## Heliyon 8 (2022) e10050

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Heliyon

journal homepage: www.cell.com/heliyon

**Research article** 

CelPress

# Association of remnant cholesterol and non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol with risk of cardiovascular mortality among US general population



Iokfai Cheang <sup>a,1</sup>, Xu Zhu <sup>a,1</sup>, Xinyi Lu <sup>a</sup>, Shi Shi <sup>a</sup>, Yuan Tang <sup>a</sup>, Xin Yue <sup>a</sup>, Shengen Liao <sup>a</sup>, Wenming Yao <sup>a</sup>, Yanli Zhou <sup>a</sup>, Haifeng Zhang <sup>a,b</sup>, Yanxiu Li <sup>a,\*\*</sup>, Xinli Li <sup>a,\*\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, 210029, China

<sup>b</sup> The Affiliated Suzhou Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Suzhou Municipal Hospital, Gusu School, Nanjing Medical University, Suzhou, 215000, China

A	R	Т	Ι	С	L	Е	Ι	Ν	F	0

Keywords: Lipid Remnant cholesterol Non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol Cardiovascular mortality Risk assessment

### ABSTRACT

*Background:* There are strong association between remnant cholesterol (RC)/non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol (NHDL-C) and increase cardiovascular (CV) risk. The aim of present study was to investigate the association between target lipid parameters (RC and NHDL-C) and the risk of CV mortality in general population. *Methods:* Data set from an open database—National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES) 2003–2014 were extracted (n = 14992). Kaplan-Meier, multivariable COX regression, and restricted cubic spline (RCS) parameters. *Results:* Compared to the lowest quartile, RC (adjusted hazard ratio [HR] = 1.63 95%CI 1.05–2.52, P for trend = 0.037) and triglycerides (TG: Model 3: HR = 1.69 95%CI 1.10–2.60, P for trend = 0.049) in the highest quartile were independently associated with the increased cardiovascular mortality, while NHDL-C and apolipoprotein B (ApoB) in adjusted models did not show association (P for ronolinearity = 0.010) levels had a similar J-shape association with CV mortality. Threshold effect analysis showed that when RC  $\leq$  29.3 mg/dL, the level of RC and CV mortality.

tality risk were positively correlated. *Conclusions:* Our findings suggest high RC levels are associated with an increased risk of CV mortality, which support that the integration of TG-rich lipoproteins parameters in risk assessment might optimize the identification and management of selected population.

# 1. Introduction

Due to the overall social development and population aging, cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the most common cause of death worldwide in the general population. Epidemiological studies demonstrated that CVD accounted for over 17 million deaths worldwide yearly [1, 2, 3]. The prevalence of CVD and disease burden are rising over years [4, 5].

Lipids are essential in the development of atherosclerosis (AS). Serum lipid profile reflects the overall cardiometabolic health and significantly relates to CVDs [6, 7]. The lipid subfractions have gained increasing attention as more valid measures of atherogenicity. As the key factor in

the pathogenesis and perpetuation of ASCVD, the treatment toward the atherogenic cholesterol—low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) lowing has been established to reduce certain CVD risks [8, 9, 10]. However, studies showed that LDL-C does not account for the total risk of ASCVD [11], while other forms of dyslipidemia also contribute to the increased risk.

Several corresponding lipid parameters have been shown to further improve management and/or reflect the overlooked residual risk of LDL-C. Previous studies indicated that TRL and their remnants may contribute significantly to residual cardiovascular risk in patients on optimized lipid-lowering therapy [12, 13]. Among, remnant cholesterol (RC) and non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (NHDL-C) share overlapped

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: liyanx2008@126.com (Y. Li), xinli3267@njmu.edu.cn (X. Li).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work and should be considered co-first authors.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10050

Received 29 March 2022; Received in revised form 8 May 2022; Accepted 19 July 2022

<sup>2405-8440/© 2022</sup> The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



#### Figure 1. Inclusion flow chart.

characteristics, and both parameters demonstrated certain associations with TG-rich lipoproteins (TRL) which have a different pathophysiological characteristic to LDL-C.

## Table 1. Baseline characteristics.

As the cholesterol content of a subset of the TRL, RC mainly accounts for the very low-density lipoproteins (VLDL) and intermediate-density lipoproteins (IDL) cholesterol. RC is highly correlated with an increased risk of major cardiovascular events regardless of LDL-C levels and statin-treatment [14, 15, 16]. It can be assessed using several methods, including immunoaffinity assays, nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy, and calculations-based on plasma triglyceride concentrations.

In addition, NHDL-C specifies the amount of cholesterol associated with TRLs without high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C) which being small and dense molecules. While NHDL-C is one of the major targets in assessing CVD risk and is the secondary target of therapy in individuals with hypertriglyceridemia, studies also suggested that NHDL-C has a superior predictive value to LDL-C in estimating the risk of major cardiovascular events [17, 18, 19, 20].

Despite the shared promising values of RC and NHDL-C in risk and/or prognostic evaluation in broad patient cohorts, most of these studies have forced on high-risk populations and the secondary complementary marker to LDL-C [21, 22, 23]. Furthermore, the different roles between RC and NHDL-C in CVD remained unclear.

Given the existing evidence, the current study aimed to examine the association of these lipid markers with the cardiovascular risk and to explore the different effects of NHDL-C and RC in the general US population.

Variable	All	Cardiovascular	Survival	P value
	(n = 14992)	Death ( $n = 254$ )	(n = 14738)	
Age, years	48.1 (19.2)	71.8 (12.1)	47.7 (19.1)	< 0.001
Male, %	7428 (49.5%)	166 (65.4%)	7262 (49.3%)	< 0.001
Body mass index, kg/m2	28.6 (6.8)	28.3 (6.2)	28.6 (6.8)	0.001
Education level, %				< 0.001
Below high school	4006 (26.7%)	103 (40.6%)	3903 (26.5%)	
High school	3452 (23.0%)	65 (25.6%)	3387 (23.0%)	
Above high school	7534 (50.3%)	86 (33.9%)	7448 (50.5%)	
Race/ethnicity, %				< 0.001
Mexican American	2529 (16.9%)	27 (10.6%)	2502 (17.0%)	
Other Hispanic	1255 (8.4%)	11 (4.3%)	1244 (8.4%)	
Non-Hispanic White	6830 (45.6%)	164 (64.6%)	6666 (45.2%)	
Non-Hispanic Black	3140 (20.9%)	44 (17.3%)	3096 (21.0%)	
Other race	1238 (8.3%)	8 (3.1%)	1230 (8.3%)	
Smoker, %	6789 (45.3%)	150 (59.1%)	6639 (45.0%)	< 0.001
Alcohol user, %	10649 (71.0%)	167 (65.7%)	10482 (71.1%)	< 0.001
Lipid-lowering drugs, %	2540 (16.9%)	91 (35.8%)	2449 (16.6%)	< 0.001
TG, mg/dL	121.1 (66.8)	145.8 (70.1)	120.6 (66.7)	< 0.001
TC, mg/dL	191.3 (40.9)	190.3 (46.2)	191.1 (40.8)	< 0.001
HDL-C, mg/dL	54.1 (15.6)	51.9 (15.3)	54.1 (15.6)	< 0.001
LDL-C, mg/dL	113.0 (35.7)	111.4 (39.2)	113.0 (35.6)	< 0.001
RC, mg/dL	24.2 (13.4)	29.1 (14.0)	24.1 (13.3)	< 0.001
NHDL-C, mg/dL	137.2 (40.2)	140.5 (44.5)	137.1 (40.1)	< 0.001
ApoB, mg/dL	92.1 (25.0)	98.0 (27.7)	92.0 (24.9)	< 0.001
Comorbid illness, %				
Diabetes mellitus, %	1654 (11.0%)	76 (29.9%)	1578 (10.7%)	< 0.001
Hypertension, %	5162 (34.4%)	160 (63.0%)	5002 (33.9%)	< 0.001
Congestive heart failure	478 (3.2%)	53 (20.9%)	425 (2.9%)	< 0.001
Coronary heart disease	594 (4.0%)	52 (20.5%)	542 (3.7%)	< 0.001
Stroke	562 (3.7%)	35 (13.8%)	527 (3.6%)	< 0.001

Data are presented as mean (SD) or n (%).

