Whelton PK, et al.
2017 High Blood Pressure Clinical Practice Guideline

2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA
Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management
of High Blood Pressure in Adults
A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on
Clinical Practice Guidelines

Downloaded from http://hyper.ahajournals.org/ by guest on December 19, 2017

WRITING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Paul K. Whelton, MB, MD, MSc, FAHA, Chair
Robert M. Carey, MD, FAHA, Vice Chair
Wilbert S. Aronow, MD, FACC, FAHA*
Bruce Ovbiagele, MD, MSc, MAS, MBA, FAHA†
Donald E. Casey, Jr, MD, MPH, MBA, FAHA†
Sidney C. Smith, Jr, MD, MACC, FAHA††
Karen J. Collins, MBA‡
Crystal C. Spencer, JD‡
Cheryl Dennison Himmelfarb, RN, ANP, PhD, FAHA§
Randall S. Stafford, MD, PhD‡‡
Sondra M. DePalma, MHS, PA-C, CLS, AACC║
Sandra J. Taler, MD, FAHA§§
Samuel Gidding, MD, FACC, FAHA¶
Randal J. Thomas, MD, MS, FACC, FAHA║║
Kenneth A. Jamerson, MD#
Kim A. Williams, Sr, MD, MACC, FAHA†
Daniel W. Jones, MD, FAHA†
Jeff D. Williamson, MD, MHS¶¶
Eric J. MacLaughlin, PharmD**
Jackson T. Wright, Jr, MD, PhD, FAHA##
Paul Muntner, PhD, FAHA†

ACC/AHA TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Glenn N. Levine, MD, FACC, FAHA, Chair
Patrick T. O’Gara, MD, MACC, FAHA, Chair-Elect
Jonathan L. Halperin, MD, FACC, FAHA, Immediate Past Chair
Sana M. Al-Khatib, MD, MHS, FACC, FAHA
Federico Gentile, MD, FACC
Joshua A. Beckman, MD, MS, FAHA
Samuel Gidding, MD, FAHA***
Kim K. Birtcher, MS, PharmD, AACC
Zachary D. Goldberger, MD, MS, FACC, FAHA
Biykem Bozkurt, MD, PhD, FACC, FAHA***
Mark A. Hlatky, MD, FACC, FAHA
Ralph G. Brindis, MD, MPH, MACC***
John Ikonomidis, MD, PhD, FAHA
Joaquin E. Cigarroa, MD, FACC
José A. Joglar, MD, FACC, FAHA
Lesley H. Curtis, PhD, FAHA***
Laura Mauri, MD, MSc, FAHA
Anita Deswal, MD, MPH, FACC, FAHA
Susan J. Pressler, PhD, RN, FAHA***
Lee A. Fleisher, MD, FACC, FAHA
Barbara Riegel, PhD, RN, FAHA
Duminda N. Wijeysundera, MD, PhD
*American Society for Preventive Cardiology Representative. †ACC/AHA Representative. ‡Lay Volunteer/Patient
Representative. §Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association Representative. ║American Academy of Physician
Assistants Representative. ¶Task Force Liaison. #Association of Black Cardiologists Representative. **American
Pharmacists Association Representative. ††ACC/AHA Prevention Subcommittee Liaison. ‡‡American College of
Preventive Medicine Representative. §§American Society of Hypertension Representative. ║║Task Force on
Performance Measures Liaison. ¶¶American Geriatrics Society Representative. ##National Medical Association
Representative. ***Former Task Force member; current member during the writing effort.

Page 1


This document was approved by the American College of Cardiology Clinical Policy Approval Committee and the American Heart Association Science Advisory and Coordinating Committee in September 2017, and by the American Heart Association Executive Committee in October 2017.

The Comprehensive RWI Data Supplement table is available with this article at http://hyper.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/HYP.0000000000000065/-/DC1.

The online Data Supplement is available with this article at http://hyper.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/HYP.0000000000000065/-/DC2.


This article has been copublished in the Journal of the American College of Cardiology.

Copies: This document is available on the World Wide Web sites of the American College of Cardiology (www.acc.org) and the American Heart Association (professional.heart.org). A copy of the document is available at http://professional.heart.org/statements by using either “Search for Guidelines & Statements” or the “Browse by Topic” area. To purchase additional reprints, call 843-216-2533 or e-mail kelle.ramsay@wolterskluwer.com.

Expert peer review of AHA Scientific Statements is conducted by the AHA Office of Science Operations. For more on AHA statements and guidelines development, visit http://professional.heart.org/statements by using either “Search for Guidelines & Statements” or the “Browse by Topic” area. To purchase additional reprints, call 843-216-2533 or e-mail kelle.ramsay@wolterskluwer.com.

Permissions: Multiple copies, modification, alteration, enhancement, and/or distribution of this document are not permitted without the express permission of the American Heart Association. Instructions for obtaining permission are located at http://www.heart.org/HEARTORG/General/Copyright-Permission-Guidelines_UCM_300404_Article.jsp. A link to the “Copyright Permissions Request Form” appears on the right side of the page.

(Hypertension. 2017;00:e000-e000.)

© 2017 by the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the American Heart Association, Inc.

Hypertension is available at http://hyper.ahajournals.org
# Table of Contents

Preamble ................................................................. 6

1. Introduction ......................................................... 10
   1.1. Methodology and Evidence Review .......... 10
   1.2. Organization of the Writing Committee ...... 10
   1.3. Document Review and Approval .......... 11
   1.4. Scope of the Guideline ................ 12
   1.5. Abbreviations and Acronyms .......... 14

2. BP and CVD Risk .................................................. 17
   2.1. Observational Relationship ........ 17
   2.2. BP Components ................ 17
   2.3. Population Risk ................ 18
   2.4. Coexistence of Hypertension and Related Chronic Conditions .... 19

3. Classification of BP .............................................. 21
   3.1. Definition of High BP ................ 21
   3.2. Lifetime Risk of Hypertension ........ 23
   3.3. Prevalence of High BP ........ 23
   3.4. Awareness, Treatment, and Control .... 26

4. Measurement of BP .............................................. 27
   4.1. Accurate Measurement of BP in the Office ... 27
   4.2. Out-of-Office and Self-Monitoring of BP ... 29
   4.3. Ambulatory BP Monitoring .......... 31
   4.4. Masked and White Coat Hypertension .... 33

5. Causes of Hypertension ......................................... 39
   5.1. Genetic Predisposition .... 39
   5.2. Environmental Risk Factors .......... 39
   5.2.1. Overweight and Obesity .......... 40
   5.2.2. Sodium Intake ........... 40
   5.2.3. Potassium ................ 40
   5.2.4. Physical Fitness ........ 41
   5.2.5. Alcohol ........ 41
   5.3. Childhood Risk Factors and BP Tracking ... 43
   5.4. Secondary Forms of Hypertension .......... 43
   5.4.1. Drugs and Other Substances With Potential to Impair BP Control ... 49
   5.4.2. Primary Aldosteronism ........ 51
   5.4.3. Renal Artery Stenosis .......... 53
   5.4.4. Obstructive Sleep Apnea .......... 54

6. Nonpharmacological Interventions ......................... 55
   6.1. Strategies ........................................ 55
   6.2. Nonpharmacological Interventions .......... 56

7. Patient Evaluation ................................................ 56
   7.1. Laboratory Tests and Other Diagnostic Procedures ... 66
   7.2. Cardiovascular Target Organ Damage ...... 67

8. Treatment of High BP ......................................... 69
   8.1. Pharmacological Treatment ........ 69
   8.1.1. Initiation of Pharmacological BP Treatment in the Context of Overall CVD Risk ... 69
Whelton PK, et al.
2017 High Blood Pressure Clinical Practice Guideline

8.1.2. BP Treatment Threshold and the Use of CVD Risk Estimation to Guide Drug Treatment of Hypertension ............................................................. 71
8.1.3. Follow-Up After Initial BP Evaluation ................................................................. 77
8.1.4. General Principles of Drug Therapy ..................................................................... 78
8.1.5. BP Goal for Patients With Hypertension ............................................................... 82
8.1.6. Choice of Initial Medication .................................................................................. 83
8.2. Achieving BP Control in Individual Patients ............................................................ 88
8.3. Follow-Up of BP During Antihypertensive Drug Therapy ........................................ 89
8.3.1. Follow-Up After Initiating Antihypertensive Drug Therapy ............................... 89
8.3.2. Monitoring Strategies to Improve Control of BP in Patients on Drug Therapy for High BP ............................... 90

9. Hypertension in Patients With Comorbidities ............................................................ 90
9.1. Stable Ischemic Heart Disease ................................................................................... 91
9.2. Heart Failure ............................................................................................................ 91
9.2.1. Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction .................................................... 96
9.2.2. Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction .................................................. 97
9.3. Chronic Kidney Disease .......................................................................................... 100
9.3.1. Hypertension After Renal Transplantation ......................................................... 105
9.4. Cerebrovascular Disease .......................................................................................... 106
9.4.1. Acute Intracerebral Hemorrhage .......................................................................... 107
9.4.2. Acute Ischemic Stroke .......................................................................................... 109
9.4.3. Secondary Stroke Prevention ................................................................................ 112
9.5. Peripheral Arterial Disease ...................................................................................... 115
9.6. Diabetes Mellitus .................................................................................................... 116
9.7. Metabolic Syndrome ............................................................................................... 119
9.8. Atrial Fibrillation ..................................................................................................... 120
9.9. Valvular Heart Disease ............................................................................................ 121
9.10. Aortic Disease ....................................................................................................... 122

10. Special Patient Groups ......................................................................................... 123
10.1. Race and Ethnicity ............................................................................................... 123
10.1.1 Racial and Ethnic Differences in Treatment ......................................................... 125
10.2. Sex-Related Issues ............................................................................................... 127
10.2.1. Women ................................................................................................................ 127
10.2.2. Pregnancy ............................................................................................................ 127
10.3. Age-Related Issues ............................................................................................... 130
10.3.1. Older Persons ..................................................................................................... 130
10.3.2. Children and Adolescents .................................................................................. 132

11. Other Considerations .............................................................................................. 133
11.1. Resistant Hypertension .......................................................................................... 133
11.2. Hypertensive Crises—Emergencies and Urgencies .............................................. 137
11.3. Cognitive Decline and Dementia .......................................................................... 143
11.4. Sexual Dysfunction and Hypertension ................................................................. 145
11.5. Patients Undergoing Surgical Procedures ............................................................. 146

12. Strategies to Improve Hypertension Treatment and Control ................................ 149
12.1. Adherence Strategies for Treatment of Hypertension ........................................... 149
12.1.1. Antihypertensive Medication Adherence Strategies ......................................... 150
12.1.2. Strategies to Promote Lifestyle Modification .................................................... 151
12.1.3. Improving Quality of Care for Resource-Constrained Populations .................. 152
Whelton PK, et al.
2017 High Blood Pressure Clinical Practice Guideline

12.2. Structured, Team-Based Care Interventions for Hypertension Control ..................................... 153
12.3. Health Information Technology–Based Strategies to Promote Hypertension Control ............ 155
  12.3.1. EHR and Patient Registries .................................................................................................... 155
  12.3.2. Telehealth Interventions to Improve Hypertension Control .............................................. 155
12.4. Improving Quality of Care for Patients With Hypertension ...................................................... 157
  12.4.1. Performance Measures ......................................................................................................... 157
  12.4.2. Quality Improvement Strategies ........................................................................................... 158
12.5. Financial Incentives ..................................................................................................................... 159
13. The Plan of Care for Hypertension ............................................................................................. 160
  13.1. Health Literacy ............................................................................................................................ 161
  13.2. Access to Health Insurance and Medication Assistance Plans................................................ 161
  13.3. Social and Community Services ................................................................................................. 162
14. Summary of BP Thresholds and Goals for Pharmacological Therapy ......................................... 164
15. Evidence Gaps and Future Directions ........................................................................................ 165
Appendix 1. Author Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Relevant) ......................... 168
Appendix 2. Reviewer Relationships With Industry and Other Entities (Comprehensive) .......... 174
Preamble
Since 1980, the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and American Heart Association (AHA) have translated scientific evidence into clinical practice guidelines (guidelines) with recommendations to improve cardiovascular health. In 2013, the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) Advisory Council recommended that the NHLBI focus specifically on reviewing the highest-quality evidence and partner with other organizations to develop recommendations (1, 2). Accordingly, the ACC and AHA collaborated with the NHLBI and stakeholder and professional organizations to complete and publish 4 guidelines (on assessment of cardiovascular risk, lifestyle modifications to reduce cardiovascular risk, management of blood cholesterol in adults, and management of overweight and obesity in adults) to make them available to the widest possible constituency. In 2014, the ACC and AHA, in partnership with several other professional societies, initiated a guideline on the prevention, detection, evaluation, and management of high blood pressure (BP) in adults. Under the management of the ACC/AHA Task Force, a Prevention Subcommittee was appointed to help guide development of the suite of guidelines on prevention of cardiovascular disease (CVD). These guidelines, which are based on systematic methods to evaluate and classify evidence, provide a cornerstone for quality cardiovascular care. The ACC and AHA sponsor the development and publication of guidelines without commercial support, and members of each organization volunteer their time to the writing and review efforts. Guidelines are official policy of the ACC and AHA.

Intended Use
Practice guidelines provide recommendations applicable to patients with or at risk of developing CVD. The focus is on medical practice in the United States, but guidelines developed in collaboration with other organizations can have a global impact. Although guidelines may be used to inform regulatory or payer decisions, they are intended to improve patients’ quality of care and align with patients’ interests. Guidelines are intended to define practices meeting the needs of patients in most, but not all, circumstances and should not replace clinical judgment.

Clinical Implementation
Management in accordance with guideline recommendations is effective only when followed by both practitioners and patients. Adherence to recommendations can be enhanced by shared decision making between clinicians and patients, with patient engagement in selecting interventions on the basis of individual values, preferences, and associated conditions and comorbidities.

Methodology and Modernization
The ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines (Task Force) continuously reviews, updates, and modifies guideline methodology on the basis of published standards from organizations, including the Institute of Medicine (3, 4), and on the basis of internal reevaluation. Similarly, the presentation and delivery of guidelines are reevaluated and modified on the basis of evolving technologies and other factors to facilitate optimal dissemination of information to healthcare professionals at the point of care.

Toward this goal, this guideline continues the introduction of an evolved format of presenting guideline recommendations and associated text called the “modular knowledge chunk format.” Each modular “chunk” includes a table of related recommendations, a brief synopsis, recommendation-specific supportive text, and when appropriate, flow diagrams or additional tables. References are provided within the modular chunk itself to facilitate quick review. Additionally, this format will facilitate seamless updating of guidelines with focused updates as new evidence is published, as well as content tagging for rapid electronic retrieval of related recommendations on a topic of interest. This evolved approach format was instituted when this guideline was near completion; therefore, the present document represents a
transitional format that best suits the text as written. Future guidelines will fully implement this format, including provisions for limiting the amount of text in a guideline.

Recognizing the importance of cost–value considerations in certain guidelines, when appropriate and feasible, an analysis of the value of a drug, device, or intervention may be performed in accordance with the ACC/AHA methodology (5).

To ensure that guideline recommendations remain current, new data are reviewed on an ongoing basis, with full guideline revisions commissioned in approximately 6-year cycles. Publication of new, potentially practice-changing study results that are relevant to an existing or new drug, device, or management strategy will prompt evaluation by the Task Force, in consultation with the relevant guideline writing committee, to determine whether a focused update should be commissioned. For additional information and policies regarding guideline development, we encourage readers to consult the ACC/AHA guideline methodology manual (6) and other methodology articles (7-10).

**Selection of Writing Committee Members**
The Task Force strives to avoid bias by selecting experts from a broad array of backgrounds. Writing committee members represent different geographic regions, sexes, ethnicities, races, intellectual perspectives/biases, and scopes of clinical practice. The Task Force may also invite organizations and professional societies with related interests and expertise to participate as partners, collaborators, or endorsers.

**Relationships With Industry and Other Entities**

**Evidence Review and Evidence Review Committees**
In developing recommendations, the writing committee uses evidence-based methodologies that are based on all available data (6-9). Literature searches focus on randomized controlled trials (RCTs) but also include registries, nonrandomized comparative and descriptive studies, case series, cohort studies, systematic reviews, and expert opinion. Only key references are cited.

An independent evidence review committee (ERC) is commissioned when there are 1 or more questions deemed of utmost clinical importance that merit formal systematic review. The systematic review will determine which patients are most likely to benefit from a drug, device, or treatment strategy and to what degree. Criteria for commissioning an ERC and formal systematic review include: a) the absence of a current authoritative systematic review, b) the feasibility of defining the benefit and risk in a time frame consistent with the writing of a guideline, c) the relevance to a substantial number of patients, and d) the likelihood that the findings can be translated into actionable recommendations. ERC members may include methodologists, epidemiologists, healthcare providers, and biostatisticians. The recommendations developed by the writing committee on the basis of the systematic review are marked with “SR”.
Guideline-Directed Management and Therapy
The term guideline-directed management and therapy (GDMT) encompasses clinical evaluation, diagnostic testing, and pharmacological and procedural treatments. For these and all recommended drug treatment regimens, the reader should confirm the dosage by reviewing product insert material and evaluate the treatment regimen for contraindications and interactions. The recommendations are limited to drugs, devices, and treatments approved for clinical use in the United States.

Class of Recommendation and Level of Evidence
The Class of Recommendation (COR) indicates the strength of the recommendation, encompassing the estimated magnitude and certainty of benefit in proportion to risk. The Level of Evidence (LOE) rates the quality of scientific evidence that supports the intervention on the basis of the type, quantity, and consistency of data from clinical trials and other sources (Table 1) (6-8).

Glenn N. Levine, MD, FACC, FAHA
Chair, ACC/AHA Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines
Table 1. Applying Class of Recommendation and Level of Evidence to Clinical Strategies, Interventions, Treatments, or Diagnostic Testing in Patient Care* (Updated August 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS (STRENGTH) OF RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>LEVEL (QUALITY) OF EVIDENCE†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS I (STRONG)</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested phrases for writing recommendations:</td>
<td>• High-quality evidence† from more than 1 RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is recommended</td>
<td>• Meta-analyses of high-quality RCTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is indicated/useful/effective/beneficial</td>
<td>• One or more RCTs corroborated by high-quality registry studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should be performed/administered/other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparative-Effectiveness Phrases†:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treatment/strategy A is recommended/indicated in preference to treatment B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treatment A should be chosen over treatment B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS IIa (MODERATE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL B-R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested phrases for writing recommendations:</td>
<td>• Moderate-quality evidence† from 1 or more RCTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is reasonable</td>
<td>• Meta-analyses of moderate-quality RCTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be useful/effective/beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparative-Effectiveness Phrases†:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treatment/strategy A is probably recommended/indicated in preference to treatment B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is reasonable to choose treatment A over treatment B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS IIb (WEAK)</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL B-NR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested phrases for writing recommendations:</td>
<td>• Moderate-quality evidence† from 1 or more well-designed, well-executed nonrandomized studies, observational studies, or registry studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May/might be reasonable</td>
<td>• Meta-analyses of such studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May/might be considered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Usefulness/effectiveness is unknown/unclear/not well established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS III: No Benefit (MODERATE)</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL C-LD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Generally, LOE A or B use only)</td>
<td>• Randomized or nonrandomized observational studies with limitations of design or execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested phrases for writing recommendations:</td>
<td>• Meta-analyses of such studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is not recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is not indicated/useful/effective/beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should not be performed/administered/other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASS III: Harm (STRONG)</strong></td>
<td><strong>LEVEL C-EO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested phrases for writing recommendations:</td>
<td>• Physiological or mechanistic studies in human subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potentially harmful</td>
<td>• Consensus of expert opinion based on clinical experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Causes harm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associated with excess morbidity/mortality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should not be performed/administered/other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COR and LOE are determined independently (any COR may be paired with any LOE).

A recommendation with LOE C does not imply that the recommendation is weak. Many important clinical questions addressed in guidelines do not lend themselves to clinical trials. Although RCTs are unavailable, there may be a very clear clinical consensus that a particular test or therapy is useful or effective.

* The outcome or result of the intervention should be specified (an improved clinical outcome or increased diagnostic accuracy or incremental prognostic information).

† For comparative-effectiveness recommendations (COR I and IIa, LOE A and B only), studies that support the use of comparator webs should involve direct comparisons of the treatments or strategies being evaluated.

‡ The method of assessing quality is evolving, including the application of standardized, widely used, and preferably validated evidence grading tools; and for systematic reviews, the incorporation of an Evidence Review Committee.

Categorizes: **COR** indicates Class of Recommendation; **EO** expert opinion; **LD**, limited data; **LOE**, Level of Evidence; **NR**, nonrandomized; **R**, randomized, and **RCT**, randomized controlled trial.
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1. Introduction

As early as the 1920s, and subsequently in the 1959 Build and Blood Pressure Study (1) of almost 5 million adults insured between 1934 and 1954, a strong direct relationship was noted between level of BP and risk of clinical complications and death. In the 1960s, these findings were confirmed in a series of reports from the Framingham Heart Study (2). The 1967 and 1970 Veterans Administration Cooperative Study Group reports ushered in the era of effective treatment for high BP (3, 4). The first comprehensive guideline for detection, evaluation, and management of high BP was published in 1977, under the sponsorship of the NHLBI (5). In subsequent years, a series of Joint National Committee (JNC) BP guidelines were published to assist the practice community and improve prevention, awareness, treatment, and control of high BP (5-7). The present guideline updates prior JNC reports.

1.1. Methodology and Evidence Review

An extensive evidence review, which included literature derived from research involving human subjects, published in English, and indexed in MEDLINE (through PubMed), EMBASE, the Cochrane Library, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and other selected databases relevant to this guideline, was conducted between February and August 2015. Key search words included but were not limited to the following: adherence; aerobic; alcohol intake; ambulatory care; antihypertensive: agents, drug, medication, therapy; beta adrenergic blockers; blood pressure: arterial, control, determination, devices, goal, high, improve, measurement, monitoring, ambulatory; calcium channel blockers; diet; diuretic agent; drug therapy; heart failure: diastolic, systolic; hypertension: white coat, masked, ambulatory, isolated ambulatory, isolated clinic, diagnosis, reverse white coat, prevention, therapy, treatment, control;
intervention; lifestyle: measures, modification; office visits; patient outcome; performance measures; physical activity; potassium intake; protein intake; renin inhibitor; risk reduction: behavior, counseling; screening; sphygmomanometers; spironolactone; therapy; treatment: adherence, compliance, efficacy, outcome, protocol, regimen; weight. Additional relevant studies published through June 2016, during the guideline writing process, were also considered by the writing committee and added to the evidence tables when appropriate. The final evidence tables included in the Online Data Supplement (http://hyper.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/HYP.0000000000000065/-/DC2) summarize the evidence used by the writing committee to formulate recommendations.

As noted in the preamble, an independent ERC was commissioned to perform a formal systematic review of 4 critical clinical questions related to hypertension (Table 2), the results of which were considered by the writing committee for incorporation into this guideline. Concurrent with this process, writing committee members evaluated other published data relevant to the guideline. The findings of the ERC and the writing committee members were formally presented and discussed, and then guideline recommendations were developed. The systematic review report, “Systematic Review for the 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults,” is published in conjunction with this guideline (8), and its respective data supplements are available online (http://hyper.ahajournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1161/HYP.0000000000000067/-/DC2). No writing committee member reported a RWI. Drs. Whelton, Wright, and Williamson had leadership roles in SPRINT (Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial). Dr. Carey chaired committee discussions in which the SPRINT results were considered.

**Table 2. Systematic Review Questions on High BP in Adults**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is there evidence that self-directed monitoring of BP and/or ambulatory BP monitoring are superior to office-based measurement of BP by a healthcare worker for 1) preventing adverse outcomes for which high BP is a risk factor and 2) achieving better BP control?</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What is the optimal target for BP lowering during antihypertensive therapy in adults?</td>
<td>8.1.5, 9.3, 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In adults with hypertension, do various antihypertensive drug classes differ in their comparative benefits and harms?</td>
<td>8.1.6, 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In adults with hypertension, does initiating treatment with antihypertensive pharmacological monotherapy versus initiating treatment with 2 drugs (including fixed-dose combination therapy), either of which may be followed by the addition of sequential drugs, differ in comparative benefits and/or harms on specific health outcomes?</td>
<td>8.1.6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure.

### 1.2. Organization of the Writing Committee

The writing committee consisted of clinicians, cardiologists, epidemiologists, internists, an endocrinologist, a geriatrician, a nephrologist, a neurologist, a nurse, a pharmacist, a physician assistant, and 2 lay/patient representatives. It included representatives from the ACC, AHA, American Academy of Physician Assistants (AAPA), Association of Black Cardiologists (ABC), American College of Preventive Medicine (ACPM), American Geriatrics Society (AGS), American Pharmacists Association (APhA), American...
1.3. Document Review and Approval

This document was reviewed by 2 official reviewers nominated by the ACC and AHA; 1 reviewer each from the AAPA, ABC, ACPM, AGS, APhA, ASH, ASPC, NMA, and PCNA; and 38 individual content reviewers. Reviewers’ RWI information was distributed to the writing committee and is published in this document (Appendix 2).

This document was approved for publication by the governing bodies of the ACC, AHA, AAPA, ABC, ACPM, AGS, APhA, ASH, ASPC, NMA, and PCNA.

1.4. Scope of the Guideline

The present guideline is intended to be a resource for the clinical and public health practice communities. It is designed to be comprehensive but succinct and practical in providing guidance for prevention, detection, evaluation, and management of high BP. It is an update of the NHLBI publication, “The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation and Treatment of High Blood Pressure” (JNC 7) (7). It incorporates new information from studies of office-based BP-related risk of CVD, ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM), home blood pressure monitoring (HBPM), telemedicine, and various other areas. This guideline does not address the use of BP-lowering medications for the purposes of prevention of recurrent CVD events in patients with stable ischemic heart disease (SIHD) or chronic heart failure (HF) in the absence of hypertension; these topics are the focus of other ACC/AHA guidelines (9, 10). In developing the present guideline, the writing committee reviewed prior published guidelines, evidence reviews, and related statements. Table 3 contains a list of publications and statements deemed pertinent to this writing effort and is intended for use as a resource, thus obviating the need to repeat existing guideline recommendations.

Table 3. Associated Guidelines and Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-extremity peripheral artery disease</td>
<td>AHA/ACC</td>
<td>2016 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of primary aldosteronism: case detection, diagnosis, and treatment</td>
<td>Endocrine Society</td>
<td>2016 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>ACC/AHA/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS</td>
<td>2014 (13)*2012 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheochromocytoma and paraganglioma</td>
<td>Endocrine Society</td>
<td>2014 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation</td>
<td>AHA/ACC/HRS</td>
<td>2014 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valvular heart disease</td>
<td>ACC/AHA</td>
<td>2017 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of cardiovascular risk</td>
<td>ACC/AHA</td>
<td>2013 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension in pregnancy</td>
<td>ACOG</td>
<td>2013 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>ACC/AHA</td>
<td>2017 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle management to reduce cardiovascular risk</td>
<td>AHA/ACC</td>
<td>2013 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of arterial hypertension</td>
<td>ESH/ESC</td>
<td>2013 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of overweight and obesity in adults</td>
<td>AHA/ACC/TOS</td>
<td>2013 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-elevation myocardial infarction</td>
<td>ACC/AHA</td>
<td>2013 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of blood cholesterol to reduce atherosclerotic cardiovascular risk in adults</td>
<td>ACC/AHA</td>
<td>2013 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular diseases during pregnancy</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>2011 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness-based guidelines for the prevention of cardiovascular disease in women</td>
<td>AHA/ACC</td>
<td>2011 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary prevention and risk-reduction therapy for patients with coronary and other atherosclerotic vascular disease</td>
<td>AHA/ACC</td>
<td>2011 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of cardiovascular risk in asymptomatic adults</td>
<td>ACC/AHA</td>
<td>2010 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic aortic disease</td>
<td>ACC/AHA/AATS/ACR/ASA/SCAI/SIR/STS/SVM</td>
<td>2010 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment of high blood pressure in children and adolescents</td>
<td>NHLBI</td>
<td>2004 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statements**

| Salt sensitivity of blood pressure | AHA | 2016 (31) |
| Cardiovascular team-based care and the role of advanced practice providers | ACC | 2015 (32) |
| Treatment of hypertension in patients with coronary artery disease | AHA/ACC/ASH | 2015 (33) |
| Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring in children and adolescents | AHA | 2014 (34) |
| An effective approach to high blood pressure control | AHA/ACC/CDC | 2014 (35) |
| Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring | ESH | 2013 (36) |
| Performance measures for adults with coronary artery disease and hypertension | ACC/AHA/AMA-PCPI | 2011 (37) |
| Interventions to promote physical activity and dietary lifestyle changes for cardiovascular risk factor reduction in adults | AHA | 2010 (38) |
| Resistant hypertension: diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment | AHA | 2008 (39) |

*The full-text SIHD guideline is from 2012 (9). A focused update was published in 2014 (13). AATS indicates American Association for Thoracic Surgery; ACC, American College of Cardiology; ACOG, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; ACR, American College of Radiology; AHA, American Heart Association; AMA, American Medical Association; ASA, American Stroke Association; ASH, American Society of Hypertension; CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; ESC, European Society of Cardiology; ESH, European Society of Hypertension.*
1.5. Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation/Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning/Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABPM</td>
<td>ambulatory blood pressure monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>angiotensin-converting enzyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>atrial fibrillation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>angiotensin receptor blocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>blood pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>calcium channel blocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>coronary heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>chronic kidney disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>continuous positive airway pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVD</td>
<td>cardiovascular disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBP</td>
<td>diastolic blood pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>diabetes mellitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECG</td>
<td>electrocardiogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRD</td>
<td>end-stage renal disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDMT</td>
<td>guideline-directed management and therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFR</td>
<td>glomerular filtration rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBPM</td>
<td>home blood pressure monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td>electronic health record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>heart failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFPeEF</td>
<td>heart failure with preserved ejection fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFrEF</td>
<td>heart failure with reduced ejection fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH</td>
<td>intracerebral hemorrhage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNC</td>
<td>Joint National Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>left ventricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVH</td>
<td>left ventricular hypertrophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>myocardial infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>magnetic resonance imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>peripheral artery disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>renin-angiotensin system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>randomized controlled trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP</td>
<td>systolic blood pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIHD</td>
<td>stable ischemic heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>transient ischemic attack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. BP and CVD Risk

2.1. Observational Relationship

Observational studies have demonstrated graded associations between higher systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) and increased CVD risk (1, 2). In a meta-analysis of 61 prospective studies, the risk of CVD increased in a log-linear fashion from SBP levels <115 mm Hg to >180 mm Hg and from DBP levels <75 mm Hg to >105 mm Hg (1). In that analysis, 20 mm Hg higher SBP and 10 mm Hg higher DBP were each associated with a doubling in the risk of death from stroke, heart disease, or other vascular disease. In a separate observational study including >1 million adult patients ≥30 years of age, higher SBP and DBP were associated with increased risk of CVD incidence and angina, myocardial infarction (MI), HF, stroke, peripheral artery disease (PAD), and abdominal aortic aneurysm, each evaluated separately (2). An increased risk of CVD associated with higher SBP and DBP has been reported across a broad age spectrum, from 30 years to >80 years of age. Although the relative risk of incident CVD associated with higher SBP and DBP is smaller at older ages, the corresponding high BP–related increase in absolute risk is larger in older persons (≥65 years) given the higher absolute risk of CVD at an older age (1).
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2.2. BP Components

Epidemiological studies have evaluated associations of SBP and DBP, as well as derived components of BP measurements (including pulse pressure, mean BP, and mid-BP), with CVD outcomes (Table 4). When considered separately, higher levels of both SBP and DBP have been associated with increased CVD risk (1, 2). Higher SBP has consistently been associated with increased CVD risk after adjustment for, or within strata of, DBP (3-5). In contrast, after consideration of SBP through adjustment or stratification, DBP has not been consistently associated with CVD risk (6, 7). Although pulse pressure and mid-BP have been associated with increased CVD risk independent of SBP and DBP in some studies, SBP (especially) and DBP are prioritized in the present document because of the robust evidence base for these measures in both observational studies and clinical trials and because of their ease of measurement in practice settings (8-11).
Table 4. BP Measurement Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BP Measurement</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBP</td>
<td>First Korotkoff sound*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBP</td>
<td>Fifth Korotkoff sound*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse pressure</td>
<td>SBP minus DBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean arterial pressure</td>
<td>DBP plus one third pulse pressure†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-BP</td>
<td>Sum of SBP and DBP, divided by 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Section 4 for a description of Korotkoff sounds.
†Calculation assumes normal heart rate.

BP indicates blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.
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2.3. Population Risk
In 2010, high BP was the leading cause of death and disability-adjusted life years worldwide (1, 2). In the United States, hypertension (see Section 3.1 for definition) accounted for more CVD deaths than any other modifiable CVD risk factor and was second only to cigarette smoking as a preventable cause of death for any reason (3). In a follow-up study of 23,272 U.S. NHANES (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey) participants, >50% of deaths from coronary heart disease (CHD) and stroke occurred among individuals with hypertension (4). Because of the high prevalence of hypertension and its associated increased risk of CHD, stroke, and end-stage renal disease (ESRD), the population-attributable risk of these outcomes associated with hypertension is high (4, 5). In the population-based ARIC (Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities) study, 25% of the cardiovascular events (CHD, coronary revascularization, stroke, or HF) were attributable to hypertension. In the Northern Manhattan study, the percentage of events attributable to hypertension was higher in women (32%) than in men (19%) and higher in blacks (36%) than in whites (21%) (6). In 2012, hypertension was the second leading assigned cause of ESRD, behind diabetes mellitus (DM), and accounted for 34% of incident ESRD cases in the U.S. population (7).
2.4. Coexistence of Hypertension and Related Chronic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Coexistence of Hypertension and Related Chronic Conditions</th>
<th>References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>LOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Many adult patients with hypertension have other CVD risk factors; a list of such modifiable and relatively fixed risk factors is provided in Table 5. Among U.S. adults with hypertension between 2009 and 2012, 15.5% were current smokers, 49.5% were obese, 63.2% had hypercholesterolemia, 27.2% had DM, and 15.8% had chronic kidney disease (CKD; defined as estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR] <60 mL/min/1.73 m² and/or urine albumin:creatinine ≥300 mg/g) (3).

Not only are CVD risk factors common among adults with hypertension, a higher percentage of adults with CVD risk factors have hypertension. For example, 71% of U.S. adults with diagnosed DM have hypertension (4). In the Chronic Renal Insufficiency Cohort (CRIC), 86% of the participants had hypertension (5). Also, 28.1% of adults with hypertension and CKD in the population-based REGARDS (Reasons for Geographic and Racial Differences in Stroke) study had apparent resistant hypertension (6). In NHANES 1999–2010, 35.7% of obese individuals had hypertension (7). The presence of multiple CVD risk factors in individuals with hypertension results in high absolute risks for CHD and stroke in this population. For example, among U.S. adults with hypertension between 2009 and 2012, 41.7% had a 10-year CHD risk >20%, 40.9% had a risk of 10% to 20%, and only 18.4% had a risk <10% (3).

Modifiable risk factors for CVD that are common among adults with hypertension include cigarette smoking/tobacco smoke exposure, DM, dyslipidemia (including high levels of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol or hypercholesterolemia, high levels of triglycerides, and low levels of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol), overweight/obesity, physical inactivity/low fitness level, and unhealthy diet (8). The relationship between hypertension and other modifiable risk factors is complex and interdependent, with several sharing mechanisms of action and pathophysiology. CVD risk factors affect BP through over activation of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system, activation of the sympathetic nervous system, inhibition of the cardiac natriuretic peptide system, endothelial dysfunction, and other mechanisms (9-11). Treating some of the other modifiable risk factors may reduce BP through modification of shared pathology, and CVD risk may be reduced by treating global risk factor burden.
Observational studies have demonstrated that CVD risk factors frequently occur in combination, with ≥3 risk factors present in 17% of patients (1). A meta-analysis from 18 cohort studies involving 257,384 patients identified a lifetime risk of CVD death, nonfatal MI, and fatal or nonfatal stroke that was substantially higher in adults with ≥2 CVD risk factors than in those with only 1 risk factor (1, 2).

Table 5. CVD Risk Factors Common in Patients With Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifiable Risk Factors*</th>
<th>Relatively Fixed Risk Factors†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current cigarette smoking, secondhand smoking</td>
<td>• CKD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>• Family history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dyslipidemia/hypercholesterolemia</td>
<td>• Increased age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overweight/obesity</td>
<td>• Low socioeconomic/educational status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical inactivity/low fitness</td>
<td>• Male sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unhealthy diet</td>
<td>• Obstructive sleep apnea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Psychosocial stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factors that can be changed and, if changed, may reduce CVD risk.
†Factors that are difficult to change (CKD, low socioeconomic/educational status, obstructive sleep apnea (12)), cannot be changed (family history, increased age, male sex), or, if changed through the use of current intervention techniques, may not reduce CVD risk (psychosocial stress) (12).

CKD indicates chronic kidney disease; and CVD, cardiovascular disease.
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3. Classification of BP

3.1. Definition of High BP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Definition of High BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Although a continuous association exists between higher BP and increased CVD risk (see Section 2.1), it is useful to categorize BP levels for clinical and public health decision making. In the present document, BP is categorized into 4 levels on the basis of average BP measured in a healthcare setting (office pressures): normal, elevated, and stage 1 or 2 hypertension (Table 6). Online Data Supplement C illustrates schematically the SBP and DBP categories defining normal BP, elevated BP, and stages 1 and 2 hypertension. This categorization differs from that previously recommended in the JNC 7 report, with stage 1 hypertension now defined as an SBP of 130–139 or a DBP of 80–89 mm Hg, and with stage 2 hypertension in the present document corresponding to stages 1 and 2 in the JNC 7 report (21). The rationale for this categorization is based on observational data related to the association between SBP/DBP and CVD risk, RCTs of lifestyle modification to lower BP, and RCTs of treatment with antihypertensive medication to prevent CVD. The increased risk of CVD among adults with stage 2 hypertension is well established. An increasing number of individual studies and meta-analyses of observational data have reported a gradient of progressively higher CVD risk going from normal BP to elevated BP and stage 1 hypertension (4-10, 12, 13, 16). In many of these meta-analyses, the hazard ratios for CHD and stroke were between 1.1 and 1.5 for the comparison of SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg versus <120/80 mm Hg and between 1.5 and 2.0 for the comparison of SBP/DBP of 130–139/85–89 mm Hg versus <120/80 mm Hg. This risk gradient was consistent across subgroups defined by sex and race/ethnicity. The relative increase in CVD risk associated with higher BP was attenuated but still present among older adults (1). The prevalence of severe hypertension has been declining over time, but approximately 12.3% of U.S. adults with hypertension have an average SBP ≥160 mm Hg or average DBP ≥100 mm Hg (22). Lifestyle modification and pharmacological antihypertensive treatment recommendations for individuals with elevated BP and stages 1 and 2 hypertension are provided in Sections 6 and 8, respectively. The relationship of this classification schema with measurements obtained by ambulatory BP recording and home BP measurements is discussed in Section 4.2.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. As was the case in previous BP classification systems, the choice and the naming of the categories were based on a pragmatic interpretation of BP-related CVD risk and benefit of BP reduction in clinical trials. Meta-analyses of observational studies have demonstrated that elevated BP and hypertension are associated with increased risk of CVD, ESRD, subclinical atherosclerosis, and all-cause death (1-17). The recommended BP classification system is most valuable in untreated adults as an aid in decisions about prevention or treatment of high BP. However, it is also useful in assessing the success of interventions to reduce BP.
Table 6. Categories of BP in Adults*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BP Category</th>
<th>SBP</th>
<th>DBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>&lt;120 mm Hg</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>120–129 mm Hg</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>130–139 mm Hg</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>≥140 mm Hg</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individuals with SBP and DBP in 2 categories should be designated to the higher BP category.

BP indicates blood pressure (based on an average of ≥2 careful readings obtained on ≥2 occasions, as detailed in Section 4); DBP, diastolic blood pressure; and SBP systolic blood pressure.
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3.2. Lifetime Risk of Hypertension

Observational studies have documented a relatively high incidence of hypertension over periods of 5 to 10 years of follow-up (1, 2). Thus, there is a much higher long-term population burden of hypertension as BP progressively increases with age. Several studies have estimated the long-term cumulative incidence of developing hypertension (3, 4). In an analysis of 1132 white male medical students (mean age: approximately 23 years at baseline) in the Johns Hopkins Precursors study, 0.3%, 6.5%, and 37% developed hypertension at age 25, 45, and 65 years, respectively (5). In MESA (Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis), the percentage of the population developing hypertension over their lifetimes was higher for African Americans and Hispanics than for whites and Asians (3). For adults 45 years of age without hypertension, the 40-year risk of developing hypertension was 93% for African-American, 92% for Hispanic, 86% for white, and 84% for Chinese adults (3). In the Framingham Heart Study, approximately 90% of adults free of hypertension at age 55 or 65 years developed hypertension during their lifetimes (4). All of these estimates were based on use of the 140/90–mm Hg cutpoint for recognition of hypertension and would have been higher had the 130/80–mm Hg cutpoint been used.
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3.3. Prevalence of High BP

Prevalence estimates are greatly influenced by the choice of cutpoints to categorize high BP, the methods used to establish the diagnosis, and the population studied (1, 2). Most general population prevalence estimates are derived from national surveys. Table 7 provides estimates for prevalence of hypertension in the U.S. general adult population (≥20 years of age) that are based on the definitions of hypertension recommended in the present guideline and in the JNC 7 report. The prevalence of hypertension among U.S. adults is substantially higher when the definition in the present guideline is used versus the JNC 7 definition (46% versus 32%). However, as described in Section 8.1, nonpharmacological treatment (not antihypertensive medication) is recommended for most U.S. adults who have hypertension as defined in the present guideline but who would not meet the JNC 7 definition for hypertension. As a consequence, the new definition results
in only a small increase in the percentage of U.S. adults for whom antihypertensive medication is recommended in conjunction with lifestyle modification.

The prevalence of hypertension rises dramatically with increasing age and is higher in blacks than in whites, Asians, and Hispanic Americans. NHANES estimates of JNC 7–defined hypertension prevalence have remained fairly stable since the early 2000s (1). Most contemporary population surveys, including NHANES, rely on an average of BP measurements obtained at a single visit (2), which is likely to result in an overestimate of hypertension prevalence compared with what would be found by using an average of ≥2 readings taken on ≥2 visits (1), as recommended in current and previous BP guidelines (3-5). The extent to which guideline recommendations for use of BP averages from ≥2 occasions is followed in practice is unclear. Adding self-report of previously diagnosed hypertension yields a 5% to 10% higher estimate of prevalence (1, 6, 7). Most individuals who were added by use of this expanded definition have been diagnosed as having hypertension by a health professional on >1 occasion, and many have been advised to change their lifestyle (2, 6).
Table 7. Prevalence of Hypertension Based on 2 SBP/DBP Thresholds*†‡

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SBP/DBP ≥130/80 mm Hg or Self-Reported Antihypertensive Medication†</th>
<th>SBP/DBP ≥140/90 mm Hg or Self-Reported Antihypertensive Medication‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, crude</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men (n=4717)</td>
<td>Women (n=4906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (n=4717)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (n=4906)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, age-sex adjusted</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group, y</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–44</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–74</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race-ethnicity§</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic white</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic black</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Asian</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prevalence estimates have been rounded to the nearest full percentage.
*130/80 and 140/90 mm Hg in 9623 participants (≥20 years of age) in NHANES 2011–2014.
†BP cutpoints for definition of hypertension in the present guideline.
‡BP cutpoints for definition of hypertension in JNC 7.
§Adjusted to the 2010 age-sex distribution of the U.S. adult population.
BP indicates blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; NHANES, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

References
3.4. Awareness, Treatment, and Control

Prevalence estimates for awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension are usually based on self-reports of the hypertension diagnosis (awareness), use of BP-lowering medications in those with hypertension (treatment), and achievement of a satisfactory SBP/DBP during treatment of hypertension (control). Before the present publication, awareness and treatment in adults were based on the SBP/DBP cutpoints of 140/90 mm Hg, and control was based on an SBP/DBP <140/90 mm Hg. In the U.S. general adult population, hypertension awareness, treatment, and control have been steadily improving since the 1960s (1-4), with NHANES 2009 to 2012 prevalence estimates for men and women, respectively, being 80.2% and 85.4% for awareness, 70.9% and 80.6% for treatment (88.4% and 94.4% in those who were aware), 69.5% and 68.5% for control in those being treated, and 49.3% and 55.2% for overall control in adults with hypertension (5). The NHANES experience may underestimate awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension because it is based on BP estimates derived from an average of readings obtained at a single visit, whereas guidelines recommend use of BP averages of ≥2 readings obtained on ≥2 occasions. In addition, the current definition of control excludes the possibility of control resulting from lifestyle change or nonpharmacological interventions. NHANES hypertension control rates have been consistently higher in women than in men (55.3% versus 38.0% in 2009–2012); in whites than in blacks and Hispanics (41.3% versus 31.1% and 23.6%, respectively, in men, and 57.2% versus 43.2% and 52.9%, respectively, in women, for 2009–2012); and in older than in younger adults (50.5% in adults ≥60 years of age versus 34.4% in patients 18 to 39 years of age for 2011–2012) up to the seventh decade (4, 5), although control rates are considerably lower for those ≥75 years (46%) and only 39.8% for adults ≥80 years (6). In addition, control rates are higher for persons of higher socioeconomic status (43.2% for adults with an income >400% above the U.S. government poverty line versus 30.2% for those below this line in 2003 to 2006) (5). Research studies have repeatedly demonstrated that structured, goal-oriented BP treatment initiatives with feedback and provision of free medication result in a substantial improvement in BP control (7-9). Control rates that are much higher than noted in the general population have been reported in care settings where a systems approach (detailed in Sections 12.2 and 12.3) has been implemented for insured adults (10-12).

References


4. Measurement of BP

4.1. Accurate Measurement of BP in the Office

| Recommendation for Accurate Measurement of BP in the Office |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| COR  | LOE         | Recommendation |
| I    | C-EO         | 1. For diagnosis and management of high BP, proper methods are recommended for accurate measurement and documentation of BP (Table 8). |

Synopsis

Although measurement of BP in office settings is relatively easy, errors are common and can result in a misleading estimation of an individual’s true level of BP. There are various methods for measuring BP in the office. The clinical standard of auscultatory measures calibrated to a column of mercury has given way to oscillometric devices (in part because of toxicological issues with mercury). Oscillometric devices use a sensor that detects oscillations in pulsatile blood volume during cuff inflation and deflation. BP is indirectly calculated from maximum amplitude algorithms that involve population-based data. For this reason, only devices with a validated measurement protocol can be recommended for use (see Section 4.2 for additional details). Many of the newer oscillometric devices automatically inflate multiple times (in 1- to 2-minute intervals), allowing patients to be alone and undisturbed during measurement. Although much of the available BP-related risk information and antihypertensive treatment trial experience have been generated by using “traditional” office methods of BP measurement, there is a growing evidence base supporting the use of automated office BP measurements (1).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Accurate measurement and recording of BP are essential to categorize level of BP, ascertain BP-related CVD risk, and guide management of high BP. Most systematic errors in BP measurement can be avoided by following the suggestions provided in Table 8, including having the patient sit quietly for 5 minutes before a reading is taken, supporting the limb used to measure BP, ensuring the BP cuff is at heart level, using the correct cuff size (Table 9), and, for auscultatory readings, deflating the cuff slowly (2). In those who are already taking medication that affects BP, the timing of BP measurements in relation to ingestion of the patient’s medication should be standardized. Because individual BP measurements tend to vary in an unpredictable or random fashion, a single reading is inadequate for clinical decision-making. An average of 2 to 3 BP measurements obtained on 2 to 3 separate occasions will minimize random error and provide a more accurate basis for estimation of BP. In addition to clinicians, other caregivers and patients who perform BP self-monitoring should be trained to follow the checklist in Table 8. Common errors in clinical practice that can lead to inaccurate estimation of BP include failure to allow for a rest period and/or talking with the patient during or immediately before the recording, improper patient positioning (e.g., sitting or lying on an examination table), rapid cuff deflation (for auscultatory readings), and reliance on BPs measured at a single occasion.
### Table 8. Checklist for Accurate Measurement of BP (3, 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Steps for Proper BP Measurements</th>
<th>Specific Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 1: Properly prepare the patient | 1. Have the patient relax, sitting in a chair (feet on floor, back supported) for >5 min.  
2. The patient should avoid caffeine, exercise, and smoking for at least 30 min before measurement.  
3. Ensure patient has emptied his/her bladder.  
4. Neither the patient nor the observer should talk during the rest period or during the measurement.  
5. Remove all clothing covering the location of cuff placement.  
6. Measurements made while the patient is sitting or lying on an examining table do not fulfill these criteria. |
| Step 2: Use proper technique for BP measurements | 1. Use a BP measurement device that has been validated, and ensure that the device is calibrated periodically.*  
2. Support the patient’s arm (e.g., resting on a desk).  
3. Position the middle of the cuff on the patient’s upper arm at the level of the right atrium (the midpoint of the sternum).  
4. Use the correct cuff size, such that the bladder encircles 80% of the arm, and note if a larger- or smaller-than-normal cuff size is used (Table 9).  
5. Either the stethoscope diaphragm or bell may be used for auscultatory readings (5, 6). |
| Step 3: Take the proper measurements needed for diagnosis and treatment of elevated BP/hypertension | 1. At the first visit, record BP in both arms. Use the arm that gives the higher reading for subsequent readings.  
2. Separate repeated measurements by 1–2 min.  
3. For auscultatory determinations, use a palpated estimate of radial pulse obliteration pressure to estimate SBP. Inflate the cuff 20–30 mm Hg above this level for an auscultatory determination of the BP level.  
4. For auscultatory readings, deflate the cuff pressure 2 mm Hg per second, and listen for Korotkoff sounds. |
| Step 4: Properly document accurate BP readings | 1. Record SBP and DBP. If using the auscultatory technique, record SBP and DBP as onset of the first Korotkoff sound and disappearance of all Korotkoff sounds, respectively, using the nearest even number.  
2. Note the time of most recent BP medication taken before measurements. |
| Step 5: Average the readings | Use an average of ≥2 readings obtained on ≥2 occasions to estimate the individual’s level of BP. |
| Step 6: Provide BP readings to patient | Provide patients the SBP/DBP readings both verbally and in writing. |

*See Section 4.2 for additional guidance.

BP indicates blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.  
Adapted with permission from Mancia et al. (3) (Oxford University Press), Pickering et al. (2) (American Heart Association, Inc.), and Weir et al. (4) (American College of Physicians, Inc.).
Table 9. Selection Criteria for BP Cuff Size for Measurement of BP in Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm Circumference</th>
<th>Usual Cuff Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22–26 cm</td>
<td>Small adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27–34 cm</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44 cm</td>
<td>Large adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–52 cm</td>
<td>Adult thigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted with permission from Pickering et al. (2) (American Heart Association, Inc.).
BP indicates blood pressure.
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4.2. Out-of-Office and Self-Monitoring of BP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Out-of-Office and Self-Monitoring of BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 3 and Systematic Review Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A²R</td>
<td>1. Out-of-office BP measurements are recommended to confirm the diagnosis of hypertension (Table 11) and for titration of BP-lowering medication, in conjunction with telehealth counseling or clinical interventions (1-4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR indicates systematic review.

Synopsis
Out-of-office measurement of BP can be helpful for confirmation and management of hypertension. Self-monitoring of BP refers to the regular measurement of BP by an individual at home or elsewhere outside the clinic setting. Among individuals with hypertension, self-monitoring of BP, without other interventions, has shown limited evidence for treatment-related BP reduction and achievement of BP control (1, 5, 6). However, with the increased recognition of inconsistencies between office and out-of-office BPs (see Section 4.4) and greater reduction in BP being recommended for hypertension control, increased attention is being paid to out-of-office BP readings. Although APBM is generally accepted as the best out-of-office measurement method, HBPM is often a more practical approach in clinical practice. Recommended procedures for the collection of HBPM data are provided in Table 10. If self-monitoring is used, it is important to ensure that the BP measurement device used has been validated with an internationally accepted protocol and the results have been published in a peer-reviewed journal (7). A guide to the relationship between HBPM BP readings...
and corresponding readings obtained in the office and by ABPM is presented in Table 11. The precise relationships between office readings, ABPM, and HBPM are unsettled, but there is general agreement that office BPs are often higher than ABPM or HBPM BPs, especially at higher BPs.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Ambulatory BP monitoring (ABPM) is used to obtain out-of-office BP readings at set intervals, usually over a period of 24 hours. Home BP monitoring (HBPM) is used to obtain a record of out-of-office BP readings taken by a patient. Both ABPM and HBPM typically provide BP estimates that are based on multiple measurements. A systematic review conducted by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force reported that ABPM provided a better method to predict long-term CVD outcomes than did office BPs. It incorporates new information from studies of home blood pressure monitoring (HBPM), ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM), the relationship of overall CVD risk to the effectiveness of blood pressure lowering, clinical outcomes related to different blood pressure goals, strategies to improve blood pressure control and various other areas. A small body of evidence suggested, but did not confirm, that HBPM could serve as a similar predictor of outcomes (4). Meta-analyses of RCTs have identified clinically useful reductions in SBP and DBP and achievement of BP goals at 6 months and 1 year when self-monitoring of BP has been used in conjunction with other interventions, compared with usual care. Meta-analyses of RCTs have identified only small net reductions in SBP and DBP at 6 months and 1 year for use of self-monitoring of BP on its own, as compared with usual care (1, 5, 6). See Section 4.4 for additional details of diagnostic classification and Section 12 for additional details of telehealth and out-of-office BP measurement for management of high BP.

Table 10. Procedures for Use of HBPM (8-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient training should occur under medical supervision, including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Information about hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selection of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledgment that individual BP readings may vary substantially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Verify use of automated validated devices. Use of auscultatory devices (mercury, aneroid, or other) is not generally useful for HBPM because patients rarely master the technique required for measurement of BP with auscultatory devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitors with provision for storage of readings in memory are preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verify use of appropriate cuff size to fit the arm (Table 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verify that left/right inter-arm differences are insignificant. If differences are significant, instruct patient to measure BPs in the arm with higher readings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructions on HBPM procedures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Remain still:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid smoking, caffeinated beverages, or exercise within 30 min before BP measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure ≥5 min of quiet rest before BP measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sit correctly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sit with back straight and supported (on a straight-backed dining chair, for example, rather than a sofa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sit with feet flat on the floor and legs uncrossed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep arm supported on a flat surface (such as a table), with the upper arm at heart level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bottom of the cuff should be placed directly above the antecubital fossa (bend of the elbow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take multiple readings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take at least 2 readings 1 min apart in morning before taking medications and in evening before supper. Optimally, measure and record BP daily. Ideally, obtain weekly BP readings beginning 2 weeks after a change in the treatment regimen and during the week before a clinic visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Record all readings accurately:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitors with built-in memory should be brought to all clinic appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BP should be based on an average of readings on ≥2 occasions for clinical decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Ambulatory BP Monitoring

All of the major RCTs have been based on use of clinic BP readings. However, ABPM is often used to supplement BP readings obtained in office settings (1). The monitors are usually programmed to obtain readings every 15 to 30 minutes throughout the day and every 15 minutes to 1 hour during the night. ABPM is conducted while individuals go about their normal daily activities. ABPM can a) provide estimates of mean BP over the entire monitoring period and separately during nighttime and daytime, b) determine the daytime-to-nighttime BP ratio to identify the extent of nocturnal “dipping,” c) identify the early-morning BP surge pattern, d) estimate BP variability, and e) allow for recognition of symptomatic hypotension. The U.S. Centers for Medicaid & Medicare Services and other agencies provide reimbursement for ABPM in patients with
suspected white coat hypertension (2). Medicare claims for ABPM between 2007 and 2010 were reimbursed at a median of $52 and were submitted for <1% of beneficiaries (3, 4). A list of devices validated for ABPM is available (5, 6).

ABPM and HBPM definitions of high BP use different BP thresholds than those used by the previously mentioned office-based approach to categorize high BP identified in Section 3.1. Table 11 provides best estimates for corresponding home, daytime, nighttime, and 24-hour ambulatory levels of BP, including the values recommended for identification of hypertension with office measurements. Typically, a clinic BP of 140/90 mm Hg corresponds to home BP values of 135/85 mm Hg and to ABPM values defined as a daytime SBP/DBP of 135/85 mm Hg, a nighttime SBP/DBP of 120/70 mm Hg, and a 24-hour SBP/DBP of 130/80 mm Hg (7, 8). These thresholds are based on data from European, Australian, and Asian populations, with few data available for establishing appropriate thresholds for U.S. populations (9-13). They are provided as a guide but should be interpreted with caution. Higher daytime SBP measurements from ABPM can be associated with an increased risk of CVD and all-cause death independent of clinic-measured BP (14). A meta-analysis of observational studies that included 13,844 individuals suggested nighttime BP is a stronger risk factor for CHD and stroke than either clinic or daytime BP (15).

Methodological issues complicate the interpretation of data from studies that report office and out-of-office BP readings. Definitions and diagnostic methods for identifying white coat hypertension and masked hypertension (see Section 4.4) have not been standardized. The available studies have differed with regard to number of office readings obtained, use of 24-hour ABPM, use of daytime-only ABPM, inclusion of daytime and nighttime BP readings as separate categories, HBPM for monitoring out-of-office BP levels, and even the BP thresholds used to define hypertension with ABPM or HBPM readings. In addition, there are few data that address reproducibility of these hypertension profiles over time, with several studies suggesting progression of white coat hypertension and especially of masked hypertension to sustained office-measured hypertension (16-22).
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4.4. Masked and White Coat Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Masked and White Coat Hypertension</th>
<th>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 4, 5, and 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COR</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. BP Patterns Based on Office and Out-of-Office Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Office/Clinic/Healthcare Setting</th>
<th>Home/Nonhealthcare/ABPM Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normotensive</td>
<td>No hypertension</td>
<td>No hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained hypertension</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masked hypertension</td>
<td>No hypertension</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White coat hypertension</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>No hypertension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABPM indicates ambulatory blood pressure monitoring; and BP, blood pressure.

Synopsis

The availability of noninvasive BP monitoring techniques has resulted in differentiation of hypertension into several clinically useful categories that are based on the place of BP measurement (Table 12) (1, 13, 14). These include masked hypertension and white coat hypertension, in addition to sustained hypertension. White coat hypertension is characterized by elevated office BP but normal readings when measured outside the office with either ABPM or HBPM. In contrast, masked hypertension is characterized by office readings suggesting normal BP but out-of-office (ABPM/HBPM) readings that are consistently above normal (15). In sustained hypertension, BP readings are elevated in both office and out-of-office settings.

In patients treated for hypertension, both “white coat effect” (higher office BPs than out-of-office BPs) and “masked uncontrolled hypertension” (controlled office BPs but uncontrolled BPs in out-of-office settings) categories have been reported (5, 15, 16). The white coat effect (usually considered clinically significant when office SBP/DBPs are >20/10 mm Hg higher than home or ABPM SBP/DBPs) has been implicated in “pseudo-resistant hypertension” (see Section 11.1) and results in an underestimation of office BP control rates (17, 18).

The prevalence of masked hypertension varies from 10% to 26% (mean 13%) in population-based surveys and from 14% to 30% in normotensive clinic populations (6, 16, 19-21).

The risk of CVD and all-cause mortality in persons with masked hypertension is similar to that noted in those with sustained hypertension and about twice as high as the corresponding risk in their normotensive counterparts (3, 4, 6, 8, 11). The prevalence of masked hypertension increases with higher office BP readings (20, 22, 23).

The prevalence of white coat hypertension is higher with increasing age (24), female versus male sex, nonsmoking versus current smoking status, and routine office measurement of BP by clinician observers versus unattended BP measurements. Many, but not all, studies (4, 6, 8, 25, 26) have identified a minimal increase in risk of CVD complications or all-cause mortality in patients who have white coat hypertension. This has resulted in a recommendation by some panels to screen for white coat hypertension with ABPM (or HBPM) to avoid initiating antihypertensive drug treatment in such individuals (2, 5, 27). The white coat effect and masked uncontrolled hypertension appear to follow the risk profiles of their white coat hypertension and masked hypertension counterparts, respectively (3, 12).

