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#### Abstract

: Background : Lipoprotein(a) [Lp(a)] is identical to low-density lipoprotein(LDL) except for the addition of apolipoprotein A (apoA), which is highly glycosylated ${ }^{1} \operatorname{Thus,~Lp(a)~may~play~an~important~role~in~the~transition~fromatherosclerosis~to~}$ thrombosis, because it activates monocyte adhesion and migration of macrophage foam cells intothe arterial wall. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is often considered a marker ofthrombosis


Aims: To studyLipoprotein (a) as a marker for cardio vascular disease and target for emerging therapies
Objective: To study variation in Plasma Lp(a) levelsin patients with CHD.and association between Plasma Lp(a) levels and risk for CHD)
Results: The mean Total Cholesterol, HDL, LDL, VLDL and Triglycerides were 243.0 $\pm 91.3$, $59.5 \pm 17.6,155.0 \pm 20.9$, $47.8 \pm 9.7$ and $298.3 \pm 55.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, respectively. The mean serum Fibrinogen, Homocysteine, $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ and Uric acid levels of the patients were $625.9 \pm 82.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}, 65.0 \pm 19.7 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}, 6.7 \pm 1.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ and $10.2 \pm 2.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, respectively.
Conclusion: $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is a marker of particular risk for poor outcomes in terms of severity and progression of CVD

## INTRODUCTION:

Lipoprotein(a) [Lp(a)] is identical to low-density lipoprotein(LDL) except for the addition of apolipoprotein A (apoA), which is highly glycosylated. There is a striking homologybetween the amino acid sequences of apoA and plasminogen, which is recognized to be a cardiovascular risk factor. ${ }^{1}$ Thus, Lp(a) may play an important role in the transition fromatherosclerosis to thrombosis, because it activates monocyte adhesion and migration of macrophage foam cells intothe arterial wall. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is often considered a marker ofthrombosis. ${ }^{3}$ Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a major cause of deathin patients with peripheral arterial disease (PAD). Thesepatients also tend to suffer from complications whenthey have diabetes, dyslipidemia and hypertension. Theymay also develop severe systemic atherosclerosis, leading to increased mortality due to coronary artery disease(CAD).High $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is positively associated with coronary arterycalcification, CAD and PAD. ${ }^{4,5}$ It also promotes thrombosis by binding to fibrin, thus blocking the fibrinolytic action ofplasmin. ${ }^{2}$ Strong evidence in epidemiological, genetic, and prospective cohort studies verified that circulating $\operatorname{Lp}(a)$ levels were associated with the presence of cardiovascular disease (CVD) ${ }^{6-8}$. In the Atherothrombosis Intervention in Metabolic Syndrome with Low HDL/High Triglycerides: Impact on Global Health Outcomes (AIM-HIGH) study, Lp(a) was also associated with increased cardiovascular event (CVE) risk in patients with established CVD and remains predictive for CVE risk at LDL cholesterol (LDL-C) levels, $1.8 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}^{9} . \mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ may be a predictor of
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peripheral and centralCVD in younger men and women with dyslipidemia.Several observations suggest that targeting $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ coulddecrease total residual cardiovascular risk, as increased plasma $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ concentrations are significantly associated with higher risk of CAD. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is a marker of particular risk for poor outcomes interms of severity and progression of CVD. Several prospective studies have correlated $\operatorname{Lp}(a)$ levels with vasculardisease in general, and plasma $L p(a)>30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ with increased cardiovascular risk. ${ }^{4}$

## AIM \& OBJECTIVES:

Aim: To studyLipoprotein (a) as a marker for cardio vascular disease and target for emerging therapies

## Objective:

1. To study variation in Plasma $\operatorname{Lp}(a)$ levelsin patients with CHD
2. To study association between Plasma $\operatorname{Lp}(a)$ levels and risk for CHD.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS:

Study design:Analytical cross sectional
Study population:Patients diagnosed with Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) attending
Study period:2 years
Sample size:Considering prevalence of CAD as $10 \%{ }^{11}$, the calculated sample at $99 \%$ confidence level is 139 which is rounded off to 150 .

