

**Supplemental Table 1: LDL-C equations identified by systematic literature review**

Lead author	Year	Formula	Country	Sample size (n)	Year of LDL-C measurement	LDL-C reference method
Friedewald	1972	$TC - HDL-C - TG/5$	United States	448	Unclear	$\beta$ quantification
DeLong	1986	$TC - HDL-C - (0.16 \times TG)$	North America	6,610	1972–1975	Ultracentrifugation
Rao	1988	$[(4.7 \times TC) - (4.364 \times HDL-C) - TG]/4.487$	Kuwait	196	Unclear	$\beta$ quantification
Hattori	1998	$(0.94 \times TC) - (0.94 \times HDL-C) - (0.19 \times TG)$	Japan	2,179	1992–1996	Ultracentrifugation
Puavilai	2004	$TC - HDL-C - (TG/6)$	Thailand	1,079	Not reported	Not reported
Anandaraja	2005	$(0.9 \times TC) - (0.9 \times [TG/5]) - 28$	India	2,008	1998	Direct method (Beckman)
Teerakanchana	2007	$(0.91 \times TC) - (0.634 \times HDL-C) - (0.111 \times TG) - 6.755$	Thailand	1,016	2004–2005	Direct method
Ahmadi	2008	$TC/1.19 + TG/1.9 - HDL/1.1 - 38$	Iran	230	2002–2003	Direct method (Technicon)
Saiedullah	2009	$TC - TG/5 - HDL-C + 15.3 (TG/TC) - 2.4$	Bangladesh	Unclear	Not reported	Not reported
Chen	2010	$(0.9 \times TC) - (0.9 \times HDL-C) - (0.1 \times TG)$	China	2,180	Not reported	Direct method (Roche)
Vujovic	2010	$TC - HDL-C - (TG/6.85)$	Serbia	2,053	2007–2008	Direct method (Kyowa Medex)
Cordova	2013	$0.7516 \times (TC - HDL-C)$	Brazil	10,664	2000–2002	Direct method (Wako)

Martin/Hopkins	2013	$TC - HDL-C - (TG / \text{adjustable factor})$	United States	1,350, 908	2009–2011	Vertical Auto Profile Ultracentrifuge (Atherotech)
Dansethakul	2015	$0.9955 \times TC - 0.9853 \times HDL-C - 0.1998 \times TG + 7.1449$	Thailand	1,786	2008	Direct method (Roche)
Lee & Hu	2015	$TC \times 0.75 - 25$	China	21,689	2010–2014	Direct method (Wako)
Rasouli	2017	$0.75 \times TC - 0.5 HDL - 0.1 \times TG$	Iran	310	Not reported	Direct method (Pars Azmon Inc)
Orejon, Ricra, Huallapa	2017	$0.974 \times TC - 0.160 \times TG - 0.968 \times HDL + 5.361$	Peru	4,644	2015	Direct method (Siemens)
Ghasemi	2018	$TC - HDL-C - TG/4$	Iran	5,030	2012–2015	Direct method (Pars Azmon Inc)
Ephraim	2018	$TC - HDL-C - TG/4$	Ghana	1,518	2016–2017	Direct method
Bauer	2020	$TC - HDL-C - TG/7.98$	Germany	3,514	2014–2019	Direct method (Roche)
Molavi	2020	$(0.97 \times TC) - (0.93 \times HDL-C) - (0.19 \times TG)$	Iran	3,844	2015	Not reported
Sampson	2020	$TC/0.948 - HDL-C/0.971 - (TG/8.56 + [TG \times \text{Non-HDL-C}]/2140 - TG^2/16100) - 9.44$	United States	8,656	1976–1999	$\beta$ quantification
Choi	2021	$TC - 0.87 \times HDL-C - 0.13 \times TG$	Korea	4,562	2017–2018	Direct method (Roche)

**Supplemental Table 2: Percentage of patients correctly classified to LDL-C category for patients with triglyceride levels of 150–399 mg/dL**

