Review of: "Why Non-HDL Cholesterol is Preferred over Apolipoprotein B-100 (Apo B)"

Tsutomu Hirano[1]

1 Showa University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript shows that nonHDL-C is less expensive than apoB and has superior predictive ability for ASCVD comparable to apoB. However, there are many places where the topic is switched from nonHDL-C to LDL-C. This inconsistency greatly diminishes the value of this paper. It is a well-known fact that nonHDL-C and apoB are more acutely predictive of ASCVD than LDL-C. The purpose of this paper is to show whether apoB or nonHDL-C has better predictive ability. However, the authors conspicuously compare nonHDL-C with LDL-C or total-C. As cited in part by the authors, Dr. Alan Snierderman has consistently shown in many papers and review articles that ApoB is a biomarker over nonHDL-C. I am not sure whether this study agrees or disagrees with Snierderman's logic. As cited in part by the authors, Snierderman has consistently shown in many papers and review articles that apoB is a biomarker over nonHDL-C. I am not sure whether this study agrees or disagrees with Snierderman's logic. The ROC curve analysis shows that nonHDL-C and apoB identify ASCVD

The fact that nonHDL-C and apoB showed higher AUC than LDL-C and total-C in the ROC analysis is not a particularly novel finding, although the small difference between apoB and nonHDL-C with respect to ROC-AUC leads us to conclude that nonHDL-C is better for economic benefits. However, we are not convinced. The difference between non-HDL-C and apoB as essential biomarker should be more clearly stated. For example, the correlation to small dense LDL and remnant. There should be many points of contention such as cholesterol Vs. protein.