

## Original Article

# ***APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms influence metabolic responses to *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. and *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino tea consumption in hypercholesterolemic subjects**

Nutjaree Jeenduang PhD<sup>1</sup>, Boonnisa Sangkaew BSc<sup>1</sup>, Pacharee Chantaracha BSc<sup>1</sup>, Sirada Chanchareonsri BSc<sup>1</sup>, Thunyaluk Plyduang MSc<sup>2</sup>, Wanida Thitdee BSc<sup>1</sup>, Cathaleeya Samae BSc<sup>1</sup>, Wacharaporn Pitumanon BSc<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Allied Health Sciences, Walailak University, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Thailand

<sup>2</sup>Center for Scientific and Technological Equipments, Walailak University, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Thailand

**Background and Objectives:** *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. (HS) and *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino (GP) have been used as traditional medicines to treat diabetes and hypercholesterolemia. Nevertheless, there is inter-individual variation in the metabolic responses to HS and GP consumption. This may be due to genetic factors. The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of HS and GP tea consumption on anthropometric data, fasting blood glucose (FBG), and lipid concentrations in hypercholesterolemia subjects with different genotypes of the *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms. **Methods and Study Design:** Forty-eight subjects with hypercholesterolemia were given either HS or GP tea for 30 days. Anthropometric and biochemical variables were determined, and *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms were analyzed using the polymerase chain reaction–restriction fragment length polymorphism (PCR-RFLP). **Results:** E4 ( $p=0.008$ ) and homozygous B1B1 ( $p=0.010$ ) carriers had significantly decreased HDL-C concentrations after HS consumption; in addition, B2 carriers who consumed HS showed significantly decreased triglyceride (TG) concentrations ( $p=0.039$ ). Regarding GP consumption, non-E4 carriers had significantly decreased HDL-C ( $p=0.009$ ) and FBG ( $p=0.042$ ) concentrations. Furthermore, B2 carriers had significantly decreased total cholesterol (TC) ( $p=0.045$ ), HDL-C ( $p=0.004$ ), and FBG ( $p=0.026$ ) concentrations. **Conclusions:** HS consumption may have beneficial effects with respect to TG concentrations in the B2 carriers, but it may adversely affect HDL-C concentrations in homozygous B1B1 and E4 carriers. In contrast, GP consumption may have favorable effects on TC and FBG concentrations but not on HDL-C concentrations for B2 and/or non-E4 carriers.

**Key Words:** *APOE*, *CETP TaqIB*, *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino, *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L., Polymorphisms

## INTRODUCTION

Dyslipidemia has been associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD). The etiology of dyslipidemia has been attributed to environmental factors such as a sedentary lifestyle, western diet, lack of exercise, smoking, alcohol consumption, and stress. Moreover, several genetic factors have been investigated to determine their link with dyslipidemia; for example, *APOA5*, *APOE*, *CETP*, *LPL*, and *LDLR*.<sup>1</sup> Dyslipidemia can be prevented in individuals by improving their lifestyle behavior, controlling their diet, or receiving pharmacological therapy. Early treatment of dyslipidemia can substantially reduce cardiovascular risk and the rate of morbidity and mortality.<sup>2</sup> Statins are the most common agent used to treat plasma lipid disorders; however, some patients have adverse side effects to this drug, such as the elevation of liver enzymes, gastrointestinal symptoms, predisposition to cholelithiasis, rhabdomyolysis, myopathy, and renal dysfunction.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, herbal therapy with fewer side effects may be an alternative approach to re-

duce hypercholesterolemia.

In Thailand, *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L (HS) and *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino (GP) are consumed traditionally as a hot drink or beverage. Studies carried out in animals and humans have primarily demonstrated that HS and GP extracts have a low degree of toxicity.<sup>4-10</sup> HS has been used as a traditional medicine to treat hypertension,<sup>11</sup> inflammatory disease,<sup>12</sup> cancer,<sup>13</sup> kidney stones, urinary bladder stones, hypercholesterolemia, fungi, and bacterial infections.<sup>14</sup> In addition, GP is commonly used to treat a variety of diseases such as diabetes mellitus,

**Corresponding Author:** Dr Nutjaree Jeenduang, School of Allied Health Sciences, Walailak University, 222 Thaiburi, Thasala, Nakhon Si Thammarat 80161, Thailand.

Tel: +66 75672193; Fax: +66 75672106

Email: nutjaree.je@wu.ac.th

Manuscript received 15 March 2015. Initial review completed 20 August 2015. Revision accepted 23 November 2015.

doi: 10.6133/apjcn.122015.04

cancer, gastritis, bronchitis, hypertension, and hypercholesterolemia.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, several studies have shown that there are variable effects on lipid profiles after HS and GP consumption.<sup>16-22</sup> These variations may be due to several environmental factors as well as genetic factors.

Apolipoprotein E (apoE) is a component of plasma chylomicrons, chylomicron remnants, very-low density lipoprotein (VLDL), intermediate density lipoprotein (IDL), and high density lipoprotein (HDL).<sup>23</sup> ApoE acts as ligand for low density lipoprotein receptor (LDLR) and LDL-related protein (LRP).<sup>23</sup> The *APOE* gene is located on chromosome 19q13.2 and consists of 4 exons and 3 introns.<sup>23</sup> There are three common alleles (E2, E3, and E4) in the *APOE* gene, which code for six genotypes of E2/E2, E3/E3, E4/E4, E2/E3, E2/E4, and E3/E4.<sup>23</sup> The E4 allele is associated with higher concentrations of low density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) and total cholesterol (TC) compared with E3 allele, while the E2 allele is associated with lower concentrations of the same plasma lipoproteins and lipids.<sup>24</sup> In addition, the E4 allele is associated with lower concentrations of high density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C).<sup>24,25</sup> It has been reported that the E4 allele is associated with an increased risk of CVD and Alzheimer's disease.<sup>24,25</sup>

The cholesteryl ester transfer protein (CETP) plays a key role in the metabolism of HDL.<sup>26</sup> CETP enables the transfer of cholesteryl esters from HDL to VLDL, IDL, and low density lipoprotein (LDL); the IDL and LDL are catabolized via the LDLR in the liver. The *CETP* gene is located on chromosome 16q21.<sup>26</sup> Several polymorphisms have been reported in this gene;<sup>27</sup> the most commonly studied of these is *TaqIB*, which is a silent base change affecting the 277<sup>th</sup> nucleotide in the first intron of the *CETP* gene.<sup>27</sup> The B2 allele is associated with increased HDL-C concentrations and decreased CETP concentrations and activity;<sup>28</sup> additionally, it is further associated with a lower CVD risk.<sup>29</sup> Several environmental factors such as smoking, alcohol consumption, obesity, and diet have been reported to modulate the effect of the *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms on lipid concentrations.<sup>30-34</sup>

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of HS and GP tea consumption on anthropometric data, fasting blood glucose (FBG), and lipid concentrations according to *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms in hypercholesterolemic subjects.