Ethical clearance: The study will be initiated after approval of Institutional Ethical committee.
Selection criteria:Patients diagnosed with Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) attending noor hospital will be subjected to the following inclusion and exclusion criteria.

## Inclusion criteria:

1. Patients diagnosed with Coronary Artery Disease (CAD) attending NOOR HOSPITAL
2. Patients of age 18 years or above of either gender.
3. Patients willing to give written informed consent to participate in the study.

## Exclusion criteria:

1. Patients not willing to participate in the study.

Patients who will satisfy the above inclusion and exclusion criteria will be included in the study. Written informed consent will be taken in all patients.

## Study procedure:

After taking consent, patient's demographic data will be collected. Data regarding the following variables will be collected:

1. Patients' sociodemographic characteristics will be collected based on their clinical records.
2. Their clinical,anthropometric, biochemical and cardiovascular characteristics will also be analyzed and recorded.
3. Cardiovascular risk will be calculated based on the Framingham risk score(FRS)
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## RESULTS:

Hundred and fifty patients were included in the study.

| Table no. 1. Distribution of patients with respect to Gender |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
| Male | 83 | 55.3 |
| Female | 67 | 44.7 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

Figure no. 1. Distribution of patients with respect to Gender


- Male - Female

Of these, 83 (55.3) were males, while $67(44.7 \%)$ were females.

| Table no. 2. Distribution of patients with respect to Comorbidities |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Frequency | Percent |
| Hypertension | 58 | 31.7 |
| Diabetes | 60 | 32.8 |
| Obesity | 2 | 1.1 |
| Hypothyroid | 29 | 15.8 |
| Obesity | 34 | 18.6 |
| Total | 183 | 100 |

The common Comorbidities of the patients were Diabetes (60, 32.8\%), Hypertension (58, 31.7\%), Obesity (34, $18.6 \%$ ) and hypothyroidism ( $29,15.8 \%$ ).
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| Table no. 3. Distribution of patients with respect to ExSmoker Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ExSmoker Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 120 | 80.0 |
| Yes | 30 | 20.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

30 patients (20\%) were Exsmokers.

| Table no. 4. Distribution of patients with respect to Never-Smoker Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Never-Smoker Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 49 | 32.7 |
| Yes | 101 | 67.3 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

101 (67.3\%) patients had history of Never-smoker status.

| Table no. 5. Distribution of patients with respect to Current-Smoker Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Current-Smoker Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 130 | 86.7 |
| Yes | 20 | 13.3 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

20 (13.3\%) were current smokers.

| Table no. 6. Distribution of patients with respect to Never drinking Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Never drinking Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 49 | 32.7 |
| Yes | 101 | 67.3 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |
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Figure no. 6. Distribution of patients with respect to Never drinking Status


- No - Yes

101 (67.3\%) patients had history of Never drinking status.

| Table no. 7. Distribution of patients with respect to Occasional drinking Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Occasional drinking Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 138 | 92.0 |
| Yes | 12 | 8.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

Figure no. 7. Distribution of patients with respect to Occasional drinking Status


■ No - Yes

12 (8\%) patients had history of Occasional drinking.
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| Table no. 8. Distribution of patients with respect to Regular drinking Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Regular drinking Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 143 | 95.3 |
| Yes | 7 | 4.7 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

7 (4.7\%) had history of Regular drinking status.

| Table no. 9. Distribution of patients with respect to Moderate drinking Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Current-Smoker Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 140 | 93.3 |
| Yes | 10 | 6.7 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

Figure no. 9. Distribution of patients with respect to Moderate drinking Status


■ No ■ Yes

10 (6.7\%) patients were Current Smoker.
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Figure no. 10. Distribution of patients with respect to Excessive drinking Status


- No - Yes

4 (2.7) patients had history of Excessive drinking.

| Table no. 11. Distribution of patients with respect to Alcoholic Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alcoholic Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No | 141 | 94.0 |
| Yes | 9 | 6.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

9 (6\%) patients were Alcoholic.

