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OBJECTIVE — Obesity is associated with increased metabolic and cardiovascular risk. The ectopic fat hypothesis suggests that subcutaneous fat may be protective, but this theory has yet to be fully explored.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS — Participants from the Framingham Heart Study (n = 3,001, 48.5% women) were stratified by visceral adipose tissue (VAT) into sex-specific tertiles. Within these tertiles, age-adjusted abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue (SAT) tertiles were examined in relation to cardiometabolic risk factors.

RESULTS — In the lowest VAT tertile, risk factor prevalence was low, although systolic blood pressure in women and rates of high triglycerides, impaired fasting glucose, hypertension, and the metabolic syndrome in men increased with increasing SAT tertile (all P < 0.04). In contrast, in the top VAT tertile, lower triglycerides were observed in men with increasing SAT (64.4% high triglycerides in SAT tertile 1 vs. 52.7% in SAT tertile 3, P = 0.03). Similar observations were made for women, although results were not statistically significant (50.6% high triglycerides in SAT tertile 1 vs. 41.0% in tertile 3, P = 0.10). Results in the highest VAT tertile were notable for a lack of increase in the prevalence of low HDL in men and women and in rates of impaired fasting glucose in men with increasing subcutaneous fat, despite sizable differences in BMI across SAT tertiles (27.1 to 36.3 kg/m² [women], 28.1 to 35.7 kg/m² [men]).

CONCLUSIONS — Although adiposity increases the absolute risk of metabolic and cardiovascular disease, abdominal subcutaneous fat is not associated with a linear increase in the prevalence of all risk factors among the obese, most notably, high triglycerides.
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Abdominal adipose tissue imaging and volumetric measurements

Participants underwent eight-slice MDCT abdominal scanning in a supine position (LightSpeed Ultra, General Electric, Milwaukee, WI). Twenty-five contiguous 5-mm thick slices (120 kVp, 400 mA, gantry rotation time 500 ms, and table feed 3:1) were obtained, covering 125 mm above the level of S1.

VAT and SAT volumes were quantified from CT scans using a dedicated offline workstation (Aquarius 3D Workstation; TeraRecon, San Mateo, CA) using a semiautomatic segmentation technique. A reader manually traced the abdominal muscular wall separating the two layers. An image display window width of −195 to −45 Hounsfield units and a window center of −120 Hounsfield units were used to identify pixels containing fat. VAT was defined as adipose tissue inside the abdominal muscular wall and SAT as adipose tissue outside the abdominal muscular wall. Interclass correlations for inter-reader comparisons were 0.997 for SAT and 0.992 for VAT on a random sample of 100 scans; high intra-reader correlations were similarly obtained.

Risk factor and covariate assessment

Covariates were measured at the seventh Framingham Offspring examination (1998–2001) and the first Third Generation examination (2002–2005). BMI was calculated as weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in meters. Waist circumference was measured at the umbilicus. Serum triglycerides, total and HDL cholesterol, and fasting plasma glucose were measured in fasting morning samples obtained from attendees. Diabetes was defined as fasting plasma glucose ≥126 mg/dl or treatment with a hypoglycemic agent or insulin; impaired fasting glucose was defined as a fasting plasma glucose level of 100–125 mg/dl in the absence of diabetes treatment. Hypertension was defined as systolic blood pressure ≥140 mmHg and diastolic blood pressure as ≥90 mmHg or antihypertensive treatment. High triglycerides were defined as ≥150 mg/dl or lipid treatment. Low HDL was defined as <40 mg/dl for men and <50 mg/dl for women. Current smoking was defined as smoking ≥1 cigarette per day in the past year. Alcohol use was evaluated through a physician-administered questionnaire and categorized as more or less than 14 drinks per week (men) or 7 drinks per week (women). Women were classified as postmenopausal if periods had stopped for ≥1 year. Metabolic syndrome was defined by modified Adult Treatment Panel III criteria (impaired fasting glucose defined as fasting plasma glucose 100–125 mg/dl in the absence of treatment of diabetes, the high triglyceride component was defined as triglycerides ≥150 mg/dl or treatment with a lipid-lowering agent, and blood pressure criteria were modified to include treatment for hypertension).

