

Re: Statins and side effects.....

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.med.cardiology/2006-02/msg00260.html>

- *From:* Larry <larry@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 09 Feb 2006 16:22:19 -0500
-

Bill wrote:

"Larry" <larry@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:7INGf.25\\$7t.23@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:7INGf.25$7t.23@xxxxxxxxxx)

Hawki63@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

"Larry" <larry@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:EHGf.2\\$u%2.0@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:EHGf.2$u%2.0@xxxxxxxxxx)

Sharon Hope wrote:

<Hawki63@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
[news:N5Eef.52243\\$PL5.36483@xx](mailto:news:N5Eef.52243$PL5.36483@xx)

You
said:

"For
the
record,
the
disabling
and
debilitating
serious
adverse

Re: Statins and side effects.....

effects
of
statins
can
take
far
longer
to
recover
from,
and
can
do

more

damage
than,some
heart
attacks."

except the
heart
attacks that
kill you

then you no
longer have
to worry
about side
effects

One more time, inability of
a patient to tolerate a statin
does NOT automatically
mean that patient will suffer
a heart attack.

It is not binary – statin or
heart attack.

It is well documented that

Re: Statins and side effects.....

statins make a miniscule difference in absolute risk of a heart attack.

Unfortunately, the public is encouraged to think that heart attack is now simply an automatic and certain "punishment" for anyone not taking statins – whether they suffer disabling adverse effects or not.

Certainly as a health professional you know that is not the reality.

That's right, Sharon. And using the same logic ... just because someone is on a statin does NOT automatically mean that they are going to have adverse effects.

Larry

thank you....it surely read as if it was "statins OR heart attack".....thus tempting the side effects of a statin could result in "disabling adverse effects worse than a heart attack" ..

my comment...the heart attack could kill you...was totally lost in the translation

as a healthcare professional...and one who can prescribe..and one who has personally and family have taken a slew of script drugs for this thing and that...my first question is "why would anyone continue with a med after its use causes devastating side effects REGARDLESS of what the doc may have said..."

in my experience...give someone a NEW med...if in a month or so..that patient experiences new and devastating adverse effects...MOST folks will discontinue said med ON their own...then come in and demand an alternative etc...

Re: Statins and side effects.....

my own hubby...after his his MI was first given Lipitor (his lipids were sky high...AND he had had a life threatening event).....within a month his muscles ached etc....well golleee...we both looked at what was new...the Lipitor...he stopped taking them post haste...THEN on next visit he told cardiologist... "No more Lipitor"duh...his lipids of course were back to sky high pre MI level...doc said "OKI...let's try Pravachol"golleee...NO adverse effects...lipids came back down...and 4 years later...continues that way

I on the other hand...started with Pravachol...NO adverse effects...also NO change in lipids.s..I stopped the med on my own after a year...why "risk" any side effects.....

now I take Lipitor..NO side effects...lipids have dropped by half..

my point.....MOST if not many patients WILL stop taking any med that gives them appreciable side effects....REGARDLESS of whether the health care provider says "cannot be drug X"...with an N of 1...it is easy to sit back and see if said adverse effects disappear....and extrapolate that it was indeed drug X...

health care professionals may write the scripts...but they are surely not in your home each day forcing you to take whatever med...

stopping a drug like a statin when "new" symptoms appear...IS the approach most patients take...

my h.o.

To you and Bill: To be honest, I can almost see Sharon's side of the story on this particular issue. We all tend to think that our doctors are well-trained and out for our best interests. It really takes a lot for a lay-person to call a doctor's advice and recommendations into question ... regardless of how bad the side effects are. If he/she says this is something you need and/or something that will help me, I know I tend to "grit my teeth", "suck in my gut", and "take my medicine". Going for 4 years? That I don't know about. I probably would have at least gone for a 2nd, 3rd, 4th opinion ... and to a major medical center at that. Perhaps she and her husband did so. And it isn't always obvious that whatever symptoms you are experiencing at the time are side effects from a drug or some new ailment. Sometimes the doctors will tell you you're a hypochondriac. Sometimes you only realize this kind of thing by looking back retrospectively at the sum of all the events.

What I am saying is there is nothing about Sharon's claims or methods that I approve of. I still think no matter what her husband's experience has been, it

Re: Statins and side effects.....

is in a very small minority of cases and she has done a poor job of substantiating anything more than that. But you can't fault her husband for doing what he was told and following doctor's orders.

Larry E.

I disagree also. But that's not my point. I can also understand someone having serious guilt after the fact. In order to resolve this one might change their perception of reality as a defense mechanism and then continue this.

For example, studies have been done on people who have waited on long lines to see a movie and people who did not wait on line at all to see the same movie. Both groups were asked how they rated the film. You would think that the people who did not wait would rate the movie higher because they had a better experience. The opposite was true. Why? The people who waited on long lines could not change their perception that they had waited for a long time. So they changed their perception of the movie to justify their actions in their minds.

Bill

Bill .. on this I completely agree with you. Sharon has a severely distorted view of reality, and seems to feel justified in misleading the public by presenting material that APPEARS to support her position but actually doesn't because either she takes things out of context, omits certain facts, or draws a foregone conclusion by implication from a study or abstract. She seems to think that her terrible experience (which I don't want to take anything away from) justifies this.

I don't know exactly what she and her husband went through and neither do you. Therefore, I tend to give her the benefit of the doubt in that particular area. You may not realize how easy it is to place yourself in the hands of a medical professional and how difficult it is to have the skill, knowledge, confidence, and chutzpah to be able to question the medical professional ... with no medical background or limited knowledge. It can also be very intimidating.

In the end, you are right ... we must all take our medical care into our own hands ... and we must all realize that we are the final arbiter and that we must make all final decisions. We have to use medical professionals as consultants. But this is easier said than done.

Larry E.

.