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#### Abstract

Objectives. This study aims to (1) determine the cardiovascular risk of persons with hypertension and diabetes attending hypertension/diabetic clinics or hypertension/health club meetings in the AMIGA (Alfonso, Mendez, Indang, General Emilio Aguinaldo and Amadeo) municipalities of Cavite; (2) suggest measures to improve the cardiovascular disease (CVD) program in these municipalities using the results of the study.

Methods. A cross-sectional study was performed on patients diagnosed with hypertension and/or diabetes who are attending clinics or club meetings in the barangays of the five AMIGA municipalities of Cavite. Participants were interviewed using an abbreviated version of the World Health Organization (WHO) STEPS questionnaire on risk factors. The participants' anthropometric measurements were obtained and their total blood cholesterol levels determined. CVD risk was then estimated using the WHO / International Society of Hypertension (ISH) risk prediction chart for the Western Pacific Region B.

Results. 1,032 participants from 27 barangays qualified for the study. Participants were predominantly female ( $74 \%$ ); over-all mean age was 58.43 years. Majority of the participants ( $79.17 \%$ ) were found to be in the low-risk group; $11.34 \%$ were in the moderate risk group; $4.46 \%$ were in the high-risk group; while $5.05 \%$ were in the very high-risk group. Majority of the participants were also found to be obese. Mean total cholesterol was $207.02 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$.

Conclusion. Majority of participants were stratified in the low-risk category ( $<10 \%$ chance to have cardiovascular events in the next 10 years), while $9.5 \%$ were in the high-risk category ( $\geq 20 \%$ risk). Obesity is a major risk factor that could be addressed in this population.
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## INTRODUCTION

Noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) have overtaken infectious diseases as the most common causes of mortality worldwide. The World Health Organization (WHO) reported that 38 million or $68 \%$ of the 56 million deaths in 2012 were due to NCDs, 16 million or $40 \%$ of which were premature deaths under 70 years of age. Majority of premature deaths ( $82 \%$ ) occur in low and middle-income countries. ${ }^{1}$ Since the majority of deaths occur in the workingage population, the economic implications of this problem are important for the sustainability of developing countries. ${ }^{2}$ NCDs are major public health issues in almost all countries
of the Western Pacific Region of the WHO, where the poor have the worst outcomes from these diseases. ${ }^{3}$ In the Philippines, cardiovascular diseases (CVD) account for 33\% of all deaths, while another 6\% is due to diabetes. The probability of dying between the ages of 30 and 70 years from NCDs in the country is $28 \% .^{4}$

Use of total CVD risk approaches have proven to be superior over vertical approaches in developed countries where a decline of $42-60 \%$ in CVD deaths were reported to be due to changes in risk factors including reduction in smoking, systolic blood pressure, and total cholesterol, while only $23-47 \%$ in the reduction was attributed to the treatment of individual risk factors or the vertical approach. ${ }^{1,2,5}$ In total CVD risk approaches, treatment decisions are based on the assessment of an individual's total predicted risk of developing a cardiovascular event like a stroke or myocardial infarction over a period of five to 10 years. ${ }^{1,5}$ Developed countries have been using risk prediction charts like the Framingham Risk Scoring System for decades but these were developed for Caucasian populations. ${ }^{5,6,7}$ As such, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Society of Hypertension (ISH) developed risk prediction charts that are population-specific using the best available mortality and risk factor data. These charts are tools that enable integrated risk assessment and risk prediction in non-Western populations. ${ }^{6,8}$

Studies have shown that the total CVD risk approach using risk prediction charts can help reduce treatment costs as opposed to single risk factor management which often leads to over-prescription of medications. Using this approach will enable low and middle-income countries with limited health care resources to prioritize those who are at high risk and will benefit most. The risk prediction charts are also intended to guide primary care clinicians in their choice of appropriate interventions to improve the life expectancy of high-risk groups and reduce the burden on health systems. ${ }^{5,6,8,9}$

This study was conducted to determine the 10 -year total CVD risk of persons with hypertension and diabetes attending clinics and/or hypertension/health club meetings in five rural municipalities of Cavite using the WHO / ISH risk prediction charts. As most of these patients are already on treatment for individual risk factors especially hypertension, the results of the study may provide guidance in the proper implementation of the CVD program.

## Study Context

The University of the Philippines - Manila through its Community Health and Development Program (UPCHDP) forged a partnership with five municipalities of Cavite, collectively called the AMIGA Inter-LGU Health Collaboration Council to initiate the implementation of the Philippine adaptation of the WHO Package of Essential Noncommunicable Disease Interventions (PhilPEN) in 2013, and this partnership is currently
ongoing. AMIGA is an acronym that stands for the first letters of these five municipalities: Alfonso, Mendez, Indang, General Emilio Aguinaldo and Amadeo. Registries of patients with hypertension and diabetes have been created in these municipalities and most barangays conduct monthly clinics for these patients. These persons with hypertension and/or diabetes in several barangays have also organized hypertension/diabetes or health clubs. This study was conceptualized to assist the AMIGA-UP-CHDP partnership to improve its ongoing program, especially in its estimation of the cardiovascular risk of the population as the municipal health offices are required to do by the Department of Health ( DOH ). The study also aims to identify measures or activities that could improve the CVD program in these municipalities to attain better results.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Study design and setting

This study is a descriptive, community-based crosssectional study conducted in the five municipalities of AMIGA in Cavite from September - November 2017. The University of the Philippines Manila Research Ethics Board (UPMREB) approved the study protocol (UPMREB 2017-256-01).