Statistical analysis

Study participants were stratified by VAT into sex-specific tertiles. Within each tertile, subjects were categorized further into sex-specific abdominal SAT tertiles. Age-adjusted means and prevalences of risk factors including BMI, waist circumference, SAT, and VAT) increased across the SAT tertiles within each VAT tertile (Table 2). Among those in the lowest VAT tertile, risk factor prevalence was uniformly low and increased with increasing SAT tertile (Table 3). Among women, the age-adjusted linear trend was significant for systolic blood pressure (109 mmHg in SAT tertile 1 vs. 114 mmHg in SAT tertile 3).

RESULTS

Study sample characteristics

Overall, 1,455 women (mean age 51.4 years) and 1,546 men (mean age 48.6 years) comprised the study sample. The average BMI was 26.7 kg/m² for women and 28.3 kg/m² for men, with 24.1% of women and 27.3% of men classified as obese. Approximately one-quarter of women had high triglycerides, low HDL, hypertension, and the metabolic syndrome, whereas 41.1% of men had high triglycerides, 31.1% had low HDL, 28.5% had hypertension, and 35.2% had the metabolic syndrome. Additional study sample characteristics are listed in Table 1.

Age-adjusted tertile analysis

All measures of adiposity (BMI, waist circumference, SAT, and VAT) increased significantly for women and men across SAT tertiles within each VAT tertile (Table 2). Among those in the lowest VAT tertile, risk factor prevalence was uniformly low and increased with increasing SAT tertile (Table 3). Among women, the age-adjusted linear trend was significant for systolic blood pressure (109 mmHg in SAT tertile 1 vs. 114 mmHg in SAT tertile 3).