TG, triglyceride; TC, total cholesterol; HDL-C, high density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL-C, low density lipoprotein cholesterol; ApoB, apolipoprotein B; RC, remnant cholesterol; NHDL-C, non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol.



Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier survival curve between different quartile of the lipid parameters in cardiovascular mortality. A: Remnant Cholesterol; B: Triglyceride; C: Non-High Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol; D: Apolipoprotein B.

#### 2. Method and material

#### 2.1. Study population and design

This retrospective cohort study used publicly available data from National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) conducted by the US National Center for Health Statistics (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA). Authors did not involve in the collection and production of the database. The detailed survey design, methods, and data are available on the NHANES website [24] and were in accordance with the "Declaration of Helsinki". The protocols for NHANES were approved by the National Center for Health Statistics of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Institutional Review Board, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

From NHANES 2003–2014 including 6 survey cycles (apolipoprotein B [ApoB] only in the NHANES 2005–2014), there were 14992 participants with available lipid profiles enrolled for the analysis. Inclusion flow chart is shown in Figure 1.

#### 2.2. Demographic characteristics and covariates

Baseline demographic variables including age, gender, education levels (below high school, high school, above high school), race/ ethnicity (Mexican American, other Hispanic, non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, other race), body weight, and height were collected from the household interview. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as body weight divided by height squared (kg/m2). The prevalence of the comorbidity (hypertension, diabetes, congestive heart failure, coronary heart disease, and stroke) was recorded by a standardized medical condition questionnaire which administered by trained interviewers.

Information on smoking, alcohol use, medication (including lipidlowering agents), and history of comorbidities had been obtained from the physical examination and associated questionnaire. Smoking habit was identified as someone who smoked  $\geq$ 100 cigarettes in their lifetime. Alcohol user was defined as those who drank at least 12 alcohol drinks in any one year.

## 2.3. Lipid profiles

Specimens from subjects who fasted for at least 8.5 h but less than 24 h were assayed for the lipid profile. Total cholesterol (TC), triglyceride (TG), HDL-C, and ApoB level were collected. Across included NHANES cycles, TC and TG were measured using enzymatic assays, and HDL-C and apoB were measured using immunoassays. LDL-C is calculated from measured values of TC, TG, and HDL-C according to the Friedewald calculation. Level of RC was calculated as TC minus LDL-C minus HDL-C [17, 25]. Level of NHDL-C was calculated as the difference between TC and HDL-C [14, 16]. Detailed instructions are discussed in each corresponding NHANES cycle Laboratory Procedures Manual https://wwwn.c dc.gov/nchs/nhanes/continuousnhanes/default.aspx.

## 2.4. Mortality ascertainment

With mean follow-up time of 5.5 years, the primary outcome was cardiovascular (CV) mortality which identified using variable for the

 Table 2. Univariate COX regression analysis for the prediction of cardiovascular mortality.

	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age	1.10 (1.09,1.11)	< 0.001
Male	1.93 (1.49,2.49)	< 0.001
Body mass index	0.99 (0.98,1.01)	0.571
Education level		< 0.001
Below high school	1	
High school	0.73 (0.53,0.99)	0.042
Above high school	0.46 (0.34,0.61)	< 0.001
Race/ethnicity		< 0.001
Mexican American	1	
Other Hispanic	1.04 (0.52,2.10)	0.914
Non-Hispanic White	2.47 (1.64,3.71)	< 0.001
Non-Hispanic Black	1.44 (0.89,2.32)	0.139
Other race	0.88 (0.40,1.93)	0.745
Cigarette Smoke	1.71 (1.33,2.20)	< 0.001
Alcohol user	0.77 (0.59,1.00)	0.047
Creatinine	1.00 (1.00,1.01)	< 0.001
Lipid-lowering drugs	3.06 (2.37,3.96)	< 0.001
RC	1.02 (1.01,1.03)	< 0.001
Triglyceride	1.00 (1.00,1.01)	< 0.001
NHDL	1.00 (1.00,1.00)	0.382
АроВ	1.01 (1.00,1.01)	0.007
Comorbidity		
Diabetes mellitus	3.90 (2.98,5.11)	< 0.001
Hypertension	3.59 (2.78,4.64)	< 0.001
Coronary heart disease	7.10 (5.23,9.63)	< 0.001
Congestive heart failure	10.57 (7.80,14.31)	< 0.001
Stroke	4.87 (3.41,6.96)	< 0.001
RC in Quartile		< 0.001
Q1	1 (reference)	
Q2	2.12 (1.36,3.31)	< 0.001
Q3	2.08 (1.33,3.24)	< 0.001
Q4	3.23 (2.13,4.91)	< 0.001
NHDL-C in Quartile		0.766
Q1	1 (reference)	
Q2	0.97 (0.68,1.39)	0.885
Q3	0.93 (0.65,1.33)	0.688
Q4	1,11 (0.79,1.56)	0.546

RC, remnant cholesterol; NHDL-C, non high density lipoprotein Cholesterol; Q, quarter.

RC (mg/dL): Q1 <14.85, Q2 14.85–20.96, Q3 20.96–30.13, Q4 >30.13. TG (mg/dL): Q1 <73.0, Q2 73.0–104.0, Q3 104.0–152.0, Q4 >152.0. NHDL (mg/dL): Q1<42.92, Q2 42.92–51.82, Q3 51.82–61.87, Q4 >61.87. ApoB (mg/dL): Q1 <74.0, Q2 74.0–90.0, Q3 90.0–108.0, Q4 >108.0.

leading cause of death. In this study, we defined death resulting from heart disease or cerebrovascular diseases as CV mortality. All-cause mortality and CVD mortality were defined according to the Tenth Version of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10). Information on follow-up time and mortality status were ascertained via using person months from the National Death Index to date of death or the end of the mortality period (December 31, 2015) [26]. Secondary outcome of all-cause mortality was acquired accordingly.

## 2.5. Statistical analysis

Continuous variables accorded with normal distribution are presented as means (standard deviations, SDs); otherwise, they are presented as medians with interquartile ranges (IQRs). Categorical variables are presented as numbers (%). Multiple imputations were applied for the missing cycle of ApoB. RC and NHLD-C were calculated and compared in each of the upper three quartiles to the lowest quartile. The shape of the relationship between lipid parameters and cardiovascular mortality was explored using the restricted cubic spline regression model and used ANOVA to test for nonlinearity. If nonlinearity was detected, we used the segmented regression to fit the piecewise-linear relationship between lipid parameters and CV mortality risk and to calculate the threshold inflection point using a recursive algorithm. Stratified Cox regression models were used to perform subgroup analyses. The significance of interaction (p-interaction) was tested using the likelihood ratio test. Hazard ratios (HR) [95% confidence intervals (CI)] for risk of endpoints were presented.

The cumulative survival rate was calculated by Kaplan-Meier method, and log-rank test was used for comparison between groups. Cox proportional hazards regression was performed, to analyze CV mortality according to the increasing values and quartiles of RC and NHDL-C. We evaluated the associations of lipids with endpoint using multivariate linear regression models analyzed by the following three adjustment models: model 1 was unadjusted; model 2 was adjusted for basic epidemic characteristic including age and sex; model 3 was further adjusted for the significant baseline characteristic of ethnicity, education level, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, lipid-lowering drugs, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, and stroke.