There are no data on the risks and benefits of treating white coat and masked hypertension. Despite these methodological differences, the data are consistent in indicating that masked hypertension and masked uncontrolled hypertension are associated with an increased prevalence of target organ damage and risk of CVD, stroke, and mortality compared with normotensive individuals and those with white coat hypertension.

Figure 1 is an algorithm on the detection of white coat hypertension or masked hypertension in patients not on drug therapy. Figure 2 is an algorithm on detection of white coat effect or masked uncontrolled hypertension in patients on drug therapy. Table 12 is a summary of BP patterns based on office and out-of-office measurements.
Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. White coat hypertension prevalence averages approximately 13% and as high as 35% in some hypertensive populations (1, 2), and ABPM and HBPM are better predictors of CVD risk due to elevated BP than are office BP measurements, with ABPM being the preferred measurement option. The major clinical relevance of white coat hypertension is that it has typically been associated with a minimal to only slightly increased risk of CVD and all-cause mortality risk (3, 4, 7, 11, 24). If ABPM resources are not readily available, HBPM provides a reasonable but less desirable alternative to screen for white coat hypertension, although the overlap with ABPM is only 60% to 70% for detection of white coat hypertension (5, 9, 27-30).

2. The incidence of white coat hypertension converting to sustained hypertension (justifying the addition of antihypertensive drug therapy to lifestyle modification) is 1% to 5% per year by ABPM or HBPM, with a higher incidence of conversion in those with elevated BP, older age, obesity, or black race (2, 7).

3. The overlap between HBPM and both daytime and 24-hour ABPM in diagnosing white coat hypertension is only 60% to 70%, and the data for prediction of CVD risk are stronger with ABPM than with office measurements (5, 9, 27-30). Because a diagnosis of white coat hypertension may result in a decision not to treat or intensify treatment in patients with elevated office BP readings, confirmation of BP control by ABPM in addition to HBPM provides added support for this decision.

4. In contrast to white coat hypertension, masked hypertension is associated with a CVD and all-cause mortality risk twice as high as that seen in normotensive individuals, with a risk range similar to that of patients with sustained hypertension (3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 31). Therefore, out-of-office readings are reasonable to confirm BP control seen with office readings.

5. The white coat effect has been implicated in office-measured uncontrolled hypertension and pseudo-resistant hypertension, which may result in BP control being underestimated when subsequently assessed by ABPM (17, 18). The risk of vascular complications in patients with office-measured uncontrolled hypertension with a white coat effect is similar to the risk in those with controlled hypertension (3, 4, 7, 11, 12). White coat hypertension and white coat effect raise the concern that unnecessary antihypertensive drug therapy may be initiated or intensified. Because a diagnosis of white coat hypertension or white coat effect would result in a decision to not treat elevated office BP readings, confirmation of BP control by ABPM (or ABPM) provides more definitive support for the decision not to initiate antihypertensive drug therapy or accelerate treatment.

6. Analogous to masked hypertension in untreated patients, masked uncontrolled hypertension is defined in treated patients with hypertension by office readings suggesting adequate BP control but out-of-office readings (HBPM) that remain consistently above goal (3, 15, 16, 32, 33). The CVD risk profile for masked uncontrolled hypertension appears to follow the risk profile for masked hypertension (3, 12, 34). Although the evidence is consistent in identifying the increased risk of masked uncontrolled hypertension, evidence is lacking on whether the treatment of masked hypertension or masked uncontrolled hypertension reduces clinical outcomes. A suggestion for assessing CVD risk is provided in Section 8.

7. Although both ABPM and HBPM are better predictors of CVD risk than are office BP readings, ABPM confirmation of elevated BP by HBPM might be reasonable because of the more extensive documentation of CVD risk with ABPM. However, unlike the documentation of a significant white coat effect to justify the decision to not treat an elevated clinic BP, it is not mandatory to confirm masked uncontrolled hypertension determined by HBPM.
Figure 1. Detection of White Coat Hypertension or Masked Hypertension in Patients Not on Drug Therapy

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1. ABPM indicates ambulatory blood pressure monitoring; BP, blood pressure; and HBPM, home blood pressure monitoring.
Whelton PK, et al.
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Figure 2. Detection of White Coat Effect or Masked Uncontrolled Hypertension in Patients on Drug Therapy

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.
See Section 8 for treatment options.
ABPM indicates ambulatory blood pressure monitoring; BP, blood pressure; CVD, cardiovascular disease; and HBPM, home blood pressure monitoring.
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5. Causes of Hypertension

5.1. Genetic Predisposition

Hypertension is a complex polygenic disorder in which many genes or gene combinations influence BP (1, 2). Although several monogenic forms of hypertension have been identified, such as glucocorticoid-remediable aldosteronism, Liddle’s syndrome, Gordon’s syndrome, and others in which single-gene mutations fully explain the pathophysiology of hypertension, these disorders are rare (3). The current tabulation of known genetic variants contributing to BP and hypertension includes more than 25 rare mutations and 120 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (3, 4). However, even with the discovery of multiple single-nucleotide polymorphisms influencing control of BP since completion of the Human Genome Project in 2003, the associated variants have only small effects. Indeed, at present, the collective effect of all BP loci identified through genome-wide association studies accounts for only about 3.5% of BP variability (4). The presence of a high number of small-effect alleles associated with higher BP results in a more rapid increase in BP with age (5). Future studies will need to better elucidate genetic expression, epigenetic effects, transcriptomics, and proteomics that link genotypes with underlying pathophysiological mechanisms.
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5.2. Environmental Risk Factors

Various environmental exposures, including components of diet, physical activity, and alcohol consumption, influence BP. Many dietary components have been associated with high BP (1, 2). Some of the diet-related factors associated with high BP include overweight and obesity, excess intake of sodium, and insufficient intake of potassium, calcium, magnesium, protein (especially from vegetables), fiber, and fish fats. Poor diet, physical inactivity, and excess intake of alcohol, alone or in combination, are the underlying cause of a large proportion of hypertension. Gut microbiota have also been linked to hypertension, especially in experimental
animals. (3) Some of the best-proven environmental relationships with high BP are briefly reviewed below, and nonpharmacological interventions to lower BP are discussed in Section 6.2.
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5.2.1. Overweight and Obesity

Insurance industry actuarial reports have identified a striking relationship between body weight and high BP (1) and a direct relationship between overweight/obesity and hypertension (2). Epidemiological studies, including the Framingham Heart Study (3) and the Nurses’ Health Study (4), have consistently identified a direct relationship between body mass index and BP that is continuous and almost linear, with no evidence of a threshold (5, 6). The relationship with BP is even stronger for waist-to-hip ratio and computed tomographic measures of central fat distribution (7). Attributable risk estimates from the Nurses’ Health Study suggest that obesity may be responsible for about 40% of hypertension, and in the Framingham Offspring Study, the corresponding estimates were even higher (78% in men and 65% in women) (8, 9). The relationship between obesity at a young age and change in obesity status over time is strongly related to future risk of hypertension. In combined data from 4 longitudinal studies begun in adolescence with repeat examination in young adulthood to early middle age, being obese continuously or acquiring obesity was associated with a relative risk of 2.7 for developing hypertension. Becoming normal weight reduced the risk of developing hypertension to a level similar to those who had never been obese (10).

5.2.2. Sodium Intake

Sodium intake is positively associated with BP in migrant (11), cross-sectional (12-14), and prospective cohort studies (15) and accounts for much of the age-related increase in BP (11, 16). In addition to the well-accepted and important relationship of dietary sodium with BP, excessive consumption of sodium is independently associated with an increased risk of stroke (17, 18), CVD (19), and other adverse outcomes (20). Certain groups with various demographic, physiological, and genetic characteristics tend to be particularly sensitive to the effects of dietary sodium on BP (21-23). Salt sensitivity is a quantitative trait in which an increase in sodium load disproportionately increases BP (21, 24). Salt sensitivity is especially common in blacks, older adults, and those with a higher level of BP or comorbidities such as CKD, DM, or the metabolic syndrome (25). In aggregate, these groups constitute more than half of all U.S. adults (26). Salt sensitivity may be a marker for increased CVD and all-cause mortality risk independently of BP (27, 28), and the trait has been demonstrated to be reproducible (29). Current techniques for recognition of salt sensitivity are impractical in routine clinical practice, so salt sensitivity is best considered as a group characteristic.

5.2.3. Potassium

Potassium intake is inversely related to BP in migrant (30), cross-sectional (13, 16, 31, 32), and prospective cohort (33) studies. It is also inversely related to stroke (34-36). A higher level of potassium seems to blunt the effect of sodium on BP (37), with a lower sodium–potassium ratio being associated with a lower level of BP than that noted for corresponding levels of sodium or potassium on their own (38). Likewise, epidemiological studies suggest that a lower sodium–potassium ratio may result in a reduced risk of CVD as compared with the pattern for corresponding levels of either cation on its own (39).
5.2.4. Physical Fitness

Epidemiological studies have demonstrated an inverse relationship between physical activity and physical fitness and level of BP and hypertension (40). Even modest levels of physical activity have been associated with a decrease in the risk of incident hypertension (41). In several observational studies, the relationship between physical activity and BP has been most apparent in white men (40). With the advent of electronic activity trackers and ABPM, it has become increasingly feasible to conduct studies that relate physical activity and BP (42). Physical fitness, measured objectively by graded exercise testing, attenuates the rise of BP with age and prevents the development of hypertension. In the CARDIA (Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults) study (43), physical fitness measured at 18 to 30 years of age in the upper 2 deciles of an otherwise healthy population was associated with one third the risk of developing hypertension 15 years later, and one half the risk after adjustment for body mass index, as compared with the lowest quintile. Change in fitness assessed 7 years later further modified risk (43). In a cohort of men 20 to 90 years of age who were followed longitudinally for 3 to 28 years, higher physical fitness decreased the rate of rise in SBP over time and delayed the time to onset of hypertension (44).

5.2.5. Alcohol

The presence of a direct relationship between alcohol consumption and BP was first reported in 1915 (45) and has been repeatedly identified in contemporary cross-sectional and prospective cohort studies (46). Estimates of the contribution of alcohol consumption to population incidence and prevalence of hypertension vary according to level of intake. In the United States, it seems likely that alcohol may account for close to 10% of the population burden of hypertension (higher in men than in women). In contrast to its detrimental effect on BP, alcohol intake is associated with a higher level of high-density lipoprotein cholesterol and, within modest ranges of intake, a lower level of CHD than that associated with abstinence (35).
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5.3. Childhood Risk Factors and BP Tracking

BP distribution in the general population increases with age. Multiple longitudinal studies have investigated the relationship of childhood BP to adult BP. A meta-analysis of 50 such studies showed correlation coefficients of about 0.38 for SBP and 0.28 for DBP, with BPs in the upper range of the pediatric distribution (particularly BPs obtained in adolescence) predicting hypertension in adulthood (1). Several factors, including genetic factors and development of obesity, increase the likelihood that a high childhood BP will lead to future hypertension (2). Premature birth is associated with a 4–mm Hg higher SBP and a 3–mm Hg higher DBP in adulthood, with somewhat larger effects in women than in men (3). Low birth weight from other causes also contributes to higher BP in later life (4).
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5.4. Secondary Forms of Hypertension

### Recommendations for Secondary Forms of Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. Screening for specific form(s) of secondary hypertension is recommended when the clinical indications and physical examination findings listed in Table 13 are present or in adults with resistant hypertension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>2. If an adult with sustained hypertension screens positive for a form of secondary hypertension, referral to a physician with expertise in that form of hypertension may be reasonable for diagnostic confirmation and treatment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

A specific, remediable cause of hypertension can be identified in approximately 10% of adult patients with hypertension (1). If a cause can be correctly diagnosed and treated, patients with secondary hypertension can achieve a cure or experience a marked improvement in BP control, with reduction in CVD risk. All new patients with hypertension should be screened with a history, physical examination, and laboratory investigations, as recommended in Section 7, before initiation of treatment.

Secondary hypertension can underlie severe elevation of BP, pharmacologically resistant hypertension, sudden onset of hypertension, increased BP in patients with hypertension previously controlled...
on drug therapy, onset of diastolic hypertension in older adults, and target organ damage disproportionate to the duration or severity of the hypertension. Although secondary hypertension should be suspected in younger patients (<30 years of age) with elevated BP, it is not uncommon for primary hypertension to manifest at a younger age, especially in blacks (2), and some forms of secondary hypertension, such as renovascular disease, are more common at older age. Many of the causes of secondary hypertension are strongly associated with clinical findings or groups of findings that suggest a specific disorder.

Figure 3 is an algorithm on screening for secondary hypertension. Table 13 is a detailed list of clinical indications and diagnostic screening tests for secondary hypertension, and Table 14 is a list of drugs that can induce secondary hypertension.

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. The causes of secondary hypertension and recommended screening tests are provided in Table 13, and drugs that can induce secondary hypertension are provided in Table 14.

2. Diagnosis of many of these disorders requires a complex set of measurements, specialized technical expertise, and/or experience in data interpretation. Similarly, specific treatment often requires a level of technical training and experience.
Figure 3. Screening for Secondary Hypertension

New-onset or uncontrolled hypertension in adults

Conditions
- Drug-resistant/induced hypertension
- Abrupt onset of hypertension
- Onset of hypertension at <30 y
- Exacerbation of previously controlled hypertension
- Disproportionate TOD for degree of hypertension
- Accelerated/malignant hypertension
- Onset of diastolic hypertension in older adults (age ≥65 y)
- Unprovoked or excessive hypokalemia

Yes

Screen for secondary hypertension (Class I) (see Table 13)

No

Screening not indicated (No Benefit)

Positive screening test

Yes

Refer to clinician with specific expertise (Class IIb)

No

Referral not necessary (No Benefit)

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.
TOD indicates target organ damage (e.g., cerebrovascular disease, hypertensive retinopathy, left ventricular hypertrophy, left ventricular dysfunction, heart failure, coronary artery disease, chronic kidney disease, albuminuria, peripheral artery disease).
Table 13. Causes of Secondary Hypertension With Clinical Indications and Diagnostic Screening Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common causes</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Clinical Indications</th>
<th>Physical Examination</th>
<th>Screening Tests</th>
<th>Additional/Confirmatory Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renal parenchymal disease (1, 3)</td>
<td>1%–2%</td>
<td>Urinary tract infections; obstruction, hematuria; urinary frequency and nocturia; analgesic abuse; family history of polycystic kidney disease; elevated serum creatinine; abnormal urinalysis</td>
<td>Abdominal mass (polycystic kidney disease); skin pallor</td>
<td>Renal ultrasound</td>
<td>Tests to evaluate cause of renal disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovascular disease (4)</td>
<td>5%–34%*</td>
<td>Resistant hypertension; hypertension of abrupt onset or worsening or increasingly difficult to control; flash pulmonary edema (atherosclerotic); early-onset hypertension, especially in women (fibromuscular hyperplasia)</td>
<td>Abdominal systolic-diastolic bruit; bruits over other arteries (carotid – atherosclerotic or fibromuscular dysplasia), femoral</td>
<td>Renal Duplex Doppler ultrasound; MRA; abdominal CT</td>
<td>Bilateral selective renal intra-arterial angiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary aldosteronism (5, 6)</td>
<td>8%–20%†</td>
<td>Resistant hypertension; hypertension with hypokalemia (spontaneous or diuretic induced); hypertension and muscle cramps or weakness; hypertension and incidentally discovered adrenal mass; hypertension and obstructive sleep apnea; hypertension and family history of early-onset hypertension or stroke</td>
<td>Arrhythmias (with hypokalemia); especially atrial fibrillation</td>
<td>Plasma aldosterone/renin ratio under standardized conditions (correction of hypokalemia and withdrawal of aldosterone antagonists for 4–6 wk)</td>
<td>Oral sodium loading test (with 24-h urine aldosterone) or IV saline infusion test with plasma aldosterone at 4 h of infusion Adrenal CT scan, adrenal vein sampling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructive sleep apnea (7)‡</td>
<td>25%–50%</td>
<td>Resistant hypertension; snoring; fitful sleep; breathing pauses during sleep; daytime sleepiness</td>
<td>Obesity, Mallampati class III–IV; loss of normal nocturnal BP fall</td>
<td>Berlin Questionnaire (8); Epworth Sleepiness Score (9); overnight oximetry</td>
<td>Polysomnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug or alcohol induced (10)§</td>
<td>2%–4%</td>
<td>Sodium-containing antacids; caffeine; nicotine (smoking); alcohol; NSAIDs; oral contraceptives; cyclosporine or tacrolimus; sympathomimetics (decongestants, anorectics); cocaine, amphetamines and other illicit drugs; neuropsychiatric agents; erythropoiesis-stimulating</td>
<td>Fine tremor, tachycardia, sweating (cocaine, ephedrine, MAO inhibitors); acute abdominal pain (cocaine)</td>
<td>Urinary drug screen (illicit drugs)</td>
<td>Response to withdrawal of suspected agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncommon causes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma (11)</td>
<td>0.1%–0.6%</td>
<td>Resistant hypertension; paroxysmal hypertension or crisis superimposed on sustained hypertension; “spells,” BP lability, headache, sweating, palpitations, pallor; positive family history of pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma; adrenal incidentaloma</td>
<td>Skin stigmata of neurofibromatosis (café-au-lait spots; neurofibromas); Orthostatic hypotension</td>
<td>24-h urinary fractionated metanephrine s or plasma metanephrine s under standard conditions (supine position with indwelling IV cannula)</td>
<td>CT or MRI scan of abdomen/pelvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushing’s syndrome (12)</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>Rapid weight gain, especially with central distribution; proximal muscle weakness; depression; hyperglycemia</td>
<td>Central obesity, “moon” face, dorsal and supraclavicular fat pads, wide (1-cm) violaceous striae, hirsutism</td>
<td>Overnight 1-mg dexamethasone suppression test</td>
<td>24-h urinary free cortisol excretion (preferably multiple); midnight salivary cortisol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothyroidism (10)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>Dry skin; cold intolerance; constipation; hoarseness; weight gain</td>
<td>Delayed ankle reflex; periorbital puffiness; coarse skin; cold skin; slow movement; goiter</td>
<td>Thyroid-stimulating hormone; free thyroxine</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperthyroidism (10)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>Warm, moist skin; heat intolerance; nervousness; tremulousness; insomnia; weight loss; diarrhea; proximal muscle weakness</td>
<td>Lid lag; fine tremor of the outstretched hands; warm, moist skin</td>
<td>Thyroid-stimulating hormone; free thyroxine</td>
<td>Radioactive iodine uptake and scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aortic coarctation (undiagnosed or repaired) (13)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>Young patient with hypertension (&lt;30 y of age)</td>
<td>BP higher in upper extremities than in lower extremities; absent femoral pulses; continuous murmur over patient’s back, chest, or abdominal bruit; left thoracotomy scar (postoperative)</td>
<td>Echocardiogram</td>
<td>Thoracic and abdominal CT angiogram or MRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary hyperparathyroidism (14)</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Hypercalcemia</td>
<td>Usually none</td>
<td>Serum calcium</td>
<td>Serum parathyroid hormone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenital adrenal hyperplasia (15)</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Hypertension and hypokalemia; virilization</td>
<td>Signs of virilization (11-</td>
<td>Hypertension and 11-beta-OH: elevated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mineralocorticoid Excess Syndromes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syndrome</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Associated Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mineralocorticoid excess syndrome other than primary aldosteronism (15)</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Early-onset hypertension; resistant hypertension; hypokalemia or hyperkalemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acromegaly (16)</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Acréal features, enlarcing shoe, glove, or hat size; headache, visual disturbances; diabetes mellitus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acromegaly

- **Frequency:** Rare
- **Features:**
  - Acréal features
  - Enlarging shoe, glove, or hat size
  - Headache, visual disturbances
  - Diabetes mellitus

### References


### 5.4.1. Drugs and Other Substances With Potential to Impair BP Control

Numerous substances, including prescription medications, over-the-counter medications, herbals, and food substances, may affect BP (Table 14) (1-6). Changes in BP that occur because of drugs and other agents have been associated with the development of hypertension, worsening control in a patient who already has hypertension, or attenuation of the BP-lowering effects of antihypertensive therapy. A change in BP may also result from drug–drug or drug–food interactions (2, 4). In the clinical assessment of hypertension, a careful history should be taken with regard to substances that may impair BP control, with close attention paid to not only prescription medications, but also over-the-counter substances, illicit drugs, and herbal products. When feasible, drugs associated with increased BP should be reduced or discontinued, and alternative agents should be used.

#### Table 14. Frequently Used Medications and Other Substances That May Cause Elevated BP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Possible Management Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>• Limit alcohol to ≤1 drink daily for women and ≤2 drinks for men (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamines (e.g., amphetamine, methylphenidate dexamethylphenidate, dextroamphetamine)</td>
<td>• Discontinue or decrease dose (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider behavioral therapies for ADHD (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants (e.g., MAOIs, SNRIs, TCAs)</td>
<td>• Consider alternative agents (e.g., SSRIs) depending on indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid tyramine-containing foods with MAOIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical antipsychotics (e.g., clozapine, olanzapine)</td>
<td>• Discontinue or limit use when possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider behavior therapy where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend lifestyle modification (see Section 6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider alternative agents associated with lower risk of weight gain, diabetes mellitus, and dyslipidemia (e.g., aripiprazole, ziprasidone) (10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>• Generally limit caffeine intake to &lt;300 mg/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid use in patients with uncontrolled hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coffee use in patients with hypertension is associated with acute increases in BP; long-term use is not associated with increased BP or CVD (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decongestants (e.g., phenylephrine, pseudoephedrine)</td>
<td>• Use for shortest duration possible, and avoid in severe or uncontrolled hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herbal supplements</strong> (e.g., Ma Huang [ephedra], St. John’s wort [with MAO inhibitors, yohimbine])</td>
<td>• Consider alternative therapies (e.g., nasal saline, intranasal corticosteroids, antihistamines) as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immunosuppressants</strong> (e.g., cyclosporine)</td>
<td>• Avoid use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral contraceptives</strong></td>
<td>• Consider converting to tacrolimus, which may be associated with fewer effects on BP (13-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSAIDs</strong></td>
<td>• Avoid use in women with uncontrolled hypertension (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreational drugs</strong> (e.g., “bath salts” [MDPV], cocaine, methamphetamine, etc.)</td>
<td>• Discontinue or avoid use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemic corticosteroids</strong> (e.g., dexamethasone, fludrocortisone, methylprednisolone, prednisone, prednisolone)</td>
<td>• Avoid or limit use when possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angiogenesis inhibitor</strong> (e.g., bevacizumab) and tyrosine kinase inhibitors (e.g., sunitinib, sorafenib)</td>
<td>• Initiate or intensify antihypertensive therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List is not all inclusive.

ADHD indicates attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; BP, blood pressure; CVD, cardiovascular disease; IUD, intrauterine device; MAOI, monoamine oxidase inhibitors; MDPV, methylenedioxypyrovalerone; NSAIDs, nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs; SNRI, serotonin norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor; SSRI, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor; and TCA, tricyclic antidepressant.
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5.4.2. Primary Aldosteronism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Primary Aldosteronism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Primary aldosteronism is defined as a group of disorders in which aldosterone production is inappropriately high for sodium status, is relatively autonomous of the major regulators of secretion (angiotensin II and potassium), and cannot be suppressed with sodium loading (2, 3). The increased production of aldosterone induces hypertension; cardiovascular and kidney damage; sodium retention; suppressed plasma renin activity; and increased potassium excretion, which, if prolonged and severe, may cause hypokalemia. However, hypokalemia is absent in the majority of cases and has a low negative predictive value for the diagnosis of primary aldosteronism (4). In about 50% of the patients, primary aldosteronism is due to increased unilateral aldosterone production (usually aldosterone-producing adenoma or, rarely, unilateral adrenal hyperplasia); in the remaining 50%, primary aldosteronism is due to bilateral adrenal hyperplasia (idiopathic hyperaldosteronism) (2, 3).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Primary aldosteronism is one of the most frequent disorders (occurring in 5% to 10% of patients with hypertension and 20% of patients with resistant hypertension) that causes secondary hypertension (5, 6). The toxic tissue effects of aldosterone induce greater target organ damage in primary aldosteronism than in primary hypertension. Patients with primary aldosteronism have a 3.7-fold increase in HF, a 4.2-fold increase in stroke, a 6.5-fold increase in MI, a 12.1-fold increase in atrial fibrillation (AF), increased left ventricular...
hypertrophy (LVH) and diastolic dysfunction, increased stiffness of large arteries, widespread tissue fibrosis, increased remodeling of resistance vessels, and increased kidney damage as compared with patients with primary hypertension matched for BP level (6-8). Because the deleterious effects of aldosterone overproduction are often reversible with unilateral laparoscopic adrenalectomy or treatment with mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (i.e., spironolactone or eplerenone), screening of patients with hypertension at increased risk of primary aldosteronism is beneficial (2, 3). These include hypertensive patients with adrenal “incidentaloma,” an incidentally discovered adrenal lesion on a computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan performed for other purposes. Patients with hypertension and a history of early onset hypertension and/or cerebrovascular accident at a young age may have primary aldosteronism due to glucocorticoid-remediable aldosteronism (familial hyperaldosteronism type-1) and therefore warrant screening (2, 3).

2. The aldosterone:renin activity ratio is currently the most accurate and reliable means of screening for primary aldosteronism (1). The most commonly used cutoff value is 30 when plasma aldosterone concentration is reported in nanograms per deciliter (ng/dL) and plasma renin activity in nanograms per milliliter per hour (ng/mL/h) (3). Because the aldosterone:renin activity ratio can be influenced by the presence of very low renin levels, the plasma aldosterone concentration should be at least 10 ng/dL to interpret the test as positive (3). Patients should have unrestricted salt intake, serum potassium in the normal range, and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (e.g., spironolactone or eplerenone) withdrawn for at least 4 weeks before testing (2, 3).

3. The diagnosis of primary aldosteronism generally requires a confirmatory test (intravenous saline suppression test or oral salt-loading test) (2, 3). If the diagnosis of primary aldosteronism is confirmed (and the patient agrees that surgery would be desirable), the patient is referred for an adrenal venous sampling procedure to determine whether the increased aldosterone production is unilateral or bilateral in origin. If unilateral aldosterone production is documented on adrenal venous sampling, the patient is referred for unilateral laparoscopic adrenalectomy, which improves BP in virtually 100% of patients and results in a complete cure of hypertension in about 50% (2, 3). If the patient has bilaterally increased aldosterone secretion on adrenal venous sampling or has a unilateral source of excess aldosterone production but cannot undergo surgery, the patient is treated with spironolactone or eplerenone as agent of choice (2, 3). Both adrenalectomy and medical therapy are effective in lowering BP and reversing LVH. Treating primary aldosteronism, either by mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists or unilateral adrenalectomy (if indicated), resolves hypokalemia, lowers BP, reduces the number of antihypertensive medications required, and improves parameters of impaired cardiac and kidney function (9, 10).
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5.4.3. Renal Artery Stenosis

### Recommendations for Renal Artery Stenosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. Medical therapy is recommended for adults with atherosclerotic renal artery stenosis (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>2. In adults with renal artery stenosis for whom medical management has failed (refractory hypertension, worsening renal function, and/or intractable HF) and those with nonatherosclerotic disease, including fibromuscular dysplasia, it may be reasonable to refer the patient for consideration of revascularization (percutaneous renal artery angioplasty and/or stent placement).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Synopsis

Renal artery stenosis refers to a narrowing of the renal artery that can result in a restriction of blood flow. Atherosclerotic disease (90%) is by far the most common cause of renal artery stenosis, whereas nonatherosclerotic disease (of which fibromuscular dysplasia is the most common) is much less prevalent and tends to occur in younger, healthier patients (3). Renal artery stenosis is a common form of secondary hypertension. Relieving ischemia and the ensuing postischemic release of renin by surgical renal artery reconstruction is an invasive strategy with a postoperative mortality as high as 13% (4). With the advent of endovascular procedures to restore blood flow, several trials were designed to test the efficacy of these procedures against medical therapy, but they suggested no benefit over medical therapy alone (1, 2).

### Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Atherosclerotic disease in the renal arteries represents systemic disease and higher risk of both renal failure and cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. No RCT to date has demonstrated a clinical advantage of renal artery revascularization (with either angioplasty or stenting) over medical therapy (2). On the basis of the CORAL (Cardiovascular Outcomes in Renal Atherosclerotic Lesions) trial, the recommended medical approach encompasses optimal management of hypertension with an antihypertensive regimen that includes a renin-angiotensin system (RAS) blocker, in addition to low-density lipoprotein cholesterol reduction with a high-intensity statin, smoking cessation, hemoglobin A1c reduction in patients with DM, and antiplatelet therapy (1).

2. Revascularization may be considered for those who do not respond to medical therapy and for those who have nonatherosclerotic disease (e.g., Takayasu arteritis in Asian populations, fibromuscular dysplasia in other populations). Fibromuscular dysplasia occurs over the lifespan of women (mean: 53 years of age) with almost equal frequency in the renal and carotid circulations (3). Percutaneous transluminal angioplasty alone (without stenting) can improve BP control and even normalize BP, especially in patients with recent onset of hypertension or resistant hypertension (5).
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5.4.4. Obstructive Sleep Apnea

**Recommendation for Obstructive Sleep Apnea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. In adults with hypertension and obstructive sleep apnea, the effectiveness of continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) to reduce BP is not well established (1-5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

Obstructive sleep apnea is a common chronic condition characterized by recurrent collapse of upper airways during sleep, inducing intermittent episodes of apnea/hypopnea, hypoxemia, and sleep disruption (6). Obstructive sleep apnea is a risk factor for several CVDs, including hypertension, coronary and cerebrovascular diseases, HF, and AF (6-9). Observational studies have shown that the presence of obstructive sleep apnea is associated with increased risk of incident hypertension (10, 11). Obstructive sleep apnea is highly prevalent in adults with resistant hypertension (≥80%) (12, 13), and it has been hypothesized that treatment with CPAP may have more pronounced effects on BP reduction in resistant hypertension (6).

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. CPAP is an efficacious treatment for improving obstructive sleep apnea. However, studies of the effects of CPAP on BP have demonstrated only small effects on BP (e.g., 2– to 3-mm Hg reductions), with results dependent on patient compliance with CPAP use, severity of obstructive sleep apnea, and presence of daytime sleepiness in study participants (1-5). Although many RCTs have been reported that address the effects of CPAP on BP in obstructive sleep apnea, most of the patients studied did not have documented hypertension, and the studies were too small and the follow-up period too short to allow for adequate evaluation. In addition, a well-designed RCT demonstrated that CPAP plus usual care, compared with usual care alone, did not prevent cardiovascular events in patients with moderate–severe obstructive sleep apnea and established CVD (14).
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6. Nonpharmacological Interventions

Correcting the dietary aberrations, physical inactivity, and excessive consumption of alcohol that cause high BP is a fundamentally important approach to prevention and management of high BP, either on their own or in combination with pharmacological therapy. Prevention of hypertension and treatment of established hypertension are complementary approaches to reducing CVD risk in the population, but prevention of hypertension provides the optimal means of reducing risk and avoiding the harmful consequences of hypertension (1-3). Nonpharmacological therapy alone is especially useful for prevention of hypertension, including in adults with elevated BP, and for management of high BP in adults with milder forms of hypertension (4, 5).
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6.1. Strategies

Nonpharmacological interventions can be accomplished by means of behavioral strategies aimed at lifestyle change, prescription of dietary supplements, or implementation of kitchen-based interventions that directly modify elements of the diet. At a societal level, policy changes can enhance the availability of healthy foods and facilitate physical activity. The goal can be to modestly reduce BP in the general population or to
undertake more intensive targeted lowering of BP in adults with hypertension or at high risk of developing hypertension (1). The intent of the general population approach is to achieve a small downward shift in the general population distribution of BP, which would be expected to result in substantial health benefits (2). The targeted approach focuses on BP reduction in adults at greatest risk of developing BP-related CVD, including individuals with hypertension, as well as those at increased risk of developing hypertension, especially blacks and adults who are overweight, consume excessive amounts of dietary sodium, have a high intake of alcohol, or are physically inactive. The targeted approach tends to be intensive, with a more ambitious goal for BP reduction. Both approaches are complementary and mutually reinforcing, and modeling studies suggest they are likely to provide similar public health benefit (3, 4). However, as the precision of risk prediction tools increases, targeted prevention strategies that focus on high-risk individuals seem to become more efficient than population-based strategies (5).
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6.2. Nonpharmacological Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. Weight loss is recommended to reduce BP in adults with elevated BP or hypertension who are overweight or obese (1-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2. A heart-healthy diet, such as the DASH (Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension) diet, that facilitates achieving a desirable weight is recommended for adults with elevated BP or hypertension (5-7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3. Sodium reduction is recommended for adults with elevated BP or hypertension (8-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4. Potassium supplementation, preferably in dietary modification, is recommended for adults with elevated BP or hypertension, unless contraindicated by the presence of CKD or use of drugs that reduce potassium excretion (13-17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5. Increased physical activity with a structured exercise program is recommended for adults with elevated BP or hypertension (3, 4, 12, 18-22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6. Adult men and women with elevated BP or hypertension who currently consume alcohol should be advised to drink no more than 2 and 1 standard drinks* per day, respectively (23-28).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the United States, 1 “standard” drink contains roughly 14 g of pure alcohol, which is typically found in 12 oz of regular beer (usually about 5% alcohol), 5 oz of wine (usually about 12% alcohol), and 1.5 oz of distilled spirits (usually about 40% alcohol) (29).
Nonpharmacological interventions are effective in lowering BP, with the most important interventions being weight loss (1), the DASH (Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension) diet (5-7, 30), sodium reduction (8-11), potassium supplementation (13, 17), increased physical activity (18-20, 22, 31), and a reduction in alcohol consumption (23, 24). Various other nonpharmacological interventions have been reported to lower BP, but the extent and/or quality of the supporting clinical trial experience is less persuasive. Such interventions include consumption of probiotics (32, 33, 34); increased intake of protein (35-37), fiber (38, 39), flaxseed (40), or fish oil (41); supplementation with calcium (42, 43) or magnesium (44, 45); and use of dietary patterns other than the DASH diet, including low-carbohydrate and vegetarian diets (5, 7, 46-49), (18-20, 22, 23, 31, 50). Stress reduction is intuitively attractive but insufficiently proved (51), as are several other interventions, including consumption of garlic (52), dark chocolate (53, 54), tea (55), or coffee (56). Behavioral therapies, including guided breathing, yoga, transcendental meditation, and biofeedback, lack strong evidence for their long-term BP-lowering effect (51, 57-61). The best proven nonpharmacological measures to prevent and treat hypertension are summarized in Table 15 (62).

The nonpharmacological interventions presented in Table 15 may be sufficient to prevent hypertension and meet goal BP in managing patients with stage 1 hypertension, and they are an integral part of the management of persons with stage 2 hypertension. To a lesser extent, the Mediterranean diet (49, 63) (which incorporates the basics of healthy eating but emphasizes consumption of legumes and monounsaturated fat, avoidance of red meats, and moderate intake of wine) has been effective in reducing BP, as well as improving lipid profile.

Table 15 is a summary of best proven nonpharmacological interventions for prevention and treatment of hypertension.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Weight loss is a core recommendation and should be achieved through a combination of reduced calorie intake and increased physical activity (1). The BP-lowering effect of weight loss in patients with elevated BP is consistent with the corresponding effect in patients with established hypertension, with an apparent dose–response relationship of about 1 mm Hg per kilogram of weight loss. Achievement and maintenance of weight loss through behavior change are challenging (64-66) but feasible over prolonged periods of follow-up (64). For those who do not meet their weight loss goals with nonpharmacological interventions, pharmacotherapy or minimally invasive and bariatric surgical procedures can be considered (67, 68). Surgical procedures tend to be more effective but are usually reserved for those with more severe and intractable obesity because of the frequency of complications. (69)

2. The DASH eating plan is the diet best demonstrated to be effective for lowering BP. Because the DASH diet is high in fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products, it provides a means to enhance intake of potassium, calcium, magnesium, and fiber. In hypertensive and nonhypertensive adults, the DASH diet has produced overall reductions in SBP of approximately 11 mm Hg and 3 mm Hg, respectively (7), and the diet was especially effective in blacks (70). When combined with weight loss (6) or a reduction in sodium intake (5, 30), the effect size was substantially increased. Most of the clinical trial experience comes from short-term feeding studies (7), but lifestyle change with the DASH diet has been successful in at least 2 trials that used a behavioral intervention over a 4-month (30) or 6-month (6) period of follow-up. Websites and books provide advice on implementation of the DASH diet. (13, 71-74) Counseling by a knowledgeable nutritionist can be helpful. Several other diets, including diets that are low in calories from carbohydrates (46), high-protein diets (75), vegetarian diets (48), and a Mediterranean dietary pattern (49, 63), have been shown to lower BP.

3. Sodium reduction interventions prevent hypertension and lower BP in adults with hypertension, especially in those with higher levels of BP, blacks, older persons, and others who are particularly susceptible to the
effects of sodium on BP (8-11). Sodium reduction interventions may prevent CVD (76, 77). Lifestyle change (behavioral) interventions usually reduce sodium intake by about 25% (approximately 1,000 mg per day) and result in an average of about a 2-mm Hg to 3-mm Hg reduction in SBP in nonhypertensive individuals, though the reduction can be more than double this in more susceptible individuals, those with hypertension, and those concurrently on the DASH diet (5) or following a weight loss intervention (12). Sodium reduction in adults with hypertension who are already being treated with BP-lowering medications further reduces SBP by about 3 mm Hg and can facilitate discontinuation of medication, although this requires maintenance of the lifestyle change and warrants careful monitoring (12). When combined with weight loss, the reduction in BP is almost doubled. A reduction in sodium intake may also lower SBP significantly in individuals with resistant hypertension who are taking multiple antihypertensive medications (78) (see Section 11.1). Reduced dietary sodium has been reported to augment the BP-lowering effects of RAS blocker therapy (79). Maintenance of the lifestyle changes necessary to reduce sodium intake is challenging (2-4, 12), but even a small decrement in sodium consumption is likely to be safe (2, 4, 9, 12, 80) and beneficial (8, 81), especially in those whose BP is salt sensitive (82). In the United States, most dietary sodium comes from additions during food processing or during commercial food preparation at sit-down and fast-food restaurants (83, 84). Person-specific and policy approaches can be used to reduce dietary sodium intake (85, 86). Individuals can take action to reduce their dietary intake of sodium by choice of fresh foods, use of food labels to choose foods that are lower in sodium content, choice of foods with a “no added sodium” label, judicious use of condiments and sodium-infused foods, use of spices and low-sodium flavorings, careful ordering when eating out, control of food portion size, and avoiding or minimizing use of salt at the table. Dietary counseling by a nutritionist with expertise in behavior modification can be helpful. A reduction in the amount of sodium added during food processing, as well as fast food and restaurant food preparation, has the potential to substantially reduce sodium intake without the need for a conscious change in lifestyle (81, 85, 87).

4. Dietary potassium is inversely related to BP and hypertension in migrant studies (88), cross-sectional reports (89-91), and prospective cohort studies (92). Likewise, dietary potassium (93-96) and a high intake of fruits and vegetables are associated with a lower incidence of stroke (97). Potassium interventions have been effective in lowering BP (13, 14, 16, 81), especially in adult patients consuming an excess of sodium (13, 74, 98) and in blacks (13). The typical BP-lowering effect of a 60-mmol (1380-mg) administration of potassium chloride has been about 2 mm Hg and 4 to 5 mm Hg in adults with normotension and hypertension, respectively, although the response is up to twice as much in persons consuming a high-sodium diet. A reduction in the sodium/potassium index may be more important than the corresponding changes in either electrolyte alone (99). Some but not all studies suggest that the intervention effect may be restricted to adult patients with a low (1500-mg to 2000-mg) daily intake of potassium (92, 100). Most of the intervention experience comes from trials of relatively short duration (median of 5 to 6 weeks) (13, 14), but the BP-lowering effect of potassium in adult patients consuming a high-sodium diet has been reproduced after an interval of 4.4 years (98). In most trials, potassium supplementation was achieved by administration of potassium chloride pills, but the BP response pattern was similar when dietary modification was used (13). Because potassium-rich diets tend to be heart healthy, they are preferred over use of pills for potassium supplementation. The 2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (101) encourage a diet rich in potassium and identify the adequate intake level for adult patients as 4700 mg/day (102). The World Health Organization recommends a potassium intake of at least 90 mmol (3510 mg) per day from food for adult patients (15). Good sources of dietary potassium include fruits and vegetables, as well as low-fat dairy products, selected fish and meats, nuts, and soy products. Four to five servings of fruits and vegetables will usually provide 1500 to >3000 mg of potassium. This can be achieved by a diet, such as the DASH diet, that is high in potassium content (6).

5. A BP-lowering effect of increased physical activity has been repeatedly demonstrated in clinical trials, especially during dynamic aerobic exercise (18, 20, 22), but also during dynamic resistance training (18, 21) and static isometric exercise (18, 19, 31). The average reductions in SBP with aerobic exercise are
approximately 2 to 4 mm Hg and 5 to 8 mm Hg in adult patients with normotension and hypertension, respectively (18). Most trials have been of relatively short duration, but increased physical activity has been an intrinsic component of longer-term weight reduction interventions used to reduce BP and prevent hypertension (3, 4, 12). BP-lowering effects have been reported with lower- and higher-intensity exercise and with continuous and interval exercise training (18, 103). Meta-analyses suggest isometric exercise results in substantial lowering of BP (18, 19, 31).

6. In observational studies, there is a strong, predictable direct relationship between alcohol consumption and BP, especially above an intake of 3 standard drinks per day (approximately 36 ounces of regular beer, 15 ounces of wine, or 4.5 ounces of distilled spirits) (29, 104, 105). Meta-analyses of RCTs that have studied the effect of reduced alcohol consumption on BP in adults have identified a significant reduction in SBP and DBP (23, 24). The benefit has seemed to be consistent across trials, but confined to those consuming ≥3 drinks/day, as well as dose dependent, with those consuming ≥6 drinks/day at baseline reducing their alcohol intake by about 50% and experiencing an average reduction in SBP/DBP of approximately 5.5/4.0 mm Hg (23, 24). Only limited information is available on the effect of alcohol reduction on BP in blacks (23, 106). In contrast to its effect on BP, alcohol seems to have a beneficial effect on several biomarkers for CVD risk, including high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (107, 108). Observational studies have shown a relatively consistent finding of an inverse relationship between alcohol intake and CHD (109, 110), within a moderate range (approximately 12–14 and ≤9 standard drinks/week for men and women, respectively). On balance, it seems reasonable for those who are consuming moderate quantities of alcohol (≤2 drinks/day) to continue their moderate consumption of alcohol.
**Table 15. Best Proven Nonpharmacological Interventions for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonpharmacological Intervention</th>
<th>Dose</th>
<th>Approximate Impact on SBP</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Normotension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight loss</td>
<td>Weight/body fat</td>
<td>-5 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2/3 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy diet</td>
<td>DASH dietary pattern</td>
<td>-11 mm Hg</td>
<td>-3 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced intake of dietary sodium</td>
<td>Dietary sodium</td>
<td>-5/6 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2/3 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced intake of dietary potassium</td>
<td>Dietary potassium</td>
<td>-4/5 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>Aerobic</td>
<td>-5/8 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2/4 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic resistance</td>
<td>-4 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isometric resistance</td>
<td>-5 mm Hg</td>
<td>-4 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderation in alcohol intake</td>
<td>Alcohol consumption</td>
<td>-4 mm Hg</td>
<td>-3 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
● Women: ≤1 drink daily

*Type, dose, and expected impact on BP in adults with a normal BP and with hypertension.
DASH indicates Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

Resources:
Your Guide to Lowering Your Blood Pressure With DASH—How Do I Make the DASH? Available at:
†In the United States, one “standard” drink contains roughly 14 g of pure alcohol, which is typically found in 12 oz of
regular beer (usually about 5% alcohol), 5 oz of wine (usually about 12% alcohol), and 1.5 oz of distilled spirits (usually
about 40% alcohol) (29).
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7. Patient Evaluation

The patient evaluation is designed to identify target organ damage and possible secondary causes of hypertension and to assist in planning an effective treatment regimen. Historical features are relevant to the evaluation of the patient (Table 16). The pattern of BP measurements and changes over time may differentiate primary from secondary causes of hypertension. A rise in BP associated with weight gain, lifestyle factors (such as a job change requiring travel and meals away from home), reduced frequency or intensity of physical activity, or advancing age in a patient with a strong family history of hypertension would suggest the diagnosis of primary hypertension. An evaluation of the patient’s dietary habits, physical activity, alcohol consumption, and tobacco use should be performed, with recommendation of the nonpharmacological interventions detailed in Section 6.2 where appropriate. The history should also include inquiry into possible occurrence of symptoms to indicate a secondary cause (Tables 13 and 16). The patient’s treatment goals and risk tolerance should also be elicited. This is especially true for older persons, for whom an assessment of multiple chronic conditions, frailty, and prognosis should be performed, including consideration of the time required to see benefit from intervention, which may not be realized for some individuals.
The physical examination should include accurate measurement of BP (Table 8). Automated oscillometric devices provide an opportunity to obtain repeated measurements without a provider present, thereby minimizing the potential for a white coat effect. Change in BP from seated to standing position should be measured to detect orthostatic hypotension (a decline >20 mm Hg in SBP or >10 mm Hg in DBP after 1 minute is abnormal). For adults ≤30 years of age with elevated brachial BP, a thigh BP measurement is indicated; if the thigh measurement is lower than arm pressures, a diagnosis of coarctation of the aorta should be considered. The physical examination should include assessment of hypertension-related target organ damage. Attention should be paid to physical features that suggest secondary hypertension (Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Historical Features Favoring Hypertension Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Hypertension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gradual increase in BP, with slow rate of rise in BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lifestyle factors that favor higher BP (e.g., weight gain, high-sodium diet, decreased physical activity, job change entailing increased travel, excessive consumption of alcohol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family history of hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure; and NSAIDs, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

7.1. Laboratory Tests and Other Diagnostic Procedures

Laboratory measurements should be obtained for all patients with a new diagnosis of hypertension to facilitate CVD risk factor profiling, establish a baseline for medication use, and screen for secondary causes of hypertension (Table 17). Optional tests may provide information on target organ damage. Monitoring of serum sodium and potassium levels is helpful during diuretic or RAS blocker titration, as are serum creatinine and urinary albumin as markers of CKD progression (1). Measurement of thyroid-stimulating hormone is a simple test to easily detect hypothyroidism and hyperthyroidism, 2 remediable causes of hypertension. A decision to conduct additional laboratory testing would be appropriate in the context of increased hypertension severity, poor response to standard treatment approaches, a disproportionate severity of target organ damage for the level of BP, or historical or clinical clues that support a secondary cause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. Basic and Optional Laboratory Tests for Primary Hypertension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic testing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting blood glucose*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete blood count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum creatinine with eGFR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum sodium, potassium, calcium*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid-stimulating hormone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2. Cardiovascular Target Organ Damage

Pulse-wave velocity, carotid intima-media thickness, and coronary artery calcium score provide noninvasive estimates of vascular target organ injury and atherosclerosis (1). High BP readings, especially when obtained several years before a noninvasive measurement, are associated with an increase in subclinical CVD risk (2-4). Although carotid intima-media thickness values and coronary artery calcium scores are associated with cardiovascular events, inadequate or absent information on the effect of improvement in these markers on cardiovascular events prevents their routine use as surrogate markers in the treatment of hypertension.

LVH is a secondary manifestation of hypertension and independently predicts future CVD events. LVH is commonly measured by electrocardiography, echocardiography, or MRI (5, 6). Left ventricular (LV) mass is associated with body size (particularly lean body mass), tobacco use, heart rate (inverse), and long-standing DM (7-9). BP lowering leads to a reduction in LV mass. In TOMHS (Treatment of Mild Hypertension Study), the long-acting diuretic chlorthalidone was slightly more effective in reducing LVH than were a calcium channel blocker (CCB) (amlodipine), ACE inhibitor (enalapril), alpha-receptor blocker (doxazosin), or beta-receptor blocker (acebutolol) (10). Beta blockers are inferior to angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs), angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors, and CCBs in reducing LVH (11).

Hypertension adversely impacts other echocardiographic markers of cardiac structure and function, including left atrial size (both diameter and area; left atrial size is also a precursor of AF); diastolic function (many parameters; a precursor of HF with preserved ejection fraction [HFpEF]); cardiac structure; and subclinical markers of LV systolic function, such as myocardial strain assessment with echocardiography and MRI.

Assessment of LVH by means of echocardiography or MRI is not universally recommended during evaluation and management of hypertension in adults because there are limited data on the cost and value of these measures for CVD risk reclassification and changes in type or intensity of treatment. Assessment of LVH is most useful in adults who are young (≤18 years of age) or have evidence of secondary hypertension, chronic uncontrolled hypertension, or history of symptoms of HF. Electrocardiographic criteria for LVH correlate weakly with echocardiographic or MRI definitions of LVH and are less strongly related to CVD outcomes (12-15). Imprecision in lead placement accounts, in part, for the poor correlation of electrocardiographic measurements with direct imaging results. However, electrocardiographic LVH has been valuable in predicting CVD risk in some reports (16, 17). Electrocardiography may also be useful in the assessment of comorbidities, such as rhythm disturbances and prior MI.

LVH, as assessed by electrocardiography, echocardiography, or MRI, is an independent predictor of CVD complications (18, 19). Reduction in LVH can predict a reduction in CVD risk, independent of change in BP (20). When used in CVD risk predictor models, echocardiographic LVH has a small but significant independent effect on CVD risk in younger patients. At older ages, LVH measured by electrocardiography or MRI provides no independent contribution to prediction of CVD risk (21-23). Patients can be classified into 4
Whelton PK, et al.
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groups on the basis of the presence or absence of LVH and a determination of whether the LVH has an eccentric (normal relative wall thickness) or concentric geometry (6, 22).
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8. Treatment of High BP

Clinicians managing adults with high BP should focus on overall patient health, with a particular emphasis on reducing the risk of future adverse CVD outcomes. All patient risk factors need to be managed in an integrated fashion with a comprehensive set of nonpharmacological (see Section 6) and pharmacological strategies. As patient BP and risk of future CVD events increase, BP management should be intensified.

8.1. Pharmacological Treatment

8.1.1. Initiation of Pharmacological BP Treatment in the Context of Overall CVD Risk

For any specific difference in BP, the relative risk of CVD is constant across groups that differ in absolute risk of atherosclerotic CVD (1-4), albeit with some evidence of lesser relative risk but greater excess risk in older than in younger adults (5-8). Thus, there are more potentially preventable CVD events attributable to elevated BP in individuals with higher than with lower risk of CVD and in older than in younger adults. The relative risk reduction for CVD prevention with use of BP-lowering medications is fairly constant for groups that differ in CVD risk across a wide range of estimated absolute risk (9, 10) and across groups defined by sex, age, body mass index, and the presence or absence of DM, AF, and CKD (5, 11-21). As a consequence, the absolute CVD risk reduction attributable to BP lowering is greater at greater absolute levels of CVD risk (9, 10, 12, 15-19, 22, 23). Put another way, for a given magnitude of BP reduction due to antihypertensive medications, fewer individuals at high CVD risk would need to be treated to prevent a CVD event (i.e., lower number needed to treat) than those at low CVD risk.
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8.1.2. BP Treatment Threshold and the Use of CVD Risk Estimation to Guide Drug Treatment of Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>SBP: A</td>
<td>1. Use of BP-lowering medications is recommended for secondary prevention of recurrent CVD events in patients with clinical CVD and an average SBP of 130 mm Hg or higher or an average DBP of 80 mm Hg or higher, and for primary prevention in adults with an estimated 10-year atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) risk of 10% or higher and an average SBP 130 mm Hg or higher or an average DBP 80 mm Hg or higher (1-9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP: C/EO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
<td>2. Use of BP-lowering medication is recommended for primary prevention of CVD in adults with no history of CVD and with an estimated 10-year ASCVD risk &lt;10% and an SBP of 140 mm Hg or higher or a DBP of 90 mm Hg or higher (3, 10-13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations (http://tools.acc.org/ASCVD-Risk-Estimator/) (13a) to estimate 10-year risk of atherosclerotic CVD. ASCVD was defined as a first CHD death, non-fatal MI or fatal or non-fatal stroke.

Synopsis

Whereas treatment of high BP with BP-lowering medications on the basis of BP level alone is considered cost effective (14), use of a combination of absolute CVD risk and BP level to guide such treatment is more efficient and cost effective at reducing risk of CVD than is use of BP level alone (15-24). Practical approaches have been developed to translate evidence from RCTs into individual patient treatment recommendations that are based on absolute net benefit for CVD risk (25), and several national and international guidelines recommend basing use of BP-lowering medications on a combination of absolute risk of CVD and level of BP instead of relying solely on level of BP (26-31).

Attempts to use absolute risk to guide implementation of pharmacological treatment to prevent CVD have had mixed results, with many reports of improvements in provider prescribing behaviors, patient adherence, and reductions in risk (32-38), but with others showing no impact on provider behaviors (39, 40). Use of global CVD risk assessment is infrequent in routine clinical practice (41-46), which suggests that intensive efforts would be required to achieve universal implementation. The choice of specific risk calculators for estimation of risk and risk threshold has been an important source of variability, ambiguity, and controversy (47-54). In addition, implementation of a standard (worldwide) absolute CVD risk threshold for initiating use of BP-lowering medications would result in large variations in medication use at a given level of BP across countries (48, 54, 55). Future research in this area should focus on issues related to implementation of a risk-based approach to CVD prevention, including the use of BP-lowering medications. Although several CVD risk assessment tools are available, on the basis of current knowledge, we recommend use of the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations (http://tools.acc.org/ASCVD-Risk-Estimator/) to estimate 10-year risk of atherosclerotic CVD (ASCVD) to establish the BP threshold for treatment (56, 57). It should be kept in mind that the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations are validated for U.S. adults ages 45 to 79 years in the absence of concurrent statin therapy (56). For those older than age 79, the 10-year ASCVD risk is generally >10%, and thus the SBP threshold for antihypertensive drug treatment for patients >79 years old is 130 mm Hg. Two recent reviews have highlighted the importance of using predicted CVD risk together with BP to guide antihypertensive drug therapy (22, 23).

Figure 4 is an algorithm on BP thresholds and recommendations for treatment and follow-up.
1. For the purposes of secondary prevention, clinical CVD is defined as CHD, congestive HF, and stroke. Several meta-analyses of RCTs support the value of using BP-lowering medications, in addition to nonpharmacological treatment, in patients with established CVD in the absence of hypertension, defined previously by an SBP ≥140 mm Hg or a DBP ≥90 mm Hg (1, 6, 7, 9). Many RCTs of BP lowering in adults without CVD have used inclusion criteria designed to increase the level of CVD risk in the study populations to increase trial efficiency by facilitating shorter duration and a smaller sample size. As a consequence, few relatively low-risk adults with hypertension have been included in the trials. Trial results provide evidence of CVD prevention from use of BP-lowering medications in adults with an average SBP ≥130 mm Hg or an average DBP ≥80 mm Hg and clinical CVD; 5-year risk of CVD (defined as stroke, CHD, HF, or other CVD death) of approximately 6% to 7% (3, 5); an estimated 10-year CVD death rate of approximately 4.5% (4); or an annual rate of major CVD events of approximately 0.9% per year (7). In the absence of clinical CVD, these risk estimates are roughly equivalent to a 10-year risk of ASCVD exceeding 10% as per the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations (56). SPRINT (Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial) provides additional support for the use of BP-lowering medications in patients without CVD at SBP levels ≥130 mm Hg; however, it is important to note that few SPRINT participants had untreated SBP between 130 mm Hg and 139 mm Hg at baseline. Furthermore, SPRINT used a Framingham 10-year risk of general CVD exceeding 15% to identify increased CVD risk (8). Although this level of risk is lower than the levels described previously, being roughly equivalent to a 6% to 7% 10-year ASCVD risk per the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations, most of the participants in SPRINT had a much higher level of CVD risk. This recommendation differs from JNC 7 in its use of CVD risk, rather than diabetes or CKD, to recognize patients, including older adults, with a SBP/DBP <140/90 mm Hg who are likely to benefit from BP lowering drug therapy in addition to nonpharmacological antihypertensive treatment. In JNC 7, the BP threshold for initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy was ≥ 140/90 mm Hg for the general adult population and ≥ 130/80 mm Hg for adults with diabetes or CKD. Since the publication of JNC 7 in 2003, we have gained additional experience with risk assessment and new data from randomized trials, observational studies and simulation analyses have demonstrated that antihypertensive drug treatment based on overall ASCVD risk assessment combined with BP levels may prevent more CVD events than treatment based on BP levels alone (15-24). According to an analysis of NHANES 2011-2014, the new definition results in only a small increase in the percentage of U.S. adults for whom antihypertensive medication is recommended in conjunction with lifestyle modification. The previously cited meta-analyses are consistent with the conclusion that lowering of BP results in benefit in higher-risk individuals, regardless of their baseline treated or untreated BP ≥130/80 mm Hg and irrespective of the specific cause of their elevated risk. These analyses indicate that the benefit of treatment outweighs the potential harm at threshold BP ≥130/80 mm Hg.

2. This recommendation is consistent with prior guidelines, such as JNC 7. In addition, for those for whom nonpharmacological therapy has been ineffective, antihypertensive drug treatment should be added in patients with an SBP ≥140 mm Hg or a DBP ≥90 mm Hg, even in adults who are at lower risk than those included in RCTs. The rationale for drug treatment in patients with an SBP ≥140 mm Hg or a DBP ≥90 mm Hg and an estimated 10-year risk of CVD <10% is based on several lines of evidence. First, the relationship of SBP with risk of CVD is known to be continuous across levels of SBP and similar across groups that differ in level of absolute risk (10). Second, the relative risk reduction attributable to BP-lowering medication therapy is consistent across the range of absolute risk observed in trials (3, 11, 58), supporting the contention that the relative risk reduction may be similar at lower levels of absolute risk. This is the case even in a meta-analysis of trials in adults without clinical CVD and an average SBP/DBP of 146/84 mm Hg (5). Finally, modeling studies support the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of treatment of younger, lower-risk patients over the course of their life spans (12, 13). Although the numbers needed to treat with BP-lowering medications to prevent a CVD event in the short term are greater in younger, lower-risk individuals with hypertension than in older, higher-risk adults with hypertension, the estimated gains in life expectancy attributable to long-term use of
BP-lowering medications are correspondingly greater in younger, lower-risk individuals than in older adults with a higher risk of CVD (12, 13). Indirect support is also provided by evidence from trials using BP-lowering medications to reduce the risk of developing higher levels of BP (59-61) and, in one case, to achieve a reduction in LV mass (62). In the HOPE-3 (Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation-3) BP Trial, there was no evidence of short-term benefit during treatment of adults (average age 66 years) with a relatively low risk of CVD (3.8% CVD event rate during 5.6 years of follow-up). However, subgroup analysis suggested benefit in those with an average SBP approximately >140 mm Hg (and a CVD risk of 6.5% during the 5.6 years of follow-up) (63). We acknowledge the importance of excluding white coat hypertension before initiating pharmacological therapy in hypertensive patients with low ASCVD risk. This may be accomplished (as described in Section 4) by HBPM or ABPM as appropriate.

Figure 4. Blood Pressure (BP) Thresholds and Recommendations for Treatment and Follow-Up

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.
*Using the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations (57). Note that patients with DM or CKD are automatically placed in the high-risk category. For initiation of RAS inhibitor or diuretic therapy, assess blood tests for electrolytes and renal function 2 to 4 weeks after initiating therapy.
†Consider initiation of pharmacological therapy for stage 2 hypertension with 2 antihypertensive agents of different classes. Patients with stage 2 hypertension and BP ≥160/100 mm Hg should be promptly treated, carefully monitored, and subject to upward medication dose adjustment as necessary to control BP. Reassessment includes BP measurement, detection of orthostatic hypotension in selected patients (e.g., older or with postural symptoms), identification of white coat hypertension or a white coat effect, documentation of adherence, monitoring of the
response to therapy, reinforcement of the importance of adherence, reinforcement of the importance of treatment, and assistance with treatment to achieve BP target.

