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Objective: To evaluate the efficacy and safety of atorvastatin at the starting doses of 10, 20, 40 mg and evaluate the effectiveness of 1 step titrate up regimen.

Material and Method: Two hundred and forty two subjects with dyslipidemia were enrolled and assigned the appropriate dose in relation to their individual cardiovascular risk status and baseline LDL-C levels. If the NCEP targets were not achieved, the doses were titrated up at week 4 and the primary efficacy was evaluated at week 8.

Results: A majority of subjects (88.8%) achieved their LDL-C goals at week 8. Almost all of the subject’s LDL-C levels reached their goals by week 2 and 4 (81.6% and 87.1%, respectively). Only 10.7% (n=25) required the sole titration. Each dose provided significant decreases in LDL-C (average -46.4%). Only 36 subjects experienced treatment related adverse events, the majority of these were in the high-risk group (n=22) with only one subject registering a serious adverse event.

Conclusion: Atorvastatin is effective and safe for Thai patients with dyslipidemia. The appropriate starting dose has contributed in the achievement of cholesterol reduction.
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Cardiovascular diseases (CVD) are the leading cause of death in most countries in the world-with emphasis on coronary heart disease (CHD), peripheral arterial disease (PAD), and stroke (cerebrovascular accident)(1-2). According to the World Health Organization (WHO) estimates, 17 million people die of CVD each year. In 1998, there were 7.3 million deaths from heart attack and 5.1 million from stroke. The WHO predicts that in 2020, there will be 11.1 million deaths from CHD(3). In Thailand, CHD was one of the leading causes of death in 2001 (the death rate was 30.3 per 100,000 population and 182.2 per 100,000 in the elderly age group)(4). The well-established risk factors of CVD include hypercholesterolemia (especially high low density lipoprotein-cholesterol [LDL-C], low high density lipoprotein-cholesterol [HDL-C], hypertension, smoking, diabetes mellitus, and physical inactivity(5-7). Results from many clinical trials have shown that reducing plasma LDL-C levels significantly reduces the risk for CHD and leads to both primary(8-10) and secondary(11-14) prevention of cardiovascular disease.

The National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment Panel (NCEP ATP) III(15) and the Third Joint Task Force of European and Other Societies guidelines(16) recommend LDL-cholesterol target levels of lower than 100 mg/dL (2.6 mmol/L) in high-CHD risk patients, and recently the Coordinating Committee of NCEP has recommended that clinicians consider an LDL-cholesterol goal of < 70 mg/dL (1.8 mmol/L) as a therapeutic option for very high-risk CHD patients. With clinical evidence, the NCEP ATP III panel expanded the
scope and intensity of LDL lowering therapy for higher risk individuals beyond that of previous NCEP ATP versions.

Although pharmacological treatments are available that effectively lower LDL-cholesterol, many patients fail to achieve and maintain target LDL-cholesterol levels. In 1997, a therapeutic survey called the Lipid Treatment Assessing Program (L-TAP) was conducted in the United States(17) which reported overall achievement rates at 38% of patients. Similarly, the first L-TAP study in Thailand(18) that took place in the same year reported very low rates of achievement of cholesterol therapy (overall success rate of 40.5%) in the patients with dyslipidemia and reported that only 41.2% of patients were treated with statins. Five years after the first evaluations were made, the L-TAP II survey was repeated to reevaluate cholesterol treatment in Thailand(19). A total of 34.6% of patients with CHD or CHD equivalent risk, 56.4% of high risk and 76.8% of low risk subjects achieved their LDL-C targets as defined by NCEP ATP III - an overall of 46.5% achievement rate. From the study population, 64% of the patients used either statins alone or a combination with statins. These studies demonstrate that although statins are effective in lowering LDL-C, there is a lower than optimal dosage being prescribed in treating dyslipidemia.

Atorvastatin has been shown to reduce LDL-cholesterol from 25% to 61% over the 2.5 mg to 80 mg dosing range(20,21). The New Atorvastatin Starting Doses (NASDAC)(22) study also tied higher LDL-C reductions across starting doses of 10, 20, 40 and 80 mg (-35.7%, -42.2%, -48.6% and -52.2% respectively). Subgroup analysis shows that a significantly more percentage of patients that achieve LDL-C goals with and without CHD risk factors increase when comparing 10 mg to 80 mg doses.

