Why conventional CV risk scores fail Native American patients

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 12 August 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Cardiovascular disease remains a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally, but its burden is disproportionately high in certain populations. Native American communities, in particular, face unique challenges in cardiovascular health, often experiencing higher rates of risk factors and earlier onset of disease. Standard cardiovascular risk prediction tools, developed predominantly in populations of European descent, frequently fail to accurately assess risk in these diverse groups. This disparity creates a significant gap in preventive care, leaving many individuals without appropriate interventions.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Conventional CV risk scores, designed for broader populations, consistently misclassify risk in Native American individuals.
- The Data: Existing models often overestimate or underestimate risk, leading to suboptimal clinical decisions for prevention.
- The Action: Clinicians should recognize the limitations of current risk calculators in Native American patients and advocate for the development and adoption of population-specific tools.

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) encompasses a range of conditions affecting the heart and blood vessels, including coronary artery disease, stroke, heart failure, and peripheral artery disease. These conditions are driven by a complex relationship between genetic predispositions, environmental factors, and lifestyle choices. Established risk factors such as hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes, obesity, and smoking are well-documented contributors to CVD development and progression. For the general population, risk prediction models like the pooled cohort equations (PCE) are widely used to estimate the 10-year risk of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) events, guiding decisions on statin therapy and other preventive measures.

But these models, while useful for many, are not universally applicable. Native American populations exhibit distinct epidemiological profiles, including a higher prevalence of type 2 diabetes, metabolic syndrome, and certain inflammatory markers, often at younger ages. These differences mean that a model calibrated on a different population may not accurately capture the true risk in Native American individuals. The consequence is either overtreatment, exposing patients to unnecessary medication and side effects, or, more critically, undertreatment, leaving high-risk individuals unprotected from preventable cardiovascular events. This unmet need for precise risk stratification is a significant barrier to equitable cardiovascular care.

The limitations of current risk assessment

The standard approach to cardiovascular risk assessment typically involves gathering demographic information, medical history, and laboratory values to calculate a composite risk score. These scores are then used to categorize individuals into low, intermediate, or high-risk groups, informing clinical guidelines for primary prevention. For instance, guidelines often recommend statin therapy for individuals with a 10-year ASCVD risk above a certain threshold. The underlying assumption is that the predictive power of these models holds across all ethnic and racial groups.

But this assumption does not hold true for Native American populations. Studies have consistently shown that models like the PCE can misclassify a substantial proportion of Native American individuals. This misclassification is not random; it often reflects systemic biases in the data used to develop and validate these models. If a model does not adequately account for the unique risk factor prevalence, genetic variations, or socioeconomic determinants of health within a specific population, its predictive accuracy will suffer. This is particularly relevant for conditions like diabetes, which has a higher prevalence and often an earlier onset in many Native American communities, significantly impacting cardiovascular risk.

The mechanisms behind these disparities are complex and multifactorial. Genetic factors play a role, with certain genetic variants being more prevalent in Native American populations that may influence lipid metabolism, inflammation, and glucose regulation. Environmental factors, including access to healthy foods, safe physical activity spaces, and quality healthcare, also contribute. Socioeconomic determinants of health, such as poverty, historical trauma, and systemic discrimination, further exacerbate these issues, creating a unique risk landscape, the market, that is not adequately captured by broad-based risk calculators. For clinicians, understanding these nuances is critical for providing effective care, and a comprehensive resource like the Oxford Handbook of Cardiology can offer valuable insights into population-specific considerations.

Developing tailored prediction tools

Addressing the shortcomings of existing risk prediction models requires a concerted effort to develop and validate tools specifically for Native American populations. This involves collecting comprehensive, longitudinal data from diverse Native American communities, ensuring that the models are built on a foundation that accurately reflects their unique risk profiles. Such models would incorporate traditional risk factors but also consider additional variables that may be more relevant to these populations, such as specific biomarkers, genetic markers, or social determinants of health.

The development process for these tailored tools must be community-engaged, involving Native American leaders, healthcare providers, and community members at every stage. This collaborative approach ensures that the models are not only scientifically sound but also culturally appropriate and acceptable to the populations they are intended to serve. Without this engagement, even a statistically robust model may fail to achieve clinical uptake and impact. The goal is to create tools that empower clinicians to make more informed decisions about preventive therapies, ultimately reducing the burden of cardiovascular disease in these underserved communities.

The open-label design of many observational studies in this area is an obvious caveat, as is the inherent difficulty in standardizing data collection across diverse tribal nations. The trial was not powered to detect differences in specific tribal subgroups, and that gap matters for truly personalized medicine. Future research needs to focus on larger, prospective cohorts with detailed phenotyping and genetic data to refine these models further. Only then can we move towards a truly equitable approach to cardiovascular risk prediction and prevention.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The persistent underperformance of standard cardiovascular risk prediction models in Native American populations is not merely a statistical anomaly; it is a significant clinical problem. GPs and specialists relying solely on tools like the PCE risk misguiding patients, either by withholding necessary preventive therapy or by prescribing it unnecessarily. This calls for a fundamental shift in how we approach risk assessment in these communities.

Clinicians must exercise a higher degree of clinical judgment when evaluating Native American patients for cardiovascular risk. This means looking beyond the calculated score and considering the broader context of a patient's health, including family history, socioeconomic factors, and the prevalence of conditions like diabetes within their community. Until validated, population-specific tools become widely available, a more holistic and cautious approach is warranted.

The pharmaceutical industry also has a role to play. Investment in research that specifically addresses health disparities and develops tailored interventions for underserved populations is critical. Simply extrapolating data from predominantly European cohorts is no longer acceptable. Real progress requires dedicated resources and a commitment to health equity, ensuring that all patients benefit from advances in cardiovascular medicine.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Okoth K, Chandan JS, Marshall T, et al. Association between the reproductive health of young women and cardiovascular disease in later life: umbrella review. BMJ. 2020;371:m3502. doi:10.1136/bmj.m3502
2. 2. Taqueti VR, Di Carli MF. Coronary Microvascular Disease Pathogenic Mechanisms and Therapeutic Options: JACC State-of-the-Art Review. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2018;72(21):2625-2641. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2018.09.042
3. 3. Balakrishna R, Bjørnerud T, Bemanian M, Aune D, Fadnes LT. Consumption of Nuts and Seeds and Health Outcomes Including Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes and Metabolic Disease, Cancer, and Mortality: An Umbrella Review. Adv Nutr. 2022;13(6):2136-2148. doi:10.1093/advances/nmac077
4. 4. de Bont J, Jaganathan S, Dahlquist M, Persson Å, Stafoggia M, Ljungman P. Ambient air pollution and cardiovascular diseases: An umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. J Intern Med. 2022;291(6):779-800. doi:10.1111/joim.13467
5. 5. Liu M, Meijer P, Lam TM, et al. The built environment and cardiovascular disease: an umbrella review and meta-meta-analysis. Eur J Prev Cardiol. 2023;30(16):1801-1827. doi:10.1093/eurjpc/zwad241
6. 6. Harrison SL, Buckley BJR, Rivera-Caravaca JM, Zhang J, Lip GYH. Cardiovascular risk factors, cardiovascular disease, and COVID-19: an umbrella review of systematic reviews. Eur Heart J Qual Care Clin Outcomes. 2021;7(4):330-339. doi:10.1093/ehjqcco/qcab029

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com