## Recruitment and screening

All adult patients diagnosed with hypertension and/or diabetes mellitus attending hypertension/diabetes clinics or hypertension/health club meetings in the AMIGA barangays and willing to sign an informed consent form were invited to participate in the study. Exclusion criteria included: age of $\geq 80$ years; had documented atherosclerotic heart disease or had a history of stroke or myocardial infarction; and with cognitive deficit (e.g. aphasia, dementia, mental disorders like retardation and psychosis) that would inhibit him/her from providing accurate information about his/her condition. A total sample size of 1,290 was computed using epi info stat calc. (Figure 1)

## Study Tools and Data Collection

At the beginning of each session, the nature and implications of the study were explained to the assembly of a clinic or club meeting attendees. After signing an informed consent form, participants were interviewed face-to-face using the WHO Steps questionnaire ${ }^{10}$ abbreviated to include only the risk factors used in the WHO/ISH risk prediction chart. The questionnaire was translated to Filipino, and this translated version had been tested in a related study conducted in the same municipalities. After the interview, anthropometric measurements (weight, height, waist, and hip circumferences) were taken using the following equipment: (1) dial type clinic weighing scale; (2) height board; and (3) non-stretch measuring tapes. Height was measured in centimeters in the standing position with


Figure 1. Research flow diagram.
footwear and headwear (hats, ribbons, etc) removed, making sure that the shoulders, buttocks, and back of the feet were touching the board and the head in a position where the angle of the eye was at a level with the top of the ear. Weight was measured in kilograms, with footwear removed and pockets emptied. Waist circumference (WC) was measured at the end of normal respiration with both hands at the side, at a level midway between the lowest rib and the iliac crest. Hip circumference was taken at the widest diameter around the buttocks. Blood pressure (BP) was taken in the seated position with both feet flat on the floor with an automated BP measuring device (Omron 7203). Researchers made sure that participants had been resting for 15 minutes before the BP was taken three times with three minutes interval. The first measurement was discarded and the mean value of the last two readings was used for analysis. ${ }^{11}$ Capillary blood cholesterol was measured with a dry biochemistry device (Accutrend Plus). ${ }^{12}$ Non-fasting capillary blood samples were used to determine total cholesterol measurements. ${ }^{13,14}$

Hypercholesterolemia was defined as cholesterol level $\geq 240 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl} .{ }^{15}$ Body mass index (BMI) was calculated in kg (weight) $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ (height) and participants were classified as underweight ( $<18.5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ), normal ( $18.6-22.9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ), overweight ( $23-24.9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) and obese ( $\geq 25 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ). ${ }^{15,16}$ Central or abdominal obesity was defined as follows: for
women $\mathrm{WC} \geq 80 \mathrm{~cm}$, waist to hip ratio (WHR) $\geq 0.85$; for men $W C \geq 90 \mathrm{~cm}, W H R \geq 1$. Smoking was defined as the use of any tobacco product within a year prior to assessment. ${ }^{16}$ Finally, risk stratification was determined using the WHO/ ISH risk prediction chart for the Western Pacific Region B (WPR B). ${ }^{16,17}$ Risk estimate parameters for the 40 -yearold group were used for participants who were less than 40 years of age. Stratification of overall risk was as follows: Low ( $<10 \%$ risk of developing stroke or myocardial infarction in the next 10 years); Moderate ( $10-<20 \%$ risk); High (20$<30 \%$ risk); and Very High ( $\geq 30 \%$ risk). ${ }^{16,17}$

## Statistics

Variables were expressed as means and frequencies with standard deviation unless otherwise stated. Continuous and categorical variables were compared using Independent samples t-test, Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test, respectively. The confidence interval was set at $95 \%$. Other descriptive statistical analyses were performed using SPSS ver 23.

## RESULTS

## Socio-demographic characteristics

1,214 attendees of the clinics or club meetings in 27 barangays of the AMIGA municipalities participated in the study but only 1,032 qualified for analysis. One hundred twenty-six had a history of stroke or myocardial infarction, or had an established cardiovascular disease while 56 were 80 years old or older. Qualified participants in the study were predominantly female (74\%). The youngest participant, already diagnosed to have hypertension, was 27 years old; the oldest was 79 , with a mean age at 58.43 for all sexes ( 58.39 for women, 58.59 for men). $60 \%$ of the qualified participants were in the 50-69 age group. Most were married (67\%). Only $12 \%$ acquired a college education; the majority were high school graduates (54\%) and elementary school graduates (25\%). 39\% were homemakers, while 21\% were self-employed. $88 \%$ claimed to have annual earnings of less than Php40,000. The socio-demographic data are shown in Table 1.

