

1 MENDELIAN RANDOMISATION ANALYSIS OF
2 CHOLESTERYL ESTER TRANSFER PROTEIN AND
3 SUBCLINICAL ATHEROSCLEROSIS: A POPULATION-
4 BASED STUDY

5 Short title: CETP and atherosclerosis in CVD risk subgroups

6 Tim Christen¹, Stella Trompet², Raymond Noordam², Lisanne L Blauw^{1,3}, Karin B Gast¹, Patrick CN
7 Rensen^{3,4}, Ko Willems van Dijk^{3,4,5}, Frits R Rosendaal¹, Renée de Mutsert¹, J Wouter Jukema⁶, for
8 the NEO study

9 1 Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC), The
10 Netherlands

11 2 Department of Internal Medicine, Section of Gerontology and Geriatrics, LUMC, The
12 Netherlands

13 3 Department of Medicine, Division of Endocrinology, LUMC, The Netherlands

14 4 Eindhoven Laboratory for Experimental Vascular Medicine, LUMC, The Netherlands

15 5 Department of Human Genetics, LUMC, The Netherlands

16 6 Department of Cardiology, LUMC, The Netherlands

17 Correspondence: T Christen, PO Box 9600, 2300 RC Leiden, The Netherlands, tel. +31-(0)71-
18 526 5620; e-mail t.christen@lumc.nl

19 Word count: 3,559, abstract: 270

20

1 HIGHLIGHTS

- 2 • CETP is not causally related to subclinical atherosclerosis in the total population
- 3 • CETP is related to atherosclerosis in normoglycemic men and (pre)diabetic women
- 4 • Effects of different direction in subgroups may mask overall associations

1 *Background*

2 Several trials to prevent cardiovascular disease by inhibiting cholesteryl ester transfer protein
3 (CETP) have failed, except REVEAL. Thus far, it is unclear to what extent CETP is causally related
4 to measures of atherosclerosis.

5 *Objective*

6 To study the causal relation between genetically-determined CETP concentration and carotid
7 intima media thickness (cIMT) in a population-based cohort study.

8 *Methods*

9 In the Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity study, participants were genotyped, and cIMT was
10 measured by ultrasonography. We examined the relation between a weighted genetic risk score for
11 CETP concentration, based on 3 SNPs that have previously been shown to largely determine CETP
12 concentration and cIMT using Mendelian randomisation in the total population and in strata by sex,
13 Framingham 10-year risk, (pre)diabetes, HDL-cholesterol, triglycerides and statin use.

14 *Results*

15 We analysed 5,655 participants (56% women) with a mean age of 56 (range 44-66) years, BMI of
16 26 (range 17-61) kg/m² and serum CETP of 2.47 (range 0.68-5.33) µg/mL. There was no evidence for
17 a causal relation between genetically-determined CETP and cIMT in the total population, but
18 associations were differently directed in men (16µm per µg/mL increase in genetically-determined
19 CETP; 95% CI: -8, 39) and women (-8 µm; -25, 9). Genetically-determined CETP appeared to be
20 associated with cIMT in normoglycemic men (26 µm; -1, 52) and in (pre)diabetic women (48 µm; -2,
21 98).

22 *Conclusion*

23 In this population-based study, there was no causal relation between genetically-determined CETP
24 concentration and cIMT in the total population, although we observed directionally differing effects in

1 men and women. Stratified results suggested associations in individuals with different
2 cardiometabolic risk factor profiles, which require replication.

3 Keywords: Reverse cholesterol transport, Atherosclerosis, Mendelian randomisation, Cohort,
4 Epidemiology

5

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Recent studies to improve cardiovascular risk prevention have focussed on cholesteryl ester
3 transfer protein (CETP) inhibitors since they increase HDL-c and decrease non-HDL-c
4 concentrations.¹⁻³

5 CETP facilitates the migration of cholesteryl esters from HDL to LDL and very low-density-
6 lipoproteins (VLDL). A high CETP concentration is therefore hypothesized to contribute to an
7 atherogenic lipoprotein profile by increasing (V)LDL-c and decreasing HDL-c.⁴ Several observational
8 studies have suggested that lower concentrations of CETP are associated with reduced CVD risk.^{5,6}
9 Most recent efforts to lower CETP concentration pharmacologically with the purpose of reducing
10 CVD risk have been unsuccessful, except for the REVEAL trial, in which CETP inhibition with
11 anacetrapib successfully lowered the risk of major coronary events in high-cardiovascular risk
12 patients.^{7,8} The effect of genetically determined CETP has been subject to considerable discussion in
13 recent literature, but in general a detrimental effect of high CETP, if any, appears to be restricted to
14 men^{2,4,8-18} Close inspection of previous studies on the association of CETP with CVD risk suggested
15 that in addition to sex, other factors potentially modulate the effects of CETP on CVD risk, including
16 HDL-c or triglyceride concentrations, insulin resistance, or the use of statins or fibrates.^{1,9,19-21} This
17 suggests that CETP inhibition could be effective in specific subgroups of the population. To provide
18 more insights in the role of CETP on cardiovascular risk, we aimed to study the causal effect of
19 genetically determined higher CETP concentration on atherosclerosis in the general low-risk
20 population, as well as specific subgroups, using a genetic risk score for CETP concentration as
21 determinant.