## SUBJECTS AND METHODS

### Subjects

Participants were recruited from the personnel of Walailak University. Inclusion criteria were hypercholesterolemia subjects who were diagnosed as having fasting TC >5.17 mmol/L and/or LDL-C >3.36 mmol/L. Exclusion criteria were as follows: chronic disease such as diabetes, thyroid disease, liver disease, renal disease, cancer, and triglyceride (TG) >4.52 mmol/L, as well as the use of anti-hypertensive, diuretics, and lipid lowering drugs. Sixty-six participants were included in the study. Eighteen subjects were dropped because they did not meet the criteria (n=8), declined to participate (n=5), lost to attrition (n=3), and for other reasons (n=2). Thus, the final analysis included 48 participants (17 males and 31 fe-

males). The study protocol was explained in detail to all participants, who gave written informed consent at the beginning of the study. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Walailak University (Protocol number 14/021).

### Study design and dietary assessment

After recruitment, the participants were randomly allocated into one of two groups. Each group of participants was instructed to take HS or GP tea two times a day, one in the morning and another in the afternoon, between the main meals for 30 days. The tea sachet (3 g) was added to 240 mL of boiling water and drunk after a steeping time of 10 min. HS and GP tea were purchased directly from the herbal medicine company in Thailand; all tea products were approved by the Thai Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The participants were instructed to avoid drinking other types of tea during the study and their diet and behavior were kept unchanged. The dietary habits were assessed by a semi-quantitative food frequency questionnaire (SFFQ) at the beginning and at the end of the study. The food items in the SFFQ were based on local foods in the Thai Food Composition Table.<sup>35</sup> The nutritional energy based on the SFFQ was computed by the multiplying the consumption frequency of each food by the nutritive values of the food. Smoking, alcohol consumption, and exercise were also recorded by questionnaire.

### Anthropometric measurements and biochemical analyses

Systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) were recorded at the brachial artery using the Omron T8 with Intellisense (HEM757A4-C1) automatic blood pressure monitor after 20 minutes of rest. The height and weight of subjects were obtained when they were wearing light clothing and without shoes. Waist circumference (WC) was also measured. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight (kg) divided by the square of the height (m<sup>2</sup>). Venous blood was collected into blood tubes after 12 h fasting; FBG and lipid profiles were measured at baseline (day 0) and day 31 of the study period. The concentrations of TC, TG, HDL-C, and FBG were measured by standardized enzymatic technique on Konelab analyzer (KONELAB 20, Tokyo, Japan). LDL-C was calculated using the Friedewald formula.

### DNA extraction and genotyping

The *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms were analyzed by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) analysis.<sup>36,37</sup> Genomic DNA was isolated from white blood cells using the Genomic DNA Mini kit (GeneAid Biotech Ltd., Taiwan). *APOE* genotype was determined by amplifying a 218 bp fragment of exon 4 of the gene by PCR followed by *AflIII* and *HaeII* digestion. The resulting DNA fragments were 145, 168, and 195 bp indicated for E3, E2, and E4 alleles, respectively. For *CETP TaqIB* genotyping, the amplification of 505 bp fragment of the intron 1 of this gene was carried out using PCR, followed by *TaqIB* digestion. The resulting DNA fragments were 415 and 90 bp for the B1 allele and an intact 505 bp fragment for the B2 allele.

**Table 1.** Allele and genotype frequencies of *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms

|                             | All       | Men       | Women     | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|
| n                           | 48        | 17        | 31        |                              |
| <i>APOE</i> genotypes       |           |           |           |                              |
| E2E2                        | 1 (2.10)  | 0 (0)     | 1 (3.23)  | 0.763                        |
| E2E3                        | 7 (14.6)  | 3 (17.7)  | 4 (12.9)  |                              |
| E3E3                        | 22 (45.8) | 8 (47.1)  | 14 (45.2) |                              |
| E3E4                        | 16 (33.3) | 6 (35.3)  | 10 (32.3) |                              |
| E4E4                        | 2 (4.20)  | 0 (0)     | 2 (6.45)  |                              |
| E2E4                        | 0 (0)     | 0 (0)     | 0 (0)     |                              |
| <i>APOE</i> alleles         |           |           |           |                              |
| E2                          | 9 (9.39)  | 3 (8.82)  | 6 (9.68)  |                              |
| E3                          | 67 (69.8) | 25 (73.5) | 42 (67.7) |                              |
| E4                          | 20 (20.8) | 6 (17.7)  | 14 (22.6) |                              |
| <i>CETP TaqIB</i> genotypes |           |           |           |                              |
| B1B1                        | 19 (39.6) | 7 (41.2)  | 12 (38.7) | 0.947                        |
| B1B2                        | 24 (50.0) | 8 (47.1)  | 16 (51.6) |                              |
| B2B2                        | 5 (10.4)  | 2 (11.8)  | 3 (9.68)  |                              |
| <i>CETP TaqIB</i> alleles   |           |           |           |                              |
| B1                          | 62 (64.6) | 22 (64.7) | 40 (64.5) |                              |
| B2                          | 34 (35.4) | 12 (35.3) | 22 (35.5) |                              |

<sup>†</sup>Data were presented as n (%) and analyzed using Chi-square test.

### Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 17.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, United States). Differences in genotypic and allelic distributions between the groups were estimated using the Chi square ( $\chi^2$ ) test. The normal distribution was tested by mean of Shapiro-Wilk test. Mean differences between genders and genotypes were assessed by independent t-test or Mann-Whitney U test. To evaluate the effects of the intervention, a paired t-test or Wilcoxon's Signed Rank test was performed. The interaction effect between the *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* genotypes and tea consumption on metabolic parameters was tested by introducing corresponding interactions terms in the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) model. A *p*-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

## RESULTS

### Anthropometric, biochemical, and nutritional characterization of the study population

The anthropometric and biochemical characteristics of the study subjects are summarized in Supplementary table 1. Among the 66 volunteers, 48 completed the study. Males had significantly increased in weight but decreased in HDL-C concentrations compared with females. There were no significant differences in the other parameters. The results of dietary nutrient intake and behavior of the study subjects are shown in Supplementary table 2. There were no significant differences in the total energy and nutrient intake at the beginning and the end of this study among the HS and GP consumption groups. The exercise, smoking, and alcohol consumption were similar throughout the study.

### Frequency of the *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms

The genotype and allele frequencies of *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms in the study population are shown in Table 1. No deviation from the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium

was found in the distribution of genotypes (*APOE*: *p*=0.372; *CETP*: *p*=0.520). Additionally, no statistically significant gender differences for genotype frequencies of *APOE* (*p*=0.763) or *CETP TaqIB* (*p*=0.947) were observed in this study population.

### Effects of *APOE* polymorphism on changes of anthropometric and biochemical characteristics after tea consumption

Table 2 shows the anthropometric and biochemical characteristics at baseline and after tea consumption in the subjects with different *APOE* genotypes. Due to the small number of homozygotes for the E4 alleles, the genotypes were referred to as E4 and non-E4 carriers for statistical analysis. In the GP group, LDL-C concentrations were significantly higher in E4 carriers compared with non-E4 carriers (*p*=0.043) at baseline. No significant differences in the other biochemical parameters were found at baseline between the E4 and non-E4 carriers in both HS and GP groups. After HS consumption, E4 carriers had significantly decreased HDL-C concentrations (*p*=0.008). In contrast, regarding the GP consumption, non-E4 carriers had significantly decreased HDL-C (*p*=0.009) and FBG (*p*=0.042) concentrations. However, there was no significant interaction between tea consumption and *APOE* genotypes on anthropometric and biochemical parameters.