## Risk factors

Seventy-two percent of the qualified participants were previously diagnosed to have hypertension, $7 \%$ were diagnosed to have diabetes, and $21 \%$ had been diagnosed to be both hypertensive and diabetic. $11 \%$ of the participants admitted to smoking and most of these were men. Only 4\% of the women participants smoked, as opposed to $30 \%$ of the men, and most smokers were in the less than 40 -yearold age group. $71.65 \%$ of the participants were classified as obese ( $\mathrm{BMI} \geq 25 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ), with almost the same distribution among men and women ( $72.41 \%$ among women, $69.57 \%$ among men). The proportion of participants with obesity progressively decreased with increasing age, from $85 \%$ in

Table 1. Socio-demographics of AMIGA participants

| Variables | Total | Women | Men | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n , (\%) | 1032 | 756 (73.26) | 276 (26.74) |  |
| Age, yrs (Mean $\pm$ S.E.) | $58.43 \pm 0.33$ | $58.34 \pm 0.39$ | $58.67 \pm 0.60$ | 0.661 |
| Age bracket, n (\%) |  |  |  | 0.200 |
| <40 | 45 (4.36) | 34 (4.50) | 11 (3.99) |  |
| 40-49 | 174 (16.86) | 127 (16.80) | 47 (17.03) |  |
| 50-59 | 315 (30.52) | 234 (30.95) | 81 (29.35) |  |
| 60-69 | 327 (31.69) | 226 (29.89) | 101 (36.59) |  |
| 70-79 | 171 (16.57) | 135 (17.86) | 36 (13.04) |  |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Marital Status, n (\%) |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Single | 55 (5.35) | 45 (5.98) | 10 (3.62) |  |
| Married | 689 (66.96) | 457 (60.69) | 232 (84.06) |  |
| Separated | 39 (3.79) | 32 (4.25) | 7 (2.54) |  |
| Widow/er | 216 (20.99) | 195 (25.90) | 21 (7.61) |  |
| Common Law | 30 (2.92) | 24 (3.19) | 6 (2.17) |  |
| ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Education, n (\%) |  |  |  | 0.016 |
| None | 3 (0.29) | 2 (0.26) | 1 (0.36) |  |
| Less than Primary | 10 (0.97) | 8 (1.06) | 2 (0.73) |  |
| Primary | 69 (6.69) | 58 (7.67) | 11 (4.00) |  |
| Secondary | 262 (25.41) | 205 (27.12) | 57 (20.73) |  |
| High School completed | 559 (54.22) | 385 (50.93) | 174 (63.27) |  |
| College | 128 (12.42) | 98 (12.96) | 30 (10.91) |  |
|  |  |  |  | <0.001 |
| Gov't | 78 (7.60) | 44 (5.86) | 34 (12.36) |  |
| Non-gov't | 59 (5.75) | 37 (4.93) | 22 (8.00) |  |
| Self-employed | 292 (28.46) | 175 (23.30) | 117 (42.55) |  |
| Non-paid | 3 (0.29) | 2 (0.27) | 1 (0.36) |  |
| Student | 3 (0.29) | 3 (0.40) | 0 (0) |  |
| Homemaker | 398 (38.79) | 388 (51.66) | 10 (3.64) |  |
| Retired | 143 (13.94) | 80 (10.65) | 63 (22.91) |  |
| Unemployed (able to work) | 17 (1.66) | 5 (0.67) | 12 (4.36) |  |
| Unemployed (unable to work) | 33 (3.22) | 17 (2.26) | 16 (5.82) |  |
| ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Income (PhP), n (\%) |  |  |  | 0.137 |
| <40,000/yr (< Q1) | 911 (88.36) | 660 (87.42) | 251 (90.94) |  |
| 40,000-80,000/yr (Q1) | 46 (4.46) | 31 (4.106) | 15 (5.44) |  |
| 81,000-121, 000/yr (Q2) | 5 (0.48) | 4 (0.53) | 1 (0.36) |  |
| 122,000-188,000/yr (Q3) | 2 (0.19) | 1 (0.13) | 1 (0.36) |  |
| 189,000/yr < (Q4) | 5 (0.48) | 4 (0.53) | 1 (0.36) |  |
| Don't know | 58 (5.63) | 51 (6.76) | 7 (2.54) |  |
| Refused to answer | 4 (0.39) | 4 (0.53) | 0 (0) |  |