ACC indicates American College of Cardiology; AHA, American Heart Association; ASCVD, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; BP, blood pressure; CKD, chronic kidney disease; DM, diabetes mellitus; and RAS, renin-angiotensin system.
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8.1.3. Follow-Up After Initial BP Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Follow-Up After Initial BP Elevation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplement 24.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. Adults with an elevated BP or stage 1 hypertension who have an estimated 10-year ASCVD risk less than 10% should be managed with nonpharmacological therapy and have a repeat BP evaluation within 3 to 6 months (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>2. Adults with stage 1 hypertension who have an estimated 10-year ASCVD risk of 10% or higher should be managed initially with a combination of nonpharmacological and antihypertensive drug therapy and have a repeat BP evaluation in 1 month (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>3. Adults with stage 2 hypertension should be evaluated by or referred to a primary care provider within 1 month of the initial diagnosis, have a combination of nonpharmacological and antihypertensive drug therapy (with 2 agents of different classes) initiated, and have a repeat BP evaluation in 1 month (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>4. For adults with a very high average BP (e.g., SBP ≥180 mm Hg or DBP ≥110 mm Hg), evaluation followed by prompt antihypertensive drug treatment is recommended (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C-E0</td>
<td>5. For adults with a normal BP, repeat evaluation every year is reasonable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

An important component of BP management in hypertensive patients is follow-up. Different periods of time for follow-up are recommended depending on the stage of hypertension, the presence or absence of target organ damage, treatment with antihypertensive medications, and the level of BP control. Recommendations for follow-up are summarized in Figure 4.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Nonpharmacological therapy (see Section 6.2) is the preferred therapy for adults with elevated BP and an appropriate first-line therapy for adults with stage 1 hypertension who have an estimated 10-year ASCVD risk of <10%. Adherence to and impact of nonpharmacological therapy should be assessed within 3 to 6 months.

2. Nonpharmacological therapy can help reduce BP in patients with stage 1 hypertension with an estimated 10-year ASCVD risk of ≥10% and should be used in addition to pharmacological therapy as first-line therapy in such patients (see Section 6.2).

3. Prompt evaluation and treatment of patients with stage 2 hypertension with a combination of drug and nonpharmacological therapy are important because of the elevated risk of CVD events in this subgroup, especially those with multiple ASCVD risk factors or target organ damage (1, 2).

4. Prompt management of very high BP is important to reduce the risk of target organ damage (see Section 11.2). The rapidity of the treatment needed is dependent on the patient’s clinical presentation (presence of new or worsening target organ damage) and presence or absence of CVD complications, but treatment should be initiated within at least 1 week.

5. Given that the lifetime risk of hypertension exceeds 80% in U.S. adults (3), it is likely that individuals with a normal BP will develop elevated BP in the future. BP may change over time because of changes in BP-related lifestyle factors, such as degree of sedentary lifestyle, dietary sodium intake, body weight, and alcohol intake.
Less commonly, secondary causes of hypertension can occur over time and lead to an increase in BP. Periodic BP screening can identify individuals who develop elevated BP over time. More frequent BP screening may be particularly important for individuals with elevated ASCVD risk.
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8.1.4. General Principles of Drug Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. Simultaneous use of an ACE inhibitor, ARB, and/or renin inhibitor is potentially harmful and is not recommended to treat adults with hypertension (1-3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis
Pharmacological agents, in addition to lifestyle modification (see Section 6.2), provide the primary basis for treatment of high BP. A large number of clinical trials have demonstrated that antihypertensive pharmacotherapy not only lowers BP but reduces the risk of CVD, cerebrovascular events, and death (4-7).

Numerous classes of antihypertensive agents are available to treat high BP (Table 18). Agents that have been shown to reduce clinical events should be used preferentially. Therefore, the primary agents used in the treatment of hypertension include thiazide diuretics, ACE inhibitors, ARBs, and CCBs (8-11) (see Section 8.1.6). Although many other drugs and drug classes are available, either confirmation that these agents decrease clinical outcomes to an extent similar to that of the primary agents is lacking, or safety and tolerability may relegate their role to use as secondary agents. In particular, there is inadequate evidence to support the initial use of beta blockers for hypertension in the absence of specific cardiovascular comorbidities (see Section 9).

When the initial drug treatment of high BP is being considered, several different strategies may be contemplated. Many patients can be started on a single agent, but consideration should be given to starting with 2 drugs of different classes for those with stage 2 hypertension (see Section 8.1.6.1). In addition, other patient-specific factors, such as age, concurrent medications, drug adherence, drug interactions, the overall treatment regimen, out-of-pocket costs, and comorbidities, should be considered. From a societal perspective, total costs must be taken into account. Shared decision making, with the patient influenced by clinician judgment, should drive the ultimate choice of antihypertensive agent(s).

Many patients started on a single agent will subsequently require ≥2 drugs from different pharmacological classes to reach their BP goals (12, 13, 14). Knowledge of the pharmacological mechanisms of action of each agent is important. Drug regimens with complementary activity, where a second antihypertensive agent is used to block compensatory responses to the initial agent or affect a different pressor mechanism, can result in additive lowering of BP. For example, thiazide diuretics may stimulate the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system. By adding an ACE inhibitor or ARB to the thiazide, an additive BP-lowering effect may be obtained (13). Use of combination therapy may also improve adherence. Several 2- and 3-fixed-dose drug combinations of antihypertensive drug therapy are available, with complementary
mechanisms of action among the components (Online Data Supplement D). However, it should be noted that many triple-dose combinations may contain a lower-than-optimal dose of thiazide diuretic. Table 18 is a summary of oral antihypertensive drugs.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Drug combinations that have similar mechanisms of action or clinical effects should be avoided. For example, 2 drugs from the same class should not be administered together (e.g., 2 different beta blockers, ACE inhibitors, or nondihydropyridine CCBs). Likewise, 2 drugs from classes that target the same BP control system are less effective and potentially harmful when used together (e.g., ACE inhibitors, ARBs). Exceptions to this rule include concomitant use of a thiazide diuretic, K-sparing diuretic, and/or loop diuretic in various combinations. Also, dihydropyridine and nondihydropyridine CCBs can be combined. High-quality RCT data demonstrate that simultaneous administration of RAS blockers (i.e., ACE inhibitor with ARB; ACE inhibitor or ARB with renin inhibitor aliskiren) increases cardiovascular and renal risk (1-3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Usual Dose, Range (mg/d)*</th>
<th>Daily Frequency</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary agents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiazide or thiazide-type diuretics</td>
<td>Chlorothalidone</td>
<td>12.5–25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Chlorothalidone is preferred on the basis of prolonged half-life and proven trial reduction of CVD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>25–50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indapamide</td>
<td>1.25–2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Monitor for hyponatremia and hypokalemia, uric acid and calcium levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metolazone</td>
<td>2.5–10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Use with caution in patients with history of acute gout unless patient is on uric acid–lowering therapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitors</td>
<td>Benazepril</td>
<td>10–40</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>· Do not use in combination with ARBs or direct renin inhibitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captopril</td>
<td>12.5–150</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>· There is an increased risk of hyperkalemia, especially in patients with CKD or in those on K⁺ supplements or K⁺-sparing drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enalapril</td>
<td>5–40</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>· There is a risk of acute renal failure in patients with severe bilateral renal artery stenosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fosinopril</td>
<td>10–40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Do not use if patient has history of angioedema with ARBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisinopril</td>
<td>10–40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Avoid in pregnancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moxipril</td>
<td>7.5–30</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perindopril</td>
<td>4–16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quinapril</td>
<td>10–80</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramipril</td>
<td>2.5–10</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trandolapril</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBs</td>
<td>Azilsartan</td>
<td>40–80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Do not use in combination with ACE inhibitors or direct renin inhibitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candesartan</td>
<td>8–32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· There is an increased risk of hyperkalemia in CKD or in those on K⁺ supplements or K⁺-sparing drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eprosartan</td>
<td>600–800</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>· There is a risk of acute renal failure in patients with severe bilateral renal artery stenosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irbesartan</td>
<td>150–300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Do not use if patient has history of angioedema with ARBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Losartan</td>
<td>50–100</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>· Avoid in pregnancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olmesartan</td>
<td>20–40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telmisartan</td>
<td>20–80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valsartan</td>
<td>80–320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB—dihydropyridines</td>
<td>Amlodipine</td>
<td>2.5–10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Avoid use in patients with HFrEF; amlodipine or felodipine may be used if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felodipine</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· They are associated with dose-related pedal edema, which is more common in women than men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isradipine</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nifedipine SR</td>
<td>5–20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nifedipine LA</td>
<td>60–120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nisoldipine</td>
<td>30–90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB—nondihydropyridines</td>
<td>Diltilazem SR</td>
<td>180–360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>· Avoid routine use with beta blockers because of increased risk of bradycardia and heart block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diltilazem ER</td>
<td>120–480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· Do not use in patients with HFrEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verapamil IR</td>
<td>40–80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>· There are drug interactions with diltilazem and verapamil (CYP3A4 major substrate and moderate inhibitor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verapamil SR</td>
<td>120–480</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verapamil-delayed onset ER (various forms)</td>
<td>100–480</td>
<td>1 (in the evening)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretics—loop</td>
<td>Bumetanide</td>
<td>0.5–4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>· These are preferred diuretics in patients with symptomatic HF. They are preferred over thiazides in patients with moderate-to-severe CKD (e.g., GFR &lt;30 mL/min).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furosemide</td>
<td>20–80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torsemide</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>· These are monotherapy agents and minimally effective antihypertensive agents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretics—potassium sparing</td>
<td>Amiloride</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>· Combination therapy of potassium-sparing diuretic with a thiazide can be considered in patients with hypokalemia on thiazide monotherapy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triamterene</td>
<td>50–100</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diuretics—aldosterone antagonists

- **Eplerenone**
  - Dose: 50–100 mg/day
  - Dose range: 12
  - Notes: Avoid in patients with significant CKD (e.g., GFR <45 mL/min).
  - These are preferred agents in primary aldosteronism and resistant hypertension.
  - Spironolactone is associated with greater risk of gynecomastia and impotence as compared with eplerenone.
  - This is common add-on therapy in resistant hypertension.
  - Avoid use with K+ supplements, other K+-sparing diuretics, or significant renal dysfunction.
  - Eplerenone often requires twice-daily dosing for adequate BP lowering.

- **Spironolactone**
  - Dose: 25–100 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1
  - Notes: These are preferred agents in primary aldosteronism and resistant hypertension.
  - Spironolactone is associated with greater risk of gynecomastia and impotence as compared with eplerenone.
  - This is common add-on therapy in resistant hypertension.
  - Avoid use with K+ supplements, other K+-sparing diuretics, or significant renal dysfunction.

### Beta blockers—cardioselective

- **Atenolol**
  - Dose: 25–100 mg/day
  - Dose range: 12
  - Notes: Beta blockers are not recommended as first-line agents unless the patient has IHD or HF.
  - These are preferred in patients with bronchospastic airway disease requiring a beta blocker.
  - Bisoprolol and metoprolol succinate are preferred in patients with HFrEF.
  - Avoid abrupt cessation.

- **Betaxolol**
  - Dose: 5–20 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Bisoprolol**
  - Dose: 2.5–10 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Metoprolol tartrate**
  - Dose: 100–400 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

- **Metoprolol succinate**
  - Dose: 50–200 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

### Beta blockers—cardioselective and vasodilatory

- **Nebivolol**
  - Dose: 5–40 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1
  - Notes: Nebivolol induces nitric oxide–induced vasodilation.
  - Avoid abrupt cessation.

### Beta blockers—noncardioselective

- **Nadolol**
  - Dose: 40–120 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Propranolol IR**
  - Dose: 160–480 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

- **Propranolol LA**
  - Dose: 80–320 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

### Beta blockers—intrinsic sympathomimetic activity

- **Acebutolol**
  - Dose: 200–800 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

- **Carteolol**
  - Dose: 2.5–10 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Penbutolol**
  - Dose: 10–40 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Pindolol**
  - Dose: 10–60 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

### Beta blockers—combined alpha- and beta-receptor

- **Carvedilol**
  - Dose: 12.5–50 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2
  - Notes: Carvedilol is preferred in patients with HFrEF.
  - Avoid abrupt cessation.

- **Carvedilol phosphate**
  - Dose: 20–80 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Labetalol**
  - Dose: 200–800 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

### Direct renin inhibitor

- **Aliskiren**
  - Dose: 150–300 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1
  - Notes: Do not use in combination with ACE inhibitors or ARBs.
  - Aliskiren is very long acting.
  - There is an increased risk of hyperkalemia in CKD or in those on K+ supplements or K+-sparing drugs.
  - Aliskiren may cause acute renal failure in patients with severe bilateral renal artery stenosis.
  - Avoid in pregnancy.

### Alpha-1 blockers

- **Doxazosin**
  - Dose: 1–8 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

- **Prazosin**
  - Dose: 2–20 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2 or 3

- **Terazosin**
  - Dose: 1–20 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1 or 2

### Central alpha1-agonist and other centrally acting drugs

- **Clonidine oral**
  - Dose: 0.1–0.8 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

- **Clonidine patch**
  - Dose: 0.1–0.3 mg/week
  - Dose range: 1 weekly

- **Methyldopa**
  - Dose: 250–1000 mg/day
  - Dose range: 2

- **Guanfacine**
  - Dose: 0.5–2 mg/day
  - Dose range: 1

  - Notes: These are generally reserved as last-line because of significant CNS adverse effects, especially in older adults.
  - Avoid abrupt discontinuation of clonidine, which may induce hypertensive crisis; clonidine must be tapered to avoid rebound hypertension.
Direct
vasodilators | Hydralazine | 250-200 | 2 or 3
| Minoxidil | 5–100 | 1-3

- These are associated with sodium and water retention and reflex tachycardia; use with a diuretic and beta blocker.
- Hydralazine is associated with drug-induced lupus-like syndrome at higher doses.
- Minoxidil is associated with hirsutism and requires a loop diuretic. Minoxidil can induce pericardial effusion.

*Dosages may vary from those listed in the FDA approved labeling (available at https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/).

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BP, blood pressure; BPH, benign prostatic hyperplasia; CCB, calcium channel blocker; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CNS, central nervous system; CVD, cardiovascular disease; ER, extended release; GFR, glomerular filtration rate; HF, heart failure; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; IHD, ischemic heart disease; IR, immediate release; LA, long-acting; and SR, sustained release.
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8.1.5. BP Goal for Patients With Hypertension

### Recommendations for BP Goal for Patients With Hypertension

References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplement 26 and Systematic Review Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>SBP: B-RSR</td>
<td>1. For adults with confirmed hypertension and known CVD or 10-year ASCVD event risk of 10% or higher (see Section 8.1.2), a BP target of less than 130/80 mm Hg is recommended (1-5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP: C-E0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iib</td>
<td>SBP: B-NR</td>
<td>2. For adults with confirmed hypertension, without additional markers of increased CVD risk, a BP target of less than 130/80 mm Hg may be reasonable (6-9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP: C-E0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR indicates systematic review.

### Synopsis

Refer to the “Systematic Review for the 2017 ACC/AHA/ACP/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults” for the complete systematic evidence review for additional data and analyses (10). Several trials have tested whether more intensive BP control improves major CVD outcomes. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews of these trials provide strong support for the more intensive approach, but the data are less clear in identification of a specific optimal BP target (1-5, 7, 11-13). Recent trials that address optimal BP targets include SPRINT and ACCORD (Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes), with targets for more intensive (SBP <120 mm Hg) and standard (SBP <140 mm Hg) treatment (14, 15), and SPS-3, with a more intensive target of <130/80 mm Hg (16). These trials yielded mixed results in achieving their primary endpoints. SPRINT was stopped early, after a median follow-up of 3.26 years, when more intensive treatment resulted in a significant reduction in the primary outcome (a CVD composite) and in all-cause mortality rate. In ACCORD, more intensive BP treatment failed to demonstrate a significant reduction in the primary outcome (a CVD composite). However, the incidence of stroke, a component of the primary outcome, was significantly reduced. The standard glycemia subgroup did show significant benefit in ACCORD, and a meta-analysis of the only 2 trials (ACCORD and SPRINT) testing an SBP goal of <120 mm Hg showed significant reduction in CVD events (17). SPS-3 failed to demonstrate benefit for the primary endpoint of recurrent stroke (p=0.08) but found a significant reduction in a subgroup with hemorrhagic stroke. Pooling of the experience from 19 trials (excluding SPRINT) that randomly assigned participants to different BP treatment targets identified a significant reduction in CVD events, MI, and stroke in those assigned to a lower (average achieved SBP/DBP was 133/76 mm Hg) versus a higher BP treatment target (2). Similar patterns of benefit were reported in 3 other meta-analyses of trials in which participants were randomly assigned to different BP targets (3-5) and in larger meta-analyses that additionally included trials that compared different intensities of treatment (12). Data from the most recent meta-analysis (42 trials and 144,220 patients) (5) demonstrate a linear association between mean achieved SBP and risk of CVD mortality with the lowest risk at 120 to 124 mm Hg. The totality of the available information provides evidence that a lower BP target is generally better than a higher BP target and that some patients will benefit from an SBP treatment goal <120 mm Hg, especially those at high risk of CVD (15). The specific inclusion and exclusion criteria of any RCT may limit extrapolation to a more general population with hypertension. In addition, all of the relevant trials have been efficacy studies in which BP measurements were more consistent with guideline recommendations than is common in clinical practice, resulting in lower
absolute values for SBP. For both of these reasons, the SBP target recommended during BP lowering (<130 mm Hg) is higher than that which was used in SPRINT.

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Meta-analysis and systematic review of trials that compare more intensive BP reduction to standard BP reduction report that more intense BP lowering significantly reduces the risk of stroke, coronary events, major cardiovascular events, and cardiovascular mortality (1). In a stratified analysis of these data, achieving an additional 10–mm Hg reduction in SBP reduced CVD risk when compared with an average SBP of 158/82 to 143/76 mm Hg, 144/85 to 137/81 mm Hg, and 134/79 to 125/76 mm Hg. Patients with DM and CKD were included in the analysis (1, 2, 11-13, 18). (Specific management details are in Section 9.3 for CKD and Section 9.6 for DM.)

2. The treatment of patients with hypertension without elevated risk has been systematically understudied because lower-risk groups would require prolonged follow-up to have a sufficient number of clinical events to provide useful information. Although there is clinical trial evidence that both drug and nondrug therapy will interrupt the progressive course of hypertension (6), there is no trial evidence that this treatment decreases CVD morbidity and mortality. The clinical trial evidence is strongest for a target BP of 140/90 mm Hg in this population. However, observational studies suggest that these individuals often have a high lifetime risk and would benefit from BP control earlier in life (19, 20).
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8.1.6. Choice of Initial Medication

Recommendation for Choice of Initial Medication
References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 27 and Systematic Review Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. For initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy, first-line agents include thiazide diuretics, CCBs, and ACE inhibitors or ARBs. (1, 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR indicates systematic review.

Synopsis

The overwhelming majority of persons with BP sufficiently elevated to warrant pharmacological therapy may be best treated initially with 2 agents (see Section 8.1.6.1). When initiation of pharmacological therapy with a single medication is appropriate, primary consideration should be given to comorbid conditions (e.g., HF, CKD) for which specific classes of BP-lowering medication are indicated (see Section 9) (1, 3). In the largest head-to-head comparison of first-step drug therapy for hypertension (4, 5), the thiazide-type diuretic chlorthalidone was superior to the CCB amlodipine and the ACE inhibitor lisinopril in preventing HF, a BP-related outcome of increasing importance in the growing population of older persons with hypertension (6-9). Additionally, ACE inhibitors were less effective than thiazide diuretics and CCBs in lowering BP and in prevention of stroke. For black patients, ACE inhibitors were also notably less effective than CCBs in preventing HF (5, 10) and in the prevention of stroke (11, 12) (see Section 10.1). ARBs may be better tolerated than ACE inhibitors in black patients, with less cough and angioedema, but according to the limited available experience they offer no proven advantage over ACE inhibitors in preventing stroke or CVD in this population, making thiazide diuretics (especially chlorthalidone) or CCBs the best initial choice for single-drug therapy. For stroke, in the general population, beta blockers were less effective than CCBs (36% lower risk) and thiazide diuretics (30% lower risk). CCBs have been shown to be as effective as diuretics for reducing all CVD events other than HF, and CCBs are a good alternative choice for initial therapy when thiazide diuretics are not tolerated. Alpha blockers are not used as first-line therapy for hypertension because they are less effective for prevention of CVD than other first-step agents, such as thiazide diuretics (4, 13).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. The overall goal of treatment should be reduction in BP, in the context of underlying CVD risk. Five drug classes have been shown, in high-quality RCTs, to prevent CVD as compared with placebo (diuretics, ACE inhibitors, ARBs, CCBs, and beta blockers) (14, 15). In head-to-head comparisons of first-step therapy, different drug classes have been reported to provide somewhat divergent capacity to prevent specific CVD events. Interpretation of meta-analyses comparing agents from different drug classes is challenging because the
relevant RCTs were conducted in different time periods, during which concurrent antihypertensive therapy was less or more common, and the efficacy of agents from certain drug classes may have changed. In recognition of this, some (2) but not all (14, 15) meta-analyses, as well as the largest individual RCT that compared first-step agents (4), have suggested that diuretics, especially the long-acting thiazide-type agent chlorthalidone, may provide an optimal choice for first-step drug therapy of hypertension. In contrast, some meta-analyses have suggested that beta blockers may be less effective, especially for stroke prevention in older adults, but interpretation is hampered by inclusion of RCTs that used beta blockers that are now considered to be inferior for prevention of CVD (16, 17). In a systematic review and network meta-analysis conducted for the present guideline, beta blockers were significantly less effective than diuretics for prevention of stroke and cardiovascular events (1). Diuretics were also significantly better than CCBs for prevention of HF. There were some other nonsignificant differences between diuretics, ACE inhibitors, ARBs, and CCBs, but the general pattern was for similarity in effect. As indicated in Section 8.1.6.1, most adults with hypertension require more than one drug to control their BP. As recommended in Section 10.1, for black adults with hypertension (without HF or CKD), initial antihypertensive treatment should include a thiazide diuretic or CCB.
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8.1.6.1. Choice of Initial Monotherapy Versus Initial Combination Drug Therapy

**Recommendations for Choice of Initial Monotherapy Versus Initial Combination Drug Therapy***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. Initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy with 2 first-line agents of different classes, either as separate agents or in a fixed-dose combination, is recommended in adults with stage 2 hypertension and an average BP more than 20/10 mm Hg above their BP target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>2. Initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy with a single antihypertensive drug is reasonable in adults with stage 1 hypertension and BP goal &lt;130/80 mm Hg with dosage titration and sequential addition of other agents to achieve the BP target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fixed-dose combination antihypertensive medications are listed in Online Data Supplement D.

**Synopsis**

Systematic review of the evidence comparing the initiation of antihypertensive treatment with monotherapy and sequential (stepped-care) titration of additional agents versus initiation of treatment with combination therapy (including fixed-dose combinations) did not identify any RCTs meeting the systematic review questions posed in the PICOTS format (P=population, I=intervention, C=comparator, O=outcome, T=timing, S=setting). However, in both ACCORD and SPRINT, 2-drug therapy was recommended for most participants in the intensive- but not standard-therapy groups.

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Because most patients with hypertension require multiple agents for control of their BP and those with higher BPs are at greater risk, more rapid titration of antihypertensive medications began to be recommended in patients with BP >20/10 mm Hg above their target, beginning with the JNC 7 report (1). In these patients, initiation of antihypertensive therapy with 2 agents is recommended. Evidence favoring this approach comes mostly from studies using fixed-dose combination products showing greater BP lowering with fixed-dose combination agents than with single agents, as well as better adherence to therapy (2, 3). The safety and efficacy of this strategy have been demonstrated in adults to reduce BPs to <140/90 mm Hg though not compared with other strategies (4-6). In general, this approach is reasonable in the very elderly, those at high CVD risk, or those who have a history of hypotension or drug-associated side effects. However, caution is advised in initiating antihypertensive pharmacotherapy with 2 drugs in older patients because hypotension or orthostatic hypotension may develop in some patients; BP should be carefully monitored.

2. The stepped-care approach defined by the initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy with a single agent followed by the sequential titration of the dose and addition of other agents has been the recommended treatment strategy since the first report of the National High Blood Pressure Education Program (7). This approach is also reasonable in the very elderly or those at risk or who have a history of hypotension or drug-
associated side effects. This strategy has been used successfully in nearly all hypertension treatment trials but has not been formally tested against other antihypertensive drug treatment strategies for effectiveness in achieving BP control or in preventing adverse outcomes.
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8.2. Achieving BP Control in Individual Patients

Recommendations for lifestyle modifications and drug selection are specified in Sections 6.2, 8.1.4, and 8.1.6. Initial drug selections should be based on trial evidence of treatment efficacy, combined with recognition of compelling indications for use of an agent from a specific drug class, as well as the individual patient’s lifestyle preferences and traits. For a subset of patients (25% to 50%) (1), the initial drug therapy will be well tolerated and effective in achieving the desired level of BP, with only the need for subsequent monitoring (see Section 8.3 for an appropriate follow-up schedule). For others, the initial drug will not be tolerated or will not be effective, requiring either a change in medication or addition of another medication, followed by BP monitoring (2). Approximately 25% of patients will require additional treatment adjustments. In a minority of this group, achievement of goal BP can be challenging.

In patients who do not respond to or do not tolerate treatment with 2 to 3 medications or medication combinations, additional trials of treatment tend to be ineffective or poorly tolerated. Some patients may become disillusioned and lost to follow-up, whereas others will identify an alternative healthcare provider, including nontraditional healers, or will try popular home remedies. Working with this more demanding subset requires provider expertise, patience, and a mechanism to respond efficiently and sensitively to concerns as they arise. In this setting, team-based care (see Section 12) may be effective, encouraging coupling of nonpharmacological and pharmacological treatments, while improving access to and communication with care providers.

In the setting of medication intolerance, consider allowing a defined period of time to evaluate the effects of lifestyle modification in patients with a relatively low CVD risk (10-year risk of ASCVD <10%, based on the ASCVD Risk Estimator [http://tools.acc.org/ASCVD-Risk-Estimator]), with scheduled follow-up visits for assessment of BP levels, including a review of HBPM data, and an appraisal of lifestyle change goal achievements. For patients with a higher level of CVD risk or with significant elevations in BP (SBP or DBP >20 or >10 mm Hg above target, respectively), medication is usually started even while the patient is pursuing lifestyle change (see Section 8.1.2).

Consideration of patient comorbidities, lifestyle, and preferences may suggest better tolerance or greater effect from one class of medication versus other classes. For example, if hyponatremia is present, it would be important to avoid or stop thiazide diuretic therapy. In this case, a loop diuretic should be used if a
diuretic is required. If hypokalemia is present, primary or secondary aldosteronism should be excluded, after which one should consider a potassium-sparing agent, such as spironolactone, eplerenone, triamterene, or amiloride. In addition, reducing dietary sodium intake will diminish urinary potassium losses. If the patient has chronic cough or a history of ACE inhibitor–induced cough or develops a cough or bronchial responsiveness while on an ACE inhibitor, one should use an ARB in place of an ACE inhibitor. For patients with bronchospastic lung disease, a beta-1-selective blocker (e.g., bisoprolol, metoprolol) should be considered if beta-blocker therapy is required. A patient who is already adherent to lifestyle change recommendations, including diligent reduction in sodium intake, may show a greater response to a RAS blocker. Prior patient experience should be considered, as in the case of cough associated with prior use of an ACE inhibitor, which is likely to reoccur if an agent from the same class is prescribed.
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8.3. Follow-Up of BP During Antihypertensive Drug Therapy

Appropriate follow-up and monitoring enable assessment of adherence (see Section 12.1) and response to therapy, help identify adverse responses to therapy and target organ damage, and allow assessment of progress toward treatment goals. High-quality RCTs have successfully and safely developed strategies for follow-up, monitoring, and reassessment from which recommendations can be made (Figure 4) (1, 2). A systematic approach to out-of-office BP assessment is an essential part of follow-up and monitoring of BP, to assess response to therapy; check for evidence of white coat hypertension, white coat effect, masked hypertension, or masked uncontrolled hypertension; and help achieve BP targets (see Sections 4 and 12).
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8.3.1. Follow-Up After Initiating Antihypertensive Drug Therapy

| Recommendation for Follow-Up After Initiating Antihypertensive Drug Therapy |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 28. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. Adults initiating a new or adjusted drug regimen for hypertension should have a follow-up evaluation of adherence and response to treatment at monthly intervals until control is achieved (1-3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Components of the follow-up evaluation should include assessment of BP control, as well as evaluation for orthostatic hypotension, adverse effects from medication therapy, adherence to medication and lifestyle therapy, need for adjustment of medication dosage, laboratory testing (including electrolyte and renal function status), and other assessments of target organ damage (1-3).
8.3.2. Monitoring Strategies to Improve Control of BP in Patients on Drug Therapy for High BP

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Systematic approaches to follow-up have been shown to improve hypertension control and can be adapted and incorporated into clinical practices according to local needs and resource availability (see Section 8.3.1 for time intervals for treatment follow-up and monitoring and Sections 12.2 and 12.3.2 on systematic strategies to improve BP control).
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9. Hypertension in Patients With Comorbidities

Certain comorbidities may affect clinical decision-making in hypertension. These include ischemic heart disease, HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), HFpEF, CKD (including renal transplantation), cerebrovascular disease, AF, PAD, DM, and metabolic syndrome (1). As noted in Section 8.1.2, this guideline generally recommends use of BP-lowering medications for secondary prevention of CVD in patients with clinical CVD (CHD, HF, and stroke) and an average BP ≥130/80 mm Hg and for primary prevention of CVD in adults with an estimated 10-year ASCVD risk of ≥10% and an average SBP ≥130 mm Hg or an average DBP ≥80 mm Hg. Although we recommend use of the ACC/AHA Pooled Cohort Equations (http://tools.acc.org/ASCVD-
Risk-Estimator/) to estimate 10-year risk of ASCVD to establish the BP threshold for treatment, the vast majority of adults with a co-morbidity are likely to have a 10-year risk of ASCVD that exceeds 10%. In some instances, clinical trial confirmation of treatment in patients with comorbidities is limited to a target BP of 140/90 mm Hg. In addition, the selection of medications for use in treating high BP in patients with CVD is guided by their use for other compelling indications (e.g., beta blockers after MI, ACE inhibitors for HFrEF), as discussed in specific guidelines for the clinical condition (2-4). The present guideline does not address the recommendations for treatment of hypertension occurring with acute coronary syndromes.
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9.1. Stable Ischemic Heart Disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients With Stable Ischemic Heart Disease (SIHD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 30-32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Beta blockers and/or CCBs might be considered to control hypertension in patients with CAD (without HFrEF) who had an MI more than 3 years ago and have angina.

Synopsis

Hypertension is a major risk factor for ischemic heart disease. Numerous RCTs have demonstrated the benefits of antihypertensive drug therapy in reducing the risk of ischemic heart disease. The following recommendations apply only to management of hypertension in patients with SIHD without HF. See Section 9.2 for recommendations for the treatment of patients with SIHD and HF.

Figure 5 is an algorithm on management of hypertension in patients with SIHD.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. In patients with increased cardiovascular risk, reduction of SBP to <130/80 mm Hg has been shown to reduce CVD complications by 25% and all-cause mortality by 27% (1).

2. After 5 years of randomized therapy in high-CVD-risk patients, ramipril produced a 22% reduction in MI, stroke, or CVD compared with placebo (10). No added benefit on CVD outcomes was seen when compared with CCBs and diuretics (15, 16). After 4.2 years of randomized therapy in patients with SIHD, perindopril reduced CVD death, MI, or cardiac arrest by 20% compared with placebo (7). Beta blockers are effective drugs for preventing angina pectoris, improving exercise time until the onset of angina pectoris, reducing exercise-induced ischemic ST-segment depression, and preventing coronary events (8, 17-22). Because of their compelling indications for treatment of SIHD, these drugs are recommended as a first-line therapy in the treatment of hypertension when it occurs in patients with SIHD. GDMT beta blockers for SIHD that are also effective in lowering BP include carvedilol, metoprolol tartrate, metoprolol succinate, nadolol, bisoprolol, propranolol, and timolol. Atenolol is not as effective as other antihypertensive drugs in the treatment of hypertension (23).

3. Dihydropyridine CCBs are effective antianginal drugs that can lower BP and relieve angina pectoris when added to beta blockers in patients in whom hypertension is present and angina pectoris persists despite beta-blocker therapy (8, 17, 19-22, 24, 25). GDMT beta blockers for SIHD that are also effective in lowering BP include carvedilol, metoprolol tartrate, metoprolol succinate, nadolol, bisoprolol, propranolol, and timolol.

4. In randomized long-term trials, use of beta blockers after MI reduced all-cause mortality by 23% (13). Given the established efficacy of beta blockers for treating hypertension and SIHD, their use for treatment continuing beyond 3 years after MI is reasonable (6, 25).

5. GDMT beta blockers and CCBs are effective antihypertensive and antianginal agents. CCBs include dihydropyridine and nondihydropyridine agents. CCBs can be used separately or together with beta blockers beginning 3 years after MI in patients with CAD who have both hypertension and angina.
Figure 5. Management of Hypertension in Patients With SIHD

Hypertension With SIHD

Reduce BP to <130/80 mm Hg with GDMT beta blockers*, ACE inhibitor, or ARBs† (Class I)

BP goal not met

Angina pectoris

Yes

Add dihydropyridine CCBs if needed (Class I)

No

Add dihydropyridine CCBs, thiazide-type diuretics, and/or MRAs as needed (Class I)

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.

*GDMT beta blockers for BP control or relief of angina include carvedilol, metoprolol tartrate, metoprolol succinate, nadolol, bisoprolol, propranolol, and timolol. Avoid beta blockers with intrinsic sympathomimetic activity. The beta blocker atenolol should not be used because it is less effective than placebo in reducing cardiovascular events.

†If needed for BP control.

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BP, blood pressure; CCB, calcium channel blocker; GDMT, guideline-directed management and therapy; and SIHD, stable ischemic heart disease.
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9.2. Heart Failure

Recommendation for Prevention of HF in Adults With Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>SBP: B-R</td>
<td>1. In adults at increased risk of HF, the optimal BP in those with hypertension should be less than 130/80 mm Hg (1-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP: C-E0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Antecedent hypertension is present in 75% of patients with chronic HF (4). In the Cardiovascular Health Study (5) and the Health, Aging and Body Composition Study (6), 11.2% of 4408 persons (53.1% women, with a mean age of 72.8 years, living in the community, and not receiving antihypertensive drugs at baseline) developed HF over 10 years (7). Compared with those with an average SBP <120 mm Hg, the adjusted incidence of HF was increased 1.6, 2.2, and 2.6 times in those with average SBPs between 120 and 139 mm Hg, between 140 and 159 mm Hg, and ≥160 mm Hg, respectively (7).

No RCTs are available that compare one BP-lowering agent to another for the management of patients with HF. The following recommendations for treatment of hypertension in HF are based on use of drugs that lower BP and also have compelling indications for management of HF (with HFREF or HFrEF) as recommended in current ACC/AHA guidelines (4, 8).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. In adults with hypertension (SBP ≥130 mm Hg or DBP ≥80 mm Hg) and a high risk of CVD, a strong body of evidence supports treatment with antihypertensive medications (see Section 8.1.2) and more-intensive rather than less-intensive intervention (see Section 8.1.5). In SPRINT, a more intensive intervention that targeted an SBP <120 mm Hg significantly reduced the primary outcome (CVD composite) by about 25% (9). The incidence of HF, a component of the primary outcome, was also substantially decreased (hazard ratio: 0.62; 95% confidence interval: 0.45–0.84). Meta-analyses of clinical trials have identified a similar beneficial effect of more-intensive BP reduction on the incidence of HF (2, 10), but the body of information from studies confined to trials that randomly assigned participants to different BP targets is more limited and less compelling (3). In addition, the available trials were efficacy studies in which BP measurements were more consistent with guideline recommendations than is common in clinical practice, resulting in lower absolute values for SBP. For both of these reasons, the SBP target recommended during BP lowering (<130 mm Hg) is higher than that used in SPRINT.
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**9.2.1. Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction**

| Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients With HFrEF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: No Benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

Approximately 50% of patients with HF have HFrEF (2-6). Numerous RCTs have shown that treatment of HFrEF with GDMT reduces mortality and HF hospitalizations (7). Large-scale RCTs have shown that antihypertensive drug therapy reduces the incidence of HF in patients with hypertension (8-11). In ALLHAT (Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial), chlorthalidone reduced the risk of HFrEF more than amloidipine and doxazosin but similarly to lisinopril (12, 13).

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. This recommendation is based on guidance in the 2017 ACC/AHA/HFSA guideline focused update on heart failure (14) (see figure from the HF focused update that is reproduced in Online Data Supplement A). Lifestyle modification, such as weight loss and sodium reduction, may serve as adjunctive measures to help these agents work better. No RCT evidence is available to support the superiority of one BP-lowering medication with compelling indications for treatment of HFrEF over another. Medications with compelling indications for HF that may be used as first-line therapy to treat high BP include ACE inhibitors or ARBs, angiotensin receptor–neprilysin inhibitors, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists, diuretics, and GDMT beta blockers (carvedilol, metoprolol succinate, or bisoprolol).

Clinical trials evaluating goal BP reduction and optimal BP-lowering agents in the setting of HFrEF and concomitant hypertension have not been performed. However, in patients at higher CVD risk, BP lowering is associated with fewer adverse cardiovascular events (7). GDMT for HFrEF with agents known to lower BP should consider a goal BP reduction consistent with a threshold now associated with improved clinical outcomes but not yet proven by RCTs in an HF population.
2. Nondihydropyridine CCBs (verapamil, diltiazem) have myocardial depressant activity. Several clinical trials have demonstrated either no clinical benefit or even worse outcomes in patients with HF treated with these drugs (1). Therefore, nondihydropyridine CCBs are not recommended in patients with hypertension and HFrEF.
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9.2.2. Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection Fraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. In adults with HFrEF who present with symptoms of volume overload, diuretics should be prescribed to control hypertension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
<td>2. Adults with HFrEF and persistent hypertension after management of volume overload should be prescribed ACE inhibitors or ARBs and beta blockers titrated to attain SBP of less than 130 mm Hg (1-6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whelton PK, et al.
2017 High Blood Pressure Clinical Practice Guideline

Synopsis

Approximately 50% of patients with HF have HFpEF (2, 7-11). The ejection fraction in these studies has varied from >40% to ≥55% (2). Patients with HFpEF are usually older women with a history of hypertension. Obesity, CHD, DM, AF, and hyperlipidemia are also highly prevalent in patients with HFpEF (2, 11, 12). Hypertension is the most important cause of HFpEF, with a prevalence of 60% to 89% in large RCTs, epidemiological studies, and HF registries (2, 13). Patients with HFpEF also have an exaggerated hypertensive response to exercise (14). Hypertensive acute pulmonary edema is an expression of HFpEF (15).

BP control is important for prevention of HFpEF in patients with hypertension (2, 16-19). ALLHAT showed that treatment of hypertension with chlorthalidone reduced the risk of HF compared with amlodipine, doxazosin, and lisinopril (19, 20). Improved BP control also reduces hospitalization, CVD events, and mortality (2, 16-19).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Diuretics are the only drugs used for the treatment of hypertension and HF that can adequately control the fluid retention of HF. Appropriate use of diuretics is also crucial to the success of other drugs used for the treatment of hypertension in the presence of HF. The use of inappropriately low doses of diuretics can result in fluid retention. Conversely, the use of inappropriately high doses of diuretics can lead to volume contraction, which can increase the risk of hypotension and renal insufficiency. Diuretics should be prescribed to all patients with hypertension and HFpEF who have evidence of, and to most patients with a prior history of, fluid retention.

2. In a trial of patients with HFpEF and MI, patients randomized to propranolol had at 32-month follow-up a 35% reduction in mortality rate (3). After 21 months of treatment in patients with HFrEF and HFpEF, compared with placebo, those randomized to nebivolol had a 14% reduction in mortality or CVD hospitalization if they had HFrEF and a 19% reduction if they had HFpEF (4). In patients with HFpEF, the primary outcome (a composite of CVD death or HF hospitalization) was observed in 22% for candesartan and 24% for placebo (11% reduction), but fewer patients receiving candesartan were hospitalized for HF (5). The use of nitrates in the setting of HFpEF is associated with a signal of harm and in most situations should be avoided. For many other common antihypertensive agents, including alpha blockers, beta blockers, and calcium channel blockers, limited data exist to guide the choice of antihypertensive therapy in the setting of HFpEF (21). Renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system inhibition, however, with ACE inhibitor or ARB and especially MRA would represent the preferred choice. A shared decision-making discussion, with the patient influenced by clinician judgment, should drive the ultimate choice of antihypertensive agents.
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### 9.3. Chronic Kidney Disease

**Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients With CKD**

References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 37 and 38 and Systematic Review Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>SBP: BR&lt;sup&gt;SR&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1. Adults with hypertension and CKD should be treated to a BP goal of less than 130/80 mm Hg (1-6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP: C-EO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>2. In adults with hypertension and CKD (stage 3 or higher or stage 1 or 2 with albuminuria [$\geq 300$ mg/d, or $\geq 300$ mg/g albumin-to-creatinine ratio or the equivalent in the first morning void]), treatment with an ACE inhibitor is reasonable to slow kidney disease progression (3, 7-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>3. In adults with hypertension and CKD (stage 3 or higher or stage 1 or 2 with albuminuria [$\geq 300$ mg/d, or $\geq 300$ mg/g albumin-to-creatinine ratio in the first morning void]) (7, 8), treatment with an ARB may be reasonable if an ACE inhibitor is not tolerated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR indicates systematic review.

**Synopsis**

Refer to the “Systematic Review for the 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults” for the complete systematic evidence review for additional data and analyses (13). Hypertension is the most common comorbidity affecting patients with CKD. Hypertension has been reported in 67% to 92% of patients with CKD, with increasing prevalence as kidney function declines (14). Hypertension may occur as a result of kidney disease, yet the presence of hypertension may also accelerate further kidney injury; therefore, treatment is an important means to prevent further kidney functional decline. This tight interaction has led to extensive debate about the optimal BP target for patients with CKD (15-18). Masked hypertension may occur in up to 30% of patients with CKD and portends higher risk of CKD progression (19-23). CKD is an important risk factor for CVD (24), and the coexistence of hypertension and CKD further increases the risk of adverse CVD and cerebrovascular events, particularly when proteinuria is present (25). Even as the importance of hypertension treatment is widely accepted, data supporting BP targets in CKD are limited, as patients with CKD were historically excluded from clinical trials. Furthermore, CKD is not included in the CVD risk calculations used to determine suitability for most clinical trials (26-28).

Until publication of the SPRINT results, most guidelines for BP targets in patients with CKD favored treatment to a BP <140/90 mm Hg (15), with consideration of the lower target of <130/80 mm Hg for those with more severe proteinuria ($\geq 300$ mg albuminuria in 24 hours or the equivalent), if tolerated (16-18). Patients with stage 3 to 4 CKD (eGFR of 20 to $<60$ mL/minute/1.73 m$^2$) comprised 28% of the SPRINT study population, and in this group intensive BP management seemed to provide the same benefits for reduction in the CVD composite primary outcome and all-cause mortality as were seen in the full study cohort. Given that most patients with CKD die from CVD complications, this RCT evidence supports a lower target of <130/80 mm Hg for all patients with CKD (Figure 6). It is appropriate to acknowledge that many patients with CKD have additional comorbidities and evidence of frailty that caused them to be excluded from past clinical trials. Observational studies of CKD cohorts indicate a higher risk of mortality at lower systolic pressures and a flat relationship of SBP to event risk in elderly patients with CKD (29, 30), which supports concerns that these complex patients may be at greater risk of complications from intensive BP treatment and may fail to achieve benefits from lower BP targets. In contrast, in the prespecified subgroup analysis of the elderly cohort in
SPRINT, frail elderly patients did sustain benefit from the lower BP target, which supports a lower goal for all patients, including those with CKD (31). In this setting, incremental BP reduction may be appropriate, with careful monitoring of physical and kidney function.

An ACE inhibitor (or an ARB, in case of ACE inhibitor intolerance) is a preferred drug for treatment of hypertension if albuminuria (≥300 mg/day or ≥300 mg/g creatinine by first morning void) is present, although the evidence is mixed (10, 11) (Figure 6). In the course of reducing intraglomerular pressure and thereby reducing albuminuria, serum creatinine may increase up to 30% because of concurrent reduction in GFR (32). Further GFR decline should be investigated and may be related to other factors, including volume contraction, use of nephrotoxic agents, or renovascular disease (33). The combination of an ACE inhibitor and an ARB should be avoided because of reported harms demonstrated in several large cardiology trials (34, 35) and in 1 diabetic nephropathy trial (36). Because of the greater risk of hyperkalemia and hypotension and lack of demonstrated benefit, the combination of an ARB (or ACE inhibitor) and a direct renin inhibitor is also contraindicated during management of patients with CKD (37).

Figure 6 is an algorithm on management of hypertension in patients with CKD.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. We recommend ASCVD risk assessment in all adults with hypertension, including those with CKD. As a matter of convenience, however, it can be assumed that the vast majority of patients with CKD have a 10-year ASCVD risk ≥10%, placing them in the high risk category that requires initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy at BP ≥130/80 mm Hg (see Section 8.1.2, Figure 4 and Table 23 for BP thresholds for initiating antihypertensive drug treatment). In SPRINT, the participants with CKD who were randomized to intensive antihypertensive therapy (SBP target <120 mm Hg) appeared to derive the same beneficial reduction in CVD events and all-cause mortality that was seen in their counterparts without CKD at baseline. Likewise, intensive therapy was beneficial even in those ≥75 years of age with frailty or the slowest gait speed. There was no difference in the principal kidney outcome (≥50% decline in eGFR or ESRD) between the intensive-and standard-therapy (SBP target <140 mm Hg) groups (26). Three other RCTs (1-3) have evaluated the effect of differing BP goals of <140/90 mm Hg versus 125–130/75–80 mm Hg on CKD progression in patients with CKD. None of these trials demonstrated a benefit for more intensive BP reduction, although post hoc follow-up analyses favored the lower targets in patients with more severe proteinuria (38, 39), and these trials were underpowered to detect differences in CVD event rates. Recent meta-analyses and systematic reviews that included patients with CKD from SPRINT support more intensive BP treatment (40-42) to reduce cardiovascular events but do not demonstrate a reduction in the rate of progression of kidney disease (doubling of serum creatinine or reaching ESRD). More intensive BP treatment may result in a modest reduction in GFR, which is thought to be primarily due to a hemodynamic effect and may be reversible. Electrolyte abnormalities are also more likely during intensive BP treatment. More intensive BP lowering in patients with CKD is also supported by a BP Lowering Treatment Trialists’ Collaboration meta-analysis of RCTs in patients with CKD (43).

2. Evidence comes from AASK (The African American Study of Kidney Disease and Hypertension), 2 small trials (1 positive, 1 negative), and a meta-analysis (3, 6, 10, 11). Albuminuria is quantified by 24-hour urine collection. A 10% to 25% increase in serum creatinine may occur in some patients with CKD as a result of ACE inhibitor therapy.

3. ARBs were shown to be noninferior to ACE inhibitors in clinical trials in the non-CKD population (35). A 10% to 25% increase in serum creatinine may occur in some patients with CKD as a result of ARB therapy.
Figure 6. Management of Hypertension in Patients With CKD

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.

*CKD stage 3 or higher or stage 1 or 2 with albuminuria ≥300 mg/d or ≥300 mg/g creatinine.

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BP, blood pressure; and CKD, chronic kidney disease.
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9.3.1. Hypertension After Renal Transplantation

### Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension After Renal Transplantation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>SBP: B-NR</td>
<td>1. After kidney transplantation, it is reasonable to treat patients with hypertension to a BP goal of less than 130/80 mm Hg (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP: C-EO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>2. After kidney transplantation, it is reasonable to treat patients with hypertension with a calcium antagonist on the basis of improved GFR and kidney survival (2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

After kidney transplantation, hypertension is common because of preexisting kidney disease, the effects of immunosuppressive medications, and the presence of allograft pathology (3). Transplant recipients frequently harbor multiple CVD risk factors and are at high risk of CVD events. Hypertension may accelerate target organ damage and kidney function decline, particularly when proteinuria is present (4-6).

Use of calcineurin inhibitor–based immunosuppression regimens after transplantation is associated with a high (70% to 90%) prevalence of hypertension (7). Hypertension is less common when calcineurin inhibitors have been used without corticosteroids in liver transplantation patients (8), although prevalence rates have not differed in steroid minimization trials after kidney transplantation (9, 10). Reports from long-term belatacept-based immunosuppression studies indicate higher GFR and preservation of kidney function. However, hypertension was still present in the majority of patients, although fewer agents were needed to achieve BP goals (11). Severity of hypertension and intensity of treatment may differ somewhat depending on the type of organ transplanted; however, most concepts relevant to kidney transplant recipients will apply to the other solid organ recipients as well.

BP targets change over time after transplantation. Initially, it is important to maintain ample organ perfusion with less stringent BP targets (<160/90 mm Hg) to avoid hypotension and risk of graft thrombosis. Beyond the first month, BP should be controlled to prevent target organ damage as in the nontransplantation setting (12, 13). Hypertension after transplantation is often associated with altered circadian BP rhythm with loss of the normal nocturnal BP fall (14, 15) and, in some, a nocturnal BP rise. These changes may return to normal after a longer period of follow-up (16).

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Although treatment targets for hypertension after transplantation should probably be similar to those for other patients with CKD, there are no trials in post-transplantation patients comparing different BP targets. As kidney transplant recipients generally have a single functioning kidney and CKD, BP targets should be similar to those for the general CKD population.

2. Limited studies have compared drug choice for initial antihypertensive therapy in patients after kidney transplantation. On the basis of a Cochrane analysis (2), most studies favor CCBs to reduce graft loss and maintain higher GFR, with some evidence suggesting potential harm from ACE inhibitors because of anemia, hyperkalemia, and lower GFR. In recognition of this concern, RAS inhibitors may be reserved for the subset of patients with hypertension and additional comorbidities that support the need for ACE inhibitor therapy (i.e., proteinuria or HF after transplantation). With appropriate potassium and creatinine monitoring, this has been demonstrated to be safe (17).
Whelton PK, et al.
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9.4. Cerebrovascular Disease

Stroke is a leading cause of death, disability, and dementia (1). Because of its heterogeneous causes and hemodynamic consequences, the management of BP in adults with stroke is complex and challenging (2). To accommodate the variety of important issues pertaining to BP management in the stroke patient, treatment recommendations require recognition of stroke acuity, stroke type, and therapeutic objectives. Future studies should target more narrowly defined questions, such as optimal BP-reduction timing and target, as well as ideal antihypertensive agent therapeutic class by patient type and event type.
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9.4.1. Acute Intracerebral Hemorrhage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. In adults with ICH who present with SBP greater than 220 mm Hg, it is reasonable to use continuous intravenous drug infusion (Table 19) and close BP monitoring to lower SBP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2. Immediate lowering of SBP (Table 19) to less than 140 mm Hg in adults with spontaneous ICH who present within 6 hours of the acute event and have an SBP between 150 mm Hg and 220 mm Hg is not of benefit to reduce death or severe disability and can be potentially harmful (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Spontaneous, nontraumatic ICH is a significant global cause of morbidity and mortality (3). Elevated BP is highly prevalent in the setting of acute ICH and is linked to greater hematoma expansion, neurological worsening, and death and dependency after ICH.

Figure 7 is an algorithm on management of hypertension in patients with acute ICH.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Information about the safety and effectiveness of early intensive BP-lowering treatment is least well established for patients with markedly elevated BP (sustained SBP >220 mm Hg) on presentation, patients with large and severe ICH, or patients requiring surgical decompression. However, given the consistent nature of the data linking high BP with poor clinical outcomes (4-6) and some suggestive data for treatment in patients with modestly high initial SBP levels (1, 7), early lowering of SBP in ICH patients with markedly high SBP levels (>220 mm Hg) might be sensible. A secondary endpoint in 1 RCT and an overview of data from 4 RCTs indicate that intensive BP reduction, versus BP-lowering guideline treatment, is associated with greater functional recovery at 3 months (1, 7).

2. RCT data have suggested that immediate BP lowering (to <140/90 mm Hg) within 6 hours of an acute ICH was feasible and safe (1, 8, 9), may be linked to greater attenuation of absolute hematoma growth at 24 hours (7), and might be associated with modestly better functional recovery in survivors (1, 7). However, a recent RCT (2) that examined immediate BP lowering within 4.5 hours of an acute ICH found that treatment to achieve a target SBP of 110 to 139 mm Hg did not lead to a lower rate of death or disability than standard reduction to a target of 140 to 179 mm Hg. Moreover, there were significantly more renal adverse events within 7 days after randomization in the intensive-treatment group than in the standard-treatment group (2). Put together, neither of the 2 key trials (1, 2) evaluating the effect of lowering SBP in the acute period after spontaneous ICH met their primary outcomes of reducing death and severe disability at 3 months.
Figure 7. Management of Hypertension in Patients With Acute ICH

BP indicates blood pressure; ICH, intracerebral hemorrhage; IV, intravenous; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.
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### 9.4.2. Acute Ischemic Stroke

#### Recommendations for Management of Hypertension in Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke

References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplement 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>1. Adults with acute ischemic stroke and elevated BP who are eligible for treatment with intravenous tissue plasminogen activator should have their BP slowly lowered to less than 185/110 mm Hg before thrombolytic therapy is initiated (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>2. In adults with an acute ischemic stroke, BP should be less than 185/110 mm Hg before administration of intravenous tissue plasminogen activator and should be maintained below 180/105 mm Hg for at least the first 24 hours after initiating drug therapy (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>3. Starting or restarting antihypertensive therapy during hospitalization in patients with BP greater than 140/90 mm Hg who are neurologically stable is safe and reasonable to improve long-term BP control, unless contraindicated (4, 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>4. In patients with BP of 220/120 mm Hg or higher who did not receive intravenous alteplase or endovascular treatment and have no comorbid conditions requiring acute antihypertensive treatment, the benefit of initiating or reinitiating treatment of hypertension within the first 48 to 72 hours is uncertain. It might be reasonable to lower BP by 15% during the first 24 hours after onset of stroke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: No Benefit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5. In patients with BP less than 220/120 mm Hg who did not receive intravenous thrombolysis or endovascular treatment and do not have a comorbid condition requiring acute antihypertensive treatment, initiating or reinitiating treatment of hypertension within the first 48 to 72 hours after an acute ischemic stroke is not effective to prevent death or dependency (4-9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Synopsis

Elevated BP is common during acute ischemic stroke (occurring in up to 80% of patients), especially among patients with a history of hypertension (10). However, BP often decreases spontaneously during the acute phase of ischemic stroke, as soon as 90 minutes after the onset of symptoms. Countervailing theoretical concerns about arterial hypertension during acute ischemic stroke include aiming to enhance cerebral perfusion of the ischemic tissue while minimizing the exacerbation of brain edema and hemorrhagic transformation of the ischemic tissue (11, 12). Some studies have shown a U-shaped relationship between the admission BP and favorable clinical outcomes, with an optimal SBP and DBP ranging from 121 to 200 mm Hg and 81 to 110 mm Hg, respectively (13). It is conceivable that an optimal arterial BP range exists during acute ischemic stroke on an individual basis, contingent on the ischemic stroke subtype and other patient-specific comorbidities. Early initiation or resumption of antihypertensive treatment after acute ischemic stroke is indicated only in specific situations: 1) patients treated with tissue-type plasminogen activator (1, 2), and 2) patients with SBP >220 mm Hg or DBP >120 mm Hg. For the latter group, it should be kept in mind that cerebral autoregulation in the ischemic penumbra of the stroke is grossly abnormal and that systemic perfusion pressure is needed for blood flow and oxygen delivery. Rapid reduction of BP, even to lower levels within the hypertensive range, can be detrimental. For all other acute ischemic stroke patients, the advantage of lowering BP early to reduce death and dependency is uncertain (4-9), but restarting antihypertensive therapy...
to improve long-term BP control is reasonable after the first 24 hours for patients who have preexisting hypertension and are neurologically stable (4, 5, 14, ).

Figure 8 is an algorithm on management of hypertension in patients with acute ischemic stroke.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. These BP cutoffs correspond to study inclusion criteria in pivotal clinical trials of intravenous thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke (1).

2. In a large observational study of patients with acute ischemic stroke who received intravenous tissue-type plasminogen activator, high BP during the initial 24 hours was linked to greater risk of symptomatic ICH (3).

3. For the goal of antihypertensive therapy, see Section 8.1.5.

4. Extreme arterial hypertension is detrimental because it can lead to encephalopathy, cardiac compromise, and renal damage. However, hypotension, especially when too rapidly achieved, is potentially harmful because it abruptly reduces perfusion to multiple organs, including the brain.

5. Data from 2 RCTs (5, 9), as well as systematic reviews and meta-analyses (6-8), indicate that antihypertensive agents reduce BP during the acute phase of an ischemic stroke but do not confer benefit with regard to short- and long-term dependency and mortality rate. One RCT did not demonstrate a benefit of continuing prestroke antihypertensive drugs during the first few days after an acute stroke, but it was substantially underpowered to answer the question (4).
Figure 8. Management of Hypertension in Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.
BP indicates blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; IV, intravenous; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.
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9.4.3. Secondary Stroke Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension for Secondary Stroke Prevention</th>
<th>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 43 and 44.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR LOE</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A</td>
<td>1. Adults with previously treated hypertension who experience a stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) should be restarted on antihypertensive treatment after the first few days of the index event to reduce the risk of recurrent stroke and other vascular events (1-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A</td>
<td>2. For adults who experience a stroke or TIA, treatment with a thiazide diuretic, ACE inhibitor, or ARB, or combination treatment consisting of a thiazide diuretic plus ACE inhibitor, is useful (1, 3-5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-R</td>
<td>3. Adults not previously treated for hypertension who experience a stroke or TIA and have an established BP of 140/90 mm Hg or higher should be prescribed antihypertensive treatment a few days after the index event to reduce the risk of recurrent stroke and other vascular events (1-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I B-NR</td>
<td>4. For adults who experience a stroke or TIA, selection of specific drugs should be individualized on the basis of patient comorbidities and agent pharmacological class (6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb B-R</td>
<td>5. For adults who experience a stroke or TIA, a BP goal of less than 130/80 mm Hg may be reasonable (6, 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb B-R</td>
<td>6. For adults with a lacunar stroke, a target SBP goal of less than 130 mm Hg may be reasonable (8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb C-LD</td>
<td>7. In adults previously untreated for hypertension who experience an ischemic stroke or TIA and have a SBP less than 140 mm Hg and a DBP less than 90 mm Hg, the usefulness of initiating antihypertensive treatment is not well established (9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Each year in the United States, >750,000 adult patients experience a stroke, of which up to 25% are recurrent strokes (10). For an individual who experiences an initial stroke or TIA, the annual risk of a subsequent or
“secondary” stroke is approximately 4% (11), and the case mortality rate is 41% after a recurrent stroke versus 22% after an initial stroke (12). Among patients with a recent stroke or TIA, the prevalence of premorbid hypertension is approximately 70% (13). Risk of recurrent stroke is heightened by presence of elevated BP, and guideline-recommended antihypertensive drug treatment to lower BP has been linked to a reduction in 1-year recurrent stroke risk (14). RCT meta-analyses show an approximately 30% decrease in recurrent stroke risk with BP-lowering therapies (1-3). An issue frequently raised by clinicians is whether the presence of clinically asymptomatic cerebral infarction incidentally noted on brain imaging (computed tomography or MRI scan) in patients without a history of or symptoms of a stroke or TIA warrants implementation of secondary stroke prevention measures. Clinically asymptomatic vascular brain injury is increasingly being considered as an entry point for secondary stroke prevention therapies, because these apparently “silent” brain infarctions are associated with typical stroke risk factors, accumulatively lead to subtle neurological impairments, and bolster risk of future symptomatic stroke events (15). Although the evidence for using antihypertensive treatment to prevent recurrent stroke in stroke patients with elevated BP is compelling (1-3), questions remain about when precisely after an index stroke to initiate it, what specific agent(s) to use (if any), which therapeutic targets to aim for, and whether the treatment approach should vary by index stroke mechanism and baseline level of BP (16).