Table no. 12. Distribution of patients with respect to Alcohol Abstinent Status

| Alcohol Abstinent Status | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No | 144 | 96.0 |
| Yes | 6 | 4.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

6 (4\%) patients had Alcohol abstinent status.

Table no. 13. Distribution of patients with respect to Alcohol drinking Status

| Alcohol dinking Status | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Never drinking | 144 | 96.0 |
| Yes | 6 | 4.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

6 (4\%) patients were Never drinkers.
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| Table no. 14. Distribution of patients with respect to Physical activity Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Physical activity Status | Frequency | Percent |
| Active | 54 | 36.0 |
| Inactive | 96 | 64.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |

Figure no. 14. Distribution of patients with respect to Physical activity Status

$54(36 \%)$ of the patients had active physical status, while 96 (64\%) patients were physically inactive.

| Table no. 15. Distribution of patients with respect to Lipoprotien a Status |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lipoprotien a Status | Frequency | Percent |
| Less than $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ | 54 | 36.0 |
| More than $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ | 96 | 64.0 |
| Total | 150 | 100.0 |
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Figure no. 15. Distribution of patients with respect to Lipoprotien a Status


54 (36\%) of the patients had Lipoprotien a levels less than $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, while 96 (64\%) patients had Lipoprotien a levels more than $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$.

| Table no. 16. Mean Age, BMI, Blood pressure of patients |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Age | 40.4 | 15.1 |
| BMI | 36.7 | 4.9 |
| Systolic BP | 153.8 | 14.6 |
| Diastolic BP | 114.8 | 11.6 |

Figure no. 16. Mean Age, BMI of patients


The mean Age, BMI, Systolic BP and Diastolic BP of the patients was $40.4 \pm 15.1$ years, $36.7 \pm 4.9,153.8 \pm$ 14.6 mm of Hg and $114.8 \pm \quad 11.6 \mathrm{~mm}$ of Hg , respectively.
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| Table no. 17. Lipid profile of patients |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| TC (mg/dl) | 243.0 | 91.3 |
| HDL | 59.5 | 17.6 |
| LDL | 155.0 | 20.9 |
| VLDL | 47.8 | 9.7 |
| Triglycerides | 298.3 | 55.2 |

Figure no. 18. Lipid profile of patients


The mean Total Cholesterol, HDL, LDL, VLDL and Triglycerides were $243.0 \pm 91.3,59.5 \pm 17.6,155.0 \pm 20.9$, $47.8 \pm \quad 9.7$ and
$298.3 \pm 55.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, respectively.

Table no. 18. Fibrinogen, Homocysteine, Lp a and S. Uric acid levels of patients

|  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fibrinogen | 625.9 | 82.1 |
| Homocysteine mmol/L | 65.0 | 19.7 |
| Lp(a) $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ | 6.7 | 1.4 |
| Uric acid | 10.2 | 2.5 |

The mean serum Fibrinogen, Homocysteine, Lp(a) and Uric acid levels of the patients were $625.9 \pm 82.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, $65.0 \pm 19.7 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}, 6.7 \pm 1.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ and $10.2 \pm 2.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, respectively.

| Table no 19 Distribution of patients with respect to age and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| Age | Male | 42.8 | 15.4 | 0.092 |
|  | Female | 38.6 | 14.7 |  |

There was no statistically significant difference between the mean age of Males and female.
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Table no 20 Distribution of patients with respect to BMI and Gender.

|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BMI | Male | 36.4 | 3.8 | 0.584 |
|  | Female | 36.8 | 5.6 |  |

There was no statistically significant difference between the mean BMI of Males and female.

| Table no 21 Distribution of patients with respect to Systolic BP and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| Systolic BP | Male | 155.1 | 14.9 | 0.344 |
|  | Female | 152.8 | 14.4 |  |

There was no statistically significant difference between the Systolic BP of Males and female.

There was no statistically significant difference between the Diastolic BP of Males and female.

| Table no 23 Distribution of patients with respect to CRP and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| CRP | Male | 9.7 | 2.5 | 0.026 |
|  | Female | 10.6 | 2.4 |  |

Figure no 23 Distribution of patients with respect to CRP and Gender.


