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## Abstract <br> Objectives

To investigate the relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese population.

## Design

Prospective cohort study.

## Setting

This study used data from the Chinese Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS).

## Participants

Middle-aged and elderly participants with complete data were enrolled for a 4-year follow-up of total mortality and plasma levels of LDL-C, including 4983 male respondents and 5535 female respondents.

## Results

During a 4 -year follow-up, there were 305 and 219 deaths in men and women, respectively. Compared with the first quintile (Q1) of LDL-C, the adjusted hazard ratios ( $95 \%$ confidence intervals) were $0.832(0.571 \sim 1.214)$ for Q2, 0.752 ( $0.509 \sim 1.110$ ) for Q3, 0.555 ( $0.364 \sim 0.844$ ) for Q4 and 0.643 ( $0.422 \sim 0.979$ ) for Q5 in men. The results from restricted cubic spine (RCS) showed that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels was used as the reference, a lower LDL-C concentration was associated with a higher 4 -year all-cause mortality risk. By contrast, both quintile analysis and RCS analysis showed a trend for increased mortality in women with low LDL-C concentrations, but the association was not statistically significant.

## Conclusions

We found that a low level of LDL-C was associated with an increased risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men. The results suggest the potential harmful effect of a low level of LDL-C on total mortality.

Keywords Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, all-cause mortality, CHARLS

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study aimed to investigate the relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese population, based on high-quality data from a nationally representative longitudinal cohort.
- A low level of LDL-C was found to be associated with an increased risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men.
- Although the public's attention focuses on the benefit of lipid lowering, this study highlights the potential harmful effect of low LDL-C.
- The 4-year follow-up period prevented assessing the long-term association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality.
- The cause-specific mortality data were not available, preventing the analysis of the association between LDL-C and cause-specific mortality.


## Introduction

For decades, the mainstream view holds that a high level of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) is a primary cause of cardiovascular events and mortality[1]. However, many studies have found that LDL-C levels are inversely associated with all-cause mortality in diseased populations, such as patients with chronic hemodialysis[2], intracerebral hemorrhage[3] and heart failure[4]. Most importantly, in a systematic review of 19 cohort studies including 30 cohorts with 68094 elderly people ( $\geq 60$ years), an inverse association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality was seen in 16 cohorts representing $92 \%$ of all participants, and none of the other cohorts found the positive association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality[5]. Since LDL-C has been regarded as "bad cholesterol" for a long time and lipid-lowering drugs have been prescribed even at normal levels of serum cholesterol[6], the impact can be substantial. Therefore, the underlying relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality needs to be clarified in large prospective cohorts.

In this study, we aimed to investigate whether LDL-C levels are associated with all-cause mortality among the middle-aged and elderly Chinese men and women, based on the longitudinal data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS).

## Methods

## Study design

As a nationally representative longitudinal study, CHARLS is designed to collect a wide range of information on the economic standing, physical and psychological health, demographics and social networks of a middle-aged and elderly Chinese population (aged $\geq 45$ years)[7]. The national baseline survey (wave 1 ) was conducted between June 2011 and March 2012 and included 17,708 respondents. The second wave (wave 2) was carried out in 2013-2014, the third wave (wave 3) in 2014-2015 and the fourth wave (wave 4) in 2015-2016. The detailed design of CHARLS can be referred to a previous publication[7]. This study was approved by Biomedical Ethics Review Committee of Peking University, and all participants signed informed consents.

## Study population

All participants recruited in the national baseline survey were included if they met the following criteria: 1 ) aged $\geq 45$ years, 2 ) measured plasma levels of LDL-C in wave 1,3 ) successfully followed up in at least one of the subsequent three waves, and 4) without lipid-lowering interventions. Finally, 10518 participants, including 4983 men and 5535 women, were included for subsequent analysis (Figure 1).

## Plasma LDL-C measurements and other covariates

Plasma samples were collected by medically-trained staff and then stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until assayed at Capital Medical University (CMU) laboratory. LDL-C was measured by the enzymatic colormetric test, with an analytical range of $3-400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and between-assay coefficient of variation of $1.20 \%$. During the testing of the CHARLS study samples, quality control (QC) samples were used daily. All test results from QC samples were within two standard deviations of mean QC control
concentrations. The other covariates collected included age, gender, smoking status, drinking status, body mass index (BMI), hypertension (defined by a history of hypertension, or systolic blood pressure $(\mathrm{SBP}) \geq 140 \mathrm{mmHg}$, or diastolic blood pressure $(\mathrm{DBP}) \geq 90 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ), high blood sugar ( HBS )/diabetes (defined by a history of HBS/diabetes, or fasting blood glucose $\geq 6.1 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$, or non-fasting blood glucose $\geq 7.8 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ ), a history of cancer, cardiovascular disease, stroke, asthma, lung disease, liver disease, digestive disease, kidney disease, arthritis, memory problem and psychological problem.

## All-cause mortality follow-up

Participants enrolled in wave 1 were followed up in subsequent three waves. In wave 2 , both the interview status (dead or alive) and death time were recorded. In waves 3 and 4, only the interview status was recorded. For those who had the exact time on all-cause death, the survival time was defined as the interval between the interview time of wave 1 and the death time. If the exact death time was not available, the survival time was computed as the median of the interval between wave 1 and the specific wave with death information. For those who did not die during the follow-up period, the survival time was defined as the interval between two interview waves.

## Patient and public involvement

Anonymised participant data were used in this study. Patients and the public were not involved in the design or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of the study.

## Statistical analysis

Data were presented as median ( $P_{25} \sim P_{75}$ ) for continuous variables and frequency (percentage) for categorical variables. Baseline characteristics between or among groups were compared by the Wilcoxon rank sum test or Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test for continuous variables and by the chi-square test for categorical variables. The Cox proportional hazard ratio model was used to estimate the hazard ratios (HRs) and 95\% confidence intervals (CIs) of LDL-C quintiles. In addition, the association between all-cause mortality and LDL-C on a continuous scale was further examined using restricted cubic splines (RCS) incorporated in Cox proportional hazards models.

All statistical analyses were performed by SAS statistical software (version 9.4, Cary, NC). All $P$ values were 2-tailed, and the significance level was set at 0.05 .

## Results

## Baseline characteristics of the study population

A total of 4983 men and 5535 women were eligible for the final analysis. The median of LDL-C levels in women was significantly higher than that in men $(P$ $<0.0001$, Supplementary Figure S1). Compared with women, men were older, had smaller BMI values and possessed greater smoking rate and drinking rate (all $P$ $<0.0001$ ). The prevalence rates of cancer, lung disease, arthritis and digestive disease in women were higher than those in men, but the prevalence rates of asthma and cardiovascular disease were lower in women (all $P<0.0001$, Supplementary Table S1).

## Characteristics of men and women according to the quintiles of LDL-C levels

After stratification by the quintiles of LDL-C levels, BMI, SBP and DBP in men were elevated with ascending quintiles as a whole (All $P<0.001$ ) (Supplementary Table S2). The prevalence of HBS/diabetes was highest in the bottom quintile of LDL-C and lowest in the fourth quintile, with prevalence rates of $34.94 \%$ and $27.02 \%$ respectively. There were no statistical differences among LDL-C quintiles for the other characteristics (e.g. age, smoking, drinking, stroke, cancer, cardiovascular disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem) (All $P>0.05$ ).

In women, LDL-C quintiles were positively associated with age, BMI, SBP and DBP (All $P<0.001$ ) (Supplementary Table S3). The prevalence rates of HBS/diabetes and liver disease in women were significantly different among different LDL-C quintiles (All $P<0.001$ ). For the remaining variables (e.g., smoking, drinking, stroke, cancer, cardiovascular disease, lung disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem), no differences were observed (All $P>0.05$ ).

## Associations of LDL-C levels with all-cause mortality

In men, 305 out of 4983 participants died during a four-year follow-up. The mortality rates were declining with ascending quintiles (Table 1). Compared with the first quintile, the univariate HRs ( $95 \%$ CIs) were 0.738 ( $0.537 \sim 1.014$ ) for the second quintile; $0.638(0.457 \sim 0.890)$ for the third quintile; $0.521(0.366 \sim 0.742)$ for the fourth quintile and $0.511(0.358 \sim 0.730)$ for the fifth quintile. After adjustment for a series of potential confounders, the non-linear association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality was observed. As compared with the first quintile, the multivariate HRs ( $95 \% \mathrm{CIs}$ ) were as follows: second quintile, $0.834(0.572 \sim 1.216)$; third quintile, $0.752(0.510 \sim 1.110)$; fourth quintile, $0.555(0.365 \sim 0.845)$; fifth quintile, $0.643(0.422 \sim 0.980)$. In women, there were 219 deaths during a four-year follow-up. The mortality rate was highest in the first quintile. After adjustment for potential confounders, no quintile showed significant lower mortality rates compared with the first quintile (all $P>0.05$ ) (Table 1).

The quintile analysis indicated that the relationship between LDL-C with all-cause mortality might be non-linear. Therefore, RCS was further performed to investigate the association between all-cause mortality and LDL-C on a continuous scale. The results from RCS showed that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels was used as the reference, lower LDL-C was associated with higher risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in men, and moderately higher LDL-C possessed lower total mortality risk, but the association was not statistically significant for very high LDL-C concentrations (Figure 2). For women, LDL-C was not significantly associated with 4-year all-cause mortality, but women at lower LDL-C concentrations were observed with a trend of a higher risk of 4-year total mortality (Figure 2).

## Discussion

In this study, we investigated the relationship between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality among the middle-aged and elderly Chinese population. In men, a low level of LDL-C was associated with increased mortality risk. In women, LDL-C was not significantly associated with 4 -year all-cause mortality.

Low-density lipoprotein has been well established as an important cause of
cardiovascular disease (CVD) for decades[1]. Since CVD is the leading cause of mortality throughout the world, it is logically reasonable that increased LDL-C should contribute to increased CVD mortality and possibly all-cause mortality. Indeed, evidences from prospective epidemiologic studies showed a positive association between non-HDL-C concentration and ischaemic heart disease mortality[8]. However, non-HDL-C includes both LDL-C and very low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (VLDL-C). It is surprising that the direct association of LDL-C with CVD mortality was not consistently reported among studies. Abdullah et al. (2018) demonstrated that LDL-C was independently associated with CVD mortality in a low 10-year risk cohort with long-term follow-up[9]. By contrast, Tikhonof et al. (2005) reported that the elderly subjects ( $\geq 65$ years) possessed the highest CVD mortality in the lowest LDL-C quartile[10]. Meanwhile, many other studies also found no association between LDL-C and CVD mortality[11-13]. When the results about the association of LDL-C with CVD mortality were inconsistent, it is more surprising to find that few studies have reported the positive association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality. In the study by Abdullah et al. (2018), there were already no associations or minimal positive associations between high LDL-C categories and all-cause mortality even in univariable Cox analyses[9]. Most remarkably, results of multivariable Cox analyses in this study were not provided for all-cause mortality, which could exert a substantial impact on the final association[14]. Actually, a large number of studies reported no association or even an inverse association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality, which has been summarized in a systematic review by Ravnskov et al. (2016)[5]. Therefore, although the mainstream view has been advocating the benefit of lowering high LDL-C, the harmful effect of low LDL-C may be largely neglected.