The statistical analyses were performed by SPSS (version 24.0; IBM) and R software (version 3.6.0; The R Foundation for Statistical Computing). Two-sided P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

#### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Baseline characteristics

Table 1 showed the characteristics of the study population. Study included 14992 participants with 49.5% of male and a mean age of 48.1  $\pm$  19.2 years old. There were 16.9% of participants who received lipid-lowering drugs. The mean RC level in the overall population was 24.2 mg/dL, TG was 121.1 mg/dL, NHDL-C was 137.2 mg/dL, and ApoB was 92.1 mg/dL.

Based on the primary endpoint—CV mortality, participants were divided into death group (254, 1.69%) and survival group (14738, 98.31%). Comparing these two groups, significances were shown in age, sex, BMI, education level, ethnicity, cigarette smoke, alcohol use, lipid-lowing drug, lipid profiles (including TG, TC, LDL-C, HDL-C, ApoB, RC, and NHDL-C), and the comorbidity (All P < 0.05).

## 3.2. Survival analysis

Kaplan-Meier survival curve showed that the survival rate of RC in the highest quartile (Q4) was lower than in the other three quartile groups, and the difference between groups was statistically significant (Log-rank test P < 0.0001, Figure 2A). TG showed a similar result as RC with statistical significance between groups (P < 0.0001, Figure 2B). On the other hand, the survival rate of patients with NHDL-C (P = 0.77, Figure 2C) and ApoB (P = 0.1, Figure 2D) did not show significance between quartiles.

#### 3.3. Prognostic value

Furthermore, univariate COX regression analysis showed that the risk of CV mortality of RC was significantly different between quartiles (P < 0.001); compared to Q1, the Q4 group had around 3-fold higher cardiovascular mortality risk (unadjusted HR = 3.23; 95%CI 2.13–4.91, P < 0.001, Table 2); while NHDL-C did not show significance in overall and quartile comparison (All P > 0.05, Table 2). In addition, age, sex, education level, ethnicity, cigarette smoke, alcohol, creatinine,

#### Table 3. Multivariate COX regression analysis for the prediction of cardiovascular mortality.

	Model 1	Pt	Model 2	Pt	Model 3	Pt
	HR (95% CI)		HR (95% CI)		HR (95% CI)	
RC		< 0.001		0.012		0.037
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	2.12 (1.36,3.31)***		1.35 (0.87,2.12)		1.41 (0.90,2.21)	
Q3	2.08 (1.33,3.24)***		1.12 (0.72,1.75)		1.11 (0.70,1.74)	
Q4	3.23 (2.13,4.91)***		1.73 (1.14,2.64) *		1.63 (1.05,2.52)*	
TG		< 0.001		0.016		0.049
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	2.04 (1.31,3.17)**		1.31 (0.84,2.04)		1.40 (0.89,2.19)	
Q3	2.10 (1.35,3.25)**		1.16 (0.75,1.79)		1.19 (0.76,1.86)	
Q4	3.17 (2.09,4.79)***		1.73 (1.14,2.62)*		1.69 (1.10,2.60)*	
NHDL		0.766		0.724		0.404
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	0.97 (0.68,1.39)		0.92 (0.65,1.31)		1.07 (0.74,1.52)	
Q3	0.93 (0.65,1.33)		0.88 (0.61,1.26)		1.12 (0.77,1.62)	
Q4	1,11 (0.79,1.56)		1.06 (0.75,1.51)		1.32 (0.92,1.88)	
АроВ		0.102		0.431		0.209
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	1.03 (0.71,1.51)		0.88 (0.61,1.29)		0.94 (0.64,1.37)	
Q3	1.04 (0.72,1.51)		0.82 (0.56,1.19)		1.01 (0.69,1.48)	
Q4	1.43 (1.01,2.03)*		1.06 (0.75,1.51)		1.31 (0.91,1.88)	

HR, Hazard ratio; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; Pt, P for trend; RC, remnant cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; NHDL-C, non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol; ApoB, apolipoprotein B.

Model 1: unadjusted.

Model 2: adjusted for age and sex.

Model 3: adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure and stroke, lipid-lowering drugs.

RC (mg/dL): Q1 <14.85, Q2 14.85–20.96, Q3 20.96–30.13, Q4 >30.13.

TG (mg/dL): Q1 <73.0, Q2 73.0–104.0, Q3 104.0–152.0, Q4 >152.0.

NHDL (mg/dL): Q1<42.92, Q2 42.92–51.82, Q3 51.82–61.87, Q4 >61.87.

ApoB (mg/dL): Q1 <74.0, Q2 74.0–90.0, Q3 90.0–108.0, Q4 >108.0.

Table 4. Multivariate COX regression analysis for the prediction of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular mortality.

	RC per 5 mg/dL increase		$\text{RC} \geq 15.5 \text{ mg/dL}$		NHDL per 5 mg/dL in	NHDL per 5 mg/dL increase		
	HR (95%CI)	Р	HR (95%CI)	р	HR (95%CI)	Р	HR (95%CI)	р
All-cause mor	tality							
Model 1	1.06 (1.04, 1.07)	< 0.001	1.63 (1.43, 1.87)	< 0.001	0.99 (0.99, 1.00)	0.046	0.84 (0.75, 0.93)	0.001
Model 2	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	0.998	0.93 (0.84, 1.07)	0.355	0.99 (0.98, 0.99)	< 0.001	0.74 (0.67, 0.83)	< 0.001
Model 3	0.99 (0.97, 1.01)	0.398	0.94 (0.82, 1.08)	0.400	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.003	0.79 (0.71, 0.89)	< 0.001
Cardiovascula	r mortality			1				
Model 1	1.11 (1.07, 1.15)	< 0.001	2.33 (1.63, 3.33)	< 0.001	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)	0.382	0.99 (0.77, 1.26)	0.920
Model 2	1.07 (1.02, 1.11)	0.003	1.35 (0.94, 1.93)	0.103	1.00 (0.99, 1.02)	0.636	0.93 (0.73, 1.20)	0.589
Model 3	1.05 (1.01, 1.10)	0.025	1.34 (0.93, 1.94)	0.114	1.01 (1.00, 1.03)	0.073	1.13 (0.87, 1.47)	0.355

Model 1: unadjusted.

Model 2: adjusted for age and sex.

Model 3: adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, stroke, and lipid-lowering drugs.

triglyceride, lipid-lowering drugs, and comorbidity (including diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, and stroke) were also associated with the risk of CV mortality (All P < 0.05).

Further analysis using multivariate Cox proportional hazards regression (Table 3), the highest quartile (Q4) of RC remained statistically significant compared to Q1 after adjustment (Model 3: HR = 1.63, 95%CI 1.05–2.52, P = 0.037). Also, across the increasing quartiles of RC showed

a significant trend regardless of the adjustment models (All P for trend  $<\!0.05$ ).

TG also demonstrated a similar significant trend for cardiovascular mortality risk across the quartiles (Model 3, Q1 vs Q4: HR = 1.6995%CI 1.10-2.60, P = 0.049). On the other hand, ApoB only showed significance in Q4 in the unadjusted model. NHDL-C did not show statistically significant in both univariate and multivariate COX regression, P for trend across the quartiles were all >0.05.



**Figure 3.** Association between the lipid parameters and cardiovascular (CV) risk. Adjusted hazard ratio of CV mortality from a restricted cubic spline logistic regression model with knots at the 5th, 35th, 65th, and 95th percentiles. Adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure and stroke, lipid-lowering drugs. The solid line and marked area represent the log-transformed hazard ratios and corresponding 95% confidence intervals. A: Remnant Cholesterol; B: Triglyceride; C: Non-High Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol; D: Apolipoprotein B.

 Table 5. Threshold effect analysis of the relationship between remnant cholesterol and cardiovascular death using 2 piece-wise linear regression models.