Table 1—Study sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>51.4 ± 9.5</td>
<td>48.6 ± 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>26.7 ± 5.4</td>
<td>28.3 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waist circumference (cm)</td>
<td>92.0 ± 14.4</td>
<td>100.3 ± 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)</td>
<td>119.5 ± 17.4</td>
<td>123.1 ± 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)</td>
<td>73.5 ± 9.1</td>
<td>78.5 ± 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting plasma glucose (mg/dl)</td>
<td>94.9 ± 16.6</td>
<td>101.0 ± 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triglycerides (mg/dl)</td>
<td>109.8 ± 65.2</td>
<td>139.6 ± 102.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired fasting glucose*</td>
<td>251 (18.0)%</td>
<td>558 (38.5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>62 (4.3)</td>
<td>95 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High triglycerides†</td>
<td>354 (24.3)%</td>
<td>635 (41.1)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low HDL‡</td>
<td>352 (24.2)%</td>
<td>481 (31.1)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>352 (24.2)%</td>
<td>440 (28.5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic syndrome</td>
<td>361 (24.8)%</td>
<td>543 (35.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoking</td>
<td>178 (12.2)%</td>
<td>203 (13.1)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol (≥14 drinks/week in men/≥7 drinks/week in women)</td>
<td>222 (15.3)%</td>
<td>247 (16.0)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmenopausal</td>
<td>694 (47.7)%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormone replacement therapy</td>
<td>333 (22.9)%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT (cm³)</td>
<td>3,076 ± 1,449</td>
<td>2,599 ± 1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT (cm³)</td>
<td>1,309 ± 809</td>
<td>2,158 ± 967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are means ± SD or n (%). *Defined as fasting plasma glucose 100–125 mg/dl in the absence of diabetes treatment. †Defined as triglycerides ≥150 mg/dl or lipid treatment. ‡Defined as HDL <40 mg/dl (men) or <50 mg/dl (women).
### Table 2—Age-adjusted measures of adiposity by sex-specific SAT tertiles within sex-specific VAT tertiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAT tertile 1</th>
<th>SAT tertile 1</th>
<th>SAT tertile 2</th>
<th>SAT tertile 3</th>
<th>Age-adjusted SAT linear P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>20.6±0.2</td>
<td>22.3±0.2</td>
<td>24.6±0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (cm)</td>
<td>74.2±0.5</td>
<td>79.0±0.5</td>
<td>84.6±0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT (cm³)</td>
<td>1,067±32</td>
<td>1,780±32</td>
<td>2,701±32</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT range (cm³)</td>
<td>170.8−1,463.2</td>
<td>1,463−2,084.9</td>
<td>2,085−5,130.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT (cm³)*</td>
<td>421±9</td>
<td>561±9</td>
<td>631±9</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT tertile 1</th>
<th>SAT tertile 2</th>
<th>SAT tertile 3</th>
<th>Age-adjusted SAT linear P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>23.7±0.2</td>
<td>25.5±0.2</td>
<td>29.4±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (cm)</td>
<td>84.3±0.5</td>
<td>90.9±0.5</td>
<td>99.3±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT (cm³)</td>
<td>2,139±40</td>
<td>2,921±40</td>
<td>4,300±40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT range (cm³)</td>
<td>727.2−2,555.6</td>
<td>2,555.8−3,337.2</td>
<td>3,348.7−7,460.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT (cm³)*</td>
<td>1,061±16</td>
<td>1,135±16</td>
<td>1,230±16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Men**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT tertile 1</th>
<th>SAT tertile 2</th>
<th>SAT tertile 3</th>
<th>Age-adjusted SAT linear P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>27.1±0.3</td>
<td>30.9±0.3</td>
<td>36.3±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (cm)</td>
<td>95.0±0.8</td>
<td>104.6±0.8</td>
<td>116.3±0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT (cm³)</td>
<td>2,910±49</td>
<td>4,123±48</td>
<td>5,730±48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT range (cm³)</td>
<td>1,678.8−3,480.8</td>
<td>3,481.5−4,692.0</td>
<td>4,713.1−8,876.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT (cm³)*</td>
<td>1,977±47</td>
<td>2,222±46</td>
<td>2,535±46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are means ± SEM. *VAT range: 202.3−800.9 cm³ (women), 172.7–1,679.2 cm³ (men). †VAT range: 803.2−1,545.1 cm³ (women), 1,679−3−2,497.4 cm³ (men). ‡VAT range: 1,546.7−5,548.0 cm³ (women), 2,497.6−6,212.7 cm³ (men). WC, waist circumference.
Table 3—Age-adjusted risk factors by sex-specific SAT tertile within sex-specific VAT tertiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAT tertile 1</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT tertile 1</td>
<td>SAT tertile 2</td>
<td>SAT tertile 3</td>
<td>Age-adjusted SAT linear P value</td>
<td>SAT tertile 1</td>
<td>SAT tertile 2</td>
<td>SAT tertile 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>47.8 ± 0.6</td>
<td>47.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>45.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>45.0 ± 0.6</td>
<td>44.3 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP</td>
<td>109 ± 1</td>
<td>111 ± 1</td>
<td>114 ± 1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>117 ± 1</td>
<td>118 ± 1</td>
<td>118 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting glucose</td>
<td>87.8 ± 0.8</td>
<td>89.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>89.2 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>94.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>97.7 ± 1.3</td>
<td>96.7 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log triglycerides</td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.03</td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.03</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired fasting glucose*</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High triglycerides†</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low HDL‡</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic syndrome</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT tertile 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>53.6 ± 0.7</td>
<td>50.8 ± 0.7</td>
<td>50.0 ± 0.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>49.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>49.3 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP</td>
<td>117 ± 1</td>
<td>119 ± 1</td>
<td>122 ± 1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>123 ± 1</td>
<td>124 ± 1</td>
<td>123 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting glucose</td>
<td>94.2 ± 1.0</td>
<td>93.3 ± 1.0</td>
<td>94.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>97.5 ± 1.1</td>
<td>101.5 ± 1.1</td>
<td>101.2 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log triglycerides</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.6 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired fasting glucose*</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High triglycerides†</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low HDL‡</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic syndrome</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT tertile 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>58.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>55.2 ± 0.7</td>
<td>52.8 ± 0.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>56.0 ± 0.8</td>
<td>51.9 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP</td>
<td>127 ± 1</td>
<td>127 ± 1</td>
<td>130 ± 1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>127 ± 1</td>
<td>128 ± 1</td>
<td>131 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting glucose</td>
<td>98.1 ± 1.7</td>
<td>104.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>104.3 ± 1.7</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>107.9 ± 1.9</td>
<td>105.4 ± 1.9</td>
<td>107.3 ± 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log triglycerides</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired fasting glucose*</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High triglycerides†</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low HDL‡</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic syndrome</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are means ± SEM or %. *Defined as fasting plasma glucose 100–125 mg/dl in the absence of diabetes treatment. †Defined as triglycerides ≥150 mg/dl or lipid treatment. ‡Defined as HDL <40 mg/dl (men) or 50 mg/dl (women). SBP, systolic blood pressure.
however, the prevalence of high triglycerides did not increase with SAT and decreased significantly among obese women (48.8% in SAT tertile 1 vs. 33.0% in SAT tertile 3, $P = 0.02$).