Figure 9 is an algorithm on management of hypertension in patients with a previous history of stroke (secondary stroke prevention).

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Two overviews of RCTs published through 2009 showed that antihypertensive medications lowered the risk of recurrent vascular events in patients with stroke or TIA (1-3).

2. Specific agents that have shown benefit in either dedicated RCTs or systematic reviews of RCT data include diuretics, ACE inhibitors, and ARBs.

3. Support for this recommendation is based on data from 2 dedicated RCTs, as well as a systematic review and meta-analysis, among patients with a history of stroke or TIA (1-3).

4. Reduction in BP appears to be more important than the choice of specific agents used to achieve this goal. Thus, if diuretic and ACE inhibitor or ARB treatment do not achieve BP target, other agents, such as CCB and/or mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist, may be added.

5. An overview of RCTs showed that larger reductions in SBP tended to be associated with greater reduction in risk of recurrent stroke. However, a separate overview of RCTs in patients who experienced a stroke noted that achieving an SBP level <130 mm Hg was not associated with a lower stroke risk, and several observational studies did not show benefit with achieved SBP levels <120 mm Hg (5).

6. Patients with a lacunar stroke treated to an SBP target of <130 mm Hg versus 130 to 140 mm Hg may be less likely to experience a future ICH.

7. No published RCTs have specifically addressed this question, but a post hoc analysis of an RCT suggests that the effectiveness of antihypertensive treatment for secondary stroke prevention diminishes as initial baseline BP declines (9).
Figure 9. Management of Hypertension in Patients With a Previous History of Stroke (Secondary Stroke Prevention)

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1. DBP indicates diastolic blood pressure; SBP, systolic blood pressure; and TIA, transient ischemic attack.
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9.5. Peripheral Arterial Disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients With PAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Patients with PAD are at increased risk of CVD and stroke. Hypertension is a major risk factor for PAD, so these patients are commonly enrolled in trials of antihypertensive drug therapy. However, patients with PAD typically comprise a small fraction of participants, so in the few trials that report results in patients with PAD, subgroup analyses are generally underpowered.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. There is no major difference in the relative risk reduction in CVD from BP-lowering therapy between patients with hypertension and PAD and patients without PAD (1). There is also no evidence that any one class of antihypertensive medication or strategy is superior (2-4). In the INVEST (International Verapamil-Trandolapril) study, the beta blocker atenolol (with or without hydrochlorothiazide) was compared with the CCB verapamil (with or without perindopril). The study showed no significant difference in CVD outcomes between the 2 drug regimens in patients with and without PAD (3). No trials have reported the effects of a higher versus a lower BP goal in patients with PAD. In the 1 trial (ALLHAT) that reported the effects of different classes of BP medications on PAD as an outcome, there was no significant difference by medication class (5).
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9.6. Diabetes Mellitus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>BP:</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>SBP:</td>
<td>B-RSR</td>
<td>1. In adults with DM and hypertension, antihypertensive drug treatment should be initiated at a BP of 130/80 mm Hg or higher with a treatment goal of less than 130/80 mm Hg (1-8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBP:</td>
<td>C-E0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td>A-SR</td>
<td>2. In adults with DM and hypertension, all first-line classes of antihypertensive agents (i.e., diuretics, ACE inhibitors, ARBs, and CCBs) are useful and effective (1, 9, 10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>3. In adults with DM and hypertension, ACE inhibitors or ARBs may be considered in the presence of albuminuria (11, 12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR indicates systematic review.

Synopsis

Refer to the “Systematic Review for the 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults” for the complete systematic evidence review for additional data and analyses (13). The prevalence of hypertension among adults with DM is approximately 80%, and hypertension is at least twice as common in persons with type 2 DM than in age-matched individuals without DM (14-16). The coexistence of hypertension and DM markedly increases the risk of developing CVD damage, resulting in a higher incidence of CHD, HF, PAD, stroke, and CVD mortality (17), and may increase risk of microvascular disease, such as nephropathy or retinopathy (16, 18).

There is limited quality evidence to determine a precise BP target in adults with DM. No RCTs have explicitly 1) documented whether treatment to an SBP goal <140 mm Hg versus a higher goal improves clinical outcomes in adults with hypertension and DM or 2) directly evaluated clinical outcomes associated with SBP <130 mm Hg (2). However, 2 high-quality systematic reviews of RCTs support an SBP target of <140 mm Hg (4, 7).

There is little or no available RCT evidence supporting a specific DBP threshold for initiation of pharmacological therapy. Several RCTs, including the HOT (Hypertension Optimal Treatment) trial, UKPDS (United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study), and ABCD (Appropriate Blood Pressure Control in Diabetes) trial (19-22), are often cited to support a lower DBP target (e.g., ≤85 or 80 mm Hg) for adults with hypertension and DM. However, these trials were conducted when the diagnostic criteria for DM were more conservative than they are currently (2 fasting glucose levels >140 mg/dL as opposed to 126 mm/dL today).
Whelton PK, et al.
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Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. We recommend ASCVD risk assessment in all adults with hypertension, including adults with DM. As a matter of convenience, however, it can be assumed that the vast majority of adults with DM have a 10-year ASCVD risk ≥ 10%, placing them in the high risk category that requires initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy at BP ≥ 130/80 mm Hg (see Section 8.1.2, Figure 4 and Table 23 for BP thresholds for initiating antihypertensive drug treatment). The ACCORD trial (5), which compared CVD outcomes in adults with DM and hypertension who were randomized to an SBP target of <140 mm Hg (standard therapy) or <120 mm Hg (intensive therapy), did not document a significant reduction in the primary outcome (CVD composite) with the lower BP goal, but the trial was underpowered to detect a statistically significant difference between the 2 treatment arms. The ACCORD trial demonstrated a small reduction in absolute risk (1.1%) for stroke, but there were few such events. More adverse events (2% increase in absolute risk) were identified in the lower BP group, especially self-reported hypotension and a reduction in estimated GFR, but these did not result in an excess of stroke or ESRD. The ACCORD trial was a factorial study; secondary analysis demonstrated a significant outcome benefit in the intensive BP/standard glycemic group (3), but benefit in the intensive BP/intensive glycemic control group was no better than in the intensive BP/standard glycemic control group, which suggests a floor benefit beyond which the combined intensive interventions were ineffective (5). An ACCORD secondary analysis suggested that an SBP <120 mm Hg is superior to standard BP control in reducing LVH (6).

A meta-analysis of 73,913 patients with DM reported that an SBP <130 mm Hg reduced stroke by 39%. However, there was no significant risk reduction for MI (23). Two meta-analyses addressing target BP in adults with DM restricted the analysis to RCTs that randomized patients to different BP levels (4, 7). Target BP of 133/76 mm Hg provided significant benefit compared with that of 140/81 mm Hg for major cardiovascular events, MI, stroke, albuminuria, and retinopathy progression (4). Several meta-analyses of RCTs included all trials with a difference in BP (24, 25), but 2 restricted their analyses to trials in which participants were randomized to different BP target levels (4, 7).

SPRINT demonstrated cardiovascular benefit from intensive treatment of BP to a goal of <120 mm Hg as compared with <140 mm Hg but did not include patients with DM. However, the results of ACCORD and SPRINT were generally consistent (26). In addition, a SPRINT substudy demonstrated that patients with prediabetes derived a benefit similar to that of patients with normoglycemia (8). Previous trials have shown similar quantitative benefits from lowering BP in persons with and without DM (9).

2. BP control is more difficult to achieve in patients with DM than in those without DM, necessitating use of combination therapy in the majority of patients (27). All major antihypertensive drug classes (i.e., ACE inhibitors, ARBs, CCBs, and diuretics) are useful in the treatment of hypertension in DM (1, 9). However, in ALLHAT, doxazosin was clearly inferior to chlorthalidone, which also reduced some events more than amlodipine or lisinopril (28).

3. ACE inhibitors and ARBs have the best efficacy among the drug classes on urinary albumin excretion (12) (see Section 9.3). Therefore, an ACE inhibitor or ARB may be considered as part of the combination. A meta-analysis of RCTs of primary prevention of albuminuria in patients with DM demonstrated a significant reduction in progression of moderately to severely increased albuminuria with the use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs (11).
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9.7. Metabolic Syndrome

Metabolic syndrome is a state of metabolic dysregulation characterized by visceral fat accumulation, insulin resistance, hyperinsulinemia, and hyperlipidemia, as well as predisposition to type 2 DM, hypertension, and atherosclerotic CVD (1-3). According to data from the NHANES III and NHANES 1999–2006 (1, 4), the prevalence of metabolic syndrome in the United States was 34.2% in 2006 and has likely increased substantially since that time. The metabolic syndrome is linked to several other disorders, including nonalcoholic steatohepatitis, polycystic ovary syndrome, certain cancers, CKD, Alzheimer’s disease, Cushing’s syndrome, lipodystrophy, and hyperalimentation (5, 6).

Lifestyle modification, with an emphasis on improving insulin sensitivity by means of dietary modification, weight reduction, and exercise, is the foundation of treatment of the metabolic syndrome. The optimal antihypertensive drug therapy for patients with hypertension in the setting of the metabolic syndrome has not been clearly defined (1). Although caution exists with regard to the use of thiazide diuretics in this population because of their ability to increase insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, and hyperuricemia and to accelerate conversion to overt DM, no data are currently available demonstrating deterioration in cardiovascular or renal outcomes in patients treated with these agents (1). Indeed, as shown in follow-up of ALLHAT, chlorthalidone use was associated with only a small increase in fasting glucose levels (1.5–4.0 mg/dL), and this increase did not translate into increased CVD risk at a later date (7-10). In addition, in post hoc analysis of the nearly two thirds of participants in ALLHAT that met criteria for the metabolic syndrome, chlorthalidone was unsurpassed in reducing CVD and renal outcomes compared with lisinopril, amlodipine, or doxazosin (9, 11). Similarly, high-dose ARB therapy reduces arterial stiffness in patients with hypertension with the metabolic syndrome, but no outcomes data are available from patients in which this form of treatment was used (12). Use of traditional beta blockers may lead to dyslipidemia or deterioration of glucose tolerance, and ability to lose weight (2). In several large clinical trials, the risk of developing DM as a result of traditional beta-blocker therapy was 15% to 29% (2). However, the newer vasodilating beta blockers (e.g., labetalol, carvedilol, nebivolol) have shown neutral or favorable effects on metabolic profiles compared with the traditional beta blockers (13). Trials using vasodilator beta blockers have not been performed to demonstrate effects on CVD outcomes.
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9.8. Atrial Fibrillation

**Recommendation for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients With AF**

References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. Treatment of hypertension with an ARB can be useful for prevention of recurrence of AF (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

AF and hypertension are common and often coexistent conditions, both of which increase in frequency with age. AF occurs in 3% to 4% of the population >65 years of age (3). Hypertension is present in more than 80% of patients with AF and is by far the most common comorbid condition, regardless of age (4). AF is associated with systemic thromboembolism, as recognized in the CHADS2 and CHA2DS2-VASc scoring systems for stroke risk (5). It is also associated with gradual worsening of ventricular function, the subsequent development of HF, and increased mortality.

Hypertension has long been recognized as a risk factor for AF because it is associated with LVH, decreased diastolic function with impaired LV filling, rising left atrial pressures with left atrial hypertrophy and enlargement, increased atrial fibrosis, and slowing of intra-atrial and interatrial electrical conduction velocities. Such a distortion of atrial anatomy and physiology increases the incidence of AF (6). Left atrial pressure also increases with ischemic or valvular heart disease and myopathies that are often associated with systemic hypertension, potentially leading to AF.

Although management of AF will continue to revolve around restoration of sinus rhythm when appropriate, rate control when it is not, and anticoagulation, control of hypertension is a key component of therapy (1, 2).

Treatment of hypertension may prevent new-onset AF, especially in patients with LVH or LV dysfunction (1). Five RCTs have compared the value of antihypertensive agents for reduction of new-onset AF (7-11). One study suggested superiority of RAS blockade over a CCB (8), and another reported superiority of RAS blockade over a beta blocker that is no longer recommended for treatment of hypertension (9). In the largest trial, there was no difference in incident AF among adults with hypertension assigned to first-step therapy with a diuretic, ACE inhibitor, or CCB (10). In ALLHAT, the incidence of AF was 23% higher during first-step antihypertensive therapy with the alpha-receptor blocker doxazosin than with chlorthalidone. Furthermore, the occurrence of AF or atrial flutter during the study, either new onset or recurrent, was associated with an increase in mortality of nearly 2.5-fold (10).
Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Although RAS blockade in theory is the treatment of choice for hypertension in patients with prior AF, relative to other classes of agents, all of the trials that have shown clinical superiority of ARBs over other agents were comparisons with CCBs or beta blockers that are no longer recommended as first-line agents for treatment of hypertension (2). There are no available trials comparing ACE inhibitors with other drugs or any RAS-blocking agents with diuretics.
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9.9. Valvular Heart Disease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients With Valvular Heart Disease</th>
<th>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 49 and 50.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>LOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Hypertension is a risk factor for the development of aortic stenosis (stage A [e.g., aortic sclerosis or bicuspid aortic valve]) and asymptomatic aortic stenosis (stage B [progressive asymptomatic aortic stenosis]). The
combination of hypertension and aortic stenosis, “2 resistors in series,” increases the rate of complications. In patients with asymptomatic mild-to-moderate aortic stenosis, hypertension has been associated with more abnormal LV structure and increased cardiovascular morbidity and mortality (1). There is no evidence that antihypertensive medications will produce an inordinate degree of hypotension in patients with aortic stenosis. Nitroprusside infusion in hypertensive patients with severe aortic stenosis lowers pulmonary and systemic resistance, with improvements in stroke volume and LV end-diastolic pressure (2). Thus, careful use of antihypertensive agents to achieve BP control in patients with hypertension and aortic stenosis is beneficial. Although there are no specific trials comparing various classes of antihypertensive agents, RAS blockade may be advantageous because of the potentially beneficial effects on LV fibrosis (3), control of hypertension, reduction of dyspnea, and improved effort tolerance (4). Diuretics should be used sparingly in patients with small LV chamber dimensions. Beta blockers may be appropriate for patients with aortic stenosis who have reduced ejection fraction, prior MI, arrhythmias, or angina pectoris. In patients with moderate or severe aortic stenosis, consultation or co-management with a cardiologist is preferred for hypertension management.

2. Vasodilator therapy can reduce the LV volume and mass and improve LV performance in patients with aortic regurgitation (5), but improvement of long-term clinical outcomes, such as time to valve replacement, have been variable (5, 6). Beta blockers may result in increased diastolic filling period because of bradycardia, potentially causing increased aortic insufficiency. Marked reduction in DBP may lower coronary perfusion pressure in patients with chronic severe aortic regurgitation (stage B [progressive asymptomatic aortic regurgitation] and stage C [asymptomatic severe AR]). However, there are no outcomes data to support these theoretical concerns.
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9.10. Aortic Disease

<p>| Recommendation for Management of Hypertension in Patients With Aortic Disease |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. Beta blockers are recommended as the preferred antihypertensive agents in patients with hypertension and thoracic aortic disease (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Thoracic aortic aneurysms are generally asymptomatic until a person presents with a sudden catastrophic event, such as an aortic dissection or rupture, which is rapidly fatal in the majority of patients (3, 4). The rationale for antihypertensive therapy is based largely on animal and observational studies associating hypertension with aortic dissection (5, 6). RCTs specifically addressing hypertension and aortic disease are not available, and trials in patients with primary hypertension do not provide insight on either the optimal BP
target or choice of antihypertensive drug therapy in patients with thoracic aortic aneurysm, aortic dissection, or aortic disease (7, 8). A study in 20 humans with hypertension suggested that hypertension is associated with significant changes in the mechanical properties of the aortic wall, with more strain-induced stiffening in hypertension than in normotension, which may reflect destruction of elastin and predisposition to aortic dissection in the presence of hypertension (9). In a retrospective observational study, high BP variability was an independent risk factor for the prognosis of aortic dissection (10). Recommendations for treatment of acute aortic dissection are provided in Section 11.2.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. In patients with chronic aortic dissection, observational studies suggest lower risk for operative repair with beta-blocker therapy (1). In a series of patients with type A and type B aortic dissections, beta blockers were associated with improved survival in both groups, whereas ACE inhibitors did not improve survival (2).
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10. Special Patient Groups

Special attention is needed for specific patient subgroups.

10.1. Race and Ethnicity

In the United States, at any decade of life, blacks have a higher prevalence of hypertension than that of Hispanic Americans, whites, Native Americans, and other subgroups defined by race and ethnicity (see Section 3.3). Hypertension control rates are lower for blacks, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans than for whites (1). Among men with hypertension, non-Hispanic white (53.8%) adults had a higher prevalence of controlled high blood pressure than did non-Hispanic black (43.8%), non-Hispanic Asian (39.9%), and Hispanic (43.5%) adults. For women with hypertension, the percentage of non-Hispanic white (59.1%) adults with controlled
high blood pressure was higher than among non-Hispanic black (52.3%) and non-Hispanic Asian (46.8%) adults (1). In Hispanic Americans, the lower control rates result primarily from lack of awareness and treatment (2, 3), whereas in blacks, awareness and treatment are at least as high as in whites, but hypertension is more severe and some agents are less effective at BP control (4). Morbidity and mortality attributed to hypertension are also more common in blacks and Hispanic Americans than in Whites. Blacks have a 1.3-times greater risk of nonfatal stroke, 1.8-times greater risk of fatal strokes, 1.5-times greater risk of HF, and 4.2-times greater risk of ESRD (4). Hispanic Americans have lower rates of hypertension awareness and treatment than those of whites and blacks, as well as a high prevalence of comorbid CVD risk factors (e.g., obesity, DM). In 2014, age-adjusted hypertension-attributable mortality rates per 1,000 persons for non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, and Hispanic-American men and women were 19.3 and 15.8, 50.1 and 35.6, and 19.1 and 14.6, respectively (5). However, Hispanics in the United States are a heterogeneous subgroup, and rates of both hypertension and its consequences vary according to whether their ancestry is from the Caribbean, Mexico, Central or South America, or Europe (6-8). Hispanics from Mexico and Central America have lower CVD rates than U.S. whites, whereas those of Caribbean origin have higher rates. Thus, pooling of data for Hispanics may not accurately reflect risk in a given patient. Finally, the excess risk of CKD outcomes in at least some blacks with hypertension may be due to the presence of high-risk APOL1 (apolipoprotein L1) genetic variants (9-11). The rate of renal decline associated with this genotype appears to be largely unresponsive to either BP lowering or RAS inhibition (9-12).
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10.1.1 Racial and Ethnic Differences in Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Race and Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplement 51.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. In black adults with hypertension but without HF or CKD, including those with DM, initial antihypertensive treatment should include a thiazide-type diuretic or CCB (1-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
<td>2. Two or more antihypertensive medications are recommended to achieve a BP target of less than 130/80 mm Hg in most adults with hypertension, especially in black adults with hypertension (5-7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Lifestyle modification (i.e., weight reduction, dietary modification, and increased physical activity) is particularly important in blacks and Hispanic Americans for prevention and first-line or adjunctive therapy of hypertension (see Sections 12.1.2 and 12.1.3). However, the adoption of lifestyle recommendations is often challenging in ethnic minority patients because of poor social support, limited access to exercise opportunities and healthy foods, and financial considerations. The greater prevalence of lower socioeconomic status may impede access to basic living necessities (8), including medical care and medications. Consideration must also be given to learning styles and preference, personal beliefs, values, and culture (9, 10).

The principles of antihypertensive drug selection discussed in Sections 8.1.4 through 8.1.6 apply to ethnic minorities with a few caveats. In Blacks, thiazide-type diuretics and CCBs are more effective in lowering BP when given as monotherapy or as initial agents in multidrug regimens (11-13). In addition, thiazide-type agents are superior to drugs that inhibit the RAS (i.e., ACE inhibitors, ARBs, renin inhibitors, and beta blockers) for prevention of selected clinical outcomes in blacks (2, 14-16). For optimum endpoint protection, the thiazide chlorthalidone should be administered at a dose of 12.5 to 25 mg/day (or 25–50 mg/d for hydrochlorothiazide) because lower doses are either unproven or less effective in clinical outcome trials (2, 16). The CCB amlodipine is as effective as chlorthalidone and is more effective than the ACE inhibitor lisinopril in reducing BP, CVD, and stroke events but less effective in preventing HF. Blacks have a greater risk of angioedema with ACE inhibitors (2, 3), and Asian Americans have a higher incidence of ACE inhibitor–induced cough (17). ACE inhibitors and ARBs are recommended more generally as components of multidrug antihypertensive regimens in blacks with CKD (see Section 9.3), with the addition of beta blockers in those with HF (see Section 9.2). Beta blockers are recommended for treatment of patients with CHD who have had a MI. Most patients with hypertension, especially blacks, require ≥2 antihypertensive medications to achieve adequate BP control. A single-tablet combination that includes either a diuretic or a CCB may be particularly effective in achieving BP control in blacks. Racial and ethnic differences should not be the basis for excluding any class of antihypertensive agent in combination therapy.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. In blacks, thiazide diuretics or CCBs are more effective in lowering BP than are RAS inhibitors or beta blockers and more effective in reducing CVD events than are RAS inhibitors or alpha blockers. RAS inhibitors are recommended in black patients with hypertension, DM, and nephropathy, but they offer no advantage over diuretics or CCBs in hypertensive patients with DM without nephropathy or HF.

2. Four drug classes (thiazide diuretic, CCB, ACE inhibitor, or ARB) lower BP and reduce cardiovascular or renal outcomes (18-21). Thus, except for the combination of ACE inhibitors and ARBs, regimens containing a combination of these classes are reasonable to achieve the BP target (16, 21). Furthermore, the combination of an ACE inhibitor or ARB with a CCB or thiazide diuretic produces similar BP lowering in blacks as in other
racial or ethnic groups. For blacks who do not achieve control with 3 drugs, see resistant hypertension (see Section 11.1).
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10.2. Sex-Related Issues

The prevalence of hypertension is lower in women than in men until about the fifth decade but is higher later in life (1). Other than special recommendations for management of hypertension during pregnancy, there is no evidence that the BP threshold for initiating drug treatment, the treatment target, the choice of initial antihypertensive medication, or the combination of medications for lowering BP differs for women versus men (2, 3).
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10.2.1. Women

A potential limitation of RCTs, including SPRINT, is that they are not specifically powered to determine the value of intensive SBP reduction in subgroups, including women in the case of SPRINT. However, in prespecified analyses, there was no evidence of an interaction between sex and treatment effect. Furthermore, no significant differences in CVD outcomes were observed between men and women in a large meta-analysis that included 31 RCTs with about 100,000 men and 90,000 women with hypertension (1). Some have called for a SPRINT-like trial with sufficient power to assess the effects of intensive SBP reduction in women (2). In meta-analyses, there was no convincing evidence that different antihypertensive drug classes exerted sex-related differences in BP lowering or provided distinct CVD protection (1). Calcium antagonists offered slightly greater benefits for stroke prevention than did ACE inhibitors for women than for men, whereas calcium antagonists reduced all-cause deaths compared with placebo in men but not in women. However, these sex-related differences might have been due to chance because of the large number of statistical comparisons that were performed. The Heart Attack Trial and Hypertension Care Computing Project reported that beta blockers were associated with reduced mortality in men but not in women, but this finding was likely due to the low event rates in women (3). Similarly, in the open-label Second Australian National BP study, a significant reduction in CVD events was demonstrated in men but not in women with ACE inhibitors versus diuretics (4).

Adverse effects of antihypertensive therapy were noted twice as often in women as in men in the TOMHS study (5). A higher incidence of ACE inhibitor–induced cough and of edema with calcium antagonists was observed in women than in men (6). Women were more likely to experience hypokalemia and hyponatremia and less likely to experience gout with diuretics (7). Hypertension in pregnancy has special requirements (see Section 10.2.2).
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10.2.2. Pregnancy

### Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Pregnancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
<td>1. Women with hypertension who become pregnant, or are planning to become pregnant, should be transitioned to methyldopa, nifedipine, and/or labetalol (1) during pregnancy (2-6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>C-LD</td>
<td>2. Women with hypertension who become pregnant should not be treated with ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or direct renin inhibitors (4-6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

BP usually declines during the first trimester of pregnancy and then slowly rises. Hypertension management during pregnancy includes 4 general areas: 1) the newly pregnant mother with existing hypertension; 2) incident hypertension; 3) preeclampsia (a dangerous form of hypertension with proteinuria that has the potential to result in serious adverse consequences for the mother [stroke, HF] and fetus [small for gestational age, premature birth]); and 4) severe hypertension, often in the setting of preeclampsia, requiring urgent treatment to prevent HF, stroke, and adverse fetal outcomes. Hypertension during pregnancy and preeclampsia are recognized as risk factors for future hypertension and CVD (7-9). BP management during pregnancy is complicated by the fact that many commonly used antihypertensive agents, including ACE inhibitors and ARBs, are contraindicated during pregnancy because of potential harm to the fetus (2, 3). The goal of antihypertensive treatment during pregnancy includes prevention of severe hypertension and the possibility of prolonging gestation to allow the fetus more time to mature before delivery.

There are 3 Cochrane database reviews of treatment for mild-to-moderate hypertension during pregnancy (10-12). With regard to the treatment of mild-to-moderate hypertension (SBP of 140–169 or DBP of 90–109 mm Hg), antihypertensive treatment reduces the risk of progression to severe hypertension by 50% compared with placebo but has not been shown to prevent preeclampsia, preterm birth, small for gestational age, or infant mortality. Beta blockers and CCBs appear superior to alpha-methyldopa in preventing preeclampsia (10). An earlier review of 2 small trials did not show improved outcomes with more comprehensive treatment of BP to a target of <130/80 mm Hg (11). Consistent with the results of the Cochrane reviews, a large multinational RCT of treatment in pregnant women with mild-to-moderate hypertension also reported that treatment prevented progression to severe hypertension, but other maternal and infant outcomes were unaffected by the intensity of treatment (13). An earlier review confined to assessing the effect of beta blockers found them generally safe and effective but of no benefit for newborn outcomes, either in placebo-controlled studies or when compared with other antihypertensive agents. There was a suggestion that beta-blocker therapy might be associated with small for gestational age and neonatal bradycardia (12). The largest experience for beta blockers is with labetalol; the largest experience for CCBs is with nifedipine.
Methyldopa and hydralazine may also be used. A review of treatment for pregnancy-associated severe hypertension found insufficient evidence to recommend specific agents; rather, clinician experience was recommended in this setting (14).

Preeclampsia is a potentially dangerous condition for the pregnant woman and fetus, occurring in 3.8% of pregnancies, and preeclampsia and eclampsia account for 9% of maternal deaths in the United States (15). Preeclampsia is associated with an increased risk of preterm delivery, intrauterine growth restriction, placental abruption, and perinatal mortality and is twice as likely to occur in the first pregnancy. The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force has recommended screening all pregnant women for preeclampsia by measuring BP at every prenatal visit (16).

It is beyond the scope of the present guideline to address the management of hypertension during pregnancy in detail. Several international guidelines provide guidance on management of hypertension during pregnancy (2, 3, 17). The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has issued a task force report that includes recommendations for prevention (aspirin in selected cases) and treatment (magnesium for severe hypertension) of hypertension in pregnancy (2). A report detailing treatment of hypertensive emergencies during pregnancy and postpartum has also been released (2, 17, 18).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. ACE inhibitors and ARBs are not approved for use during pregnancy; they are fetotoxic. Among the agents recommended, no specific agent is first choice because there are no data supporting one over another. Therapeutic classes are not recommended because potential toxicity differs among agents within classes.

2. ACE inhibitors and ARBs are fetotoxic in the second and third trimesters of pregnancy. Adverse effects in the first trimester of pregnancy may be secondary to hypertension or the medication (4, 5). Adverse events in the later trimesters have been suggested by observational data and meta-analyses (6). For ARBs, case reports with effects similar to ACE inhibitors have been published (19).
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10.3. Age-Related Issues

10.3.1. Older Persons

| Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Older Persons |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| COR | LOE | Recommendations |
| I   | A   | 1. Treatment of hypertension with a SBP treatment goal of less than 130 mm Hg is recommended for noninstitutionalized ambulatory community-dwelling adults (≥65 years of age) with an average SBP of 130 mm Hg or higher (1). |
| Iia  | C-EO | 2. For older adults (≥65 years of age) with hypertension and a high burden of comorbidity and limited life expectancy, clinical judgment, patient preference, and a team-based approach to assess risk/benefit is reasonable for decisions regarding intensity of BP lowering and choice of antihypertensive drugs. |

Synopsis

Because of its extremely high prevalence in older adults, hypertension is not only a leading cause of preventable morbidity and mortality but, perhaps more importantly, is under-recognized as a major contributor to premature disability and institutionalization (2-5). Both SBP and DBP increase linearly up to the fifth or sixth decade of life, after which DBP gradually decreases while SBP continues to rise (6). Thus, isolated systolic hypertension is the predominant form of hypertension in older persons (7, 8). RCTs have clearly demonstrated that BP lowering in isolated systolic hypertension (defined as SBP ≥160 mm Hg with variable DBP ≤90, ≤95, or ≤110 mm Hg) is effective in reducing the risk of fatal and nonfatal stroke (primary outcome), cardiovascular events, and death (9-12).

Cross-sectional and longitudinal epidemiologic studies in older adults have raised questions about the benefits of more intensive antihypertensive treatment and the relationship between BP lowering and risk of falls (13). Treatment of elevated BP in older persons is challenging because of a high degree of heterogeneity in comorbidity, as well as poly-pharmacy, frailty, cognitive impairment, and variable life expectancy. However, over the past 3 decades, RCTs of antihypertensive therapy have included large numbers of older persons, and in every instance, including when the SBP treatment goal was <120 mm Hg, more intensive treatment has...
safely reduced the risk of CVD for persons over the ages of 65, 75, and 80 years (1, 14). Both HYVET (Hypertension in the Very Elderly Trial) and SPRINT included those who were frail but still living independently in the community (1, 14), and both were stopped early for benefit (HYVET after 1.8 years and SPRINT after 3.26 years). In fact, BP-lowering therapy is one of the few interventions shown to reduce mortality risk in frail older individuals. RCTs in noninstitutionalized community-dwelling older persons have also demonstrated that improved BP control does not exacerbate orthostatic hypotension and has no adverse impact on risk of injurious falls (1, 15, 16). It should be noted, however, that SPRINT excluded those with low (<110 mm Hg) standing BP on study entry. Older persons need to be carefully monitored for orthostatic hypotension during treatment. Intensive BP control increases the risk of acute kidney injury, but this is no different from the risk seen in younger adults (1). In summary, despite the complexity of management in caring for older persons with hypertension, RCTs have demonstrated that in many community-dwelling older adults, even adults >80 years of age, BP-lowering goals during antihypertensive treatment need not differ from those selected for persons <65 years of age (17). Importantly, no randomized trial of BP lowering in persons >65 years of age has ever shown harm or less benefit for older versus younger adults. However, clinicians should implement careful titration of BP lowering and monitoring in persons with high comorbidity burden; large RCTs have excluded older persons at any age who live in nursing homes, as well as those with prevalent dementia and advanced HF.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. We recommend ASCVD risk assessment in all adults with hypertension, including older persons. As a matter of convenience, however, it can be assumed that the vast majority of older adults have a 10-year ASCVD risk ≥ 10%, placing them in the high risk category that requires initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy at BP ≥ 130/80 mm Hg (see Section 8.1.2, Figure 4 and Table 23 for BP thresholds for initiating antihypertensive drug treatment). Large RCTs using medications to reduce hypertension-related CVD risk with a mean follow-up of ≥2 years have now included a large number of adults ≥65 years of age. These trials have enrolled a broad range of ages ≥65 years, including persons in their 90s and even 100s, as well as those with mild-to-moderate frailty but who were ambulatory and able to travel to a treatment clinic. In these patients, RCTs have shown that BP lowering decreased CVD morbidity and mortality but did not increase the risk of orthostatic hypotension or falls (1, 15, 16). Analysis of the NHANES (2011–2014) data set indicates that 88% of U.S. adults (98% men and 80% women) ≥65 years old have a 10-year predicted ASCVD risk ≥10% or have a history of CVD (CHD, stroke, or HF). For persons ≥75 years of age, 100% have an ASCVD risk score ≥10% or a history of CVD. Therefore, the BP target of ≤130/80 mm Hg would be appropriate (see Section 8.1.2). Initiation of antihypertensive therapy with 2 agents should be undertaken cautiously in older persons, and they need to be monitored carefully for orthostatic hypotension and history of falls. In SPRINT, the benefit was for an SBP goal of <120 mm Hg. Older persons may present with neurogenic orthostatic hypotension associated with supine hypertension. This is particularly common in Parkinson’s disease and other neurodegenerative disorders. For management of this problem, the reader is referred to the recommendations of a 2017 consensus panel (18).

2. Patients with prevalent and frequent falls, advanced cognitive impairment, and multiple comorbidities may be at risk of adverse outcomes with intensive BP lowering, especially when they require multiple BP-lowering medications. Older persons in this category typically reside in nursing homes and assisting living facilities, are unable to live independently in the community, and have not been represented in RCTs.
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10.3.2. Children and Adolescents

Pediatric guidelines are available from other organizations (1, 2). The 2011 report updates the 2004 report for publications through 2008 (antihypertensive medication trials, normative data on pediatric BP) but is otherwise unchanged. In the 2011 guideline (3), BP was stratified into normal, prehypertension (90th percentile to 95th percentile), stage 1 hypertension (95th percentile to >99th percentile), and stage 2 hypertension (above stage 1) by using age-, sex-, and height-based tables beginning at 1 year of age, which were based on the distribution of BP in more than 60,000 healthy children in various population-based studies (1). These definitions were designed to be analogous to definitions in the extant JNC 7 report; for older adolescents (≥14 years), the JNC 7 thresholds generally apply (4). Treatment recommendations are based on hypertension severity, published short-term clinical trials of antihypertensive treatment, age, coexisting CVD risk factors, and risk stratification by presence of LVH on echocardiogram. The treatment goal is to achieve BP <90th percentile. New tables for ambulatory BP distribution in children have been developed. A classification of BP that is based on these ambulatory BP results has been proposed (5, 6). Publication of new evidence-based pediatric guidelines is anticipated in late 2017.
Whelton PK, et al.
2017 High Blood Pressure Clinical Practice Guideline
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11. Other Considerations

11.1. Resistant Hypertension

The diagnosis of resistant hypertension is made when a patient takes 3 antihypertensive medications with complementary mechanisms of action (a diuretic should be 1 component) but does not achieve control or when BP control is achieved but requires ≥4 medications (1). On the basis of the previous cutoff of 140/90 mm Hg, the prevalence of resistant hypertension is approximately 13% in the adult population (2, 3). Multiple single-cohort studies have indicated that common risk factors for resistant hypertension include older age, obesity, CKD, black race, and DM. Estimates suggest the prevalence would be about 4% higher with the newly recommended control target of <130/80 mm Hg (subject to validation in future study). The prognosis of resistant hypertension (by the previous definition) (1), compared with the prognosis of those who more readily achieve control, has not been fully ascertained; however, risk of MI, stroke, ESRD, and death in adults with resistant hypertension and CHD may be 2- to 6-fold higher than in hypertensive adults without resistant hypertension (4-6). The evaluation of resistant hypertension involves consideration of many patient characteristics, pseudoresistance (BP technique, white coat hypertension, and medication compliance), and screening for secondary causes of hypertension (Figure 10; Section 5.4; Table 13). The term “refractory hypertension” has been used to refer to an extreme phenotype of antihypertensive treatment failure, defined as failure to control BP despite use of at least 5 antihypertensive agents of different classes, including a long-acting thiazide-type diuretic, such as chlorthalidone, and a mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist, such as spironolactone (7). The prevalence of refractory hypertension is low; patients with refractory hypertension experience high rates of CVD complications, including LVH, HF, and stroke.

Treatment of resistant hypertension involves improving medication adherence, improving detection and correction of secondary hypertension, and addressing other patient characteristics (8-10). Pharmacological therapy with combinations of medications with complementary mechanisms of action provides an empirical approach that enhances BP control while mitigating untoward effects of potent vasodilators (e.g., fluid retention and reflex tachycardia). CCBs, inhibitors of RAS, and chlorthalidone comprise a common 3-drug regimen (11). Considerable evidence indicates that the addition of spironolactone to multidrug regimens provides substantial BP reduction (12) when compared with placebo. Substantial data also demonstrate the advantage of spironolactone as compared with other active drugs (8, 13-15). In particular, the recent PATHWAY-2 (Optimum Treatment for Drug-Resistant Hypertension) RCT demonstrated the superiority of spironolactone over alpha and beta blockers (13). There is also clinical trial evidence that the addition of hydralazine or minoxidil is effective in achieving BP control in patients resistant to usual
combination therapy (8, 12-16). The dosing of multidrug regimens, occasionally including nighttime dosing, may be best optimized by hypertension specialists.

Several studies have investigated devices that interrupt sympathetic nerve activity (carotid baroreceptor pacing and catheter ablation of renal sympathetic nerves); however, these studies have not provided sufficient evidence to recommend the use of these devices in managing resistant hypertension (8-10). In particular, 2 RCTS of renal sympathetic nerve ablation have been negative (8, 9).
Figure 10. Resistant Hypertension: Diagnosis, Evaluation, and Treatment

**Confirm treatment resistance**
Office SBP/DBP $\geq$130/80 mm Hg
and
Patient prescribed $\geq$3 antihypertensive medications at optimal doses, including a diuretic, if possible
or
Office SBP/DBP <130/80 mm Hg but patient requires $\geq$4 antihypertensive medications

↓

**Exclude pseudoresistance**
Ensure accurate office BP measurements
Assess for nonadherence with prescribed regimen
Obtain home, work, or ambulatory BP readings to exclude white coat effect

↓

**Identify and reverse contributing lifestyle factors**
- Obesity
- Physical inactivity
- Excessive alcohol ingestion
- High-salt, low-fiber diet

↓

**Discontinue or minimize interfering substances**
- NSAIDs
- Sympathomimetic (e.g., amphetamines, decongestants)
- Stimulants
- Oral contraceptives
- Licorice
- Ephedra

↓

**Screen for secondary causes of hypertension**
- Primary aldosteronism (elevated aldosterone/renin ratio)
- CKD (eGFR $<60$ mL/min/1.73 m$^2$)
- Renal artery stenosis (young female, known atherosclerotic disease, worsening kidney function)
- Pheochromocytoma (episodic hypertension, palpitations, diaphoresis, headache)
- Obstructive sleep apnea (snoring, witnessed apnea, excessive daytime sleepiness)

↓

**Pharmacological treatment**
Maximize diuretic therapy
Add a mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist
Add other agents with different mechanisms of actions
Use loop diuretics in patients with CKD
and/or patients receiving potent vasodilators (e.g., minoxidil)

↓

**Refer to specialist**
Refer to appropriate specialist for known or suspected secondary cause(s) of hypertension
Refer to hypertension specialist if BP remains uncontrolled after 6 mo of treatment

*See additional details in Section 6, Nonpharmacological Intervention.
†See Section 5.4.1 and Table 14 for complete list of drugs that elevate BP.
‡See Section 5.4 and Table 13 for secondary hypertension.
BP indicates blood pressure; CKD, chronic kidney disease; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; NSAIDs, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.
Adapted with permission from Calhoun et al. (1) (American Heart Association, Inc.).
References


11.2. Hypertensive Crises—Emergencies and Urgencies

### Recommendations for Hypertensive Crises and Emergencies

References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplement 55.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>1. In adults with a hypertensive emergency, admission to an intensive care unit is recommended for continuous monitoring of BP and target organ damage and for parenteral administration of an appropriate agent (Tables 19 and 20) (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>2. For adults with a compelling condition (i.e., aortic dissection, severe preeclampsia or eclampsia, or pheochromocytoma crisis), SBP should be reduced to less than 140 mm Hg during the first hour and to less than 120 mm Hg in aortic dissection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>3. For adults without a compelling condition, SBP should be reduced by no more than 25% within the first hour; then, if stable, to 160/100 mm Hg within the next 2 to 6 hours; and then cautiously to normal during the following 24 to 48 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Synopsis

Hypertensive emergencies are defined as severe elevations in BP (>180/120 mm Hg) associated with evidence of new or worsening target organ damage (3-6). The 1-year death rate associated with hypertensive emergencies is >79%, and the median survival is 10.4 months if the emergency is left untreated (7). The actual BP level may not be as important as the rate of BP rise; patients with chronic hypertension can often tolerate higher BP levels than previously normotensive individuals. Hypertensive emergencies demand immediate reduction of BP (not necessarily to normal) to prevent or limit further target organ damage. Examples of target organ damage include hypertensive encephalopathy, ICH, acute ischemic stroke, acute MI, acute LV failure with pulmonary edema, unstable angina pectoris, dissecting aortic aneurysm, acute renal failure, and eclampsia. In general, use of oral therapy is discouraged for hypertensive emergencies. Hypertensive emergencies in patients with acute ICH and acute ischemic stroke are discussed in Section 9.4.

In contrast, hypertensive urgencies are situations associated with severe BP elevation in otherwise stable patients without acute or impending change in target organ damage or dysfunction. Many of these patients have withdrawn from or are noncompliant with antihypertensive therapy and do not have clinical or laboratory evidence of acute target organ damage. These patients should not be considered as having a hypertensive emergency and instead are treated by reinstitution or intensification of antihypertensive drug therapy and treatment of anxiety as applicable. There is no indication for referral to the emergency department, immediate reduction in BP in the emergency department, or hospitalization for such patients.

Figure 11 is an algorithm on diagnosis and management of a hypertensive crisis. Tables 19 and 20 summarize intravenous antihypertensive drugs for treatment of hypertensive emergencies.

### Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. There is no RCT evidence that antihypertensive drugs reduce morbidity or mortality in patients with hypertensive emergencies (8). However, from clinical experience, it is highly likely that antihypertensive therapy is an overall benefit in a hypertensive emergency (9). There is also no high-quality RCT evidence to inform clinicians as to which first-line antihypertensive drug class provides more benefit than harm in hypertensive emergencies (8). This lack of evidence is related to the small size of trials, the lack of long-term follow-up, and failure to report outcomes. However, 2 trials have demonstrated that nicardipine may be better than labetalol in achieving the short-term BP target (1, 10-12). Several antihypertensive agents in various pharmacological classes are available for the treatment of hypertensive emergencies (Table 19). Because
autoregulation of tissue perfusion is disturbed in hypertensive emergencies, continuous infusion of short-acting titratable antihypertensive agents is often preferable to prevent further target organ damage (5, 6). The selection of an antihypertensive agent should be based on the drug’s pharmacology, pathophysiological factors underlying the patient’s hypertension (as well as they can be rapidly determined), degree of progression of target organ damage, the desirable rate of BP decline, and the presence of comorbidities (Table 20). The therapeutic goal is to minimize target organ damage safely by rapid recognition of the problem and early initiation of appropriate antihypertensive treatment.

2. Compelling conditions requiring rapid lowering of SBP, usually to <140 mm Hg, in the first hour of treatment include aortic dissection, severe preeclampsia or eclampsia, and pheochromocytoma with hypertensive crisis.

3. There is no RCT evidence comparing different strategies to reduce BP, except in patients with ICH (9, 13). Neither is there RCT evidence to suggest how rapidly or how much BP should be lowered in a hypertensive emergency (9). However, clinical experience indicates that excessive reduction of BP may cause or contribute to renal, cerebral, or coronary ischemia and should be avoided. Thus, comprehensive dosing of intravenous or even oral antihypertensive agents to rapidly lower BP is not without risk. Oral loading doses of antihypertensive agents can engender cumulative effects, causing hypotension after discharge from the emergency department or clinic.
Figure 11. Diagnosis and Management of a Hypertensive Crisis

SBP >180 mm Hg and/or DBP >120 mm Hg

Target organ damage new/progressive/worsening

Yes

Hypertensive emergency

Admit to ICU (Class I)

Conditions:
- Aortic dissection
- Severe preeclampsia or eclampsia
- Pheochromocytoma crisis

Yes

Reduce SBP to <140 mm Hg during first h* and to <120 mm Hg in aortic dissection† (Class I)

No

Markedly elevated BP

Reinstitute/intensify oral antihypertensive drug therapy and arrange follow-up

Yes

Reduce BP by max 25% over first h†, then to 160/100–110 mm Hg over next 2–6 h, then to normal over next 24–48 h (Class I)

No

Yes

No

Colors correspond to Class of Recommendation in Table 1.
*Use drug(s) specified in Table 19.
†If other comorbidities are present, select a drug specified in Table 20.
BP indicates blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; ICU, intensive care unit; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.
### Table 19. Intravenous Antihypertensive Drugs for Treatment of Hypertensive Emergencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Drug(s)</th>
<th>Usual Dose Range</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCB—dihydropyridines</td>
<td>Nicardipine</td>
<td>Initial 5 mg/h, increasing every 5 min by 2.5 mg/h to maximum 15 mg/h.</td>
<td>Contraindicated in advanced aortic stenosis; no dose adjustment needed for elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clevidipine</td>
<td>Initial 1–2 mg/h, doubling every 90 s until BP approaches target, then increasing by less than double every 5–10 min; maximum dose 32 mg/h; maximum duration 72 h.</td>
<td>Contraindicated in patients with soybean, soy product, egg, and egg product allergy and in patients with defective lipid metabolism (e.g., pathological hyperlipidemia, lipoid nephrosis or acute pancreatitis). Use low-end dose range for elderly patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasodilators—Nitric-oxide dependent</td>
<td>Sodium nitroprusside</td>
<td>Initial 0.3–0.5 mcg/kg/min; increase in increments of 0.5 mcg/kg/min to achieve BP target; maximum dose 10 mcg/kg/min; duration of treatment as short as possible. For infusion rates ≥4–10 mcg/kg/min or duration &gt;30 min, thiosulfate can be coadministered to prevent cyanide toxicity.</td>
<td>Intra-arterial BP monitoring recommended to prevent “overshoot.” Lower dosing adjustment required for elderly. Tachyphylaxis common with extended use. Cyanide toxicity with prolonged use can result in irreversible neurological changes and cardiac arrest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitroglycerin</td>
<td>Initial 5 mcg/min; increase in increments of 5 mcg/min every 3–5 min to a maximum of 20 mcg/min.</td>
<td>Use only in patients with acute coronary syndrome and/or acute pulmonary edema. Do not use in volume-depleted patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasodilators—direct</td>
<td>Hydralazine</td>
<td>Initial 10 mg via slow IV infusion (maximum initial dose 20 mg); repeat every 4–6 h as needed.</td>
<td>BP begins to decrease within 10–30 min, and the fall lasts 2–4 h. Unpredictability of response and prolonged duration of action do not make hydralazine a desirable first-line agent for acute treatment in most patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrenergic blockers—beta1 receptor selective antagonist</td>
<td>Esmolol</td>
<td>Loading dose 500–1000 mcg/kg/min over 1 min followed by a 50-mcg/kg/min infusion. For additional dosing, the bolus dose is repeated and the infusion increased in 50-mcg/kg/min increments as needed to a maximum of 200 mcg/kg/min.</td>
<td>Contraindicated in patients with concurrent beta-blocker therapy, bradycardia, or decompensated HF. Monitor for bradycardia. May worsen HF. Higher doses may block beta2 receptors and impact lung function in reactive airway disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrenergic blockers—combined alpha1 and nonselective</td>
<td>Labetalol</td>
<td>Initial 0.3–1.0-mg/kg dose (maximum 20 mg) slow IV injection every 10 min or 0.4–1.0-mg/kg/h IV infusion up to 3 mg/kg/h. Adjust</td>
<td>Contraindicated in reactive airways disease or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Especially useful in hyperadrenergic syndromes. May worsen HF and should not be given in...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beta receptor antagonist | rate up to total cumulative dose of 300 mg. This dose can be repeated every 4–6 h. | patients with second- or third-degree heart block or bradycardia.

| Adrenergic blockers—nonselective alpha receptor antagonist | Phentolamine | IV bolus dose 5 mg. Additional bolus doses every 10 min as needed to lower BP to target. | Used in hypertensive emergencies induced by catecholamine excess (pheochromocytoma, interactions between monamine oxidase inhibitors and other drugs or food, cocaine toxicity, amphetamine overdose, or clonidine withdrawal).

| Dopamine-1-receptor selective agonist | Fenoldopam | Initial 0.1–0.3 mcg/kg/min; may be increased in increments of 0.05–0.1 mcg/kg/min every 15 min until target BP is reached. Maximum infusion rate 1.6 mcg/kg/min. | Contraindicated in patients at risk of increased intraocular pressure (glaucoma) or intracranial pressure and those with sulfite allergy.

| ACE inhibitor | Enalaprilat | Initial 1.25 mg over a 5-min period. Doses can be increased up to 5 mg every 6 h as needed to achieve BP target. | Contraindicated in pregnancy and should not be used in acute MI or bilateral renal artery stenosis. Mainly useful in hypertensive emergencies associated with high plasma renin activity. Dose not easily adjusted. Relatively slow onset of action (15 min) and unpredictability of BP response.

BP indicates blood pressure; CCB, calcium channel blocker; HF, heart failure; IV, intravenous; and MI, myocardial infarction.
### Table 20. Intravenous Antihypertensive Drugs for Treatment of Hypertensive Emergencies in Patients With Selected Comorbidities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comorbidity</th>
<th>Preferred Drug(s)*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acute aortic dissection</td>
<td>Esmolol, labetalol</td>
<td>Requires rapid lowering of SBP to ≤120 mm Hg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta blockade should precede vasodilator (e.g., nicardipine or nitroprusside) administration, if needed for BP control or to prevent reflex tachycardia or inotropic effect; SBP ≤120 mm Hg should be achieved within 20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute pulmonary edema</td>
<td>Clevidipine, nitroglycerin nitroprusside</td>
<td>Beta blockers contraindicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute coronary syndromes</td>
<td>Esmolol†, labetalol, nicardipine, nitroglycerin†</td>
<td>Nitrates given in the presence of PDE-5 inhibitors may induce profound hypotension. Contraindications to beta blockers include moderate-to-severe LV failure with pulmonary edema, bradycardia (&lt;60 bpm), hypotension (SBP &lt;100 mm Hg), poor peripheral perfusion, second- or third-degree heart block, and reactive airways disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute renal failure</td>
<td>Clevidipine, fenoldopam, nicardipine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclampsia or preeclampsia</td>
<td>Hydralazine, labetalol, nicardipine</td>
<td>Requires rapid BP lowering. ACI inhibitors, ARBs, renin inhibitors, and nitroprusside contraindicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perioperative hypertension (BP ≥160/90 mm Hg or SBP elevation ≥20% of the preoperative value that persists for &gt;15 min)</td>
<td>Clevidipine, esmolol, nicardipine, nitroglycerin</td>
<td>Intraoperative hypertension is most frequently seen during anesthesia induction and airway manipulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute sympathetic discharge or catecholamine excess states (e.g., pheochromocytoma, post-cardiotomy status)</td>
<td>Clevidipine, nicardipine, phentolamine</td>
<td>Requires rapid lowering of BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute ICH</td>
<td>Section 9.4.1</td>
<td>Section 9.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute ischemic stroke</td>
<td>Section 9.4.2</td>
<td>Section 9.4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agents are listed in alphabetical order, not in order of preference.
†Agent of choice for acute coronary syndromes.

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; BP, blood pressure; bpm, beats per minute; ICH, intracerebral hemorrhage; LV, left ventricular; PDE-5, phosphodiesterase type-5; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

### References
**11.3. Cognitive Decline and Dementia**

**Recommendation for Prevention of Cognitive Decline and Dementia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. In adults with hypertension, BP lowering is reasonable to prevent cognitive decline and dementia (1-6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

Dementia is a leading cause of mortality and placement into nursing homes and assisted living facilities, affecting >46 million individuals globally and 5 million persons in the United States, a number that is expected to double by 2050 (7). A 5-year delay in onset of dementia would likely decrease the number of cases of incident dementia by about 50% after several decades (8). Vascular disease and its risk factors are implicated in a large proportion of patients with dementia, including those with Alzheimer’s dementia (9-11). Hypertension is also the primary risk factor for small-vessel ischemic disease and cortical white matter abnormalities (12-15). Most observational studies have suggested that better control of SBP may reduce Alzheimer’s disease and other dementias, and the evidence is stronger for BP lowering in middle age than in the elderly (9, 16). Clinical trials with dementia assessment have evaluated all-cause dementia but not Alzheimer’s disease specifically. However, all of these trials have methodological issues, such as low power, insufficient follow-up length, and inadequately designed dementia assessment batteries.

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Five clinical trials of BP lowering have included assessment for incident dementia. Of these 5 trials, 4 demonstrated a reduction in dementia incidence, with 2 of these 4 demonstrating statistical significance (746-751). SYST-EUR (Systolic Hypertension in Europe) (17) and PROGRESS (Perindopril Protection Against Recurrent Stroke) (18) both showed statistically significant reductions in incident dementia. SYST-EUR achieved an SBP of 152 mm Hg in the treatment arm (8.3 mm Hg lower than placebo arm) during its blinded phase and an SBP of 149 mm Hg (7.0 mm Hg lower than comparison group) during its open-label follow-up phase (2, 3). PROGRESS achieved an SBP of 138 mm Hg in the treatment group (9 mm Hg lower than the placebo group) and demonstrated dementia prevention in patients with a recent stroke (5). The trial showing...
no benefit in the direction of dementia reduction achieved an SBP reduction of only 3.2 mm Hg, whereas the other 4 trials achieved SBP reductions of 7 to 15 mm Hg (746-751). When the rate of cognitive decline (not dementia) has been a trial outcome, 7 clinical trials of BP-lowering therapy have been completed, and 2 of these have shown benefit (4-6, 19-22). No randomized trial of BP lowering has demonstrated an adverse impact on dementia incidence or cognitive function. However, the anticipated results from SPRINT, the first adequately powered RCT to test whether intensive BP control reduces dementia, may help clarify this issue in the near future.
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11.4. Sexual Dysfunction and Hypertension

An association among sexual dysfunction, atherosclerosis, and hypertension can be constructed from several epidemiology surveys, clinical trials, and cohort studies. Although these data converge to suggest that endothelial dysfunction is a common denominator, the story is complete. Sexual dysfunction represents several domains in desire or interest, as well as physical limitations such as erectile dysfunction. In addition, beta blockers, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists, and other antihypertensive drugs can have negative effects on libido and erectile function. There are emerging data on the association between erectile dysfunction and CVD compared with other domains of sexual dysfunction. Experimental and clinical studies describe a role for angiotensin II, endothelin, and hydrogen sulfide on cavernous tissue function (1). Many of the signaling pathways for the increased production of oxidative stress and the subsequent deleterious effects of oxidative stress on vascular tissue have been described. Accordingly, it is reasonable to suggest that hypertension might lead to vascular changes that cause erectile dysfunction but, conversely, erectile dysfunction may be part of the causal pathway to CVD (1). Although there is insufficient evidence to recommend screening for CVD risk factors in all men with erectile dysfunction, it has been reported as a sole precursor for CVD in men (2-6).

With the introduction of the phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors, which can be coadministered with antihypertensive medications, there is now effective therapy for erectile dysfunction that has implications for systemic vascular disease (7). These drugs have additive effects on lowering BP and are recommended as a primary therapy for pulmonary hypertension (8). Although data are available to suggest that some antihypertensive medications affect erectile dysfunction more than others, the use of phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors make drug class distinctions for erectile dysfunction less relevant (9). The long-term safety and efficacy of chronic administration of phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors for the mitigation of CVD has yet to be determined and represents an important knowledge gap.
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11.5. Patients Undergoing Surgical Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Treatment of Hypertension in Patients Undergoing Surgical Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 57 and 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preoperative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intraoperative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

Hypertension in the perioperative period increases the risk of CVD, cerebrovascular events, and bleeding (15, 16). As many as 25% of patients who undergo major noncardiac surgery (17) and 80% of patients who have cardiac surgery experience perioperative hypertension (16, 18). In general, the level of risk is related to the severity of the hypertension.

No high-quality RCTs were identified relating to the treatment of hypertension in patients undergoing major surgical procedures. One analysis evaluated data from 3 prospective, randomized, open-label, parallel-comparison studies in patients undergoing cardiac surgery and concluded that clevidipine is a safe and effective treatment for acute hypertension in patients undergoing cardiac surgery (19). Another systematic review and meta-analysis, including 4 studies, concluded that clevidipine is more effective than other antihypertensive drugs in the management of perioperative hypertension without adverse events (20). Several general strategies and principles based on experience and observation are recommended for this section. In the management of patients with perioperative hypertension, it is important to assess other potential contributing factors, such as volume status, pain control, oxygenation, and bladder distention, when the use of pharmacological therapy to control BP is under consideration. Uncontrolled hypertension is associated with increased perioperative and postoperative complications. Certain medications (e.g., beta blockers, clonidine) may be associated with rebound hypertension if discontinued abruptly (13). Therefore,
several general strategies and principles based on experience and observation are recommended for this section. These recommendations for beta blockers, ACE inhibitors, and ARBs are generally consistent with the “2014 ACC/AHA Guideline on Perioperative Cardiovascular Evaluation and Management of Patients Undergoing Noncardiac Surgery” and are provided to assist in the management of patients undergoing major noncardiac surgical procedures (21).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. If well tolerated, beta blockers should be continued in patients who are currently receiving them for longitudinal reasons, particularly when longitudinal treatment is provided according to GDMT, such as for MI (22). Multiple observational studies support the benefits of continuing beta blockers in patients who are undergoing surgery and who are on these agents for longitudinal indications (1-7).

2. In the absence of conclusive RCTs, the expert opinion of this writing committee is that control of BP to levels recommended by the present guideline (BP <130/80 mm Hg) or other target levels specified for a particular individual is reasonable before undertaking major elective procedures in either the inpatient or outpatient setting. If the patient is unable to take oral medications, it is reasonable to use intravenous medications (Table 19) as necessary to control BP. Special consideration of placement on parenteral therapy usually occurs for patients taking clonidine or beta blockers because of the risk of stopping these medications acutely. Withdrawal syndromes, accompanied by sympathetic discharge and acute hypertension, can occur on cessation of these agents (13).

3. Data on the potential risk and benefit of ACE inhibitors in the perioperative setting are limited to observational analyses, and this area is controversial. Recent evidence from a large cohort study demonstrates that patients who stopped their ACE inhibitors or ARBs 24 hours before noncardiac surgery were less likely to suffer the primary composite outcome (all-cause death, stroke, or myocardial injury) and intraoperative hypotension than were those continuing these medications until surgery (10).

4. JNC 6 (23) noted conflicting evidence for patients with DBP >110 mm Hg and recommended delay of surgery for gradual reduction in DBP before proceeding with surgery. In a systematic review and meta-analysis of 30 observational studies, preoperative hypertension was associated with a 35% increase in cardiovascular complications (12). An increase in complications, including dysrhythmias, myocardial ischemia or infarction, neurological complications, and renal failure, has been reported in patients with DBP ≥110 mm Hg immediately before surgery (24). In contrast, patients with DBP <110 mm Hg do not appear to be at significantly increased risk (25). The relationship of systolic hypertension to surgical risk is less certain. Among patients undergoing carotid endarterectomy, increased risk of postoperative hypertension and neurological defects were observed (26), and an increased risk of CVD morbidity after coronary artery bypass graft surgery has been observed in patients with isolated systolic hypertension (27). During induction of anesthesia for surgery, sympathetic action can result in a 20– to 30–mm Hg increase in BP and a 15- to 20-bpm increase in heart rate among patients with normal BP (24). Exaggerated responses may occur in patients with poorly treated or untreated hypertension by as much as 90 mm Hg and 40 bpm (24). With further anesthesia, the accompanying inhibition of the sympathetic nervous system and loss of baroreceptor control may result in intraoperative hypotension. Lability in BP appears more likely in patients with poorly controlled hypertension (25), whereas studies have observed that patients with controlled hypertension respond similarly to those who are normotensive (28). Early work indicated that patients with severe hypertension (SBP >210 mm Hg and DBP >105 mm Hg) had exaggerated responses in BP during the induction of anesthesia (28).