### Effects of *CETP TaqIB* polymorphism on changes of anthropometric and biochemical characteristics after tea consumption

Table 3 shows the anthropometric and biochemical characteristics at baseline and after tea consumption in the subjects with different *CETP TaqIB* genotypes. Due to the small number of homozygotes for the B2 allele, the genotypes were referred to as B2 and non-B2 carriers for statistical analysis. In the HS group, FBG concentrations were significantly higher in B2 carriers than non-B2 carriers at baseline (*p*=0.041) and after intervention (*p*=0.048). In the GP group, BMI was significantly lower

**Table 2.** Characteristics at baseline and after *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. or *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino tea consumption according to *APOE* genotype

| Variables                            | <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.<br>(n=24) |                       | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> | <i>Gynostemma pentaphyllum</i> Makino<br>(n=24) |                      | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> | <i>p</i> -interaction <sup>§</sup> |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                                      | Non-E4 carriers<br>(n=13)               | E4 carriers<br>(n=11) |                              | Non-E4 carriers<br>(n=17)                       | E4 carriers<br>(n=7) |                              |                                    |
| Weight (kg)                          |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 63.5±8.78                               | 62.4±14.5             | 0.816                        | 64.2±8.35                                       | 71.4±23.9            | 0.611                        | 0.757                              |
| Endpoint                             | 63.9±8.88                               | 62.9±14.8             | 0.486                        | 64.9±7.38                                       | 71.1±23.5            | 0.518                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.337                                   | 0.103                 |                              | 0.173   | 0.321                |                              |                                    |
| Body mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 24.4±1.93                               | 23.7±4.04             | 0.607                        | 25.5±3.30                                       | 27.1±9.09            | 0.427                        | 0.370                              |
| Endpoint                             | 24.6±2.01                               | 23.9±4.12             | 0.629                        | 22.5±9.01                                       | 26.9±8.96            | 0.286                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.348                                   | 0.141                 |                              | 0.132   | 0.356                |                              |                                    |
| Waist circumference (cm)             |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 81.4±5.78                               | 79.8±15.9             | 0.745                        | 83.9±7.74                                       | 85.9±14.9            | 0.949                        | 0.173                              |
| Endpoint                             | 81.2±6.85                               | 78.3±10.5             | 0.415                        | 83.8±7.81                                       | 87.1±16.9            | 0.519                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.881                                   | 0.645                 |                              | 0.445   | 0.356                |                              |                                    |
| Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)       |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 126±24.9                                | 131±16.4              | 0.605                        | 124±22.9  | 128±17.1             | 0.668                        | 0.933                              |
| Endpoint                             | 124±19.1                                | 126±22.7              | 0.783                        | 125±21.0  | 117±14.7             | 0.402                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.611                                   | 0.235                 |                              | 0.496   | 0.078                |                              |                                    |
| Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)      |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 82.9±15.9                               | 86.7±14.7             | 0.494                        | 82.8±14.5                                       | 85.6±9.74            | 0.652                        | 0.763                              |
| Endpoint                             | 81.9±12.1                               | 82.9±13.7             | 0.885                        | 82.5±18.6                                       | 80.0±15.5            | 0.772                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.585                                   | 0.337                 |                              | 0.318   | 0.279                |                              |                                    |
| Total cholesterol (mmol/L)           |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 6.24±0.86                               | 6.56±1.04             | 0.417                        | 5.90±0.82                                       | 6.56±0.62            | 0.067                        | 0.298                              |
| Endpoint                             | 6.06±0.86                               | 6.54±0.93             | 0.203                        | 5.73±0.84                                       | 6.17±1.16            | 0.335                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.176                                   | 0.900                 |                              | 0.358   | 0.148                |                              |                                    |
| Triglyceride (mmol/L)                |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 1.58±0.81                               | 1.52±0.82             | 0.794                        | 1.25±0.68                                       | 1.30±0.56            | 0.804                        | 0.522                              |
| Endpoint                             | 1.49±0.96                               | 1.42±0.61             | 0.733                        | 1.30±0.61                                       | 1.10±0.35            | 0.440                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.606                                   | 0.413                 |                              | 0.831   | 0.353                |                              |                                    |
| LDL-C (mmol/L)                       |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 4.15±0.90                               | 4.33±1.02             | 0.643                        | 3.77 ± 0.78                                     | 4.45±0.47            | 0.043*                       | 0.618                              |
| Endpoint                             | 4.06±0.76                               | 4.44±0.77             | 0.250                        | 3.68 ± 0.69                                     | 4.28±0.98            | 0.102                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.566                                   | 0.409                 |                              | 0.502   | 0.493                |                              |                                    |

LDL-C: low density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C: high density lipoprotein cholesterol.

Each value represents the mean±SD.

<sup>†</sup>Data were analyzed using Student's *t*-test or Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison between non E4 carriers and E4 carriers.

<sup>‡</sup>Data were analyzed using paired *t*-test or Wilcoxon's Signed Rank test for the comparison between baseline and endpoint.

<sup>§</sup>Data were analyzed using ANCOVA for interaction term.

\**p*-value <0.05.

**Table 2.** Characteristics at baseline and after *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. or *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino tea consumption according to *APOE* genotype (cont.)

| Variables                     | <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.<br>(n=24) |                       | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> | <i>Gynostemma pentaphyllum</i> Makino<br>(n=24) |                      | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> | <i>p</i> -interaction <sup>§</sup> |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                               | Non-E4 carriers<br>(n=13)               | E4 carriers<br>(n=11) |                              | Non-E4 carriers<br>(n=17)                       | E4 carriers<br>(n=7) |                              |                                    |
| HDL-C (mmol/L)                |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                      | 1.37±0.28                               | 1.53±0.45             | 0.300                        | 1.56±0.29                                       | 1.52±0.23            | 0.761                        | 0.549                              |
| Endpoint                      | 1.31±0.30                               | 1.46±0.44             | 0.362                        | 1.48±0.32                                       | 1.38±0.22            | 0.480                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>  | 0.147                                   | 0.008*                |                              | 0.009*  | 0.073                |                              |                                    |
| Fasting blood glucose(mmol/L) |   |                       |                              |   |                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                      | 5.12±0.44                               | 5.11±0.38             | 1.000                        | 5.28±0.53                                       | 5.23±0.33            | 0.832                        | 0.646                              |
| Endpoint                      | 4.95±0.47                               | 4.83±0.36             | 0.497                        | 5.13±0.55                                       | 5.08±0.39            | 0.814                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>  | 0.115                                   | 0.061                 |                              | 0.042*  | 0.340                |                              |                                    |

LDL-C: low density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C: high density lipoprotein cholesterol.

Each value represents the mean±SD.

<sup>†</sup>Data were analyzed using Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison between non E4 carriers and E4 carriers.

<sup>‡</sup>Data were analyzed using paired t-test or Wilcoxon's Signed Rank test for the comparison between baseline and endpoint.

<sup>§</sup>Data were analyzed using ANCOVA for interaction term.