Equation	LDL-C category, mg/dL								
	<40	40–54	55–69	70–99	100–129	130–159	160–189	≥190	Overall
Martin/Hopkins	68.6	72.1	72.8	85.6	84.5	83.0	80.7	88.7	83.5
Sampson	39.3	42.8	51.9	78.3	82.3	83.3	81.8	89.0	79.3
Chen	63.5	64.7	67.3	82.3	82.0	81.4	80.3	92.8	81.3
Puavilai	31.5	37.4	49.9	80.3	85.2	84.2	78.5	80.5	79.4
DeLong	35.9	43.0	55.2	83.0	85.9	83.1	75.8	77.7	80.0
Friedewald	16.7	14.8	23.5	61.4	73.3	80.7	83.2	91.6	67.8

**Supplemental Table 3: Percentage of patients correctly classified to LDL-C category for patients with triglyceride levels of 400–799 mg/dL**

Equation	LDL-C category, mg/dL								
	<40	40–54	55–69	70–99	100–129	130–159	160–189	≥190	Overall
Extended M/H	59.0	45.7	43.6	65.2	60.8	58.4	56.8	71.4	60.3
Martin/Hopkins	41.3	41.5	42.1	65.4	61.0	57.4	54.3	65.9	59.2
Sampson	14.6	11.7	15.7	40.0	43.8	45.3	44.6	84.5	37.3
Chen	25.3	29.3	34.8	63.3	63.0	60.4	54.8	67.3	57.7
Puavilai	8.2	4.9	9.1	37.1	49.5	56.4	57.1	73.5	38.0
DeLong	9.4	6.6	12.1	42.1	53.8	58.9	57.4	70.7	42.2
Friedewald	4.4	1.1	2.5	15.6	26.5	36.6	43.5	83.0	18.2

**Supplemental Table 4: Percentage of patients correctly classified to LDL-C category, stratified by subgroups**

	Martin/Hopkins	Sampson	Chen	Puavilai	DeLong	Friedewald
<b>Age category, y</b>						
<18	91.4	87.6	87.5	83.8	83.1	83.9
18–59	89.6	85.9	84.0	83.8	83.0	83.1
≥60	89.5	86.8	84.8	84.7	83.8	83.2
<b>Sex</b>						
Women	90.4	87.1	84.0	85.2	84.3	84.7
Men	88.7	85.3	84.8	82.9	82.2	81.4
<b>Fasting status</b>						
Non-fasting	89.2	85.3	83.3	84.1	83.8	80.2
Fasting	90.4	87.5	84.8	85.0	83.9	85.3
<b>eGFR, mL/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup></b>						
<60	89.5	87.1	85.0	85.0	84.3	82.1
≥60	90.9	86.9	83.9	85.2	84.6	83.3
<b>Diabetes</b>						
Yes	88.6	84.8	83.7	84.0	84.1	76.8
No	89.6	86.3	84.4	84.1	83.3	83.4
<b>Hypertension</b>						
Yes	89.9	86.6	84.1	85.1	84.6	81.4
No	89.6	86.3	84.4	84.1	83.3	83.3
<b>ASCVD</b>						
Yes	90.1	87.2	86.1	84.5	84.2	81.0
No	89.6	86.3	84.3	84.1	83.3	83.2
<b>High-sensitivity C-reactive protein, mg/L</b>						
<2	91.4	87.2	85.2	84.7	83.8	85.0
≥2	89.9	86.8	83.3	85.4	84.8	82.1
<b>TSH, uIU/mL</b>						
<0.5	91.0	87.8	84.2	85.6	85.0	84.3
0.5–4.5	90.6	87.0	84.1	85.2	84.4	83.3
>4.5	89.7	86.9	83.3	85.3	84.8	82.5
<b>Overall</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>86.3</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>84.1</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>83.2</b>

**Supplemental Figure 1: PRISMA chart for identification of relevant studies**