It should be noted that the confounding effect of statin treatment should be minimized, as this study excluded those who used lipid-lowering interventions. There was also no association between baseline LDL-C and the presence of cancer, stroke and CVD neither among men nor among women (Supplementary Tables S2 and S3). Moreover, when participants who had died during the first observation year were
excluded, this relationship was not changed. This could relieve the concern that serious diseases may lower cholesterol soon before death occurs. We speculate that the difference between men and women was due to the much lower LDL-C levels in males than in females. This could result in the small sample size of female participants with low LDL-C concentrations, leading to insufficient power for the association in women. Indeed, there was observed a high risk trend for women at low LDL-C concentrations, although the association was not statistically significant.

Several explanations for the unfavorable effects of low LDL-C levels may be proposed. LDL-C has been suggested to play an important role in host defense against both bacterial and viral pathogens[15]. Indeed, many animal and laboratory experiments have shown that LDL could bind to and inactivate a broad range of microorganisms and their toxic products[16-18]. This hypothesis may be further supported by the recent finding that LDL-C was associated with reduced infectious mortality based on the data from 37,250 patients in the international Monitoring Dialysis Outcomes (MONDO) database[2]. In addition, it has been proposed that LDL-C may have the potential to protect against cancer as many cancer types are caused by viruses[19]. Ravnskov et al. (2012) reviewed nine cohort studies including more than 140,000 individuals followed for $10-30$ years and found that low cholesterol was associated with cancer[20]. Moreover, cholesterol-lowering experiments on rodents have led to cancer as well[21]. In agreement with these findings, individuals with familial hypercholesterolaemia have been found to possess significantly lower cancer mortality[22]. Therefore, lower LDL-C may contribute to a higher risk of death from infection and cancer, which in turn results in increased all-cause mortality.

This study demonstrated that middle-aged and elderly Chinese men with low LDL-C had an increased risk of all-cause mortality, which calls for special attention to be paid to the possible harmful effect of a low level of LDL-C. However, some limitations should be noted. First, the follow-up period was limited to 4 years. For a longer follow-up time, the associations between LDL-C and all-cause mortality in women might be displayed. In addition, cause-specific mortality data were not
available for the time being, preventing the analysis of the association between LDL-C and cause-specific mortality.

In China, 4-year total mortality is associated with a low level of plasma LDL-C in middle-aged and elderly men. The findings in this study may suggest the potential harmful effect of a low level of LDL-C. More prospective and well-designed studies are needed to validate the relationship between LDL-C and mortality.
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## Figure legends

Figure 1 Flowchart on the selection of eligible participants.
Figure 2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality in men and women, respectively.
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Table 1 Associations between LDL-C and all-cause mortality

|  | Total | Deaths <br> (\%) | Unadjusted |  | Adjusted* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 991 | 88(8.88) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1008 | 67(6.65) | $0.733(0.533 \sim 1.007)$ | 0.0554 | 0.832(0.571~1.214) | 0.3408 |
| Q3 | 992 | 57(5.75) | 0.638(0.457~0.891) | 0.0083 | 0.752(0.509~1.110) | 0.1512 |
| Q4 | 1004 | 47(4.68) | $0.519(0.364 \sim 0.739)$ | 0.0003 | $0.555(0.364 \sim 0.844)$ | 0.0060 |
| Q5 | 988 | 46(4.66) | $0.512(0.358 \sim 0.731)$ | 0.0002 | 0.643(0.422~0.979) | 0.0397 |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1117 | 52(4.66) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1102 | 49(4.45) | 0.963(0.652~1.423) | 0.8505 | 1.172(0.732~1.876) | 0.5090 |
| Q3 | 1097 | 29(2.64) | $0.566(0.360 \sim 0.892)$ | 0.0141 | 0.612(0.353~1.061) | 0.0800 |
| Q4 | 1112 | 41(3.69) | 0.793(0.527~1.194) | 0.2671 | $0.836(0.511 \sim 1.369)$ | 0.4774 |
| Q5 | 1107 | 48(4.34) | 0.928(0.627~1.373) | 0.7077 | $0.859(0.533 \sim 1.384)$ | 0.5324 |

*Adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, cardiovascular disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.


Figure 1 Flowchart on the selection of eligible participants.
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Figure 2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality in men and women, respectively.
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Supplementary Table S1 Characteristics of the study population

| Characteristiscs | Men <br> $(n=4983)$ | Women <br> $(n=5535)$ | $P$ value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age-yr | $59(53 \sim 66)$ | $57(51 \sim 65)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| BMI-kg/m |  |  |  |
| SBP-mmHg | $22.40(20.35 \sim 24.83)$ | $23.51(21.18 \sim 26.14)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| DBP-mmHg | $127.67(115.67 \sim 141.67)$ | $127.00(114.00 \sim 143.33)$ | 0.3762 |
| Lifestyle-no. (\%) | $75.33(67.67 \sim 83.67)$ | $74.33(67.00 \sim 82.67)$ | 0.0017 |
| Smoking ever |  |  |  |
| Drinking ever | $3738(75.24)$ | $420(7.62)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Disease history-no. (\%) | $3297(66.43)$ | $826(15.00)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Hypertension | $1942(44.15)$ |  |  |
| HBS/Diabetes | $1461(30.17)$ | $2290(46.21)$ | 0.0457 |
| Cancer | $40(0.81)$ | $1565(29.20)$ | 0.2840 |
| Stroke | $133(2.69)$ | $67(1.22)$ | 0.0373 |
| Cardiovascular disease | $499(10.10)$ | $136(2.47)$ | 0.4948 |
| Lung disease | $620(12.54)$ | $738(13.47)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Arthritis | $1548(31.23)$ | $508(9.26)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Liver disease | $197(4.00)$ | $2243(40.80)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Kidney disease | $309(6.27)$ | $188(3.44)$ | 0.1321 |
| Digestive disease | $1030(20.79)$ | $315(5.75)$ | 0.2691 |
| Asthma | $283(5.72)$ | $1394(25.38)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Psychological problem | $60(1.21)$ | $216(3.93)$ | $<0.0001$ |
| Memory problem | $97(1.96)$ | $94(1.72)$ | 0.0337 |

Note: BMI, body mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HBS, high blood sugar.

| 6 |  | Quintile 1 | Quintile 2 | Quintile 3 | Quintile 4 | Quintile 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 |  | $(n=991)$ | $(n=1008)$ | $(n=992)$ | $(n=1004)$ | $(n=988)$ |


| 10 | $(\leq 83.89 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL})$ | $(83.89 \sim 101.68)$ | $(101.68 \sim 117.14)$ | $(117.14 \sim 136.86)$ | $(>136.86)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 Age-yr | $59(52 \sim 66)$ | $59(53 \sim 67)$ | $59(52 \sim 66)$ | $59(53 \sim 67)$ | $59(53 \sim 65)$ | 0.5405 |

Supplementary Table S2 Baseline characteristics of participants by quintiles of LDL-C in men

| $755(76.57)$ | $754(75.02)$ | $751(75.94)$ | $759(75.75)$ | $719(72.92)$ | 0.3788 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $654(66.40)$ | $663(66.10)$ | $664(67.14)$ | $664(66.40)$ | $652(66.13)$ | 0.9890 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $373(43.52)$ | $354(40.05)$ | $394(43.83)$ | $402(45.07)$ | $419(48.33)$ | 0.0131 |
| $337(34.81)$ | $277(28.35)$ | $267(27.93)$ | $266(27.06)$ | $314(32.78)$ | 0.0003 |
| $13(1.32)$ | $7(0.70)$ | $5(0.51)$ | $6(0.60)$ | $9(0.92)$ | 0.2728 |
| $26(2.64)$ | $33(3.31)$ | $21(2.13)$ | $25(2.50)$ | $28(2.85)$ | 0.5818 |
| $86(8.78)$ | $98(9.81)$ | $103(10.47)$ | $113(11.31)$ | $99(10.10)$ | 0.4453 |
| $131(13.37)$ | $135(13.46)$ | $106(10.77)$ | $120(12.00)$ | $128(13.09)$ | 0.3170 |
| $300(30.43)$ | $332(33.10)$ | $280(28.34)$ | $312(31.23)$ | $324(33.03)$ | 0.1233 |
| $51(5.23)$ | $42(4.19)$ | $35(3.57)$ | $38(3.81)$ | $31(3.18)$ | 0.1855 |
| $56(5.73)$ | $73(7.29)$ | $59(6.02)$ | $57(5.71)$ | $64(6.56)$ | 0.5518 |
| $211(21.46)$ | $213(21.24)$ | $225(22.82)$ | $203(20.28)$ | $178(18.14)$ | 0.1264 |
| $66(6.76)$ | $49(4.89)$ | $43(4.36)$ | $59(5.91)$ | $66(6.72)$ | 0.0754 |
| $14(1.43)$ | $10(1.00)$ | $14(1.42)$ | $14(1.40)$ | $8(0.82)$ | 0.6092 |
| $25(2.55)$ | $13(1.30)$ | $21(2.13)$ | $19(1.90)$ | $19(1.94)$ | 0.3810 |

Supplementary Table S3 Baseline characteristics of participants by quintiles of LDL-C in women

| Characteristics | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Quintile } 1 \\ (n=1117) \\ (\leq 91.24 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Quintile } 2 \\ (n=1102) \\ (91.24 \sim 109.41) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Quintile } 3 \\ (n=1097) \\ (109.41 \sim 126.03) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Quintile } 4 \\ (n=1112) \\ (126.03 \sim 147.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Quintile } 5 \\ (n=1107) \\ (>147.49) \end{gathered}$ | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{11}$ Age-yr | 56 (49~64) | 56 (49~64) | 57 (50~63) | 58 (52~65) | 59 (53~66) | <0.0001 |
| ${ }_{13}^{12} \mathrm{BMI}-\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.15 \\ (20.90 \sim 25.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.30 \\ (21.01 \sim 25.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.39 \\ (21.10 \sim 26.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.63 \\ (21.32 \sim 26.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.12 \\ (21.57 \sim 26.83) \end{gathered}$ | <0.0001 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15 \mathrm{SBP}-\mathrm{mmHg} \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 124.67 \\ (112.00 \sim 141.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125.67 \\ (113.00 \sim 142.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127.00 \\ (114.67 \sim 143.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127.50 \\ (114.83 \sim 142.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 130.00 \\ (117.00 \sim 146.00) \end{gathered}$ | $<0.0001$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & 18 \mathrm{DBP}-\mathrm{mmHg} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73.33 \\ (65.67 \sim 81.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.33 \\ (66.67 \sim 82.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.00 \\ (67.33 \sim 82.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.67 \\ (67.67 \sim 82.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75.33 \\ (67.67 \sim 83.33) \end{gathered}$ | 0.0102 |
| ${ }_{20}$ Lifestyle-no. (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 Smoking ever | 71 (6.39) | 93 (8.49) | 78 (7.15) | 79 (7.13) | 99 (8.97) | 0.1289 |
| 22 Drinking ever | 173 (15.61) | 160 (14.61) | 169 (15.50) | 165 (14.89) | 159 (14.40) | 0.9108 |
| ${ }_{24}{ }^{\text {Disease history-no. (\%) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 Hypertension | 425 (42.71) | 452 (45.80) | 439 (44.98) | 459 (46.22) | 515 (51.24) | 0.0033 |
| 26 HBS/Diabetes | 310 (28.78) | 290 (27.46) | 280 (26.19) | 312 (28.94) | 373 (34.53) | 0.0003 |
| 28 Cancer | 14 (1.27) | 15 (1.38) | 18 (1.66) | 14 (1.27) | 6 (0.54) | 0.1876 |
| 29 Stroke | 31 (2.80) | 16 (1.47) | 27 (2.47) | 31 (2.81) | 31 (2.81) | 0.1910 |
| 30 Cardiovascular disease | 144 (13.08) | 135 (12.41) | 140 (12.89) | 166 (15.08) | 153 (13.87) | 0.3924 |
| 31 Lung disease | 110 (9.94) | 112 (10.29) | 103 (9.45) | 91 (8.26) | 92 (8.36) | 0.3540 |
| 33 Arthritis | 454 (41.05) | 450 (41.21) | 421 (38.55) | 454 (41.01) | 464 (42.14) | 0.5201 |
| 34 Liver disease | 53 (4.80) | 40 (3.69) | 25 (2.31) | 43 (3.91) | 27 (2.46) | 0.0060 |
| 35 Kidney disease | 74 (6.71) | 62 (5.69) | 57 (5.24) | 66 (6.01) | 56 (5.09) | 0.4894 |
| 37 Digestive disease | 279 (25.20) | 267 (24.45) | 269 (24.70) | 300 (27.20) | 279 (25.34) | 0.6078 |
| 38 Asthma | 43 (3.89) | 43 (3.94) | 44 (4.03) | 39 (3.54) | 47 (4.26) | 0.9374 |
| 39 Psychological problem | 16 (1.45) | 19 (1.74) | 23 (2.12) | 17 (1.54) | 19 (1.73) | 0.7936 |
| 41 Memory problem | 18 (1.63) | 19 (1.74) | 11 (1.01) | 15 (1.36) | 23 (2.09) | 0.3240 |

42

Note: BMI, body mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HBS, high blood sugar.