The mean CRP levels of females $(10.6 \pm 2.4)$ was statistically higher as compared that of males $(9.7 \pm 2.5)$.
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| Table no 24 Distribution of patients with respect to Total Cholesterol and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| Total Cholesterol | Male | 232.2 | 86.7 | 0.190 |
|  | Female | 251.7 | 94.5 |  |



There was no statistically significant difference between the mean Total Cholesterol of Males and female.

| Table no 25 Distribution of patients with respect to HDL and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| HDL | Male | 56.7 | 7.6 | 0.056 |
|  | Female | 61.7 | 22.5 |  |
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There was no statistically significant difference between the mean HDL of Males and female.

Table no 26 Distribution of patients with respect to LDL and Gender.

|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LDL | Male | 153.3 | 16.5 | 0.351 |
|  | Female | 156.4 | 23.9 |  |

Figure no 26 Distribution of patients with respect to LDL and Gender.


There was no statistically significant difference between the mean LDL of Males and female.

| Table no 27 Distribution of patients with respect to VLDL and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| VLDL | Male | 46.8 | 9.1 | 0.240 |
|  | Female | 48.6 | 10.1 |  |
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There was no statistically significant difference between the mean VLDL of Males and female.

| Table no 28 Distribution of patients with respect to S. Triglycerides and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| S. Triglycerides | Male | 302.5 | 66.6 | 0.428 |
|  | Female | 295.0 | 44.1 |  |



There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Triglycerides of Males and females.

| Table no 29 Distribution of patients with respect to S. Fibrinogen and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| Fibrinogen | Male | 639.3 | 71.7 | 0.067 |
|  | Female | 615.1 | 88.5 |  |
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Figure no 29 Distribution of patients with respect to S. Fibrinogen and Gender.


There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Fibrinogen of Males and females.

| Table no 30 Distribution of patients with respect to S. Homocysteine and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| S. Homocysteine | Male | 67.1 | 21.4 | 0.259 |
|  | Female | 63.3 | 18.2 |  |
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| Table no 31 Distribution of patients with respect to S. Uric Acid and Gender. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gender | Mean | Std. Deviation | P value |
| S. UricAcid | Male | 7.0 | 1.3 | 0.040 |
|  | Female | 6.5 | 1.4 |  |



There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Uric acid of Males and females.