5. Although few studies describe risks of withdrawing beta blockers in the perioperative time period (2, 5), longstanding evidence from other settings suggests that abrupt withdrawal of long-term beta blockers is
harmful (29-31). There are fewer data to describe whether short-term (1 to 2 days) perioperative use of beta blockers, followed by rapid discontinuation, is harmful (5, 14, 21, 30).

6. The 2014 ACC/AHA perioperative guideline specifically recommends against starting beta blockers on the day of surgery in beta-blocker–naive patients (5, 21, 30), particularly at high initial doses, in long-acting form, and if there are no plans for dose titration or monitoring for adverse events. Data from the POISE (Perioperative Ischemic Evaluation) study demonstrate the risk of initiating long-acting beta blockers on the day of surgery (14).

7. Several antihypertensive agents in a variety of pharmacological classes are available for the treatment of hypertensive emergencies (Table 19).
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12. Strategies to Improve Hypertension Treatment and Control

In addition to promoting pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatment adherence in individual patients with hypertension, several population-based systems approaches can play an important role in treatment goals.

12.1. Adherence Strategies for Treatment of Hypertension

Therapeutic nonadherence (not following recommended medical or health advice, including failure to “persist” with medications and recommended lifestyle modifications) is a major contributor to poor control of hypertension and a key barrier to reducing CVD deaths. Adherence rates vary substantially in different populations and, in general, are lower for lifestyle change and more behaviorally demanding regimens.
12.1.1. Antihypertensive Medication Adherence Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Antihypertensive Medication Adherence Strategies</th>
<th>References that support recommendations are summarized in Online Data Supplements 59 and 60.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COR</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Up to 25% of patients do not fill their initial prescription for antihypertensive therapy (8-10). During the first year of treatment, the average patient has possession of antihypertensive medications only 50% of the time, and only 1 in 5 patients has sufficiently high adherence to achieve the benefits observed in clinical trials (11, 12).

Factors contributing to poor adherence are myriad, complex, and multilevel (11, 13, 14). Therefore, solutions to improve adherence may be introduced at patient, provider, and healthcare system levels (13, 15, 16). Several systematic reviews and meta-analyses have assessed the impact of interventions on adherence to antihypertensive medications, including modification of antihypertensive therapy (1-7, 11, 15, 16). No single intervention is uniquely effective, and a sustained, coordinated effort that targets all barriers to adherence in an individual is likely to be the most effective approach. See Online Data Supplement F for barriers to medication adherence and the most successful interventions.

The creation of an encouraging, blame-free environment in which patients are recognized for achieving treatment goals and given “permission” to answer questions related to their treatment honestly is essential to identify and address nonadherence. Patient medication adherence assessment tools (17) are presented in Online Data Supplement A. Members of the hypertension care team may use these self-report tools in a nonthreatening fashion to identify barriers and facilitate behaviors associated with improved adherence to antihypertensive medications. Use of more objective methods (e.g., pill counts, data on medication refills) to assess adherence along with self-report methods is optimal.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Remembering to take medication is often challenging, particularly for regimens that must be dosed several times daily. Taking medications several times throughout the day requires greater attention to scheduling, as well as additional issues such as transportation or storage, which can be challenging for some patients. The impact of once-daily dosing of antihypertensive drugs versus dosing multiple times daily has been evaluated in several meta-analyses (1-3). Medication adherence was greatest with once-daily dosing (range 71% to 94%) and declined as dosing frequency increased (1, 2).

2. Assessment and possible modification of drug therapy regimens can improve suboptimal adherence. Simplifying medication regimens, either by less frequent dosing (i.e., once daily versus multiple times daily) or use of combination drug therapy, improves adherence. Available fixed-dose combination drug therapy is listed in Online Data Supplement D.
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12.1.2. Strategies to Promote Lifestyle Modification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Strategies to Promote Lifestyle Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplement 61.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. Effective behavioral and motivational strategies to achieve a healthy lifestyle (i.e., tobacco cessation, weight loss, moderation in alcohol intake, increased physical activity, reduced sodium intake, and consumption of a healthy diet) are recommended for adults with hypertension (1, 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

The primary lifestyle modification interventions that can help reduce high BP are outlined in Section 6 (healthy diet, weight loss, exercise and moderate alcohol intake). In addition, tobacco cessation is crucial for CVD risk reduction. These modifications are central to good health and require specific motivational and cognitive intervention strategies designed to promote adherence to these healthy behaviors. High-quality evidence supporting some of these strategies is provided in Online Data Supplement 6. Additionally, interventions such as goal setting, provision of feedback, self-monitoring, follow-up, motivational interviewing, and promotion of self-sufficiency are most effective when combined. Most individuals have clear expectations about what a
new lifestyle will provide; if their experiences do not match these expectations, they will be dissatisfied and less motivated to maintain a lifestyle change, particularly in environments that do not support healthy choices. Other factors that may influence adoption and maintenance of new physical activity or dietary behaviors include age, sex, baseline health status, and body mass index, as well as the presence of comorbid conditions and depression, which negatively affect adherence to most lifestyle change regimens (1). Primary strategies include cognitive-behavioral strategies for promoting behavior change, intervention processes and delivery strategies, and addressing cultural and social context variables that influence behavioral change.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. It is crucial to translate and implement into practice the most effective evidence-based strategies for adherence to nonpharmacological treatment for hypertension. Both adoption and maintenance of new CVD risk-reducing behaviors pose challenges for many individuals. Success requires consideration of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, as well as individual, provider, and environmental factors that may influence the design of such interventions (1). High-quality evidence has shown that even modest sustained lifestyle changes can substantially reduce CVD morbidity and mortality (1). Because many beneficial effects of lifestyle changes accrue over time, long-term adherence maximizes individual and population benefits. Interventions targeting sodium restriction, other dietary patterns, weight reduction, and new physical activity habits often result in impressive rates of initial behavior changes but frequently are not translated into long-term behavioral maintenance.
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12.1.3. Improving Quality of Care for Resource-Constrained Populations

The availability of financial, informational, and instrumental support resources can be important though not sole determinants of hypertension control (1, 2). The management of hypertension in resource-constrained populations poses a challenge that will require the implementation of all recommendations discussed in Section 13 (Table 21), with specific sensitivity to challenges posed by limited financial resources, including those related to health literacy, alignment of and potential need to realign healthcare priorities by patients, the convenience and complexity of the management strategy, accessibility to health care, and health-related costs (including medications). Resource-constrained populations are also populations with high representation of groups most likely to manifest health disparities, including racial and ethnic minorities (see Section 10.1), residents located in rural areas, and older adults. The more comprehensive BP targets proposed in the present guideline will present added challenges in these populations.

It is crucial to invest in measures to enhance health literacy and reinforce the importance of adhering to treatment strategies, while paying attention to cultural sensitivities. These measures may include identification of and partnering with community resources and organizations devoted to hypertension control and cardiovascular health. Although comparative-effectiveness data documenting efficacy of various interventions are limited, multidisciplinary team–based approaches and the use of community health workers (see Sections 12.1.1 and 12.2) have shown some utility, as has the use of out-of-office BP monitoring (or no-cost BP control visits), particularly among resource-constrained populations (3-5). Long-acting once-daily medications (e.g., chlorthalidone, amlodipine) that are now available generically and often on discount formularies can often be used to reduce complexity of the regimen and promote adherence by decreasing the effect of missed medication dosages. When possible, prescriptions requiring longer than 30-day refills should
be considered, especially once a stable regimen is achieved. Where appropriate, using scored tablets and pill cutters can decrease the cost of medication for patients.
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12.2. Structured, Team-Based Care Interventions for Hypertension Control

Recommendation for Structured, Team-Based Care Interventions for Hypertension Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A team-based care approach is recommended for adults with hypertension (1-7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

Team-based care to improve BP control is a health systems–level, organizational intervention that incorporates a multidisciplinary team to improve the quality of hypertension care for patients (8-10). Various team-based hypertension care models have been demonstrated to increase the proportion of individuals with controlled BP and to reduce both SBP and DBP (1-7, 11, 12). A team-based care approach is patient centered and is frequently implemented as part of a multifaceted approach, with systems support for clinical decision making (i.e., treatment algorithms), collaboration, adherence to prescribed regimen, BP monitoring, and patient self-management. Team-based care for hypertension includes the patient, the patient’s primary care provider, and other professionals, such as cardiologists, nurses, pharmacists, physician assistants, dietitians, social workers, and community health workers. These professionals complement the activities of the primary care provider by providing process support and sharing the responsibilities of hypertension care. Section 13 contains a comprehensive, patient-centered plan of care that should be the basis of all team-based care for hypertension.

Team-based care aims to achieve effective control of hypertension by application of the strategies outlined in Online Data Supplement H (3). Delineation of individual team member roles on the basis of knowledge, skill set, and availability, as well as the patient’s needs, allows the primary care provider to delegate routine matters to the team, thereby permitting more time to manage complex and critical patient-care issues. Important implementation aspects, such as type of team member added, role of team members related to medication management, and number of team members, influence BP outcomes (3, 13). Team member roles should be clear to all team members and to patients and families.

Team-based care often requires organizational change and reallocation of resources (14, 15). Systems-level support, such as use of electronic health records (EHR) (see Section 12.3.1), clinical decision support (i.e., treatment algorithms), technology-based remote monitoring (see Section 12.3.2), self-management support tools, and monitoring of performance, are likely to augment and intensify team-based care efforts to reduce high BP.
Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. RCTs and meta-analyses of RCTs of team-based hypertension care involving nurse or pharmacist intervention demonstrated reductions in SBP and DBP and/or greater achievement of BP goals when compared with usual care (1, 2, 4, 5). Similarly, systematic reviews of team-based care, including a review of studies that included community health workers, for patients with primary hypertension showed reductions in SBP and DBP and improvements in BP control, appointment keeping, and hypertension medication adherence as compared with usual care (3, 12).
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12.3. Health Information Technology–Based Strategies to Promote Hypertension Control

12.3.1. EHR and Patient Registries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>1. Use of the EHR and patient registries is beneficial for identification of patients with undiagnosed or undertreated hypertension (1-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>2. Use of the EHR and patient registries is beneficial for guiding quality improvement efforts designed to improve hypertension control (1-3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis

A growing number of health systems are developing or using registries and EHR that permit large-scale queries to support population health management strategies to identify undiagnosed or undertreated hypertension. Such innovations are implemented as ongoing quality improvement initiatives in clinical practice. To reduce undiagnosed hypertension and improve hypertension management, a multipronged approach may include 1) application of hypertension screening algorithms to EHR databases to identify at-risk patients, 2) contacting at-risk patients to schedule BP measurements, 3) monthly written feedback to clinicians about at-risk patients who have yet to complete a BP measurement, and 4) electronic prompts for BP measurements whenever at-risk patients visit the clinic (1, 2).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. A growing number of health systems have implemented secure EHR and are developing databases that permit large-scale queries to support population health management strategies for more effective and accurate identification of patients with hypertension (1-3).

2. A growing number of health systems have implemented secure EHR and are developing databases that permit large-scale quality improvement initiative–designed queries to support population health management strategies for more effective management and control of hypertension (1-3).
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12.3.2. Telehealth Interventions to Improve Hypertension Control

Recommendation for Telehealth Interventions to Improve Hypertension Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. Telehealth strategies can be useful adjuncts to interventions shown to reduce BP for adults with hypertension (1-5).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whelton PK, et al.
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Synopsis

Telehealth strategies, such as telemedicine, digital health (“eHealth”), and use of mobile computing and communication technologies (“mHealth”), are new and innovative tools to facilitate improvements in managing patients with hypertension. mHealth interventions show promise in reducing SBP in patients with hypertension but with large variability in behavioral targets, intervention components, delivery modalities, and patient engagement (5). In addition, there are important implications for the role of social networks, social media, and electronic technology as viable components of weight management and other lifestyle modification and disease management programs (6).

Commonly used telehealth interventions for hypertension management are listed in Online Data Supplement I. Wireless technologies (Online Data Supplement I) allow linking BP devices and other measurement devices to telephone- or Internet-based transmission systems or to Wi-Fi access points available in users’ homes and in communities. Some systems require patients to manually enter data, which is then forwarded to a remote computer or the mobile device of the telehealth provider through a telephone line or the Internet (7). When data are received, they are stored and analyzed, and reports are generated, including variations and averages in BP and other parameters over the recording period.

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text

1. Meta-analyses of RCTs of different telehealth interventions have demonstrated greater SBP and DBP reductions (1, 2, 4) and a larger proportion of patients achieving BP control (2) than those achieved with usual care without telehealth. The effect of various telehealth interventions on BP lowering was significantly greater than that of BP self-monitoring without transmission of BP data, which suggests a possible added value of the teletransmission approach (1, 3). Although mHealth interventions in general showed promise in reducing SBP in patients with hypertension, results were inconsistent (5). It is unclear which combination of telehealth intervention features is most effective, and telehealth has not been demonstrated to be effective as a standalone strategy for improving hypertension control.
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12.4. Improving Quality of Care for Patients With Hypertension

12.4.1. Performance Measures

**Recommendation for Performance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>1. Use of performance measures in combination with other quality improvement strategies at patient-, provider-, and system-based levels is reasonable to facilitate optimal hypertension control (1-3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

Efforts to improve suboptimal medical care include the use of performance measures, which are defined as standardized, validated approaches to assess whether correct healthcare processes are being performed and that desired patient outcomes are being achieved (4). Performance measures are often combined with other quality improvement strategies, such as certification or financial incentives tied to higher-quality care (5). Guidelines help define clinical care standards that can be used to develop performance measures. As guidelines evolve over time to incorporate new evidence, related performance measures may also evolve.

Because identification, treatment, and control of hypertension are suboptimal, performance measures for hypertension control have been developed and recommended for use in quality improvement projects aimed at improving hypertension control and related outcomes in clinical practice (6-8). Because the specific methods used in performance measures can have an impact on their accuracy and ultimate impact (e.g., the method of BP measurement used in the assessment), they should be developed, tested, and implemented according to published standards (9). See Online Data Supplement J for publicly available performance measures to assess the quality of hypertension care (generally using JNC 7 criteria).

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. RCTs on the impact of performance measures on hypertension control are lacking; RCTs of quality improvement protocols have shown improvements in hypertension control (1, 2). Furthermore, a large observational study showed that a systematic approach to hypertension control, including the use of performance measures, was associated with significant improvement in hypertension control compared with historical control groups (3).
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12.4.2. Quality Improvement Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation for Quality Improvement Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>References that support the recommendation are summarized in Online Data Supplements 66 and 67.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COR**  | **LOE** | **Recommendations** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>1. Use of quality improvement strategies at the health system, provider, and patient levels to improve identification and control of hypertension can be effective (1-8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

High-quality BP management is multifactorial and requires the engagement of patients, families, providers, and healthcare delivery systems (9). The difference between patient outcomes achieved with current hypertension treatment methods and patient outcomes thought to be possible with best-practice treatment methods is known as a quality gap, and such gaps are at least partly responsible for the loss of thousands of lives each year (10). This includes expanding patient and healthcare provider awareness, appropriate lifestyle modifications, access to care, evidence-based treatment, a high level of medication adherence, and adequate follow-up (9). Quality improvement strategies or interventions aimed at reducing the quality gap for a group of patients who are representative of those encountered in routine practice have been effective in improving the hypertension care and outcomes across a wide variety of clinic and community settings (1-4, 6, 8, 10).

Hypertension quality improvement strategies, with examples of substrategies that have been demonstrated to reduce BP and improve BP, are provided in Online Data Supplement E. Because the effects of the different quality improvement strategies varied across trials, and most trials included >1 quality improvement strategy, it is not possible to discern which specific quality improvement strategies have the greatest effects. Team-based care (see Section 12.4) and an organized system of regular review, with antihypertensive drug therapy implemented via a stepped-care protocol, had a clinically significant effect on reducing SBP and DBP and improving BP control. The assessed strategies in Online Data Supplement E may be beneficial under some circumstances and in varying combinations (1-5). National initiatives such as Million Hearts Make Control Your Goal Blood Pressure Toolkit and Team Up Pressure Down provide quality improvement tools to support hypertension care in communities and clinical settings (11). For other national and regional initiatives to improve hypertension, see Online Data Supplement G.

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Systematic review and meta-analyses of trials of quality improvement interventions at health system, provider, and patient levels have demonstrated greater SBP and DBP reductions and a larger proportion of patients achieving BP control than those observed with no intervention or usual care. Multicomponent and multilevel strategies at the local community and healthcare delivery system levels have been shown to improve BP control (6, 7).
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**Recommendations for Financial Incentives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-R</td>
<td>Financial incentives paid to providers can be useful in achieving improvements in treatment and management of patient populations with hypertension (1-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>B-NR</td>
<td>Health system financing strategies (e.g., insurance coverage and copayment benefit design) can be useful in facilitating improved medication adherence and BP control in patients with hypertension (4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis**

With the evolution of the U.S. health system to reward “value over volume,” payment systems have focused on financial incentives to improve quality of care. Use of performance measures promulgated by national organizations, governmental payers, and commercial payers have fostered greater attention to control of high BP among healthcare providers and their patients. These performance measures have formed the basis for determining financial incentives for pay for performance initiatives, commercial insurer “pay-for-value” contracts, and the Medicare Shared Savings Programs developed by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Innovation for Accountable Care Organizations. In addition, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has developed The Million Hearts: Cardiovascular Disease Risk Reduction Model, which is an RCT designed to identify and test scalable models of care delivery that reduce CVD risk (5).

Greater attention is being paid to the influence of health insurance coverage and benefit designs focused on reducing patient copayments for antihypertensive medications.

**Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text**

1. Moderate-quality evidence with mixed results suggests that population-based payment incentive programs can play an important role in achieving better BP control (1-3).
2. Reduced copayments for health care, including for medications, and improved outcomes of hypertension care have been identified in several U.S. studies and in single studies in Finland, Israel, and Brazil (4). This is consistent with other evidence on how copayments reduce uptake of care and has implications for policy makers, particularly because the balance of evidence does not suggest that reducing medication copayments leads to an increase in overall healthcare expenditure.
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13. The Plan of Care for Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>C-EO</td>
<td>1. Every adult with hypertension should have a clear, detailed, and current evidence-based plan of care that ensures the achievement of treatment and self-management goals, encourages effective management of comorbid conditions, prompts timely follow-up with the healthcare team, and adheres to CVD GDMT (Table 22).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synopsis
A specific plan of care for hypertension is essential and should reflect understanding of the modifiable and nonmodifiable determinants of health behaviors, including the social determinants of risk and outcomes. A clinician’s sequential flow chart for management of hypertension is presented in Table 21. Detailed evidence-based elements of the plan of care are listed in Table 22. The determinants will vary among demographic subgroups (see Section 10 for additional information).

Recommendation-Specific Supportive Text
1. Studies demonstrate that implementation of a plan of care for hypertension can lead to sustained reduction of BP and attainment of BP targets over several years (1). Meta-analysis of RCTs shows reductions in BP of patients with hypertension and achievement of BP goals at 6 months and 1 year when compared with usual care.
Table 21. Clinician’s Sequential Flow Chart for the Management of Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure office BP accurately</th>
<th>Section 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detect white coat hypertension or masked hypertension by using ABPM and HBPM</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate for secondary hypertension</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify target organ damage</td>
<td>Sections 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce lifestyle interventions</td>
<td>Section 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and discuss treatment goals</td>
<td>Sections 7 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ASCVD risk estimation to guide BP threshold for drug therapy</td>
<td>Section 8.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align treatment options with comorbidities</td>
<td>Section 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account for age, race, ethnicity, sex, and special circumstances in antihypertensive treatment</td>
<td>Sections 10 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate antihypertensive pharmacological therapy</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insure appropriate follow-up</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use team-based care</td>
<td>Section 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect patient to clinician via telehealth</td>
<td>Section 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detect and reverse nonadherence</td>
<td>Section 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detect white coat effect or masked uncontrolled hypertension</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use health information technology for remote monitoring and self-monitoring of BP</td>
<td>Section 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABPM indicates ambulatory blood pressure monitoring; ASCVD, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; BP, blood pressure; and HBPM, home blood pressure monitoring.

13.1. Health Literacy

Communicating alternative behaviors that support self-management of healthy BP in addition to medication adherence is important. This should be done both verbally and in writing. Today, mobile phones have a recording option. For patients with mobile phones, the phone can be used to inform patients and family members of medical instructions after the doctor’s visit as an additional level of communication. Inclusion of a family member or friend that can help interpret and encourage self-management treatment goals is suggested when appropriate. Examples of needed communication for alternative behaviors include a specific regimen relating to physical activity; a specific sodium-reduced meal plan indicating selections for breakfast, lunch, and dinner; lifestyle recommendations relating to sleep, rest, and relaxation; and finally, suggestions and alternatives to environmental barriers, such as barriers that prevent healthy food shopping or limit reliable transportation to and from appointments with health providers and pharmacy visits.

13.2. Access to Health Insurance and Medication Assistance Plans

Health insurance and medication plan assistance for patients is especially important to improving access to and affordability of medical care and BP medications. Learning how the patient financially supports and budgets for his or her medical care and medications offers the opportunity to share additional insight relating to cost reductions, including restructured payment plans. Ideally, this would improve the patient’s compliance with medication adherence and treatment goals.
13.3. Social and Community Services

Health care can be strengthened through local partnerships. Hypertensive patients, particularly patients with lower incomes, have more opportunity to achieve treatment goals with the assistance of strong local partnerships. In patients with low socioeconomic status or patients who are challenged by social situations, integration of social and community services offers complementary reinforcement of clinically identified treatment goals. Social and community services are helpful when explicitly related to medical care. However, additional financial support and financial services are incredibly beneficial to patients, some of whom may choose to skip a doctor’s appointment to pay a residential utility bill.
Table 22. Evidence-Based Elements of the Plan of Care for Patients With Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan of Care</th>
<th>Associated Section(s) of Guideline and Other Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pharmacological and nonpharmacological treatments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication selection (initial and ongoing)</td>
<td>Section 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring for adverse effects and adherance</td>
<td>Sections 8.3.1, 8.3.2, 12.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpharmacological interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weight loss if overweight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moderate alcohol consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of common comorbidities and conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>Section 9.1 (3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced ejection fraction</td>
<td>Section 9.2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preserved ejection fraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>Section 9.6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic kidney disease</td>
<td>Section 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular disease</td>
<td>Section 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral arterial disease</td>
<td>Section 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation</td>
<td>Section 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valvular heart disease</td>
<td>Section 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left ventricular hypertrophy</td>
<td>Section 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoracic aortic disease</td>
<td>Section 9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient and family education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving BP control and self-monitoring</td>
<td>Sections 4.2, 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment and prognosis</td>
<td>Section 8.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual activity and dysfunction</td>
<td>Section 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special patient groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>Section 10.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons</td>
<td>Section 10.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and adolescents</td>
<td>Section 10.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic syndrome</td>
<td>Section 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible secondary causes of hypertension</td>
<td>Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistant hypertension</td>
<td>Section 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with hypertension undergoing surgery</td>
<td>Section 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal transplantation</td>
<td>Section 9.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychosocial factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-specific issues</td>
<td>Section 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally sensitive issues (race and ethnicity)</td>
<td>Section 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource constraints</td>
<td>Section 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinician follow-up, monitoring, and care coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up visits</td>
<td>Sections 8.1.3, 8.3.1, 8.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-based care</td>
<td>Section 12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic health record</td>
<td>Section 12.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health information technology tools for remote and self-monitoring</td>
<td>Section 12.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic and cultural factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health literacy</td>
<td>Section 13.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health insurance and medication assistance plans</td>
<td>Section 13.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>Section 13.1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#### Community services

**Section 13.1.3**

BP indicates blood pressure.
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### 14. Summary of BP Thresholds and Goals for Pharmacological Therapy

Several different BP thresholds and goals for the long-term treatment of hypertension with pharmacological therapy are recommended in this guideline. To provide a quick reference for practicing clinicians, these are summarized for hypertensive patients in general and for those with specific comorbidities in Table 23.
Table 23. BP Thresholds for and Goals of Pharmacological Therapy in Patients With Hypertension
According to Clinical Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Condition(s)</th>
<th>BP Threshold, mm Hg</th>
<th>BP Goal, mm Hg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical CVD or 10-year ASCVD risk ≥10%</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clinical CVD and 10-year ASCVD risk &lt;10%</td>
<td>≥140/90</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons (≥65 years of age; noninstitutionalized, ambulatory, community-living adults)</td>
<td>≥130 (SBP)</td>
<td>&lt;130 (SBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific comorbidities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic kidney disease</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic kidney disease after renal transplantation</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart failure</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable ischemic heart disease</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary stroke prevention</td>
<td>≥140/90</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary stroke prevention (lacunar)</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral arterial disease</td>
<td>≥130/80</td>
<td>&lt;130/80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASCVD indicates atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; BP, blood pressure; CVD, cardiovascular disease; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.

15. Evidence Gaps and Future Directions

In the present guideline, the writing committee was able to call on the large body of literature on BP and hypertension to make strong recommendations across a broad range of medical conditions. Nonetheless, significant gaps in knowledge exist.

Importantly, there are areas where epidemiological and natural history studies suggest that hypertension prevention or earlier treatment of hypertension might substantially improve outcomes, but clinical trials are lacking to provide guidance. The combination of epidemiological data showing a graded relationship between BP and outcomes, particularly above a BP of 120/80 mm Hg, and the results of the SPRINT trial showing benefit of more comprehensive treatment to a target BP of <120/80 mm Hg, suggests that a lifelong BP below that level will substantially lower CVD and CKD incidence. This is especially the case for younger individuals, those with DM, and those with high lifetime CVD risk based on the presence of multiple risk factors, including high BP. If hard, cardiovascular outcome clinical trials remain the sole driver of evidence-based guidelines, then determining the full benefit of earlier intervention may not be possible because of the cost and length of time needed for intervention. Outcomes may be different if antihypertensive treatment is initiated earlier in the natural history of CVD. DM may provide a population in whom to test this hypothesis. Composite outcomes that include both prevention of events and surrogates, such as prevention of decline in renal function or amelioration of measures of subclinical atherosclerosis, vascular stiffness, or LV structure and function, should be considered. Otherwise, these younger individuals may be undertreated and experience mortality or CVD events before being old enough to enter hard outcome-driven trials such as SPRINT. Replication of SPRINT, especially in younger patients with DM and in countries where nonischemic stroke is the predominant cause of CVD, is highly desirable. Likewise, implementation studies that demonstrate the practicality of SPRINT-like interventions in resource-constrained practice settings are needed.

More information is urgently needed relating hypertensive target organ damage to CVD risk and outcomes. Should the identification of target organ damage and hypertensive heart disease prompt more aggressive BP management (i.e., increase the rationale for instituting pharmacological therapy earlier or more intensively? Should all patients with hypertension be screened with echocardiogram for LVH? Should...
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echocardiography be repeated once LVH is noted? Is it important to document LVH regression? At present, there are no RCT data to inform guideline recommendations.

ABPM and HBPM provide enhanced ability to both diagnose hypertension and monitor treatment. Although evidence is sufficient to recommend incorporating these tools into clinical practice, more knowledge about them is required. Areas of inquiry include closer mapping of the relationship of outcomes to ambulatory and home BP measurements, so that definitions of hypertension and hypertension severity based on these measures can be developed, including the importance of masked hypertension, white coat hypertension, and nocturnal hypertension. Reproducibility of ambulatory and home BPs must be studied, and cohorts should include a broader range of ethnicities. Trials with entry criteria and treatment goals based on ambulatory or home BP measures should be conducted, including studies of masked and white coat hypertension. The practicality and cost of incorporating ABPM into EHR and routine care should be assessed. The existence of these techniques should not hamper efforts to investigate ways to improve accuracy in the measurement of clinic BP. Further research on improving accuracy of office BP measurements, including number of measurements, training of personnel measuring BP, and device comparisons, will help standardize care and thus improve outcomes. Technology for measurement of BP continues to evolve with the emergence of cuffless devices and other strategies that provide the opportunity for continuous noninvasive assessment of BP. The accuracy, cost, and usefulness of these new technologies will need to be assessed.

The contemporary healthcare environment is dramatically different from the era in which awareness of hypertension as a risk factor and benefits of treatment were discovered. With the advent of the EHR, complex calculations of CVD risk and renal function can be incorporated into routine reports, and many new avenues to support intervention strategies are available to clinicians. Optimizing these approaches will require continued focused research. Recognition that simply applying what we know about BP control would have a large impact on population health, observations on inefficiencies and excessive cost in the U.S. healthcare system, and the growth of information technology have led to promising studies of ways to improve and monitor hypertension care. Results of this research are reflected in this guideline, but further work is required. Examples for study include the effectiveness of multidisciplinary healthcare teams to achieve BP treatment goals at lower cost, social media to maintain contact with patients, information technology to monitor outcomes and decrease practice variability, and incentives to providers to achieve better outcomes for patients. A key goal of these efforts should be to demonstrate reduction in healthcare disparities across ethnicity, sex, social and economic class, and age barriers.

More research on the prevention of the development of hypertension and the benefit of lifetime low BP should be conducted. In this regard, elucidation of genetic expression, epigenetic effects, transcriptomics, and proteomics that link genotypes with longitudinal databases may add considerable knowledge about beneficial outcomes of lifelong lower BP, determinants of rise in BP over time, and identification of new treatment targets through understanding the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms. Research should be directed toward the development of therapies that directly counteract the mechanisms accounting for the development of hypertension and disease progression. Additional research aimed at development of practical approaches to implementation of clinical and population-based strategies to prevent obesity, increase physical fitness, and control excess salt and sugar intake could have significant public health impact. In addition, there are minimal, if any, data on whether treatment of hypertension during pregnancy mitigates risk; thus, there is a need for further research in this area, considering both proximate (during the pregnancy and postpartum period) and distant (CVD prevention) outcomes (1).

In the very old, frailty and higher risk of medication side effects complicate treatment. Additional knowledge of the effects of antihypertensive treatment for patients with dementia and patients who reside in long-term-care facility settings is needed. The best approach to older persons who have supine hypertension but postural hypotension needs to be clarified.

Further research related to shared decision-making with patients and their families is needed. Examples include areas where evidence does not clearly identify one treatment or goal as substantially better
than another, where improved patient knowledge (or improved provider knowledge of the patient’s circumstances) might improve compliance, where reliance on patient collaboration improves achievement of outcomes (e.g., HBPM, use of social media), and where there are competing health concerns (e.g., older individuals with frailty).

Finally, clinical guidelines are increasingly required to manage the large body of accumulated knowledge related to diagnosis and management of high BP. However, guidelines often cause controversy and confusion when competing recommendations are made by different “expert” groups or when changes in definitions, treatments, or treatment goals are introduced. Now may be the time to begin the investigation of the impact of guidelines on clinical practice, costs, and patient outcomes, as well as ways to facilitate communication and collaboration between different guideline-developing organizations. This document is, as its name implies, a guide. In managing patients, the responsible clinician’s judgment remains paramount.
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Search Terms:

An extensive evidence review, which included literature derived from research involving human subjects, published in English, and indexed in MEDLINE (through PubMed), EMBASE, the Cochrane Library, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and other selected databases relevant to this guideline, was conducted between February and August 2015. Key search words included but were not limited to the following: adherence; aerobic; alcohol intake; ambulatory care; antihypertensive: agents, drug, medication, therapy; beta adrenergic blockers; blood pressure: arterial, control, determination, devises, goal, high, improve, measurement, monitoring, ambulatory; calcium channel blockers; diet; diuretic agent; drug therapy; heart failure: diastolic, systolic; hypertension: white coat, masked, ambulatory, isolated ambulatory, isolated clinic, diagnosis, reverse white coat, prevention, therapy, treatment, control; intervention; lifestyle: measures, modification; office visits; patient outcome; performance measures; physical activity; potassium intake; protein intake; renin inhibitor; risk reduction: behavior, counseling; screening; sphygmomanometers; spironolactone; therapy; treatment: adherence, compliance, efficacy, outcome, protocol, regimen; weight. Additional relevant studies published through June 2016, during the guideline writing process, were also considered by the writing committee, and added to the evidence tables when appropriate.
Abbreviations:

1º, primary; 2º, secondary; AASK, African American Study of Kidney Disease and Hypertension; ABI, ankle-brachial index; ABCD, Appropriate Blood Pressure Control in Diabetes; ABPM, ambulatory blood pressure monitoring; ACCESS, Acute Candesartan Cilexetil Evaluation in Stroke Survivors; ACCOMPLISH, Avoiding Cardiovascular Events Through Combination Therapy in Patients Living With Systolic Hypertension; ACCORD, Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes; ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme; ACEI, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; ADVANCE, Action in Diabetes and Vascular Disease; AF, atrial fibrillation; AFL, atrial flutter; AHR, adjusted hazard ratio; AIPRD, Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibition in Progressive Renal Disease; ALLHAT, Antihypertensive Lipid Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial; AMI, acute myocardial infarction; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; ARIC, Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities; ASCOT, Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial; BB, beta blocker; BMI, body mass index; BP, blood pressure; BPLTTC, Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trials’ Collaboration; bpm, beats per minute; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CAD, coronary artery disease; CATIS, China Antihypertensive Trial in Acute Ischemic Stroke; CCB, calcium-channel blocker; CCU, coronary care unit; CHD, coronary heart disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; CHHIPS, Controlling Hypertension and Hypotension Immediately Post-Stroke; CI, confidence interval; CKD, chronic kidney disease; COMFORT, Combination Pill of Losartan Potassium and Hydrochlorothiazide for Improvement of Mediation Compliance Trial; COSSACS, the Continue or Stop Post-Stroke Antihypertensives Collaborative Study; CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; Cr, creatinine; CrCl, creatinine clearance; CRP, C-reactive protein; CR/XL, metoprolol controlled release/extended release; CT, computed tomography; CV, cardiovascular; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DASH, Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; DM, diabetes mellitus; DM-1, diabetes mellitus type-1; DM-2, diabetes mellitus type-2; ECG, electrocardiogram; ED, emergency department; EF, ejection fraction; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESKD, end-stage kidney disease; ESRD, end-stage renal disease; FC, functional class; FDC, fixed dose combination; FEVER, Felodipine Event Reduction; GITs, gastrointestinal therapeutic system; GFR, glomerular filtration rate; HBPM, home blood pressure monitoring; HCTZ, hydrochlorothiazide; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HEDIS, Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set; HF, heart failure; HFNEF, reduced ejection fraction; HFP EF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; HR, hazard ratio; HTN, hypertension; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; ICH, intracerebral hemorrhage; IDACO, International Database of Ambulatory Blood Pressure in relation to Cardiovascular Outcome; IHD, ischemic heart disease; IMT, intimal media thickness; INDANA, Individual Data Analysis of Antihypertensive Drug Intervention trials; INTERACT2, the second intensive Blood Pressure Reduction in Acute Cerebral Hemorrhage Trial; INVEST, International Verapamil-Trandolapril Study; INWEST, the Intravenous Nimodipine West European Stroke Trial; IQI, interquartile interval; IQR, interquartile range; IRR, incident rate ratio; ISDN, isosorbide dinitrate; IV, intravenous; JNC-7, 7th Report of the Joint National Committee; KPNC, Kaiser Permanente Northern California; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; LGSAS, low-gradient severe aortic stenosis; LIFE, Losartan Intervention For Endpoint Reduction in Hypertension; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVH, left ventricular hypertrophy; LVMi, left ventricular mass index; MACCE, major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events; MACE, major adverse cardiac events; MAP, mean arterial pressure; MD, mean difference; MDPIT, Multicenter Diltiazem Postinfarction Research Group; MDRD, Modification of Diet in Renal Disease; MERIT, Metoprolol CR/XL Randomised Intervention Trial; MESA, Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis; MH, masked hypertension; MI, myocardial infarction; MOSES, The Morbidity and Mortality After Stroke, Eprosartan Compared With Nitrendipine for Secondary Prevention; MPR, medication possession ratio; MRFIT, Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; N/A, not available; NCQA, National Committee for Quality Assurance; NEMESIS, North East Melbourne Stroke Incidence Study; NHANES, National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys; NIH, National Institute of Health; NNT, number needed to treat; NR, not relative;
NS, nonsignificant; NSAID, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; NUTRICODE, Nutrition and Chronic Diseases Expert Group; NYHA, New York Heart Association; ONTARGET, Ongoing Telmisartan Alone and in Combination With Ramipril Global Endpoint Trial; OR, odds ratio; OSA, obstructive sleep apnea; P4P, pay for performance; PA, pulmonary artery; PAD, peripheral artery disease; PAMELA, Pressione Arteriose Monitorate E Loro Associazioni; PCP, primary care provider; periop, perioperative; PREDIMED, Prevention with a Mediterranean Diet; PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; PROBE, Prospective, randomized, open, blinded endpoint; PROGRESS, The perindopril protection against recurrent stroke study; PRONTO, Prospective Optical Coherence Tomography Imaging of Patients with endovascular Age-Related Macular Degeneration Treated with Intraocular Ranibizumab; pt, patient; PTCA, percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; PVD, peripheral vascular disease; QI, quality improvement; RAAS, renin angiotensin aldosterone system; RCT, randomized controlled trial; REIN-2, Blood Pressure Control for Renoprotection in Patients with Non-diabetic Renal Disease; RH, relative hazard; ROADMAP, Randomized Olmesartan and Diabetes Microalbuminuria Prevention; RR, relative risk; Rx, medical prescription; SAE, severe adverse event; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SCOPE-AS, Symptomatic Cardiac Obstruction – Pilot Study of Enalapril in Aortic Stenosis; SD, standard deviation; SE, stress echocardiography; SH, sustained hypertension; SHEP, Summer Health Enrichment; SITS-ISTR, Safe Implementation of Thrombolysis in Stroke-International Stroke Thrombolysis Register; SKIPOGH, Swiss Kidney Project on Genes in Hypertension; SPC, single pill combination; SPRINT, Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial; Syst-Eur, Systolic Hypertension in Europe; t-PA, tissue plasminogen activator; TIA, transient ischemic attack; TOHP, Trials of Hypertension Prevention; TOMHS, Treatment of Mild Hypertension Study; TONE, Trial of Nonpharmacologic Intervention in the Elderly; TOPCAT, Treatment of Preserved Cardiac Function Heart Failure With Aldosterone Antagonist; TR, target range; UA, unstable angina; U.K., United Kingdom; UKPDS, United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study; U.S., United States; VA, Veterans Affairs; VA Coop; Veterans Administration Cooperative Study Group on Antihypertensive Agents; VA NEPHRON-D, Veterans Affairs Nephropathy in Diabetes; VALIANT, Valsartan in Acute Myocardial Infarction Trial; VALUE, Valsartan Antihypertensive Long-term Use Evaluation; WCH, white coat hypertension; and WPW; Wolff-Parkinson-White syndrome.
## Data Supplement 1. Coexistence of Hypertension and Related Chronic Conditions (Section 2.4)

| Study Acronym; Author; Year Published | Study Type/Design; Study Size (N) | Patient Population | Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR RR; & 95% CI) | Summary/Conclusion Comment(s) |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Wilson PW, et al., 1999 (1) 10335688 | Study type: Nonrandomized        | **Inclusion criteria:** Men and women 18–74 y and free of CHD at baseline, from the Framingham Offspring Study  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A | **1st endpoint:** Total CHD (first occurrence of angina, UA, MI, and coronary death), Hard CHD (first MI and coronary death)  
**Results:** Presence of ≥3 risk factors was associated with a 2.39 times greater risk of CHD in men (95% CI: 1.56–3.36; p<0.001) and a 5.90 increased risk of CHD in women (95% CI: 2.54–13.73; p<0.001) | • CVD risk factors infrequently occur in isolation (only 28%–30% of the time); presence of ≥3 risk factors occurred 17% of the time in both men and women; presence of ≥3 risk factors associated with high risk of CHD and coronary death (attributable risk of 20% in men and 48% in women) |
| Berry JD, et al., 2012 (2) 22276822 | Study type: Nonrandomized         | **Inclusion criteria:** Meta-analysis of 18 cohort studies  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A | **1st endpoint:** Fatal CHD, nonfatal MI, fatal or nonfatal stroke  
**Results:** Participants with optimal RF profile (total cholesterol <180 mg/dL, untreated BP <120 mm Hg systolic, and <80 mm Hg diastolic, non diabetic, nonsmoker) compared to participants with ≥2 risk factors had lower risk of CVD through the age of 80 y (4.7% vs. 29.6% for men, 6.4% vs. 20.5% for women), lower lifetime risk of fatal heart disease and nonfatal MI (3.6% vs. 37.5% for men, <1% vs. 18.3% for women), and lower lifetime risk of fatal or nonfatal stroke (2.3% vs. 8.3% for men, 5.3% vs. 10.7% for women) | • Increased burden of 80 risk factors associated with higher lifetime risk of CVD |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; and CI; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lewington S, et al., 2002 **12493255** | **Study type:** Meta-analysis of 61 observational cohort studies | **Inclusion criteria:** Men and women with no history of previous CVD and record of key study variables. **Exclusion criteria:** Prior CVD | **1° endpoint:** Cause-specific mortality  
**Results:** 958,074 persons followed for a mean of 12 y to death (12.7 million person-y at risk. Number of deaths attributed to:  
-Stroke: 11960  
-IHD: 34,283  
-Other vascular:10092  
-Non-vascular: 60797  
Above a SBP ≥115 mm Hg and DBP ≥75 mm Hg, there was a progressive rise in vascular death with progressively high BP with no evidence of a J-curve (approximately doubling of stroke and IHD mortality for a 20 mm Hg higher level of SBP or 10 mm Hg higher level of DBP, in those 40–69 y). With progressively higher age, the BP-related proportional risk of vascular mortality was somewhat reduced but the corresponding absolute risk was much higher. | • In adults aged 40–89 y, usual BP is strongly related to vascular (and overall) mortality, without evidence of a threshold down to at least an SBP/DBP of 115/75 mm Hg. |
| Rapsomaniki E, et al., 2014 **24881994** | **Study type:** Observational cohort study  
**Size:** 1.25 million patients, in 225 primary care practices in the UK, followed for a median of 5.2 y using electronic medical records. | **Inclusion criteria:** Men and women ≥30 y, with no previous diagnosis of CVD, who had been registered at their practices for ≥1 year. **Exclusion criteria:** N/A | **1° endpoint:** 12 acute and chronic CVD outcomes  
**Results:** 83,098 initial CVD events recorded. Within each of 3 age groups (30–59, 60–79, and ≥80 y), the lowest risk for CVD was in those with a SBP 90–114 mm Hg and DBP 60–74 mm Hg. There was a direct relationship between level of BP and most CVD outcomes, with no evidence of J-curve, with the strongest relationship for SBP and stroke and weakest for abdominal aneurysm. | • Despite modern treatments, the lifetime burden of BP-related CVD was substantial. |
| Wilson PW, et al., 1999 (1) **10335688** | **Study type:** Nonrandomized | **Inclusion criteria:** Men and women 18–74 y and free of CHD at baseline, from the Framingham Offspring Study | **1° endpoint:** Total CHD (first occurrence of angina, UA, MI, and coronary death), Hard CHD (first MI and coronary death) | • CVD risk factors infrequently occur in isolation (only 28%–30% of the time) |
### Guo X, et al., 2013 (3) 23634212

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies  
**Size:** 870,678 pts  
**Inclusion criteria:** Studies reporting adjusted risk for CVD or mortality with pre-HTN  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A  
**1° endpoint:** CVD and all-cause mortality  
**Results:** SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg compared to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- All-cause mortality: RR: 0.91; 95% CI: 0.81–1.02  
- CVD mortality: RR: 1.10 (95% CI: 0.92, 1.30)  
- MI RR: 1.43; 95% CI: 1.10–1.86  
- Stroke: RR: 1.35; 95% CI: 1.10–1.66  

SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg compared to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- CVD RR: 1.24; 95% CI: 1.32–1.62  
- MI RR: 1.43; 95% CI: 1.10–1.86  
- Stroke RR: 1.35; 95% CI: 1.10–1.66  

Compared to pts with SBP/DBP <120/80 mm Hg, the RR for CVD, MI and stroke were larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg vs. SBP/DBP of 130–139/85–89 mm Hg.

### Guo X, et al., 2013 (4) 24234576

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies  
**Size:** 1,010,858 pts  
**Inclusion criteria:** Studies reporting adjusted risk for fatal and nonfatal stroke, CHD, MI and total CVD events with pre-HTN, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A  
**1° endpoint:** Fatal and nonfatal stroke, CHD, MI and total CVD events  
**Results:** SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg compared to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- CVD RR: 1.24; 95% CI: 1.10–1.39  
- MI RR: 1.43; 95% CI: 1.10–1.86  
- Stroke RR: 1.35; 95% CI: 1.10–1.66  

SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg compared to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- CVD RR: 1.56; 95% CI: 1.36–1.78  
- MI RR: 1.99; 95% CI: 1.59–2.50  
- Stroke RR: 1.95; 95% CI: 1.69–2.24  

Compared to pts with SBP/DBP<120/80 mm Hg, the RR for CVD, MI and stroke were larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 130–139/85–89 mm Hg vs. SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg.

### Huang Y, et al., 2013 (5) 23915102

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies  
**Size:** 468,561 pts from 18 prospective cohort studies  
**Inclusion criteria:** Studies reporting risk for CVD, CHD and stroke, with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A  
**1° endpoint:** CVD, CHD, and stroke  
**Results:** Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- CVD RR: 1.46; 95% CI: 1.32–1.62  
- MI RR: 1.60; 95% CI: 1.51–1.69

Compared to pts with SBP/DBP <120/80 mm Hg, the RR for CVD was larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 130–139/85–89 mm Hg vs.
| Huang Y, et al., 2014 (6) 24074825 | **Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies  
**Size:** 1,003,793 pts were derived from 6 prospective cohort studies | **Inclusion criteria:** Studies reporting adjusted risk for ESRD with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
Adults ≥18 y BP evaluated at baseline ≥ 1 y follow-up for ESRD  
Results reported with adjustment  
**Exclusion criteria:** 1) enrollment depended on having a condition or risk factor, 2) the study reported only age- and sex-adjusted RRs, and 3) data were derived from the same cohort or from a 2° analysis | **1° endpoint:** ESRD  
**Results:** Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- ESRD RR: 1.44; 95% CI: 1.19–1.74  
Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- ESRD RR: 2.02; 95% CI: 1.70–2.40;  
- p value comparing these risk ratios=0.01 | **SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg**  
- Compared to pts with SBP/DBP <120/80 mm Hg, the RR for ESRD was larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 120–139/85–89 mm Hg vs. SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg |

| Huang Y, et al., 2013 (7) 24623843 | **Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies  
**Size:** 762,393 pts from 19 prospective cohort studies | **Inclusion criteria:** Studies reporting adjusted risk for stroke with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
Adults ≥18 y  
BP evaluated at baseline  
≥1 y follow-up for stroke  
Results reported with adjustment  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Enrollment depended on having a specific risk factor condition (e.g., DM or other baseline chronic diseases)  
- The RR was unadjusted or only adjusted for age and sex  
- Data were derived from the same cohort or meta-analysis of other cohort studies. | **1° endpoint:** Stroke  
**Results:** Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- Stroke: RR: 1.44; 95% CI: 1.27–1.63  
Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
- Stroke: RR: 1.95; 95% CI: 1.73–2.21  
- p value comparing these risk ratios ≤0.001 | **SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg**  
- Compared to pts with SBP/DBP <120/80 mm Hg, the RR for stroke was larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 120–139/85–89 mm Hg vs. SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Huang Y, et al., 2014 (8)        | 1,129,098 pts from 20 prospective cohort studies | - Studies reporting adjusted risk for all-cause/CVD mortality with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
  - Adults ≥18 y  
  - BP evaluated at baseline  
  - ≥2 y follow-up for mortality  
  - Results reported with adjustment |  All-cause and CVD mortality             | Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
  - All-cause mortality RR: 0.96; 95% CI: 0.85–1.08  
  - CVD mortality RR: 1.08; 95% CI: 0.98–1.18  
  Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
  - All-cause mortality RR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.95–1.12  
  - CVD mortality RR: 1.28; 95% CI: 1.16–1.41  
  p value comparing these risk ratios:  
  - All-cause mortality p=0.33  
  - CVD mortality p=0.01 | - Enrollment depended on having a specific risk factor condition (e.g., DM or other baseline chronic diseases)  
  - The RR was unadjusted or only adjusted for age and sex  
  - Data were derived from the same cohort or meta-analysis of other cohort studies. |
| Huang Y, et al., 2015 (9)        | 591,664 pts from 17 prospective cohort studies | - Studies reporting adjusted risk for CHD with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
  - Adults ≥18 y  
  - BP evaluated at baseline  
  - Results reported with adjustment | CHD                                           | Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
  - CHD RR: 1.27; 95% CI: 1.07–1.50  
  Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
  - CHD RR: 1.58; 95% CI: 1.24–2.02  
  p value comparing these RR: 0.15 | - Enrollment depended on having a specific risk factor condition (e.g., DM or other baseline chronic diseases)  
  - The RR was unadjusted or only adjusted for age and sex  
  - Data were derived from the same cohort or meta-analysis of other cohort studies. |
| Lee M, et al., 2011 (10)         | 21956722              | - Studies reporting adjusted risk for stroke with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg  
  - Adults ≥18 y | Incident stroke                      | Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:  
  - Stroke RR: 1.22; 95% CI: 0.95–1.57 | - Enrollment depended on having a specific risk factor condition (e.g., DM or other baseline chronic diseases)  
  - The RR was unadjusted or only adjusted for age and sex  
  - Data were derived from the same cohort or meta-analysis of other cohort studies. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies</td>
<td>Studies reporting adjusted risk for CHD with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg</td>
<td>Cross-sectional, case-control or retrospective cohort; The RR was unadjusted or only adjusted for age and sex; 95% CI not reported; Data were derived from the same cohort or meta-analysis of other cohort studies; Results from trial of antihypertensive medication</td>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to &lt;120/80 mm Hg: Stroke RR: 1.79; 95% CI: 1.49–2.16</td>
<td>SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg compared to pts with SBP/DBP &lt;120/80 mm Hg, the RR for CHD was larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 130–139/85–89 mm Hg vs. SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg. No difference in all-cause mortality was present across BP levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies</td>
<td>Prospective cohort studies reporting risk for outcomes with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg; Pts free of CVD at baseline; Follow-up ≥5 y; Adjusted results reported; 95% CI was reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>CVD, CVD mortality, all-cause mortality</td>
<td>Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to &lt;120/80 mm Hg: CVD RR: 1.41; 95% CI: 1.25–1.59 CVD mortality RR: 1.18; 95% CI: 0.98–1.42 All-cause mortality RR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.88–1.13 Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to &lt;120/80 mm Hg: CVD RR: 1.74; 95% CI: 1.51–2.01 CVD mortality RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.13–1.58 All-cause mortality RR: 1.02; 95% CI: 0.97–1.08</td>
<td>Compared to pts with SBP/DBP&lt;120/80 mm Hg, RR for CVD and CVD mortality were larger for pts with SBP/DBP of 130–139/85–89 mm Hg vs. SBP/DBP of 120–129/80–84 mm Hg. No difference in all-cause mortality was present across BP levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: 2° analysis of an RCT</td>
<td>Men and women ≥55 y with HTN and 1 additional CHD risk factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Achieving SBP/DBP&lt;140/90 mm Hg, use of ≥2 drug classes</td>
<td>BP control (&lt;140/90 mm Hg) can be achieved in most pts ≥2 or more drug classes are often required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Size:** 518,520 pts from 18 prospective cohort studies

- **BP evaluated at baseline**
- **Results reported with adjustment**

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Cross-sectional, case-control or retrospective cohort
- The RR was unadjusted or only adjusted for age and sex
- 95% CI not reported
- Data were derived from the same cohort or meta-analysis of other cohort studies
- Results from trial of antihypertensive medication

Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:
- Stroke RR: 1.79; 95% CI: 1.49–2.16

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies

**Size:** 934,106 pts from 18 prospective cohort studies

- **Studies reporting adjusted risk for CHD with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg, 120–129/80–84 mm Hg or 130–139/85–89 mm Hg**
- **BP evaluated at baseline**
- **95% CI was reported**

**Exclusion criteria:** N/A

**1° endpoint:** CHD

**Results:** Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:
- CHD RR: 1.16; 95% CI: 0.96–1.42
  Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:
  - CHD RR: 1.53; 95% CI: 1.19–1.97

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of nonrandomized studies

**Size:** 396,200 pts from 13 prospective cohort studies

- **Prospective cohort studies reporting risk for outcomes with 120–139/80–89 mm Hg**
- **Pts free of CVD at baseline,**
- **Follow-up ≥5 y**
- **Adjusted results reported**
- **95% CI was reported**

**Exclusion criteria:** N/A

**1° endpoint:** CVD, CVD mortality, all-cause mortality

**Results:** Comparing SBP/DBP 120–129/80–84 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:
- CVD RR: 1.41; 95% CI: 1.25–1.59
- CVD mortality RR: 1.18; 95% CI: 0.98–1.42
- All-cause mortality RR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.88–1.13
  Comparing SBP/DBP 130–139/85–89 mm Hg to <120/80 mm Hg:
  - CVD RR: 1.74; 95% CI: 1.51–2.01
  - CVD mortality RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.13–1.58
  - All-cause mortality RR: 1.02; 95% CI: 0.97–1.08

**Study type:** 2° analysis of an RCT

**Size:** 33,357 pts in the ALLHAT

- **Men and women ≥55 y with HTN and 1 additional CHD risk factor**
- **Pts randomized to doxazosin.**

**1° endpoint:** Achieving SBP/DBP<140/90 mm Hg, use of ≥2 drug classes

- **BP control (<140/90 mm Hg) can be achieved in most pts ≥2 or more drug classes are often required.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Endpoint 1</th>
<th>Results 1</th>
<th>Results 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalhof B, et al., 2002 (14)</td>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td>Size: 9,193 pts 55–80 y in the Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in HTN</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Men and women with ECG signs of LVH. Trough sitting SBP 160–200 mm Hg or DBP 95–115 mm Hg after 1–2 wk of placebo.</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: 2° HTN, MI/stroke within 6 mo, angina, HF or LVEF &lt;40%.</td>
<td>Endpoint 1: Following a titration schedule to reach a target SBP/DBP&lt;140/90 mm Hg</td>
<td>Results: SBP/DBP control was achieved by 66% at 5 y of follow-up and 63% of pts were on ≥2 drug classes.</td>
<td>Pts with a mean SBP/DBP of 160–200/95–115 mm Hg will need ≥2 classes of antihypertensive medication to achieve SBP/DBP &lt;140/90 mm Hg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald DS, et al., 2009 (15)</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of RCT</td>
<td>Size: 10,968 pts in 42 trials of factorial designs comparing monotherapy, combination therapy and placebo.</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Randomized placebo-controlled trials comparing 2 of 4 (thiazides, BB s, ACEIs, and CCB) drug classes.</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Trials &lt;2 wk duration, no placebo group, nonrandomized order of treatment.</td>
<td>Endpoint 1: Mean BP reduction.</td>
<td>Results: Combination therapy vs. monotherapy produced larger SBP reductions:</td>
<td>Combination therapy results in substantially larger SBP and DBP reductions compared with monotherapy, even after dose titration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewington S, et al., 2002 (16)</td>
<td>Aim: To describe the age-specific relevance of BP to cause-specific mortality</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of cohort studies</td>
<td>Size: 61 prospective studies with 12.7 million person-y of observation, 56,000 vascular deaths in 40–89 y.</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Collaboration was sought from the investigators of all prospective observational studies in which data on BP, blood cholesterol, date of birth (or age), and sex had been recorded at a baseline screening visit, and in which cause and date of death (or age at death) had been routinely sought for all screens during more than 5,000 person-y of follow-up (see appendix A). Relevant studies were identified through computer searches of Medline and Embase, by hand-searches of meeting abstracts, and by extensive discussions with investigators.</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: To minimize the effects of reverse causality (whereby...</td>
<td>1° endpoint:</td>
<td>Throughout middle and old age, usual BP is strongly and directly related to vascular (and overall) mortality, without any evidence of a threshold down to at least 115/75 mm Hg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
established disease could change the usual BP), studies were excluded if they had selected pts on the basis of a positive history of stroke or heart disease, and individuals from contributing studies were excluded from the present analyses if they had such a history recorded at baseline.

80–89: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.64–0.70)

- HRs for other vascular mortality for a 20 mm Hg lower SBP by age-group
  - 40–49: 0.43 (95% CI: 0.38–0.48)
  - 50–59: 0.50 (95% CI: 0.47–0.54)
  - 60–69: 0.53 (95% CI: 0.51–0.56)
  - 70–79: 0.64 (95% CI: 0.61–0.67)
  - 80–89: 0.70 (95% CI: 0.65–0.75)

- Similar results for DBP also in figure 1.
- Similar results for men and women separately for stroke, figure 3, and IHD, figure 5.

Ettehad D, et al., 2016 (17) 26724178

**Aim:** This systematic review and meta-analysis aims to combine data from all published large-scale BP-lowering trials to quantify the effects of BP reduction on CV outcomes and death across various baseline BP levels, major comorbidities, and different pharmacological interventions.

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of RCTs

**Size:** 123 studies with 613,815 pts

**Inclusion criteria:**
- RCTs of BP-lowering treatment that included a minimum of 1,000 pt-y of follow-up in each study arm. No trials were excluded because of presence of baseline comorbidities, and trials of antihypertensive drugs for indications other than HTN were eligible.
- Eligible studies fell into 3 categories: 1st, random allocation of pts to a BP-lowering drug or placebo; 2nd, random allocation of pts to different BP-lowering drugs; and third, random allocation of pts to different BP-lowering targets.

**Exclusion criteria:**
- <1,000 pt y of follow-up in each treatment group.
- Intervention: BP-lowering meds
- Comparator: Placebo, active comparator or less intensive treatment

**1° endpoint:**
- CVD.
- Major CVD events, CHD, stroke, HF, renal failure, and all-cause mortality.
- Standardized RR for 10 mm Hg difference in SBP
  - CVD RR: 0.80 (95% CI: 0.77–0.83)

**Other endpoints:**
- CHD RR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.78–0.88)
- Stroke RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.68–0.77)
- HF RR: 0.72 (95% CI: 0.67–0.78)
- Total deaths RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.84–0.91)

**Other results:**
- Benefit for CVD and other endpoints not different by baseline SBP, including <130 mm Hg
  - CVD: 0.63; 95% CI: 0.50–0.80; p=0.22
  - CHD: 0.55; 95% CI: 0.42–0.72; p=0.93
  - Stroke: 0.65; 95% CI: 0.27–1.57; p=0.38
  - HF: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.41–1.70; p=0.27
  - Total deaths: 0.53; 95% CI: 0.37–0.76; p=0.79
- More precision around estimates of benefits in SBP 130–139 at baseline, fig 4 in paper
- Results similar in trials of people with and without CVD at baseline figure 5
- CVD+ 0.77 (95% CI: 0.71–0.81)

- BP-lowering significantly reduces vascular risk across various baseline BP levels and comorbidities. Our results provide strong support for lowering BP to SBP<130 mm Hg and providing BP-lowering treatment to individuals with a history of CVD, CHD, stroke, DM, HF, and CKD.
- In stratified analyses, we saw no strong evidence that proportional effects were diminished in trials that included people with lower baseline SBP (<130 mm Hg), and major CV events were clearly reduced in high-risk pts with various baseline comorbidities. Both of these major findings—the efficacy of BP-lowering below 130 mm Hg and the similar proportional effects in high risk populations—are consistent with and extend the findings of the SPRINT trial.

**Limitations:**
### Law MR, et al., 2009 (18) 19454737

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of use of BP-lowering drugs in prevention of CVD from 147 randomized trials  
**Size:** Of 147 randomized trials of 464,000 pts, 37 trials of BBs in CAD included 38,892 pts, and 37 trials of other antihypertensive drugs in CAD included 85,395 pts  

**Inclusion criteria:** The database search used Medline (1966 to Dec. 2007) to identify randomized trials of BP-lowering drugs in which CAD events or strokes were recorded. The search also included the Cochrane Collaboration and Web of Science databases and the citations in trials and previous meta-analyses and review articles.  
**Exclusion criteria:** Trials were excluded if there were <5 CAD events and strokes or if treatment duration was <6 mo.  