Supplementary Figure S1 The box-plot of plasma LDL-C levels in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men and women.
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## Abstract <br> Objectives

To investigate the relationship between low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) and all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese population.

## Design

Prospective cohort study.

## Setting

This study used data from the Chinese Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS).

## Participants

Middle-aged and elderly participants with complete data were enrolled for a 4-year follow-up of total mortality and plasma levels of LDL-C, including 4981 male respondents and 5529 female respondents.

## Results

During a 4 -year follow-up, there were 305 and 219 deaths in men and women, respectively. Compared with the first quintile (Q1) of LDL-C, the adjusted hazard ratios $(95 \%$ confidence intervals) were $0.866(0.567 \sim 1.325)$ for Q 2 , $0.782(0.507 \sim 1.206)$ for $\mathrm{Q} 3,0.577(0.363 \sim 0.916)$ for Q 4 and $0.788(0.497 \sim 1.248)$ for Q5 in men. The results from restricted cubic spine (RCS) showed that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels was used as the reference, a lower LDL-C concentration was associated with a higher 4-year all-cause mortality risk. By contrast, both quintile analysis and RCS analysis did not show a statistically significant association in women.

## Conclusions

We found that a very low plasma level of LDL-C was associated with an increased risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men. The results suggest the potential harmful effect of a quite low level of LDL-C on total mortality.

Keywords Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, all-cause mortality, CHARLS

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study used high-quality data from a nationally representative longitudinal cohort to investigate the relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese population.
- The use of restricted cubic spline provided a more comprehensive spectrum of the non-linear relation between LDL-C and all-cause mortality.
- Although the public's attention focuses on the benefit of lipid lowering, this study highlights the potential harmful effect of very low LDL-C.
- The 4-year follow-up period prevented the assessment of a long-term association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality.
- The unavailability of cause-specific mortality data prevented the analysis of the association between LDL-C and cause-specific mortality.


## Introduction

For decades, the mainstream view holds that a high level of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) is a primary cause of cardiovascular events and mortality[1]. However, many studies have found that LDL-C levels are inversely associated with all-cause mortality in diseased populations, such as patients with chronic hemodialysis[2], intracerebral hemorrhage[3] and heart failure[4]. Most importantly, in a systematic review of 19 cohort studies including 30 cohorts with 68094 elderly people ( $\geq 60$ years), an inverse association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality was seen in 16 cohorts representing $92 \%$ of all participants, and none of the other cohorts found the positive association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality[5]. Since LDL-C has been regarded as "bad cholesterol" for a long time and lipid-lowering drugs have been prescribed even at normal levels of serum cholesterol[6], the impact can be substantial. Therefore, the underlying relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality needs to be clarified in large prospective cohorts.

In this study, we aimed to investigate whether LDL-C levels are associated with all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese men and women, based on the longitudinal data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS).

## Methods

## Study design

As a nationally representative longitudinal study, CHARLS is designed to collect a wide range of information on the economic standing, physical and psychological health, demographics and social networks of a middle-aged and elderly Chinese population (aged $\geq 45$ years)[7]. The national baseline survey (wave 1 ) was conducted between June 2011 and March 2012 and included 17,708 respondents. The second wave (wave 2) was carried out in 2013-2014, the third wave (wave 3) in 2014-2015 and the fourth wave (wave 4) in 2015-2016. The detailed design of CHARLS can be referred to a previous publication[7]. This study was approved by Biomedical Ethics Review Committee of Peking University, and all participants signed informed consents.

## Study population

All participants recruited in the national baseline survey were included if they met the following criteria: 1 ) aged $\geq 45$ years, 2 ) measured plasma levels of LDL-C in wave 1,3 ) successfully followed up in at least one of the subsequent three waves, and 4) without lipid-lowering interventions. Finally, 10510 participants, including 4981 men and 5529 women, were included for subsequent analysis (Figure 1).

## Plasma LDL-C measurements and other covariates

Plasma samples were collected by medically-trained staff and then stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until assayed at Capital Medical University (CMU) laboratory. LDL-C was measured by the enzymatic colormetric test, with an analytical range of $3-400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and between-assay coefficient of variation of $1.20 \%$. During the testing of the CHARLS study samples, quality control (QC) samples were used daily. All test results from QC samples were within two standard deviations of mean QC control
concentrations. The other covariates collected included age, gender, smoking status, drinking status, body mass index (BMI), educational level, household income, living alone status, rural residence, activity of daily living (ADL) disability, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension (defined by a history of hypertension, or systolic blood pressure (SBP) $\geq 140 \mathrm{mmHg}$, or diastolic blood pressure $(\mathrm{DBP}) \geq 90 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ), high blood sugar (HBS)/diabetes (defined by a history of HBS/diabetes, or fasting blood glucose $\geq 6.1 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$, or non-fasting blood glucose $\geq 7.8 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ ), a history of cancer, cardiovascular disease, stroke, asthma, lung disease, liver disease, digestive disease, kidney disease, arthritis, memory problem and psychological problem.

## All-cause mortality follow-up

Participants enrolled in wave 1 were followed up in subsequent three waves. In wave 2, both the interview status (dead or alive) and death time were recorded. In waves 3 and 4, only the interview status was recorded. For those who had the exact time on all-cause death in wave 2 , the survival time was defined as the interval between the interview time of wave 1 and the death time. If the exact death time was not available in waves 3 and 4, the survival time was computed as the median of the interval between wave 1 and the specific wave with death information. For those who did not die during the follow-up period, the survival time was defined as the interval between wave 1 and the last interview wave with follow-up information.

## Patient and public involvement

Anonymised participant data were used in this study. Patients and the public were not involved in the design or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of the study.

## Statistical analysis

Data were presented as median $\left(P_{25} \sim P_{75}\right)$ for continuous variables and frequency (percentage) for categorical variables. Baseline characteristics between or among groups were compared by the Wilcoxon rank sum test or Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test for continuous variables and by the chi-square test for categorical variables. The Cox proportional hazard ratio model was used to estimate the hazard ratios (HRs) and

95\% confidence intervals (CIs) of LDL-C quintiles. In addition, the association between all-cause mortality and LDL-C on a continuous scale was further examined using restricted cubic splines (RCS) incorporated in Cox proportional hazards models. Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) was used to determine the optimal number of knots in RCS. In this study, 3 knots were used in all RCS analyses, with knot locations at the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles of LDL-C. To be consistent with quintile analyses, the reference point was the 20th percentile of LDL-C in both men and women. All statistical analyses were performed by SAS statistical software (version 9.4, Cary, NC). All $P$ values were 2-tailed, and the significance level was set at 0.05 .

## Results

## Baseline characteristics of the study population

A total of 4981 men and 5529 women were eligible for the final analysis. The median of LDL-C levels in women was significantly higher than that in men $(P$ $<0.0001$, Supplementary Figure S1). Compared with women, men were older, had smaller BMI values and possessed greater smoking rate and drinking rate (all $P$ $<0.0001$ ). The prevalence rates of heart disease, arthritis and digestive disease in women were higher than those in men, but the prevalence rates of asthma and lung disease were lower in women (all $P<0.0001$, Table 1).

## Characteristics of men and women according to the quintiles of LDL-C levels

After stratification by the quintiles of LDL-C levels, BMI, SBP, DBP and hemoglobin in men were elevated with ascending quintiles as a whole (All $P<0.001$ ) (Table 2). The prevalence of HBS/diabetes was highest in the bottom quintile of LDL-C and lowest in the fourth quintile, with prevalence rates of $34.81 \%$ and $27.06 \%$ respectively. There were no statistical differences among LDL-C quintiles for many other characteristics (e.g. age, smoking, drinking, ADL disability, living alone, stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem) (All $P>0.05$ ).

In women, LDL-C quintiles were positively associated with age, BMI, SBP,

DBP and hemoglobin (All $P<0.001$ ) (Table 3). The prevalence rates of HBS/diabetes and liver disease in women were significantly different among different LDL-C quintiles (All $P<0.001$ ). For the remaining variables (e.g., smoking, drinking, household income, ADL disability, educational level, rural residence, stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem), no differences were observed (All $P>$ $0.05)$.

## Associations of LDL-C levels with all-cause mortality

In men, 305 out of 4981 participants died during a four-year follow-up. The mortality rates were declining with ascending quintiles (Table 4). Compared with the first quintile, the univariate HRs ( $95 \% \mathrm{CIs}$ ) were 0.733 ( $0.533 \sim 1.007$ ) for the second quintile; $0.639(0.458 \sim 0.892)$ for the third quintile; $0.519(0.364 \sim 0.739)$ for the fourth quintile and $0.512(0.359 \sim 0.732)$ for the fifth quintile. After adjustment for a series of potential confounders, the non-linear association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality was observed. As compared with the first quintile, the multivariable HRs ( $95 \% \mathrm{CIs}$ ) were as follows: second quintile, $0.866(0.567 \sim 1.325)$; third quintile, $0.782(0.507 \sim 1.206)$; fourth quintile, $0.577(0.363 \sim 0.916)$; fifth quintile, $0.788(0.497 \sim 1.248)$. In women, there were 219 deaths during a four-year follow-up. The mortality rate was highest in the first quintile. After adjustment for potential confounders, no quintile showed significant lower mortality rates compared with the first quintile (all $P>0.05$ ) (Table 4).

The quintile analysis indicated that the relationship between LDL-C with all-cause mortality might be non-linear. Therefore, RCS was further performed to investigate the association between all-cause mortality and LDL-C on a continuous scale. The results from RCS showed that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels was used as the reference, lower LDL-C was associated with higher risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in men, and moderately higher LDL-C possessed lower total mortality risk, but the association was not statistically significant for much higher LDL-C concentrations (Figure 2). The sub-group analyses by age indicated that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels was taken as the reference, a lower level of

LDL-C was associated with a higher risk of 4 -year all-cause mortality in both middle-aged ( $45 \sim 60$ years) and elderly ( $\geq 60$ years) men (Figure 3 ). For women, LDL-C was not significantly associated with 4-year all-cause mortality (Figures 2 and $3)$.