Remnant Cholesterol Inflection Point	group	HR (95% CI)	P for log likelihood ratio
29.3	$\leq$ 29.3	1.05 (1.02, 1.08)***	0.003
	>29.3	1.00 (0.99, 1.02)	
HR: Hazard Ratio.			
*P < 0.05, **P < 0.01,	***P < 0.00	01.	

Further analysis employing both increasing value and the cut-off values based on previous research [9], the increasing value of RC showed significant association with cardiovascular mortality (Model 3: HR = 1.05, 95%CI 1.01–1.10, P = 0.025, Table 4) but no significance in the cut-off model ( $\geq$ 15.5 mg/dL). NHDL-C did not show significance in CVD mortality, while significantly associated with all-cause mortality after adjustment (Cut-off  $\geq$ 130 mg/dL, Model 3: HR = 0.79, 95% CI 0.71–0.89, P < 0.001, Table 4).

## 3.4. Restricted cubic spline

To further evaluate the linearity between the target lipid parameter and the risk of CV mortality, restricted cubic spline model showed a nonlinear J-shaped association in RC (P for non-linearity <0.001, Figure 3A). The inflection point of RC was 29.3 mg/dL (*P* for log likelihood ratio = 0.003). On the left of the inflection point, the risk of cardiovascular increased with increasing RC (HR = 1.05, 95%CI 1.02–1.08, P < 0.001; Table 5). On the right side of the inflection point, the fluctuation was not significant (HR = 1.00, 95%CI 0.99–1.02, P > 0.05; Table 5). Furthermore, TG also showed a similar nonlinear J-shaped association (P for non-linearity = 0.01, Figure 3B).

Although ApoB and NHDL-C did not show significant in trend, ApoB (P for non-linearity = 0.001, Figure 3C) and NHDL-C (P for non-linearity = 0.349, Figure 3D) showed a linear association in RCS.

#### 3.5. Result for secondary endpoint of all-cause mortality

The association of the lipid parameters above with the secondary endpoint—all-cause mortality were also explored (Table 6). RC, TG, NHDL-C, and ApoB were all shown significance in the univariate Cox regression analysis. Results of K-M survival analysis, Cox regression analysis, and RCS suggested that both ApoB and NHDL-C showed a Ushape association with all-cause mortality (Figures 4 and 5, Table 7). To be noted, TG and RC remained a similar trend and pattern in the analysis.

#### 3.6. Subgroup analysis of CVD mortality risk prediction

While the above results showed the association with RC and cardiovascular mortality and association with NHDL-C and all-cause mortality,

Variable	All (n = 14992)	Death (n = 1411)	Survival $(n = 13581)$	P value
Age, years	48.1 (19.2)	70.0 (14.4)	45.9 (18.2)	< 0.001
Male, %	7428 (49.5%)	824 (58.4%)	6604 (48.6%)	<0.001
Body mass index, kg/m2	28.6 (6.8)	28.2 (6.2)	28.7 (6.8)	0.001
Education level, %				< 0.001
Below high school	4006 (26.7%)	581 (41.2%)	3425 (25.2%)	
High school	3452 (23.0%)	352 (24.9%)	3100 (22.8%)	
Above high school	7534 (50.3%)	478 (33.9%)	7056 (52.0%)	
Race/ethnicity, %				< 0.001
Mexican American	2529 (16.9%)	189 (13.4%)	2340 (17.2%)	
Other Hispanic	1255 (8.4%)	63 (4.5%)	1192 (8.8%)	
Non-Hispanic White	6830 (45.6%)	859 (60.9%)	5971 (44.0%)	
Non-Hispanic Black	3140 (20.9%)	248 (17.6%)	2892 (21.3%)	
Other race	1238 (8.3%)	52 (3.7%)	1186 (8.7%)	
Smoker, %	6789 (45.3%)	816 (57.8%)	5973 (44.0%)	<0.001
Alcohol user, %	10649 (71.0%)	921 (65.3%)	9728 (71.6%)	< 0.001
Lipid-lowering drugs, %	2540 (16.9%)	410 (29.1%)	2130 (15.7%)	<0.001
TC, mg/dL	191.3 (40.9)	190.3 (46.2)	191.4 (40.3)	< 0.001
HDL-C, mg/dL	54.1 (15.6)	54.0 (16.8)	54.1 (15.4)	< 0.001
LDL-C, mg/dL	113.0 (35.7)	109.4 (40.0)	113.4 (35.2)	< 0.001
RC, mg/dL	24.2 (13.4)	26.9 (13.7)	23.9 (13.3)	< 0.001
NHDL-C, mg/dL	137.2 (40.2)	136.3 (44.2)	137.3 (39.8)	< 0.001
Comorbid illness, %				
Diabetes mellitus, %	1654 (11.0%)	355 (25.2%)	1299 (9.6%)	< 0.001
Hypertension, %	5162 (34.4%)	845 (59.9%)	4317 (31.8%)	< 0.001
Coronary heart disease	478 (3.2%)	193 (13.7%)	285 (2.1%)	< 0.001
Congestive heart failure	594 (4.0%)	201 (14.2%)	393 (2.9%)	< 0.001
Stroke	562 (3.7%)	187 (13.3%)	375 (2.8%)	< 0.001

## Table 6. Baseline Characteristics by All-cause death.

Data are presented as mean (SD) or n (%).

TC, total cholesterol; HDL-C, high density lipoprotein cholesterol; LDL, low density lipoprotein cholesterol; RC, remnant cholesterol; NHDL-C, non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol.

subgroup analysis incorporating the Framingham risk score (FRS) did not show added risk prediction value across the increasing quartiles (P > 0.05, Tables 8, 9, and 10).

Furthermore, association between the lipids and CVD mortality in the subgroup patients who have been taking lipid-lowering therapy were analyzed. Although the overall trend did not show significance, multivariate regression analysis showed that TG (Model 3, Q1 vs Q4: HR = 2.74, 95%CI 1.06–7.11) and RC (Model 3, Q1 vs Q4: HR = 3.01, 95%CI 1.16–7.80) in the highest quartile remained significant among the models (Table 11).

# 4. Discussion

Present study demonstrated the association between lipid profiles and cardiovascular mortality in a US national-scale general population. Among, we found that both higher levels of remnant cholesterol and triglyceride were associated with the worse cardiovascular outcome in Kaplan-Meier survival curve and Cox regression analysis. Furthermore, both RC and TG demonstrated a nonlinear J-shaped association with CV mortality. On the other hand, ApoB and NHDL-C did not show a significant association in CV mortality, whereas showed a U-shape association with all-cause mortality.

Currently, management in reducing LDL-C has been recommended as the main strategy for reducing CVD risk. However, there are still wide gaps in the assessment of the total and residual cardiovascular risk. Previous studies showed the levels of TG and RC, but not LDL-C, were associated with cardiovascular outcomes independent of other risk factors [14]. Even after lowering LDL-C to the guideline recommended target, pathogenesis of AS from TRLs remain contribute to residual atherosclerotic CVD risk [27]. TRL is not only a component of residual risk in patients with well-controlled LDL levels on statins, but also a future risk factor for asymptomatic patients with increased risk. Also, study suggested that utilizing ApoB and NHDL-C as secondary targets are superior in identifying statin-treated patients at residual risk of all-cause mortality and myocardial infarction [19]. Therefore, these parameters reflecting the systemic lipo-metabolism such as TG, RC, NHDL-C, and ApoB might be utilized to develop effective and timely strategies to cope with these challenges of CVD epidemics.

Despite the seemingly smaller number of VLDL and IDL parameters, the physical properties of lower density and small molar in nature cause a comparable concentration in plasma. The definition of RC (TC—LDL-C—HDL-C) and NHDL-C (TC—HDL-C) overlaps at a certain level while both parameters contain the class of VLDL/IDL components. In the current study, these two parameters (RC and NHDL-C) demonstrated a distinct prognostic value, while pair of RC and TG/ApoB and NHDL-C demonstrated a similar and significant trend in CVD prognostic evaluation.