*Comparison between women and men was done using Chi-Square or Fisher's Exact test for categorical variables and Independent samples $t$-test for continuous variables.
${ }^{a}$ Missing data: $3 ;{ }^{b}$ Missing data: $1 ;{ }^{c}$ Missing data: 6 ; ${ }^{d}$ Missing data: 1
those less than 40 years of age to $52 \%$ among those in the $70-79$ age group. Mean BMI was $25.55 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. More than $60 \%$ of the participants also had central or abdominal obesity both by waist circumference (66.76\%) and waist-to-hip ratio (69.71\%), but this was more prevalent among the women ( $74.74 \%$ and $86.09 \%$ respectively) compared to the men ( $44.93 \%$ and $24.73 \%$ ). Mean waist circumference among women was 86.28 cm , and 88.28 cm among men. Mean waist-to-hip ratio among women was 0.92 , and 0.96 among
men. $19.63 \%$ of the participants had hypercholesterolemia, and this was seen more in the women, $22.58 \%$ of whom had the condition, compared to men (11.59\%). Mean cholesterol was $207 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{d}$ l, with women showing a slightly higher mean value ( $210.07 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ ) compared to men (198.78 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl})$. Mean values of the different risk factors according to age and sex are shown in Table 2, while the distribution of the risk factors according to age and sex are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 2. Clinical characteristics of AMIGA participants

|  | Overall |  |  |  |  |  |  | Women |  |  |  |  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total |  |
| Systolic BP | Mean | 126.78 | 130.95 | 132.53 | 132.56 | 133.60 | 132.20 | 124.33 | 128.95 | 131.18 | 132.14 | 132.29 | 130.98 | 134.36 | 136.35 | 136.41 | 133.53 | 138.52 | 135.54 | 0.002 |
|  | S.E. | 2.8 | 1.46 | 1.14 | 1.17 | 1.67 | 0.64 | 2.64 | 1.72 | 1.33 | 1.45 | 1.95 | 0.76 | 7.95 | 2.59 | 2.13 | 1.99 | 3.02 | 1.17 |  |
| Diastolic BP | Mean | 85.22 | 85.05 | 81.22 | 77.54 | 71.82 | 79.32 | 83.27 | 83.37 | 80.18 | 77.36 | 71.02 | 78.38 | 91.23 | 89.57 | 84.24 | 77.94 | 74.8 | 81.89 | $<0.001$ |
|  | S.E. | 1.89 | 0.88 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 0.82 | 0.38 | 1.87 | 0.98 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.94 | 0.43 | 4.87 | 1.74 | 1.12 | 1.31 | 1.66 | 0.77 |  |
| $\mathrm{CHOL}(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dL})$ | Mean | 212.06 | 199 | 213 | 206.4 | 203.9 | 207.0 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 214.1 | 196.9 | 216.0 | 211.9 | 207.6 | 210.1 | 206.1 | 204 | 204.1 | 193.8 | 190.1 | 198.8 | <0.001 |
|  | S.E. | 5.46 | 2.6 | 1.98 | 1.98 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 6.42 | 2.91 | 2.39 | 2.37 | 3.08 | 1.32 | 10.61 | 5.42 | 3.2 | 3.25 | 3.66 | 1.91 |  |
| BMI (kg/m²) | Mean | 26.89 | 26.92 | 26.12 | 25.11 | 23.59 | $25.55^{\text {b }}$ | 26.85 | 26.95 | 26.36 | 25.27 | 23.96 | 25.73 | 27.03 | 26.85 | 25.45 | 24.77 | 22.22 | 25.08 | 0.034 |
|  | S.E. | 0.58 | 0.36 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.14 | 0.73 | 0.46 | 0.3 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.8 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.36 | 0.57 | 0.23 |  |
| WC (cm) | Mean | 86.75 | 88.22 | 88.21 | 87.07 | 82.82 | 86.89 | 85.47 | 86.58 | 87.84 | 86.61 | 82.92 | 86.28 | 90.73 | 92.66 | 89.29 | 88.08 | 82.44 | 88.58 | 0.002 |
|  | S.E. | 1.32 | 0.8 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.8 | 0.33 | 1.54 | 0.93 | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.89 | 0.39 | 2.29 | 1.36 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 1.86 | 0.62 |  |
| W/H Ratio | Mean | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.91 | $0.93{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.91 | 0.9 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.96 | <0.001 |
|  | S.E. | 0.0095 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0.006 | 0.002 | 0.01 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 0.024 | 0.009 | 0.007 | 0.006 | 0.013 | 0.004 |  |

a69 excluded data; $\mathbf{b} 2$ missing data; ${ }^{\text {c2 }}$ missing data. Comparison between women and men was done using independent samples $t$-test.
Systolic BP: Systolic blood pressure; Diastolic BP: Diastolic blood pressure; CHOL: Total blood cholesterol level;
BM: Body mass index; WC: Waist circumference; W/H ratio: Waist/Hip ratio

