

## Re: Exercise and raising HDL

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.cardiology/2004-07/1282.html>

---

**From:** Zee (zwalanga\_at\_yahoo.com)

**Date:** 07/29/04

Date: 29 Jul 2004 16:12:42 -0700

"GeorgeW" <look@signature\_to.reply> wrote in message  
news:<K2aOc.2067\$cK.1464@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...  
> "Zee" <zwalanga@yahoo.com> wrote in message  
> news:e5f4a9c2.0407290831.7e0a611@posting.google.com...  
> > "GeorgeW" <look@signature\_to.reply> wrote in message  
> news:<U%0Oc.1868\$9Y6.1842@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...  
>  
> <snip>  
>  
> > "It may be that my numbers don't apply to many people...."  
> >  
> > My numbers don't apply either. I don't know who this mythical person  
> > is the guidelines (developed by physicians in the pay of pharmas) have  
> > in mind.  
>  
> > How do you know that your numbers don't apply?

Well they just don't match up with any 'theory' I've read.

>  
> For example, is you LDL higher than the "standard"?

Very much so.

If so, do you question  
> the applicability of the standard for a specific reason like, for example,  
> your TC is high also?

Yes my tc is very high also. And yes, the standard does not seem to work for me. I have very high tc very high ldl, very low tris, normal to high hdl, normal to low blood pressure and no heart disease. I'm 62. I've had this honker of a cholesterol level all my life. In Canadian numbers from a low of 9.4 (currently) to a high of 14.

Things seem to be different for women, and for people who don't have Mets syndrome.

Another confounding thing is that owing to statin injury and not complete recovery approaching the Aug 8 'anniversary' of Baycol recall in 2001, I am in terrible physical shape. I can't get into my size 8 speedo suit which I was wearing for a very intensive triathlete training program then 1997–1999. But conversely or perversely, my total and ldl are lower now than then when I was running in the gym and swimming daily. Very hard. Not a plateau program but a pushing program based on an Everest summiteers training program.

But back to the numbers: you know I should be dead if one hears my numbers. I am not touting anything just totally puzzled. I realize of course I could have a heart attack or stroke tomorrow. But I had nuclear imaging and stress tests in April. I'm fine.

I really don't know about the balance but I have noticed my hdl drops when my total drops. I think. Don't have my test results handy to compare. Maybe others can comment about how the various numbers affect each other.

Oh and the other way I don't seem to conform is I seem to work better on a very high carb diet, with most of the protein from plant sources. But I do still eat some meat. In fact I was told that was good for one who does not take any cholesterol lowering meds but wants to lower cholesterol: apparently a very high complex carb diet binds to the cholesterol.

I don't use any supplements. Coenzyme q10 didn't seem to do anything for me. Nor did B complex and folate. Maybe I didn't use them long enough I don't know, because many here say folate for example lowers homocysteine. Didn't for me. It's stuck at 11–12.

Zee

- >
- > *This is what I've been wondering about in my case. When one's TC is very*
- > *low (or very high), does that imply a lower ideal HDL than the "standard"?*
- > *It seems logical that it would because  $TC = HDL + LDL + Trig/5$ . I asked a*
- > *cardiologist this question and he said the standard recommendation for HDL*
- > *still applies. I also posted the question here on SMC a month ago and got*
- > *no answer.*
- >
- > *Intuitively I would say that the ratios of HDL and LDL to TC may be more*
- > *important than their absolute values.*