\**p*-value < 0.05.

**Table 3.** Characteristics at baseline and after *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. or *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino tea consumption according to *CETP TaqIB* genotype

| Variables                            | <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.<br>(n=24) |                                      | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> | <i>Gynostemma pentaphyllum</i> Makino<br>(n=24) |                                      | <i>p</i> -value <sup>†</sup> | <i>p</i> -interaction <sup>§</sup> |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                                      | Non-B2 carriers<br>(B1B1)<br>(n=11)     | B2 carriers<br>(B1B2+B2B2)<br>(n=13) |                              | Non-B2 carriers<br>(B1B1)<br>(n=8)              | B2 carriers<br>(B1B2+B2B2)<br>(n=16) |                              |                                    |
| Weight (kg)                          |   |                                      |                              |   |                                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 59.6±8.11                               | 65.9±13.3                            | 0.183                        | 77.8±19.2                                       | 60.6±6.49                            | 0.004*                       | 0.268                              |
| Endpoint                             | 60.1±7.93                               | 66.3±13.8                            | 0.296                        | 76.6±19.1                                       | 61.4±6.31                            | 0.060                        |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.284                                   | 0.147                                |                              | 0.208   | 0.321                                |                              |                                    |
| Body mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) |   |                                      |                              |   |                                      |                              |                                    |
| Baseline                             | 23.2±2.61                               | 24.9±3.24                            | 0.184                        | 29.6±7.66                                       | 24.2±2.79                            | 0.016*                       | 0.462                              |
| Endpoint                             | 23.4±2.51                               | 25.0±3.44                            | 0.209                        | 29.1±7.60                                       | 21.2±8.69                            | 0.039*                       |                                    |
| <i>p</i> -value <sup>‡</sup>         | 0.290                                   | 0.163                                |                              | 0.203   | 0.155                                |                              |                                    |

LDL-C: low density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C: high density lipoprotein cholesterol.

Each value represents the mean±SD.

<sup>†</sup>Data were analyzed using Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison between non B2 carriers and B2 carriers.

<sup>‡</sup>Data were analyzed using paired t-test or Wilcoxon's Signed Rank test for the comparison between baseline and endpoint.

<sup>§</sup>Data were analyzed using ANCOVA for interaction term.

\**p*-value < 0.05.

**Table 3.** Characteristics at baseline and after *Hibiscus sabdariffa* L. or *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Makino tea consumption according to *CETP TaqIB* genotype (cont.)

| Variables                       | <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.<br>(n=24) |                                      | p-value <sup>†</sup> | <i>Gynostemma pentaphyllum</i> Makino<br>(n=24) |                                      | p-value <sup>†</sup> | p-interaction <sup>§</sup> |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
|                                 | Non-B2 carriers<br>(B1B1)<br>(n=11)     | B2 carriers<br>(B1B2+B2B2)<br>(n=13) |                      | Non-B2 carriers<br>(B1B1)<br>(n=8)              | B2 carriers<br>(B1B2+B2B2)<br>(n=16) |                      |                            |
| Waist circumference (cm)        |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 76.2±6.16                               | 84.5±13.5                            | 0.052                | 91.9±12.4                                       | 80.8±6.26                            | 0.018*               | 0.600                      |
| Endpoint                        | 77.4±7.70                               | 82.0±9.09                            | 0.196                | 90.9±14.5                                       | 81.6±7.42                            | 0.053                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.325                                   | 0.194                                |                      | 0.577   | 0.813                                |                      |                            |
| Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)  |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 123±17.8                                | 132±24.1                             | 0.326                | 130±20.9  | 123±21.4                             | 0.523                | 0.439                      |
| Endpoint                        | 120±14.2                                | 129±24.1                             | 0.262                | 133±23.7  | 118±15.6                             | 0.101                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.496                                   | 0.287                                |                      | 0.643   | 0.174                                |                      |                            |
| Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg) |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 78.7±8.32                               | 89.8±18.3                            | 0.109                | 85.4±14.2                                       | 82.9±12.9                            | 0.677                | 0.989                      |
| Endpoint                        | 77.9±8.20                               | 86.1±14.6                            | 0.163                | 86.4±19.9                                       | 79.5±16.4                            | 0.404                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.789                                   | 0.313                                |                      | 0.331   | 0.274                                |                      |                            |
| Total cholesterol (mmol/L)      |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 6.45±0.90                               | 6.34±1.01                            | 0.770                | 5.73±0.85                                       | 6.27±0.75                            | 0.123                | 0.490                      |
| Endpoint                        | 6.41±0.68                               | 6.18±1.08                            | 0.554                | 5.80±1.06                                       | 5.91±0.90                            | 0.784                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.676                                   | 0.352                                |                      | 0.692   | 0.045*                               |                      |                            |
| Triglyceride (mmol/L)           |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 1.42±0.57                               | 1.66±0.96                            | 0.865                | 1.23±0.64                                       | 1.29±0.66                            | 0.806                | 0.103                      |
| Endpoint                        | 1.55±0.83                               | 1.37±0.80                            | 0.459                | 1.13±0.38                                       | 1.30±0.62                            | 0.491                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.447                                   | 0.039*                               |                      | 0.554   | 0.959                                |                      |                            |
| LDL-C (mmol/L)                  |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 4.45±0.87                               | 4.05±0.99                            | 0.317                | 3.60±0.83                                       | 4.15±0.68                            | 0.101                | 0.314                      |
| Endpoint                        | 4.42±0.60                               | 4.08±0.89                            | 0.294                | 3.79±1.03                                       | 3.89±0.72                            | 0.776                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.861                                   | 0.831                                |                      | 0.249   | 0.080                                |                      |                            |
| HDL-C (mmol/L)                  |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 1.35±0.29                               | 1.52±0.41                            | 0.262                | 1.56±0.24                                       | 1.54±0.29                            | 0.831                | 0.313                      |
| Endpoint                        | 1.27±0.30                               | 1.47±0.40                            | 0.200                | 1.49±0.24                                       | 1.43±0.32                            | 0.610                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.010*                                  | 0.149                                |                      | 0.190   | 0.004*                               |                      |                            |
| Fasting blood glucose (mmol/L)  |   |                                      |                      |   |                                      |                      |                            |
| Baseline                        | 4.94±0.35                               | 5.26±0.40                            | 0.041*               | 5.28±0.29                                       | 5.26±0.56                            | 0.920                | 0.485                      |
| Endpoint                        | 4.72±0.36                               | 5.05±0.41                            | 0.048*               | 5.15±0.32                                       | 5.10±0.58                            | 0.815                |                            |
| p-value <sup>‡</sup>            | 0.051                                   | 0.106                                |                      | 0.404   | 0.026*                               |                      |                            |

LDL-C: low density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C: high density lipoprotein cholesterol.

Each value represents the mean±SD.

<sup>†</sup>Data were analyzed using Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison between non B2 carriers and B2 carriers.

<sup>‡</sup>Data were analyzed using paired t-test or Wilcoxon's Signed Rank test for the comparison between baseline and endpoint.

<sup>§</sup>Data were analyzed using ANCOVA for interaction term.