## DISCUSSION

Lipoprotein(a) $[\operatorname{Lp}(a)]$ is identical to low-density lipoprotein(LDL) except for the addition of apolipoprotein A (apoA), which is highly glycosylated. There is a striking homologybetween the amino acid sequences of apoA and plasminogen, which is recognized to be a cardiovascular risk factor. ${ }^{1}$ Thus, Lp(a) may play an important role in the transition fromatherosclerosis to thrombosis, because it activates monocyte adhesion and migration of macrophage foam cells intothe arterial wall. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is often considered a marker ofthrombosis. ${ }^{3}$ Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a major cause of deathin patients with peripheral arterial disease (PAD Lp(a) was also associated with increased cardiovascular event (CVE) risk in patients with established CVD and remains predictive for CVE risk at LDL cholesterol (LDL-C) levels , $1.8 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}^{9} . \mathrm{Lp}$ (a) may be a predictor of peripheral and centralCVD in younger men and women with dyslipidemia.Several observations suggest that targeting $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ coulddecrease total residual cardiovascular risk, as increased plasma $\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ concentrations are significantly associated with higher risk of CAD. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is a marker of particular risk for poor outcomes in terms of severity and progression of CVD. Several prospective studies have correlated Lp(a) levels with vasculardisease in general, and plasma $\operatorname{Lp}(a)>30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ with increased cardiovascular risk. ${ }^{4}$ after approval from the ethics committee a total of 150 patients were enrolled for the study (Table No.1) Hundred and fifty patients were included in the study.(Fig. No. 1) Of these, 83 (55.3) were males, while 67 ( $44.7 \%$ ) were females.(Fig. No. 2) The common Comorbidities of the patients were Diabetes ( $60,32.8 \%$ ), Hypertension ( $58,31.7 \%$ ), Obesity (34, $18.6 \%$ ) and hypothyroidism (29, $15.8 \%$ )here our study is in concordance with the study done by Gencer B etal ${ }^{2}$.in his study similar findings were encountered while enrolling the cases(Fig. No. 3) 30 patients (20\%) were
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Exsmokers.(Fig. No. 4) 101 (67.3\%) patients had history of Never-smoker status.(Fig. No. 5) 20 (13.3\%) were current smokers.(Fig. No. 6) 101 (67.3\%) patients had history of Never drinking status.( Table No.7) 12 (8\%) patients had history of Occasional drinking.(Fig. No. 7) 12 ( $8 \%$ ) patients had history of Occasional drinking.(Fig. No. 8) 7 (4.7\%) had history of Regular drinking status.(Fig. No. 9) 10 (6.7\%) patients were Current Smoker.(Fig. No. 10) 4 (2.7\%) patients had history of Excessive drinking.(Fig. No. 11) 9 (6\%) patients were Alcoholic.
(Fig. No. 12) 6 (4\%) patients had Alcohol abstinent status.(Fig. No. 13) 6 (4\%) patients were Never drinkers.(Fig. No. 14) 54 (36\%) of the patients had active physical status, while 96 (64\%) patients were physically inactive.(Fig. No. 15) 54 ( $36 \%$ ) of the patients had Lipoprotien a levels less than $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, while 96 (64\%) patients had Lipoprotien a levels more than $30 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$. Here our stu8dy is in accordance with the study done by Albers JJ etal his study also reveals results similar to us
(Fig. No. 17) The mean Age, BMI, Systolic BP and Diastolic BP of the patients was $40.4 \pm 15.1$ years, $36.7 \pm 4.9,153.8 \pm 14.6 \mathrm{~mm}$ of Hg and $114.8 \pm 11.6 \mathrm{~mm}$ of Hg , respectively.(Fig. No. 18) The mean Total Cholesterol, HDL, LDL, VLDL and Triglycerides were 243.0 $\pm 91.3$, $59.5 \pm 17.6,155.0 \quad \pm 20.9,47.8 \pm 9.7$ and $298.3 \pm 55.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, respectively.( Table No.18) The mean serum Fibrinogen, Homocysteine, Lp(a) and Uric acid levels of the patients were $625.9 \pm 82.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}, 65.0 \pm 19.7 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{L}, 6.7 \pm 1.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ and $10.2 \pm 2.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, respectively.(Fig. No. 19) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean age of Males and female.
(Fig. No.20) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean BMI of Males and female.(Fig. No.21) There was no statistically significant difference between the Systolic BP of Males and female.(Fig. No.22) There was no statistically significant difference between the Diastolic BP of Males and female.(Fig. No.23)here again our study is in accordance with the study done by Hojo Y etal The mean CRP levels of females $(10.6 \pm 2.4)$ was statistically higher as compared that of males ( $9.7 \pm 2.5$ ).(Fig. No.24) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean Total Cholesterol of Males and female.(Fig. No.25) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean HDL of Males and female.(Fig. No.26) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean LDL of Males and female.(Fig. No.27) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean VLDL of Males and female.(Fig. No.28) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Triglycerides of Males and females.(Fig. No.29) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Fibrinogen of Males and females.(Fig. No.30) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Homocysteine of Males and females.(Fig. No.31) There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Uric acid of Males and females.in all of the above parameters our study is in accordance with the previous studies done by Kamstrup PR Anuurad E etal ${ }^{6}$ in all the studies lipoprotein a is is marker for various cardiovascular decease however multicentric studies with larger sample size are required to come to a conclusion

## CONCLUSION:

$\mathrm{Lp}(\mathrm{a})$ is a marker of particular risk for poor outcomes in terms of severity and progression of CVD.
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[^0]:    There was no statistically significant difference between the mean S. Homocysteine of Males and females.