Table 3. Risk factors prevalent among AMIGA participants

|  | Overall |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total |
|  | N | 45 | 174 | 315 | 327 | 171 | 1032 |
| HPN only | n (\%) | 37 (82.22) | 135 (77.59) | 227 (72.06) | 222 (67.89) | 118 (69.01) | 739 (71.61) |
|  | 95\% CI | 71.05-93.39 | 71.39-83.78 | 67.11-77.02 | 62.83-72.95 | 62.07-75.94 | 68.86-74.36 |
| DM only | n (\%) | 5 (11.11) | 13 (7.47) | 23 (7.30) | 24 (7.34) | 8 (4.68) | 73 (7.07) |
|  | 95\% CI | 1.93-20.29 | 3.56-11.38 | 4.43-10.17 | 4.51-10.17 | 1.51-7.84 | 5.51-8.64 |
| HPN + DM | n (\%) | 3 (6.67) | 26 (14.94) | 65 (20.63) | 81 (24.77) | 45 (26.32) | 220 (21.32) |
|  | 95\% CI | -0.62-13.95 | 9.65-20.24 | 16.17-25.10 | 20.09-29.45 | 19.72-32.92 | 18.82-23.82 |
| Smoking ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | n (\%) | 10 (22.22) | 12 (6.90) | 44 (13.97) | 34 (10.43) | 14 (8.19) | 114 (11.06) |
|  | 95\% CI | 10.08-34.37 | 3.13-10.66 | 10.14-17.80 | 7.11-13.75 | 4.08-12.30 | 9.14-12.97 |
| Obese (BMI-WHO) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | n (\%) | 10 (22.22) | 34 (19.54) | 49 (15.56) | 36 (11.08) | 9 (5.26) | 138 (13.40) |
|  | 95\% CI | 10.07-34.37 | 13.65-25.43 | 11.55-19.56 | 7.66-14.49 | 1.92-8.61 | 11.32-15.48 |
| Obese (BMI-AP) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | n (\%) | 31 (68.89) | 112 (64.37) | 179 (56.83) | 161 (49.54) | 58 (33.92) | 541 (52.52) |
|  | 95\% CI | 55.36-82.41 | 57.25-71.48 | 51.35-62.29 | 44.10-54.97 | 26.82-41.01 | 49.47-55.57 |
| Obese (W/H Ratio) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | ${ }^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{F}$ \%) | $32(71.11)$ | 117 (67.24) | 232 (73.88) | 221 (67.79) | 116 (67.84) | 718 (69.71) |
|  | 95\% CI | 57.87-84.35 | 60.27-74.21 | 69.03-78.74 | 62.72-72.86 | 60.84-74.84 | 66.90-72.52 |
| Obese (WC) | n (\%) | 30 (66.67) | 131 (75.29) | 227 (72.06) | 208 (63.61) | 93 (54.39) | 689 (66.76) |
|  | 95\% CI | 52.89-80.44 | 68.88-81.70 | 67.11-77.02 | 58.39-68.82 | 46.92-61.85 | 63.89-69.64 |
| High Cholesterold | n (\%) | 11 (24.44) | 27 (15.52) | 76 (24.20) | 62 (18.96) | 26 (15.20) | 202 (19.59) |
|  | 95\% CI | 11.89-37.00 | 10.14-20.90 | 19.47-28.94 | 14.71-23.21 | 9.82-20.59 | 17.17-22.02 |

${ }^{1} 1$ missing data; ; 2 missing data; ${ }^{c}$ 2 missing data; 1 d missing data. HPN: Hypertension; DM: Diabetes mellitus; BMI-WHO: Body mass index-World
Health Organization: BMI-AP: Body mass index-Asia Pacific; W/H ratio: Waist/Hip Ratio; WC ratio: Waist circumference ratio

## Risk Stratification

Tables 5 and 6 show the distribution of the overall CVD risk according to age and sex. Almost $80 \%$ of the participants were in the low-risk group (79.17\%), though the proportion among women was higher ( $82.54 \%$ ) than men ( $69.93 \%$ ). The distribution of participants in the moderate, high and very high-risk groups was $11.34 \%, 4.46 \%$, and $5.05 \%$ respectively. More men tended to be in the higher risk groups than women.

## DISCUSSION

The Philippine Department of Health has committed to the use of the total CVD risk approach, particularly the Philippine adaption of the WHO Package of Essential NCD Interventions (PhilPEN) which includes using the WHO/ ISH risk prediction chart as its main strategy in the reduction of mortality from CVD in the country. The same program is presently being implemented in the AMIGA municipalities and it is in this context that the present study was conducted.

The researchers aim to determine the CVD risk of patients with hypertension and/or diabetes attending hyper-
tension and/or diabetes clinics or hypertension/health club meetings in the barangays of the AMIGA municipalities using the WHO/ISH risk prediction chart for the WPR B. Since all of the participants already had diagnosed disease, the overall CVD risk of the participants was expected to be high. However, there is no published data on CVD risk estimates in the Philippines, whether these are risk estimates of the general population or of the population with hypertension and/or diabetes. We, therefore, compared our data with those of other Asian countries that have published CVD risk estimates of their general population or segments thereof. Indeed the proportion of the participants in our study who were considered at high risk ( $\geq 20 \%$ or a summation of those at high and very high risk) was higher at $9.5 \%$ compared to that of India (4.9\%), China ( $1.1 \%$ ), Iran (1.2 ), and the mgolia (6\%). The finding at a lager proportion of the male participants were in the high-risk group than the wince med to indule in more risk bavior then we men coling as in the women, e.g. smoking as shown in this study.