The safety of atorvastatin has also been evaluated and confirmed from pooled data from 44 clinical trials comprising of 9,416 patients across the dose ranges of 10 to 80 mg(23). The Treating to New Targets trial (TNT)(24) also revealed similar results analyzing a population of 10,001 subjects. The overall incidence of adverse events (AE) of atorvastatin-treated patients was low and comparable with that found in placebo and other statins. Likewise, Jones et al reported that doses of atorvastatin ranging from 10 mg to 80 mg reported no dose response relationship with regards to the overall incidence of AEs. The most frequently occurring adverse event was myalgia and all AEs were mild or moderate in severity(22).

The present study was designed to assess whether atorvastatin treatment in Thai dyslipemic patients results in a quick achievement of LDL-C target with either no titration, or just 1 titration step, provided the starting dose was appropriate for the level of LDL-C reduction required. As such, subjects were assigned to an atorvastatin starting dose according to their LDL-C level and their individual CHD risk categorization (as defined by NCEP ATP III) upon entry. A subject’s target LDL-C level was dependent upon their baseline LDL-C level and their CHD risk assessment.

Material and Method

Study design

The present study was an 8-week prospective, multicenter, open-label study of atorvastatin for treatment of dyslipidemia in Thai subjects. The present study was carried out over 8 months at nine study sites in Thailand. For subjects, a target LDL-C, according to their individual cardiovascular risk categorization (defined by the NCEP ATP III) and their LDL-C at baseline was determined prior to the study start. An atorvastatin starting dose (10, 20 or 40 mg/day) was thus determined (Table 1).

Serum lipid levels were evaluated at weeks 2, 4 and 8. Subjects who achieved their LDL-C target by the week 4 visit continued on their starting dose for the remaining 4 weeks; subjects who did not achieve their LDL-C target by the week 4 visit were titrated up 1 dose step for the remaining 4 weeks (i.e., 10 mg to 20 mg; 20 mg to 40 mg and 40 mg to 80 mg).

Patient population

Study patients were outpatient Thai men and women aged between 18-80 years, diagnosed with dyslipidemia, and followed the Therapeutic Lifestyle Changes (TLC) diet for at least 1 month prior to screening. Those with prior antilipidemic medication were required to have a 6 week washout period prior to screening. They should be eligible for LDL lowering drug therapy at baseline as determined by the following NCEP ATP III LDL-C cut off points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDL-C</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 190 mg/dL</td>
<td>subjects with 0 or 1 CHD risk factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 160 mg/dL</td>
<td>subjects with 2 or more CHD risk factors and 10-year risk &lt; 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 130 mg/dL</td>
<td>subjects with 2 or more CHD risk factors and 10-year risk 10-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 100 mg/dL</td>
<td>subjects with documented CHD or CHD risk equivalents (10-year risk &gt; 20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion criteria included those with a history of intolerance or hypersensitivity to statins, levels of LDL-C > 220 mg/dL and triglyceride level > 600 mg/dL, a progressive fatal disease with a life expectancy of under 2 years, impaired hepatic function defined by aspartate aminotransferase (AST) or alanine aminotransferase (ALT) > 2 times of the upper limit of normal (ULN) at baseline. Additionally, they did not have uncontrolled hypertension, drug/alcohol abuse, gastrointestinal disease limiting drug absorption or partial ileal bypass, planned elective surgery during the study and any severe disease or major problem or surgical procedure within 3 months prior to screening. Pregnant or lactating women were also excluded as were individuals with secondary causes of hyperlipoproteinemia, defined as uncontrolled primary hypothyroidism (thyroid-stimulation hormone > 1.5 x ULN), blood urea nitrogen ≥ 30 mg/dL, creatinine ≥ 2.0 mg/dL or creatine kinase (CK) ≥ 3 x ULN at baseline. Those that participated in another study involving investigational or marketed products within 30 days prior to entry into the present study, had a mental condition that renders the subject unable to understand the nature, scope, and possible consequences of the present study, and/or demonstrated evidence of an uncooperative attitude were all excluded.

The study protocol was approved by an institutional review board of each study site and conducted in compliance with the ethical principles of the most recent version of the International Conference of Harmonization (ICH) Good Clinical Practice (GCP) Guidelines, all local regulatory requirements and the Declaration of Helsinki. All patients gave written informed consent.