1 METHODS

2 *Study design and study population*

3 The Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity (NEO) study is a population-based, prospective cohort
4 study of 6,671 men and women aged between 45 and 65 years. The study design and population are
5 described in detail elsewhere.²² All inhabitants with a self-reported body mass index (BMI) of 27
6 kg/m² or higher and living in the greater area of Leiden, the Netherlands were eligible to participate in
7 the NEO study. In addition, all inhabitants aged between 45 and 65 years from one adjacent
8 municipality (Leiderdorp, the Netherlands) were invited to participate irrespective of their BMI,
9 allowing for a reference distribution of BMI. Participants visited the NEO study centre for extensive
10 baseline measurements, including blood sampling and cIMT. Research nurses recorded current
11 medication use by means of a medication inventory. Prior to the study visit, participants completed
12 questionnaires at home with respect to demographic, lifestyle, and clinical information.

13 The Medical Ethical Committee of the Leiden University Medical Centre (LUMC) approved the
14 protocol. All participants gave their written informed consent.

15 For the present analyses, we excluded participants from non-European ancestry or with poor
16 genotyping quality (n=927) : when the sample call rate was <98%, there was a sex mismatch,
17 heterozygosity rate was not within ± 3 SD of mean heterozygosity rate, participants differed based on
18 the first two principal components (PCs) (± 3.5 SD), samples were duplicates, or concordance with
19 another DNA sample was >0.25 (related individuals). Furthermore, we excluded participants with
20 missing CETP (n=31) and cIMT measurement (n=58).

21 *Blood sampling*

22 During the visit to the NEO study centre, venous blood samples were obtained from the
23 antecubital vein after a >10 hour overnight fast. Fasting serum total cholesterol and TG concentrations
24 were measured with enzymatic colorimetric assays (Roche Modular P800 Analyzer, Roche
25 Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany) and fasting serum HDL-c concentrations with third generation

1 homogenous HDL-c methods (Roche Modular P800 Analyzer, Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim,
2 Germany). LDL-c concentrations were calculated using the Friedewald equation.²³ Furthermore,
3 aliquots of plasma and serum were stored at -80°C after centrifugation. DNA was extracted and
4 genotyping was performed by the Centre National de Génotypage (Evry Cedex, France), using the
5 Illumina HumanCoreExome-24 BeadChip (Illumina Inc., San Diego, California, United States of
6 America). Subsequently, genotypes were imputed to the 1000 Genome Project reference panel (v3
7 2011) using IMPUTE (v2.2) software.^{24,25} Three variants within the CETP gene were discovered in a
8 genome wide association study in this population: rs12720922, rs247616 and rs1968905 were used
9 for the present study, of which rs12720922 and rs1968905 were imputed variants (Blauw et al,
10 submitted).

11 CETP concentrations were measured in serum that had undergone one previous freeze-thaw cycle
12 with enzyme-linked immune sorbent assay (ELISA) kits according to the manufacturer's instructions
13 (DAIICHI CETP ELISA, Daiichi, Tokyo, Japan; coefficient of variation 11.7%).

14 *Subclinical atherosclerosis*

15 Carotid intima media thickness (cIMT) was used as a measure of subclinical atherosclerosis.
16 cIMT was assessed by ultrasonography of the common carotid arteries (CCA). A 15 mm long section
17 10 mm proximal of the CCA bifurcation was measured while the subject was in supine position. cIMT
18 was measured using a 7.5–10 MHz linear-array probe and the Art.Lab system in B-mode setting and
19 using a wall-track system (ART.LAB version 2.1, Esaote, Maastricht, The Netherlands) to detect
20 boundaries between lumen and intima, as well as between media and adventitia. cIMT was measured
21 during six heart beats in angles of 180, 135 and 90 degrees (right CCA) and 180, 225 and 270 degrees
22 (left CCA). We calculated the mean IMT for each participant by averaging the 36 cIMT
23 measurements within each individual. Measurements of cIMT were validated by analysing repeated
24 measurements in 169 randomly selected participants, which resulted in an intra-observer CV of 5.8%
25 and an inter-observer CV of 9.0%. Detailed results of the validation study are presented in Appendix
26 1.

1 *Other variables*

2 On the questionnaire, participants reported their highest level of education in ten categories
3 according to the Dutch education system, which was further reclassified into low (none, primary
4 school or lower vocational education) or high (other). Participants reported their medical history of
5 diabetes and cardiovascular diseases. Pre-existing CVD was defined as myocardial infarction, angina
6 pectoris, congestive heart failure, stroke, or peripheral vascular disease. In addition, all use of
7 medication in the month preceding the study visit was recorded. Tobacco smoking was reported in
8 three categories: never smoker, former smoker or current smoker. Participants reported their physical
9 activity during leisure time, which was expressed in metabolic equivalent hours per week.
10 Menopausal state was categorized in pre-, and postmenopausal state according to information on
11 ovariectomy, hysterectomy and self-reported state of menopause in the questionnaire. The
12 Framingham 10-year risk of cardiovascular disease was calculated by summation of component
13 scores based on age, LDL-c, HDL-c, diastolic and systolic blood pressure, diabetes, and smoking.²⁶

14 *Statistical analysis*

15 The present study is a cross-sectional analysis of the baseline measurements of the NEO study. In
16 the NEO study, individuals with a BMI of 27 kg/m² or higher were oversampled. To represent
17 baseline associations in the general population adjustments for the oversampling of individuals with a
18 BMI \geq 27 kg/m² were made.²⁷ This was done by weighting all participants towards the BMI
19 distribution of participants from the Leiderdorp municipality.²⁸ The BMI distribution of the
20 participants from Leiderdorp was similar to the BMI distribution of the general Dutch population.²⁹
21 All results were based on weighted analyses.