Firstly, RC is primarily composed of VLDL, IDL, and chylomicron. In the fasting state, RC is associated with increased risk for CVD [28, 29, 30]. Previous study also showed that the remnant levels were independently correlated with triglyceride levels [31]. RC contributes to the sum of cholesterol carried within the atherogenic ApoB-containing lipoproteins without the level of LDL-C [32]. As a parameter indicating the level of TRL, RC might show a similar trend in CVD prognostic assessment.

On the other hand, NHDL-C includes the assessment of remnant lipoprotein cholesterol and also the additional risk mainly from LDL-C. Therefore, parameters composed with the level of LDL-C might not accurately reflect the lipometabolic state causing the difference in the risk assessment and prognostic values, while RC might be a better marker for patients with the lipid-lowing agents.

In addition, ApoB is a direct measure of circulating numbers of atherogenic lipoproteins containing VLDL, IDL, and LDL. NHDL-C includes but is not limited to these lipid components which could explain the similar results of the current study. Also, previous study showed ApoB is superior to NHDL-C as a secondary target for residual risk control and management in CVD patients. It has been raised that while ApoB is not available, NHDL-C should be used to supplement LDL-C [33]. However, our results regarding NHDL-C only demonstrated significant U-shape association with all-cause mortality similar to a previous study among hypertension population [27], but it did not show positive results in CV mortality. A plausible explanation is that, with the influence of LDL-C, the "harvest" phenomenon occurred wherein the older individuals with hypercholesterolemia are those who are less susceptible to the pathological effects of cholesterol [34, 35].

Moreover, it is worth mentioning that there were J-shaped relationship between TGs (TG and RC) and the cardiovascular risk. There are multiple underlying mechanisms that influenced the TG levels by a combination of environmental and genetic factors that regulate from



Figure 4. Kaplan-Meier survival curve between different quartile of the lipid parameters in all-cause mortality. A: Remnant Cholesterol; B: Triglyceride; C: Non-High Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol; D: Apolipoprotein B.

synthesis to circulation. The pathophysiology of increasing TG overlapped with various metabolic cardiovascular risk conditions [36, 37, 38] such as obesity, diabetes, metabolic syndrome, etc. As in the current study, researchers have focused on the potential role of TG, TRLs, and remnants on cardiovascular risk. The J-shaped association we observed between TGs and CV mortality was consistent with results from some major studies [39].

The mechanisms regulating plasma triglyceride, TRL, and TRLresidue levels involve complex pathways. There is evidence regard to the involvement of triglyceride-rich remnants in development of cardiovascular disease. Because TRL cholesterol (TRL-C) levels change proportionally to residue concentrations, assessing TRL-C provides an approximation of circulating residue levels. Current data emphasizes the distinct value of remnants in CVD and complements a certain knowledge gap for exploring reliable biomarkers in clinical practice. However, it is not an accurate or specific biomarker and must be used with caution. Further prognostic cohort studies should be conducted to determine whether this line of investigation translates into new and effective paradigms for lipid management.

In summary, our findings are consistent with previous studies and support the role of these parameters including TG and RC as risk factors for CVD risk. Thus, measurement of remnant cholesterol levels may be helpful for CVD risk assessment in clinical practice. With the emerging and novel lipid lowering therapies including statins, proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 inhibitors, antisense inhibitors of Apolipoprotein (a), microsomal triglyceride transfer protein inhibitors, etc., will likely disturb the precise assessment in these patients. Levels of RC and NHDL-C are relatively accessible parameters. Incorporate these lipid parameters reflecting various aspects of lipometabolism, especially in VLDL and IDL, might provide a better assessment and optimal management target for high CVD risk patients. Results of future prospective cohort studies regarding the measurement of each lipid component and their participating pathway in ASCVD should be further revisited and explored.

## 4.1. Limitation

There are certain limitations of our study. This study was a community-based retrospective study with a relatively large sample size from representative US general population, but further generalization of the results should be validated in other study settings. Due to the nature of study design, the level of LDL-C was calculated with an indirect method which might lead to a certain level of bias in the analysis of RC. In addition, study included partial participants (16.9%) who received lipid-lowing agents. Although results showed there was significance in the lipid-lowing subgroup which indicated the residual risk, improvement of the methodology and/or selection of population might be needed for precluding bias. Finally, although the regression models included a broad set of covariates, other confounding factors such as eating habits may also have played a role.



Figure 5. Association between the lipid parameters and all-cause mortality. Adjusted hazard ratio of all-cause mortality from a restricted cubic spline logistic regression model with knots at the 5th, 35th, 65th, and 95th percentiles. Adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure and stroke, lipid-lowering drugs. The solid line and marked area represent the log-transformed hazard ratios and corresponding 95% confidence intervals. A: Remnant Cholesterol; B: Triglyceride; C: Non-High Density Lipoprotein Cholesterol; D: Apolipoprotein B.

Table 7. Mu	ltivariate COX regression analysi	is for the prediction o	f all-cause mortality.			
	Model 1	Pt	Model 2	Pt	Model 3	Pt
	HR (95% CI)		HR (95% CI)		HR (95% CI)	
RC						
Q1	1	< 0.001	1	0.597	1	0.304
Q2	1.46 (1.24,1.73)***		0.94 (0.80,1.12)		0.97 (0.82,1.15)	
Q3	1.65 (1.40,1.95)***		0.90 (0.76,1.06)		0.90 (0.76,1.06)	
Q4	1.74 (1.48,2.05)***		0.93 (0.79,1.09)		0.88 (0.74,1.04)	
TG		< 0.001		0.406		0.186
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	1.54 (1.30,1.81)***		0.99 (0.84,1.18)		1.04 (0.88,1.23)	
Q3	1.63 (1.38,1.91)***		0.89 (0.76,1.05)		0.91 (0.77,1.07)	
Q4	1.75 (1.49,2.06)***		0.94 (0.80,1.10)		0.90 (0.76,1.07)	
NHDL		0.007		< 0.001		0.009
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	0.88 (0.76,1.02)		0.79 (0.68,0.91)**		0.86 (0.75,1.00)	
Q3	0.77 (0.66,0.89)		0.64 (0.55,0.74)***		0.77 (0.66,0.90)*	
Q4	0.87 (0.75,1.00)		0.69 (0.59,0.80)***		0.84 (0.72,0.97)*	
АроВ		0.213		< 0.001		0.001
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	1.03 (0.89,1.20)		0.85 (0.73,0.98)*		0.87 (0.74,1.01)	
Q3	0.91 (0.78,1.06)		0.68 (0.58,0.79)***		0.75 (0.64,0.88)***	
Q4	1.05 (0.91,1.22)		0.73 (0.63,0.85)***		0.78 (0.67,0.91)**	

9

HR, Hazard ratio; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; Pt, P for trend; RC, remnant cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; NHDL, non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol; ApoB, apolipoprotein B.

Model 1: unadjusted.

Model 2: adjusted for age and sex.

Model 3: adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure and

stroke, lipid-lowering drugs. RC (mg/dL): Q1 <14.85, Q2 14.85-20.96, Q3 20.96-30.13, Q4 >30.13.

TG (mg/dL): Q1 <73.0, Q2 73.0–104.0, Q3 104.0–152.0, Q4 >152.0.

NHDL (mg/dL): Q1<42.92, Q2 42.92-51.82, Q3 51.82-61.87, Q4 >61.87.

ApoB (mg/dL): Q1 <74.0, Q2 74.0–90.0, Q3 90.0–108.0, Q4 >108.0.

Table 8. Discrimination and reclassification after update FRS Model.