\*p-value< 0.05.

in B2 carriers than non-B2 carriers at both baseline ( $p=0.016$ ) and after intervention ( $p=0.039$ ). In addition, weight and WC were significantly lower in B2 carriers than non-B2 carriers in the GP group at baseline ( $p=0.004$  and  $p=0.018$ , respectively). After HS consumption, subjects with the B1B1 genotype had significantly decreased HDL-C concentrations ( $p=0.010$ ), whereas B2 carriers had significantly decreased TG concentrations ( $p=0.039$ ). In contrast, regarding GP consumption, B2 carriers had significantly decreased TC ( $p=0.045$ ), HDL-C ( $p=0.004$ ), and FBG ( $p=0.026$ ) concentrations. Nevertheless, there was no significant interaction between tea consumption and *CETP TaqIB* genotypes on anthropometric and biochemical parameters.

## DISCUSSION

The effects of HS and GP consumption on the decreased TC, LDL-C, and FBG concentrations, as well as increased HDL-C concentrations, have been reported in several studies.<sup>16-20</sup> However, Kuriyan et al showed that the consumption of leaf extract (1 g/day) of HS in hypercholesterolemic subjects for 90 days did not appear to have a blood lipid lowering effect.<sup>21</sup> In addition, Mohagheghi et al reported that the consumption of calyx extract of HS in hypertensive subjects increased TC and HDL-C concentrations.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, Park et al reported that the consumption of GP extract or actiponin (450 mg/day) for 12 weeks in obesity subjects had significantly decreased HDL-C concentrations.<sup>22</sup> We suggest that the inconsistent effects of HS or GP consumption on lipid concentrations may be modulated by several factors including the concentrations or types of the administered HS and GP, the duration of the study, the number of subjects, environmental factors, and genetic factors. In the present study, we investigated the effects of HS and GP consumption on anthropometric data, FBG, and lipid concentrations in hypercholesterolemia subjects with different genotypes of the *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms. To our knowledge, no human study examining the effect of HS and GP tea consumption on metabolic responses according to the *APOE* and *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms has been performed.

Several clinical studies have shown that the E4 allele plays a role in the development of atherosclerosis and CVD.<sup>24</sup> It is well known that the E4 allele is associated with higher concentrations of TC, LDL-C and TG;<sup>24,38</sup> our findings found that E4 carriers had significantly higher LDL-C concentrations than non-E4 carriers in the GP group at baseline. Because of the relatively small sample size in the present study, the effect of the *APOE* genotype on TC and TG concentrations in both HS and GP groups may fail to reach statistical significance. After HS consumption, we observed that E4 carriers had significantly decreased HDL-C concentrations, which is consistent with previous studies. Egert et al showed that E4 carriers had a significantly decreased concentration of serum HDL-C and apoA1 after Quercetin supplementation.<sup>39</sup> In addition, Minihane et al demonstrated that supplementation with fish oil in apoE4 individuals led to a significant increase in TC and a trend toward reduction in HDL-C relative to the common homozygous E3E3 profile.<sup>40</sup> In contrast, our findings shown that non-E4 carriers had sig-

nificantly decreased HDL-C and FBG concentrations after GP consumption. Our results were similar to a previous study; Loktionov et al reported that the drinking of black tea by a subject with E3E3 homozygous revealed lowered HDL-C concentrations, while there was no response in E4-bearing subjects.<sup>41</sup>

The effects of HS and GP tea consumption on FBG, and lipid concentrations according to *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms were also observed. It is generally acknowledged that the *TaqIB* polymorphism in the *CETP* gene influences the HDL-C values,<sup>28</sup> with individuals homozygous for the B1 allele having lower concentrations of HDL-C than carriers of at least 1 B2 allele. In the present study, we did not observe the significant difference in HDL-C concentrations between B2 and non-B2 carriers in both HS and GP groups at baseline and after intervention. Moreover, B2 carriers in the HS group showed significantly higher FBG concentrations than non-B2 carriers at baseline and after intervention. In contrast, B2 carriers in the GP group had a significantly lower weight, BMI, and WC than non-B2 carriers at baseline; these inconsistent results may be due to the small sample size in our study.

After HS consumption, we found that homozygous B1B1 and B2 carriers had significantly decreased HDL-C and TG concentrations, respectively, whereas GP consumption in non-E4 and B2 carriers showed significantly decreased HDL-C and FBG concentrations. Our results were inconsistent with other studies that have demonstrated a favorable effect on HDL-C concentrations according to *CETP TaqIB* alleles after dietary intervention. Li et al demonstrated the beneficial effects of the B2 allele on HDL-C concentrations in men with higher intakes of total fat, animal fat, saturated fat, and monounsaturated fat.<sup>34</sup> Du et al demonstrated that the elevated HDL concentrations after high carbohydrate and low fat (HC/LF) diet in healthy Chinese Han youth were associated with the B2 allele,<sup>42</sup> whereas males with the B1B1 genotype are more susceptible to the influence of a HC/LF diet on their HDL-C concentrations.<sup>42</sup> In addition, Estévez-González et al showed that the consumption of skim milk enriched with olive oil increased the HDL-C and apolipoproteinA-I concentrations in children with hypercholesterolemia, this effect being more intense in carriers of the B1B1 genotype.<sup>43</sup> Finally, Gammon et al. revealed that B1B1 homozygotes had a significantly lower TAG:HDL-C ratio after kiwifruit intervention than after the control intervention.<sup>44</sup>

Although a significant decrease in lipid and FBG concentrations after HS or GP tea consumption according to *APOE* or *CETP TaqIB* genotypes was observed in our study, the significant interaction between tea consumption and these genetic polymorphisms on lipid and FBG concentrations was not demonstrated; however, this lack of power to detect a statistical significance may be due to the small sample size of the study. In addition, the mechanism underlying the reduction of lipid and FBG concentrations after HS and GP tea consumption according to *APOE* or *CETP TaqIB* polymorphisms is still unknown. However, we suggest that GP consumption could potentially reduce FBG concentrations in non-E4 and B2 carriers by improving insulin sensitivity. In previous studies,

the insulin sensitizer rosiglitazone only improved glucose tolerance in ApoE3 knock-in (KI) mice but not in ApoE4 KI mice.<sup>45,46</sup> *In vivo* study showed that the expression of APOE4 reduced insulin-receptor substrate 1 (IRS-1), PI3K expression, and the reduced Akt phosphorylation led to reduced liver insulin signaling, insulin concentrations, and high glucose content.<sup>47</sup> In addition, subjects with the B2B2 genotype had significantly lower fasting insulin (FINS) and homeostasis model assessment-insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) levels compared with subjects with the B1B1 genotype.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, it has been reported that the dammarane compounds in the GP can suppress protein tyrosine phosphatase 1B (PTP-1B) activity and increase glucose transporter 4 (GluT4) translocation resulting in enhanced glucose uptake and improved insulin sensitivity.<sup>49,50</sup> This suggests that non-E4 and B2 carriers who consume GP tea may be more susceptible to suppressed PTP-1B activity or enhanced GluT4 translocation by dammarane compounds, resulting in lower FBG concentrations.