22 Data were summarized by sex as mean (SD; normally distributed data only), median (25th, 75th
23 percentiles; non-normally distributed data only), or as percentage (categorical data).

24 We examined the observational association between CETP concentration and cIMT using
25 multivariate linear regression analysis. Results are presented as beta coefficients with 95% confidence
26 intervals (CI) which can be interpreted as difference in cIMT (μ m) per unit (μ g/mL) of measured

1 CETP concentration. These regression models were adjusted for age and sex, LDL-c concentrations,
2 ethnicity, education, physical activity and smoking. Adjustment for LDL-c was performed to evaluate
3 the association between CETP and IMT through HDL-c. Because it is not completely known whether
4 the following factors are common causes of both CETP and cIMT, and therefore their role as
5 confounding factors is doubted, we performed separate observational analyses additionally adjusted
6 for statin use, diabetes and hypertension.

7 We calculated a weighted genetic risk score (GRS) by summation of the products of the number
8 of alleles per SNP and the effect size per allele. We estimated the association of the separate SNPs
9 and the GRS with CETP concentrations using linear regression analyses.

10 We estimated the causal relation between the separate SNPs for CETP concentration and cIMT
11 using linear regression analyses, and we examined the causal association between CETP
12 concentration and cIMT using an instrumental variable two-stage-least-squares regression analysis in
13 which CETP concentration was instrumented by a genetic risk score composed by the three genetic
14 variants in the *CETP* gene. The regression coefficients from these analyses can be interpreted as
15 difference in cIMT (μm) per unit ($\mu\text{g/mL}$) in genetically-determined CETP concentration.

16 The analyses were performed in the total population, and separately for pre-specified subgroups
17 based on sex, high CVD risk profile (defined as a Framingham predicted 10-year risk of 10% or
18 higher), (pre)diabetes (defined as having fasting glucose concentrations ≥ 6.1 mmol/L, self-reported
19 diabetes or using glucose-lowering medication), high HDL-c concentration (with a cut-off value of
20 1.04 mmol/L in men, and 1.30 mmol/L in women), triglyceride concentration (with a cut-off value of
21 1.7 mmol/L), statin use, and menopausal status.³⁰⁻³²

22 Analyses were performed in Stata (version 14, StataCorp. 2015)

23

1 RESULTS

2 *Baseline characteristics*

3 **Table 1 – Baseline characteristics of the participants of the Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity study, men and**
 4 **women aged between 45 and 65 years (n=5,655).**

	Total population (n=5,655)	CETP ≤ median (2.60 µg/mL)	CETP > median (2.60 µg/mL)
Age (y)	56 (6)	56 (6)	56 (6)
Sex (male)	44	52	36
BMI (kg/m ²)	26 (4)	26 (4)	26 (4)
Tobacco smoking (% never)	38	36	41
Physical activity (MET h/week)	30 (16-50)	30 (16-50)	30 (16-50)
Education level (% high)	47	49	46
(Pre)diabetes (%)	14	17	11
Hypertension (%)	34	34	34
CVD (%)	5	7	3
Statin use (%)	10	15	5
Framingham 10-year risk ≥10%	24	24	23
Total cholesterol (mmol/L)	5.7 (1.0)	5.5 (1.0)	5.9 (1.0)
HDL cholesterol (mmol/L)	1.6 (0.5)	1.6 (0.5)	1.6 (0.5)
LDL cholesterol (mmol/L)	3.5 (1.0)	3.3 (0.9)	3.8 (0.9)
Triglycerides (mmol/L)	1.2 (0.9)	1.2 (0.8)	1.2 (0.9)
CETP (µg/mL)	2.47 (0.65)	1.96 (0.32)	2.98 (0.47)
Coding allele rs247616 (%)	56	66	46
Coding allele rs12720922 (%)	17	11	23
Coding allele rs1968905 (%)	82	80	84

5 Results were based on analyses weighted towards the BMI distribution of the general population (2,715 men and
 6 2,940 women)

7 Results are shown as mean (SD), median (25th, 75th percentiles) or percentage

8 BMI, body mass index; CETP, cholesteryl ester transfer protein; cIMT, carotid intima media thickness; HDL,
 9 high density lipoprotein; LDL, low density lipoprotein; MET, metabolic equivalent of task; NEO, Netherlands
 10 Epidemiology of Obesity

11

1 Baseline characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 1, stratified by sex. The
 2 mean (SD) age of the participants was 56 (6) years, and 56% were women. The mean BMI was 26 (4)
 3 kg/m², mean CETP concentration was 2.47 (0.65) µg/mL, and the mean cIMT was 616 (92) µm.

