

Disparities In Blood Pressure, Glycemic and Cholesterol Control Among Adults with Prior Myocardial Infarction and Limited English Proficiency: A Nationwide Cross-Sectional Analysis

Rasha Khan, D.O. ¹, Mohibur Rahman, D.O. ¹, Viha Atri, MBBS, Avica Atri, M.D. ¹, Shivaraj Patil, M.D. ² Ola Khraisha, M.D. ²

•¹Department of Medicine, Albert Einstein Medical Center, PA

• ²Division of Cardiovascular Diseases, Albert Einstein Medical Center, PA

Introduction

- It is unclear if patients with prior MI and limited English proficiency (LEP) have suboptimal control of traditional risk factors compared to English-proficient patients
- We aim to identify if LEP leads to disparities in blood pressure, glycemic, and cholesterol control in this high-risk population.

Methods

- Patients aged ≥ 20 years with prior MI were identified using combined data from National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey cycles conducted from 2015 to 2020 (pre-pandemic).
- LEP was defined as a participant receiving the survey in a non-English language or by interpreter
- Self-reported history of diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c %), blood pressure, and cholesteroltriglyceride levels were analyzed.
- Categorical variables were reported as proportions and continuous variables as mean ± standard deviation (S.D).
- An independent sample t-test was used to compare means, and a chi-square test was used to compare proportions.

Results

- A total of 16,831,852 (weighted) patients met study criteria, amongst whom 4.9% had LEP.
- Majority of patients with LEP were **Hispanic** (78.3%).
- Compared to English proficient patients, LEP patients had poorer glycemic (7.2 \pm 1.8% vs. 7.9 \pm 1.5%) and systolic blood pressure control (131.1 \pm 20.9 vs. 134.2 \pm 23.6 mm Hg).
- LDL-cholesterol level was suboptimal regardless of self-reported hyperlipidemia status, and worse among patients with LEP (Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of Prior Myocardial Infarction Patients stratified by English proficiency.

Variable	English Proficient	Limited English Proficiency	P value
	(N=16,010,179)	(N=821,673)	(weighted)
Age	65.4 ± 11.5	65.2 ± 11.9	<0.001
Female sex (%)	35.2	43.5	<0.001
Race (%)			
Non-Hispanic White	74.6	0	-
Non-Hispanic Black	10.6	0	-
Hispanic	5.3	78.3	<0.001
Other	9.5	21.7	<0.001
Diabetes (%)	39.7	38.2	<0.001
Hemoglobin A1c%	7.2 ± 1.8	7.9 ± 1.5	<0.001
Hypertension (%)	74.8	70.3	<0.001
Systolic Blood Pressure	131.1 ± 20.9	134.2 ± 23.6	<0.001
Diastolic Blood Pressure	70.5 ± 16.1	66.1 ± 16.6	<0.001
Hyperlipidemia (%)	69.5	66.6	<0.001
Total Cholesterol	175.7 ± 41.1	175.3 ± 42.4	<0.001
LDL-Cholesterol	96 ± 42.3	108 ± 41.4	<0.001
HDL-Cholesterol	48.9 ± 18.6	46.3 ± 11.9	<0.001
Triglyceride	130.5 ± 86.9	171.9 ± 194	<0.001
Non-Hyperlipidemic (%)	30.5	33.5	<0.001
Total Cholesterol	163.4 ± 38.3	158.1 ± 21.5	<0.001
LDL-Cholesterol	90.5 ± 32.9	90.5 ± 18.5	<0.001
HDL-Cholesterol	48.5 ± 14.3	46.7± 11.1	<0.001
Triglyceride	114.5 ± 54.1	94.8 ± 20.8	<0.001

Conclusion

- In a nationally representative sample, prior MI
 patients with LEP had poorly controlled
 modifiable risk factors than those with
 adequate English proficiency.
- Beyond the LEP status, this high-risk cohort of patients had LDL-Cholesterol levels that were significantly greater than the recommended target level of < 70 mg/dl for secondary prevention.
- Reducing language barriers by providing language-concordant care and improving interpreter services should be examined to achieve secondary prevention targets among high-risk patients with LEP.

References

- 1. Steen DL, Khan I, Andrade K, Koumas A, Giugliano RP. Event Rates and Risk Factors for Recurrent Cardiovascular Events and Mortality in a Contemporary Post Acute Coronary Syndrome Population Representing 239 234 Patients During 2005 to 2018 in the United States. J Am Heart Assoc. 2022;11(9):e022198. doi:10.1161/JAHA.121.022198
- Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, et al. 2018
 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA
 Guideline on the Management of Blood Cholesterol: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines [published correction appears in Circulation. 2019 Jun 18;139(25):e1182-e1186] [published correction appears in Circulation. 2023 Aug 15;148(7):e5]. Circulation. 2019;139(25):e1082-e1143. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000055