## Discussion

In this study, we investigated the relationship between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality among the middle-aged and elderly Chinese population. In men, a very low level of LDL-C was associated with increased mortality risk. In women, LDL-C was not significantly associated with 4 -year all-cause mortality.

Low-density lipoprotein has been well established as an important cause of cardiovascular disease (CVD) for decades[1]. Since CVD is the leading cause of mortality throughout the world, it is logically reasonable that increased LDL-C should contribute to increased CVD mortality and possibly all-cause mortality. Indeed, evidences from prospective epidemiologic studies showed a positive association between non-HDL-C concentration and ischaemic heart disease mortality[8]. However, non-HDL-C includes both LDL-C and very low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (VLDL-C). It is surprising that the direct association of LDL-C with CVD mortality was not consistently reported among studies. Abdullah et al. (2018) demonstrated that LDL-C was independently associated with CVD mortality in a low 10-year risk cohort with long-term follow-up[9]. By contrast, Tikhonof et al. (2005) reported that the elderly subjects ( $\geq 65$ years) possessed the highest CVD mortality in the lowest LDL-C quartile[10]. Meanwhile, many other studies also found no association between LDL-C and CVD mortality[11-13]. When the results about the association of LDL-C with CVD mortality were inconsistent, it is more surprising to find that few studies have reported the positive association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality. In the study by Abdullah et al. (2018), there were already no associations or minimal positive associations between high LDL-C categories and all-cause mortality even in univariable Cox analyses[9]. Most remarkably, results of multivariable Cox analyses in this study were not provided for all-cause mortality,
which could exert a substantial impact on the final association[14]. Actually, a large number of studies reported no association or even an inverse association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality, which has been summarized in a systematic review by Ravnskov et al. (2016)[5]. Therefore, although the mainstream view has been advocating the benefit of lowering high LDL-C, the harmful effect of very low LDL-C may be largely neglected.

It should be noted that the confounding effect of statin treatment should be minimized, as this study excluded those who used lipid-lowering interventions. There was also no association between baseline LDL-C and the presence of cancer, stroke and heart disease in men and women (Tables 2 and 3). Moreover, when participants who had died during the first observation year were excluded, this relationship was not changed (Supplementary Table S1 and Figure S2). This could relieve the concern that serious diseases may lower cholesterol soon before death occurs. One of the possible reasons for the difference between men and women may be due to fewer death events in women than in men, which might result in insufficient power for the association.

Several explanations for the unfavorable effects of low LDL-C levels may be proposed. LDL-C has been suggested to play an important role in host defense against both bacterial and viral pathogens[15]. Indeed, many animal and laboratory experiments have shown that LDL could bind to and inactivate a broad range of microorganisms and their toxic products[16-18]. This hypothesis may be further supported by the recent finding that LDL-C was associated with reduced infectious mortality based on the data from 37,250 patients in the international Monitoring Dialysis Outcomes (MONDO) database[2]. In addition, it has been proposed that LDL-C may have the potential to protect against cancer as many cancer types are caused by viruses[19]. Ravnskov et al. (2012) reviewed nine cohort studies including more than 140,000 individuals followed for $10-30$ years and found that low cholesterol was associated with cancer[20]. Moreover, cholesterol-lowering experiments on rodents have led to cancer as well[21]. In agreement with these findings, individuals with familial hypercholesterolaemia have been found to possess
significantly lower cancer mortality[22]. Therefore, lower LDL-C may contribute to a higher risk of death from infection and cancer, which in turn results in increased all-cause mortality.

This study demonstrated that middle-aged and elderly Chinese men with low LDL-C had an increased risk of all-cause mortality, which calls for special attention to be paid to the possible harmful effect of a very low level of LDL-C. However, some limitations should be noted. First, the follow-up period was limited to 4 years. For a longer follow-up time, the associations between LDL-C and all-cause mortality in women might be displayed. In addition, cause-specific mortality data were not available for the time being, preventing the analysis of the association between LDL-C and cause-specific mortality. Moreover, there are issues of multiple testing for comparisons of characteristics among LDL-C quintiles, which could result in Type I error inflation. At last, some of the measured co-morbidities were not specified and detailed in the database, such as lung disease, digestive disease, liver disease, kidney disease, psychological problem and memory problem.

In China, 4-year total mortality is associated with a very low level of plasma LDL-C in middle-aged and elderly men. The findings in this study may suggest the potential harmful effect of a quite low level of LDL-C. More prospective and well-designed studies are needed to validate the relationship between LDL-C and mortality.
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## Figure legends

Figure 1 Flowchart on the selection of eligible participants.
Figure 2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality in men and women, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease,
liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.

Figure 3 Results from restricted cubic spline for the association between LDL-C and 4 -year all-cause mortality for middle-aged ( $45 \sim 60$ years old) and elderly ( $\geq 60$ years old) people, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.
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Table 1 Characteristics of the study population

| Characteristics | $\begin{gathered} \text { Men } \\ (n=4981) \end{gathered}$ | Women $(n=5529)$ | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age-yr | 59 (53~66) | 57 (51~65) | $<0.0001$ |
| BMI-kg/m ${ }^{2}$ | 22.40 (20.35~24.83) | 23.51 (21.17~26.14) | $<0.0001$ |
| SBP-mmHg | 127.67 (115.67~141.67) | 127.00 (114.00~143.33) | 0.3764 |
| DBP-mmHg | 75.33 (67.67~83.67) | 74.33 (67.00~82.67) | 0.0017 |
| Above-average household income-no. (\%) | 2104 (49.68) | 2360 (50.32) | 0.5468 |
| Education level-no. (\%) |  |  | $<0.0001$ |
| 1 | 4287 (86.07) | 5134 (92.86) |  |
| 2 | 592 (11.89) | 347 (6.28) |  |
| 3 | 102 (2.05) | 48 (0.87) |  |
| ADL disability-no. (\%) | 716 (14.55) | 1011 (18.57) | $<0.0001$ |
| Living alone-no. (\%) | 471 (9.46) | 832 (15.05) | $<0.0001$ |
| Rural residence-no. (\%) | 3282 (65.89) | 3524 (63.74) | 0.0210 |
| Lifestyle-no. (\%) |  |  |  |
| Smoking ever | 3738 (75.24) | 420 (7.63) | $<0.0001$ |
| Drinking ever | 3297 (66.43) | 826 (15.01) | $<0.0001$ |
| Disease history-no. (\%) |  |  |  |
| Hypertension | 1904 (43.35) | 2245 (45.34) | 0.0530 |
| HBS/Diabetes | 1460 (30.16) | 1564 (29.19) | 0.2846 |
| Cancer | 40 (0.81) | 67 (1.22) | 0.0372 |
| Stroke | 133 (2.69) | 136 (2.48) | 0.4958 |
| Heart disease | 499 (10.10) | 738 (13.47) | $<0.0001$ |
| Lung disease | 620 (12.54) | 508 (9.26) | $<0.0001$ |
| Arthritis | 1548 (31.23) | 2243 (40.80) | $<0.0001$ |
| Liver disease | 197 (4.00) | 188 (3.44) | 0.1326 |
| Kidney disease | 309 (6.27) | 315 (5.75) | 0.2701 |
| Digestive disease | 1030 (20.79) | 1393 (25.37) | $<0.0001$ |
| Asthma | 283 (5.72) | 216 (3.93) | $<0.0001$ |
| Psychological problem | 60 (1.21) | 94 (1.72) | 0.0336 |
| Memory problem | 97 (1.96) | 86 (1.57) | 0.1238 |
| Laboratory measurements |  |  |  |
| LDL cholesterol-mg/dL | 109.41 (88.92~131.06) | 117.91 (96.26~141.50) | $<0.0001$ |
| Triglyceride-mg/dL | 96.46 (69.03~145.14) | 110.63 (79.65~159.30) | $<0.0001$ |
| HDL cholesterol-mg/dL | 48.71 (39.43~59.54) | 50.64 (41.75~60.31) | $<0.0001$ |
| Hemoglobin-(g/dL) | 15.10 (14.00~16.20) | 13.60 (12.50~14.60) | $<0.0001$ |

ADL, activity of daily living; BMI, body mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HBS, high blood sugar.

Educational level: 1, Less than lower secondary education; 2, Upper secondary \& vocational training; 3, Tertiary education.

| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 3 | $(35.95 \sim 59.92)$ | $(39.43 \sim 60.70)$ | $(39.43 \sim 58.76)$ | $(39.82 \sim 59.54)$ | $(41.37 \sim 58.76)$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  | 14.80 | 14.90 | 15.00 | 15.10 | 15.40 |
| 5 | Hemoglobin- $(\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{dL})$ | $(13.60 \sim 16.00)$ | $(13.80 \sim 16.10)$ | $(14.00 \sim 16.20)$ | $(14.00 \sim 16.30)$ | $(14.30 \sim 16.50)$ |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3 Baseline characteristics of participants by quintiles of LDL-C in women