Although the majority ( $79.17 \%$ ) of the participants classified as obese according to the BMI ( $71.65 \%$ ). This flassified as obese high compared to the national prevalence figure is very high compared to the national prevalence
rate of obesity which is $31.1 \%$. ${ }^{19}$ Women accounted for most of the $66.76 \%$ and $68.71 \%$ who were found to have central obesity by waist circumference and waist-to-hip ratio respectively since most men were found to have normal measurements. Hypercholesterolemia ( $\geq 240 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$ ) was found to be present in $19.63 \%$ of the participants, which is comparable to the national prevalence $(18.6 \%),{ }^{19}$ though much higher than that reported in similar studies done in Sri Lanka (6.2\%) ${ }^{20}$ and Bangladesh ( $10.7 \%$ ). ${ }^{21}$ The mean total
cholesterol level was high at $207.02 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, a little higher than the national mean $(201.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}) .{ }^{19}$ The high prevalence of obesity and a high mean total cholesterol level emphasize the need for lifestyle changes among the participants in the study. Thorough documentation of the diet and physical activity of these participants need to be done and a program organized especially among the members of the health clubs to address these factors.

Non-fasting blood samples were used in the determination of total cholesterol in this study. Though traditionally cholesterol levels are determined after 1012 hours of fasting, the European Atherosclerosis Society and the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine stated in a joint consensus statement published in July 2016 that evidence is lacking that proves that fasting is superior to non-fasting when evaluating the lipid profile for cardiovascular risk assessment. With fasting ( $1-6$ hours after meals) lipid profles to those obtained under fasting conditions and found no clinically significant difference between the two They have therefore recommended the use of non-fasting blood samples for routine assessment of plasma lipid profiles ${ }^{13}$ Similar statements were issued in the UK NICE (National Clinical Guidance Center) and the Joint British Societies Guidelines (2013), as well as the Canadian Cardiovascular Society Guidelines (2012). ${ }^{14}$ In our study, we chose to use the nonfasting sample based on the above recommendation because the need for participants to fast proved to be an important obstacle in the implementation of a similar study that this researcher conducted in the same municipalities.

A limitation of this study is the exclusion of other risk factors not included in the WHO/ISH risk prediction chart in the questionnaire (diet, physical activity, and alcohol intake). The WHO Steps questionnaire has a complete set of questions that cover these risk factors but because of the

Table 4. Risk factors prevalent among AMIGA participants based on sex

|  | Women |  |  |  |  |  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total |
|  | N | 34 | 127 | 234 | 226 | 135 | 756 | 11 | 47 | 81 | 101 | 36 | 276 |
| HPN only | n (\%) | 28 (82.35) | 102 (80.31) | 173 (73.93) | 161 (71.24) | 93 (68.89) | 557 (73.68) | 9 (81.82) | 33 (70.21) | 54 (66.67) | 61 (60.40) | 25(69.44) | 182 (65.94) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 69.54-95.17 | 73.40-87.23 | 68.31-79.56 | 65.34-77.14 | 61.08-76.70 | 70.54-76.82 | 59.03-104.61 | 57.14-83.29 | 56.40-76.93 | 50.86-69.93 | 54.40-84.49 | 60.35-71.53 |
| DM only | n (\%) | 3 (8.82) | 8 (6.30) | 15 (6.41) | 14 (6.19) | 7 (5.18) | 47 (6.22) | 2 (18.18) | 5 (10.64) | 8 (9.88) | 10 (9.90) | 1 (2.78) | 26 (9.42) |
|  | 95\% Cl | -0.71-18.36 | 2.07-10.52 | 3.27-9.55 | 3.05-9.34 | 1.44-8.93 | 4.50-7.94 | -4.61-40.97 | 1.82-19.45 | 3.38-16.37 | 4.08-15.73 | -2.59-8.15 | 5.97-12.87 |
| HPN + DM | n (\%) | 3 (8.82) | 17 (13.39) | 46 (19.66) | 51 (22.57) | 35 (25.93) | 152 (20.11) | 0 (0) | 9 (19.15) | 19 (23.46) | 30 (29.70) | 10 (27.78) | 68 (24.64) |
|  | 95\% Cl | -0.71-18.36 | 7.46-19.31 | 14.57-24.75 | 17.12-28.02 | 18.53-33.32 | 17.25-22.96 | 0 | 7.90-30.40 | 14.23-32.68 | 20.79-38.61 | 13.15-42.41 | 19.55-29.72 |
| Smoking ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | n (\%) | 3 (8.82) | 2 (1.57) | 8 (3.42) | 9 (4.00) | 8 (5.93) | 30 (3.97) | 7 (63.64) | 10 (21.28) | 36 (44.44) | 25 (24.75) | 6 (16.67) | 84 (30.43) |
|  | 95\% CI | -0.71-18.36 | -0.59-3.74 | 1.09-5.75 | 1.44-6.56 | 1.94-9.91 | 2.58-5.37 | 35.21-92.06 | 9.58-32.98 | 33.62-55.27 | 16.34-33.17 | 4.49-28.84 | 25.01-35.86 |
| Obese(BMI-WHO) $^{\text {b }}$ | n (\%) | 8 (23.53) | 25 (19.68) | 38 (16.24) | 29 (12.95) | 9 (6.67) | 109 (14.46) | 2 (18.18) | 9 (19.15) | 11 (13.58) | 7 (6.93) | 0 (0) | 29 (10.51) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 9.27-37.79 | 12.77-26.60 | 11.51-20.96 | 8.55-17.34 | 2.46-10.87 | 11.95-16.97 | -4.61-40.97 | 7.90-30.40 | 6.12-21.04 | 1.98-11.88 | 0 | 6.89-14.12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Obese } \\ & (\text { BMI-AP) } \end{aligned}$ | n (\%) | 23 (67.65) | 79 (62.20) | 132 (56.41) | 118 (52.68) | 50 (37.04) | 402 (53.32) | 8 (72.73) | 33 (70.21) | 47 (58.02) | 43 (42.57) | 8 (22.22) | 139 (50.36) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 51.92-83.37 | 53.77-70.64 | 50.06-62.76 | 46.14-59.22 | 28.89-45.18 | 49.75-56.88 | 46.41-99.05 | 57.14-83.29 | 47.28-68.77 | 32.93-52.22 | 8.64-35.80 | 44.46-56.26 |
| Obese (W/H Ratio) | n (\%) | 30 (88.23) | 104 (81.89) | 208 (89.27) | 200 (88.49) | 108 (80.00) | 650 (86.09) | 2 (18.18) | 13 (27.66) | 24 (29.63) | 21 (21.00) | 8 (22.22) | 68 (24.73) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 77.41-99.06 | 75.19-88.59 | 85.30-93.24 | 84.34-92.66 | 73.25-86.75 | 83.62-88.56 | -4.61-40.97 | 14.87-40.45 | 19.69-39.57 | 13.02-28.98 | 8.64-35.80 | 19.63-29.83 |
| Obese (WC) | n (\%) | 24 (70.59) | 98 (77.16) | 188 (80.34) | 171 (75.66) | 84 (62.22) | 565 (74.73) | 6 (54.54) | 33 (70.21) | 39 (48.15) | 37 (36.63) | 9 (25.00) | 124 (44.93) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 55.27-85.90 | 69.86-84.47 | 75.25-85.43 | 70.07-81.26 | 54.04-70.40 | 71.64-77.83 | 25.12-83.97 | 57.14-83.29 | 37.27-59.03 | 27.24-46.03 | 10.85-39.15 | 39.06-50.80 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { High } \\ \text { Cholesterold } \end{gathered}$ | n (\%) | 9 (26.47) | 18 (14.29) | 67 (28.75) | 51 (22.57) | 25 (18.52) | 170 (22.55) | 9 (81.82) | 9 (19.15) | 9 (11.11) | 11 (10.89) | 1 (2.78) | 39 (14.13) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 11.64-41.30 | 8.18-20.40 | 22.94-34.57 | 17.12-28.02 | 11.97-25.07 | 19.56-25.53 | 59.02-104.6 | 7.90-30.40 | 4.27-17.95 | 4.82-16.97 | -2.59-8.15 | 10.02-18.24 |