Furthermore, the effect of HS and GP consumption on decreased HDL-C concentrations according to *APOE* or *CETP TaqIB* genotypes in this study may be involved in the activities of enzymes in the reverse cholesterol transport (RCT) pathway, such as CETP, lecithin cholesterol acyltransferase (LCAT), hepatic lipase (HL), and/or lipoprotein lipase (LPL).<sup>51</sup> The interaction between *CETP TaqIB* or *APOE* polymorphisms and environmental factors (e.g. smoking, alcohol, diet, and exercise) were found to modulate the CETP, LCAT, HL, and/or LPL activities, which then led to variations on HDL-C concentrations.<sup>52,53</sup> Furthermore, we also observed a significantly decrease in TG and TC concentrations in B2 carriers after HS and GP consumption, respectively. The reduction of TG by HS consumption may result from the increased LPL activity or reducing VLDL production in the liver. Previous studies have shown that the HS extract is able to reduce VLDL cholesterol,<sup>54,55</sup> whereas the reduction of TC by GP consumption may be explained by a decrease in cholesterol synthesis. *In vitro* studies have revealed that damulin A and B, two dammarane type saponins purified from the leaves of GP, were able to decrease cholesterol synthesis via the increased phosphorylation of AMP-activated protein kinase (AMPK).<sup>50</sup>

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the effects of HS and GP tea consumption on metabolic parameters according to *APOE* and *CETP* polymorphisms in hypercholesterolemic subjects. The limitations of our study result from a small sample size. Because two polymorphisms in two genes were studied, other variants in these genes or in other genes may be associated with the metabolic responses to HS or GP tea consumption. We recommend that further studies on a larger sample subdivided by gender are required to confirm the results. Moreover, the mechanism underlying the metabolic responses according to the *APOE* or *CETP TaqIB* genotypes should be elucidated by *in vitro* or *in vivo* study. The activities of CETP, LCAT, HL, and LPL, as well as insulin and HOMA-IR should be determined.

In conclusion, we indicate that HS consumption may have beneficial effects with respect to TG concentrations in the B2 carriers, but it may adversely affect HDL-C

concentrations in E4 and homozygous B1B1 carriers. In contrast, GP consumption may have favorable effects on TC, FBG concentrations but not HDL-C concentrations for non-E4 and/or B2 carriers. These findings may pave the way to personalized tea consumption to prevent CVD in hypercholesterolemic subjects.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors sincerely thank the participants of this study for their cooperation. The authors also thank Pamaporn Nakthanom for secretarial assistance.

#### AUTHOR DISCLOSURES

All authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. This study was financially supported by the Undergraduate Research Grant 2014, and Human Genetics Research Unit (WU59520), Institute of Research and Development, Walailak University.

#### REFERENCES

- Kathiresan S, Srivastava D. Genetics of human cardiovascular disease. *Cell*. 2012;148:1242-57. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2012.03.001.
- Baigent C, Keech A, Kearney PM, Blackwell L, Buck G, Pollicino C, Kirby A, Sourjina T, Peto R, Collins R, Simes R; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaborators. Efficacy and safety of cholesterol-lowering treatment: prospective meta-analysis of data from 90,056 participants in 14 randomised trials of statins. *Lancet*. 2005;366:1267-78.
- Bellosta S, Corsini A. Statin drug interactions and related adverse reactions. *Expert Opin Drug Saf*. 2012;11:933-46. doi: 10.1517/14740338.2012.712959.
- Gurrola-Diaz CM, Garcia-Lopez PM, Sanchez-Enriquez S, Troyo-Sanroman R, Andrade-Gonzalez I, Gomez-Leyva JF. Effects of Hibiscus sabdariffa extract powder and preventive treatment (diet) on the lipid profiles of patients with metabolic syndrome (MeSy). *Phytomedicine*. 2010;17:500-5. doi: 10.1016/j.phymed.2009.10.014.
- Mohagheghi A, Maghsoud S, Khashayar P, Ghazi-Khansari M. The effect of Hibiscus sabdariffa on lipid profile, creatinine, and serum electrolytes: a randomized clinical trial. *ISRN Gastroenterology*. 2011;2011:976019. doi: 10.5402/2011/976019.
- Onyenekwe PC, Ajani EO, Ameh DA, Gamaniel KS. Anti-hypertensive effect of roselle (Hibiscus sabdariffa) calyx infusion in spontaneously hypertensive rats and a comparison of its toxicity with that in Wistar rats. *Cell Biochem Funct*. 1999;17:199-206.
- Falsey TO, Pal A, Bawankule DU, Yadav NP, Khanuja SP. Toxic effects of oral administration of extracts of dried calyx of Hibiscus sabdariffa Linn. (Malvaceae). *Phytother Res*. 2009;23:412-6. doi: 10.1002/ptr.2644.
- Attawish A, Chivapat S, Phadungpat S, Bansiddhi J, Techadamrongsin Y, Mitrijit O, Chaorai B, Chavalittumrong P. Chronic toxicity of Gynostemma pentaphyllum. *Fitoterapia*. 2004;75:539-51.
- Chiranthanut N, Teekachunhatean S, Panthong A, Khonsung P, Kanjanapothi D, Lertprasertsuk N. Toxicity evaluation of standardized extract of Gynostemma pentaphyllum Makino. *J Ethnopharmacol*. 2013;149:228-34. doi: 10.1016/j.jep.2013.06.027.
- Chavalittumrong P, Sriwanthana B, Kijphati R, Jitjuk B, Treesangsri W, Phadungpat S, Boonruad T, Bandsiddhi B, Banjob M. A phase I trial of Gynostemma pentaphyllum-Makino in healthy volunteers. *Songklanakar J Sci Technol*. 2007;29:83-93.
- Haji Faraji M, Haji Tarkhani A. The effect of sour tea (Hibiscus sabdariffa) on essential hypertension. *J Ethnophar-*