Endpoint level	FRS Model	Update Model	C-index	P value	IDI (95%CI)	P value	NRI (95%CI)	P value
CV mortality	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, LDL, and HDL	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, and RC	0.863 vs 0.864	0.507	0.001 (-0.006, 0.006)	0.931	0.057 (-0.048, 0.151)	0.554
	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, TC, and HDL	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, and RC	0.864 vs 0.864	0.603	0.001 (-0.006, 0.006)	0.911	0.038 (-0.089, 0.145)	0.653
All-cause mortality	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, LDL, and HDL	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, and NHDL	0.832 vs 0.831	0.200	0.002 (-0.002, 0.005)	0.455	0.006 (-0.041, 0.053)	0.733
	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, TC, and HDL	age, sex, blood pressure, smoking, and NHDL	0.831 vs 0.831	0.386	0.002 (-0.001, 0.005)	0.257	0.009 (-0.033, 0.044)	0.614

IDI, integrated discrimination improvement; NRI, net reclassification improvement; CI, confidence interval.

#### Table 9. Subgroup analysis of the association with RC and cardiovascular mortality.

Variables	Subgroups	Ν	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	p-t	p-int
			OR	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)		
Age	<45	6995	1.00 (Ref.)	1.30 (0.18, 9.55)	2.43 (0.41, 14.29)	1.92 (0.29, 12.65)	0.770	0.708
	45–69	5413	1.00 (Ref.)	1.27 (0.51, 3.17)	1.23 (0.50, 3.00)	1.60 (0.68, 3.75)	0.662	
	>69	2584	1.00 (Ref.)	1.52 (0.88, 2.61)	1.07 (0.62, 1.86)	1.70 (1.00, 2.91)	0.061	
Sex	Male	7428	1.00 (Ref.)	1.60 (0.92, 2.80)	1.18 (0.67, 2.07)	1.80 (1.05, 3.08)	0.067	0.856
	Female	7564	1.00 (Ref.)	1.13 (0.53, 2.43)	1.00 (0.46, 2.14)	1.49 (0.70, 3.17)	0.482	
Lipid-lowering drugs	Yes	2540	1.00 (Ref.)	2.48 (0.93, 6.62)	1.66 (0.62, 4.43)	2.74 (1.06, 7.11)	0.081	0.392
	No	12452	1.00 (Ref.)	1.22 (0.73, 2.04)	1.04 (0.62, 1.74)	1.40 (0.85, 2.33)	0.410	
Hypertension	Yes	5162	1.00 (Ref.)	1.20 (0.68, 2.13)	1.07 (0.61, 1.87)	1.73 (1.02, 2.93)	0.051	0.574
	No	9830	1.00 (Ref.)	1.74 (0.82, 3.70)	1.23 (0.57, 2.69)	1.57 (0.73, 3.39)	0.391	
Diabetes	Yes	1654	1.00 (Ref.)	1.70 (0.61, 4.70)	1.51 (0.56, 4.09)	2.15 (0.82, 5.64)	0.364	0.958
	No	13338	1.00 (Ref.)	1.37 (0.83, 2.27)	1.06 (0.63, 1.77)	1.56 (0.95, 2.56)	0.141	
FRS	Low risk	11145	1.00 (Ref.)	1.33 (0.69, 2.55)	0.76 (0.37, 1.54)	1.23 (0.60, 2.51)	0.310	0.647
	Moderate risk	2682	1.00 (Ref.)	1.28 (0.59, 2.79)	1.29 (0.60, 2.75)	1.53 (0.71, 3.29)	0.745	
	High risk	1165	1.00 (Ref.)	1.98 (0.57, 6.87)	1.74 (0.51, 5.92)	3.00 (0.91, 9.92)	0.080	

Analyses were adjusted for covariates age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, stroke, and lipid-lowering drugs when they were not the strata variables. HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; Q: quartile; Ref., reference; p-t, p for trend; p-int, p for interaction. FRS, Framingham risk score; Low risk (<10%), moderate risk (10–20%), high risk (>20%). All risks calculated using FRS.

Table 10. Subgroup a	Fable 10. Subgroup analysis of the association with NHDL-C and all-cause mortality.											
Variables	Subgroups	roups N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	p-t	p-int				
			OR	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)						
Age	<45	6995	1.00 (Ref.)	0.95 (0.56, 1.63)	0.97 (0.55, 1.69)	1.12 (0.65, 1.93)	0.944	0.002				
	45–69	5413	1.00 (Ref.)	0.73 (0.55, 0.97)	0.59 (0.44, 0.79)	0.64 (0.48, 0.84)	0.002					
	>69	2584	1.00 (Ref.)	0.88 (0.73, 1.06)	0.80 (0.66, 0.97)	0.81 (0.67, 0.98)	0.091					
Sex	Male	7428	1.00 (Ref.)	0.85 (0.71, 1.03)	0.71 (0.58, 0.87)	0.75 (0.61, 0.91)	0.004	0.933				
	Female	7564	1.00 (Ref.)	0.87 (0.69, 1.11)	0.80 (0.63, 1.02)	0.83 (0.66, 1.05)	0.304					
Lipid-lowering drugs	Yes	2540	1.00 (Ref.)	0.85 (0.66, 1.10)	0.97 (0.74, 1.28)	1.16 (0.87, 1.55)	0.227	0.002				
	No	12452	1.00 (Ref.)	0.83 (0.69, 0.99)	0.63 (0.52, 0.76)	0.67 (0.56, 0.80)	< 0.001					
Hypertension	Yes	5162	1.00 (Ref.)	0.89 (0.74, 1.08)	0.86 (0.71, 1.04)	0.83 (0.68, 1.01)	0.255	0.089				
	No	9830	1.00 (Ref.)	0.78 (0.62, 0.99)	0.57 (0.44, 0.74)	0.69 (0.55, 0.87)	< 0.001					

(continued on next page)

Variables	Subgroups	Ν	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	p-t	p-int
			OR	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)		
Diabetes	Yes	1654	1.00 (Ref.)	0.88 (0.67, 1.16)	0.92 (0.68, 1.25)	0.96 (0.71, 1.30)	0.819	0.152
	No	13338	1.00 (Ref.)	0.84 (0.70, 0.99)	0.67 (0.56, 0.81)	0.71 (0.59, 0.84)	< 0.001	
FRS	Low risk	11145	1.00 (Ref.)	0.73 (0.59, 0.91)	0.64 (0.50, 0.82)	0.62 (0.48, 0.80)	< 0.001	0.055
	Moderate risk	2682	1.00 (Ref.)	0.90 (0.70, 1.16)	0.71 (0.53, 0.95)	0.79 (0.59, 1.07)	0.127	
	High risk	1165	1.00 (Ref.)	1.29 (0.88, 1.91)	1.20 (0.81, 1.76)	1.23 (0.84, 1.82)	0.630	

Analyses were adjusted for covariates age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, stroke, and lipid-lowering drugs when they were not the strata variables. HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; Q: quartile; Ref., reference; p-t, p for trend; p-int, p for interaction. FRS, Framingham risk score; Low risk (<10%), moderate risk (10–20%), high risk (>20%). All risks calculated using FRS.