**Evaluation of efficacy and safety**

The primary efficacy variable was the percentage of subjects who achieved LDL-C target at week 8. Secondary variables included the percentage of subjects who achieved LDL-C target at week 2, 4 and 8 with 1 step titration; the change and percent change from baseline at weeks 2, 4, 8 for LDL-C, high density lipoprotein-cholesterol (HDL-C), LDL/HDL ratio, total cholesterol (TC) and triglycerides.

Evaluations of safety were based on physical examinations, vital signs and body weight, and adverse events along with clinical laboratory tests (i.e. a complete blood count; fasting blood sugar, liver function test, blood urea nitrogen, creatinine, potassium, creatine phosphokinase, and urinalysis). Treatment-emergent AEs were events that emerged during the treatment phase or that increased in severity from baseline. Serious adverse events were events that resulted in death, were life-threatening, required or prolonged hospitalization, resulted in persistent or significant disability/incapacity, and congenital abnormalities/birth defects.

**Statistical method**

The sample size was determined to provide an accurate estimate of the treatment target response rate (the percentage of subjects achieving their designated LDL-C target at week 8. It was estimated that a sample size of 240 would provide a 95%CI of 66-79%, which is within ±10% of the observed response rate.
assuming a 10% dropout and an observed response rate of 72.5%. For subgroup analysis, subjects were classified at baseline into three risk groups (i.e. low, medium, high risk group) according to their baseline risk level with respect to CHD as defined by NCEP ATP III.

Descriptive statistics for efficacy and safety data were used. All efficacy variables were analyzed for the intent-to-treat (ITT) population, and repeated/confirmed for the evaluable (EVAL) population. The ITT population was defined as subjects who took at least one dose of the study drug and had a post baseline lipid assessment. The EVAL population consisted of a subset of subjects who satisfied the ITT criteria, who met the inclusion/exclusion criteria and who adhered strictly to the conditions of evaluable in being assigning correct doses at baseline and week 4, 80% > 120% medication compliant at both Weeks 4 and 8 and had no major protocol violations.

Results

Study population

Three hundred and twenty two individuals were screened and 242 (100%) were treated with the study medication. The ITT and EVAL populations were 240 (99.2%) and 220 patients (90.9%) respectively. Eleven (4.5%) subjects were discontinued from the present study. The majority of discontinuations (7 subjects) were not related to the study drug with only four (1.6%) cases related to the study drug.

Demographic and Baseline Characteristics

The mean duration of diagnosis of dyslipidemia was 3.6 years (range 0.0-26.4 years). After categorization according to NCEP ATP III guidelines, a majority of the patients were categorized as high risk (66.5%) (Fig. 1). Most of the present study population was female except in the medium risk. The low risk group was the youngest in age and had the lowest weight as shown in Table 2.

A majority of each patient in each risk group were assigned 10 mg of atorvastatin as shown in Table 3. The initial dose of 40 mg was assigned only to 65 subjects in the high risk group. The overall majority of subjects (54.1%) were assigned to 10 mg/day atorvastatin at baseline (19.0%, 20 mg/day and 26.9%, 40mg/day).

At week 4, 25 subjects (10.7%) were titrated up 1 step. As a whole, the number of subjects assigned to 10, 20, 40 and 80 mg/day atorvastatin at week 4 were 114 (48.9%), 55 (23.6%), 52 (22.3%) and 12 subjects (5.2%) respectively. Of the subjects that were titrated at week 4 (i.e., had not reached their LDL-C target), 52% went on to reach their target by week 8.

Efficacy evaluation

Primary efficacy

In the total study population, 88.8% and 91.4% of subjects achieved their LDL-C target at week 8 for the ITT and EVAL groups respectively (Table 4).

Secondary efficacy

The percentage of LDL-C responders at week 2 and 4

Both the ITT and EVAL groups showed high values for the percentage of subjects who achieved their target LDL-C levels as soon as week 2 and 4. The overall ITT values are at 81.6% and 87.1% for week 2 and 4 respectively while the EVAL group recorded 83.2% and 90.0% success respectively (Table 4).