| $\begin{array}{ll}13 & \\ 14 & \\ 15 & \text { Characteristics } \\ 16 & \end{array}$ | Quintile 1 $\begin{gathered} (n=1114) \\ (\leq 91.24 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}) \end{gathered}$ | Quintile 2 $\begin{gathered} (n=1102) \\ (91.24 \sim 109.41) \end{gathered}$ | Quintile 3 $\begin{gathered} (n=1096) \\ (109.41 \sim 126.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quintile } 4 \\ (n=1111) \\ (126.03 \sim 147.68) \end{gathered}$ | Quintile 5 $\begin{array}{r} (n=1106) \\ (>147.68) \end{array}$ | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 Age-yr 18 | 56 (49~64) | 56 (49~64) | 57 (50~63) | 58 (52~65) | 59 (53~66) | <0.0001 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19 \mathrm{BMI}-\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2} \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.15 \\ (20.90 \sim 25.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.30 \\ (21.01 \sim 25.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.39 \\ (21.10 \sim 26.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.63 \\ (21.32 \sim 26.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.12 \\ (21.57 \sim 26.83) \end{gathered}$ | $<0.0001$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 2 \mathrm{SBP}-\mathrm{mmHg} \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 124.67 \\ (112.00 \sim 141.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125.67 \\ (113.00 \sim 142.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127.00 \\ (114.67 \sim 143.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127.67 \\ (114.67 \sim 142.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 130.00 \\ (117.00 \sim 146.00) \end{gathered}$ | $<0.0001$ |
| ${ }_{25}^{24} \mathrm{DBP}-\mathrm{mmHg}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73.33 \\ (65.67 \sim 81.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.33 \\ (66.67 \sim 82.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.00 \\ (67.33 \sim 82.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.67 \\ (67.67 \sim 82.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75.33 \\ (67.67 \sim 83.33) \end{gathered}$ | 0.0103 |
| ${ }_{27}^{26}$ Above-average household 2 income-no. (\%) | 458 (48.21) | 482 (50.42) | 461 (48.99) | 497 (53.61) | 462 (50.44) | 0.1720 |
| $2 \Phi$ ducation level-no. (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4079 |
| 39 | 1023 (91.83) | 1030 (93.47) | 1023 (93.34) | 1025 (92.26) | 1033 (93.40) |  |
| 32 | 76 (6.82) | 67 (6.08) | 63 (5.75) | 76 (6.84) | 65 (5.88) |  |
| 33 | 15 (1.35) | 5 (0.45) | 10 (0.91) | 10 (0.90) | 8 (0.72) |  |
| 34 ADL disability-no. (\%) | 216 (19.69) | 183 (16.90) | 188 (17.59) | 215 (19.58) | 209 (19.05) | 0.3416 |
| ${ }_{36}^{35}$ iving alone-no. (\%) | 155 (13.91) | 162 (14.70) | 143 (13.05) | 186 (16.74) | 186 (16.82) | 0.0429 |
| 3 Rural residence-no. (\%) | 715 (64.18) | 695 (63.07) | 726 (66.24) | 706 (63.55) | 682 (61.66) | 0.2526 |
| $3 \&$ ifestyle-no. (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 Smoking ever | 71 (6.39) | 93 (8.49) | 78 (7.15) | 79 (7.14) | 99 (8.97) | 0.1294 |
| 41 Drinking ever | 173 (15.61) | 160 (14.61) | 169 (15.50) | 165 (14.91) | 159 (14.40) | 0.9112 |
| 4Disease history-no. (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 Hypertension | 414 (41.69) | 440 (44.58) | 431 (44.21) | 451 (45.46) | 509 (50.70) | 0.0014 |
| $45 \quad$ HBS/Diabetes | 310 (28.78) | 290 (27.46) | 280 (26.19) | 311 (28.88) | 373 (34.53) | 0.0003 |
| 46 Cancer | 14 (1.27) | 15 (1.38) | 18 (1.66) | 14 (1.27) | 6 (0.54) | 0.1876 |
| $47 \quad$ Stroke | 31 (2.80) | 16 (1.47) | 27 (2.47) | 31 (2.81) | 31 (2.81) | 0.1906 |
| 48 Heart disease | 144 (13.08) | 135 (12.41) | 140 (12.89) | 166 (15.09) | 153 (13.87) | 0.3873 |
| 50 Lung disease | 110 (9.94) | 112 (10.29) | 103 (9.45) | 91 (8.27) | 92 (8.36) | 0.3566 |
| 51 Arthritis | 454 (41.05) | 450 (41.21) | 421 (38.55) | 454 (41.05) | 464 (42.14) | 0.5189 |
| 52 Liver disease | 53 (4.80) | 40 (3.69) | 25 (2.31) | 43 (3.91) | 27 (2.46) | 0.0060 |
| 54 Kidney disease | 74 (6.71) | 62 (5.69) | 57 (5.24) | 66 (6.02) | 56 (5.09) | 0.4886 |
| 55 Digestive disease | 279 (25.20) | 267 (24.45) | 269 (24.70) | 299 (27.13) | 279 (25.34) | 0.6323 |
| 56 Asthma | 43 (3.89) | 43 (3.94) | 44 (4.03) | 39 (3.54) | 47 (4.26) | 0.9384 |
| 58 Psychological problem | 16 (1.45) | 19 (1.74) | 23 (2.12) | 17 (1.54) | 19 (1.73) | 0.7943 |
| 59 Memory problem | 18 (1.63) | 19 (1.74) | 11 (1.01) | 15 (1.36) | 23 (2.09) | 0.3245 |

${ }_{4}^{3}$ Laboratory measurements

|  | 78.48 | 100.90 | 117.91 | 135.70 | 165.08 | $<0.0001$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LDL cholesterol-mg/dL | $(68.04 \sim 85.83)$ | $(96.26 \sim 105.54)$ | $(113.66 \sim 121.78)$ | $(130.28 \sim 141.50)$ | $(155.03 \sim 179.00)$ |  |
|  | 110.63 | 103.54 | 107.97 | 110.63 | 125.23 | $<0.0001$ |
| Triglyceride-mg/dL | $(73.46 \sim 192.93)$ | $(74.34 \sim 153.99)$ | $(77.88 \sim 152.22)$ | $(82.31 \sim 151.34)$ | $(92.93 \sim 162.84)$ |  |
|  | 46.39 | 50.64 | 51.42 | 51.80 | 51.80 | $<0.0001$ |
|  |  | $(35.57 \sim 57.60)$ | $(40.98 \sim 60.70)$ | $(42.53 \sim 60.70)$ | $(43.69 \sim 61.08)$ | $(44.46 \sim 60.31)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HDL cholesterol-mg/dL | 13.20 | 13.30 | 13.60 | 13.70 | 13.80 |
|  |  | $(12.10 \sim 14.30)$ | $(12.30 \sim 14.50)$ | $(12.60 \sim 14.70)$ | $(12.80 \sim 14.60)$ | $(12.80 \sim 14.80)$ |

Table 4 Associations between all-cause mortality and LDL-C

|  | Total | Deaths <br> (\%) | Unadjusted |  | Adjusted* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 991 | 88(8.88) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1008 | 67(6.65) | 0.733(0.533~1.007) | 0.0554 | 0.866(0.567~1.325) | 0.5079 |
| Q3 | 991 | 57(5.75) | $0.639(0.458 \sim 0.892)$ | 0.0084 | 0.782(0.507~1.206) | 0.2651 |
| Q4 | 1004 | 47(4.68) | $0.519(0.364 \sim 0.739)$ | 0.0003 | $0.577(0.363 \sim 0.916)$ | 0.0197 |
| Q5 | 987 | 46(4.66) | 0.512(0.359~0.732) | 0.0002 | 0.788(0.497~1.248) | 0.3093 |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1114 | 52(4.66) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1102 | 49(4.45) | 0.960(0.650~1.419) | 0.8394 | $1.348(0.816 \sim 2.229)$ | 0.2440 |
| Q3 | 1096 | 29(2.64) | 0.565(0.359~0.890) | 0.0138 | 0.675(0.375~1.214) | 0.1889 |
| Q4 | 1111 | 41(3.69) | 0.792(0.526~1.192) | 0.2632 | 0.974(0.567~1.674) | 0.9239 |
| Q5 | 1106 | 48(4.34) | 0.926(0.625~1.371) | 0.7007 | 1.043(0.620~1.755) | 0.8736 |

*Adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.


Figure 1 Flowchart on the selection of eligible participants.
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Figure 2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality in men and women, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.
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Figure 3 Results from restricted cubic spline for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality for middle-aged (45~60 years old) and elderly ( $\geq 60$ years old) people, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.
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Supplementary Table S1 Associations between all-cause mortality and LDL-C ${ }^{\#}$

|  | Total | Deaths <br> (\%) | Unadjusted |  | Adjusted* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 972 | 69 (7.10) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 999 | 58 (5.81) | $0.806(0.568 \sim 1.142)$ | 0.2251 | 0.978(0.623~1.536) | 0.9244 |
| Q3 | 979 | 45 (4.60) | 0.642(0.441~0.934) | 0.0205 | 0.763(0.473~1.231) | 0.2681 |
| Q4 | 992 | 35 (3.53) | 0.491(0.327~0.737) | 0.0006 | 0.532(0.317~0.893) | 0.0169 |
| Q5 | 982 | 41 (4.18) | 0.579(0.394~0.853) | 0.0056 | 0.819(0.498~1.348) | 0.4329 |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1106 | 44 (3.98) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1094 | 41 (3.75) | 0.951(0.622~1.456) | 0.8177 | 1.284(0.755~2.182) | 0.3561 |
| Q3 | 1094 | 27 (2.47) | 0.622(0.385~1.005) | 0.0523 | 0.702(0.383~1.287) | 0.2528 |
| Q4 | 1105 | 35 (3.17) | 0.799 (0.513~1.246) | 0.3222 | 0.912(0.514~1.619) | 0.7542 |
| Q5 | 1099 | 41 (3.73) | 0.934(0.610~1.430) | 0.7538 | $0.995(0.576 \sim 1.720)$ | 0.9853 |

\#Participants who died during the first year were excluded.
*Adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, living alone, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.


Supplementary Figure S1 The box-plot of plasma LDL-C levels in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men and women.


Supplementary Figure S2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4 -year all-cause mortality in men and women (excluding participants who died during the first year). The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, living alone, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of co丸art studies

| $\stackrel{\square}{9}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section/Topic | Item <br> \# | $\begin{array}{ll} \\ \text { Recommendation } & \text { a } \\ & \text { ¢ } \\ & \text { a } \\ \text { a }\end{array}$ | Reported on page \# |
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | 2 |
|  |  | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was $f$ | 2 |
| Introduction |  |  |  |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 3 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses | 4 |
| Methods |  |  |  |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 4 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 4,5 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe mods of follow-up | 4,5 |
|  |  | (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed | Not applicable |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Giverediagnostic criteria, if applicable | 4,5 |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurenoent). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | 4,5 |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | 4,7,8,9 |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groufीings were chosen and why | 5 |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | 5,6 |
|  |  | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | 5,6,7 |
|  |  | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | 4,5 |
|  |  | (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed | 5 |
|  |  | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | 4,7,8,9 |
| Results |  |  |  |
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| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study-eg numbers potentially eligible, examinedfor eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | 4,5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | 4,5 |
|  |  | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4 |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on eesures and potential confounders | 6 |
|  |  | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | 4 |
|  |  | (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) | 5 |
| Outcome data | 15* | Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time § | 7 |
| Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precisior $\mathrm{eg}, 95 \%$ confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included 용 | 6,7 |
|  |  | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized 部 | 5,6,7 |
|  |  | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful timeperiod | Not applicable |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses | 6,7,8,9 |
| Discussion |  | 惑 |  |
| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives | 8 |
| Limitations |  | $\stackrel{\square}{3}$ |  |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of afalyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence | 8,9,10 |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results | 8,9,10 |
| Other information |  |  |  |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based | 10,11 |

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cệ
Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published exanerples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine ${ }^{\circ}$
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## Abstract <br> Objectives

To investigate the relationship between low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) and all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese population.

## Design

Prospective cohort study.

## Setting

This study used data from the Chinese Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS).

## Participants

Middle-aged and elderly participants with complete data were enrolled for a 4-year follow-up of total mortality and plasma levels of LDL-C, including 4981 male respondents and 5529 female respondents.

## Results

During a 4 -year follow-up, there were 305 and 219 deaths in men and women, respectively. Compared with the first quintile (Q1) of LDL-C, the adjusted hazard ratios $(95 \%$ confidence intervals) were $0.818(0.531 \sim 1.260)$ for Q 2 , $0.782(0.507 \sim 1.208)$ for Q3, $0.605(0.381 \sim 0.962)$ for Q 4 and $0.803(0.506 \sim 1.274)$ for Q5 in men. The results from restricted cubic spine (RCS) showed that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels ( $84 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ) was used as the reference, a lower LDL-C concentration ( $<84 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ) was associated with a higher 4 -year all-cause mortality risk. By contrast, both quintile analysis and RCS analysis did not show a statistically significant association in women.

## Conclusions

Compared with moderately elevated LDL-C (e.g., $117-137 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ), a lower plasma level of LDL-C (e.g., $\leq 84 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ) was associated with an increased risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men. The results suggest the potential harmful effect of a quite low level of LDL-C on total mortality.

Keywords Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, all-cause mortality, CHARLS

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study used high-quality data from a nationally representative longitudinal cohort to investigate the relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese population.
- The use of restricted cubic spline provided a more comprehensive spectrum of the non-linear relation between LDL-C and all-cause mortality.
- Although the public's attention focuses on the benefit of lipid lowering, this study highlights the potential harmful effect of very low LDL-C.
- The 4-year follow-up period prevented the assessment of a long-term association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality.
- The unavailability of cause-specific mortality data prevented the analysis of the association between LDL-C and cause-specific mortality.