- macol. 1999;65:231-6.
12. Dafallah AA, al-Mustafa Z. Investigation of the anti-inflammatory activity of *Acacia nilotica* and *Hibiscus sabdariffa*. *Am J Chin Med*. 1996;24:263-9.
  13. Chewonarin T, Kinouchi T, Kataoka K, Arimochi H, Kuwahara T, Vinitketkumnuen U, Ohnishi Y. Effects of roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* Linn.), a Thai medicinal plant, on the mutagenicity of various known mutagens in *Salmonella typhimurium* and on formation of aberrant crypt foci induced by the colon carcinogens azoxymethane and 2-amino-1-methyl-6-phenylimidazo [4,5-b] pyridine in F344 rats. *Food Chem Toxicol*. 1999;37:591-601.
  14. Mahadevan N, Shivali PK. *Hibiscus sabdariffa* Linn. An overview. *Nat Prod Rad*. 2009;8:77-83.
  15. Naumovski VR, Huang THW, Tran VH, Li GQ, Duke CC, Roufogalis BD. Chemistry and pharmacology of *Gynostemma pentaphyllum*. *Phytochem Rev*. 2005;4:197-219.
  16. Mozaffari-Khosravi H, Jalali-Khanabadi BA, Afkhami-Ardekani M, Fatehi F. Effects of sour tea (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*) on lipid profile and lipoproteins in patients with type II diabetes. *J Altern Complement Med*. 2009;15:899-903. doi: 10.1089/acm.2008.0540.
  17. Gurrola-Diaz CM, Garcia-Lopez PM, Sanchez-Enriquez S, Troyo-Sanroman R, Andrade-Gonzalez I, Gomez-Leyva JF. Effects of *Hibiscus sabdariffa* extract powder and preventive treatment (diet) on the lipid profiles of patients with metabolic syndrome (MeSy). *Phytomedicine*. 2010;17:500-5. doi: 10.1016/j.phymed.2009.10.014.
  18. Lin TL, Lin HH, Chen CC, Lin MC, Chou MC, Wang CJ. *Hibiscus sabdariffa* extract reduces serum cholesterol in men and women. *Nutr Res*. 2007;27:140-5. doi: 10.1016/j.nutres.2007.01.007.
  19. Huyen VTT, Phan DV, Thang P, Hoa NK, Ostenson CG. *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* Tea Improves Insulin Sensitivity in Type 2 Diabetic Patients. *J Nutr Metab*. 2013;765383. doi: 10.1155/2013/765383.
  20. Huyen VTT, Phan DV, Thang P, Ky PT, Hoa NK, Ostenson CG. Antidiabetic effects of add-on *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* extract therapy with sulfonylureas in type 2 diabetic patients. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2012;452313. doi: 10.1155/2012/452313.
  21. Kuriyan R, Kumar DR, RR, Kurpad AV. An evaluation of the hypolipidemic effect of an extract of *Hibiscus sabdariffa* leaves in hyperlipidemic Indians: a double blind, placebo controlled trial. *BMC Complement Alternat Med*. 2010;10:27. doi: 10.1186/1472-6882-10-27.
  22. Park SH, Huh TL, Kim SY, Oh MR, TirupathiPichiah PB, Chae SW, Cha YS. Antiobesity effect of *Gynostemma pentaphyllum* extract (actiponin): a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2014;22:63-71. doi: 10.1002/oby.20539.
  23. Mahley RW, Rall SC Jr. Apolipoprotein E. far more than a lipid transport protein. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet*. 2000;1:507-37.
  24. Bennet AM, Di Angelantonio E, Ye Z, Wensley F, Dahlin A, Ahlborn A et al. Association of apolipoprotein E genotypes with lipid concentrations and coronary risk. *JAMA*. 2007;298:1300-11.
  25. Knopman DS, Mosley TH, Catellier DJ, Coker LH. Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities Study Brain MRI Study. Fourteen-year longitudinal study of vascular risk factors, APOE genotype, and cognition: the ARIC MRI Study. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2009;5:207-14. doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2009.01.027.
  26. Yamashita S, Hirano K, Sakai N, Matsuzawa Y. Molecular biology and pathophysiological aspects of plasma cholesterol ester transfer protein. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2000;1529:257-75.
  27. Dullaart RP, Sluiter WJ. Common variation in the CETP gene and the implications for cardiovascular disease and its treatment: an updated analysis. *Pharmacogenomics*. 2008;9:747-63. doi: 10.2217/14622416.9.6.747.
  28. Kuivenhoven JA, de Knijff P, Boer JM, Smalheer HA, Botma GJ, Seidell JC, Kastelein JJ, Pritchard PH. Heterogeneity at the CETP gene locus. Influence on plasma CETP concentrations and HDL cholesterol concentrations. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 1997;17:560-8.
  29. Ordovas JM, Cupples LA, Corella D, Otvos JD, Osgood D, Martinez A, Lahoz C, Coltell O, Wilson PW, Schaefer EJ. Association of cholesteryl ester transfer protein-TaqIB polymorphism with variations in lipoprotein subclasses and coronary heart disease risk: The Framingham study. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2000;20:1323-9.
  30. Hannuksela ML, Liinamaa MJ, Kesäniemi YA, Savolainen MJ. Relation of polymorphisms in the cholesteryl ester transfer protein gene to transfer protein activity and plasma lipoprotein levels in alcohol drinkers. *Atherosclerosis*. 1994;110:35-44.
  31. Kauma H, Savolainen MJ, Heikkilä R, Rantala AO, Lilja M, Reunanen A, Kesäniemi YA. Sex difference in the regulation of plasma high density lipoprotein cholesterol by genetic and environmental factors. *Hum Genet*. 1996;97:156-62.
  32. Freeman DJ, Griffin BA, Holmes AP, Lindsay GM, Gaffney D, Packard CJ, Shepherd J. Regulation of plasma HDL cholesterol and subfraction distribution by genetic and environmental factors. Associations between the TaqIB RFLP in the CETP gene and smoking and obesity. *Arterioscler Thromb*. 1994;14:336-44.
  33. Talmud PJ. Gene-environment interaction and its impact on coronary heart disease risk. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 2007;17:148-52.
  34. Li TY, Zhang C, Asselbergs FW, Qi L, Rimm E, Hunter DJ, Hu FB. Interaction between dietary fat intake and the cholesterol ester transfer protein TaqIB polymorphism in relation to HDL-cholesterol concentrations among US diabetic men. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2007;86:1524-9.
  35. Nutritive values of Thai foods (Thai version) published by the Nutrition Division, Ministry of Public Health (MOPH). The latest version was published in 2001. [Internet] 2014 [cited 2014/6/12]; Available from: <http://nutrition.anamai.moph.go.th/temp/main/view.php?group=1&id=614>.
  36. Zivelin A, Rosenberg N, Peretz H, Amit Y, Kornbrot N, Seligsohn U. Improved method for genotyping apolipoprotein E polymorphisms by a PCR-based assay simultaneously utilizing two distinct restriction enzymes. *Clin Chem*. 1997;43:1657-9.
  37. Mohrschladt MF, van der Sman-de Beer F, Hofman MK, van der Krabben M, Westendorp RG, Smelt AH. TaqIB polymorphism in CETP gene: the influence on incidence of cardiovascular disease in statin-treated patients with familial hypercholesterolemia. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2005;13:877-82.
  38. Dammerman M, Breslow JL. Genetic basis of lipoprotein disorders. *Circulation*. 1995;91:505-12.
  39. Egert S, Boesch-Saadatmandi C, Wolfram S, Rimbach G, Muller MJ. Serum lipid and blood pressure responses to quercetin vary in overweight patients by apolipoprotein E genotype. *J Nutr*. 2010;140:278-84. doi: 10.3945/jn.109.117655.
  40. Minihane AM, Khan S, Leigh-Firbank EC, Talmud P, Wright JW, Murphy MC, Griffin BA, Williams CM. Apo E polymorphism and fish oil supplementation in subjects with an atherogenic lipoprotein phenotype. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol*. 2000;20:1990-7.