The percentage of LDL-C responders at week 8 with 1 step titration

The 25 subjects whom did not reach their LDL-C target were titrated up one step. The majority of the subjects were in the high risk group (18 subjects (72.0%)) while the medium risk group had two subjects (8.0%) and the low risk having five (20.0%). Of the subjects titrated, 52% reached their target by Week 8, 2 (40%) subjects for the low risk; 1 subject (50%) for the medium risk; and 10 patients (56%) for the high risk.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that atorvastatin is effective in reducing LDL-C levels and achieving target levels in patients with dyslipidemia. The majority of patients achieved their LDL-C target at week 8, with high values for the percentage of subjects who achieved their target LDL-C levels as soon as week 2 and 4. The overall ITT values are at 81.6% and 87.1% for week 2 and 4 respectively while the EVAL group recorded 83.2% and 90.0% success respectively (Table 4).

Conclusion

This study demonstrates the efficacy and safety of atorvastatin in reducing LDL-C levels and achieving target levels in patients with dyslipidemia. The results support the use of atorvastatin as a treatment option for patients with dyslipidemia, particularly in high-risk patients. Further research is needed to evaluate the long-term effects of atorvastatin in reducing cardiovascular events and improving patient outcomes.
Table 2. Demographic and baseline characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Low risk (n = 53)</th>
<th>Medium risk (n = 28)</th>
<th>High risk (n = 161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age, yrs (SD)</td>
<td>56.1 (11.0)</td>
<td>52.1 (11.2)</td>
<td>57.7 (6.3)</td>
<td>57.1 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex [n (%)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80 (33.1)</td>
<td>9 (17.0)</td>
<td>20 (71.4)</td>
<td>51 (31.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>162 (66.9)</td>
<td>44 (83.0)</td>
<td>8 (28.6)</td>
<td>110 (68.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (SD) (kg)</td>
<td>65.4 (12.8)</td>
<td>62.7 (12.3)</td>
<td>69.1 (13.1)</td>
<td>65.6 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (SD) (cm)</td>
<td>158.4 (8.4)</td>
<td>158.3 (7.9)</td>
<td>162.4 (9.2)</td>
<td>157.8 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Treatment assignment of atorvastatin at baseline - safety analysis population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atorvastatin</th>
<th>Total (n = 242)</th>
<th>Low risk (n = 53)</th>
<th>Medium risk (n = 28)</th>
<th>High risk (n = 161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>131 (54.1)</td>
<td>41 (77.4)</td>
<td>17 (60.7)</td>
<td>73 (45.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>46 (19.0)</td>
<td>12 (22.6)</td>
<td>11 (39.3)</td>
<td>23 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>65 (26.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65 (40.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Percentage of subjects that achieved LDL-C target by risk group at week 2, 4 and 8 by ITT and EVAL groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>Medium risk</th>
<th>High risk</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITT Population</td>
<td>n = 52</td>
<td>n = 28</td>
<td>n = 160</td>
<td>n = 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL Population</td>
<td>n = 45</td>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td>n = 149</td>
<td>n = 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change and percent change from baseline in lipid parameters (LDL-C, HDL-C, LDL/HDL ratio, TC and triglycerides)

Atorvastatin reduced LDL-C, total cholesterol (TC) and triglycerides (TG) levels in all risk groups by an average of 46.4%, 34.6% and 22.5% respectively among the ITT population. An increase in HDL-C from baseline to week 8 was also observed in all treatment groups by an average of 3.3% (Table 5, Fig. 2). The LDL/HDL ratio equated to a 47.1% mean decrease and the results were similar across risk groups: low, 44.6%; medium, 46.7%; high, 47.9%.

Safety

Overall, 36 (14.9%) subjects experienced 45 treatment related AEs: low risk 10 (18.9%) subjects, medium risk 4 (14.3%) subjects, and high risk 22 (13.7%) subjects. Only seven treatment related AEs were recorded as severe i.e. asthenia, chest pain, anorexia, nausea, vomiting, weight loss and myalgia-all of which were experienced by one subject (0.4%) - it was concluded to have been non-treatment related. The commonly reported treatment related AEs are summarized in Table 6.

