

Re: "Statins caused my kidney failure"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.cardiology/2004-07/0916.html>

From: Bill (*xxx_at_yy.zz*)

Date: 07/22/04

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 2004 05:13:03 GMT

"Sharon Hope" <shope@anet.net> wrote in message
news:78FLc.159611\$XM6.122427@attbi_s53...

>

> "Bill" <xxx@yy.zz> wrote in message

> news:x3lLc.2616\$4L7.2330@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...

>>

>> "Sharon Hope" <shope@anet.net> wrote in message

>> news:fKkLc.132401\$JR4.83874@attbi_s54...

>>>

>>> "Bill" <xxx@yy.zz> wrote in message

>>> news:DYpKc.2084\$R05.1952@newssvr15.news.prodigy.com...

>>>>

>>>> "Owen Lowe" <noemails@please.com> wrote in message

>>>> news:noemails-4FD736.23393317072004@corp.supernews.com...

>>>>> In article <qzkKc.2168\$4L7.1160@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>,

>>>>> "Bill" <xxx@yy.zz> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>>> You are deliberately misreading what the words say. It means

> out

>>> of a

>>>>>>> population of 1000 people 18 lives will be saved by those

> taking

>>> Zocor

>>>>>> over

>>>>>>> the 5 year period. Do you agree or disagree with this?

>>>>>

>>>>>> <SNIPing is GOOD>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Again, does or does not the sentence below mean that in tested

>>> population

>>>> had

>>>>>>> a reduced risk of death over the 5 year period while taking Zocor?

> If

>>> not,

>>>>>>> what does it mean to you.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> "Results showed that the participants who took Zocor decreased

> *their*
>>> *odds*
>>>>> *of overall mortality by 1.8% in the next five years, compared to*
>>> *those*
>>>> *who*
>>>>> *were untreated (placebo group)"*
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> *I think it's a convoluted sentence... It's not directly saying that*
> *it*
>>>>> *reduced deaths of the group by 1.8%, it's saying it reduced the odds*
> *of*
>>>>> *dying by 1.8%. Then you need to look at... What were the*
> *participants'*
>>>>> *odds of dying within 5 years without the Zocor treatment? If it was*
> *high*
>>>>> *risk, say 20% (just picking a number out of thin air), then after*
> *the 5*
>>>>> *years of Zocor was the risk then 19.64%? Or does it mean it was down*
> *to*
>>>>> *18.2%?*
>>>>>
>>>>> *Working through the numbers: If you have your group of 1000, all at*
> *the*
>>>>> *same 20% high risk, by the odds, untreated, 200 would likely die*
> *within*
>>>>> *5 years. According to the statement, after the Zocor treatment the*
>>>>> *overall risk is lowered by 1.8% to either 19.64% or 18.2%. Therefore*
>>>>> *you'd expect either 196 or 182 to die during the 5 years. Of your*
>>>>> *original 1000, either 4 or 18 would not die who had been expected*
> *to --*
>>>>> *by appearances the med "saved" either .4% or 1.8% of all*
> *participants.*
>>>>> *(This still means that 182 or 196 taking Zocor died regardless of the*
>>>>> *treatment.)*
>>>>>
>>>>> *The question then to ask is whether it's cost effective, not only*
>>>>> *financially but side-effect-wise to medicate 1000 to save 18 - or*
> *less,*
>>>>> *4. It would appear to me, given the percentage of patients who*
>>>>> *experience negative side-effects (roughly 5% according to some*
> *reports*
>>>>> *and Dr. Chung) that 3 times, or more, the number of patients are*
>>>>> *detrimentally affected than are helped.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *(I attempted to find where the statement entered into the thread to*
> *read*
>>>>> *the original context but wasn't successful.)*
>>>>>
>>>>> *Yes I agree we don't know the precise numbers because we do not have*
> *the*

> > > > *original article, but it does clearly say that less people in the*
> *Zocor*
> > > *group*
> > > > *died than in the placebo group – which is the only point I am trying*
> *to*
> > > *make.*
> > > > *<snip>*
> > >
> > > *Careful. You have not addressed the "unrelated" category of deaths.*
> > >
> >
> > *For about the 10th time the quote said:*
> >
> > *"Results showed that the participants who took Zocor decreased their odds*
> > *of overall mortality by 1.8% in the next five years, compared to those*
> > *who were untreated (placebo group)"*
> >
> >
> > *And I think "overall mortality" kinda means "overall mortality".*
> >
> > *Bill*
>
> *I think you kinda want it to mean that.*
>
> *Are you saying that if a person drops out of the study due to being hit by*
> *lightning and killed instantly, that would help the statistics of the group,*
> *placebo or statin, from which he came? That would further weaken the 1.8%*
> *odds (as described so excellently in the post we are following).*
>
> *You need to check the full story to see if the authors kinda meant that or*
> *if you are kinda jumping to conclusions.*
>

You should go back and read the original article. Cardiac deaths are discussed separately. Yes, I think it is reasonable to assume the words mean what they say. And it is unreasonable for you to assume that the words mean differently than what they say. In other words in your view, "overall mortality" does not mean "overall mortality" Is that correct?

I would think also the burden of proof is on you.

Bill