4 *Serum CETP concentration and atherosclerosis*

5 **Table 2** – Associations of observed CETP concentrations (adjusted), CETP SNPs, and genetically-determined CETP
 6 concentrations with the intima media thickness in the total population of the Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity study (*n*
 7 = 5,655) and in men and women separately.

cIMT	Difference in cIMT in µm (95% CI)		
	Total population	Men (44%)	Women (56%)
CETP concentration (per µg/mL) (crude)	-2 (-7, 4)	8 (-1, 17)	-0 (-7, 6)
CETP concentration (per µg/mL) (adjusted)	-1 (-6, 5)	10 (1, 19)	-7 (-14, -1)
CETP concentration (per µg/mL) (additionally adjusted)	-1 (-6, 5)	10 (1, 19)	-7 (-14, -0)
rs1968905-G (per risk-increasing allele)	2 (-5, 9)	-2 (-13, 10)	3 (-7, 12)
rs247616-C (per risk-increasing allele)	0 (-5, 6)	-4 (-12, 4)	4 (-4, 11)
rs12720922-A (per risk-increasing allele)	2 (-5, 8)	7 (-3, 17)	-3 (-11, 5)
Genetically-determined CETP (µg/mL)	2 (-12, 16)	16 (-8, 39)	-8 (-25, 9)


8 Results were based on analyses weighted towards the BMI distribution of the general population (n=5,655), and
 9 were derived from beta coefficients (95% CI) from linear regression and expressed as difference in cIMT µm.
 10 Results for the genetic risk score were presented as µm difference in cIMT per µg/mL genetically-determined
 11 CETP concentration. Observational analyses were adjusted for age, LDL-c concentration, ethnicity, education,
 12 physical activity, and smoking. The additionally adjusted model was additionally adjusted for statin use,
 13 diabetes and hypertension. The observational analyses in the total population was additionally adjusted for sex.

14
 15 CETP, cholesteryl ester transfer protein; cIMT, intima media thickness; LDL-c, low density lipoprotein
 16 cholesterol; SNP, single nucleotide polymorphism
 17

18 In observational analyses in the total population, CETP concentration was weakly associated with
 19 cIMT (adjusted coefficient: -1 µm per µg/mL CETP; 95% CI: -6, 5). Table 2 reports stratified
 20 analyses with a weak positive association in men (10 µm per µg/mL higher CETP concentration; 95%
 21 CI: 1, 19) and a weak negative association in women (-7 µm per µg/mL CETP; 95% CI: -14, -0)

22 *Associations between genetically-determined CETP and atherosclerosis*

1 The genetic risk score (GRS) of three independent CETP SNP risk alleles rs247616-C,
 2 rs12720922-A, and rs1968905-G accounted for 14.7% of variation in CETP concentrations in the
 3 participants of the NEO study.



5
 6 **Figure 1 – Associations with 95% confidence intervals of SNPs rs1968905, rs247616, and rs12720922 and the**
 7 **genetic risk score composed from these SNPs with serum CETP concentrations in the participants of the Netherlands**
 8 **Epidemiology of Obesity study, men and women aged between 45 and 65 year (n=5,655). Associations are expressed**
 9 **in μg/mL CETP per allele of the SNPs or per unit of the genetic risk score.**


10 Figure 1 reports the difference in CETP concentration per CETP-increasing SNP allele and per
 11 point increase in GRS: 0.78 μg/mL (95% CI: 0.73, 0.83). Table 2 reports causal relations between
 12 variations in the *CETP* gene and cIMT. CETP was not causally related to cIMT in the total study
 13 population. We observed a causal relation between CETP and cIMT in men of 16 μm (95% CI: -8,
 14 39) difference in cIMT per μg/mL genetically-determined CETP in men and -8 μm (95% CI: -25, 9)
 15 in women.

16 *Subgroup analyses*

17 Men and women were stratified for CVD risk profile, (pre)diabetes, fasting HDL-c, triglycerides
 18 and statin use. The results of the stratified analyses reported in Figure 2 and Figure 3 demonstrate that


1 in men with a low 10-year Framingham risk, one $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP was related to
2 12 μm (95% CI: -12, 36) thicker cIMT, while in men with a 10-year risk $\geq 10\%$ the relation was 24
3 μm (95% CI: -25, 72) per $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP. In men without (pre)diabetes one
4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP was related with 26 μm (95% CI: -1, 52) thicker cIMT per
5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$, and with -24 μm (95% CI: -66, 18) in men with (pre)diabetes. In men with normal HDL-c,
6 normal TG concentrations, or not using statins, the associations ranged between 19 and 21 μm per
7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP concentration, while in men with low HDL-c CETP was
8 inversely related to cIMT (-20 μm per $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ CETP; 95% CI: -67, 27).

9 One $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP was related with a -17 μm (95% CI: -36, 1) difference
10 in cIMT in women with a low 10-year Framingham risk, while in women with a 10-year Framingham
11 risk $\geq 10\%$ this relation was 23 μm (95% CI: -14, 59) per $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP. In
12 women with (pre)diabetes, one $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ genetically-determined CETP was related with a 48 μm (95%
13 CI: -2, 98) thicker cIMT, and with -13 μm (95% CI: -31, 5) difference in cIMT in women without
14 (pre)diabetes. We observed relations close to the null in women with low HDL-c, high TG
15 concentrations, or who used statins. In women with normal HDL-c, fasting TG, or not using statins,
16 the relations ranged between -9 and -14 μm per $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ CETP. In premenopausal women, one $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$
17 genetically-determined CETP was related with a -25 μm (95% CI: -59, 8) difference in cIMT, and -0
18 (-19, 18) in postmenopausal women.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Figure 2 – Associations between (genetically determined) serum CETP concentrations ($\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$) and intima media thickness (μm) in men participating in the Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity study, aged 45-65 years (n=2,715). CETP, cholesteryl ester transfer protein; cIMT, carotid intima media thickness; CVD, cardiovascular disease; HDL-c, high density lipoprotein cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

Figure 3 – Associations between (genetically determined) serum CETP concentrations ($\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$) and intima media thickness (μm) in women participating in the Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity study, aged 45-65 years (n=2,940). CETP, cholesteryl ester transfer protein; cIMT, carotid intima media thickness; CVD, cardiovascular disease; HDL-c, high density lipoprotein cholesterol; TG, triglycerides.

