportion of Days Covered (PDC). PloS one. 2025;20(6):e0325293.

44. Ofori□Asenso R, Ilomaeki J, Tacey M, Si S, Curtis AJ, Zomer E, et al. Predictors of first□year nonadherence and discontinuation of statins among older adults: a retrospective cohort study. British journal of clinical pharmacology. 2019;85(1):227-35.

45. de La Harpe R, Muzambi R, Bhaskaran K, Eastwood S, Herrett E. Inequities in statin adherence for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: a historical cohort study in English primary care. European journal of preventive cardiology. 2025:zwaf219.

46. Seaman K, Sanfilippo F, Bulsara M, Roughead L, Kemp-Casey A, Bulsara C, et al. Predictors of ceasing or reducing statin medication following a large increase in the consumer copayment for medications: a retrospective observational study. Public Health Research and Practice. 2020;30(1).

47. Chowdhury MZI, Turin TC. Variable selection strategies and its importance in clinical prediction modelling. Family medicine and community health. 2020;8(1):e000262.

48. Barton RR, Rhodes-Leader LA, editors. Bootstrap Confidence Intervals for Simulation Output Parameters. 2023 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC); 2023: IEEE.

49. Farag KA, Asselhab MA, Binsoud BM, Abobaker ZM. Performance Comparison of Traditional Bootstrap and Bias-Corrected and Accelerated Methods in Constructing Confidence Intervals for Non-Normal Data: A Simulation Study. Libyan Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences. 2025:115-20.

50. Chung TK, Jeon Y, Hong Y, Hong S, Moon JS, Lee H. Factors affecting the changes in antihypertensive medications in patients with hypertension. Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine. 2022;9:999548.

51. Bauer T, Höfer H, Schirmel J. Dry grasslands in urban areas can harbour arthropod species of local conservation concern and should be prioritised for biodiversity friendly mowing regimes. Insect Conservation and Diversity. 2024;17(5):811-25.

52. Riley P, Riley A, Turtle J, Ben-Nun M. COVID-19 deaths: Which explanatory variables matter the most? Plos one. 2022;17(4):e0266330.

53. Engebretsen I, Bugge C, Støvring H, Husebye E, Sverre E, Dammen T, et al. Treatment patterns and adherence to lipid-lowering drugs during eight-year follow-up after a coronary heart disease event. Atherosclerosis. 2024;393:117550.

54. Lam WY, Fresco P. Medication adherence measures: an overview. BioMed research international. 2015;2015(1):217047.

55. Baryakova TH, Pogostin BH, Langer R, McHugh KJ. Overcoming barriers to patient adherence: the case for developing innovative drug delivery systems. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery. 2023;22(5):387-409.

56. 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.

57. 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.

58. Hai J-J, Wong Y-K, Wong C-K, Un K-C, Chan P-H, Siu C-W, et al. Prognostic implications of statin intolerance in stable coronary artery disease patients with different levels of high-sensitive troponin. BMC cardiovascular disorders. 2019;19(1):168.

59. Warren JR, Falster MO, Tran B, Jorm L. Association of continuity of primary care and statin adherence. PLoS One. 2015;10(10):e0140008.

60. Artner A, Zelkó R, Hankó B. Optimizing statin therapy in older adults: a systematic review of dosing, titration, and combination strategies. Geroscience. 2025:1-23.

61. Adam L, Baretella O, Feller M, Blum MR, Papazoglou DD, Boland B, et al. Statin therapy in multimorbid older patients with polypharmacy-a cross-sectional analysis of the Swiss OPERAM trial population. Frontiers in cardiovascular medicine. 2023;10:1236547.

62. Grintsevich J, Vasilyeva L, Bragina A, Podzolkov V. STATIN ADHERENCE IN REAL CLINICAL PRACTICE. Journal of Hypertension. 2021;39:e377-e8.

63. Raebel MA, Dyer W, Nichols GA, Goodrich GK, Schmittdiel JA. Relationships between medication adherence and cardiovascular disease risk factor control in elderly patients with diabetes. Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy. 2017;37(10):1204-14.

64. 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.

65. Mauskop A, Borden WB. Predictors of statin adherence. Current cardiology reports. 2011;13(6):553-8.

66. Bonfim MR, Hansen A, Turi BC, Zanini GdS, Oliveira ASB, Amaral SLd, et al. Adherence to statin treatment and associated factors in female users from the Unified Health System (SUS). Revista da Escola de Enfermagem da USP. 2014;48(03):477-83.

67. Wilson A, Manku-Scott T, Shepherd D. Recording of smoking status: a survey of general practice records of those with and without smoking-related disease. Primary Health Care Research & Development. 2003;4(3):227-31.

68. Thun MJ, Carter BD, Feskanich D, Freedman ND, Prentice R, Lopez AD, et al. 50-year trends in smoking-related mortality in the United States. New England Journal of Medicine. 2013;368(4):351-64.

69. Duncan MS, Greevy RA, Tindle HA, Vasan RS, Lipworth L, Aldrich MC, et al. Inclusion of smoking data in cardiovascular disease risk estimation. JAMA cardiology. 2022;7(2):195-203.

70. 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.

71. Duncan MS, Freiberg MS, Greevy Jr RA, Kundu S, Vasan RS, Tindle HA. Association of smoking cessation with subsequent risk of cardiovascular disease. Jama. 2019;322(7):642-50.

72. Liaw S-T, Guo JGN, Ansari S, Jonnagaddala J, Godinho MA, Borelli Jr AJ, et al. Quality assessment of real-world data repositories across the data life cycle: a literature review. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association. 2021;28(7):1591-9.



Figure 1: Selection of eligible patients



Figure 2: Distribution of statin adherence among patients in first two years after index date (N= 3,432)