Eleven subjects discontinued from the present study with only four cases deemed to be related to the study drug. This could be broken down to two subjects in each of the low (3.8%) and high (1.2%) risk groups. Adverse events that occurred in the first three patients included hepatitis, headache, myalgia and CPK rising.
Table 5. Percent change from baseline in lipid parameters by risk group in the ITT group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total, n = 240 mean (95%CI)</th>
<th>Low risk, n = 52 mean (95%CI)</th>
<th>Medium risk, n = 28 mean (95%CI)</th>
<th>High risk, n = 160 mean (95%CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C</td>
<td>-46.4 (-48.3, -44.6)</td>
<td>-43.0 (-46.4, -39.5)</td>
<td>-44.6 (-49.7, -39.4)</td>
<td>-47.9 (-50.2, -45.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triglycerides</td>
<td>-22.5 (-26.2, -18.8)</td>
<td>-17.1 (-25.2, -9.0)</td>
<td>-27.4 (-38.4, -16.4)</td>
<td>-23.4 (-28.0, -18.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>-34.6 (36.1, -33.2)</td>
<td>-32.9 (-35.3, -30.5)</td>
<td>-35.0 (-38.8, -31.2)</td>
<td>-35.1 (-37.0, -33.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C</td>
<td>3.3 (1.0, 5.7)</td>
<td>4.9 (0.6, 9.2)</td>
<td>6.2 (-3.1, 15.4)</td>
<td>2.3 (-0.6, 5.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Treatment related AEs, experienced by more than one subject - safety population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment related AE</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myalgia</td>
<td>7 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorexia</td>
<td>3 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis</td>
<td>3 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>3 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspepsia</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other patient had fatigue, chest pains, anorexia, nausea, vomiting, weight loss, and myalgia.

Two subjects experienced a serious adverse event (SAE) (acute cholangitis/bile duct stone and acute bronchitis); however, both SAES were not related to the study drug. One of the subjects discontinued prematurely from the present study while the other completed the study. Both subjects recovered from their SAE and both were taking 10 mg/day atorvastatin.

Eleven subjects (4.6%) had elevated creatine phosphokinase (CPK), greater than 2 times but less than 10 times that of ULN, without regard to baseline abnormality. CPK values for five of these subjects returned to < 2 times of ULN by the final visit. No subjects experienced extreme CPK elevation (> 10 times of ULN).

Discussion

The primary objective of this study was to determine the percentage of subjects achieving LDL-C target at week 8. In the total study population, a large
proportion of subjects (88.8%) achieved their target LDL-C by week 8; however, it is worth noting that 81.6% of subjects had achieved their LDL-C target by week 2, and that this response was sustained through to week 4 (87.1%) and continued until the end of the study (week 8). This result is comparable to another study in Asian subjects where 93% of subjects reached their target NCEP LDL-C(25) - the slightly higher value may be explained by the fact that it was a 16 week study, while the current study was carried out over 8 weeks.

As described, the total study population was divided into 3 categories (low, medium and high risk) dependent on starting LDL-C and CHD risk. The response (in terms of reaching LDL-C target) at week 2 was comparable across risk groups. At week 8, the response was slightly lower in the high risk group (87.5%) compared with the low (90.4%) and medium (92.9%) risk groups.

The majority (54.1%) of subjects were assigned 10 mg/day atorvastatin at baseline (19.0%, 20 mg/day and 26.9%, 40mg/day). In the total sample only 25 (10%) subjects who did not reach their LDL-C target were titrated up to the next dose level were titrated at week 4. The majority of these (n = 18) were in the high risk group, and only 12 subjects were assigned to 80 mg/day atorvastatin. Of the subjects that were titrated at week 4, 52% went on to reach their target by week 8.

The overall reduction for LDL-C was 46.4% for the total population. This result is comparable to published data from other studies in Asian populations where a 42% reduction has been observed after 8 weeks of treatment with 10 mg/day atorvastatin(25,26). Across risk groups, greatest reduction in LDL-C was observed in the high risk group (low, 43.0%; medium, 44.6%; high, 47.9%). This is perhaps not surprising as subjects in the high risk group were treated more aggressively; 40.4% (n = 65) of the high risk group were treated more aggressively; 40.4% (n = 65) of the high risk group were assigned to 40 mg/day atorvastatin at baseline, with no subjects assigned 20 mg/day atorvastatin.

In line with the reduction in LDL-C, TC was also reduced in subjects participating in the present study. Overall TC reduction was 34.6% for the total population. Across risk groups, the reduction in TC was slightly higher in the medium and high risk groups compared with the low risk (low, 32.9%; medium, 35.0%; high, 35.1%). Other studies in Asian populations have reported similar findings(25-27). Wang et al, observed a 31% reduction in TC in Japanese subjects after 8 weeks of treatment with 10 mg/day atorvastatin(25).