1 DISCUSSION

2 In 5,655 men and women, we investigated the causal associations between CETP and measures of
3 subclinical atherosclerosis. We showed that there was a marginal observational association between
4 CETP and subclinical atherosclerosis in the study population, while a genetic propensity towards
5 higher CETP concentrations was not associated with cIMT. However, stratified analyses in
6 prespecified subgroups of sex, cardiovascular risk, (pre)diabetes, HDL-c, triglycerides and statin use
7 suggested a marginal association between higher CETP and thicker cIMT in men, and a minimal
8 association in the opposite direction in women, albeit with wide confidence intervals.

9 The null results in the total study population of this study are consistent with findings in the total
10 population in previous Mendelian randomisation studies and randomised controlled trials, however
11 some Mendelian randomisation studies did not measure CETP concentrations.^{8,14-17} Our findings
12 indicate that if a relation between CETP concentrations and subclinical measures of CVD is present,
13 this may be restricted to men, and to women with a moderate-to-high cardiovascular risk or
14 (pre)diabetes in a middle aged population. Our results in high-cardiovascular risk individuals are
15 consistent with the results of the REVEAL trial, that showed a small decrease in incidence of major
16 coronary events in patients with atherosclerotic vascular disease treated with anacetrapib, compared
17 with placebo.⁷ These findings are consistent with the positive relations between CETP and subclinical
18 and clinical CVD that were observed mainly in studies in predominantly men.^{1,2,5,9,18} Our findings in
19 women with (pre)diabetes are supported by a smaller previous study that reported that higher
20 observed CETP concentrations were associated with CVD risk in women with type 2 diabetes, but we
21 observed subgroup effects in men that were not observed by this previous study.³³

22 CETP mediates the transfer of cholesteryl ester from HDL towards LDL, which is generally
23 assumed to be detrimental with respect to the development of CVD.^{34,35} The surprising absence of an
24 association between CETP and subclinical atherosclerosis on a population level is consistent with the
25 failure of the recent ILLUMINATE³⁶, dal-OUTCOMES³⁷, and ACCELERATE³⁸ clinical trials of
26 pharmacologic CETP inhibition, due to futility or inferiority. However, the ineffectiveness of drugs

1 that target an increase in HDL-c via CETP in the general population may be explained by opposing
2 effects in subgroups that may be masked in summary effect estimates. Although most clinical trials
3 may likely not be powered to perform stratified analyses, reporting stratum-specific effect estimates
4 may reveal different relations in subgroups.

5 The observed sex differences may be explained by a difference in the relative contribution of a
6 detrimental lipoprotein profile to atherosclerosis in men and women of the same age. This may be an
7 explanation for the observation that women develop atherosclerosis and CVD later than men.³⁹ It has
8 been shown that while cholesterol is a slightly stronger risk factor in men, diabetes is a stronger
9 cardiovascular risk factor in women than in men.⁴⁰ Therefore, women of the same age may need an
10 accumulation of multiple risk factors that are detrimental to the vascular endothelium to develop
11 atherosclerosis. This may be due to vasoprotective effects of endogenous oestrogens,⁴¹ which is
12 consistent with the marginally negative effects that we observed in premenopausal women, and no
13 relation in postmenopausal women. Consequently, the underlying mechanisms of differing relations
14 between CETP and cIMT may reach further than changes in lipid metabolism that are associated with
15 endogenous oestrogens.

16 Strengths of this study are the large study population with measurements of CETP, cIMT and
17 genetic information to perform a Mendelian randomisation study in the general population. Moreover,
18 extensive phenotypic data was available. Therefore, we were able to perform several subgroup
19 analyses based on sex, menopausal status, medication use and cardiovascular risk factors. The present
20 study also has some limitations that need to be considered. First, the use of cIMT as a measure of
21 subclinical atherosclerosis may limit interpretation of the results in terms of cardiovascular risk.
22 However, previous research has indicated that cIMT is strongly associated with the incidence of
23 future cardiovascular disease in the general population.⁴² Second, performing several subgroup
24 analyses increases the risk of chance findings. Further research is needed to replicate the observed
25 relations. Third, this study was performed in a white middle-aged population. Genetic variants or the
26 effects of CETP on atherosclerosis may be specific for this kind of population, and the results
27 therefore need to be confirmed in other ethnicities.