**1° endpoint:** CAD events; stroke  

**Results:** In 37 trials of pts with a history of CAD, BB reduced CAD events 29% (95% CI: 22%–34%). In 27 trials in which BBs were used after acute MI, BB reduced CAD events 31% (95% CI: 24%–38%), and in 11 trials in which BB were used after long-term CAD, BB insignificantly reduced CAD events 13%. In 7 trials, BB reduced stroke 17% (95% CI: 1%–30%). CAD events were reduced 14% (95% CI: 2%–25%) in 11 trials of thiazide diuretics, 17% (95% CI: 11%–22%) in 21 trials of ACEIs, insignificantly reduced CAD events 13%. In 7 trials, BB reduced stroke 17% (95% CI: 1%–30%).  

**Interpretation:** Lowering of BP into what has been regarded the normotensive range should therefore be routinely considered for the prevention of CVD among those deemed to be of sufficient absolute risk.

### Sundstrom J, et al., 2015 (19) 25531552

**Aim:** To investigate whether pharmacologic BP reduction prevents CV events and deaths in pts with grade 1 HTN.  

**Inclusion criteria:** RCTs of at least 1 y duration; pts ≥18 y, at least 80% of whom had grade 1 HTN and no previous CVD (MI, angina pectoris, CABG, PCI, stroke, TIA, carotid surgery, peripheral arterial)  

**1° endpoint:** Total major CV events, comprising stroke (nonfatal stroke or death from cerebrovascular disease), coronary events (nonfatal MI or death from CHD, including sudden death), HF (causing death or resulting in lack of individual pt data, which would have allowed a more reliable assessment of treatment effects in different pt groups.  

**Interpretation:** BP-lowering therapy is likely to prevent stroke and death in pts with uncomplicated grade 1 HTN.
Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs

Size: 10 RTCs with 15,266 pts

Inclusion criteria: Intentional BP-lowering comparing active drug treatment with placebo, or less active treatment (intentional BP-lowering trials), or comparison of an active drug with placebo over baseline antihypertensive treatment, resulting in a BP difference of at least 2 mm Hg in either SBP or DBP (nonintentional BP-lowering trials); enrolling of hypertensive individuals only or a high proportion (at least 40%) of them.

Exclusion criteria: N/A

1º endpoint:
- As some trials were done on low-risk pts, others on higher risk pts, no evaluation of absolute risk-reduction was made. However, a 2º analysis was done including trials or trial subgroups with mean baseline SBP/DBP values in grade 1 range and a low-to-moderate risk (<5% CV deaths in 10 y in controls): FEVER stratum with baseline SBP below the median (<153 mm Hg); HTN Detection and Follow-up Program stratum with baseline DBP 90–94 mm Hg and no CVD; OSLO (e17); TOMHS (e28) and USPHS. Risks of stroke, CHD, the composite of stroke and CHD, and all-cause death were significantly reduced by BP-lowering in these low-to-moderate risk pts (control group: average CV mortality 4.5% in10 y) with a moderate BP elevation (average SBP/DBP 145.5/91 mm Hg) at randomization. Standardized RR associated with 10/5 reduction in BP: stroke 0.33 (95% CI: 0.11–0.98) CHD 0.68 (95% CI: 0.48–0.95)

Other endpoints:
Each of the above outcomes independently; and total deaths.

CHD 0.91 (95% CI: 0.74–1.12)
Stroke 0.72 (95% CI: 0.55–0.99)
HF 0.80 (95% CI: 0.57–1.12)
CVD deaths 0.75 (95% CI: 0.57–0.98)
Total deaths 0.78 (95% CI: 0.67–0.92)

Only the first event for a pt was used for the analysis of each outcome, but a pt who had >1 outcome type could contribute to more than 1 analysis. They also tabulated overall withdrawals and withdrawals due to adverse events.

Meta-analyses favor BP-lowering treatment even in grade 1 HTN at low-to-moderate risk, and lowering SBP/DBP to <140/90 mm Hg.

Achieving <130/80 mm Hg appears safe, but only adds further reduction in stroke.

5 y risks in BPLTTC control groups CVD events 7.4%, CVD deaths 3.1%

Tho-mopoulos C, et al., 2014 (20) 25259547

Aim: Investigating whether all grades of HTN benefit from BP-lowering treatment and which are the target BP levels to maximize outcome reduction.

Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs

Size: 32 RCTs with 104,359 pts

Exclusion criteria: Excluded trials did not contribute an event for any of the outcomes of interest.

surgery, intermittent claudication, or renal failure); and compared an antihypertensive drug provided as monotherapy or a stepped-care algorithm vs. placebo or another control regimen.
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| Xie X, et al., 2015 (21) 26559744 | **Aim:** To assess the efficacy and safety of intensive BP-lowering strategies. |
| | **Study type:** Meta-analysis of RCTs |
| | **Size:** 19 RCTs with 44,989 pts |
| | **Inclusion criteria:** RCTs with at least 6 mo follow-up that randomly assigned pts to more intensive vs. less intensive BP-lowering treatment, with different BP targets or different BP changes from baseline. Reference lists from identified trials and review articles were manually scanned to identify any other relevant studies. |
| | **Exclusion criteria:** N/A |
| | **Intervention:** BP-lowering meds |
| | **Comparator:** Less intensive treatment |
| | | BP difference 6.8/3.5 |
| | | The mean follow-up BP levels in the less intensive BP-lowering |
| | **1° endpoint:** |
| | | CVD, other major CV events, defined as a MI, stroke, HF, or CV death, separately and combined; nonvascular and all-cause mortality; ESKD, and adverse events. Progression of albuminuria (defined as new onset of micro-albuminuria/macro-albuminuria or a change from micro-albuminuria to macro-albuminuria) and retinopathy (retinopathy progression of 2 or more steps) were also recorded for trials that were done in pts with DM |
| | | CVD RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.78–0.96) |
| | **Other endpoints:** |
| | | MI RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.76–1.00) p=0.042 |
| | | Stroke RR: 0.78 (95% CI: 0.68–0.90) |
| | | HF RR: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.66–1.11) |
| | | CVD death RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.74–1.11) |
| | | Total deaths RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.81–1.03) |
| | | **Limitations:** |
| | | Lack of individual pt data, which would have allowed a more reliable assessment of |
regimen group were 140/81 mm Hg, compared with 133/76 mm Hg in the more intensive treatment group.

Other results:
- Benefit for CVD not different by baseline SBP
  120–139: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.76–1.05)
  140–160: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.68–1.00)
  >160: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.73–1.09)
p-heterogeneity: 0.60
- Benefit for CVD not different for more intensive and less intensive targets in intensive group
  <140 or <150 mm Hg: 0.76 (95% CI: 0.60–0.97)
  <120–<130 mm Hg: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.84–1.00; p-hetero: 0.06)
- Absolute benefits were proportional to absolute risk.
- For trials in which all pts had vascular disease, renal disease, or DM at baseline, the average control group rate of major vascular events was 2.9% per y compared with 0.9% per y in other trials, and the numbers needed to treat were 94 (95% CI: 44–782) in these trials vs. 186 (95% CI: 107–708) in all other trials.
- Increase in Severe hypotension: 0.3% vs. 0.1% per person y OR: 2.68 (95% CI: 1.21–5.89)

Data Supplement 3. Out-of-Office and Self-Monitoring of BP (Section 4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population (N)</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pickering TG, et al., 1988 (22)</td>
<td>Study type: 24-h ABPM &lt;134/90 24-h ABPM or HBPM</td>
<td>N/A 292 pts</td>
<td>1st endpoint: WCH=21%</td>
<td>Multiple methodologies used to define MH. Prevalence 8.5%–16.6% (general population), 14.7%–30.4% (nonelevated clinic population)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>1st Endpoint</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review + self-monitoring</td>
<td>SBP/DBP ≥130/85 mm Hg</td>
<td>Change in clinic SBP/DBP</td>
<td>Self-monitoring vs. usual care resulted in lower SBP/DBP (-3.1/-2.0 mm Hg) at 6 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Pts from 16 clinics in integrated health system in Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>Change in SBP/DBP at 12 mo</td>
<td>Self-monitoring with self-titration was associated with SBP and DBP differences of 9.2 mm Hg and 3.4 mm Hg, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster RCT</td>
<td>Uncontrolled BP</td>
<td>SBP/DBP &lt;140/90 mm Hg (&lt;130/80 mm Hg in DM or CKD) at 6 and 12 mo.</td>
<td>Telemonitoring resulted in better BP control (57%) at 6 and 12 mo and larger SBP declines at 6, 12, and 18 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>SBP/DBP ≥130/85 mm Hg</td>
<td>Change in SBP/DBP at 12 mo</td>
<td>Self-monitoring with self-titration was associated with SBP and DBP differences of 9.2 mm Hg and 3.4 mm Hg, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>1° endpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siu AL, et al., 2015</td>
<td>U.S. Preventive Services Task Force commissioned systematic review and meta-analysis of office and out of office BP relationships for diagnostic accuracy of diagnosing high BP after an initial office-based classification of high BP.</td>
<td>Adults ≥18 y.  24 studies based on “confirmation” by means of ABPM and 6 by means of HPBM.</td>
<td>ABPM or HBPM conformation of office-based diagnosis of high BP.  CVD risk-relationships for ABPM, HBPM and office-based BPs also reviewed.  ABPM was recommended as the best method to confirm an office-based diagnosis of high BP, with HBPM an acceptable alternative, based on “over diagnosis” of high BP with office BP measurements (White coat hypertension) and stronger relationships between out of office BP measurements (especially ABPM) with vascular events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhlig K, et al., 2012</td>
<td>Systematic review  Self-monitoring vs. usual care vs. self-monitoring+support</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Change in clinic SBP/DBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi SS, et al., 2015</td>
<td>RCT  Self-monitoring of BP vs. usual care.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Change in clinic SBP/DBP and HTN control (SBP/DBP &lt;140/90 mm Hg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal R, et al., 2011</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Change in clinic SBP/DBP and MAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</td>
<td>Study Type/Design; Definitions</td>
<td>Patient Population (N)</td>
<td>HBPM (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Viera AJ, et al., 2010 (29) 20671718  | Office BP ×3  
Duplicate measures of:  
24-h ABPM >130/80  
Daytime ABPM >135/85  
HBPM >135/85  
50 pts  
Untreated  
Borderline HTN and BP >110/70 and <160/110  
MH=43/35  
MH=54/53  
MH=51/45 |  
For MH diagnosis  
95% agreement daytime and 24-h ABPM  
Only 47%–53% agreement between HBPM and either daytime or 24-h ABPM |
Duplicate measures of:  
24-h ABPM >130/80  
Daytime ABPM >135/85  
HBPM >135/85  
420 pts  
Untreated  
Borderline HTN and BP >120/80 and <149/95  
MH=15–17  
MH=43–44  
MH=48–50 |  
For MH Diagnosis  
92%–94% agreement daytime and 24-h ABPM  
70% agreement between HBPM and either daytime K=0.3–0.36 |
| Bayo B, et al., 2006 (31) 16534404 | Office BP ×3  
HBPM ×3 d  
190 untreated pts  
Spanish  
Borderline  
WCH=35 (95% CI: 28–42)  
WCH=42 (95% CI: 34, 48) |  
Compared to ABPM, HBPM pulse pressure variation: 59% negative predictive value: 69% |

Data Supplement 4. White Coat Hypertension (Section 4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Number of Patients</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Hypertension Criteria</th>
<th>WCH (%)</th>
<th>MH (%)</th>
<th>WCH (%)</th>
<th>MH (%)</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asayama K, et al., 2015 (32)</td>
<td>Obs (IDACO) database</td>
<td>8,237 untreated pts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Office BP ×2 &gt;140/90 (office) &gt;130/80 (24-h ABPM) &gt;135/85 (daytime ABPM) &gt;120/70 (nighttime ABPM)</td>
<td>WCH=9.1</td>
<td>MH=13.4</td>
<td>WCH=10.7</td>
<td>MH=9.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conen D, et al., 2014 (33)</td>
<td>Obs 13 IDACO Cohorts</td>
<td>7,506 untreated pts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Office ×2 Awake ABPM &gt;135/85 24-h ABP &gt;130/80 Analyzed by decade in y</td>
<td>WCH=2.2% age 18–30, increasing to 19.5% in both sexes age &gt;70 y MH=inverted U distribution (13% and 11% in 18–30 y 18% and 20% in those 30–50 y Increased prevalence in men</td>
<td>WCH=3.0 in age 18–30 increasing to 19.1% both sexes age &gt;70 y MH=inverted U distribution (12% and 9% in youngest and oldest, 19% and 17% in those 30–50 y Increase prevalence in men</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Similar prevalence using either 24-h or awake ABPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasothimiou EG, et al., 2012 (34)</td>
<td>Office BP ×3 × &gt;140/90 HBPM &gt;135/85 Daytime ABPM &gt;135/85</td>
<td>613 pts (66% untreated, 34% treated)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WCH=15% MH=15%</td>
<td>WCH=14% MH=16%</td>
<td>WCH: 89% agreement daytime ABPM and HBPM, kappa=0.79 MH: 86% agreement, kappa=0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll de TG, et al., 2011 (35)</td>
<td>Office ×2 &gt;140/90 Daytime ABPM &gt;135/85 HBPM &gt;135/85</td>
<td>403 untreated pts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WCH=24%</td>
<td>WCH=8.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stergiou GS, et al., 2005 (36)</td>
<td>Office ×3 ×2 &gt;140/90 HBPM ≥135/85 awake ABPM ≥135/85</td>
<td>438 untreated/ treated pts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>MH=12% WCH=16%</td>
<td>MH=14% WCH=15%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No difference in proportions of pts Dx with MH or WCH by HBPM or awake ABPM No difference between treated and untreated. However, only 44% overlap for MH, but 90–95% if 5 mm Hg zone of uncertainty added.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</td>
<td>Study Type/Design; Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population</td>
<td>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</td>
<td>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sega R, et al., 2001 (37) 11560854   | Population-based PAMELA Study; Office ×3 >140/90, HBPM >132/83, ABPM >125/79, LVMI by echo | 2,051 pts | ● WCH=12%  
● MH=9%  | ● 70% agreement between ABPM and HBPM for WCH and 57% for MH |
| Vinyoles E et al., 2008 (38) 18300853 | Study type:  
● Cross-sectional, comparative multicenter descriptive study  
Size: 6,176 pts | N/A | 1° endpoint: WCH=21%  | ● Multiple methodologies used to define MH,  
● Prevalence 8.5%–16.6% (general population), 14.7%–30.4% (nonelevated clinic population) |
| Pickering TG, et al., 1988 (22) 3336140 | Study type:  
● Observational cohort  
● 24-h ABPM <134/90  
● Systematic review  
● Office vs. ABPM or HBPM  
Size: 292 pts | N/A | 1° endpoint: WCH=21%  | ● Multiple methodologies used to define MH,  
● Prevalence 8.5%–16.6% (general population), 14.7%–30.4% (nonelevated clinic population) |
| Piper MA, et al., 2015 (39) 25531400 | Study type:  
● Systematic review  
● Office vs. ABPM or HBPM | N/A | 1° endpoint:  
● WCH=5–35% (ABPM)  
● WCH conversion to SH ~1%–5% y | ● Prevalence of WCH sufficiently high to require ABPM confirmation of SH in those with elevated clinic BP |
| Asayama K, et al., 2014 (32) 25135185 | Study type:  
● Observational (IDACO) database  
ABPM measured:  
Office BP ×2  
>140/90 (office)  
>130/80 (24-h ABPM)  
>135/85 (daytime ABPM)  
>120/70 (nighttime ABPM)  
Size: 8,237 | Inclusion criteria: Untreated, >18 y | 1° endpoint:  
● WCH=6.3%–12.5%  
● MH=9.7%–19.6%  | ● Variable prevalence of both WCH and MH based on method of defining |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>1st endpoint:</th>
<th>Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>≥18 y, untreated</td>
<td>WCH=2.2% age 18–30 y, increasing to 19.5% both sexes age &gt;70 y</td>
<td>Increase in WCH prevalence with increasing age in both sexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 IDACO cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td>MH=inverted U distribution (13% and 11% in youngest and oldest, 18% and 20% in those 30–50 y)</td>
<td>Peak MH prevalence age 30–50 y with drop at age extremes. Greater prevalence of MH in males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office ×2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase prevalence in males</td>
<td>Similar prevalence when 24-h vs. awake ABPM used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awake ABPM &gt;135/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-h ABP &gt;130/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzed by decade in y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 7,506 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>1st endpoint:</th>
<th>Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>≥18 y, untreated</td>
<td>WCH=2.6%</td>
<td>Pts with pre-HTN had 7 times higher rate of MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKIPOGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>MH=15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office BP ×4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime ABPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &gt;140/90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime &gt;135/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>1st endpoint:</th>
<th>Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observational</td>
<td>≥18 y, untreated</td>
<td>Long-term follow-up for CVD events</td>
<td>WCH=13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 IDACO cohort Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MH=8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &gt;140/90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &gt;135/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 8.3-y follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 5,007 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>1st endpoint:</th>
<th>Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analysis of observational cohort studies (8 WCH, 5 MH)</td>
<td>≥18 y, untreated</td>
<td>Long-term follow-up for CVD events</td>
<td>WCH=16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-h ABPM &gt;130/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MH=5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime &gt;135/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 7,961 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Study endpoints:</th>
<th>Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 observational studies</td>
<td>≥78% untreated</td>
<td>F/NF CVD</td>
<td>Adj HR vs. NTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &lt;140/90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Median follow-up =9.5 y</td>
<td>WCH=1.22 (CI: 0.96–1.53), p=0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-h ABPM &gt;135/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MH=1.62 (CI: 1.35–1.96), p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 7,030 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Supplement 6. White Coat Hypertension (Correlation with Clinical Outcomes) (Section 4.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Endpoints and Length of Follow-up</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusions/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NICE 2011 (44) 22855971</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Systematic Review 3 Meta-analyses 11 observational studies &quot;best method&quot; comparison of office vs. HBPM or ABPM that best predicted (i.e., statistically significant predictors and higher HR values) clinical outcomes (after adjustment for covariates in multivariate analyses)</td>
<td>• Home vs. office (n=7,685) • ABPM vs. office (n=33,158) • Home vs. ABPM vs. Office (n=2,442)</td>
<td>• Outcomes of interest: mortality, stroke, MI, HF, DM, vascular procedures, hospitalization for angina, and other MACCE</td>
<td>For predicting clinical outcomes: ABPM vs. office (9 studies): • ABPM superior to office (8 studies) • No difference between ABPM and office (1 study) HBPM vs. office (3 studies): • HBPM superior to office (2 studies) • No difference between HBPM and office (1 study) HBPM vs. ABPM vs. office (2 studies): • HBPM similar to ABPM and both superior to office (1 study) • No difference between HBPM, ABPM and office (1 study)</td>
<td>• Overall recommendation for ABPM to confirm HTN diagnosis (HBPM recommended if ABPM not practical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierdomenico SD, et al., 2011 (42) 20847724</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis (8 studies) NTN vs. WCH or MH based mostly on daytime ABPM &lt;135/85</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Untreated</td>
<td><strong>Follow-up 3.2–12.8 y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Composite CVD</strong></td>
<td>WCH vs. NTN: OR: 0.96; 95% CI: 0.65–1.42 MH vs. NTN: OR: 2.09; 95% CI: 1.55–2.81 SH vs. NTN: OR: 2.59; 95% CI: 2.00–3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asayama K, et al., 2014 (32) 25135185</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Observational (IDACO) database • CV outcomes risk by WCH, MH, NTN • ABPM measured: Office BP ×2 &gt;140/90 (office)</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> &gt;18 y, untreated</td>
<td><strong>F/NF CVD/stroke, 729 CV events</strong></td>
<td><strong>Follow-up 10.6 y</strong></td>
<td>WCH adjusted HR: 1.2; 95% CI: 0.93–1.54; p=0.16 MH adjusted HR: 1.81; 95% CI: 1.41–2.32; p&lt;0.0001 SH adjusted HR: 2.31; 95% CI: 1.91–2.80; p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population-based (4 international cohorts)</td>
<td>Office ×3 &gt;140/90, Awake ABPM &gt;130/80</td>
<td>Office &lt;140/90, 24-h ABPM &gt;135/85</td>
<td>Office &lt;140/90, 24-h ABPM or HBPM</td>
<td>Office ×3 &lt;140/90, HBPM &gt;135/85 and 24-h ABPM &gt;130/80</td>
<td>Cross-sectional study assessing target organ damage by BP control status. Control: Office &lt;140/90, daytime &lt;135/85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type:</td>
<td>Population-based (4 international cohorts)</td>
<td>Observational 4 studies</td>
<td>Meta-analysis 7 studies</td>
<td>Observational PAMELA Study</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>8,237</td>
<td>5,955</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>2,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV and all-cause mortality Follow-up 16 y</td>
<td>F/NF CVD Follow-up 3.2–12.3 y (mean=8 y)</td>
<td>F or F/NF CVD Follow-up 5.4 y</td>
<td>LVMI, carotid IMT, UAE, Cross-sectional</td>
<td>LVMI, carotid IMT and UAE increased in masked uncontrolled HTN compared to controlled HTN. LVMI and UAE increased in SH</td>
<td>LVMI, carotid IMT and UAE increased in masked uncontrolled HTN compared to controlled HTN. LVMI and UAE increased in SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCH adjusted HR: 1.15; 95% CI: 0.61–2.16; p=0.66</td>
<td>WCH adjusted HR: 1.22 (95% CI: 0.96, 1.53), p=0.09</td>
<td>WCH adjusted HR: 1.12 (95% CI: 0.84–1.50), p=0.59</td>
<td>WCH mortality in WCH adjusted HR: 2.04 (95% CI: 0.87–4.78), p=0.10</td>
<td>WCH adjusted HR: 2.28; 95% CI: 1.87–2.78; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>SH and masked uncontrolled HTN but not WCE associated with increased target organ damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH adjusted HR: 2.01; 95% CI: 1.31–3.08; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>MH adjusted HR: 1.62; 95% CI: 1.35–1.96; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>MH adjusted HR: 2.0; 95% CI: 1.58–2.52; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>All-cause mortality in WCH adjusted HR: 1.50; 95% CI: 1.03–2.18; p=0.03</td>
<td>Systolic HTN adjusted HR: 2.28; 95% CI: 1.87–2.78; p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Trend but insignificant increase in CV mortality and significant increase in total mortality in WCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke not increased in WCH but tended to approach systolic HTN risk 6 y after baseline ABPM.</td>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>Follow-up 5.4 y</td>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>Follow-up 9.5 y</td>
<td>Risk of developing systolic HTN greater in those with WCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohkubo T, et al., 2005 (48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Observational cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Untreated (70%) • Treated (30%) • CVD mortality/stroke • Follow-up 10 y</td>
<td>• WCH RH: 1.28; 95% CI: 0.76–2.14; p=0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size: 1,332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MH RH: 2.13; 95% CI: 1.38–3.29; p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SH RH: 2.26; 95% CI: 1.77–4.54; p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Similar results treated and untreated, males, and females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tientcheu D, et al., 2015 (49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Observational cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dallas Heart Study • 54% African American • 30%–39% treated</td>
<td>• WCH adj HR: 2.09; 95% CI: 1.05–4.15; p=0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size: 3,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MH adj HR: 2.03; 95% CI: 1.36–3.03; p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SH adj HR: 3.12; 95% CI: 2.13–4.56; p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher CVD with SH, MH and WCH (African Americans only). CVD risk not increased in whites with WCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Supplement 7. Renal Artery Stenosis (Section 5.4.3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawes CM, et al., 2003 (50)</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis of RCTs of BP drugs recording CHD events and strokes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• CHD RR or 46% Stroke 64%</td>
<td>• All classes of BP meds confer benefit while BB confer greater benefit in those with CAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size: 464,000 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riaz IB, et al., 2014 (51)</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> 540 studies and 7 RCTs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Incidence of nonfatal MI 6.74% in both the stenting and medical therapy groups: OR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.70–1.43; p=0.99, incidence of renal events in stenting population was found to be 19.58% vs. 20.53% in medical therapy OR: 0.95; 95% CI: 0.76–1.18; p=0.62.</td>
<td>• BP effect, CV accident not specifically reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size: 2,139 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper CJ, et al., 2014 (52)</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Residential treatment center medical therapy with or without renal stent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Composite endpoint of death from CV or renal causes, MI, stroke, hospitalization for congestive HF, progressive renal insufficiency, or the need for renal-replacement therapy. 35.1% and 35.8%, respectively; HR with stenting: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.76–1.17; p=0.58 Difference in SBP favoring the stent group: -2.3 mm Hg; 95% CI: -4.4– -0.2; p=0.03.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Atherosclerotic renal artery stenosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study, Year, and Authors</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xie X, et al., 2015 (21)</td>
<td>MA of RTC</td>
<td>44,989 pts</td>
<td>Achieved BP 133/76 mm Hg (intensive) 140/81 (less intense)</td>
<td>More intensive approach reduced major CV events (stroke and MI) except heat failure, CVD, ESRD, and total mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunström M, et al., 2016 (53)</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of levels of BP control in DM hypertensives</td>
<td>73,738 pts</td>
<td>Baseline SBP &gt;150 RR for: All death: 0.89; 95% CI: 0.80–0.99</td>
<td>BP lowering reduces major CV events in DM. Caution for initiating treatment in diabetics with SBP &lt;140/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ettehad D, et al., 2015 (17)</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of large RTCs of antihypertensive treatment</td>
<td>613,815 pts</td>
<td>Every 10 mm Hg reduction in SBP RR: Major CV events: 0.80; 95% CI: 0.77–0.83</td>
<td>BP lowering reduces CV risk across various baseline BP levels and comorbidities. Suggest lowering SBP &lt;130 mm Hg and BP-lowering treatment to pts with a history of CVD, CHD, stroke, DM, HF, and CKD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 8. RCTs Comparing Obstructive Sleep Apnea (Section 5.4.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barb F, et al., 2010 (57) 20007932</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: Assess the effect on BP of 1 y of treatment with CPAP in nonsleepy pts with HTN and OSA.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria</strong>: Pts with HTN (on medications or ≥140/90) and</td>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong>: CPAP</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint</strong>: Decrease in BP</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint</strong>: Decrease in BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong>: Conservative treatment</td>
<td><strong>Results</strong>: At 12 mo, CPAP decreased SBP by 1.89 mm Hg (95% CI: 3.90–0.11 mm Hg; p=0.065) and DBP 2.19 mm Hg</td>
<td><strong>Limitations</strong>: Not blinded; both groups consisted of pts with severe sleep-apnea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 359 pts; 12 mo follow-up</td>
<td>Size: 194 pts; 3 mo follow-up</td>
<td>Size: 96 pts; 3 mo follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Assess the effect of CPAP on BP in pts with OSA and resistant hypertension.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts with resistant hypertension and OSA.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts with resistant hypertension and OSA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> CPAP</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> No therapy</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> CPAP + conventional drug treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Change in 24-h ABPM from baseline to 12 wk.</td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> - When the changes in BP were compared between groups by intent to treat, the CPAP group achieved a greater decrease in 24-h mean BP (3.1 mm Hg (95% CI: 0.6, 5.6); p=0.02) and 24-h DBP (3.2 mm Hg (95% CI: 1.0, 5.4; p=0.005) but not in 24-h SBP (3.1 mm Hg (95% CI: -0.6–6.7; p=0.10) compared to control. - There was also a greater nocturnal BP dipping pattern in CPAP treated pts than control (35.9% vs. 21.6%; adjusted OR: 2.4; CI: 1.2–5.1; p=0.02). - There was a significant positive correlation between h of CPAP use and the decrease in mean 24-h BP (r=0.29; 0.006). SBP (r=0.25; p=0.02) and DBP (r=0.30; p=0.005).</td>
<td><strong>Comparators:</strong> Conventional drug treatment alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> CPAP induced a significant reduction in BP, albeit small, in hypertensive pts with OSA.</td>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> Did not use sham CPAP as placebo; open-label; short follow-up.</td>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> Among pts with resistant hypertension and OSA, CPAP treatment for 12 wk compared with control resulted in a decrease in 24-h mean and DBP and improvement in nocturnal pressure pattern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations:** Small study; only 3 mo follow-up; lack of sham control.
### Study 1

**Muxfeldt ES, et al., 2015 (60)**

**Aim:** Evaluate the effect of CPAP on pts with resistant hypertension and OSA.

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 434 pts; 6 mo of follow-up

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with resistant hypertension and OSA

**Intervention:** CPAP + conventional antihypertensive therapy

**Comparator:** Antihypertensive therapy alone. Conventional antihypertensive therapy included spironolactone.

**1° endpoint:** BP reduction at 6 mo via ABPM

**Results:**
- On an intention-to-treat analysis, there was no significant difference in any BP change, neither in nocturnal BP fall, between CPAP and control groups. The best effect of CPAP was on night-time SBP in per-protocol analysis, with greater reduction of 4.7 mm Hg (95% CI: -1.6%–5.8%; p=0.25, in comparison with the control group.
- Median use of CPAP was 4.8 h.

**Limitations:** Nonblinded design; per protocol analysis underpowered to show the prespecified outcome of 6–7 mm Hg SBP differences between CPAP and control groups.

**Conclusions:** CPAP had no significant effect on clinic or ambulatory BP in pts with resistant hypertension and moderately severe to severe OSA. However, in the specific subgroup of pts with uncontrolled ambulatory BP, CPAP may modestly reduce night-time SBP and improve the nocturnal BP fall pattern. The reason for lack of BP reduction in the overall study may have been due to excellent control of BP with median 5 medications, including spironolactone, in the majority of pts.

### Study 2

**Pedrosa RP, et al., 2013 (61)**

**Aim:** Evaluate the effect of CPAP on pts with resistant hypertension and OSA.

**Study type:** RCT with

**Size:** 40 pts; 6 mo follow-up

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with resistant hypertension and OSA

**Intervention:** CPAP + conventional antihypertensive therapy (n=20)

**Comparator:** Antihypertensive therapy alone (n=20).

**1° endpoint:** BP reduction at 6 mo by ABPM.

**Results:**
- BP was 162±4/97±2 mm Hg prior to randomization. CPAP was used for 6 h/night. Compared with the control group, awake SBP/DBP decreased significantly in the CPAP group (-6.5±3.3/-4.5±1.9 vs. +3.1±3.3/2.1±2/7 mm Hg; p<0.05). BP changes were significant only when pts were awake but not at night by ABPM.

**Limitations:** Small; but strength was rigorous exclusion of pts who were nonadherent; control arm did not undergo placebo treatment; nonblinded.

**Conclusions:** Treatment of OSA with CPAP significantly reduces daytime BP in pts with resistant hypertension.

---

**Data Supplement 9. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Dietary Fiber Intake) (Section 6.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
| Whelton SP, et al., 2005 (62) | **Aim:** Study the effect of dietary fiber intake on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:**  
- 21 RCTs (25 comparisons) with 1,477 pts  
- 20 of the RCTs were conducted in nonhypertensive persons  
- 13 double-blind, 3 single blind and 9 open label  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCT  
- ≥16 y  
- English language publication before Feb. 2004  
- No concurrent interventions  
**Exclusion criteria:** Missing key data  
**Intervention:** Fiber supplementation, either as a pill (8 trials), cereal/fruit/veg (15 trials), Pectin (1 trial), Guar gum (1 trial)  
**Comparator:** Placebo or no fiber supplementation  
**1° endpoint:** In a pooled analysis of the overall group (hypertensive and normotensive persons), the mean for change in SBP was -1.15 mm Hg; 95% CI: -2.68–0.39 mm Hg and for DBP was -1.65 mm Hg; 95% CI: -2.70– -0.61 mm Hg. In the subgroup of 20 trials conducted in nonhypertensives, the mean change in SBP was -0.14 mm Hg; 95% CI: -1.10–0.86 mm Hg. In the subgroup of 5 trials conducted in hypertensives, the mean change in BP was -5.95 mm Hg; 95% CI: (-9.50– -2.40) mm Hg.  
**Safety endpoint:** N/A |  
| Streppel MT, et al., 2005 (63) | **Aim:** Study the effect of fiber supplementation on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:**  
- 23 RCTs (25 comparisons) in 1,404 pts  
- Mean duration=9 wk  
- Mean age=42 y  
- 16 double-blind, with 14 (67%) of the 21 comparisons conducted in normotensive pts  
- 3 trials based on plant protein and 4 trials based on animal protein  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- Human RCT  
- BP 1° or 2° outcome  
**Exclusion criteria:** Inadequate reporting of the data  
**Intervention:** Fiber supplementation (average dose=11.5 g/d); soluble fiber in 11 trials, insoluble fiber in 7 trials, and a mixture in the remaining trials  
**Comparator:** Placebo or no fiber supplementation  
**1° endpoint:** In the overall group (hypertensive and normotensive pts), a pooled analysis identified a MD for change in SBP of -1.13 mm Hg; 95% CI: -2.49–0.23. In a subgroup of 17 trials conducted in “nonhypertensives” (mean baseline BP<140/90 mm Hg or <50% receiving antihypertensive medication), the mean treatment effect was -0.23 mm Hg; 95% CI: -1.43–0.98 in univariate analysis and -1.00 mm Hg; 95% CI: -1.94– -0.06 mm Hg in multivariate analysis that adjusted for age, sex, study design, duration of intervention, and fiber dose. The corresponding effects in 8 trials conducted in hypertensives were -4.53 mm Hg; 95% CI: -6.69– -2.38 mm Hg; and -2.42 mm Hg; 95% CI: -5.28– -0.45 mm Hg.  
**Safety endpoint:** N/A |  
| **● This is the most detailed and comprehensive review of the topic.**  
**● It provides limited evidence, overall, that fiber supplementation results in a significant in BP and suggests no evidence in support of an effect in normotensives.**  
**● Findings consistent with experience in the meta-analysis by Whelton et al.** |
### Evans CE, et al., 2011 (64) 25668347

**Aim:** Study the effect of fiber supplementation on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:** 28 trials met the inclusion criteria and reported fiber intake and SBP and/or DBP. 18 trials were included in a meta-analysis.

### Inclusion criteria
- RCTs, in humans of at least 6 wk duration  
- Fiber isolate or fiber-rich diet against a control or placebo  
- Published between 1 January 1990 and 1 December 2013.

### Exclusion criteria:
N/A

### Intervention:
Fiber supplementation (average dose =11.5 g/d) - soluble fiber in 11 trials, insoluble fiber in 7 trials, and a mixture in the remaining trials

### Comparator:
Placebo or no fiber supplementation

### 1° endpoint:
Studies were categorized into 1 of 12 fiber-type categories. The pooled estimates for all fiber types were -0.9 mm Hg (95% CI: -2.5–0.6 mm Hg) and -0.7 mm Hg (95% CI: -1.9–0.5 mm Hg) for SBP and DBP, respectively. The median difference in total fiber was 6 g.

Analyses of specific fiber types concluded that diets rich in beta-glucans reduce SBP by 2.9 mm Hg (95% CI: 0.9, 4.9 mm Hg) and DBP by 1.5 mm Hg (95% CI: 0.2–2.7 mm Hg) for a median difference in beta-glucans of 4 g. Heterogeneity for individual fiber types was generally low.

### Safety endpoint:
N/A

### Data Supplement 10. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Fish Oil) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Campbell F, et al., 2012 (65) 22345681 | Aim: Study the effect of fish oil supplementation on BP  
Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis  
Size:  
- 17 RCTs (25 comparisons) with 1,524 pts.  
- 9 trials were conducted in normotensives (1,049) | Inclusion criteria:  
- RCT  
- English language publication before January 2011  
- Duration ≥8 wk | Intervention: Fish oil given in capsule form, with doses varying from 0.8–13.33 g/d.  
Comparator: Placebo (usually corn oil, olive oil, or safflower oil.) | 1° endpoint: In a pooled analysis of the 8 trials conducted in hypertensive pts, the mean for change in SBP was -2.56 mm Hg; 95% CI: -4.53– -0.58 mm Hg. The corresponding SBP change for the 9 trials conducted in normotensives was -0.50 mm Hg; 95% CI: -1.44– 0.45. | • This is the most recent of many that have been published.  
• Previous meta-analyses have been conducted by Appel et al (1993), Morris et al. (1993), Geleijnse et al (2002) and Dickinson et al. (2006).  
• In general, the findings have been fairly consistent in demonstrating a relatively small (2 3/4 mm Hg SBP) but significant effect, with most of this being attributable to the results in trials conducted in hypertensive pts. |
**2017 Hypertension Guideline Data Supplements**

| Rodriguez-Leyva D, et al., 2013 (66) 24126178 | **Aim:** Study the effect of flaxseed on BP in hypertensive pts  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 110 pts with PAD | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- >40 y  
- PAD for >6 mo, ABI <0.9  
**Exclusion criteria:** Inability to walk, bowel disease, moderate to severe renal failure, life expectancy <2 y with high cardiac risk, allergy to any of the study products, pts who plan to undergo surgery during the course of the trial, and no more than 2 fish meals per wk | **Intervention:** Pts given 1 food item per day for 6 mo, containing either 30 g of milled flax seed or placebo. Flaxseed contains omega-3 fatty acids, lignans, and fiber.  
**Comparator:** Placebo | **1° endpoint:** SBP and DBP consistently decreased in the flaxseed group over the course of the study. After 6 mo, SBP in the flaxseed group dropped significantly to 136±22 mm Hg (p=0.04). On the contrary, in the placebo group, SBP rose slightly to 146±21 mm Hg. After 6 mo of intervention, DBP in the flaxseed group fell to 72±11 mm Hg (p=0.004), whereas DBP in the placebo group remained the same (79±10 mm Hg). | - Based on this 1 RCT, flaxseed appeared to have a significant BP lowering effect |

---

**Data Supplement 11. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Potassium Supplementation to Placebo or Usual Diet) (Section 6.2)**

| Study Acronym; Author; Year Published | **Aim:** Study the effect of potassium supplementation on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:** | **Patient Population** | **Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)** | **Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; & 95% CI)** | **Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Whelton PK, et al., 1997 (67) 9168293 | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- Human RCT  
- Without HTN  
- Potassium supplementation vs. control  
- No concurrent interventions  
**Exclusion criteria:** Missing key data | **Intervention:** Potassium supplementation in 1,049 pts (potassium chloride tabs in 10 RCTs with 618 pts and diet in 2 RCT with 431 pts)  
**Comparator:** No potassium supplementation | **1° endpoint:**  
- Significant reduction in BP.  
- Overall (hypertensives and normotensives), mean: 3.11 mm Hg; 95% CI: -4.32– -1.91 mm Hg.  
- In the 12 trials conducted in normotensives, mean: -1.8 mm Hg; 95% CI: -2.9– -0.6 mm Hg for SBP and -1.0 mm Hg; 95% CI: -2.1–0.0 for DBP | - This is the most comprehensive presentation of the effects of potassium on BP, including experience in normotensives.  
- Significant reduction in SBP overall and in the subgroups with and without HTN.  
- In a subsequent meta-analysis of 23 trials, Geleijnse JM, Kok FJ, and Grobbee DE (J Hum Hypertens. 2003;17:471-480) reported a similar effect of potassium on SBP in both hypertensives and nonhypertensives (mean of -3.2 and -1.4 mm Hg, respectively). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aburto NJ, et al., 2013</td>
<td>Study the effect of potassium supplementation on BP</td>
<td>Systematic review and meta-analysis</td>
<td>21 RCTs (n=1,892); 16 in pts with HTN (n=818) and 3 RCTs in pts without HTN (n=757)</td>
<td>RCT in humans, Duration ≥4 wk, 24-h collections of urinary potassium, No concomitant interventions</td>
<td>Potassium supplementation in 20 trials, supplements plus diet/education in 1 trial, and diet/education alone in 2 trials.</td>
<td>No potassium supplementation (placebo or usual diet)</td>
<td>Overall change in SBP= -5.93; 95% CI: -10.15– -1.70. After removing outlier trials, the change was -3.49 mm Hg; 95% CI: -5.15– -1.82 mm Hg.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geleijns JM, et al., 2003</td>
<td>Study the effect of potassium supplementation on BP</td>
<td>Systematic review and meta-regression analysis</td>
<td>27 RCTs; 19 in pts with HTN and 11 RCTs in pts without HTN</td>
<td>RCT in adults, Published after 1966, Duration ≥2 wk, No concomitant interventions</td>
<td>Potassium supplementation</td>
<td>No potassium supplementation (placebo or usual diet)</td>
<td>Overall change in SBP= -2.42; 95% CI: -3.75– -1.08</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1° endpoint: | Overall change in SBP= -5.93; 95% CI: -10.15– -1.70. After removing outlier trials, the change was -3.49 mm Hg; 95% CI: -5.15– -1.82 mm Hg. | N/A |

In the 19 trials conducted in hypertensives, change in SBP was -3.51 mm Hg; 95% CI: -5.31– -1.72. | N/A |

In the 3 trials conducted in persons without HTN, change in SBP was 0.97 mm Hg; 95% CI: -3.07–1.14. | N/A |

Safety endpoint: N/A
### Data Supplement 12. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Protein Intake on BP) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rebholz CM, et al., 2012 (70) 23035142 | **Aim:** Study the effect of protein intake on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:**  
- 40 RCTs (44 comparisons) with 3,277 pts  
- 32 comparisons of protein vs. carbohydrate  
- 12 comparisons of vegetable vs. animal protein  
- 35 of the RCTs were conducted in normotensive persons (28 with SBP in the prehypertensive range) | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCT in humans  
- ≥18 y  
- Publication between January 1, 1950 and April 1, 2011  
- No concurrent interventions  
- No more than 10% difference in calories, sodium, potassium, fiber between the treatment arms  
- Duration ≥1 wk  
**Exclusion criteria:** Missing key data | **Intervention:**  
- Protein intake  
- 1° meta-analysis: any source of protein, with a median protein supplementation dose of 40 g/d (20–66 g/d)  
- 2° meta-analysis: specifically vegetable or animal protein  
**Comparator:**  
- 1° meta-analysis: carbohydrate  
- 2° meta-analysis: vegetable or animal protein | **1° endpoint:**  
- 1° meta-analysis  
There was a fairly consistent trend for a small BP lowering effect of protein compared to carbohydrate intake (86% of the trials). In a pooled analysis of the overall group (hypertensive and normotensive persons), the mean for change in SBP was -1.76 (95% CI: -2.33–-1.20). In a subgroup of 15 trials in which none of the participants were receiving antihypertensive medication, the mean change in SBP was -1.95 (95% CI: -2.62–-1.29).  
- 2° meta-analysis  
For the comparison of vegetable vs. animal protein, there was no evidence of a difference in BP. In a pooled analysis of the overall group (hypertensive and normotensive pts) the mean change in SBP was -0.10 (95% CI: -2.31–2.11) mm Hg. In a subgroup of 8 trials in which none of the pts were receiving antihypertensive medication, the mean change in SBP was -0.55 (95% CI: -3.06–1.96). | **●** This is the most detailed and comprehensive review of the topic.  
**●** It provides strong evidence that protein supplementation results in a significant but modest reduction in BP and suggests that the effect size is similar following supplementation with protein from vegetables or animals. |
| Tielemans SM, et al., 2013 (71) 23514841 | **Aim:** Study the effect of protein intake on BP | **Inclusion criteria**  
- RCTs, in “generally healthy adults” | **Intervention:** Protein intake | **1° Safety endpoint:** N/A | **Findings consistent with experience in the meta-analysis by Rebholz et al.** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis</th>
<th>Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis</th>
<th>Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size: 16 RCT (210 comparisons) of protein vs. carbohydrate in 1,449 pts, with 14 (67%) of the 21 comparisons conducted in normotensive pts. -3 trials based on plant protein and 4 trials based on animal protein.</td>
<td>Size: 9 RCTs with 418 pts.</td>
<td>Size: 9 RCTs with 418 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria:</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publications between January 1966–January 2012</td>
<td>- RCTs in adults with DM-2</td>
<td>- Inadequate reporting of the key data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concurrent intervention</td>
<td>- Publications up to August 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator: Carbohydrate intake</td>
<td>Intervention: High protein diet intervention and 5% difference in dietary protein intake between intervention and control groups</td>
<td>Comparator: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>Intervention: Pooled experience in the 14 trials identified a nonsignificant reduction in mean SBP of -3.10 (95% CI: -4.63– -1.56).</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (73)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of protein intake on BP in DM-2</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of probiotic fermented milk on BP.</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of probiotic fermented milk on BP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator: Not specified but all of the trials reported to be</td>
<td>Comparator: Not specified but all of the trials reported to be</td>
<td>Comparator: Not specified but all of the trials reported to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (73)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Inadequate reporting of the data</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Inadequate reporting of the data</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Inadequate reporting of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator: N/A</td>
<td>Comparator: N/A</td>
<td>Comparator: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (73)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Concurrent intervention</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Concurrent intervention</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Concurrent intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator: Carbohydrate intake</td>
<td>Comparator: Carbohydrate intake</td>
<td>Comparator: Carbohydrate intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (73)</td>
<td>Dong JY, et al., 2013 (72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(cross-over) trial said to use a parallel design. Antihypertensive drug use reported in 3 trials and in an additional 3 trials mean SBP exceeded 150 mm Hg at baseline. **Size:** 14 RCTs with 702 pts (median size=40).

- Intervention with enzymatically hydrolysed milk
- Cointervention

placebo controlled. However, 2 were single blind and 1 was open label.

lactotripeptides Valine-Proline-Proline and Isolucine-Proline-Proline.
- These findings may have special relevance for countries, like Japan, where consumption of fermented milk products is common.

---

**Data Supplement 13. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Sodium Reduction to Placebo or Usual Diet) (Section 6.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUTRICODE</strong> Mozaffarian D, et al., 2014 (74) 25119608</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Study the effect of sodium reduction on BP and CVD mortality  <strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-regression analysis  <strong>Size:</strong> 103 RCTs (107 comparisons) with 6,970 pts; 38 of the 107 comparisons were conducted in normotensive pts</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCT in 2 previous Cochrane meta-analyses  <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong>  - Duration &lt;1 wk  - Mean 24-h collections or estimates of urinary sodium reduced &lt;20 mmol in the intervention group compared to control  - Concomitant interventions</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Sodium reduction  <strong>Comparator:</strong> No sodium reduction</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong>  - Strong evidence for a linear relationship between reduction in sodium intake and lower levels of SBP throughout the entire distribution of sodium studied, with larger reductions in older persons, blacks (compared to whites) and hypertensives (compared to normotensives). For a white, normotensive population at age 50 y, each reduction of 100 mmol/d (2.3 g/d) in dietary sodium lowered SBP by a mean: 3.74 (95% CI: 5.18–2.29).  - Modeling based on global estimates of sodium intake, effect of sodium reduction on BP, and effect of BP reduction on CVD mortality attributed 1.65 million CVD deaths annually due sodium intake &gt;2 g/d. this would represent 9.5% (95% CI: 6.4–12.8) of all CVD mortality. Estimates were not</td>
<td><strong>RCT meta-regression analysis that provides evidence for BP lowering following a reduction in dietary sodium intake, overall and in normotensive persons, with a more pronounced effect in those who were older, black and had a higher starting level of BP.</strong>  <strong>These findings are consistent with other reports.</strong>  <strong>The modeling analysis suggested sodium reduction would yield important population health benefits but did not specify the magnitude of the potential benefit for pts within the normal BP range.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aburto NJ, et al., 2013 (68) 23558164

**Aim:** Study the effect of sodium reduction on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:** Overall study included 36 trials (49 comparisons) conducted in 6,736 pts. Of these, 3,263 were nonhypertensive. The results in normotensives in this table are based on experience in 7 RCTs conducted in 3,067 normotensive pts.  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCT in humans  
- Trial duration ≥4 wk  
- 24-h urinary sodium ≥40 mmol/d less in treatment compared to control group  
- No concurrent interventions  
- Not acutely ill  
**Exclusion criteria:** Lack of above  
**Intervention:** Sodium reduction  
**Comparator:** No sodium reduction  

**1° Safety endpoint:** N/A  

In pooled analysis, the overall change in SBP was -3.39 (95% CI: -4.31–-2.46) mm Hg. In the pts with HTN, the change was -4.06 (95% CI: -5.15–-2.96). In the normotensives, the change was -1.38 (95% CI: -2.74–0.02).  

Safety endpoint: In the small number of relevant trials, there was no significant effect of sodium reduction on lipid levels (Total cholesterol, LDL-cholesterol, HDL-cholesterol, triglyceride levels; 11 trials) or on plasma (7 trials) or urinary catecholamine levels (2 trials). Experience in 4 trials (3 which could not be included in the meta-analysis) suggested a beneficial effect of sodium reduction on urinary protein excretion.

### He FJ, et al., 2013 (75) 22437256

**Aim:** Study the effect of sodium reduction on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis  
**Size:** Overall study included 34 trials (37 comparisons) conducted in 3,230 pts.  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCTs  
- Healthy adults ≥18 y  
- Trial duration ≥4 wk  
- Sodium intake only difference between treatment and control group  
- 24-h urine sodium ≥40 mmol less in treatment compared to control  
**Exclusion criteria:** Lack of above  
**Intervention:** Sodium reduction  
**Comparator:** No sodium reduction  

**1° endpoint:** In an overall pooled analysis, the change for SBP was -4.18 (95% CI: -5.18–-3.18) mm Hg. In the trials of persons with HTN, the mean change was -5.39 (95% CI: -6.62–-4.15) mm Hg. In the trials conducted in normotensives, the change in SBP was -2.42 (95% CI: -3.56–-1.29) mm Hg.  

In meta-regression analysis, change in 24-h urinary sodium was significantly associated with reduction in SBP (4.3 mm Hg for a 100 mmol reduction in 24-h urinary sodium).  

Safety endpoint: In meta-regression analysis, change in 24-h urinary sodium was significantly associated with reduction in SBP. In this context, reduced sodium intake resulted in a statistically significant but small reduction in SBP.
pts. 12 of the RCTs (14 comparisons) were conducted in 2,240 normotensive pts.

Safety endpoint:
In the small number of relevant trials (which included both hypertensive and normotensive pts) that provided safety endpoint measurements (4–14 trials), there was no change in total, LDL- or HDL-cholesterol, or triglyceride levels. There were small significant increases in plasma renin activity, aldosterone, and noradrenaline levels but these were consistent with expected physiologic responses to sodium reduction.

Graudal NA, et al., 2012 (76)

Aim: Study the effect of sodium reduction on BP

Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Size: Overall study included 167 trials. Of these, 71 RCTs were conducted in 5,577 normotensive pts, with the following characteristics:
- Median age: 27 y (13–67 y)
- Median trial duration: 7 d (4–1,100 d)
- 5,292 Whites (71 studies)
- 268 Blacks (7 studies)
- 215 Asians (3 studies)

Inclusion criteria:
- RCTs
- 24-h collections or estimates from ≥8 h collections of urinary sodium excretion

Exclusion criteria:
Systematic studies in unhealthy pts with diseases other than HTN

Intervention: Sodium reduction

Comparator: No sodium reduction

1° endpoint: The overall effect of sodium reduction was not presented.

A forest plot of 71 comparisons (from 61 trials) in the 4,919 normotensive whites assigned to sodium reduction compared to usual sodium intake identified a trend towards lower SBP in 50 (70%), no difference in 8 (11%), and higher SBP in 13 (19%). In a pooled analysis, sodium reduction compared to usual sodium intake in the normotensives yielded the following MDs in SBP:
- Whites: -1.27 (95% CI: -1.88– -0.66)
- Blacks: -4.02 (95% CI: -7.37– -0.68)
- Asians: -1.27 (95% CI: -3.07– -0.54)

A corresponding analysis in the hypertensives yielded the normotensives yielded the following MDs in SBP:
- Whites: -5.48 (95% CI: -6.53– -4.43)
- Blacks: -6.44 (95% CI: -8.85– -4.03)
- Asians: -10.21 (95% CI: -16.98– -3.44)

Safety endpoint: In the relevant trials (all cross-over studies and including the heterogeneous group of trials that included many small studies of short duration in young persons.

- Overall finding of lower BP in those assigned to a reduced intake of dietary sodium, with an apparently greater effect in Blacks compared to Whites and Asians.

- The hormone changes in this meta-analysis likely reflect a physiologic response to sodium reduction, especially in studies of short duration and rapid changes in sodium intake. The increases in total cholesterol and triglyceride levels were not noted in the meta-analyses conducted by Aburto et al. and He et al.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Endpoint</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DASH-Sodium Trial</strong></td>
<td>Sacks FM, et al., 2001 (77)</td>
<td>Adults ≥22 y</td>
<td>Feeding study in which pts were randomized to a DASH or control diet at 3 levels of assigned dietary sodium intake (High=210 mmol/d; Intermediate=100 mmol/d; Low=50 mmol/d)</td>
<td>• Reduced sodium intake resulted in a significant reduction in SBP, with a greater reduction during assignment to the Low compared to the Intermediate sodium intake diet. At every level of sodium intake, the achieved reduction in SBP was greater on the control group compared to the DASH diet and for Blacks compared to other pts. • Reducing sodium intake from the high to intermediate level decreased SBP by 2.1 mm Hg (p&lt;0.001) during the control diet and 1.3 mm Hg (p=0.03) during the DASH diet. • Reducing sodium intake from the intermediate low level decreased SBP by a further 4.6 mm Hg (p&lt;0.001) during the control diet and 1.7 mm Hg (p&lt;0.01) during the DASH diet.</td>
<td>Each pt served as their own control (crossover design)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOHP II Trial (Sodium component)</strong></td>
<td>Kumanyika SK, et al., 2005 (78)</td>
<td>Healthy community-dwelling adults 30–54 y BMI between 110% and 165% of desirable body weight</td>
<td>Behavior change intervention aimed at studying the effects of modest (25%–30%) reductions in dietary sodium intake during 6 mo</td>
<td>• Compared to usual care, the sodium reduction group experienced a significant mean reduction of 51 mmol for 24-h urinary excretion and -2.9 (SD: 0.5) mm Hg (p&lt;0.001) in SBP at 6 mo (-5.1 mm Hg in Blacks).</td>
<td>This was the largest trial of sodium reduction in HTN prevention and also provides the longest duration of follow.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TOHP Phase I

**Aim:** Study the effect of sodium reduction on BP and prevention of HTN

**Study type:** Randomized, controlled factorial trial.

**Size:** Overall, 2,182 adults, with the 327 assigned to sodium reduction compared

### Inclusion criteria:
- Community-dwelling adults 30–54 y
- Not on antihypertensive medication
- DBP 80-89 mm Hg
- Healthy

### Exclusion criteria:
- Disease
- Inability to comply with the protocol

### Intervention:
- Behavior change intervention

### Comparator:
- Usual care

### 1° endpoint:
Change in DBP

### 2° endpoint:
Change in SBP

### Safety endpoint:
CVD events, symptoms and general well being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled factorial trial.</th>
<th>Size: 2,382 pts, of whom 594 were randomized to sodium reduction (alone) and 596 were randomized to usual care.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td>Taking antihypertensive medication. Heart disease, renal disease, poorly controlled hyperlipidemia or DM, DM requiring insulin, special dietary requirements, &gt;14 drinks/wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong></td>
<td>Usual care group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up to 48 mo (minimum 36 mo) of follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the sodium reduction group and -2.2 mm Hg in the usual care group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A progressive reduction in effect size for urinary sodium excretion and BP was noted over time, with mean for SBP at 18, 36 mo and termination of -2.0 (SD: 0.5) mm Hg (p&lt;0.001), -1.2 (SD: 0.5) mm Hg (p=0.02), and -1.0 (SD: 0.5) mm Hg (p=0.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of HTN</td>
<td>At 6 mo of follow-up the incidence of new onset HTN was 39% lower in the pts randomized to reduced dietary sodium intake compared to the usual care group (p=0.04).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During more prolonged follow-up, the effect size decreased but remained significant after 48 mo of follow-up (14% reduction; p=0.04). Overall, the incidence of HTN was reduced by 18% (p=0.048).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety endpoint:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Significantly lower DBP (0.9 mm Hg; p<0.05) and SBP (1.7 mm Hg; p<0.01) in the sodium reduction group compared to usual care
- Few CVD events
- No difference in symptoms
- Significant improvement in general well-being at 6 and 18 mo (p<0.05)
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Data Supplement 14. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Stress Reduction) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canter PH, et al., 2004 (81) 15480084</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of transcendental meditation on BP</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: • RCT in humans • Publication in any language until May 2004 • No concurrent interventions</td>
<td>Intervention: • Use of transcendental meditation techniques as taught by Maharishi Mahesh Yogi • Practiced on a regular basis over an extended period</td>
<td>1° endpoint: Statistically significant reduction in SBP reported in 3 of 5 trials that provided such information. 1° Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>• Only a handful of RCTs available from the large number of publications on this topic. • Trials had methodological weaknesses and were subject to potential bias due to the affiliation of authors to the transcendental meditation organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 6 RCTs with wide range of pts: young to elderly; healthy volunteers to Blacks with HTN.
• HTN: 2 trials
• High normal BP: 2 trials
• Normotensive: 1 trial
• Not stated: 1 trial
• Sample sizes ranging from 34–156 pts
• Follow-up from 2 mo–1 y

**Exclusion criteria:**
N/A

**Comparator:**
No treatment, sham, alternative treatment

- A few trials reported small reductions in SBP but clinical relevance of findings is unclear.
- Most of the trials were underpowered and could have missed a significant finding.
- The authors concluded that “there is at present insufficient good quality information to conclude whether or not transcendental meditation has a cumulative positive effect on BP”

---

### Data Supplement 15. RCTs and Meta-analyses Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Dietary Patterns) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Appel LJ, et al., 1997 (82) 9099655  | **Aim:** Study the effect of dietary patterns on BP  
**Study type:**  
- Multicenter RCT  
- 3 arm parallel design  
- 3 wk pre-randomization run-in phase  
- Feeding study with 8 wk of intervention  
**Size:** 459 adults, mean age 44 y. (326 normotensive)  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- Adults ≥22 y  
- SBP<160 mm Hg and DBP 80–95 mm Hg  
- No antihypertensive medication  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- CVD event within 6 mo  
- Poorly controlled DM or hyperlipidemia  
- BMI ≥35  
- Pregnancy or lactation  
- Chronic illness that would interfere with participation  
- Unwillingness to stop taking vitamins, mineral supplements, Ca++ antacids  
**Intervention:**  
- Diet high in fruits and vegetables  
- “Combination” diet high in fruits, vegetables, low-fat dairy products, and reduced total fat, saturated fat and cholesterol.  
**Comparator:** Usual U.S. diet  
1° endpoint: Compared to the control diet, both intervention diets reduced BP, with an overall mean (95% CI) reduction of:  
- Fruits and Veg. Diet: SBP: -2.8 (95% CI: -4.7– -0.9) DBP: -1.1 (95% CI: -2.4– -0.3)  
- Combination Diet: SBP: -5.5 (95% CI: -7.4– -3.7) DBP: -3.0 (95% CI: -4.3– -1.6)  
The BP changes in the subgroup with HTN were:  
- Fruits and Veg. Diet: SBP: -7.2 (-11.4, -3.0) DBP: -2.8 (-5.4, -0.3)  
- Combination Diet: SBP: -11.4 (-15.9, -6.9) DBP: -5.5 (-8.2, -2.7)  
**This trial was the first of several to document the value of the combination diet (later renamed the DASH diet).  
- The BP reductions noted with the DASH (combination) diet were substantial and well maintained.  
- Generalizability was limited due to the nature of the intervention (feeding study) and the relatively short period of intervention experience (8 wk) |
Sacks FM, et al., 2001 (77) 11136953

**Aim:** Study the effect of different levels of sodium intake on BP during consumption of a DASH or usual U.S. diet

**Study type:**
- Multicenter RCT with 2 parallel diet arms (DASH diet or usual U.S. diet)
- Within each arm, randomized cross-over trial with 3 periods testing different levels of sodium intake (no washout)

**Size:** 412, with 59% (243) being normotensive

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Adults ≥22 y
- Average SBP between 120–159 mm Hg and average DBP between 80–95 mm Hg
- No use of antihypertensive medication

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Heart disease, renal insufficiency, poorly controlled hyperlipidemia or DM, DM requiring insulin, special dietary requirements, >14 alcoholic drinks /wk.

**Intervention:** 3 levels of dietary sodium while consuming a DASH or usual U.S. diet. The target sodium intake levels for a daily energy intake of 2,100 kcal were:
- High: 150 mmol (3,450 mg)/d
- Intermediate: 100 mmol (2,300 mg)/d
- Low: 50 mmol (1,150 mg)/d

The mean achieved levels of sodium during the high, intermediate and low sodium periods were 144, 107 and 67 mmol/d in the DASH diet group and 141, 106, and 64 mmol/d in the usual U.S. diet group.