Triglycerides were also reduced overtime during the present study. The overall reduction in triglycerides was 22.5% at week 8; this varied somewhat across risk group (low, 17.1%; medium, 27.4%; high, 23.4%). Again, these results are comparable to the findings of Wu et al, and Wang et al, who reported a 22% and 23% reduction in triglycerides, respectively; both studies used 10 mg/day atorvastatin(25,26).

In the total population, HDL-C was only slightly increased over the 8 week duration of the present study (3.3% at Week 8); this result varied a lot across risk groups, with the lowest increase observed in the high risk group (4.9% low; 6.2% medium, 2.3% high). This result is similar to the findings of Wu et al, who reported a 4.6% increase in HDL-C after 8 weeks of treatment with 10 mg/day atorvastatin(26). However, the increase in HDL-C observed in the present study was low compared to 11% and 13%, which has been observed in Japanese subjects treated with 10 mg/day atorvastatin for 8 weeks(26,27).

All doses of atorvastatin were well tolerated. In addition, the overall incidence and severity of AEs was generally low during the present study. Only 11 (4.5%) subjects prematurely discontinued from the present study; five discontinued as a result of AEs, four of them were treatment related and two of them were myalgia. As a whole, the number of myalgia reported in the present study (2.9%) was lower than other studies analyzing atorvastatin doses ranging from 10 mg and 80 mg(22,24). There were no premature discontinuations from the present study due to abnormal laboratory test results. The incidence of abnormal laboratory test results was, for the most part, unremarkable. Importantly, no subject experienced extreme elevation of CPK (>10 x ULN), and there were no cases of rhabdomyolysis or myopathy reported during the present study.

In conclusion, Atorvastatin at the doses of 10, 20, 40, and 80 mg was found to be a highly effective, safe, and well tolerated statin treatment for dyslipidemia in this Thai sample population. The appropriate starting dose was a contributing factor in the achievement of cholesterol reduction.
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วัตถุประสงค์: เพื่อศึกษาประสิทธิผลและความปลอดภัยของยาอะทอวาสแตตินขนาดเริ่มต้น 10 มิลลิกรัม 20 มิลลิกรัม หรือ 40 มิลลิกรัม โดยปรับขนาดยาอีกครั้ง

วัสดุและวิธีการ: อาสาสมัครที่มีระดับไขมันผิดปกติในเลือดจำนวน 242 รายได้รับยาในขนาดที่เหมาะสมโดยขึ้นกับภาวะของปัจจัยเสี่ยงโรคหลอดเลือดและหัวใจ และระดับ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) ของผู้ป่วย ณ วันคัดเลือก สำหรับผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) ที่อยู่ในระดับที่ต้องการต่ำกว่าตามเกณฑ์ NCEP จะมีการปรับขนาดยาในสัปดาห์ที่ 4 และจะมีการประเมินประสิทธิผลหลังในสัปดาห์ที่ 8

ผลการศึกษา: ในสัปดาห์ที่ 8 อาสาสมัครส่วนใหญ่ (88.8%) สามารถบรรลุเป้าหมายในการลดระดับ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) และเกียรติ ข้าราชการ ของผู้ป่วย ณ วันคัดเลือก สำหรับผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) ที่อยู่ในระดับที่ต้องการต่ำกว่าตามเกณฑ์ NCEP จะมีการปรับขนาดยาในสัปดาห์ที่ 4 และจะมีการประเมินประสิทธิผลหลังในสัปดาห์ที่ 8

ผลการศึกษา: ในสัปดาห์ที่ 8 อาสาสมัครส่วนใหญ่ (88.8%) สามารถบรรลุเป้าหมายในการลดระดับ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) และเกียรติ ข้าราชการ ของผู้ป่วย ณ วันคัดเลือก สำหรับผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) ที่อยู่ในระดับที่ต้องการต่ำกว่าตามเกณฑ์ NCEP จะมีการปรับขนาดยาในสัปดาห์ที่ 4 และจะมีการประเมินประสิทธิผลหลังในสัปดาห์ที่ 8

สรุป: อาการของอาสาสมัครที่มีประสิทธิผลและความปลอดภัยในอาสาสมัครชาวไทยที่มีระดับไขมันผิดปกติในเลือด และพบการป้องกันในอาสาสมัครที่เหมาะสมที่สอดคล้องความสำเร็จในการลดระดับ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ ผลิตภัณฑ์ (LDL-C) ที่ก้าวหน้าได้