1 The causal role of CETP is subject to controversy and at the moment of conceptualizing this
2 study, three of four experimental studies of CETP inhibition had been halted due to a lack of
3 protective effect.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ If additional research confirms the potential subgroup effects of CETP, this may
4 indicate that personalisation of pharmacotherapy may be a sensible strategy in the primary and
5 secondary prevention of (recurrent) cardiovascular disease. Further research may elucidate the
6 efficacy of intervening on CETP in subgroups of clinical trials that have been performed. We
7 conclude that despite the absence of a relation between CETP and atherosclerosis in a population of
8 men and women, this relation may be present in men with normal glucose, HDL-c and triglyceride
9 concentrations, and women with a high cardiovascular risk profile or impaired fasting glucose.
10 Further research may give insight in potential sex differences in the aetiology of atherosclerosis.

11

1 DISCLOSURES

2 Conflicts of interest: none.

3 All authors have approved the final article. RdM, FRR, PR, KWvD, ST, LB, RN and JWJ were
4 involved in the conception and design of the study, RdM in the acquisition of data, all authors in the
5 interpretation of data and revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, and final
6 approval of the manuscript. TC performed statistical analyses and drafted the manuscript. All authors
7 edited and proofread the manuscript.

8

1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

2 We express our gratitude to all individuals who participate in the Netherlands Epidemiology in
3 Obesity study. We are grateful to all participating general practitioners for inviting eligible
4 participants. We furthermore thank P. van Beelen and all research nurses for collecting the data and P.
5 Noordijk and her team for sample handling and storage and I. de Jonge, MSc for all data management
6 of the NEO study. The genotyping in the NEO study was supported by the Centre National de
7 Génotypage (Paris, France), headed by Jean-Francois Deleuze.

8

1 FUNDING SOURCES

2 The NEO study is supported by the participating Departments, the Division and the Board of
3 Directors of the Leiden University Medical Centre, and by the Leiden University, Research Profile
4 Area 'Vascular and Regenerative Medicine'. We acknowledge the support from the Netherlands
5 Cardiovascular Research Initiative: an initiative with support of the Dutch Heart Foundation
6 (CVON2014-02 ENERGISE).

7

1 REFERENCES

- 2 1. Kuivenhoven JA, Jukema JW, Zwinderman AH, et al. The role of a common variant of the
3 cholesteryl ester transfer protein gene in the progression of coronary atherosclerosis. The
4 Regression Growth Evaluation Statin Study Group. *The New England journal of medicine*
5 1998;338:86-93.
- 6 2. Zhong S, Sharp DS, Grove JS, et al. Increased coronary heart disease in Japanese-American
7 men with mutation in the cholesteryl ester transfer protein gene despite increased HDL levels. *The*
8 *Journal of clinical investigation* 1996;97:2917-23.
- 9 3. Ritsch A, Patsch JR. Cholesteryl ester transfer protein: gathering momentum as a genetic
10 marker and as drug target. *Curr Opin Lipidol* 2003;14:173-9.
- 11 4. Inazu A, Brown ML, Hesler CB, et al. Increased high-density lipoprotein levels caused by a
12 common cholesteryl-ester transfer protein gene mutation. *The New England journal of medicine*
13 1990;323:1234-8.
- 14 5. Okamura T, Sekikawa A, Kadowaki T, et al. Cholesteryl ester transfer protein, coronary
15 calcium, and intima-media thickness of the carotid artery in middle-age Japanese men. *The*
16 *American journal of cardiology* 2009;104:818-22.
- 17 6. Boekholdt SM, Kuivenhoven JA, Wareham NJ, et al. Plasma levels of cholesteryl ester
18 transfer protein and the risk of future coronary artery disease in apparently healthy men and
19 women: the prospective EPIC (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and nutrition)-Norfolk
20 population study. *Circulation* 2004;110:1418-23.
- 21 7. Group HTRC. Effects of Anacetrapib in Patients with Atherosclerotic Vascular Disease. *The*
22 *New England journal of medicine* 2017.
- 23 8. Barter PJ, Rye KA. Cholesteryl Ester Transfer Protein Inhibition Is Not Yet Dead--Pro.
24 *Arteriosclerosis, thrombosis, and vascular biology* 2016;36:439-41.
- 25 9. Kakko S, Tamminen M, Paivansalo M, et al. Cholesteryl ester transfer protein gene
26 polymorphisms are associated with carotid atherosclerosis in men. *European journal of clinical*
27 *investigation* 2000;30:18-25.
- 28 10. Ordovas JM. Genetic polymorphisms and activity of cholesterol ester transfer protein (CETP):
29 should we be measuring them? *Clinical chemistry and laboratory medicine* 2000;38:945-9.
- 30 11. Inazu A, Koizumi J, Mabuchi H. Cholesteryl ester transfer protein and atherosclerosis. *Curr*
31 *Opin Lipidol* 2000;11:389-96.
- 32 12. Boekholdt SM, Thompson JF. Natural genetic variation as a tool in understanding the role of
33 CETP in lipid levels and disease. *Journal of lipid research* 2003;44:1080-93.
- 34 13. Parra ES, Panzoldo NB, Kaplan D, et al. The I405V and Taq1B polymorphisms of the CETP
35 gene differentially affect sub-clinical carotid atherosclerosis. *Lipids in health and disease*
36 2012;11:130.
- 37 14. Wu Z, Lou Y, Qiu X, et al. Association of cholesteryl ester transfer protein (CETP) gene
38 polymorphism, high density lipoprotein cholesterol and risk of coronary artery disease: a meta-
39 analysis using a Mendelian randomization approach. *BMC medical genetics* 2014;15:118.
- 40 15. Yu Q, Liu EQ, Zhao SH, et al. Association between Taq1B polymorphism of cholesteryl ester
41 transfer protein and coronary artery disease in the Chinese population. *Journal of Zhejiang*
42 *University Science B* 2012;13:342-7.
- 43 16. Niu WQ, Qi Y. Circulating Cholesteryl Ester Transfer Protein and Coronary Heart Disease
44 Mendelian Randomization Meta-Analysis. *Circ-Cardiovasc Gene* 2015;8:114-U232.
- 45 17. Johannsen TH, Frikke-Schmidt R, Schou J, Nordestgaard BG, Tybjaerg-Hansen A. Genetic
46 Inhibition of CETP, Ischemic Vascular Disease and Mortality, and Possible Adverse Effects. *Journal of*
47 *the American College of Cardiology* 2012;60:2041-8.
- 48 18. Ference BA, Kastelein JJP, Ginsberg HN, et al. Association of Genetic Variants Related to
49 CETP Inhibitors and Statins With Lipoprotein Levels and Cardiovascular Risk. *Jama* 2017;318:947-56.