${ }^{a_{1}}$ missing data; ${ }^{{ }^{2} 2}$ missing data; ${ }^{c} 2$ missing data; ${ }^{d} 1$ missing data. HPN: Hypertension; DM: Diabetes mellitus; BMI-WHO: Body mass index-World
Health Organization; BMI-AP: Body mass index-Asia Pacific; W/H ratio: Waist/Hip Ratio; WC ratio: Waist circumference ratio

Table 5. NCD risk prediction among AMIGA participants

|  | Overall |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total |
|  | N | 45 | 174 | 315 | 327 | 171 | 1032 |
| Low Risk | n (\%) | 44 (97.78) | 161 (92.53) | 276 (87.62) | 233 (71.25) | 103 (60.23) | 817 (79.17) |
|  | 95\% Cl | 93.47-102.1 | 88.62-96.43 | 83.98-91.26 | 66.35-76.16 | 52.90-67.57 | 76.69-81.64 |
| Moderate Risk | n (\%) | 0 | 6 (3.45) | 21 (6.67) | 54 (16.51) | 36 (21.05) | 117 (11.34) |
|  | 95\% CI | 0 | 0.74-6.16 | 3.91-9.42 | 12.49-20.54 | 14.94-27.16 | 9.40-13.27 |
| High Risk | n (\%) | 1 (2.22) | 5 (2.87) | 6 (1.90) | 20 (6.12) | 14 (8.19) | 46 (4.46) |
|  | 95\% CI | -2.08-6.53 | 0.39-5.36 | 0.39-3.41 | 3.52-8.71 | 4.08-12.30 | 3.20-5.72 |
| Very High Risk | n (\%) | 0 (0) | 2 (1.15) | 12 (3.81) | 20 (6.12) | 18 (10.53) | 52 (5.04) |
|  | 95\% CI | 0 | -0.43-2.73 | 1.69-5.92 | 3.52-8.71 | 5.93-15.13 | 3.70-6.37 |