Fable 11. Multivariate COX regression an	alysis for the prediction of	cardiovascular mortality in	patients with lipid-lowering therapy.
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------

	Model 1	Pt	Model 2	Pt	Model 3	Pt
	HR (95% CI)		HR (95% CI)		HR (95% CI)	
RC		0.128		0.016		0.081
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	2.27 (0.85-6.01)		2.36 (0.89-6.26)		2.48 (0.93-6.62)	
Q3	1.72 (0.65–4.53)		1.76 (0.66–4.65)		1.66 (0.62-4.43)	
Q4	2.61 (1.03-6.60) *		3.34 (1.32-8.47) *		2.74 (1.06–7.11) *	
TG		0.133		0.015		0.079
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	2.21 (0.83-5.93)		2.30 (0.86-6.18)		2.50 (0.93-6.73)	
Q3	1.90 (0.72–4.98)		1.97 (0.75–5.18)		1.91 (0.72–5.05)	
Q4	2.74 (1.08–6.92) *		3.52 (1.39-8.93) **		3.01 (1.16–7.80) *	
NHDL		0.681		0.186		0.166
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	0.71 (0.40–1.24)		0.79 (0.45–1.39)		0.93 (0.52–1.65)	
Q3	0.89 (0.50–1.56)		1.22 (0.69–2.15)		1.40 (0.79–2.50)	
Q4	0.87 (0.49–1.56)		1.53 (0.84–2.76)		1.72 (0.94–3.14)	
АроВ		0.713		0.265		0.251
Q1	1		1		1	
Q2	0.81 (0.45–1.46)		0.93 (0.51–1.67)		0.98 (0.54–1.79)	
Q3	0.73 (0.40–1.34)		0.91 (0.49–1.68)		1.07 (0.58–1.99)	
Q4	0.94 (0.53–1.69)		1.51 (0.83–2.72)		1.65 (0.90–3.01)	

HR, Hazard ratio; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval; Pt, P for trend; RC, remnant cholesterol; TG, triglyceride; NHDL-C, non-high density lipoprotein cholesterol; ApoB, apolipoprotein B.

Model 1: unadjusted.

Model 2: adjusted for age and sex.

Model 3: adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, education level, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, smoker, alcohol user, BMI, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure and stroke, lipid-lowering drugs.

RC (mg/dL): Q1 <14.85, Q2 14.85–20.96, Q3 20.96–30.13, Q4 >30.13.

TG (mg/dL): Q1 <73.0, Q2 73.0–104.0, Q3 104.0–152.0, Q4 >152.0.

NHDL (mg/dL): Q1<42.92, Q2 42.92-51.82, Q3 51.82-61.87, Q4 >61.87.

ApoB (mg/dL): Q1 <74.0, Q2 74.0–90.0, Q3 90.0–108.0, Q4 >108.0.

## 5. Conclusion

Our study demonstrated that levels of the target lipid parameters (RC and NHDL-C) are associated with the outcomes in US general population. RC displayed a positive correlation and J-shaped relationship with cardiovascular mortality, while NHDL-C only showed an association in allcause mortality. Study further supported that considering these TRL parameters in clinical practice could help optimize risk management. Further large-scale prospective studies are required to confirm the prognostic effect and underlying mechanism.

# Declarations

## Author contribution statement

Iokfai Cheang; Xinli Li: Conceived and designed the experiments; Wrote the paper.

Xu Zhu: Analyzed and interpreted the data; Wrote the paper.

Xinyi Lu; Shi Shi: Analyzed and interpreted the data.

Yuan Tang; Xin Yue; Shengen Liao: Contributed reagents, materials, analysis tools or data.

#### I. Cheang et al.

#### Funding statement

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

# Data availability statement

Study used publicly available data from National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). Data will be made available on request.

#### Declaration of interest's statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

# Additional information

No additional information is available for this paper.

## Acknowledgements

We appreciate the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention and all participants who enrolled in the NHANES.

#### References

- [1] L.J. Laslett, P. Alagona Jr., B.A. Clark 3rd, J.P. Drozda Jr., F. Saldivar, S.R. Wilson, et al., The worldwide environment of cardiovascular disease: prevalence, diagnosis, therapy, and policy issues: a report from the American College of Cardiology, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 60 (25 Suppl) (2012 Dec 25) S1–49. PMID: 23257320.
- [2] GBD 2013 Mortality and Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013, Lancet 385 (9963) (2015 Jan 10) 117–171. Epub 2014 Dec 18. PMID: 25530442; PMCID: PMC4340604.
- [3] G.A. Roth, M.D. Huffman, A.E. Moran, V. Feigin, G.A. Mensah, M. Naghavi, C.J. Murray, Global and regional patterns in cardiovascular mortality from 1990 to 2013, Circulation 132 (17) (2015 Oct 27) 1667–1678. PMID: 26503749.
- [4] E.J. Benjamin, P. Muntner, A. Alonso, M.S. Bittencourt, C.W. Callaway, A.P. Carson, et al., American heart association council on epidemiology and prevention Statistics committee and stroke Statistics subcommittee. Heart disease and stroke statistics-2019 update: a report from the American heart association, Circulation 139 (10) (2019 Mar 5) e56–e528, erratum in: Circulation. 2020 Jan 14;141(2):e33. PMID: 30700139.
- [5] D. Zhao, J. Liu, M. Wang, X. Zhang, M. Zhou, Epidemiology of cardiovascular disease in China: current features and implications, Nat. Rev. Cardiol. 16 (4) (2019 Apr) 203–212.
- [6] M. Ruiz-Canela, A. Hruby, C.B. Clish, L. Liang, M.A. Martínez-González, F.B. Hu, Comprehensive metabolomic profiling and incident cardiovascular disease: a systematic review, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 6 (10) (2017 Sep 28), e005705. PMID: 28963102; PMCID: PMC5721826.
- [7] B.A. Ference, I. Graham, L. Tokgozoglu, A.L. Catapano, Impact of lipids on cardiovascular health: JACC health promotion series, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 72 (10) (2018 Sep 4) 1141–1156.
- [8] E.P. Navarese, J.G. Robinson, M. Kowalewski, et al., Association between baseline LDL-C level and total and cardiovascular mortality after LDL-C lowering: a systematic review and meta-analysis [published correction appears in jama, JAMA 319 (15) (2018) 1566–1579, 2018 oct 2;320(13):1387].
- [9] Authors/Task Force Members, ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines (CPG); ESC National Cardiac Societies. 2019 ESC/EAS guidelines for the management of dyslipidaemias: lipid modification to reduce cardiovascular risk, Atherosclerosis 290 (2019 Nov) 140–205. Epub 2019 Aug 31. Erratum in: Atherosclerosis. 2020 Jan;292: 160-162. Erratum in: Atherosclerosis. 2020 Feb;294:80-82. PMID: 31591002.
- [10] S.M. Grundy, N.J. Stone, A.L. Bailey, et al., AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA Guideline on the management of blood cholesterol: a report of the American college of cardiology/American heart association task force on clinical practice guidelines [published correction appears in J Am coll cardiol, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 73 (24) (2019) e285–e350, 2019 jun 25; 73(24):3237-3241].
- [11] U. Ravnskov, M. de Lorgeril, D.M. Diamond, R. Hama, T. Hamazaki, B. Hammarskjöld, et al., LDL-C does not cause cardiovascular disease: a comprehensive review of the current literature, Expet Rev. Clin. Pharmacol. 11 (10) (2018 Oct) 959–970. PMID: 30198808.