41. Loktionov A, Bingham SA, Vorste H, Jerling JC, Runswick SA, Cummings JH. Apolipoprotein E genotype modulates the effect of black tea drinking on blood lipids and blood coagulation factors: a pilot study. *Br J Nutr.* 1998;79:133-9.
42. Du J, Fang DZ, Lin J, Xiao LY, Zhou XD, Shigdar S, Duan W. TaqIB polymorphism in the CETP gene modulates the impact of HC/LF diet on the HDL profile in healthy Chinese young adults. *J Nutr Biochem.* 2010;21:1114-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jnutbio.2009.09.009.
43. Estévez-González MD, Saavedra-Santana P, López-Ríos L, Chirino R, Cebrero-García E, Peña-Quintana L, Betancor-León P. HDL cholesterol levels in children with mild hypercholesterolemia: effect of consuming skim milk enriched with olive oil and modulation by the TAQ1B polymorphism in the CETP Gene. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2010;56:288-93. doi: 10.1159/000290405.
44. Gammon CS, Minihane AM, Kruger R, Conlon CA, von Hurst PR, Jones B, Stonehouse W. TaqIB polymorphism in the cholesteryl ester transfer protein (CETP) gene influences lipid responses to the consumption of kiwifruit in hypercholesterolaemic men. *Br J Nutr.* 2014;111:1077-84. doi: 10.1017/S0007114513003437.
45. Arbones-Mainar JM, Johnson LA, Altenburg MK, Kim HS, Maeda N. Impaired adipogenic response to thiazolidinediones in mice expressing human apolipoprotein E4. *FASEB J.* 2010;24:3809-18. doi: 10.1096/fj.10-159517.
46. To AW, Ribe EM, Chuang TT, Schroeder JE, Lovestone S. The  $\epsilon 3$  and  $\epsilon 4$  alleles of human APOE differentially affect tau phosphorylation in hyperinsulinemic and pioglitazone treated mice. *PLoS One.* 2011;6:e16991. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016991.
47. Ong QR, Chan ES, Lim ML, Wong BS. Expression of human apolipoprotein E4 reduces insulin-receptor substrate 1 expression and Akt phosphorylation in the ageing liver. *FEBS Open Bio.* 2014;4:260-5. doi: 10.1016/j.fob.2014.02.011.
48. Jiang T, Song XX, Zhang M, Qi WH, Zhang XW. Association between insulin resistance and cholesteryl ester transfer protein gene polymorphism in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Yi Chuan Xue Za Zhi.* 2005;22:298-301. (In Chinese)
49. Hung TM, Hoang DM, Kim JC, Jang HS, Ahn JS, Min BS. Protein tyrosine phosphatase 1B inhibitory by dammaranes from Vietnamese Giao-Co-Lam tea. *J Ethnopharmacol.* 2009;124:240-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jep.2009.04.027.
50. Nguyen PH, Gauhar R, Hwang SL, Dao TT, Park DC, Kim JE, Song H, Huh TL, Oh WK. New dammarane-type glucosides as potential activators of AMP-activated protein kinase (AMPK) from *Gynostemma pentaphyllum*. *Bioorg Med Chem.* 2011;19:6254-60. doi: 10.1016/j.bmc.2011.09.013.
51. Yamashita S, Hirano K, Sakai N, Matsuzawa Y. Molecular biology and pathophysiological aspects of plasma cholesteryl ester transfer protein. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 2000;1529:257-75.
52. Talmud PJ, Hawe E, Robertson K, Miller GJ, Miller NE, Humphries SE. Genetic and environmental determinants of plasma high density lipoprotein cholesterol and apolipoprotein AI concentrations in healthy middle-aged men. *Ann Hum Genet.* 2002;66:111-24.
53. Seip RL, Zoeller RF, Angelopoulos TJ, Salonia J, Bilbie C, Moyna NM et al. Interactive effects of APOE haplotype, sex, and exercise on postheparin plasma lipase activities. *J Appl Physiol.* 2011;110:1021-8. doi: 10.1152/jappphysiol.00287.2010.
54. Farombi EO, Ige OO. Hypolipidemic and antioxidant effects of ethanolic extract from dried calyx of *Hibiscus sabdariffa* in alloxan-induced diabetic rats. *Fundam Clin Pharmacol.* 2007;21:601-9.
55. Ochani PC, D'Mello P. Antioxidant and antihyperlipidemic activity of *Hibiscus sabdariffa* Linn. leaves and calyces extracts in rats. *Indian J Exp Biol.* 2009;47:276-82.

**Supplementary table 1.** Baseline characteristics of the subjects

| Variables                            | All (n=48) | Men (n=17) | Women (n=31) | p-value <sup>†</sup> |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Age (years)                          | 42.5±8.64  | 41.1±9.25  | 43.2±8.35    | 0.080                |
| Weight (kg)                          | 64.7±12.9  | 68.7±12.3  | 62.5±13.0    | 0.035*               |
| Body mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) | 25.0±4.46  | 24.3±3.80  | 25.5±4.79    | 0.371                |
| Waist circumference (cm)             | 82.6±10.8  | 84.5±12.9  | 81.5±9.42    | 0.437                |
| Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)       | 127±20.9   | 130±19.6   | 125±21.9     | 0.450                |
| Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)      | 84.1±14.0  | 84.4±13.6  | 83.9±14.5    | 0.882                |
| Total cholesterol (mmol/L)           | 6.24±0.88  | 6.20±0.75  | 6.26±0.96    | 0.803                |
| Triglyceride (mmol/L)                | 1.41±0.73  | 1.78±0.98  | 1.21±0.45    | 0.074                |
| LDL-C (mmol/L)                       | 4.10±0.86  | 4.02±0.81  | 4.14±0.89    | 0.641                |
| HDL-C (mmol/L)                       | 1.49±0.32  | 1.36±0.30  | 1.57±0.32    | 0.030*               |
| Fasting blood glucose (mmol/L)       | 5.19±0.44  | 5.18±0.39  | 5.19±0.48    | 0.821                |

LDL-C: low density lipoprotein cholesterol; HDL-C: high density lipoprotein cholesterol.

Each value represents the mean±SD.

<sup>†</sup>Data were analyzed using Student's t-test or Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison between genders.

\*p-value <0.05.

**Supplementary table 2.** Dietary nutrition intake and behavior of the subjects

| Variables               | <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> L.<br>(n=24) |           | p-value <sup>†</sup> | <i>Gynostemmapentaphyllum</i> Makino<br>(n=24) |           | p-value <sup>†</sup> |
|-------------------------|---|-----------|----------------------|--|-----------|----------------------|
|                         | Baseline                                | Endpoint  |                      | Baseline                                       | Endpoint  |                      |
| Total energy (kcal/day) | 2303±242                                | 2320±212  | 0.357                | 2424±193                                       | 2413±172  | 0.547                |
| Protein (g/day)         | 103±11.1                                | 105±11.4  | 0.323                | 105±14.9                                       | 103±15.2  | 0.139                |
| Total fat (g/day)       | 50.1±8.52                               | 50.1±9.00 | 0.953                | 54.2±6.81                                      | 52.9±7.72 | 0.092                |
| Carbohydrates (g/day)   | 355±45.5                                | 359±39.4  | 0.104                | 372±37.8                                       | 376±34.6  | 0.315                |
| Smoking (n)             | 1                                       | 1         | N/A                  | 0  | 0         | N/A                  |
| Alcohol consumption (n) | 0                                       | 0         | N/A                  | 0  | 0         | N/A                  |
| Exercise (days/wk)      | 2.42±2.06                               | 2.75±2.44 | 0.349                | 1.50±1.98                                      | 1.38±1.97 | 0.317                |

Each value represents the mean±SD.

<sup>†</sup>Data were analyzed using paired t-test or Wilcoxon's Signed Rank test for the comparison between baseline and endpoint.

N/A, not applicable.