## Introduction

For decades, the mainstream view holds that a high level of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) is a primary cause of cardiovascular events and mortality[1]. However, many studies have found that LDL-C levels are inversely associated with all-cause mortality in diseased populations, such as patients with chronic hemodialysis[2], intracerebral hemorrhage[3] and heart failure[4]. Most importantly, in a systematic review of 19 cohort studies including 30 cohorts with 68094 elderly people ( $\geq 60$ years), an inverse association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality was seen in 16 cohorts representing $92 \%$ of all participants, and none of the other cohorts found the positive association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality[5]. Since LDL-C has been regarded as "bad cholesterol" for a long time and lipid-lowering drugs have been prescribed even at normal levels of serum cholesterol[6], the impact can be substantial. Therefore, the underlying relationship between LDL-C and all-cause mortality needs to be clarified in large prospective cohorts.

In this study, we aimed to investigate whether LDL-C levels are associated with all-cause mortality among middle-aged and elderly Chinese men and women, based on the longitudinal data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS).

## Methods

## Study design

As a nationally representative longitudinal study, CHARLS is designed to collect a wide range of information on the economic standing, physical and psychological health, demographics and social networks of a middle-aged and elderly Chinese population (aged $\geq 45$ years)[7]. The national baseline survey (wave 1 ) was conducted between June 2011 and March 2012 and included 17,708 respondents. The second wave (wave 2) was carried out in 2013-2014, the third wave (wave 3) in 2014-2015 and the fourth wave (wave 4) in 2015-2016. The detailed design of CHARLS can be referred to a previous publication[7]. This study was approved by Biomedical Ethics Review Committee of Peking University, and all participants signed informed consents.

## Study population

All participants recruited in the national baseline survey were included if they met the following criteria: 1 ) aged $\geq 45$ years, 2 ) measured plasma levels of LDL-C in wave 1,3 ) successfully followed up in at least one of the subsequent three waves, and 4) without lipid-lowering interventions. Finally, 10510 participants, including 4981 men and 5529 women, were included for subsequent analysis (Figure 1).

## Plasma LDL-C measurements and other covariates

Plasma samples were collected by medically-trained staff and then stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until assayed at Capital Medical University (CMU) laboratory. LDL-C was measured by the enzymatic colormetric test, with an analytical range of $3-400 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ and between-assay coefficient of variation of $1.20 \%$. During the testing of the CHARLS study samples, quality control (QC) samples were used daily. All test results from QC samples were within two standard deviations of mean QC control
concentrations. The other covariates collected included age, gender, smoking status, drinking status, body mass index (BMI), educational level, household income, living alone status, rural residence, activity of daily living (ADL) disability, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension (defined by a history of hypertension, or systolic blood pressure (SBP) $\geq 140 \mathrm{mmHg}$, or diastolic blood pressure (DBP) $\geq 90 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ), high blood sugar (HBS)/diabetes (defined by a history of HBS/diabetes, or fasting blood glucose $\geq 6.1 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$, or non-fasting blood glucose $\geq 7.8 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}$ ), a history of cancer, cardiovascular disease, stroke, asthma, lung disease, liver disease, digestive disease, kidney disease, arthritis, memory problem and psychological problem. Activity of daily living (ADL) covers the following items: dressing, bathing and showering, eating, getting in/out bed, using the toilet and controlling urination or defecation. Every item in the ADL scale has a four-scale answer for each question: "no difficulty", "have difficulty but can still do it", "have difficulty and need help", and "can not do it". ADL was assigned a value of 0 if the respondents had no difficulty in all these activities and 1 otherwise. Hand grip strength was measured with a dynamometer (Yuejian ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ WL-1000, Nantong, China) in kilograms ( kg ) twice on each hand. The mean score of two measures in the dominant hand was calculated to define hand grip strength in this study.

## All-cause mortality follow-up

Participants enrolled in wave 1 were followed up in subsequent three waves. In wave 2, both the interview status (dead or alive) and death time were recorded. In waves 3 and 4, only the interview status was recorded. For those who had the exact time on all-cause death in wave 2 , the survival time was defined as the interval between the interview time of wave 1 and the death time. If the exact death time was not available in waves 3 and 4, the survival time was computed as the median of the interval between wave 1 and the specific wave with death information. For those who did not die during the follow-up period, the survival time was defined as the interval between wave 1 and the last interview wave with follow-up information.

## Patient and public involvement

Anonymised participant data were used in this study. Patients and the public
were not involved in the design or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of the study.

## Statistical analysis

Data were presented as median ( $P_{25} \sim P_{75}$ ) for continuous variables and frequency (percentage) for categorical variables. Baseline characteristics between or among groups were compared by the Wilcoxon rank sum test or Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test for continuous variables and by the chi-square test for categorical variables. The Cox proportional hazard ratio model was used to estimate the hazard ratios (HRs) and $95 \%$ confidence intervals (CIs) of LDL-C quintiles. In addition, the association between all-cause mortality and LDL-C on a continuous scale was further examined using restricted cubic splines (RCS) incorporated in Cox proportional hazards models. Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) was used to determine the optimal number of knots in RCS. In this study, 3 knots were used in all RCS analyses, with knot locations at the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles of LDL-C. To be consistent with quintile analyses, the reference point was the 20th percentile of LDL-C in both men and women. All statistical analyses were performed by SAS statistical software (version 9.4, Cary, NC). All $P$ values were 2-tailed, and the significance level was set at 0.05 .

## Results

## Baseline characteristics of the study population

A total of 4981 men and 5529 women were eligible for the final analysis. The median of LDL-C levels in women was significantly higher than that in men $(P$ $<0.0001$, Supplementary Figure S1). Compared with women, men were older, had smaller BMI values and possessed greater smoking rate and drinking rate (all $P$ $<0.0001$ ). The prevalence rates of heart disease, arthritis and digestive disease in women were higher than those in men, but the prevalence rates of asthma and lung disease were lower in women (all $P<0.0001$, Table 1).

Characteristics of men and women according to the quintiles of LDL-C levels
After stratification by the quintiles of LDL-C levels, BMI, SBP, DBP and 6
hemoglobin in men were elevated with ascending quintiles as a whole (All $P<0.001$ ) (Table 2). The prevalence of HBS/diabetes was highest in the bottom quintile of LDL-C and lowest in the fourth quintile, with prevalence rates of $34.81 \%$ and $27.06 \%$ respectively. There were no statistical differences among LDL-C quintiles for many other characteristics (e.g., age, smoking, drinking, ADL disability, living alone, stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem) (All $P>0.05$ ).

In women, LDL-C quintiles were positively associated with age, BMI, SBP, DBP and hemoglobin (All $P<0.001$ ) (Table 3). The prevalence rates of HBS/diabetes and liver disease in women were significantly different among different LDL-C quintiles (All $P<0.001$ ). For the remaining variables (e.g., smoking, drinking, household income, ADL disability, educational level, rural residence, hand grip strength, stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem), no differences were observed (All $P>0.05$ ).

## Associations of LDL-C levels with all-cause mortality

In men, 305 out of 4981 participants died during a four-year follow-up. The mortality rates were declining with ascending quintiles (Table 4). Compared with the first quintile, the univariate HRs ( $95 \%$ CIs) were 0.733 ( $0.533 \sim 1.007$ ) for the second quintile; $0.639(0.458 \sim 0.892)$ for the third quintile; $0.519(0.364 \sim 0.739)$ for the fourth quintile and $0.512(0.359 \sim 0.732)$ for the fifth quintile. After adjustment for a series of potential confounders, the non-linear association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality was observed. As compared with the first quintile, the multivariable HRs ( $95 \%$ CIs) were as follows: second quintile, $0.818(0.531 \sim 1.260)$; third quintile, 0.782(0.507~1.208); fourth quintile, $0.605(0.381 \sim 0.962)$; fifth quintile, $0.803(0.506 \sim 1.274)$. In women, there were 219 deaths during a four-year follow-up. The mortality rate was highest in the first quintile. After adjustment for potential confounders, no quintile showed significant lower mortality rates compared with the first quintile (all $P>0.05$ ) (Table 4).

The quintile analysis indicated that the relationship between LDL-C with
all-cause mortality might be non-linear. Therefore, RCS was further performed to investigate the association between all-cause mortality and LDL-C on a continuous scale. The results from RCS showed that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels $(84 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL})$ was used as the reference, lower LDL-C $(<84 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL})$ was associated with higher risk of 4 -year all-cause mortality in men, and moderately higher LDL-C ( $84-135 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ) possessed lower total mortality risk, but the association was not statistically significant for much higher LDL-C concentrations ( $>135 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ) (Figure 2). The sub-group analyses by age indicated that when the 20th percentile of LDL-C levels was taken as the reference, a lower level of LDL-C was associated with a higher risk of 4 -year all-cause mortality in both middle-aged ( $45 \sim 60$ years) and elderly ( $\geq 60$ years) men (Figure 3). For women, LDL-C was not significantly associated with 4-year all-cause mortality (Figures 2 and 3).

In addition, we found that 125 out of 4981 men and 89 out of 5529 women had LDL-C $<50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$. When participants with LDL-C $<50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ were excluded, the hazard ratio of the fourth LDL-C quintile in men was changed a little with marginal statistical significance ( $P=0.0698$, Supplementary Table S1). Moreover, no interactions were found between LDL-C and potential risk factors of mortality, with the exception that the interaction between LDL-C and smoking in women was statistical significant ( $P=0.0498$, Supplementary Table S2).

## Discussion

In this study, we investigated the relationship between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality among the middle-aged and elderly Chinese population. In men, a very low level of LDL-C was associated with increased mortality risk. In women, LDL-C was not significantly associated with 4-year all-cause mortality.

Low-density lipoprotein has been well established as an important cause of cardiovascular disease (CVD) for decades[1]. Since CVD is the leading cause of mortality throughout the world, it is logically reasonable that increased LDL-C should contribute to increased CVD mortality and possibly all-cause mortality. Indeed, evidences from prospective epidemiologic studies showed a positive association
between non-HDL-C concentration and ischaemic heart disease mortality[8]. However, non-HDL-C includes both LDL-C and very low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (VLDL-C). It is surprising that the direct association of LDL-C with CVD mortality was not consistently reported among studies. Abdullah et al. (2018) demonstrated that LDL-C was independently associated with CVD mortality in a low 10-year risk cohort with long-term follow-up[9]. By contrast, Tikhonof et al. (2005) reported that the elderly subjects ( $\geq 65$ years) possessed the highest CVD mortality in the lowest LDL-C quartile[10]. Meanwhile, many other studies also found no association between LDL-C and CVD mortality[11-13]. When the results about the association of LDL-C with CVD mortality were inconsistent, it is more surprising to find that few studies have reported the positive association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality. In the study by Abdullah et al. (2018), there were already no associations or minimal positive associations between high LDL-C categories and all-cause mortality even in univariable Cox analyses[9]. Most remarkably, results of multivariable Cox analyses in this study were not provided for all-cause mortality, which could exert a substantial impact on the final association[14]. Actually, a large number of studies reported no association or even an inverse association between LDL-C and all-cause mortality, which has been summarized in a systematic review by Ravnskov et al. (2016)[5]. Therefore, very low LDL-C in populations not on lipid therapy may be associated with harm.

It should be noted that the confounding effect of statin treatment should be minimized, as this study excluded those who used lipid-lowering interventions. There was also no association between baseline LDL-C and the presence of cancer, stroke and heart disease in men and women (Tables 2 and 3). Moreover, when participants who had died during the first observation year were excluded, this relationship was not changed (Supplementary Table S3 and Figure S2). This could relieve the concern that serious diseases may lower cholesterol soon before death occurs. One of the possible reasons for the difference between men and women may be due to fewer death events in women than in men, which might result in insufficient power for the association.