- [12] H.N. Ginsberg, C.J. Packard, M.J. Chapman, J. Borén, C.A. Aguilar-Salinas, M. Averna, et al., Triglyceride-rich lipoproteins and their remnants: metabolic insights, role in atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, and emerging therapeutic strategies-a consensus statement from the European Atherosclerosis Society, Eur. Heart J. 42 (47) (2021 Dec 14) 4791–4806. PMCID: PMC8670783.
- [13] S.V. Nguyen, T. Nakamura, K. Kugiyama, High remnant lipoprotein predicts recurrent cardiovascular events on statin treatment after acute coronary syndrome, Circ. J. 78 (10) (2014) 2492–2500. Epub 2014 Aug 26. PMID: 25168189.
- [14] O. Castañer, X. Pintó, I. Subirana, A.J. Amor, E. Ros, Á. Hernáez, et al., Remnant cholesterol, not LDL cholesterol, is associated with incident cardiovascular disease, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 76 (23) (2020 Dec 8) 2712–2724. PMID: 33272365.
- [15] A. Varbo, M. Benn, B.G. Nordestgaard, Remnant cholesterol as a cause of ischemic heart disease: evidence, definition, measurement, atherogenicity, high risk patients, and present and future treatment, Pharmacol. Ther. 141 (3) (2014 Mar) 358–367. Epub 2013 Nov 26. PMID: 24287311.
- [16] A. Varbo, M. Benn, A. Tybjærg-Hansen, B.G. Nordestgaard, Elevated remnant cholesterol causes both low-grade inflammation and ischemic heart disease, whereas elevated low-density lipoprotein cholesterol causes ischemic heart disease without inflammation, Circulation 128 (12) (2013 Sep 17) 1298–1309. Epub 2013 Aug 7. PMID: 23926208.
- [17] K. Moriyama, E. Takahashi, Non-HDL cholesterol is a more superior predictor of small-dense LDL cholesterol than LDL cholesterol in Japanese subjects with TG levels < 400 mg/dL, J. Atherosclerosis Thromb. 23 (9) (2016 Sep 1) 1126–1137. Epub 2016 Mar 18. PMID: 27001003; PMCID: PMC5090818.
- [18] Y. Zhang, N.Q. Wu, S. Li, C.G. Zhu, Y.L. Guo, P. Qing, et al., Non-HDL-C is a better predictor for the severity of coronary atherosclerosis compared with LDL-C, Heart Lung Circ. 25 (10) (2016 Oct) 975–981.
- [19] C.D.L. Johannesen, M.B. Mortensen, A. Langsted, B.G. Nordestgaard, Apolipoprotein B and non-HDL cholesterol better reflect residual risk than LDL cholesterol in statin-treated patients, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 77 (11) (2021 Mar 23) 1439–1450.
- [20] G. Harari, M.S. Green, A. Magid, S. Zelber-Sagi, Usefulness of non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol as a predictor of cardiovascular disease mortality in men in 22-year follow-up, Am. J. Cardiol. 119 (8) (2017 Apr 15) 1193–1198. Epub 2017 Jan 25. PMID: 28267961.
- [21] D. Yu, Z. Wang, X. Zhang, B. Qu, Y. Cai, S. Ma, et al., Remnant cholesterol and cardiovascular mortality in patients with type 2 diabetes and incident diabetic nephropathy, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 106 (12) (2021 Nov 19) 3546–3554.
- [22] E.Y. Lee, Y. Yang, H.S. Kim, J.H. Cho, K.H. Yoon, W.S. Chung, et al., Effect of visitto-visit LDL-, HDL-, and non-HDL-cholesterol variability on mortality and cardiovascular outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention, Atherosclerosis 279 (2018 Dec) 1–9. Epub 2018 Oct 17. PMID: 30359786.
- [23] Q. Cheng, X.C. Liu, C.L. Chen, Y.Q. Huang, Y.Q. Feng, J.Y. Chen, The U-shaped association of non-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality among patients with hypertension, Front Cardiovasc Med 8 (2021 Jul 14), 707701. PMID: 34336961; PMCID: PMC8316599.
- [24] National Center for Health Statistics, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey: NHANES Survey Methods and Analytic Guidelines. https://wwwn.cdc. gov/nchs/nhanes/AnalyticGuidelines.aspx. Accessed May 2021.
- [25] T. de Nijs, A. Sniderman, J. de Graaf, ApoB versus non-HDL-cholesterol: diagnosis and cardiovascular risk management, Crit. Rev. Clin. Lab Sci. 50 (6) (2013 Nov) 163–171.
- [26] National Center for Health Statistics, Office of Analysis and Epidemiology. The Linkage of National Center for Health Statistics Survey Data to the National Death Index—2015 Linked Mortality File (LMF): Methodology Overview and Analytic Considerations, March 2019. Hyattsville, Maryland. Available at the following address: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data-linkage/mortality-methods.htm. Accessed October 2021.
- [27] A. Langsted, C.M. Madsen, B.G. Nordestgaard, Contribution of remnant cholesterol to cardiovascular risk, J. Intern. Med. 288 (1) (2020 Jul) 116–127. PMID: 32181933.
- [28] T. Nakamura, H. Takano, K. Umetani, K. Kawabata, J.E. Obata, Y. Kitta, et al., Remnant lipoproteinemia is a risk factor for endothelial vasomotor dysfunction and coronary artery disease in metabolic syndrome, Atherosclerosis 181 (2) (2005 Aug) 321–327. Epub 2005 Feb 16. PMID: 16039286.
- [29] K. Kugiyama, H. Doi, K. Takazoe, H. Kawano, H. Soejima, Y. Mizuno, et al., Remnant lipoprotein levels in fasting serum predict coronary events in patients with coronary artery disease, Circulation 99 (22) (1999 Jun 8) 2858–2860. PMID: 10359727.
- [30] A. Varbo, M. Benn, A. Tybjærg-Hansen, A.B. Jørgensen, R. Frikke-Schmidt, B.G. Nordestgaard, Remnant cholesterol as a causal risk factor for ischemic heart disease, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 61 (4) (2013 Jan 29) 427-436. Epub 2012 Dec 19. Erratum in: J Am Coll Cardiol. 2019 Mar 5;73(8):987-988. PMID: 23265341.
- [31] S.M. Boekholdt, G.K. Hovingh, S. Mora, B.J. Arsenault, P. Amarenco, T.R. Pedersen, et al., Very low levels of atherogenic lipoproteins and the risk for cardiovascular events: a meta-analysis of statin trials, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 64 (5) (2014 Aug 5) 485–494. PMCID: PMC4443441.
- [32] J.R. Burnett, A.J. Hooper, R.A. Hegele, Remnant cholesterol and atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk, J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 76 (23) (2020 Dec 8) 2736–2739.
- [33] M.R. Langlois, A.D. Sniderman, Non-HDL cholesterol or apoB: which to prefer as a target for the prevention of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease? Curr. Cardiol. Rep. 22 (8) (2020 Jun 19) 67.
- [34] A.S. Karlamangla, B.H. Singer, D.B. Reuben, T.E. Seeman, Increases in serum nonhigh-density lipoprotein cholesterol may be beneficial in some high-functioning

#### I. Cheang et al.

older adults: MacArthur studies of successful aging, J. Am. Geriatr. Soc. 52 (4) (2004 Apr) 487–494.

- [35] M. Bertolotti, C. Mussi, E. Pellegrini, A. Magni, M. Del Puppo, S. Ognibene, et al., Age-associated alterations in cholesterol homeostasis: evidence from a crosssectional study in a Northern Italy population, Clin. Interv. Aging 9 (2014 Mar 17) 425–432. PMID: 24669190; PMCID: PMC3962317.
- [36] Y.Q. Huang, G. Shen, K. Lo, J.Y. Huang, L. Liu, C.L. Chen, et al., Association of circulating selenium concentration with dyslipidemia: results from the NHANES, J. Trace Elem. Med. Biol. 58 (2020 Mar), 126438. PMID: 31760326.
- [37] M. So, M. Takahashi, Y. Miyamoto, Y. Ishisaka, M. Iwagami, Y. Tsugawa, N.N. Egorova, T. Kuno, The effect of obesity on in-hospital mortality among patients with COVID-19 receiving corticosteroids, Diabetes Metabol. Syndr. 16 (1) (2021 Dec 29), 102373. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34979344.
- [38] E.K. Duran, A.D. Pradhan, Triglyceride-rich lipoprotein remnants and cardiovascular disease, Clin. Chem. 67 (1) (2021 Jan 8) 183–196.
- [39] J. Pičha, J. Kovář, T. Blahová, Fasting and nonfasting triglycerides in cardiovascular and other diseases, Physiol. Res. 64 (Suppl 3) (2015) S323–330. PMID: 26680665.