**CONCLUSIONS**

**Principal findings**
Cardiometabolic risk increases with increasing visceral adiposity and BMI. Among those in the bottom two VAT tertiles, increasing subcutaneous fat is generally associated with increases in risk factor prevalence. Among those in the highest VAT tertile, however, increasing SAT is not associated with uniform increases in risk factors prevalence, despite significant increases in BMI, waist circumference, VAT, and SAT. Most striking, linear trends for triglycerides actually decrease with increasing SAT in the top VAT tertile, suggesting that subcutaneous fat may be associated with beneficial effects on triglyceride levels in those with the most visceral fat.

In the context of the current literature
Although total adiposity is strongly associated with metabolic and cardiovascular risk, it is becoming increasingly clear that different fat compartments contribute differentially to these risks. Abdominal visceral fat is a stronger correlate of cardiovascular disease risk than BMI, waist circumference, or abdominal subcutaneous fat (5,6). Central obesity, in which fat mass is predominantly intra-abdominal, is more strongly associated with insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, and atherosclerosis than is peripheral obesity, in which fat is predominantly subcutaneous (1,15). Weight loss through diet and exercise, which results in reductions in visceral fat (16), is associated with improvements in insulin sensitivity (17), blood pressure (18), serum lipids (19), and inflammatory markers (20). Similarly, loss of VAT by omentectomy leads to decreases in glucose and insulin levels (11), whereas loss of SAT by liposuction does not always produce the same beneficial effects (12,13), suggesting that VAT is more likely to be responsible for the metabolic abnormalities associated with obesity.

A few studies have suggested a possible beneficial role for SAT, observing that increased hip and thigh fat mass is associated with lower glucose and lipid levels, independent of abdominal fat (9). Patients with lipodystrophic loss of SAT have an increased risk for insulin resistance, diabetes, and dyslipidemia (21). In mice, transplantation of subcutaneous fat into visceral compartments leads to decreases in body weight and total fat mass and improved glucose metabolism, whereas transplantation of visceral fat into either subcutaneous or visceral compartments results in no such improvements. This suggests that subcutaneous

---

**Figure 1**—Age-adjusted levels of risk factors by tertile of SAT in normal-weight (A and D), overweight (B and E), and obese (C and F) subjects. *$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, and ***$P < 0.001$ for linear trend across tertiles. DM, diabetes; HTN, hypertension; IFG, impaired fasting glucose; MetS, metabolic syndrome; TGs, triglycerides.
fat may differ from visceral fat in ways that are metabolically beneficial (14).

Our results confirm that cardiometabolic risk increases significantly with increases in VAT. The prevalence of many risk factors, including hypertension and the metabolic syndrome, also increases with increasing SAT for all VAT and BMI tertiles. Among those in the lower two-thirds of the VAT distribution, more SAT is also associated with increased risk of most other risk factors examined, sug-

going that SAT is not protective in these individuals. Among those with the most VAT, however, increased SAT is associated with lower triglycerides, suggesting that SAT may be associated with beneficial effects on triglyceride levels in the obese.