- 1 19. Postmus I, Warren HR, Trompet S, et al. Meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies
2 of HDL cholesterol response to statins. *Journal of medical genetics* 2016;53:835-45.
- 3 20. Corsetti JP, Gansevoort RT, Navis G, Sparks CE, Dullaart RP. LPL polymorphism (D9N) predicts
4 cardiovascular disease risk directly and through interaction with CETP polymorphism (TaqIB) in
5 women with high HDL cholesterol and CRP. *Atherosclerosis* 2011;214:373-6.
- 6 21. Silverman MG, Ference BA, Im K, et al. Association Between Lowering LDL-C and
7 Cardiovascular Risk Reduction Among Different Therapeutic Interventions A Systematic Review and
8 Meta-analysis. *Jama-J Am Med Assoc* 2016;316:1289-97.
- 9 22. de Mutsert R, den Heijer M, Rabelink TJ, et al. The Netherlands Epidemiology of Obesity
10 (NEO) study: study design and data collection. *European journal of epidemiology* 2013;28:513-23.
- 11 23. Friedewald WT, Levy RI, Fredrickson DS. Estimation of the concentration of low-density
12 lipoprotein cholesterol in plasma, without use of the preparative ultracentrifuge. *Clin Chem*
13 1972;18:499-502.
- 14 24. Genomes Project C, Abecasis GR, Auton A, et al. An integrated map of genetic variation from
15 1,092 human genomes. *Nature* 2012;491:56-65.
- 16 25. Marchini J, Howie B, Myers S, McVean G, Donnelly P. A new multipoint method for genome-
17 wide association studies by imputation of genotypes. *Nat Genet* 2007;39:906-13.
- 18 26. D'Agostino RB, Vasan RS, Pencina MJ, et al. General cardiovascular risk profile for use in
19 primary care - The Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation* 2008;117:743-53.
- 20 27. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Epidemiologic studies utilizing surveys: accounting for the sampling
21 design. *American journal of public health* 1991;81:1166-73.
- 22 28. Lumley T. Analysis of Complex Survey Samples. *Journal of Statistical Software* 2004;9:1-19.
- 23 29. VWS Mv. Hoeveel mensen hebben overgewicht? (Available at:
24 <https://www.volksgezondheidszorginfo/onderwerp/overgewicht/cijfers-context/huidige-situatie>
25 Accessed December 20, 2016) 2013.
- 26 30. Expert Panel on Detection E, Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in A. Executive Summary
27 of The Third Report of The National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on
28 Detection, Evaluation, And Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol In Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III).
29 *Jama* 2001;285:2486-97.
- 30 31. Nordestgaard BG, Langsted A, Mora S, et al. Fasting is not routinely required for
31 determination of a lipid profile: clinical and laboratory implications including flagging at desirable
32 concentration cut-points-a joint consensus statement from the European Atherosclerosis Society
33 and European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine. *European heart journal*
34 2016.
- 35 32. Expert Committee on the D, Classification of Diabetes M. Report of the expert committee on
36 the diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes care* 2003;26 Suppl 1:S5-20.
- 37 33. Alsema M, Dekker JM, Kuivenhoven JA, et al. Elevated cholesteryl ester transfer protein
38 concentration is associated with an increased risk for cardiovascular disease in women, but not in
39 men, with Type 2 diabetes: the Hoorn Study. *Diabet Med* 2007;24:117-23.
- 40 34. Krauss RM, Wojnooski K, Orr J, et al. Changes in lipoprotein subfraction concentration and
41 composition in healthy individuals treated with the CETP inhibitor anacetrapib. *Journal of lipid*
42 *research* 2012;53:540-7.
- 43 35. Langsted A, Nordestgaard BG. Nonfasting Lipids, Lipoproteins, and Apolipoproteins in
44 Individuals with and without Diabetes: 58 434 Individuals from the Copenhagen General Population
45 Study. *Clinical Chemistry* 2011;57:482-9.
- 46 36. Barter PJ, Caulfield M, Eriksson M, et al. Effects of torcetrapib in patients at high risk for
47 coronary events. *New Engl J Med* 2007;357:2109-22.
- 48 37. Schwartz GG, Olsson AG, Abt M, et al. Effects of Dalcetrapib in Patients with a Recent Acute
49 Coronary Syndrome. *New Engl J Med* 2012;367:2089-99.