Several explanations for the unfavorable effects of low LDL-C levels may be proposed. LDL-C has been suggested to play an important role in host defense against both bacterial and viral pathogens[15]. Indeed, many animal and laboratory experiments have shown that LDL could bind to and inactivate a broad range of microorganisms and their toxic products[16-18]. This hypothesis may be further supported by the recent finding that LDL-C was associated with reduced infectious mortality based on the data from 37,250 patients in the international Monitoring Dialysis Outcomes (MONDO) database[2]. In addition, it has been proposed that LDL-C may have the potential to protect against cancer as many cancer types are caused by viruses[19]. Ravnskov et al. (2012) reviewed nine cohort studies including more than 140,000 individuals followed for $10-30$ years and found that low cholesterol was associated with cancer[20]. Moreover, cholesterol-lowering experiments on rodents have led to cancer as well[21]. In agreement with these findings, individuals with familial hypercholesterolaemia have been found to possess significantly lower cancer mortality[22]. Therefore, lower LDL-C may contribute to a higher risk of death from infection and cancer, which in turn results in increased all-cause mortality.

This study demonstrated that middle-aged and elderly Chinese men with very low LDL-C had an increased risk of all-cause mortality, which calls for special attention to be paid to the possible harmful effect of a very low level of LDL-C. However, some limitations should be noted. First, the follow-up period was limited to 4 years. For a longer follow-up time, the associations between LDL-C and all-cause mortality in women might be displayed. Second, cause-specific mortality data were not available for the time being, preventing the analysis of the association between LDL-C and cause-specific mortality. Third, there are issues of multiple testing for comparisons of characteristics among LDL-C quintiles, which could result in Type I error inflation. Fourth, some of the measured co-morbidities were not specified and detailed in the database, such as lung disease, digestive disease, liver disease, kidney disease, psychological problem and memory problem. At last, well-designed, large-scale population studies are needed to formulate the specific LDL-C level(s)
threshold for mortality risk in the future.
In China, compared with moderately elevated LDL-C (e.g., $117-137 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ), a lower plasma level of LDL-C (e.g., $\leq 84 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ ) was associated with an increased risk of 4-year all-cause mortality in middle-aged and elderly men. The findings in this study may suggest the potential harmful effect of a quite low level of LDL-C. More prospective and well-designed studies are needed to validate the relationship between LDL-C and mortality.

## Acknowledgements

This analysis uses data or information from the Harmonized CHARLS dataset and Codebook, Version C as of April 2018 developed by the Gateway to Global Aging Data. The development of the Harmonized CHARLS was funded by the National Institute on Ageing (R01 AG030153, RC2 AG036619, R03 AG043052). For more information, please refer to www.g2aging.org.

## Funding

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (81703316 to C.K., 81703322 to Y.W.) and Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK20170350).

## Competing interests

None declared.

## Patient consent for publication

Obtained

## Contributors

CK and YS conceived and designed the research; LZ and CK wrote the manuscript; and YW and SY performed the data analysis. All authors contributed to the interpretations of the findings. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

## Ethics approval

CHARLS was approved by Biomedical Ethics Review Committee of Peking University, and all participants signed informed consents.

## Data sharing statement

The data used and analysed in this study are publicly available from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (http://charls.pku.edu.cn/zh-CN).

## Figure legends

Figure 1 Flowchart on the selection of eligible participants.
Figure 2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4 -year all-cause mortality in men and women, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.

Figure 3 Results from restricted cubic spline for the association between LDL-C and 4 -year all-cause mortality for middle-aged (45~60 years old) and elderly ( $\geq 60$ years old) people, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.
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Table 1 Characteristics of the study population

| Characteristics | $\begin{gathered} \text { Men } \\ (n=4981) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Women } \\ & (n=5529) \end{aligned}$ | $P$ value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age-yr | 59 (53~66) | 57 (51~65) | <0.0001 |
| BMI-kg/m ${ }^{2}$ | 22.40 (20.35~24.83) | 23.51 (21.17~26.14) | <0.0001 |
| SBP-mmHg | 127.67 (115.67~141.67) | 127.00 (114.00~143.33) | 0.3764 |
| DBP-mmHg | 75.33 (67.67~83.67) | 74.33 (67.00~82.67) | 0.0017 |
| Hand grip strength (kg) | 36.85 (30.50~43.00) | 25.00 (20.00~29.50) | <0.0001 |
| Above-average household income-no. (\%) | 2104 (49.68) | 2360 (50.32) | 0.5468 |
| Education level-no. (\%) |  |  | $<0.0001$ |
| 1 | 4287 (86.07) | 5134 (92.86) |  |
| 2 | 592 (11.89) | 347 (6.28) |  |
| 3 | 102 (2.05) | 48 (0.87) |  |
| ADL disability-no. (\%) | 716 (14.55) | 1011 (18.57) | $<0.0001$ |
| Living alone-no. (\%) | 471 (9.46) | 832 (15.05) | <0.0001 |
| Rural residence-no. (\%) | 3282 (65.89) | 3524 (63.74) | 0.0210 |
| Lifestyle-no. (\%) |  |  |  |
| Smoking ever | 3738 (75.24) | 420 (7.63) | $<0.0001$ |
| Drinking ever | 3297 (66.43) | 826 (15.01) | <0.0001 |
| Disease history-no. (\%) |  |  |  |
| Hypertension | 1904 (43.35) | 2245 (45.34) | 0.0530 |
| HBS/Diabetes | 1460 (30.16) | 1564 (29.19) | 0.2846 |
| Cancer | 40 (0.81) | 67 (1.22) | 0.0372 |
| Stroke | 133 (2.69) | 136 (2.48) | 0.4958 |
| Heart disease | 499 (10.10) | 738 (13.47) | <0.0001 |
| Lung disease | 620 (12.54) | 508 (9.26) | $<0.0001$ |
| Arthritis | 1548 (31.23) | 2243 (40.80) | <0.0001 |
| Liver disease | 197 (4.00) | 188 (3.44) | 0.1326 |
| Kidney disease | 309 (6.27) | 315 (5.75) | 0.2701 |
| Digestive disease | 1030 (20.79) | 1393 (25.37) | $<0.0001$ |
| Asthma | 283 (5.72) | 216 (3.93) | <0.0001 |
| Psychological problem | 60 (1.21) | 94 (1.72) | 0.0336 |
| Memory problem | 97 (1.96) | 86 (1.57) | 0.1238 |
| Laboratory measurements |  |  |  |
| LDL cholesterol-mg/dL | 109.41 (88.92~131.06) | 117.91 (96.26~141.50) | $<0.0001$ |
| Triglyceride-mg/dL | 96.46 (69.03~145.14) | 110.63 (79.65~159.30) | $<0.0001$ |
| HDL cholesterol-mg/dL | 48.71 (39.43~59.54) | 50.64 (41.75~60.31) | $<0.0001$ |
| Hemoglobin-(g/dL) | 15.10 (14.00~16.20) | 13.60 (12.50~14.60) | $<0.0001$ |

ADL, activity of daily living; BMI, body mass index; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HBS, high blood sugar.
Educational level: 1, Less than lower secondary education; 2, Upper secondary \& vocational training; 3, Tertiary education.

Table 2 Baseline characteristics of participants by quintiles of LDL-C in men

| 6 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
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${ }^{59} \mathrm{HDL}$ cholesterol-mg/dL

| Quintile 1 | Quintile 2 | Quintile 3 | Quintile 4 | Quintile 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $(n=991)$ | $(n=1008)$ | $(n=991)$ | $(n=1004)$ | $(n=987)$ | $P$ value |


| $(\leq 83.89 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL})$ | $(83.89 \sim 101.68)$ | $(101.68 \sim 117.14)$ | $(117.14 \sim 136.86)$ | $(>136.86)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $59(52 \sim 66)$ | $59(53 \sim 67)$ | $59(52 \sim 66)$ | $59(53 \sim 67)$ | $59(53 \sim 65)$ | 0.5405 |


| $59(52 \sim 66)$ | $59(53 \sim 67)$ | $59(52 \sim 66)$ | $59(53 \sim 67)$ | $59(53 \sim 65)$ | 0.5405 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.57 | 22.18 | 22.36 | 22.64 | 23.27 | $<0.0001$ |
| $(19.78 \sim 24.21)$ | $(20.31 \sim 24.40)$ | $(20.44 \sim 24.61)$ | $(20.65 \sim 25.07)$ | $(20.95 \sim 25.68)$ |  |
| 126.00 | 126.00 | 127.00 | 128.00 | 130.67 | 0.0002 |
| $(114.00 \sim 140.00)$ | $(115.33 \sim 139.67)$ | $(114.67 \sim 142.33)$ | $(115.67 \sim 142.50)$ | $(118.00 \sim 144.00)$ |  |
| 75.00 | 74.33 | 74.67 | 75.33 | 76.67 | 0.0002 |
| $(66.67 \sim 83.33)$ | $(66.67 \sim 82.00)$ | $(67.33 \sim 83.33)$ | $(67.67 \sim 83.67)$ | $(69.33 \sim 85.33)$ |  |
| 35.93 | 36.00 | 36.93 | 37.50 | 37.50 | 0.0132 |
| $(30.00 \sim 42.50)$ | $(30.00 \sim 42.60)$ | $(30.00 \sim 43.00)$ | $(31.50 \sim 43.75)$ | $(31.50 \sim 42.90)$ |  |
| $402(48.43)$ | $413(47.91)$ | $407(48.05)$ | $430(49.20)$ | $452(54.99)$ | 0.0186 |

0.0035

843 (85.41)
125 (12.66)
19 (1.93)
115 (11.81) 0.0590
79 (8.00) 0.1264
623 (63.12) 0.0216

| $719(72.92)$ | 0.3788 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $652(66.13)$ | 0.9890 |


| $414(47.81)$ | 0.0092 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $314(32.78)$ | 0.0003 |
| $9(0.92)$ | 0.2728 |
| $28(2.85)$ | 0.5818 |
| $99(10.10)$ | 0.4453 |
| $128(13.09)$ | 0.3170 |
| $324(33.03)$ | 0.1233 |
| $31(3.18)$ | 0.1855 |
| $64(6.56)$ | 0.5518 |
| $178(18.14)$ | 0.1264 |
| $66(6.72)$ | 0.0754 |
| $8(0.82)$ | 0.6092 |
| $19(1.94)$ | 0.3810 |


| 96.46 | 88.50 | 92.93 | 97.35 | 108.86 | $<0.0001$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(65.49 \sim 177.88)$ | $(64.61 \sim 129.21)$ | $(69.03 \sim 138.95)$ | $(72.57 \sim 136.29)$ | $(79.65 \sim 152.22)$ |  |
| 47.55 | 49.48 | 47.93 | 49.10 | 48.71 | 0.0061 |


| 3 | $(35.95 \sim 59.92)$ | $(39.43 \sim 60.70)$ | $(39.43 \sim 58.76)$ | $(39.82 \sim 59.54)$ | $(41.37 \sim 58.76)$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  | 14.80 | 14.90 | 15.00 | 15.10 | 15.40 | $<0.0001$ |
| 5 | Hemoglobin-(g/dL) | $(13.60 \sim 16.00)$ | $(13.80 \sim 16.10)$ | $(14.00 \sim 16.20)$ | $(14.00 \sim 16.30)$ | $(14.30 \sim 16.50)$ |  |
| 6 |  | 71.91 | 93.56 | 109.41 | 126.42 | 153.87 | $<0.0001$ |
| 7 |  | $(61.47 \sim 78.09)$ | $(88.92 \sim 97.81)$ | $(105.54 \sim 113.27)$ | $(121.39 \sim 131.44)$ | $(144.20 \sim 170.49)$ |  |