Table 6. NCD risk prediction among AMIGA participants based on sex

|  | Women |  |  |  |  |  |  | Men |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age | $<40$ | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total | <40 | 40-49 | 50-59 | 60-69 | 70-79 | Total |
|  | N | 34 | 127 | 234 | 226 | 135 | 756 | 11 | 47 | 81 | 101 | 36 | 276 |
| Low Risk | n (\%) | 34 (100) | 119 (93.70) | 213 (91.03) | 169 (74.78) | 89 (65.93) | 624 (82.54) | 10 (90.91) | 42 (89.36) | 63 (77.78) | 64 (63.37) | 14 (38.89) | 193 (69.93) |
|  | 95\% CI | 100 | 89.47-97.93 | 87.36-94.69 | 69.12-80.44 | 57.93-73.92 | 79.83-85.25 | 73.92-107.90 | 80.55-98.18 | 68.72-86.83 | 53.97-72.76 | 22.96-54.81 | 64.52-75.34 |
| Moderate Risk | n (\%) | 0 | 5 (3.94) | 11 (4.70) | 33 (14.60) | 25 (18.52) | 74 (9.79) | 0 | 1 (2.13) | 10 (12.35) | 21 (20.79) | 11 (30.56) | 43 (15.58) |
|  | 95\% CI | 0 | 0.55-7.32 | 1.99-7.41 | 10.0-19.21 | 11.97-25.07 | 7.67-11.91 | 0 | -2.00-6.25 | 5.18-19.51 | 12.88-28.71 | 15.51-45.60 | 11.30-19.86 |
| High Risk | n (\%) | 0 | 1 (0.79) | 3 (1.28) | 15 (6.64) | 9 (6.67) | 28 (3.70) | 1 (9.09) | 4 (8.51) | 3 (3.70) | $5(4.95)$ | 5 (13.89) | 18 (6.52) |
|  | 95\% CI | 0 | -0.75-2.32 | -0.16-2.72 | 3.39-9.88 | 2.46-10.87 | 2.36-5.05 | -7.90-26.08 | 0.53-16.49 | -0.41-7.82 | 0.72-9.18 | 2.59-25.19 | 3.61-9.43 |
| Very High Risk | n (\%) | 0 | 2 (1.57) | 7 (2.99) | 9 (3.98) | 12 (8.89) | 30 (3.97) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (6.17) | 11 (10.89) | 6 (16.67) | 22 (7.97) |
|  | 95\% CI | 0 | -0.59-3.74 | 0.81-5.17 | 1.43-6.53 | 4.09-13.69 | 2.58-5.36 | 0 | 0 | 0.93-11.41 | 4.81-16.97 | 4.49-28.84 | 4.78-11.17 |

level ( $\geq 30 \%$ risk), three levels above the low risk category, unless BP was persistent at $\geq 160 / 100$ or the cholesterol level $\geq 320 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{dl}$, in which cases medication should also be started. If the protocol is strictly followed, only $20 \%$ of the participants should be receiving medications. ${ }^{a}$ The 'practice notes' did not specify how much higher the risk would be in the presence of these additional risk factors so it is unclear if medication should be maintained especially in the moderate and high-risk groups when these other risk factors are present, and most clinicians presently supervising the management of these patients rely on current clinical guidelines for single risk factors especially hypertension and hypercholesterolemia.

This brings forth questions in the use of the WHO/ ISH risk prediction chart in determining the appropriate management choice for populations like that in this study. Many researchers have noted that the use of the WHO/ ISH risk prediction chart has not been validated in most Asian countries. ${ }^{5,6,7,18,20}$ A large retrospective study conducted in Malaysia comparing the use of several risk prediction charts found the Framingham Risk Score and the SCORE (Systematic Coronary Risk Evaluation) to be the most applicable in the Malaysian population for the identification of patients at high CVD risk, while the $\mathrm{WHO} / \mathrm{ISH}$ risk prediction chart was the least applicable. ${ }^{22}$ Researchers have noted that since only a few risk factors are taken into consideration in the WHO/ISH risk prediction charts the proportion of those with high CVD risk could be underestimated in a given population especially if the 'practice notes' were ignored. ${ }^{5,6,7,18,20}$ Therefore, there is a need to develop more comprehensive CVD risk prediction charts, ${ }^{5}$ and these charts must be validated for each population. ${ }^{22}$

That being said, the total CVD risk approach still offers the best strategy option for low and middle-income countries like the Philippines, where financial resources for health leaves much to be desired. In the absence of studies validating which CVD risk prediction model is the most applicable in the country, the WHO/ISH risk prediction chart and the PhilPEN may be the only choice for now. Clearer guidelines for populations like the participants in this study, however, need to be developed. It is therefore recommended that the participants in this study be followed up on a long term basis as a way of validating the WHO/ ISH risk prediction charts or for the development of a more specific CVD risk prediction chart for Filipinos with hypertension and/or diabetes.

## CONCLUSION

Majority of patients with hypertension and/or diabetes attending clinics or hypertension/health club meetings in the AMIGA municipalities of Cavite were found to be in

[^0]the low-risk group (with $<10 \%$ risk of developing a CVD accident in the next 10 years), while $9.5 \%$ were in the high-risk category ( $\geq 20 \%$ risk). However, majority of the participants in this study were found to be obese which is still a risk factor for CVD. Future and ongoing programs must then focus on improving the lifestyle choices of their target audience with regards to obesity and other diet-related diseases.
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