**Comparator:** See description above

**1° endpoint:**
- At each level of sodium intake, SBP and DBP were lower during consumption of the DASH diet compared to the usual U.S. diet, the difference being greatest with high sodium intake and lowest with low sodium intake, with the mean SBP difference between the DASH and usual US diets during high, intermediate and low sodium intake being -5.9 (95% CI: -8.0– -3.7), -5.0 (95% CI: -7.6– -2.5), and -2.2 (95% CI: -4.4– -0.1). The corresponding differences for DBP were -2.9 (95% CI: -4.3– -1.5), -2.5 (95% CI: -4.1– -0.8), and -1.0 (95% CI: -2.5, 0.4).

- In both the DASH and usual U.S. diet arms, SBP and DBP were significantly lower during intermediate compared to high sodium intake, and during low compared to intermediate sodium intake, with the decrement being greater for the latter change.
- In comparison to consumption of a usual U.S. diet at the high level of

The corresponding changes in the subgroup of normotensives were:
- Fruits and Veg. Diet: SBP: -0.8 (-2.7, 1.1) DBP: -0.3 (-1.9, 1.3)
- Combination Diet: SBP: -3.5 (-5.3, -1.6) DBP: -2.1 (-3.6, -0.5)

**1° Safety endpoint:** Infrequent and similar occurrence of gastrointestinal symptoms in each group

This trial provided additional documentation of the effectiveness of a DASH diet in lowering BP in normotensives (and hypertensives) and the complementary benefit of consuming a reduced intake of sodium.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREMIER</th>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> Study the effect of 2 behavioral interventions, aimed at dietary change, on BP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Appel LJ, et al., 2003 (83) 12709466 | **Study type:**
| | • Multicenter RCT with 3 parallel arms:
| | • Established
| | • Established plus DASH diet
| | • Advice only |
| | **Size:**
| | 810 adults, with 62% (506) normotensive. At baseline, mean age, BMI and SBP/DBP were 50 y, 33 kg/m², and 135/85 mm Hg, respectively. |
| | **Duration:** 6 mo, with observations at 3 and 6 mo. |
| | **Inclusion criteria:**
| | • Adults ≥25y
| | • Average SBP between 120–159 mm Hg and average DBP between 80–95 mm Hg
| | • No use of antihypertensive medication
| | • BMI between 18.5 and 45 kg/m² |
| | **Exclusion criteria:**
| | • Regular use of drugs that affect BP
| | • Target organ damage or DM
| | • Use of weight-loss meds
| | • Hx CVD event
| | • HF, angina, cancer, within 2 y
| | • Consumption of >21 alcoholic drinks /wk
| | • Pregnancy, planned pregnancy, lactation |
| | **Intervention:**
| | • Structured behavioral interventions that used an identical format (4 individual and 14 group sessions) to facilitate adoption of “established” dietary recommendations for reduction in BP or “established” plus the DASH diet. The “established” dietary recommendations used in PREMIER were a) weight loss in overweight participants, b) sodium reduction, increased physical activity, reduced alcohol intake in pts consuming alcohol. |
| | **1ª endpoint**
| | • Compared to control (advice only), SBP and DBP were significantly reduced with both active interventions but there was no significant difference in the effect size between the 2 active intervention groups. This was true for both the normotensive and hypertensive pts, with the effect size being larger in the hypertensive group. In the normotensives, the MD for change in SBP was identical for the “established” compared to “established plus DASH Diet” groups: -3.1 (95% CI: -5.1-- -1.1) mm Hg
| | • The corresponding changes for DBP were -1.6 (95% CI: -2.9-- -0.2) for the “established” intervention group and -2.0 (95% CI: -3.4-- -0.6) for the “established intervention plus DASH Diet) group. |
| | • Overall, the incidence of HTN was lowest and the percent with optimal BP was highest in the “established plus DASH” diet but the incidence of sodium intake, the normotensive group consuming the DASH diet at the low level of sodium intake had a mean SBP difference of 7.1 mm Hg (p<0.001). |
| | **1º Safety endpoint:** Participants tended to report less symptoms during periods of reduced sodium intake, with a statistically significant reduction in reports of headache (p<0.05) consistent with prior experience in the TONE trial. |
| | • This was an interesting trial which employed a behavior change approach to implement both active interventions. |
| | • The investigators goal was to determine the additive value of the DASH Diet in persons already following key elements of conventional (established) recommendations for nonpharmacologic intervention to lower BP. |
| | • The intervention approach in this trial was less effective in achieving weight loss and reduction in dietary sodium compared to the corresponding experience in the TOHP and TONE trials and the DASH Diet effects on intermediate variables (such as fruit and vegetable consumption) was less than that achieved in the DASH Diet feeding studies. |
| | • Despite the modest intervention effects, both SBP and DBP were significantly reduced with the conventional intervention approach (in normotensives as well as overall) and addition of the DASH diet did not have a
| Aim: Compare effects of 3 diets, each with a reduced intake of saturated fats, on BP and serum lipids | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- Adults ≥30 y  
- Average SBP between 120–159 mm Hg and  
**Intervention:**  
- High protein with reduced fat/saturated fat content  
**Comparator:** Advice only | **Intervention goals in the “established” group,** with a MDs of 3.8 kg (8.4 lbs) for body weight, 11.6 mmol (267 mg)/d for urinary sodium excretion, no change in physical activity (but better fitness), and no change in alcohol consumption (but very low alcohol consumption at baseline).  
- Weight loss was somewhat greater in the “established” plus DASH diet group, with a MD of 4.8 kg (10.6 lbs) for body weight. This group also manifested expected effects of the DASH diet, with significantly higher urinary potassium and phosphorous levels, greater consumption of fruits and vegetables, dietary calcium, dairy products, and a lower consumption of total fat and saturated fat.  
- **Comparator:** Advice only  
- **1° endpoint**  
  Compared with the high carbohydrate diet, the high protein diet:  
  HTN was significantly less and the percent with optimal BP was higher in both active intervention groups compared to advice only. The difference between the 2 active intervention groups was not significant. In the normotensives, there was a nonsignificant trend towards less HTN and a significantly higher percent with optimal BP in both active intervention groups compared to advice only, with no significant difference for percent with optimal BP in the 2 active intervention groups.  
  **1° Safety endpoint:** N/A | **Safety endpoint:** N/A  
- There were some nonsignificant trends for slightly lower BP, less HTN, and more optimal BP in the “established plus DASH Diet” group compared to “established” group. The authors also cited use of the DASH Diet as a means to beneficially influence CVD risk factors in addition to BP. |

Appel LJ, et al., 2005 (84) 16287956
| Study type: | Study type: Single center parallel arm RCT that compared the 2 diets over 12 mo of intervention. | Study type: | 2 center RCT  
3 period crossover design  
Each 8 wk period was separated by a 2–4 wk wash-out phase |
| Size: | Size: 161–164 included in analyses (191 pts randomized). 132 (80.5%) of the 164 included in the BP analyses were normotensive. Mean age and BMI were 54 y and 30.2 kg/m², respectively. | Size: | 148 pts, with a mean age of 46.8 y at |
| Aim: | Aim: Compare the effects of a low-carbohydrate and a low-fat diet on body weight and CVD risk factors (including BP) | Aim: | Compare the effects of a low-carbohydrate and a low-fat diet on body weight and CVD risk factors (including BP) |
| Inclusion criteria: | Inclusion criteria:  
22–75 y  
BMI: 30–45 kg/m² | Inclusion criteria: | 22–75 y  
BMI: 30–45 kg/m²  
CVD  
DM-2  
Kidney disease  
Use of prescription weight loss meds/surgery  
Weight loss >6.8 kg during prior 6 mo |
| Exclusion criteria: | Exclusion criteria:  
DM, CVD (current or H/O), LDL cholesterol >220 mg/dL, fasting triglycerides >750 mg/dL, weight >350 lb., taking that effect BP or lipids, unwillingness to stop vitamin/mineral supplements, >14 alcoholic drinks/wk. | Exclusion criteria: | DM, CVD (current or H/O), LDL cholesterol >220 mg/dL, fasting triglycerides >750 mg/dL, weight >350 lb., taking that effect BP or lipids, unwillingness to stop vitamin/mineral supplements, >14 alcoholic drinks/wk. |
| Comparator: | Comparator:  
High unsaturated fats (predominantly monounsaturated fat) with low saturated fat content | Comparator: | High carbohydrate with reduced fat/saturated fat content |
| Intervention: | Intervention:  
Low-carbohydrate diet, with digestible carbohydrate (total carbohydrate minus total fiber) <40 g/d  
Behavioral counselling that employed a mix of 20 individual and group meetings  
Low fat diet, with <30% of daily energy | Intervention: | Low-carbohydrate diet, with digestible carbohydrate (total carbohydrate minus total fiber) <40 g/d  
Behavioral counselling that employed a mix of 20 individual and group meetings  
Low fat diet, with <30% of daily energy |
| 1st endpoint: | 1st endpoint:  
Compared to the low-fat diet group, the low-carbohydrate diet group had a mean decrease at 12 mo of:  
Body weight: -3.5 (95% CI: -5.6– -1.4) kg  
Fat mass: -1.5 (95% CI: -2.6– -0.4) kg  
HDL-C: 7.0 (11.0–3.0) mg/dL  
Ratio total/HDL-C: -0.44 (95% CI: -0.71– -0.16)  
Sr. triglyceride: -14.1 (95% CI: -27.4– -0.8) mg/dL | 1st endpoint: | Compared to the low-fat diet group, the low-carbohydrate diet group had a mean decrease at 12 mo of:  
Body weight: -3.5 (95% CI: -5.6– -1.4) kg  
Fat mass: -1.5 (95% CI: -2.6– -0.4) kg  
HDL-C: 7.0 (11.0–3.0) mg/dL  
Ratio total/HDL-C: -0.44 (95% CI: -0.71– -0.16)  
Sr. triglyceride: -14.1 (95% CI: -27.4– -0.8) mg/dL |
| ● This clinical trial provides 1 of the longest follow-up experiences related to the topic.  
● It suggests low carbohydrate diets may be somewhat better than traditional low fat diets in achievement of weight loss, improvement of lipid profile, inflammation, and CHD risk.  
● Although the BP differences were not significant, there was a consistent trend toward lower BPs in the low-carbohydrate diet group. | ● Significant reduction in SBP and improvement in lipid profile. | ● Significant reduction in SBP and improvement in lipid profile. |
baseline. Mean SBP/DBP at baseline were 124.9/79.4 and 120.3/77.5 mm Hg in the low-fat and low-carbohydrate groups, respectively. The corresponding BMIs were 97.9 and 96.3 kg/m². All 148 pts were included in the analysis (intention to treat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim:</th>
<th>Compare effects of low-carbohydrate and low-fat diets on weight loss and CVD risk factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Study type: | • Systematic review and meta-analysis  
• Cochrane Collaboration strategy |
| Size: | 5 trials (447 pts) |
| Inclusion criteria: | • RCT  
• Adults ≥16 y  
• Low-carbohydrate diet and low-fat diet interventions  
• BMI ≥25 kg/m²  
• Follow-up ≥6 m |
| Intervention: | Low-carbohydrate diet: maximum of 60 g/d carbohydrate  
Comparator: Low-fat diet: maximum of 30% energy from fat |

**1° Safety endpoint:** No serious side effects noted

| Inclusion criteria: | • Behavioral counselling that used identical format to that employed in the low carbohydrate group  
• At 3, 6, and 12 mo, BP tended to be lower in the low-carbohydrate group but none of the differences in SBP or DBP were significant.  
• CRP was reduced in both diet groups but to a significantly greater extent in the low-carbohydrate group.  
• At 6 and 12 mo pts in the low carbohydrate group experienced a significant improvement in their 10-y Framingham CHD risk score. In contrast, there was no change in Framingham CHD risk in the low-fat diet group.  
1° Safety endpoint: No serious side effects noted |

**1° endpoint:** At 6 mo, the low-carbohydrate diet pts, compared to the low-fat diet participants, had a mean reduction in body weight that was greater by -3.3 (95% CI: -5.3– -1.4) kg, and a more favorable profile for HDL-cholesterol and triglyceride levels. In contrast, the profile for total-cholesterol and HDL-cholesterol was more favorable in those assigned to a low-fat diet. The profile for SBP tended to be better in the low carbohydrate diet pts but the differences were not significant: MD at 6 mo: -2.4 (95% CI: -4.9–0.1) mm Hg.  
**1° Safety endpoint:** N/A

● This systematic review/meta-analysis tends to suggest low-carbohydrate diets are somewhat more effective in reducing body weight compared to the traditionally recommended low-fat diets.  
● Although the BP differences were not significant they would probably have reached a conventional level of significance had subsequent clinical trials (including the Bazzano et al. trial) been included in the analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nordmann AJ, et al., 2011 (87)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Compare effects of Mediterranean and low-fat diets on weight loss and CVD risk factors&lt;br&gt;<strong>Study type:</strong> Systematic review and meta-analysis&lt;br&gt;<strong>Cochrane Collaboration strategy</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Size:</strong> 6 trials (2,650 pts)</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• RCT&lt;br&gt;• Intent to treat analysis&lt;br&gt;• Overweight/obese with at least 1 additional CVD risk factor&lt;br&gt;• Follow-up ≥6 mo</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Mediterranean diet: moderate fat intake (main sources olive oil and nuts), rich in vegetables, and low in red meat.</td>
<td>Compared to the low-fat diet, the Mediterranean diet resulted in MDs of:&lt;br&gt;• Body weight: -2.2 (95% CI: -3.9 – -0.6) kg&lt;br&gt;• BMI: -0.6 (95% CI: -1.0– -0.1) kg/m²&lt;br&gt;• SBP: -1.7 (95% CI: -3.3– -0.05) mm Hg&lt;br&gt;• DBP: -1.5 (95% CI: -2.1– -0.8)&lt;br&gt;• Fasting Plasma Glucose: -3.8 (95% CI: -7.0– -0.6) mg/dL&lt;br&gt;• Total-Cholesterol.: -7.4 (95% CI: -10.3– -4.4)&lt;br&gt;• CRP: -1.0 (95% CI: -1.5– -0.5)</td>
<td><strong>Overall, this study suggests the Mediterranean diet compared to the traditional low fat diet results in greater weight loss, a better CVD risk factor profile (including better BP control), and less inflammation.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>The number of eligible trials was small and the study samples were heterogeneous (2 2° and 4 1° prevention trials).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokoyama Y, et al., 2014 (88)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Compare the effects of vegetarian and omnivorous diets on BP&lt;br&gt;<strong>Study type:</strong> Systematic review and meta-analysis&lt;br&gt;<strong>Size:</strong> 7 trials (n=311).&lt;br&gt;• 6 were RCT (n=198)&lt;br&gt;• 4 parallel and 3 cross-over designs&lt;br&gt;• All were open&lt;br&gt;• Follow-up ≥6 wk (mean=15.7 wk)&lt;br&gt;• Mean age=44.5 y</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Adults ≥20 y&lt;br&gt;• English language publications between Jan 1946-Nov 2013</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Lacto-ovo in 4 trials&lt;br&gt;• Lacto in 1 trial&lt;br&gt;• Vegan in 2 trials&lt;br&gt;<strong>Comparator:</strong> Omnivorous diet in all trials</td>
<td>Compared to the omnivorous diet, the vegetarian diet resulted in MDs of:&lt;br&gt;• SBP: -4.8 (95% CI: -6.6– -3.1) mm Hg&lt;br&gt;• DBP: -2.2 (95% CI: -3.5– -1.0)&lt;br&gt;SBP was lower in the vegetarian diet group in 5 of the 7 trials (significant in 3) and DBP was lower in 6 of the 7 trials (significant in 2).</td>
<td><strong>Overall, this meta-analysis of clinical trials suggested BP was lower in those who consumed a vegetarian diet compared to their counterparts who consumed an omnivorous diet.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>However, the trials were generally small, heterogeneous in their design and conduct, and of questionable quality.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Even greater reductions in SBP and DBP were noted in a MA of 32 observational studies.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREDIMED&lt;br&gt; Toledo E, et al., 2013 (89)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Compare the effects of a Mediterranean and lower-fat diet on BP&lt;br&gt;<strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Adults, men 5,580 y, women 60–80 y&lt;br&gt;• Free from CVD</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Pts assigned to a control group or to 1 of 2 Mediterranean diets.</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> The percentage of pts with controlled BP increased in all 3 intervention groups (p-value for within-group changes: p&lt;0.001). Pts</td>
<td><strong>Overall, this study suggests the Mediterranean diet and a low-fat diet exerted beneficial effects on BP and could be part of advice to pts for controlling BP.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Both the traditional Mediterranean diet and a low-fat diet exerted beneficial effects on BP and could be part of advice to pts for controlling BP.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Study type:** RCT, single-blinded, in Spanish primary healthcare centers

**Size:** 7,447 men (55–80 y) and women (60–80 y) at high risk for CVD.

**Exclusion criteria:** Do not meet criteria listed above

**Comparator:** Lower fat diet

allocated to either of the 2 Mediterranean diet groups had significantly lower DBP than the pts in the control group (-1.53 mm Hg (95% CI: -2.01– -1.04) for the Mediterranean diet supplemented with extra virgin olive oil, and -0.65 mm Hg (95% CI: -1.15– -0.15) mm Hg for the Mediterranean diet supplemented with nuts). No between-group differences in changes of SBP were seen.

**However, lower values of DBP were noted in the 2 groups following the Mediterranean diet with extra virgin olive oil or with nuts than in the control group.**

---

### Data Supplement 16. RCTs and Meta-analysis RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Alcohol Reduction) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xin X, et al., 2001 (90) 11711507</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of alcohol reduction on BP</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> - RCT in humans  - Publication between 1966-1999  - Duration ≥1 wk  - Only pts regularly consuming alcohol  - Only difference between the comparison groups was alcohol intake</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Reduction in alcohol consumption. In most trials this was achieved by randomization to &quot;light&quot; alcohol but some RCT were based on a behavioral intervention aimed at reducing the number of drinks consumed.</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> - Overall, alcohol reduction was associated with a significant reduction in mean SBP of -3.31 (95% CI: -4.10– -2.52) and DBP of -2.04 (95% CI: -2.58– -1.49).  - In the subgroup of 7 RCTs in persons with HTN, the mean changes in SBP and DBP were -3.9 (95% CI: -5.04– -2.76) and -2.41 (95% CI: -3.25– -1.57).  - In the subgroup of 6 RCTs in normotensives the corresponding changes in SBP and DBP were -3.5 (95% CI: -4.61– -2.51) and -1.80 (95% CI: -3.03– -0.58).</td>
<td><strong>This is the most recent meta-analysis of this topic. Although this meta-analysis reports % reduction in alcohol intake, most trials aimed at reducing the number of alcoholic drinks consumed achieved a reduction of about 3 drinks/d.</strong>  - The intervention results were consistent with the relationship alcohol and BP in observational epidemiology – about a 1 mm Hg higher SBP per alcoholic drink consumed. In observational studies, type of alcohol does not seem to matter and at lower levels of alcohol consumption (&lt;1 standard size alcoholic drink per day in women and &lt;2 in men) there does not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a meta-regression analysis, a dose-response was noted between % reduction in alcohol consumption and mean reduction in BP.

1° Safety endpoint: N/A

This trial was designed to evaluate interventions for treatment of alcohol dependence.

BP measurements were not standardized.

About 20% of the observations were missing and assumed to be random.

Relatively small number of trials

Limited details provided
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wallace P, et al., 1988 (93) 3052668</strong></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>909 adults (641 men and 268 women)</td>
<td>Heavy drinking during wk prior to screening interview.</td>
<td>None mentioned</td>
<td>Physician counselling aimed at reduced consumption of alcohol.</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>The goal was to blind those conducting the outcome assessment to treatment assignment but by 6 mo assignment was known in 20-30% of the participants. ● A reduction in SBP was noted despite use of a modest intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lang T, et al., 1995 (94) 8596098</strong></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>14 site physicians; 129 adults (95% men)</td>
<td>Heavy drinking (documented by history and liver enzyme elevation). HTN (SBP/DBP &gt;140/90 mm Hg)</td>
<td>2º HTN Severe liver disease Planned move/retirement.</td>
<td>Physician and worker counselling aimed at reduced consumption of alcohol.</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>● Behavioral intervention state of the art for its time ● Careful measurements of BP using Hawksley RZ sphygmomanometer. ● Main analyses do not seem to have accounted for cluster design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | Size: 4 trials which collectively studied 305 pts | SBP ≥140 mm Hg and/or DBP ≥85 mm Hg ≥8 wk duration BP outcome | | Comparator: Usual care | DBP -3.2 (-5.0— -1.4) Safety endpoint: N/A |
| **Roerecke M et al., 2017** | **Aim:** Study the effect of reduced alcohol intake on BP.  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis.  
**Size:** 36 RCT with 2865 participants.  
**Design:** 15 parallel-arm trials  
21 crossover trials  
**Setting:** 13 in hypertension  
13 in normotension  
12 HTN and NT  
Only 3 trials presented data for women. | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCT in adult humans  
- Publication on or before July 13, 2016.  
- Full text articles.  
- Change in alcohol intake for ≥1 wk | **Intervention:** Reduction in alcohol consumption. Strategy varied from controlled inpatient administration to randomization to “light” alcohol to pragmatic primary care trials with counselling to reduce alcohol intake.  
**Duration:** Follow-up from 1 wk to 2 y (median 4 wk). | **Safety endpoint:** N/A  
**1st endpoint:**  
- Overall, alcohol reduction was associated with a significant reduction in mean SBP of -3.31 (95% CI: -4.10--2.52) and DBP of -2.04 (95% CI: -2.58--1.49).  
- In the subgroup of 7 RCTs in persons with HTN, the mean changes in SBP and DBP were SBP: -3.13 (95% CI: -3.93--2.32) DBP: -2.00 (95% CI: -2.65--1.35).  
- In meta-regression analysis, there was a strong relationship between the extent of BP reduction and change in BP, with no reduction in BP for those consuming 2 or less drinks at baseline but increasing reductions in BP for those with progressively higher intakes of alcohol at baseline. For instance, in those consuming ≥6 drinks/day and reducing their alcohol intake by approximately 50%, the estimated reduction in SBP and DBP were: SBP: -5.5 (95% CI: -6.70--4.30) DBP: -3.97 (95% CI: -4.70--3.25). Similar patterns of the effect of baseline alcohol intake on treatment effect were noted for a variety of subgroups.  
**1st Safety endpoint:** N/A |
## Data Supplement 17. RCTs and Meta-analysis RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Calcium Supplementation) (Section 6.2)

| Study Acronym; Author; Year Published | Aim: Study the effect of calcium supplementation on BP | Study Type: Systematic review and meta-analysis | Size: 40 RCTs with 2,492 pts. | Study Population Inclusion criteria: RCT in humans; Publication between 1996 and 2003; Nonpregnant normotensive pts or hypertensive pts; Only difference between the comparison groups was magnesium intake; Follow-up ≥2 wk | Study Intervention (Study Comparator (# patients)) Intervention: Increased calcium intake, with a range from 355–2,000 mg/d (mean=1,200 mg/d; median=1,055 mg/d), primarily as a gluconate or carbonate salt. Comparator: Placebo or usual intake – 32 double-blind. | Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; & 95% CI) 1° endpoint: Overall, increased calcium intake was associated with a significant reduction in mean SBP of -1.86 (95% CI: -2.91– -0.81) and DBP of -0.99 (95% CI: -1.61– -0.37). The reduction was slightly less but still significant in the subset of 32 double-blind trials, with a mean SBP of -1.67 (95% CI: -2.87– -0.47) and DBP of -0.93 (95% CI: -1.64– -0.22). There was no significant difference between the effect size in those with a baseline BP ≥ or<140/90 mm Hg. - The mean change in SBP and DBP for those with a baseline BP≥140/90 mm Hg (23 comparisons) was -2.17 (95% CI: -3.78– -0.55) and -0.95 (95% CI: -1.89– -0.01), respectively. - The mean in SBP and DBP for those with a baseline BP<140/90 mm Hg was -1.67 (95% CI: -3.01– -0.27) and -1.02 (95% CI: -1.85– -0.19) mm Hg, respectively. The authors reported slightly larger effect sizes in those with a lower initial calcium intake, in trials that employed a dietary calcium intake. Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events This is the most recent SR/MA on this topic to include RCT conducted in both normotensive and hypertensive pts. The authors interpreted their results as being consistent with a beneficial effect of calcium supplementation on BP, with about a 2 mm Hg reduction in SBP for a 1 g increase in calcium intake. This is slightly larger effect size than noted in several earlier meta-analyses. A subsequent Cochrane Collaboration meta-analysis was confined to 13 RCT in 485 adults (≥18 y) with HTN studied for ≥8 wk (Dickinson HO et al. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2006; CD004639). The authors noted a significant reduction in mean of -2.5 (95% CI: -4.5– -0.6) for SBP but a more modest insignificant change of -0.8 (95% CI: -2.1– 0.4) for DBP. Due to the poor quality of the RCT and heterogeneity of the results, the authors concluded the reduction in SBP was likely an artifact due to bias. Although not included in most meta-analyses, calcium supplementation has been effective as a treatment in pregnant women at risk for pre-eclampsia. Several of the meta-analyses (including the 1 by van Mierlo et al) have suggested a bigger effect size in persons with a lower intake of calcium at baseline and in trials that utilized a dietary intervention. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| Van Mierlo LA, et al., 2006 (95) | Aim: Study the effect of calcium supplementation on BP | Study Population Exclusion criteria: Study pts having renal disease or hyperparathyroidism | | | | |
intervention (compared to a supplement), and in the 4 trials conducted in Asians.

1° Safety endpoint: N/A

- Most of the trials were of short duration and did not (have the capacity) report on potential adverse effects such renal stones.
- In addition to being small, several trials were of uncertain quality.
- Overall, RCT experience provides limited and inconsistent evidence from trials of variable quality in support of calcium supplementation for prevention (or treatment) of HTN. Better evidence supports the role of calcium supplements, in conjunction with vitamin D, in strengthening bone density.

### Data Supplement 18. RCTs and Meta-analyses RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Physical Activity) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Whelton SP, et al., 2002 (96) 11926784 | Aim: Study the effect of aerobic exercise on BP  
Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis  
Size: 38 reports (54 comparisons) with 2,419 pts; 27 of the comparisons were conducted in normotensive pts  
Inclusion criteria:  
- English language publication between 1966–2001  
- RCT in adults ≥18 y  
- Duration ≥2 wk  
- No concurrent interventions  
Exclusion criteria: Missing BP data | Intervention: Aerobic exercise  
Comparator: No exercise prescribed | 1° endpoint:  
- For the overall group, a pooled analysis of experience in 53 trials identified a mean net change in SBP of -3.84 (95% CI: -4.97– -2.72). In subgroup analysis, the effect was noted in different ethnic groups, in trials that employed different designs, durations, and sample sizes, in trials with obese, overweight or normal weight pts, and in trials that employed different types, intensity levels, and duration of aerobic exercise.  
- In the subgroup of 15 trials in hypertensives, the mean net change in SBP was -4.94 (95% CI: -7.17– -2.70).  
- This meta-analysis provides the most comprehensive analysis of the effect of aerobic exercise on BP and provides strong evidence in support of aerobic exercise as an intervention to lower BP in normotensives.  
- Recognizing this, many of the trials were small and of short duration. |
| Study | Aim: Study the effect of different types of physical activity on BP | Inclusion criteria: | Intervention: | 1° endpoint: Overall (trials in hypertensives and normotensive), pooled experience identified a significant reduction in BP with all forms of physical activity (aerobic and both forms of resistance training), with mean reductions in SBP of -3.5 mm Hg following aerobic endurance training, -1.8 mm Hg following dynamic resistance training, and -10.9 mm Hg following static (isometric) resistance training (p<0.001 for the difference between the effect size following static [isometric] and other forms of physical activity). In subgroup analysis, dynamic aerobic endurance and dynamic resistance training resulted in mean SBP changes of -2.1 (95% CI: -3.3– -0.83) and -4.3 (95% CI: -7.7– -0.90), respectively, in the pts with pre-HTN and smaller, nonsignificant reductions in the remaining pts with a normal BP. | Safety endpoint: N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cornelissen VA, et al., 2013 (97) 23525435 | Dynamic aerobic endurance | Parallel arm RCTs | 1° Safety endpoint: N/A | Most recent in a series of progressively updated publications from Dr. Cornelissen and her colleagues. The findings suggest a beneficial effect of all forms of physical activity on BP, with a disproportionately large effect of resistance training on BP. Many of the available RCTs have been small, of short duration, and of uncertain quality. |
| | Resistance training | Adults≥18 y | Physical activity | Suggests resistance training is effective in lowering BP and was the basis for recommending this intervention in the Canadian HTN Education Program recommendations. |
| | - Static (Isometric) | Peer reviewed journals up to February 2012 | Comparator: No prescription of physical activity | |
| | Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis | Trial duration ≥4 wk | Inclusion criteria: | |
| | Size: Overall, 93 studies (>5,000 pts) | Exclusion criteria: Inadequate reporting of the data | Intervention: Physical activity | |
| | • Dynamic aerobic endurance | | Comparator: No prescription of physical activity | |
| | • Resistance training | | Inclusion criteria: | |
| | - Dynamic | | • Parallel arm RCTs | |
| | - Static (Isometric) | | • Adults≥18 y | |
| | Study: Overall, 93 studies (>5,000 pts) | | • Peer reviewed journals up to February 2012 | |
| | • 59 Dynamic Aerobic Endurance studies | | • Trial duration ≥4 wk | |
| | • 13 Dynamic Resistance Training studies | | | |
| | • 4 Static (Isometric) Resistance | Rossi AM, et al., 2013 (98) 23541664 | | |
| | • 12 Different interventions within 1 trial | Aim: Study the effect of resistance exercise on BP | Inclusion criteria: RCTs in adults (≥18 y) | 1° endpoint: Pooled experience (hypertensive and normotensive pts) identified a small, nonsignificant reduction in mean SBP of -1.03 (95% CI: -3.44–0.39). The corresponding finding |
| | | Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis | BP-lowering 1° outcome | |
| | | | Intervention: Dynamic resistance training but overall reporting of the details was poor. | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Safety endpoint: N/A | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garcia-Hermosa A, et al., 2013 (99)</td>
<td>Study the effect of exercise on BP in obese children.</td>
<td>Systematic review and meta-analysis.</td>
<td>9 RCTs (410 pts).</td>
<td>Children ≤14 y with obesity, RCT, Duration ≥8 wk, 1° outcome: change in BP</td>
<td>Physical activity, principally aerobic exercise.</td>
<td>No physical exercise, nutrition, education, or dietary restriction intervention</td>
<td>Change in SBP: In pooled analysis, mean change in SBP was -0.4 (95% CI: -0.66-- -0.24).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• The discrepancy in effect size between this meta-analysis and the 1 conducted by Cornelisson et al may have been due to the more restrictive requirement by Rossi et al that change in BP be the 1° outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson DJ, et al., 2014 (100) 24582191</td>
<td>Study the effect of physical activity on BP in children with obesity.</td>
<td>Systematic review and meta-analysis.</td>
<td>9 RCTs (223 pts: 127 intervention and 96 controls): 6 were conducted in normotensives.</td>
<td>Adults ≥18 y, RCT, including cross-over trials, Duration ≥4 wk, Published in a peer reviewed journal between January 1, 1966 and July 31, 2013, Studies that employed any intervention other</td>
<td>Pure isometric exercise.</td>
<td>Use of a control group was a requirement but no additional specific information provided.</td>
<td>In the overall pooled analysis (hypertensive and normotensive trials), mean change in SBP was -6.77 (95% CI: -7.93-- -5.62) mm Hg.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• This meta-analysis focused specifically on the effect of physical activity on BP in children with obesity. Although it is not stated explicitly, it seems likely that all of the participants were normotensive and not receiving medication that could influence level of BP. • The findings are consistent with other meta-analyses of the effect of physical activity on BP. • Only limited information regarding study details is provided in this publication. The interventions were heterogeneous in type, duration, and quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Aim: Study the effect of resistance training on BP.

Study type: Meta-analysis

Size: 28 randomized, controlled trials, involving 33 study groups and 1,012 pts.

Inclusion criteria:
- Adults ≥18 y
- RCT, including cross-over trials.
- Duration ≥4 wk
- Published in a peer reviewed journal up to June 2010

Exclusion criteria: Interventions other than pure isometric exercise (e.g., dynamic resistance)

Intervention: Resistance training, including isometric and dynamic modalities.

Comparator: Use of a control group was a requirement but no additional specific information provided.

1° endpoint: Resistance training induced a significant SBP/DBP reduction in 28 normotensive or prehypertensive study groups of -3.9 (-6.4, -1.2)/-3.9 (-5.6, -2.2] mm Hg). In the 5 hypertensive study groups, the change in mean SBP/DBP was -4.1 (95% CI: -0.63–1.4)/-1.5 (95% CI: -3.4–0.4) mm Hg. When the study groups were divided according to the mode of training, isometric handgrip training in 3 groups resulted in a larger decrease in SBP/DBP (-13.5 [95% CI: -16.5– -10.5]/-6.1 [95% CI: -8.3– -3.9] mm Hg) than dynamic resistance training in 30 groups (-2.8 [95% CI: -4.3– -1.3]/-2.7 [95% CI: -3.8– -1.7] mm Hg).

Safety endpoint: N/A

This meta-analysis supports the BP-lowering potential of dynamic resistance training and isometric handgrip training.

Results further suggest that isometric handgrip training may be more effective for reducing BP than dynamic resistance training.

However, given the small amount of isometric studies available, additional studies are warranted to confirm this finding.

Data Supplement 19. RCTs and Meta-analysis RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Magnesium Supplementation) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kass L, et al., 2012 (102) 22318649</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of magnesium supplementation on BP</td>
<td>RCT in humans</td>
<td>Increased magnesium intake, with a range in elemental magnesium of 120 to 973 mg/d and a mean of 410 mg/d.</td>
<td>1° endpoint: Overall, increased magnesium intake was associated with a small nonsignificant reduction in mean SBP of -0.32 (95% CI: -0.41– -0.23) and DBP of -0.36 (95% CI: -0.44– -0.27).</td>
<td>This is the most recent systematic review/meta-analysis on this topic. The authors interpreted their results as being consistent with a beneficial effect of magnesium supplementation on BP. However, this interpretation seems at odds with the data. In an earlier meta-analysis of 20 RCT (6 in normotensives) by Jee Systolic...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Size: 22 RCTs (23 comparisons) with 1,173 pts. Data for RCTs conducted in normotensive pts were not presented. However, most RCTs were conducted in normotensives and only 6 of the RCTs included some (or all) pts who were being treated with antihypertensive medication. Overall mean age was ~50 y. Follow-up varied from 3–24 wk, with a mean of 11.3 wk. | comparison groups was magnesium intake | • Forest plots revealed considerable heterogeneity in effect size.  
• The authors reported slightly larger effect sizes in subgroup analysis of cross-over RCT and RCT that employed a dose of magnesium >370 mg/d.  

**Exclusion criteria:** Comparison of different doses of alcohol intake  

| HTN et al (Am J Hypert. 2002;15:691-696) magnesium supplementation resulted in small mean NS reductions of -0.6 (95% CI: -2.2–1.0) mm Hg in SBP and -0.8 (95% CI: -1.9–0.4) in DBP. In meta-regression analysis, there was an apparent dose-response with SBP and DBP reductions of -4.3 (95% CI: -6.3– -2.2) and -2.3 (95% CI: -4.9–0) mm Hg for each 10 mmol/d higher level of magnesium intake.  
• A Cochrane systematic review/meta-analysis of magnesium supplementation for treatment of HTN in adults (Dickinson HO et al. Cochrane Database Systematic Review 2006: CD 004640) included 12 RCT (n=545) with follow-up of 8–26 wk. Overall, mean SBP and DBP were reduced by -1.3 (95% CI: -4.0–1.5) and -2.2 (95% CI: -3.4– -0.9) mm Hg, respectively. The authors noted the studies were of poor quality, with considerable heterogeneity, and felt the results were likely biased.  
• Some authors have suggested there may be a greater BP effect when the intervention is by means of diet change but there is insufficient RCT evidence to support this position.  
• Magnesium sulfate is the drug of choice for prevention of seizures in the pre-eclamptic woman, or prevention of recurrence of seizures in the eclamptic woman, as demonstrated in RCT and a 2010 Cochrane review (Duley L et al. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. CD000127, 2010).  
• Overall, RCT experience provides insufficient evidence to recommend oral

**1° Safety endpoint:** N/A
magnesium supplementation as a means to prevent (or treat) HTN.

### Data Supplement 20. RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Weight Loss) (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author, Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; and 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Neter JE, et al., 2003 (103) 12975389 | **Aim:** Study the effect of weight loss on BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:** 25 RCTs (34 comparisons) with 4,874 pts; 17 of the comparisons were conducted in normotensive pts | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCT in humans  
- English language publication between 1966–2002  
- Nonpharmacologic intervention  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Duration <8 wk  
- Missing data  
- Objective not weight loss  
- Concomitant intervention(s) | **Intervention:** Weight loss (calorie reduction, physical activity, or combination of both)  
**Comparator:** No weight loss prescription | **1° endpoint:**  
- For the overall group, mean baseline body weight was 88.3 kg and mean change in body weight following the application of the weight loss intervention was -5.1 (95% CI: -6.03– -4.25) kg. This represents a mean percent change of -5.8%.  
- There was strong evidence for a BP lowering effect of weight loss on BP, overall and in normotensive subgroup. In the normotensive group, the mean for change in SBP was 4.08 (95% CI: -6.01– -2.16).  
- Overall, a 1 kg reduction in body weight was associated with a mean change in SBP of -1.05 (95% CI: -1.43– -0.66) mm Hg. | **Safety endpoint:** N/A  
- Substantial evidence for a reduction in BP, overall and in normotensives.  
- With the exception of the mean (95% CI) changes in BP, this paper provides limited data for the normotensive group |
| Ho M, et al., 2012 (104) 23166346 | **Aim:** Study the effect of lifestyle weight loss interventions in obese/overweight children on weight  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- RCTs, in obese/overweight children and adolescents ≤18 y | **Intervention:** Lifestyle weight loss program with a dietary component  
**Comparator:** No treatment, usual care or | **1° endpoint:** Pooled experience in the 7 RCTs with BP experience identified a significant reduction in mean SBP of -3.40 (95% CI: -5.19– -1.61). The pooled SBP MD was -3.72 (95% CI: -4.74– -2.69) in the 3 RCTs with a duration >1 y | **Safety endpoint:** N/A  
- Findings in children are consistent with experience in adult normotensives and with experience in hypertensive pts. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis</th>
<th>Size: Overall, 38 studies</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria: RCTs, quasi-experimental studies, and natural experiments in humans</th>
<th>Intervention: Weight loss</th>
<th>1º endpoint: Pooled experience in 19 studies (20 comparisons) identified a small but significant reduction in mean SBP of -1.65 (95% CI: -2.56– -0.71). The effect size was greater in studies that employed an intervention that combined diet and physical activity (mean change in SBP of -2.11 mm Hg).</th>
<th>Safety endpoint: N/A</th>
<th>• Considerable heterogeneity in the data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis</td>
<td>Size: Overall study included 23 studies (28 comparisons) conducted in 18,925 pts.</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: RCTs, quasi-experimental studies, and natural experiments in humans</td>
<td>Intervention: Weight loss</td>
<td>1º endpoint: Pooled experience in 19 studies (20 comparisons) identified a small but significant reduction in mean SBP of -1.65 (95% CI: -2.56– -0.71). The effect size was greater in studies that employed an intervention that combined diet and physical activity (mean change in SBP of -2.11 mm Hg).</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>• Study included a mix of RCTs (13), quasi-experimental studies (9), and natural experiments (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of childhood obesity prevention programs on BP</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: RCTs, quasi-experimental studies, and natural experiments in humans</td>
<td>Intervention: Weight loss</td>
<td>1º endpoint: Pooled experience in 19 studies (20 comparisons) identified a small but significant reduction in mean SBP of -1.65 (95% CI: -2.56– -0.71). The effect size was greater in studies that employed an intervention that combined diet and physical activity (mean change in SBP of -2.11 mm Hg).</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>• Study included a mix of RCTs (13), quasi-experimental studies (9), and natural experiments (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai L, et al., 2014 (105) 24552832</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Studies that targeted prevention/weight maintenance</td>
<td>Intervention: Weight loss</td>
<td>1º endpoint: Pooled experience in 19 studies (20 comparisons) identified a small but significant reduction in mean SBP of -1.65 (95% CI: -2.56– -0.71). The effect size was greater in studies that employed an intervention that combined diet and physical activity (mean change in SBP of -2.11 mm Hg).</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>• Study included a mix of RCTs (13), quasi-experimental studies (9), and natural experiments (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of childhood obesity prevention programs on BP</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Studies that targeted prevention/weight maintenance</td>
<td>Intervention: Weight loss</td>
<td>1º endpoint: Pooled experience in 19 studies (20 comparisons) identified a small but significant reduction in mean SBP of -1.65 (95% CI: -2.56– -0.71). The effect size was greater in studies that employed an intervention that combined diet and physical activity (mean change in SBP of -2.11 mm Hg).</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
<td>• Study included a mix of RCTs (13), quasi-experimental studies (9), and natural experiments (1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOHP, Phase II Hypertension Prevention Collaborative Research Group,</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Healthy community-dwelling adults 30–54 y</td>
<td>Intervention: Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity) aimed at</td>
<td>1º endpoint: Change in SBP</td>
<td>• Considerable heterogeneity in the data</td>
<td>• Large trial of weight loss in prevention of HTN and also provides the longest duration of follow-up</td>
<td>• Considerable heterogeneity in the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of weight loss on BP and prevention of HTN.</td>
<td>Intervention: Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity) aimed at</td>
<td>1º endpoint: Change in SBP</td>
<td>• Considerable heterogeneity in the data</td>
<td>• Large trial of weight loss in prevention of HTN and also provides the longest duration of follow-up</td>
<td>• Considerable heterogeneity in the data</td>
<td>• Considerable heterogeneity in the data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1997 (106) 9080920 | **Study type:** Randomized, controlled factorial trial.  
**Size:** 2,382 pts, of whom 1,192 were randomized to a weight loss intervention and 1,190 were randomized to a no weight loss intervention.  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- BMI between 110% and 165% of desirable body weight  
- Not taking BP-lowering medication  
- Mean SBP <140 mm Hg and DBP 83-89 mm Hg  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Taking antihypertensive medication  
- Heart disease, renal disease, poorly controlled hyperlipidemia or DM, DM requiring insulin, special dietary requirements  
- >14 drinks/wk  
**Comparator:** Usual care group  
**Intervention:** Studying the effects of a modest reduction in body weight during up to 48 mo (minimum 36 mo) of follow-up.  
- **BMI:** between 110% and 165% of desirable body weight  
- **Not taking BP-lowering medication**  
- **Mean SBP <140 mm Hg** and DBP 83-89 mm Hg  
- **Exclusion criteria:**  
  - Taking antihypertensive medication  
  - Heart disease, renal disease, poorly controlled hyperlipidemia or DM, DM requiring insulin, special dietary requirements  
  - >14 drinks/wk  
- **Comparator:** Usual care group  
**1° endpoint:** Change in DBP  
**2° endpoint:** Change in SBP  
**Safety endpoint:** N/A  
- **BMI:** between 110% and 165% of desirable body weight  
- **Not taking BP-lowering medication**  
- **Mean SBP <140 mm Hg** and DBP 83-89 mm Hg  
- A progressive reduction in the effect sizes for body weight and BP was noted over time, with mean for SBP at 18, 36 mo and termination of -1.8 (SD: 0.5; p<0.001), -1.3 (SD: 0.5; p=0.01), and -1.1 (SD: 0.5; p=0.04).  
- The assumptions for a main effects factorial analysis (independence of the interventions) were not demonstrated. Given this finding, the most reliable analysis of this trial was comparison of the experience in each active intervention group with the usual care group. This results in a reduction in statistical power.  
- Consistent with the pattern in the proceeding TOHP I trial weight loss reduced BP and the incidence of HTN but the effect sizes for weight loss and BP as well as the difficulty of maintaining the intervention in highly motivated and extensively counselled participants underscores the difficulty of achieving and maintaining ideal body weight in the general population by means of lifestyle change.  

| TOHP, Phase I 1992 (79) 1586398 | **Aim:** Study the effect of weight loss on BP and prevention of HTN  
**Study type:** Randomized, controlled factorial trial.  
**Size:** Overall, 2,182 adults, with the 308  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- Community-dwelling adults 30–54 y  
- Not on antihypertensive medication  
- DBP 80-89 mm Hg  
- Healthy  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Disease  
**Intervention:** Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity)  
**Comparator:** Usual care group  
**1° endpoint:** Change in DBP  
**2° endpoint:** Change in SBP  
**Safety endpoint:** CVD events, symptoms and general and well being  
- **Significantly lower DBP (2.3 mm Hg; p<0.01) and SBP (2.9 mm Hg; p<0.01) in the weight loss group compared to usual care.**  
- **Few CVD events**  
- **No difference in symptoms**  
- **Significant improvement in general well-being at 6 and 18 mo (p<0.05)**  

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
### Data Supplement 21. RCTs and Systematic Reviews for RCTs Studying the Effect of Nonpharmacologic Interventions on BP (Section 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOHP, Phase II (Weight Loss component) 1997 (1)</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of weight loss on BP and prevention of HTN. Study type: Randomized, controlled factorial trial.</td>
<td>Healthy community-dwelling adults 30–54 y BMI between 110% and 165% of desirable body weight Not taking BP-lowering medication Mean SBP &lt;140 mm Hg and DBP 83-89 mm Hg</td>
<td>Intervention: Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity) aimed at studying the effects of a modest reduction in body weight during up to 48 mo (minimum 36 mo) of follow-up.</td>
<td>1° endpoint: Change in SBP Compared to usual care, the weight loss group experienced a significant mean (standard error) reduction of -4.5 kg in body weight and -3.7 (0.5) (p&lt;0.001) mm Hg in SBP at 6 mo (-6.0 mm Hg in the weight loss group and -2.2 mm Hg in the usual care group). A progressive reduction in the effect sizes for body weight and BP</td>
<td>• This was the largest trial of weight loss in prevention of HTN and also provides the longest duration of follow-up • The assumptions for a main effects factorial analysis (independence of the interventions) were not demonstrated. Given this finding, the most reliable analysis of this trial was comparison of the experience in each active intervention group with the usual care group. This results in a reduction in statistical power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONE Whelton PK, et al., 1998 (107)</td>
<td>Aim: Study the effect of weight loss on BP and need for antihypertensive drug therapy Study type: RCT, factorial design Size: 585 (obese) participants</td>
<td>Community-dwelling adults 60–80 y SBP &lt;145 mm Hg and DBP &lt;85 mm Hg on 1 antihypertensive medication</td>
<td>Intervention: Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity) Comparator: Usual care, with similar level of contact compared to active intervention group</td>
<td>1° endpoint: Recurrence of HTN following withdrawal of antihypertensive medication (or CVD event) 2° endpoint: BP (while still on antihypertensive medication prior to tapering of medication) Safety endpoint: CVD events, symptoms (including headaches), dietary composition</td>
<td>• Significant reduction in SBP prior to withdrawal of antihypertensive medication (mean±SE=-4.0±1.3 mm Hg) • 1° outcome significantly less common in weight loss group compared to usual care – Rel. HR: 0.70; 95% CI, 0.57–0.87; p&lt;0.001 • No overt evidence for adverse effects of intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Safety endpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONE</td>
<td>Study the effect of weight loss on BP and need for antihypertensive drug therapy</td>
<td>Community-dwelling adults 60-80 y SBP &lt;145 mm Hg and DBP &lt;85 mm Hg on 1 antihypertensive medication</td>
<td>Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity)</td>
<td>Usual care group</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOHP, Phase I</td>
<td>Study the effect of weight loss on BP and prevention of HTN</td>
<td>Community-dwelling adults 30–54 y</td>
<td>Behavior change intervention (combination of diet change and physical activity)</td>
<td>Usual care group</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 22. Observational Studies of CV Target Organ Damage Including LVH (Section 7.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIFE Devereux RB, et al., 2004 (108) 15547162</td>
<td>Study type: Sub-study of pts with HTN and ECG LVH Size: 941</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: • 55–80 y • BP 160–200/95–115 mm Hg • No MI or stroke within 6 mo • Had echo • Did not require treatment with BB, ACE or AT-1 antagonist for other reasons</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Change in LV mass assessed by echo and change in BP in relation to CVD events</td>
<td>• Reduction in LV mass by echo independently related to CVD outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDIA Armstrong AC, et al., 2014 (109) 24507735</td>
<td>Study type: Observational study of population-based cohorts</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: African American and white men and women stratified by education (above/below high school) 18–30 y at study start and followed for over 20 y; previously healthy</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Composite of hard CVD events</td>
<td>• LV mass measured at age 18–30 y leads to modest risk reclassification later in life • Low number of events limits generalizability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Net reclassification improvement for LVM/height was 0.13 (p<0.01) and for LVM/BSA was 0.11 (p=0.02).

**ARIC**
Okwuosa TM, et al., 2015 (110) 25497261

**Study type:** Observational study of population-based cohorts

**Size:** 14,489

**Inclusion criteria:** African American and white men and women population-based cohort mean age 54.7 ± 5.7 y at study start and followed for over 25 y; previously healthy

**1° endpoint:** Pooled cohort CV events and 10-y Framingham CVD events

**Results:**
- 792 (5.5%) 10-y Pooled Cohort CV events and 690 (4.8%) 10-y Framingham CHD events.
- LVH was associated with CVD events (HR: 1.62; 95% CI: 1.38–1.90) and CHD events (HR: 1.56; 95% CI: 1.32–1.86).
- LVH by ECG did not significantly reclassify or improve C statistic compared with Framingham risk score (C statistics 0.767/0.719; net reclassification index =0.001 [p=not significant]), compared with (C statistics 0.770/0.718), respectively.

**MESA**
Zalawadiya SK, et al., 2015 (111) 24699336

**Study type:** Observational study of population-based cohorts

**Size:** 4,921

**Inclusion criteria:** Multi-ethnic cohort of men and women followed for a mean follow-up of 4.5 y

**1° endpoint:** Hard CVD endpoints

**Results:** MRI calculated LVH (indexed to BSA or height; >95th percentile) predicted hard CVD events (LVH-BSA: HR: 2.36; 95% CI: 1.37–4.04; p=0.002; LVH-height [1.7]: HR: 1.95; 95% CI: 1.17–3.26; p=0.01), but did not improve risk reclassification beyond conventional risk factors

---

**Data Supplement 23. RCTs on Use of Risk Estimation to Guide Treatment of Hypertension (Section 8.1.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sundstrom J, et al., 2014 (112) 25131978</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> We aimed to investigate whether the benefits of BP-lowering drugs are proportional to baseline CV risk, to</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> BPLTTC: trials were eligible if they met the original inclusion criteria specified in the protocol, 11 and were part of the subset of studies that randomly allocated</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> BP-lowering meds</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Lowering BP provides similar relative protection at all levels of baseline CV risk, but progressively greater absolute risk reductions as baseline risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo or less intensive treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 11 trials and 26 randomized groups with 67,475 pts (51,917 pts data available for the calculation of the risk equations)</td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 10 RTCs with 15,266 pts</td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 10 RTCs with 15,266 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim:** To investigate whether pharmacologic BP reduction prevents CV events and deaths in pts with grade 1 HTN.

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of RCTs

**Size:** 10 RTCs with 15,266 pts

**Inclusion criteria:** RCTs of at least 1 y duration; pts ≥18 y, at least 80% of whom had grade 1 HTN and no previous CVD (MI, angina pectoris, CABG, PCI, stroke, TIA, carotid surgery, peripheral arterial surgery, intermittent claudication, or renal failure); and compared an antihypertensive drug provided as monotherapy or a stepped-care algorithm vs. placebo or another control regimen.

**Exclusion criteria:** Excluded trials did not contribute an event

**Intervention:** BP-lowering meds

**Comparator:**
- Placebo or less intensive treatment
- The difference in average achieved BP between the active and control groups was 3.6/2.4 mm Hg in the BPLTTC (Appendix Table 2, available at www.annals.org) but is unknown for the other contributing trial subgroups.

**1st endpoint:** Total major CV events, comprising stroke (nonfatal stroke or death from cerebrovascular disease), coronary events (nonfatal MI or death from CHD, including sudden death), HF (causing death or resulting in hospitalization), or CV death; OR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.74–1.01)

**Other endpoints:**
- CHD 0.91 (95% CI: 0.74–1.12)
- Stroke 0.72 (95% CI: 0.55–0.99)
- HF 0.80 (95% CI: 0.57–1.12)
- CVD deaths 0.75 (95% CI: 0.57–0.98)

**Summary:**
- BP-lowering therapy is likely to prevent stroke and death in pts with uncomplicated grade 1 HTN.
- 5 y risks in BPLTTC control groups CVD events 7.4% CVD deaths 3.1%
| Thompson AM, et al., 2011 (113) | Aim: To evaluate the effect of antihypertensive treatment on 2° prevention of CVD events and all-cause mortality among pts without clinically defined HTN. | Inclusion criteria: Studies were eligible for inclusion if they were RCTs of antihypertensive treatment among pts with BP <140 mm Hg systolic or <90 mm Hg diastolic for the prevention of CVD events (fatal or nonfatal stroke, fatal or nonfatal MI, CHF, or CVD mortality). Exclusion criteria: Studies were excluded if CVD events were not reported by HTN status in studies that included pts with and without HTN; the study population did not include pts with BP in the normal or prehypertensive ranges; the study population did not include pts with preexisting CVD or CVD equivalents, such as diabetes; antihypertensive treatment was not part of the intervention; treatment allocation was not random; a measure of variance (p-value or CI) was not reported or could not be calculated from the information provided; pts <18 y; or there were differences between Intervention: BP-lowering meds, the majority were studies of ACEI, next most common were BBs. Comparator: Placebo or active comparator 1° endpoint: • Composite CVD (fatal or nonfatal stroke, fatal or nonfatal MI, CHF, or CVD mortality): CVD RR: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.80–0.90), absolute risk reduction: 27.1/1,000. • This implies that a 2.7% absolute risk reduction reflects a 15% RR reduction, so the baseline risk for CVD would have been about 18%, but the follow-up interval is unclear. Other endpoints: • Stroke RR: 0.77 (95% CI: 0.61, 0.98) • MI RR: 0.80 (95% CI: 0.69, 0.93) • HF RR: 0.71 (95% CI: 0.65, 0.77) • CVD death RR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.69, 0.99) • Total deaths RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.80, 0.95) Other results: Table 4 shows similar results for CVD from studies of pts with CAD vs. other, HF vs. other, and DM vs. non-DM. Similar results from studies of ACEI vs. other. These results support the Summary: Among pts with clinical history of CVD but without HTN, antihypertensive treatment was associated with decreased risk of stroke, CHF, composite CVD events, and all-cause mortality. Limitations: • Difference in achieved BP was not reported. • Average baseline SBP not reported. No information on the entry levels of BP other than not hypertensive. Difficult to use to establish a treatment threshold or goal. • Many of these studies were designed to try to demonstrate specific drug benefits rather than BP-lowering benefits. Can we attribute the benefits to BP-lowering? We know these pts did not have HTN but we do not know the lower limit of the BP inclusion ranges or the treatment associated difference in SBP between groups making it difficult to
### Xie X, et al., 2015 (21)

**Aim:** To assess the efficacy and safety of intensive BP-lowering strategies.

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of RCTs

**Size:** 19 RCTs with 44,989 pts

**Inclusion criteria:** RCTs with at least 6 mo follow-up that randomly assigned pts to more intensive vs. less intensive BP-lowering treatment, with different BP targets or different BP changes from baseline. Reference lists from identified trials and review articles were manually scanned to identify any other relevant studies.

**Exclusion criteria:** N/A

**Intervention:** BP-lowering meds

**Comparator:**
- Less intensive treatment
- BP difference 6.8/3.5
- The mean follow-up BP levels in the less intensive BP-lowering regimen group were 140/81 mm Hg, compared with 133/76 mm Hg in the more intensive treatment group.

**1º endpoint:**
- CVD, other major CV events, defined as a MI, stroke, HF, or CV death, separately and combined; nonvascular and all-cause mortality; ESKD, and adverse events. Progression of albuminuria (defined as new onset of micro-albuminuria/macro-albuminuria or a change from micro-albuminuria to macro-albuminuria) and retinopathy (retinopathy progression of 2 or more steps) were also recorded for trials that were done in pts with DM
  - CVD RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.78–0.96)

**Other endpoints:**
- MI RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.76–1.00; p=0.042)
- Stroke RR: 0.78 (95% CI: 0.68–0.90)
- HF RR: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.66–1.11)
- CVD death RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.74–1.11)
- Total deaths RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.81–1.03)

**Other results:**
- Benefit for CVD not different by baseline SBP
  - 120–139: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.76–1.05)
  - 140–160: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.68–1.00)
  - >160: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.73–1.09)

**Summary:** Intensive BP-lowering, including to <130 mm Hg, provided greater vascular protection than standard regimens. In high-risk pts, there are additional benefits from more intensive BP-lowering, including for those with SBP <140 mm Hg at baseline. The net absolute benefits of intensive BP-lowering in high-risk individuals are large.

**Limitations:**
- Lack of individual pt data, which would have allowed a more reliable assessment of treatment effects in different pt groups.
- Interpretation: Supports treating pt with and without CVD at threshold of 130 to <130. Supports treating at threshold of about 130 even down to a CVD event rate of 0.9% per y.
### Aim:
This systematic review and meta-analysis aims to combine data from all published large-scale BP-lowering trials to quantify the effects of BP reduction on CV outcomes and death across various baseline BP levels, major comorbidities, and different pharmacological interventions.

### Inclusion criteria:
- RCTs of BP-lowering treatment that included a minimum of 1,000 pt-y of follow-up in each study arm. No trials were excluded because of presence of baseline comorbidities, and trials of antihypertensive drugs for indications other than HTN were eligible.
- Eligible studies fell into 3 categories: 1st, random allocation of pts to a BP-lowering drug or placebo; 2nd, random allocation of pts to different BP-

### Intervention:
BP-lowering meds

### Comparator:
Placebo, active comparator or less intensive treatment

### 1° endpoint:
- CVD.
- Major CVD events, CHD, stroke, HF, renal failure, and all-cause mortality.
- Standardized RR for 10 mm Hg difference in SBP
  - CVD RR: 0.80 (95% CI: 0.77–0.83)

### Other endpoints:
- CHD RR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.78–0.88)
- Stroke RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.68–0.77)

### Summary:
- BP-lowering significantly reduces vascular risk across various baseline BP levels and comorbidities. Our results provide strong support for lowering BP to SBP <130 mm Hg and providing BP-lowering treatment to individuals with a history of CVD, CHD, stroke, DM, HF, and CKD.
- In stratified analyses, we saw no strong evidence that proportional effects were diminished in trials that included people with lower
**Study type**: Meta-analysis of RCTs

**Size**: 123 studies with 613,815 pts

**Exclusion criteria**: <1,000 pt-y of follow-up in each treatment group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HF RR</td>
<td>0.72 (95% CI: 0.67–0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total deaths RR</td>
<td>0.87 (95% CI: 0.84–0.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other results**:
- Benefit for CVD and other endpoints not different by baseline SBP, including <130 mm Hg fig 4 in paper
  - CVD: 0.63; 95% CI: 0.50–0.80; p=0.22
  - CHD: 0.55; 95% CI: 0.42–0.72; p=0.93
  - Stroke: 0.65; 95% CI: 0.27–1.57; p=0.38
  - HF: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.41–1.70; p=0.27
  - Total deaths: 0.53; 95% CI: 0.37–0.76; p=0.79
- More precision around estimates of benefits in SBP 130–139 at baseline, fig 4 in paper
- Results similar in trials of people with and without CVD at baseline figure 5
- CVD+ 0.77 (95% CI: 0.71–0.81)
- CVD- 0.74 (95% CI: 0.67–0.83)
- Total deaths
  - CVD+ 0.90 (95% CI: 0.83–0.98)
  - CVD- 0.84 (95% CI: 0.75–0.93)
- Other outcomes similarly in figure 5
- In appendix, in general, benefits for CVD prevention seen in groups with and without baseline CHD, Stroke, DM, CKD and HF when examined separately, but no absolute risks provided to enable estimation of how far down the absolute risk curve these findings have been demonstrated.