Table 3 Baseline characteristics of participants by quintiles of LDL-C in women


| $\begin{array}{ll}3 & \text { Digestive disease }\end{array}$ | 279 (25.20) | 267 (24.45) | 269 (24.70) | 299 (27.13) | 279 (25.34) | 0.6323 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 Asthma | 43 (3.89) | 43 (3.94) | 44 (4.03) | 39 (3.54) | 47 (4.26) | 0.9384 |
| 6 Psychological problem | 16 (1.45) | 19 (1.74) | 23 (2.12) | 17 (1.54) | 19 (1.73) | 0.7943 |
| $7 \quad$ Memory problem 8 Laboratory measurements | 18 (1.63) | 19 (1.74) | 11 (1.01) | 15 (1.36) | 23 (2.09) | 0.3245 |
| 10 <br> 11 Triglyceride-mg/dL | $\begin{gathered} 110.63 \\ (73.46 \sim 192.93) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 103.54 \\ (74.34 \sim 153.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107.97 \\ (77.88 \sim 152.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110.63 \\ (82.31 \sim 151.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125.23 \\ (92.93 \sim 162.84) \end{gathered}$ | $<0.0001$ |
| ${ }^{13} \mathrm{HDL}$ cholesterol-mg/dL 14 | $\begin{gathered} 46.39 \\ (35.57 \sim 57.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50.64 \\ (40.98 \sim 60.70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.42 \\ (42.53 \sim 60.70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.80 \\ (43.69 \sim 61.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.80 \\ (44.46 \sim 60.31) \end{gathered}$ | $<0.0001$ |
| 15 16 17 Hemoglobin-(g/dL) | $\begin{gathered} 13.20 \\ (12.10 \sim 14.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.30 \\ (12.30 \sim 14.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.60 \\ (12.60 \sim 14.70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.70 \\ (12.80 \sim 14.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.80 \\ (12.80 \sim 14.80) \end{gathered}$ | $<0.0001$ |
| ${ }_{19}^{18}$ LDL cholesterol-mg/dL | $\begin{gathered} 78.48 \\ (68.04 \sim 85.83) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100.90 \\ (96.26 \sim 105.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 117.91 \\ (113.66 \sim 121.78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135.70 \\ (130.28 \sim 141.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 165.08 \\ (155.03 \sim 179.00) \end{gathered}$ | <0.0001 |

Table 4 Associations between all-cause mortality and LDL-C

|  | Total | Deaths <br> (\%) | Unadjusted |  | Adjusted* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 991 | 88(8.88) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1008 | 67(6.65) | 0.733(0.533~1.007) | 0.0554 | $0.818(0.531 \sim 1.260)$ | 0.3619 |
| Q3 | 991 | 57(5.75) | $0.639(0.458 \sim 0.892)$ | 0.0084 | 0.782(0.507~1.208) | 0.2677 |
| Q4 | 1004 | 47(4.68) | $0.519(0.364 \sim 0.739)$ | 0.0003 | 0.605(0.381~0.962) | 0.0335 |
| Q5 | 987 | 46(4.66) | 0.512(0.359~0.732) | 0.0002 | 0.803(0.506~1.274) | 0.3520 |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1114 | 52(4.67) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1102 | 49(4.45) | 0.960(0.650~1.419) | 0.8394 | $1.245(0.749 \sim 2.071)$ | 0.3985 |
| Q3 | 1096 | 29(2.65) | $0.565(0.359 \sim 0.890)$ | 0.0138 | 0.626(0.345~1.136) | 0.1233 |
| Q4 | 1111 | 41(3.69) | 0.792(0.526~1.192) | 0.2632 | 0.852(0.489~1.483) | 0.5704 |
| Q5 | 1106 | 48(4.34) | 0.926(0.625~1.371) | 0.7007 | $0.958(0.563 \sim 1.630)$ | 0.8736 |

*Adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.


Figure 1 Flowchart on the selection of eligible participants.
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Figure 2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality in men and women, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.
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Figure 3 Results from restricted cubic spline for the association between LDL-C and 4-year all-cause mortality for middle-aged ( $45 \sim 60$ years old) and elderly ( $\geq 60$ years old) people, respectively. The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, marital status, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.
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Supplementary Table S1 Associations between all-cause mortality and LDL-C\#

|  | Total | Deaths <br> (\%) | Unadjusted |  | Adjusted* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 866 | 75 (8.66) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1008 | 67(6.65) | $0.750(0.539 \sim 1.042)$ | 0.0865 | 0.863(0.551~1.351) | 0.5180 |
| Q3 | 991 | 57(5.75) | 0.653(0.463~0.922) | 0.0155 | 0.833(0.531~1.307) | 0.4261 |
| Q4 | 1004 | 47(4.68) | $0.531(0.368 \sim 0.764)$ | 0.0007 | 0.643(0.399~1.036) | 0.0698 |
| Q5 | 987 | 46(4.66) | 0.524(0.363~0.756) | 0.0006 | 0.861(0.533~1.390) | 0.5406 |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1025 | 46 (4.49) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1102 | 49(4.45) | 0.998(0.667~1.492) | 0.9920 | 1.231(0.735~2.062) | 0.4290 |
| Q3 | 1096 | 29(2.65) | 0.587(0.369~0.935) | 0.0248 | 0.619(0.340~1.127) | 0.1167 |
| Q4 | 1111 | 41(3.69) | 0.822(0.540~1.253) | 0.3628 | 0.840(0.480~1.472) | 0.5430 |
| Q5 | 1106 | 48(4.34) | 0.962(0.642~1.441) | 0.8511 | 0.939(0.548~1.609) | 0.8180 |

"Participants with LDL-C $<50 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL}$ were excluded.
*Adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, living alone, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.

Supplementary Table S2 Analyses of interactions between LDL-C and potential risk
factors

| ID | Interaction term | $P$ value in men | $P$ value in women |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LDL-C*age | 0.7323 | 0.0931 |
| 2 | LDL-C*obesity (BMI $\geqslant 28)$ | 0.4033 | 0.4825 |
| 3 | LDL-C*rural residence | 0.1426 | 0.8102 |
| 4 | LDL-C*ADL disability | 0.4108 | 0.5052 |
| 5 | LDL-C*smoking | 0.6150 | 0.0498 |
| 6 | LDL-C*drinking | 0.8680 | 0.4018 |
| 7 | LDL-C*hypertension | 0.7685 | 0.8919 |
| 8 | LDL-C*diabetes | 0.7151 | 0.1260 |
| 9 | LDL-C*heart disease | 0.8480 | 0.9988 |
| 10 | LDL-C*stroke | 0.1101 | 0.3961 |
| 11 | LDL-C* cancer | 0.6451 | 0.6695 |
| 12 | LDL-C*lung disease | 0.6657 | 0.4847 |
| 13 | LDL-C*memory disease | 0.6225 | 0.4887 |
| 14 | LDL-C*kidney disease | 0.1251 | 0.1876 |
| 15 | LDL-C*arthritis | 0.4297 | 0.1671 |
| 16 | LDL-C*asthma | 0.4187 | 0.4779 |
| 17 | LDL-C*liver disease | 0.6929 | 0.7013 |
| 18 | LDL-C*digestive disease | 0.1048 | 0.4019 |
| 19 | LDL-C*psychological disease | 0.4605 | 0.3731 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |

Supplementary Table S3 Associations between all-cause mortality and LDL-C ${ }^{\#}$

|  | Total | Deaths <br> (\%) | Unadjusted |  | Adjusted* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value | HR (95\%CI) | $P$ value |
| Men |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 972 | 69 (7.10) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 999 | 58 (5.81) | 0.806(0.568~1.142) | 0.2251 | 0.921(0.582~1.457) | 0.7236 |
| Q3 | 979 | 45 (4.60) | 0.642(0.441~0.934) | 0.0205 | 0.762(0.472~1.231) | 0.2668 |
| Q4 | 992 | $35 \text { (3.53) }$ | 0.491(0.327~0.737) | 0.0006 | 0.566(0.337~0.951) | 0.0315 |
| Q5 | 982 | 41 (4.18) | 0.579(0.394~0.853) | 0.0056 | 0.841(0.510~1.386) | 0.4970 |
| Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1106 | 44 (3.98) | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Q2 | 1094 | 41 (3.75) | 0.951(0.622~1.456) | 0.8177 | 1.171(0.683~2.005) | 0.5660 |
| Q3 | 1094 | 27 (2.47) | 0.622(0.385~1.005) | 0.0523 | 0.648(0.350~1.198) | 0.1664 |
| Q4 | 1105 | 35 (3.17) | 0.799(0.513~1.246) | 0.3222 | 0.815(0.454~1.462) | 0.4924 |
| Q5 | 1099 | 41 (3.73) | 0.934(0.610~1.430) | 0.7538 | 0.910(0.519~1.596) | 0.7424 |

"Participants who died during the first year were excluded.
*Adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, living alone, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.


Supplementary Figure S1 The box-plot of plasma LDL-C levels in middle-aged and elderly Chinese men and women.


Supplementary Figure S2 Results from restricted cubic splines for the association between LDL-C and 4 -year all-cause mortality in men and women (excluding participants who died during the first year). The multivariable models were adjusted for age, smoking, drinking, BMI, living alone, household income, educational level, rural residence, ADL disability, hand grip strength, HDL-C, triglyceride, hemoglobin, hypertension, HBS/diabetes, history of stroke, cancer, heart disease, lung disease, liver disease, kidney disease, digestive disease, asthma, arthritis, psychological problem and memory problem.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cołort studies
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| Section/Topic | Item <br> \# | $\begin{array}{ll} \\ \text { Recommendation } & \text { oे } \\ & \text { os } \\ \\ \text { a }\end{array}$ | Reported on page \# |
| Title and abstract | 1 | (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract | 2 |
|  |  | (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was und | 2 |
| Introduction |  |  |  |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported | 3 |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses | 4 |
| Methods |  |  |  |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper | 4 |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection | 4,5 |
| Participants | 6 | (a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe mods of follow-up 융 | 4,5 |
|  |  | (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed | Not applicable |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Givererediagnostic criteria, if applicable | 4,5 |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurenient). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group | 4,5 |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias | 4,7,8,9 |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at No | 4 |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groufing were chosen and why | 5 |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding | 5,6 |
|  |  | (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions | 5,6,7 |
|  |  | (c) Explain how missing data were addressed | 4,5 |
|  |  | (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed | 5 |
|  |  | (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses | 4,7,8,9 |
|   <br> Results  <br>  0 |  |  |  |
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| Participants | 13* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study-eg numbers potentially eligible, examine\&्\&for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed | 4,5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage | 4,5 |
|  |  | (c) Consider use of a flow diagram ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4 |
| Descriptive data | 14* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on er pores and potial confounders | 6 |
|  |  | (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest | 4 |
|  |  | (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) | 5 |
| Outcome data | 15* | Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time | 7 |
| Main results | 16 | (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision eg, $95 \%$ confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included | 6,7 |
|  |  | (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized $\overrightarrow{\text { a }}$ | 5,6,7 |
|  |  | (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful timeaperiod | Not applicable |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses | 6,7,8,9 |
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| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives | 8 |
| Limitations |  | $3$ |  |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of åalalyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence | 8,9,10 |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results | 8,9,10 |
| Other information |  |  |  |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based | 11 |
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