- 1 38. Nicholls SJ, Lincoff AM, Barter PJ, et al. Assessment of the clinical effects of cholesteryl ester
2 transfer protein inhibition with evacetrapib in patients at high-risk for vascular outcomes: Rationale
3 and design of the ACCELERATE trial. *American heart journal* 2015;170:1061-9.
- 4 39. Kannel WB, Wilson PWF. Risk-Factors That Attenuate the Female Coronary-Disease
5 Advantage. *Archives of internal medicine* 1995;155:57-61.
- 6 40. Peters SAE, Singhatheh Y, Mackay D, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Total cholesterol as a risk
7 factor for coronary heart disease and stroke in women compared with men: A systematic review and
8 meta-analysis. *Atherosclerosis* 2016;248:123-31.
- 9 41. Bairey Merz CN, Johnson BD, Sharaf BL, et al. Hypoestrogenemia of hypothalamic origin and
10 coronary artery disease in premenopausal women: a report from the NHLBI-sponsored WISE study.
11 *Journal of the American College of Cardiology* 2003;41:413-9.
- 12 42. Lorenz MW, Markus HS, Bots ML, Rosvall M, Sitzer M. Prediction of clinical cardiovascular
13 events with carotid intima-media thickness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Circulation*
14 2007;115:459-67.
- 15 43. Cao G, Beyer TP, Zhang Y, et al. Evacetrapib is a novel, potent, and selective inhibitor of
16 cholesteryl ester transfer protein that elevates HDL cholesterol without inducing aldosterone or
17 increasing blood pressure. *Journal of lipid research* 2011;52:2169-76.
- 18 44. Schwartz GG, Olsson AG, Ballantyne CM, et al. Rationale and design of the dal-OUTCOMES
19 trial: efficacy and safety of dalcetrapib in patients with recent acute coronary syndrome. *American*
20 *heart journal* 2009;158:896-901 e3.
- 21 45. Clark RW, Ruggeri RB, Cunningham D, Bamberger MJ. Description of the torcetrapib series of
22 cholesteryl ester transfer protein inhibitors, including mechanism of action. *Journal of lipid research*
23 2006;47:537-52.

24
25


1 APPENDIX

2 Within the NEO study, cIMT was determined in all participants. Precision of cIMT measurements
3 is crucial to prevent misclassification, decreased study power and diluted effect estimates. We
4 examined the reproducibility of the cIMT measurements in the common carotid artery. We performed
5 paired scans of the cIMT in a random sample of participants at the baseline of the study. Of 169
6 participants with repeated measurements, 76 participants were scanned twice by the same
7 sonographer, and 93 participants were scanned twice by two different sonographers. Sonographers
8 were blinded for the scan of the other sonographer. All sonographers were right-handed research
9 nurses who recently had been trained to measure cIMT by an experienced sonographer according to
10 standardized procedures.

11 To study agreement within and between sonographers we constructed Bland-Altman plots and
12 calculated 95% limits of agreement (LA), intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) and coefficients
13 of variation (CVs) for intra-observer and inter-observer measurements separately. For the Bland-
14 Altman plots we calculated the mean cIMT of 2 paired measurements and the difference between 2
15 paired cIMT measurements by subtracting the second measurement from the first measurement. The
16 ICC explains how much of the total variance between measurements is caused by true inter-subject
17 variability. An ICC of one represents perfect agreement and ICC of zero implies no agreement at all.
18 The CV expresses the standard error between paired measurements as a percentage of the sample
19 mean, where a CV of 0% equals perfect agreement and a CV of 100% signifies no agreement at all.
20 We calculated the ICC and CV for the intra-observer measurements, as well as for the inter-observer
21 measurements.

22 The mean difference for the intra-observer measurement was -0.009 mm (SD 0.054, 95% LA -
23 0.114 mm to 0.097 mm, Supplementary figure 1, Panel A) and the mean absolute difference was
24 0.043 mm (SD 0.033). Sixty-nine (91%) intra-observer measurements had an absolute cIMT
25 difference between paired measurements of less than 0.100 mm. The intra-observer ICC was 0.74
26 (95% CI 0.62 to 0.83) and the CV was 5.8%. The inter-observer measurements had a mean difference
27 of 0.000 mm (SD 0.084, 95% LA -0.164 mm to 0.164 mm, Supplementary figure 1, Panel B) and the


- 1 mean absolute difference was 0.064 mm (SD 0.054). Seventy-seven (83%) inter-observer
- 2 measurements had an absolute cIMT difference between paired measurements of less than 0.100 mm.
- 3 The inter-observer ICC was 0.49 (95% CI 0.33 to 0.63) and the CV was 9.0%.
- 4



1

2 **Supplementary figure 1** – Bland-Altman plots representing the difference between repeated cIMT measurements by the
 3 absolute mean cIMT of the repeated measurement. Solid lines represent 95% limits of agreement (LA). Panel A presents the
 4 intra-observer variation, panel B presents the inter-observer variation.

5



1

2

Supplementary figure 2 – Plots representing the absolute difference in repeated cIMT measurements by the mean of the repeated measurements. Grey solid lines represent the 95% confidence intervals of the regression line. Panel A represents

3

the intra-observer variation, panel B represents the inter-observer variation.

4