Mechanisms

The ectopic fat hypothesis suggests that a hallmark of obesity is fat deposition in liver, skeletal muscle, and pancreatic β-cells resulting from insufficient adipocyte growth and differentiation in the setting of nutritional excess (22). Such ectopic fat stores are theorized to affect tissue and organ function by physical compression, the secretion of various locally acting substances, and cell dysfunction or cell death of nonadipose cells, a phenomenon known as lipotoxicity (7). In line with this theory, SAT represents a proper expansion of nonpathogenic adipocytes and therefore may be considered a protective fat depot (22). Improvements in insulin sensitivity with thiazolidinedione treatment, which increases subcutaneous fat stores, are suggestive of a protective effect of SAT (10). Our results are consistent with a potential protective role for SAT in the case of triglycerides among the obese.

Another possible explanation for obesity-related cardiometabolic disease is the portal vein hypothesis, which proposes that increased visceral fat leads to higher free fatty acid concentrations in the portal vein, increased systemic fatty acid flux, and increased hepatic lipase activity, which removes lipids from LDL and HDL, and may lead to dyslipidemia (23). Although our results do not contradict the detrimental effects of VAT proposed by the portal vein hypothesis (the prevalence of all risk factors increased with VAT tertile in our sample), they do support the notion that such a theory is, at best, incomplete because it does not explain either the detrimental or the beneficial effects of SAT, which does not drain through the portal vein, on cardiometabolic risk.

VAT and SAT differ not only in anatomic location but also in cytokine secretion profile. SAT releases 2–3 times more leptin than VAT (24), whereas VAT secretes more adiponectin, interleukin-6, interleukin-8, plasminogen activator inhibitor 1, and angiotensin than does SAT (23). Although the relationships between VAT and SAT secretion profiles and cardiometabolic pathogenesis are,
Subcutaneous adipose tissue and risk factors

at present, unclear, it may be that para-
crine and perhaps endocrine factors
contribute to the differential effects of
VAT and SAT.

It is important to note that our results
suggest a possible protective effect of SAT
only among those in the highest tertile of
VAT. Indeed, in the lower VAT tertiles,
increasing SAT is associated only with in-
creases in risk factor prevalence. One
explanation for this difference is that there is
a relatively larger increase in VAT in the
lower tertiles and that SAT is simply a
marker for increased VAT in these groups.
SAT by itself may not be deleterious or
beneficial in the absence of the positive
energy balance of obesity. Accordingly,
SAT may only be protective in obese
individuals because these individuals are
already in positive energy balance and SAT
provides a nonpathological energy stor-
age depot. It is also important to note that
the lack of increase in the prevalence of
risk factors such as low LDL and impaired
fasting glucose with increasing SAT
among the obese may be due to a thresh-
old effect, whereby risk factor prevalence
is already so high that increasing SAT is
not associated with further increases in
prevalence.

Strengths and limitations
Compared with previous work on subcu-
taneous fat and cardiometabolic risk, the
strengths of the present study include a
large sample size with a wide range of BMI
and age, thereby reducing the likelihood
of ascertainment bias in the results. In ad-
dition, the study benefits from the quanti-
fication of fat volumes from CT scans
rather than a single-slice measurement of
fat area. A major limitation of the study is
its lack of data on subcutaneous fat stores
aside from the abdomen; therefore, we
cannot generalize our findings to glu-
teofemoral fat. Further, we are unable to
separate deep versus superficial SAT in
the abdomen. It may be that superficial
SAT is less pathogenic than deep SAT
(25). In addition, analysis by VAT and
SAT tertiles increases the number of sta-
tistical tests performed, increasing the
likelihood of false-positive results at the
P < 0.05 significance level. Other limita-
tions include the cross-sectional study de-
sign, which precludes inferences of causality,
and the lack of ethnic diversity, which may limit generalizability to non-
white groups.

In summary, whereas abdominal adi-
posity is associated with a higher abso-
lute risk of metabolic and cardiovascular
disease, subcutaneous abdominal fat is
not associated with a linear increase in the
prevalence of all risk factors among the
obese. Indeed, in the case of high triglyc-
cerides, SAT may actually be a protective
fat depot in obese individuals.
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