**Limitations**:
- Lack of individual pt data, which would have allowed a more reliable assessment of treatment effects in different pt groups.
- Interpretation: Lowering of BP into what has been regarded the normotensive range should therefore be routinely considered for the prevention of CVD among those deemed to be of sufficient absolute risk.
### SPRINT

**Wright JT Jr, et al., 2015**

**26551272**

| **Aim:** To test the effectiveness of a goal SBP<120 mm Hg vs. a goal SBP<140 mm Hg for the prevention of CVD in pts with SBP≥130 mm Hg at baseline. | **Inclusion criteria:** SBP≥130 mm Hg, with upper limit varying as number of pre-trial BP-lowering meds increased. Age ≥50 y Presence of at least 1 of the following:
- Clinical or subclinical CVD
- CKD stage ≥3
- Age≥75
- Framingham General CVD risk≥15% in 10 y | **Intervention:** Intensive BP-lowering treatment to goal SBP <120 mm Hg |
| **Study type:** RCT | **Comparison:**
- Standard BP-lowering treatment to goal SBP<140 mm Hg
- Net treatment difference: ~3 drugs (2.8) on average vs. 2 drugs (1.8) on average
- During the trial, mean SBP was 121.5 vs. 134.6. | **1° endpoint:** CVD (MI, ACS, stroke, HF, CVD death)
HR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.64, 0.89) |
| **Size:** 9361 pts followed median of 3.26 y. | **Other endpoints:**
- Total deaths HR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.60–0.90)
- 1° or death HR: 0.78 (95% CI: 0.67–0.90)
- Components of 1° composite mostly consistent in direction other than ACS – no difference. |
|  | **CKD outcomes:**
- 1° in CKD pts: reduction in GFR of ≥50% or ESRD HR: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.42, 1.87)
- Incident albuminuria HR: 0.72 (95% 0.48, 1.07)
- In pts without CKD: reduction in GFR ≥30% and to <60 HR: 3.49 (95% CI: 2.44–5.10)
- Incident albuminuria HR: 0.81 (95% CI: 0.63–1.04) |
|  | **Adverse events:**
- SAEs: 1.04; p=0.25
- Significant absolute increases seen in intensive group for hypotension (1%), syncope (0.6%), electrolyte abnormality (0.8%), acute kidney injury/acute renal failure (1.6%) over the study period. |
|  | **Summary:**
- More intensive SBP lowering to a goal of <120 mm Hg with achieved mean of approximately 121 mm Hg resulted in less CVD and lower total mortality over 3.26 y in comparison with a goal SBP <140 mm Hg and achieved SBP of ~135 mm Hg.
- There were small increases in some expected SAEs. Perhaps unexpected, a sizable increase in reduced eGFR in the non-CKD group and AKI/ARF overall was observed in the intensive group. While of uncertain etiology and significance, there is speculation this could be an acute hemodynamic effect, especially given the findings regarding albuminuria. |
|  | **Limitations:** Few pts were untreated at baseline ~9%, so SPRINT provides little if any insight at present regarding BP-lowering medication initiation for untreated people with SBP 130–139. |
| Lawes MR, et al., 2009 (115) 1622626 | **Aim:** To determine the quantitative efficacy of different classes of BP-lowering drugs in preventing CHD and stroke, and who should receive treatment.  
- 5 questions encapsulate this uncertainty: 1st, do BBs have a special effect over and above lowering BP in preventing CHD events in people with a history of CHD? 2nd, does the effect of BP-lowering drugs in preventing CHD and stroke differ in people with and without a history of CVD (i.e., is there a different effect in 2nd and 1st prevention)? 3rd, does BP reduction alone explain the effect of BP-lowering drugs in preventing CHD and stroke? 4th, should the use of BP-lowering drugs be limited to people with high BP and not given to those at high risk of CVD?  
| **Inclusion criteria:** The database search (by MRL) used Medline (1966 to December 2007; any language) to identify randomized trials of BP-lowering drugs in which CHD events or strokes were recorded (irrespective of whether BP reduction was considered the mechanism of action). Search terms were “antihypertensive agents” or “HTN” or “diuretics, thiazide” or “adrenergic beta-antagonists” or “angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors” or “receptors, angiotensin/antagonists & inhibitors” or “tetrazoles” or “CCBs” or “vasodilator agents” or the names of all BP-lowering drugs listed in the British National Formulary as keywords or text words. Limits were Medline publication type “clinical trial” or “controlled clinical trial” or “RCT” or “meta-analysis”. We also searched the Cochrane Collaboration and Web of Science databases and the citations in trials and previous meta-analysis and review articles.  
| **Exclusion criteria:** We excluded nonrandomized trials and trials in which treated groups but not control groups  | **Intervention:** BP-lowering medications  
| **Comparison:** Placebo or less intensive treatment  
| **1st endpoint:**  
- CHD and stroke co-1st  
- Standardized to a 10/5 mm Hg BP reduction  
- Overall CHD: 0.78 (95% CI: 0.73–0.83)  
- Stroke: 0.59 (95% CI: 0.52–0.67)  
- In absence of vascular disease CHD: 0.79 (95% CI: 0.72–0.86)  
- Stroke: 0.54 (95% CI: 0.45–0.65)  
- History of CHD CHD: 0.76 (95% CI: 0.68–0.86)  
- Stroke: 0.65 (95% CI: 0.53–0.80)  
- History of stroke CHD: 0.79 (95% CI: 0.62–1.00)  
- Stroke: 0.66 (95% CI: 0.56–0.79)  
- No big drug class effects except more benefit for BBs shortly after MI.  
- Treatment benefits seen down to pre-treatment SBP of 110–119 mm Hg for CHD events RR: 0.78 (95% CI: 0.63–0.96) and 130–139 mm Hg for stroke RR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.63–0.89)  
| **Summary:** The effect of BP-lowering drugs in reducing the risk of disease is entirely or largely due to BP reduction, with 1 main exception, a special extra effect of BBs in people who have had a recent MI. The proportional reduction in CHD events and stroke for a given reduction in BP, an approximate halving in risk for each 10 mm Hg diastolic reduction, is the same in people with and without a history of vascular disease and in people without high BP as well as in those with high BP. There is benefit in lowering BP in anyone at sufficient CV risk whatever their BP, so avoiding the need to measure BP routinely.  

**Limitation:** Most of the pts without HTN were in the trials of people with pre-existing CVD; hence, most of the results of BP lowering in people with SBP<140 are in people with CVD. No absolute risks or benefits provided. Not possible to estimate how far down the risk curve these results apply.  

**Interpretation:** This MA provides stronger support for...
who have a lower BP? A corollary is whether BP should be reduced to a limited extent only, a treat to target approach. Although cohort (prospective/observational) studies do not show a lower BP limit below which risk ceases to decline (“the lower the better”), this has not been shown in randomized trials across a wide range of BP. Finally, what is the quantitative effect of taking ≥1 BP-lowering drugs in lowering BP and preventing CHD events and stroke according to dose, pretreatment BP, and age? To date no such quantitative summary of effect, taking account of these determining factors, has been made.

**Study type:** Meta-analysis of RCTs

**Size:** 147 RCTs of BP-lowering meds and CHD events (22,000) and stroke (12,000). had other interventions as well as BP reduction, such as cholesterol reduction. We excluded trials in pts with chronic renal failure because these pts typically have high BP and high rates of CVD and their response to standard BP-lowering therapy may differ from other people. We also excluded trials in which fewer than 5 CHD events and strokes were recorded or the duration of treatment was less than 6 mo, as these data would contribute little to the overall results and substantially increase the complexity of the analyses. RCTs were otherwise included irrespective of pt age, disease status, BP before treatment, or use of other drugs.

treating at levels <140 for people with CVD than for people without CVD.
### Lewington S, et al., 2002 (16) 12493255

**Aim:** To describe the age-specific relevance of BP to cause-specific mortality  
**Study type:** Meta-analysis of cohort studies  
**Size:** 61 prospective studies with 12.7 million person-y of observation, 56,000 vascular deaths in 40–89 y.  
**Inclusion criteria:** Collaboration was sought from the investigators of all prospective observational studies in which data on BP, blood cholesterol, date of birth (or age), and sex had been recorded at a baseline screening visit, and in which cause and date of death (or age at death) had been routinely sought for all screens during more than 5,000 person-y of follow-up (see appendix A; [http://image.thelancet.com/extra/s01art8300webappendixA.pdf](http://image.thelancet.com/extra/s01art8300webappendixA.pdf)). Relevant studies were identified through computer searches of Medline and Embase, by hand-searches of meeting abstracts, and by extensive discussions with investigators.  
**Exclusion criteria:** To minimize the effects of reverse causality (whereby established disease could change the usual BP), studies were excluded if they had selected pts on the basis of a positive history of stroke or heart disease, and individuals from contributing studies were excluded from the present analyses if they had such a history recorded at baseline.  
**Intervention:** N/A  
**Comparator:** N/A  
- The exposures of interest were the level of SBP and DBP and age-group.  
**1° endpoint:**  
- Not completely clear, but for our purposes, stroke and IHD death would be co-1°. Also looked at other vascular deaths.  
- HRs for stroke mortality for a 20 mm Hg lower SBP by age-group  
  40–49: 0.36 (95% CI: 0.32–0.40)  
  50–59: 0.38 (95% CI: 0.35–0.40)  
  60–69: 0.43 (95% CI: 0.41–0.45)  
  70–79: 0.50 (95% CI: 0.48–0.52)  
  80–89: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.63–0.71)  
- HRs for IHD mortality for a 20 mm Hg lower SBP by age-group  
  40–49: 0.49 (95% CI: 0.45–0.53)  
  50–59: 0.50 (95% CI: 0.49–0.52)  
  60–69: 0.54 (95% CI: 0.53–0.55)  
  70–79: 0.60 (95% CI: 0.58–0.61)  
  80–89: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.64–0.70)  
- HRs for other vascular mortality for a 20 mm Hg lower SBP by age-group  
  40–49: 0.43 (95% CI: 0.38–0.48)  
  50–59: 0.50 (95% CI: 0.47–0.54)  
  60–69: 0.53 (95% CI: 0.51–0.56)  
  70–79: 0.64 (95% CI: 0.61–0.67)  
  80–89: 0.70 (95% CI: 0.65–0.75)  
- Similar results for DBP also in figure 1.  
- Similar results for men and women separately for stroke, figure 3, and IHD, figure 5.  
**Summary:** Throughout middle and old age, usual BP is strongly and directly related to vascular (and overall) mortality, without any evidence of a threshold down to at least 115/75 mm Hg.

### Thomopoulos C, et al., 2014 (20) 25259547

**Aim:** Investigating whether all grades of HTN benefit from BP-lowering treatment and which are the target  
**Inclusion criteria:** Intentional BP-lowering comparing active drug treatment with placebo, or less active treatment (intentional BP-lowering trials), or comparison of an active drug  
**Intervention/Comparator:** Criteria of eligibility were intentional BP-lowering comparing active drug treatment with placebo, or less active treatment  
**1° endpoint:**  
- As some trials were done on low-risk pts, others on higher risk pts, no evaluation of absolute risk-reduction was made. However, a 2° analysis was done including  
**Summary:** Meta-analyses favor BP-lowering treatment even in grade 1 HTN at low-to-moderate risk, and lowering SBP/DBP to <140/90 mm Hg. Achieving <130/80 mm Hg.
| BP levels to maximize outcome reduction. | with placebo over baseline antihypertensive treatment, resulting in a BP difference of at least 2 mm Hg in either SBP or DBP (nonintentional BP-lowering trials); enrolling of hypertensive individuals only or a high proportion (at least 40%) of them. | (intentional BP-lowering trials), or comparison of an active drug with placebo over baseline antihypertensive treatment, resulting in a BP difference of at least 2 mm Hg in either SBP or DBP (nonintentional BP-lowering trials); enrolling of hypertensive individuals only or a high proportion (at least 40%) of them. Other inclusion criteria can be found in the preceding paper. 51 trials were found eligible either for assessing BP-lowering effects in different HTN grades or for assessing the effects of achieving different BP levels | trials or trial subgroups with mean baseline SBP/DBP values in grade 1 range and a low-to-moderate risk (<5% CV deaths in 10 y in controls): FEVER stratum with baseline SBP below the median (<153 mm Hg) (e7); HTN Detection and Follow-up Program stratum with baseline DBP 90–94 mm Hg and no CVD (e9); OSLO (e17); TOMHS (e28) and USPHS (e29). Risks of stroke, CHD, the composite of stroke and CHD, and all-cause death were significantly reduced by BP-lowering in these low-to-moderate risk pts (control group: average CV mortality 4.5% in 10 y) with a moderate BP elevation (average SBP/DBP 145.5/91 mm Hg) at randomization. Standardized risk ratio associated with 10/5 reduction in BP: stroke 0.33 (95% CI: 0.11–0.98) CHD 0.68 (95% CI: 0.48–0.95) CVD death 0.57 (95% CI: 0.32–1.02) total death 0.53 (95% CI: 0.35–0.80) • Compared outcomes of achieved on study SBP <130 vs. ≥130 Standardized Risk ratio associated with 10/5 reduction in BP: stroke 0.68 (95% CI: 0.57, 0.83) CHD 0.87 (95% CI: 0.76, 1.00) HF 0.92 (95% CI: 0.47, 1.77) CVD 0.81 (95% CI: 0.67, 1.00) CVD death 0.88 (95% CI: 0.77, 1.01) total death 0.88 (95% CI: 0.77, 0.99) • Outcomes of achieved on study SBP 130–139 vs. ≥140 appears safe, but only adds further reduction in stroke. |
| Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs | Exclusion criteria: N/A | Size: 32 RCTs with 104,359 pts |
| Lonn EM, et al., 2016 (116) 27041480 | **Aim:** To assess efficacy of fixed-dose antihypertensive therapy in adults with intermediate CVD risk.  
**Study type:** Double-blind, placebo-controlled RCT, factorial design  
**Size:** 12,705 pts | **Inclusion criteria:** Men ≥55 y and women ≥60 y at intermediate risk for CVD. No BP restrictions.  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Known CVD  
- Indications or contraindications to study meds  
- Mod/advanced CKD  
- Symptomatic hypotension | **Intervention:** FDC of ARB (candesartan 16 mg/d) and diuretic (hydrochlorothiazide 12.5 mg/d) or placebo  
**Follow-up:** Median=5.6 y | **1° endpoint:** 1 co-1° CVD composite outcomes  
- CVD mortality, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke  
- Above plus cardiac arrest, HF, revascularization | **Summary:**  
- Standardized Risk ratio associated with 10/5 reduction in BP: stroke 0.63 (95% CI: 0.52–0.77)  
- CHD 0.77 (95% CI: 0.70–0.86)  
- HF 0.76 (95% CI: 0.47–1.25)  
- CVD 0.74 (95% CI: 0.62–0.88)  
- CVD death 0.81 (95% CI: 0.67–0.97)  
- total death 0.87 (95% CI: 0.75–1.00)  
- Similar pattern of results for on treatment DBP. |
| Neaton JD et al., 1993 (117) 8336373 | **Aim:** To compare 6 antihypertensive drugs (representing different drug classes)  
**Study type:** Double-blind, placebo-controlled RCT  
**Size:** 902 pts with stage 1 HTN | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- Men and women 45–69 y  
- Not taking antihypertensive medications, with DBP 90–99 mm Hg  
- Taking 1 antihypertensive medication, with DBP <95 mm Hg and between 85–99 mm Hg after withdrawal of BP medications | **Intervention:** Treatment (number):  
- Once daily (AM):  
  - Placebo (234)  
  - Chlorthalidone 15 mg/d (136)  
  - Acebutolol 400 mg/d (132)  
  - Doxazosin 2 mg/d (134)  
  - Amlodipine 5 mg/d (131)  
  - Enalapril 5 mg/d (135)  
**Follow-up:** Median=4.4 y | **1° endpoint:** BP, QoL, side effects, chemistries, ECG, clinical events | **Summary:**  
- Drugs (plus diet) more effective compared to placebo (plus diet) for control of BP.  
- Minimal differences between drug regimens |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Endpoint</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Dieren S, et al., 2012 (118) 22677192</td>
<td>To assess differences in treatment effects of a fixed combination of perindopril–indapamide on major clinical outcomes in pts with type 2 DM across subgroups of CV risk.</td>
<td>DM-2, aged ≥55 y, with a history of major macrovascular or microvascular disease, or at least 1 other risk factor for vascular disease</td>
<td>Perindopril–indapamide or matching placebo</td>
<td>• The Framingham equation was used to calculate 5-y CVD risk and to divide participants into 2 risk groups, moderate-to-high risk (&lt;25% and no history of macrovascular disease), very high risk (&gt;25% and/or history of macrovascular disease).</td>
<td>• Relative effects of BP-lowering with perindopril–indapamide on CV outcomes were similar across risk groups whilst absolute effects trended to be greater in the high-risk group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery AA, et al., 2003 (119) 12923409</td>
<td>To estimate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of BP-lowering treatment over a lifetime.</td>
<td>We created models for 20 different strata of sex, age (age 30–70 y in 10-y bands), and CV risk (low and high)</td>
<td>Treatment and nontreatment of HTN.</td>
<td>Life expectancy, and incremental cost: effectiveness ratios for treatment and nontreatment strategies</td>
<td>• Probabilities of clinical events were obtained from published literature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study type: RCT

Size: 11,140 pts with DM-2, from the ADVANCE trial
cholesterol, no DM, and no LVH, and high-risk profile was defined as smoker, 90th percentile total cholesterol, 10th percentile HDL cholesterol, DM, and LVH.

**Exclusion criteria:** N/A

**Inclusion criteria:** To estimate the rate of cv and non-CV deaths in a hypothetical U.S. population of untreated hypertensive pts, we used the following procedure: age-specific death rates in the U.S. general population were obtained from national vital statistics (1994), and in untreated hypertensive population they were obtained from the control groups of the INDANA database. This latter group represents a unique cohort of 14 942 untreated or placebo-treated hypertensive pts, 26–96 y with an average follow-up of 5 y

**Exclusion criteria:** N/A

**Intervention:** The gain in life expectancy without stroke, CHD, and CV events was estimated from the area between the 2 survival curves of treated and control groups. The relative gain in life expectancy was defined as the ratio of gain in life expectancy to life expectancy.

**1° endpoint:** Stroke and CHD co-

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>endpoint</th>
<th>Stroke</th>
<th>CHD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RRa (%) | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.91 |
| NNTc    | 333  | 333  | 100  | 53   | 13   |
| GLEd (%)| 20   | 4.1  | 17   | 3.4  | 5.4  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>endpoint</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stroke   | Stroke and CHD co-

**Summary:** Absolute gains in life expectancy are likely to be greater for younger, lower risk people with HTN than for older, higher risk people with HTN. However, the NNT to prevent an event will likely be greater especially in the short term in younger, lower risk people. This modeling analysis provides support for treating younger, lower risk individuals with HTN, but relies on the assumption that the relative benefits of treatments observed in short-term trials of higher risk individuals applies over a longer term to lower risk individuals.
survival curve of the life-long treated population. Gains in event-free life expectancy were estimated from survival curves. A sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the impact of possible death misclassifications.

**Size:** 6 RCTs, ~30,000 pts

---

| Czernichow S et al., 2011 (121) 20081867 | **Aim:** The objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to compare the relative reductions in risk achieved with different starting levels of BP (and treatment regimens).  
**Study type:** Meta-analysis of RCTs  
**Size:** 32 trials with 201,566 pts (20,079 1° outcome events) | **Inclusion criteria:** RCTs of BP-lowering (drug vs. control or less intensive treatment) or different classes of drug therapy that included a minimum of 1,000 pt-y of follow-up in each study arm.  
**Exclusion criteria:** <1,000 pt-y of follow-up in each treatment group. | **Intervention:** BP-lowering meds  
**Comparator:** Placebo, active comparator or less intensive treatment | **1° endpoint:**  
- Major CVD events (stroke, CHD, and HF.  
- No evidence of differences in the ratio of risk across varying levels of baseline BP (with all classes of BP-lowering medications).  
**Summary:**  
- Effectiveness of BP-lowering regiments in reducing RR of major CVD events does not seem to be influenced by starting level of BP.  
**Limitations:**  
- The majority of the participants studied were at high risk for CVD.  
- Information pertaining to the effect of treatment on absolute risk was not presented in this manuscript.

---

**Data Supplement 24. Follow-Up After Initial BP Evaluation (Section 8.1.3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Ambrosius WT, et al., 2014 (122) 24902920

**Aim:** To describe the study design of the SPRINT Study

**Study type:** SPRINT RCT

**Inclusion criteria:** Adults ≥50 y, average SBP ≥130 mm Hg and evidence of CVD, CKD, or 10-y Framingham risk score ≥15%, or ≥75 y

**Intervention:** 9,361 pts randomized to 2 treatment groups:
- Standard treatment group, SBP target <140 mm Hg
- Intensive treatment group: SBP target <120 mm Hg.

**1° endpoint:** MI, ACS, stroke, HF, or CVD death.

**Relevant 2° endpoint:** All-cause mortality, decline in kidney function or development of ESRD, incident dementia, decline in cognitive function, and small-vessel cerebral ischemic disease

**Summary:** This paper describes the protocol followed in the SPRINT trial that was successful in helping participants to attain and maintain BP targets in the study groups. Once treated, participants had follow-up visits to assessment BP control monthly until BP was at target. Medications were titrated and added as per protocol, when target BP was not attained.

### Cushman WC, et al., 2007 (123) 17599425

**Aim:** To describe the study design of the BP trial of the ACCORD Trial

**Study type:** Description of study design and protocol for the ACCORD RCT

**Inclusion criteria:** Adults with a diagnosis of DM-2 for at least 3 mo and at high risk for CVD events, who meet the following BP criteria: (1) SBP 130–160 mm Hg and taking 0–3 antihypertensive medications; (2) SBP 161–170 and on 0–2 antihypertensive medications; or (3) SBP 171-180 and taking 0-1 antihypertensive medication. Other entry criteria included spot urine sample <2+, protein–Cr ratio <700 mg protein/1 g Cr, or 24-h protein excretion <1.0 g/24 h.

**Intervention:**
- Unmasked, open-label, factorial design, randomized trial with a sample size of 4,733 pts
- Pts randomized to intensive SBP control (<120 mm Hg) or standard control (<140 mm Hg)

**1° endpoint:** Major CVD event (nonfatal MI or stroke, or CV death)

**Relevant 2° endpoint:** Expanded macrovascular outcome (1° outcome plus coronary revascularization or HF hospitalization), total mortality, each of the separate components of the 1° outcome, HF death or hospitalization, and composite microvascular disease outcome (kidney and eye disease).

**Summary:** This paper describes the protocol followed in the ACCORD trial that was successful in helping participants to attain and maintain BP targets in the study groups. Once treated, participants had follow-up visits to assessment BP control monthly until BP was at target. Medications were titrated and added as per protocol, when target BP was not attained.
## Data Supplement 25. RCTs for General Principles of Drug Therapy (Combination Therapies that Inhibit the RAAS) (Section 8.1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA NEPHRON-D Fried LF, et al., 2013 (124) 24206457</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Assess the efficacy of combination of an ACEI and an ARB vs. ARB monotherapy in reducing the progression of proteinuric diabetic nephropathy  <strong>Study type:</strong> Multicenter, double-blind, RCT at 32 VA Medical Centers  <strong>Size:</strong> 1448 pts</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts with type 2 DM, a urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio of ≥300, and an eGFR 30.0–89.9 mL/min/1.73 m²  <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong>  - Subjects with known non-diabetic kidney disease  - Serum K+ &gt;5.5 mmol/L  - Current treatment with sodium polystyrene sulfonate  - Inability to stop prescribed medication that increases the risk of hyperkalemia</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Losartan 100 mg daily plus lisinopril 10–40 mg daily (n=724)  <strong>Comparator:</strong> Losartan 100 mg daily plus placebo (n=724)</td>
<td>1° endpoint: After a median follow-up of 2.2 y, the study was stopped early due to safety concerns. There was no difference in the 1° outcome of first occurrence of change in eGFR (decrease of ≥30 mL/min/1.73 m² if initial GFR was ≥60 mL/min/1.73 m² or a decline of ≥50% if initial eGFR was &lt;60 mL/min/1.73 m²), ESRD, or death (HR with combination therapy: 0.88; 95% CI: 0.70–1.12; p=0.30).  2° endpoint: There was no difference in the 2° endpoint of first occurrence of change in eGFR or ESRD (HR: 0.78; 95% CI: 0.58–1.05; p=0.10). There were no differences between combination therapy or losartan monotherapy for the endpoints of ESRD, death, composite of MI, HF, or stroke, MI, CHF, and stroke (p&lt;0.05 for all).</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Combination therapy of losartan plus lisinopril did not improve renal outcomes compared to losartan alone, and was associated with greater risk of acute kidney injury and hyperkalemia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTITUDE Parving HH, et al., 2012 (125) 23121378</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Determine if addition of aliskiren as an adjunct to an ACEI or ARB reduces the risk of CV and renal events in pts with type 2 DM</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> ≥35 y with type 2 DM, ≥35 y with type 2 DM  On ACEI or ARB  At least 1 of the following: persistent macroalbuminuria (urine microalbumin to creatinine ratio ≥200 mg/g) and eGFR ≥30 mL/min/1.73 m², persistent microalbuminuria (≥200 mg/g) and &lt;200 mg/g) and a mean eGFR ≥30 and &lt;60</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Aliskiren 300 mg daily added to conventional treatment with an ACEI or ARB (n=4,274)  <strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo (n=4,287)</td>
<td>1° endpoint: After a median follow-up of 32.9 mo the study was stopped early. There was no difference in the 1° composite outcome death from CV causes or first occurrence of cardiac arrest with resuscitation; nonfatal MI; nonfatal stroke; 2° endpoint: There was no difference in the 2° endpoint of first occurrence of change in eGFR or ESRD (HR: 2.40; 95% CI: 1.3–2.2; p&lt;0.001).</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Combination therapy of losartan plus lisinopril did not improve renal outcomes compared to losartan alone, and was associated with greater risk of acute kidney injury and hyperkalemia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong></td>
<td>Doubled-blind, multicenter RCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>8561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusion criteria:**
- mL/min/1.73 m², or history of CVD (e.g., MI, stroke, HF, or CAD) and a mean eGFR ≥30 and <60 mL/min/1.73 m²

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Serum K+ >5.0 mmol/L
- Type 1 DM
- Unstable serum Cr
- CV history (NYHA Class III or IV, SBP ≥170 mm Hg or DBP ≥110 mm Hg or SBP ≥135 and <170 mm Hg or DBP ≥82 and <100 mm Hg with at least 3 agents, 2nd or third degree heart block, renal artery stenosis
- Surgical or medical conditions (malignancy in last 5 y, <2 y life expectancy, renal transplant or immunosuppressive therapy, drug/alcohol abuse, hypersensitivity/allergy/contraindication to study drugs, pregnancy)
- Concomitant treatment with ≥2 agents blocking RAAS or K⁺-sparing diuretics

**Safety endpoint:**
- There was no differences in CV composite outcome, renal composite outcome, or death from any cause (p>0.05 for all)

**Summary:**
- Aliskiren added to background treatment of an ACEI or ARB did not decrease CV or renal outcomes, and was associated with increased risk of cardiac arrest with resuscitation, hyperkalemia, and hypotension.

---

**ONTARGET**  
Yusuf S, et al., 2008 (126)  
18378520

**Aim:** Evaluate whether use of an ARB was noninferior to ACEI, and whether the combination was superior to ACEI alone in the prevention of vascular events in pts with CVD or DM but not HF.

**Study type:** Multi-center, double-blind, RCT

**Inclusion criteria:**
- ≥55 y
- Coronary, peripheral, or cerebrovascular disease or DM with end-organ damage

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Inability to discontinue ACEI or ARB
- Known hypersensitivity or intolerance to ACEI or ARB
- Selected CVDs (congestive HF, hemodynamically significant valvular or outflow tract obstruction, constrictive pericarditis, complex congenital heart disease, syncopal episodes of unknown etiology <3 mo, planned cardiac surgery

**Intervention:** Ramipril 10 mg daily (n=8,576)

**Comparator:**
- Telmisartan 80 mg daily (n=8,542)
- Combination of telmisartan and ramipril (n=8,502)

**1° endpoint:** After a median follow-up of 56 mo, there was no difference between ramipril vs. telmisartan or combination therapy vs. ramipril in the 1° composite outcome of death from CV causes, MI, stroke, or hospitalization for HF (RR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.94–1.08; p=0.12).

**2° endpoint:**
- There was no differences in composite outcome of death from CV causes, MI, or stroke in the ramipril vs. telmisartan groups RR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.9–1.07); p=0.001 or ramipril vs. combination RR: 1.00; 95% CI: 0.93–1.09
- There were no differences between ramipril vs. telmisartan or combination therapy in 2° outcomes including MI, stroke, hospitalization for HF, death from CV causes, death from non-CV causes, or death from any cause (p>0.05 for all).
or PTCA <3 mo, uncontrolled HTN on treatment [e.g., BP >160/100 mm Hg], heart transplant recipient, stroke due to subarachnoid hemorrhage)

- Other conditions (significant renal artery disease, hepatic dysfunction, uncorrected volume or sodium depletion, 1° hyperaldosteronism, hereditary fructose intolerance, other major noncardiac illness or expected to reduce life expectancy or significant disability interfere with study participation, simultaneously taking another experimental drug, unable to provide written informed consent).

ramipril monotherapy (480 pts vs. 283 pts; p<0.001)
- Hypotensive symptoms were cited as reason for permanent discontinuing more in telmisartan vs. ramipril (RR: 1.54; p<0.001) and combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy (RR: 2.75; p<0.001)
- Renal impairment was more common in combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.2–1.44

Summary: Combination therapy with telmisartan and ramipril did not decrease the risk of CV events in pts at high risk compared to monotherapy with ramipril. In addition, combination therapy was associated with increased risk of hypotension, hyperkalemia, and renal impairment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym (if applicable)</th>
<th>Author Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawes CM, et al., 2003 (50)</td>
<td>12658016</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs of BP drugs recording CHD events and strokes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CHD RR or 46% Stroke 64%</td>
<td>All classes of BP meds confer benefit while BB confer greater benefit in those with CAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV J, et al., 2013 (127)</td>
<td>23798459</td>
<td>Study type: MA of RTC that randomly assigned individuals to different target BP levels</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.5/4.5 mm Hg BP difference. Intensive BP lowering achieved. RR for Major CV events: 11%; 95% CI: 1%–21% MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–25%</td>
<td>More intensive strategy for BP control reduced cardio-renal endpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: MA of RTC that randomly assigned individuals to different target BP levels</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Achieved BP 133/76 mm Hg (intensive) 140/81 (less intense)</td>
<td>More intensive approach reduced major CV events (stroke and MI) except heat failure, CVD, ESRD, and total mortality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke: 24%; 95% CI: 8%–37%</td>
<td>Stroke: 24%; 95% CI: 8%–37%</td>
<td>Stroke: 24%; 95% CI: 8%–37%</td>
<td>Stroke: 24%; 95% CI: 8%–37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRD: 11%; 95% CI: 3%–18%</td>
<td>ESRD: 11%; 95% CI: 3%–18%</td>
<td>ESRD: 11%; 95% CI: 3%–18%</td>
<td>ESRD: 11%; 95% CI: 3%–18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 4%–16%</td>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 4%–16%</td>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 4%–16%</td>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 4%–16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinopathy 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td>Retinopathy 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td>Retinopathy 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td>Retinopathy 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major CV events: 14%; 95% CI: 4%–22%</td>
<td>Major CV events: 14%; 95% CI: 4%–22%</td>
<td>Major CV events: 14%; 95% CI: 4%–22%</td>
<td>Major CV events: 14%; 95% CI: 4%–22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–24%</td>
<td>MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–24%</td>
<td>MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–24%</td>
<td>MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke: 22%; 95% CI: 10%–32%</td>
<td>Stroke: 22%; 95% CI: 10%–32%</td>
<td>Stroke: 22%; 95% CI: 10%–32%</td>
<td>Stroke: 22%; 95% CI: 10%–32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 3%–16%</td>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 3%–16%</td>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 3%–16%</td>
<td>Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 3%–16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinopathy progression: 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td>Retinopathy progression: 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td>Retinopathy progression: 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td>Retinopathy progression: 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More intensive had no effects on HF: 15%; 95% CI: -11%–34%</td>
<td>More intensive had no effects on HF: 15%; 95% CI: -11%–34%</td>
<td>More intensive had no effects on HF: 15%; 95% CI: -11%–34%</td>
<td>More intensive had no effects on HF: 15%; 95% CI: -11%–34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV death: 9%; 95% CI: -11%–26%</td>
<td>CV death: 9%; 95% CI: -11%–26%</td>
<td>CV death: 9%; 95% CI: -11%–26%</td>
<td>CV death: 9%; 95% CI: -11%–26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mortality: 9%; 95% CI: -3%–19%</td>
<td>Total mortality: 9%; 95% CI: -3%–19%</td>
<td>Total mortality: 9%; 95% CI: -3%–19%</td>
<td>Total mortality: 9%; 95% CI: -3%–19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESKD: 10%; 95% CI: -6%–23%</td>
<td>ESKD: 10%; 95% CI: -6%–23%</td>
<td>ESKD: 10%; 95% CI: -6%–23%</td>
<td>ESKD: 10%; 95% CI: -6%–23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xie X, et al., 2015 (21) 26559744</td>
<td>Study type: MA of RTC that randomly assigned individuals to different target BP levels</td>
<td>Size: 19 trials (n=44,989)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
| Study type: Cumulative meta-analysis of RCTs to study benefit of more vs. less intensive BP lowering | N/A | N/A | Stroke, MI, HF, CVD mortality, and all-cause mortality  
• Difference in achieved SBP/DBP=7.6/4.5 mm Hg  
• For stroke and MI the cumulative Z score crossed the efficacy boundary after addition of the SPRINT results  
• For CVD mortality and HF, the cumulative Z curve crossed the conventional significance boundary (but not the sequential monitoring boundary)  
• For all-cause mortality, the cumulative Z curve did not reside in the futility area but did not cross the conventional significance boundary. | The results strongly supported the benefit of intensive BP reduction for prevention of stroke and MI and suggested benefit for prevention of CVD mortality and HF.

| Study type: Network meta-analysis in which the authors attempted to compare the benefits and adverse effects resulting from intensive reduction in SBP | N/A | N/A |  
• There was a significant reduction in stroke (RR: 0.54) and MI (RR: 0.68)  
• The point estimate favored all-cause mortality, CVD mortality and HF but the results did not achieve significance  
• SBP targets <120 and <130 mm Hg ranked #1 and #2 as the most efficacious  
• Serious adverse effects were more common at a lower SBP (120 vs. 150 or 140 mm Hg) | Overall, the beneficial effects of treatment were consistent with other reports. The cluster plots of treatment benefit vs. risk are difficult to interpret due to limitations of the available data base and the authors’ decision to weight treatment benefits and potential adverse effects equally.

Verdecchia P et al., 2016

Bangalore S, et al., 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Cluster plots for combined efficacy and safety suggested a SBP &lt;130 mm Hg as the optimal target for SBP reduction during treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bundy JD, et al., 2017</td>
<td>Systematic review and network meta-analysis to assess the benefits of intensive SBP reduction during treatment of hypertension</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In general, there were linear associations between achieved SBP and risk of CVD and all-cause mortality, with the lowest risk at a SBP of 120–124 mm Hg. This was by far the largest and best powered meta-analysis to assess the relationship between SBP reduction and major outcomes during treatment of hypertension. The findings provided strong evidence for the “lower is better” approach to treatment in patients with a high SBP who are at high risk for CVD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawes CMM, et al., 2002</td>
<td>Review of observational reports and randomized controlled trials</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The relative benefits of BP lowering for CHD prevention likely to be consistent across a wide range of different populations. Likely to be considerable benefit for BP lowering beyond traditional thresholds, especially in those at high risk for CVD. BP lowering is likely to be more important than choice of initial agent. A large majority of patients being treated for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly supports lower BPs during BP treatment, especially in those at high risk of CVD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hypertension have suboptimal BPs. Initiatives to lower their BP further are essential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (include Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; and 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xie X, et al., 2015 (21) 26559744</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess the efficacy and safety of intensive BP-lowering strategies. <strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis of RCTs <strong>Size:</strong> 19 RCTs with 44,989 pts</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCTs with at least 6 mo follow-up that randomly assigned pts to more intensive vs. less intensive BP-lowering treatment, with different BP targets or different BP changes from baseline. Reference lists from identified trials and review articles were manually scanned to identify any other relevant studies. <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> N/A</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> BP-lowering meds <strong>Comparator:</strong> - Less intensive treatment - BP difference 6.8/3.5 - The mean follow-up BP levels in the less intensive BP-lowering regimen group were 140/81 mm Hg, compared with 133/76 mm Hg in the more intensive treatment group.</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> - CVD, other major CV events, defined as a MI, stroke, HF, or CV death, separately and combined; nonvascular and all-cause mortality; ESKD, and adverse events. Progression of albuminuria (defined as new onset of microalbuminuria/macro-albuminuria or a change from microalbuminuria to macroalbuminuria) and retinopathy (retinopathy progression of 2 or more steps) were also recorded for trials that were done in pts with DM - CVD RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.78–0.96)</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Intensive BP-lowering, including to &lt;130 mm Hg, provided greater vascular protection than standard regimens. In high-risk pts, there are additional benefits from more intensive BP-lowering, including for those with SPB &lt;140 mm Hg at baseline. The net absolute benefits of intensive BP-lowering in high-risk individuals are large. <strong>Limitations:</strong> - Lack of individual pt data, which would have allowed a more reliable assessment of...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other endpoints:
- MI RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.76–1.00) p=0.042
- Stroke RR: 0.78 (95% CI: 0.68–0.90)
- HF RR: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.66–1.11)
- CVD death RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.74–1.11)
- Total deaths RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.81–1.03)

Other results:
- Benefit for CVD not different by baseline SBP
  120–139: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.76–1.05)
  140–160: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.68–1.00)
  >160: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.73–1.09) p-heterogeneity: 0.60
- Benefit for CVD not different for more intensive and less intensive targets in intensive group
  <140 or <150 mm Hg: 0.76 (95% CI: 0.60–0.97)
  <120–<130 mm Hg: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.84–1.00; p-hetero: 0.06)
- Absolute benefits were proportional to absolute risk.
- For trials in which all pts had vascular disease, renal disease, or DM at baseline, the average control group rate of major vascular events was 2.9% per y compared with 0.9% per y in other trials, and the numbers needed to treat were 94 (95% CI: 76–115) per CVD event.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julius S, et al., 2006 (55)</td>
<td>RCT in pre-HTN16 mg candesartan vs. placebo</td>
<td>809 pts</td>
<td>58% men</td>
<td>During the first 2 y, HTN developed in 154 (40.4%) pts in the placebo group compared with only 53 (13.6%) of those in the candesartan group, for a RR of 66.3% (p&lt;0.0001). After 4 y, HTN developed in 240 (63.0%) in the placebo group vs. only 208 (53.2%) in the candesartan group RR 15.6% (p&lt;0.0069).</td>
<td>2/3 of those with pre-HTN develop HTN within 4 y. Candesartan interrupts the onset and reduced by 15.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawes CM, et al., 2003 (50)</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of RCTs of BP drugs recording CHD events and strokes</td>
<td>464,000 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHD RR or 46% Stroke 64%</td>
<td>All classes of BP meds confer benefit while BB confer greater benefit in those with CAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonn EM, et al., 2016 (116)</td>
<td>Double-blind, placebo-controlled RCT, factorial design</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Men ≥55 y and women ≥60 y at intermediate risk for CVD. No BP restrictions. Exclusion criteria: Known CVD, Indications or contraindications to study meds, Mod/advanced CKD, Symptomatic hypotension</td>
<td>FDC of ARB (candesartan 16 mg/d) and diuretic (hydrochlorothiazide 12.5 mg/d) or placebo</td>
<td>1° endpoint: 1 co-1° CVD composite outcomes CVD mortality, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke Above plus cardiac arrest, HF, revascularization</td>
<td>Summary: SBP/DBP reduction of 6.0/3.0 mm Hg, No difference in treatment effect 1st co-1° 0.93 (0.79–1.10) 2nd co-1° 0.95 (0.81–1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neaton JD, et al., 1993 (117) 8336373

**Aim:** To compare 6 antihypertensive drugs (representing different drug classes)  
**Study type:** Double-blind, placebo-controlled RCT  
**Size:** 902 pts with stage 1 HTN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Intervention:</th>
<th>1° endpoint:</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Men and women 45–69 y  
• Not taking antihypertensive medications, with DBP 90–99 mm Hg  
• Taking 1 antihypertensive medication, with DBP <95 mm Hg and between 85–99 mm Hg after withdrawal of BP medications | Treatment (number):  
Once daily (AM):  
• Placebo (234)  
• Chlorthalidone 15 mg/d (136)  
• Acebutolol 400 mg/d (132)  
• Doxazosin 2 mg/d (134)  
• Amlodipine 5 mg/d (131)  
• Enalapril 5 mg/d (135) | BP, QoL, side effects, chemistries, ECG, clinical events | • Suggestion of a subgroup effect in tertile with the highest baseline BP and increased CVD risk.  
• Minimal differences between drug regimens |

**Follow-up:** Median=4.4 y

### Data Supplement 27. Choice of Initial Medication (Section 8.1.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym Author Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Psaty BM, et al., 2003 12759325      | Study type: Network meta-analysis to compare value of different first-line antihypertensive drugs in prevention of major CVD and all-cause mortality  
Size: 42 trials (n=192,478) | N/A | • For all outcomes, low-dose diuretics were better than placebo  
• None of the other first-line agents (β-blockers, ACEI, CCBs, α-receptor blockers and ARBs) were superior to low-dose diuretics  
• For several outcomes, low-dose diuretics were superior to other agents | • Low-dose diuretics were identified as the most effective first-line treatment for prevention of CVD and all-cause mortality during treatment of hypertension | N/A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brunström M, et al., 2016 (53) 26920333 | Meta-analysis of levels of BP control in DM hypertensives. | 49 trials (most pts with DM-2) | 73,738 pts | Baseline SBP >150 RR for  
• All death: 0.89; 95% CI:0.80–0.99  
• CVD: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.57–0.99  
• MI: 0.74; 95% CI: 0.63–0.87  
• Stroke: 0.77; 95% CI: 0.65–0.91  
• ESRD: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.71–0.94  
Baseline SBP140–150 RR of  
• Death: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.78–0.98  
• MI: 0.84; 95% CI: 0.76–0.9 
• HF: 0.80; 95% CI: 0.66–0.97  
If baseline SBP,140 mm Hg, however, further treatment increased the risk of CV mortality (1.15; 95% CI: 1.00–1.32)  
BP lowering reduces major CV events in DM. Caution for initiating treatment in diabetics with SBP <140/90 | N/A |
| Ettehad D, et al., 2015 (17) 26724178 | Meta-analysis of large RTCs of antihypertensive treatment | N/A | Every 10 mm Hg reduction in SBP RR:  
• Major CV events: 0.80; 95% CI: 0.77–0.83  
• CHD: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.78–0.88  
• Stroke: 0.73; 95% CI: 0.68–0.77, HF (0.72, 0.67–0.78  
• All-cause mortality: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.87; 0.84–0.91  
• ESRD: 0.95; 0.84–1.07  
• BP lowering reduces CV risk across various baseline BP levels and comorbidities. Suggest lowering SBP <130 mm Hg and BP-lowering treatment to pts with a history of CVD, CHD, stroke, DM, HF, and CKD. | N/A |
| Thomopolous C, et al., 2016 (54) 26848994 | Meta-analysis of RTCs of more vs. less intense BP control | 16 trials (52,235 pts) compared more vs. less intense treatment 34 (138,127 pts) active vs. placebo | More intense BP  
• Stroke RR: 0.71; 95% CI: 0.60–0.84  
• CHD RR: 0.80; 95% CI: 0.68–0.95  
• Intensive BP reduction improves CV outcomes compared to less intense  
• Achieved BP <130/80 may be associated with CV benefit. | N/A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study, Year, etc.</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julius S, et al., 2006 (55) 16537662</td>
<td>RCT in pre-HTN 16 mg candesartan vs. placebo  <strong>Study type:</strong></td>
<td>809 pts  <strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>58% men</td>
<td><strong>During the first 2 y, HTN developed in 154 (40.4%) pts in the placebo group compared with only 53 (13.6%) of those in the candesartan group, for a RR of 66.3% (p&lt;0.0001). After 4 y, HTN developed in 240 (63.0%) in the placebo group vs. only 208 (53.2%) in the candesartan group RR 15.6% (p&lt;0.0069).</strong>  <strong>2/3 of those with pre-HTN develop HTN within 4 y. Candesartan interrupts the onset and reduced by 15.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ference BA, et al., 2014 (56) 24591335</td>
<td>Evaluated the effect of 12 polymorphisms (associated with BP) on the odds of CHD and compared it with the effect of lower SBP observed in both prospective cohort studies and BP-lowering randomized trials  <strong>Study type:</strong>  <strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>199,477 pts in 63 studies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>12 polymorphisms were associated with a 0.32 mm Hg lower SBP (p=1.79×10⁻⁷) and a 0.093-mm Hg/decade slower age-related rise in SBP (p=3.05×10⁻⁶). The effect of long-term exposure to lower SBP on CHD mediated by these polymorphisms was 2-fold greater than that observed in prospective cohort studies (p=0.006) and 3-fold greater than that observed in short-term BP treatment trials (p=0.001).</strong>  <strong>SBP may be causally associated with the rate of rise in SBP with age and has a cumulative effect on the risk of CHD.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Acronym</td>
<td>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</td>
<td>Patient Population</td>
<td>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</td>
<td>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ambrosius WT, et al., 2014 (122) 24902920 | **Aim:** To describe the study design of the SPRINT trial  
**Study type:** description of study design and protocol for the SPRINT RCT | Inclusion criteria: Adults ≥50 y, average SBP ≥130 mm Hg and evidence of CVD, CKD, or 10-y Framingham risk score ≥15%, or age ≥75 y | Intervention: 9361 participants randomized to 2 treatment groups: (1) Standard treatment group, SBP target <140 mm Hg, and (2) Intensive treatment group: SBP target <120 mm Hg. | 1° endpoint: MI, ACS, stroke, HF, or CVD death. | Relevant 2° endpoint: All-cause mortality, decline in kidney function or development of ESRD, incident dementia, decline in cognitive function, and small-vessel cerebral ischemic disease  
Summary: This paper describes the protocol followed in the SPRINT trial that was successful in helping participants to attain and maintain BP targets in the study groups. Once treated, participants had follow-up visits to assessment BP control monthly until BP was at target. Medications were titrated and added as per protocol, when target BP was not attained. |
| Cushman WC, et al., 2007 (123) 17599425 | **Aim:** To describe the study design of the BP trial of the ACCORD trial.  
**Study type:** description of study design and protocol | Inclusion criteria: Adults with a diagnosis of type 2 DM for at least 3 mo and at high risk for CVD events, who meet the following BP criteria: (1) SBP 130–160 mm Hg and taking 0–3 antihypertensive medications; (2) SBP 161–170 and on 0–2 antihypertensive | Intervention:  • Unmasked, open-label, factorial design, randomized trial with a sample size of 4,733 pts  
• Patients were randomized to intensive SBP control (<120 mm Hg) or standard control (<140 mm Hg) | 1° endpoint: Major CVD event (nonfatal MI or stroke, or CV death) | Relevant 2° endpoint: Expanded macrovascular outcome (1° outcome plus coronary revascularization or HF hospitalization), total mortality, each of the separate components of the 1° outcome, HF death or hospitalization, and |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Xu W, et al., 2015 (128) 25655523 | Retrospective assessment of the impact of follow-up intervals and treatment intensification thresholds on CVD events | Primary care practices in the U.K., 1986–2010. | N/A | Increased risk of acute CVD event or death with:  
• Systolic intensification thresholds >150 mm Hg  
• Delays of >1.4 mo before medication intensification after SBP elevation  
• Delays of >2.7 mo before BP follow-up after antihypertensive medication intensification  
• Timely medical management and follow-up impacts outcomes in the treatment of pts with HTN.  
• Retrospective study, but still sheds important light on the impact of follow-up actions |
### Data Supplement 29. Monitoring Strategies to Improve Control of BP in Patients on Drug Therapy for High BP (Section 8.3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym Author Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (include Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2nd Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brennan T, et al., 2010 (130) 20415618 | **Aim:** Assess impact of follow-up and monitoring system including home BP monitoring and telephonic nurse case management on BP control in pts treated for HTN  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 638 African American pts with high BP from a national health maintenance organization plan  
**Inclusion criteria:** HTN  
**Intervention:** intervention group received telephonic nurse case management, pt education materials, lifestyle counseling, and a home BP monitor  
**Comparator:** Control group received a home BP monitor only  
**Outcome:** intervention group achieved lower SBP (123.6 vs. 126.7 mm Hg, p=0.03) and was 50% more likely than the control group to achieve BP control OR: 1.50; 95% CI: 0.997–2.27; p=0.052 | | | | Combination of home BP monitoring and nurse case management controlled HTN better than home BP alone |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosworth, et al., 2009 [131]</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Assess impact of telephone follow-up intervention and/or home BP monitoring on BP control in pts with treated HTN</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts with HTN, from 2 university-affiliated primary care clinics.</td>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 636 pts were randomized; 475 pts completed the trial, including 24-mo follow-up period.</td>
<td><strong>Bosworth, et al., 2011 [132]</strong>&lt;br&gt;Aim: Assess impact of telephone follow-up interventions on BP control in pts with treated HTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bosworth, et al., 2011 [132]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Assess impact of telephone follow-up interventions on BP control in pts with treated HTN</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Primary care clinics at a VA Medical Center</td>
<td><strong>RCT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> Of 1551 eligible pts, 593 randomized</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Inclusion Criteria</td>
<td>2 intervention groups:</td>
<td>Intervention group with all components achieved better BP control vs. usual care</td>
<td>Combination of home BP monitoring, Internet-based BP management tools, and pharmacist care management helped control HTN better than usual care and better than BP monitoring and Internet-based tool alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green BB, et al., 2008 (133) 18577730</td>
<td>Assess impact of follow-up and monitoring system including home BP monitoring, Internet-based BP management tool, and pharmacist care management on BP control in pts treated for HTN</td>
<td>Uncontrolled HTN and Internet access</td>
<td>one with home BP monitoring and Internet tool, and the other with home BP monitoring, Internet tool, and pharmacist care management</td>
<td>56% (95% CI: 49%–62%) or combination intervention group achieved BP control vs. usual care (p&lt;0.001) and intervention with only home BP monitor and Internet tool (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heisler M, et al., 2012 (134) 22570370</td>
<td>Assess impact of follow-up pharmacist care management system on BP control in pts treated for HTN</td>
<td>Uncontrolled HTN and Internet access</td>
<td>14-mo intervention period</td>
<td>Mean SBP was 2.4 mm Hg lower (95% CI: -3.4-- -1.5), p&lt;0.001 in the intervention group immediately after the intervention period, compared to the control group BP decrease was the same in the intervention and control groups (9 mm Hg).</td>
<td>Pharmacist care management system in a “real world” setting was more effective than usual care in lowering BP in the short-term, but in the longer-term follow-up did not differ significantly from usual care. This study is one of very few studies to show no significant longer term impact of a care management system on BP control in pts with HTN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margolis KL, et al., 2013 (25) 23821088</td>
<td>Assess impact of follow-up and monitoring system including home BP tele-monitoring and pharmacist case management on BP control in pts treated for HTN</td>
<td>Uncontrolled HTN</td>
<td>222 pts randomized to 8 usual care clinics and 228 randomized to 8 intervention clinics</td>
<td>Intervention group achieved better BP control compared to usual care during 12 mo of intervention and persisting during 6 mo of follow-up</td>
<td>Combination of home BP tele-monitoring and pharmacist case management helped control HTN better than usual care at 6, 12, and 18 mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Supplement 30. RCTs Comparing Stable Ischemic Heart Disease (Section 9.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| INVEST Bangalore S, et al., 2014 (135) 25145522 | **Aim:** To investigate optimal BP in pts ≥60 y with CAD and SBP >150 mm Hg treated with antihypertensive drugs  
**Study type:** Post-hoc analysis of PROBE trial (INVEST study—atenolol/HCTZ or verapamil-SR/trandolapril)  
**Size:** 8,354 pts | **Inclusion criteria:** Pts ≥60 y with CAD and SBP >150 mm Hg treated with antihypertensive therapy  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A | **Intervention:**  
• 4,787 pts (57%) achieved SBP<140 mm Hg (group 1)  
• SBP achieved was <140 mm Hg (group 1)  
**Comparator:**  
• 1,747 pts (21%) achieved SBP of 140–149 mm Hg (group 2); 1,820 pts (22%) achieved SBP ≥150 mm Hg (group 3)  
• SBP achieved was 140–149 mm Hg (group 2) and 150 mm Hg or higher (group 3) | **1° endpoint:** All-cause death, nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke. Multiple propensity score-adjusted 1° outcome showed that compared with group 1, the risk of 1° outcome adjusted HR: 1.12 (95% CI: 0.95–1.32; p=0.19); for group 2 adjusted HR: 1.85 (95% CI: 1.59, 2.14), p<0.0001; for group 3 adjusted HR: 1.64 (95% CI: 1.40, 1.93), p<.0001  
**1° Safety endpoint:** No significant difference between the 3 groups | **Relevant 2° endpoint:** Multiple propensity score-adjusted analysis:  
• Compared with group 1, no significant difference in all-cause mortality in group 2 but increased all-cause mortality in group 3 (HR: 1.64; 95% CI: 1.40–1.93; p<0.0001).  
• Compared with group 1, increase CV mortality in group 2 (HR: 1.34; 95% CI: 1.01–1.77; p=0.04) and in group 3 (HR: 2.29; 95% CI: 1.79–2.93; p<0.0001).  
• Compared with group 1, total MI was in group 2 (HR: 1.20; 95% CI: 0.90–1.60; p=0.21) but was increased in group 3 (HR: 2.39; 95% CI: 1.87-3.05; p<0.0001).  
• Compared with group 1, no significant difference with group 2 but an increase in nonfatal MI in group 3 (adjusted HR: 2.45; 95% CI: 1.02–3.71; p<0.0001).  
• Compared with group 1, an increase in total stroke in group 2 (HR: 1.89; 95% CI: 1.26–2.82; p=0.002) and in group 3 (HR: 2.93; 95% CI: 2.01–4.27; p=0.001).  
• Compared with group 1, an increase in nonfatal stroke in group 2 (HR: 1.70; 95% CI: 1.06–2.72; p=0.03) and in group 3 (HR: 2.78; 95% CI: 1.80–4.30; p=0.001).  
• HF and revascularization not significant  
**Study limitations and adverse events:** The present study was not designed to test whether pts ≥60 y with CAD and a SBP of 140–149 mm Hg would benefit
<p>| Study type: Meta-analysis of use of BP-lowering drugs in prevention of CVD from 147 randomized trials | Size: Of 147 randomized trials of 464,000 pts, 37 trials of BBs in CAD included 38,892 pts, and 37 trials of other antihypertensive drugs in CAD included 85,395 pts | Inclusion criteria: The database search used Medline (1966 to Dec. 2007) to identify randomized trials of BP-lowering drugs in which CAD events or strokes were recorded. The search also included the Cochrane Collaboration and Web of Science databases and the citations in trials and previous meta-analyses and review articles. Exclusion criteria: Trials were excluded if there were &lt;5 CAD events and strokes or if treatment duration was &lt;6 mo. | N/A | 1° endpoint: CAD events; stroke Results: In 37 trials of pts with a history of CAD, BBs reduced CAD events 29% (95% CI: 22%, 34%). In 27 trials in which BBs were used after acute MI, BBs reduced CAD events 31% (95% CI: 24%–38%), and in 11 trials in which BBs were used after long-term CAD, BBs insignificantly reduced CAD events 13%. In 7 trials, BBs reduced stroke 17% (95% CI: 1%–30%). CAD events were reduced 14% (95% CI: 2%–25%) in 11 trials of thiazide diuretics, 17% (95% CI: 11%–22%) in 21 trials of ACEIs, insignificantly 14% in 4 trials of angiotensin receptor blockers, and 15% (95% CI: 8%–22%) in 22 trials of CCBs. Stroke was reduced 38% (95% CI: 20%–47%) in 10 trials of thiazide diuretics, 22% (95% CI: 8%–34%) in 13 trials of ACEIs, and 34% from antihypertensive treatment. No adverse events were reported. Summary: The optimal SBP in pts ≥60 y with CAD and SBP &gt;150 mm Hg treated with antihypertensive therapy was &lt;140 mm Hg. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>1st endpoint and results</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>To investigate effect of ACE-I (Ramipril 10 mg) on CV events in high risk pts. over 5y with a mean entry BP of 139/79 mm Hg in both groups</td>
<td>Pts ≥55 y with history of CAD, stroke, PVD or DM with either HTN, elevated total cholesterol, low LDL cholesterol, smoking, or micro albuminuria.</td>
<td>Ramipril (10 mg) (4,645)</td>
<td>Placebo (4,652)</td>
<td>Composite of MI, stroke, or mortality from CV causes.</td>
<td>Endpoint reduction Ramipril group vs. Placebo (14% vs. 17.8%; RR: 0.78; CI: 0.70–0.86; p&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVE</td>
<td>To assess if captopril decrease morbidity and mortality in pts with LV dysfunction after MI</td>
<td>Pts (21–80 y) surviving 3 d after MI, EF≤40%.</td>
<td>Captopril (titrated doses) (115)</td>
<td>Placebo (1116)</td>
<td>All-cause mortality: 20% vs. 25%, RR: 19%; 95% CI: 3%–32%; p=0.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPA</td>
<td>To investigate efficacy of perindopril in CV events in pts with stable CAD.</td>
<td>Pts ≥18 y (women) with CAD &gt;mo before screening, revascularization &gt;6 mo before screening, ≥70% narrowing of major</td>
<td>Perindopril (6,110)</td>
<td>Placebo (6,108)</td>
<td>Composite of CV death, nonfatal MI, cardiac arrest with successful CPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other endpoints:** Fatal and nonfatal major CV events were reduced in the captopril group.

**Results:** Endpoint reduction Ramipril group vs. Placebo (14% vs. 17.8%; RR: 0.78; CI: 0.70–0.86; p<0.001)

- Death from cardiac causes reduced (6.1% vs. 8.1%; p<0.001)
- Death from MI reduced (9.9% vs. 12.3%; p<0.001)
- Death from any cause (10.4 % vs. 12.2%; p=0.005)
**MERIT-HF**  
Goldstein S, et al., 1999 (139)  
Aim: To investigate if metoprolol (CR/XL) once daily with std. treatment lowers mortality in pts with HFrEF  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 3,991 pts

| Size: 12,218 pts | coronary artery. Men with history of chest pain, positive ECG, echo or nuclear test  
**Exclusion criteria:** HF, planned revascularization, <110 mm Hg SBP, uncontrolled HTN, >100 mm Hg DBP, <1 mo use of ACEI or ARB, Cr>150 µmol/L, serum K>5.5 mmol/L |

**MERIT-HF**  
Goldstein S, et al., 1999 (139)  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
Pts 40–80 y with NYHA class II-IV HF for 3 mo before randomization and on standard treatment 2 wk before entry, Stable clinical condition during 2 wk run-in phase, EF ≤0.40.  
**Exclusion criteria:** Acute MI, UA <28 d of entry, contra to beta blockade <6 mo, HF due to systemic disease/alcohol abuse, heart transplant candidate, ICD, planned revascularization in past 4 mo, decompensated heart, SBP <100 mm Hg, CCB treatment, amiodarone use within 6 mo

**Intervention:**  
Metoprolol CR/XL (1,990)  
**Comparator:** Placebo (2,001)

**1° endpoint:** All-cause mortality in the intent to treat  
**Results:** 145 vs. 217 deaths [11.0 %], RR: 0.66 (95% CI: 0.53–0.81; p=0.00009) or adjusted for interim analyses p=0.0062.  
• Fewer sudden deaths in the metoprolol group (p=0.0002)  
• Lesser deaths from HFrEF in the metoprolol group (p=0.002)  
• Metoprolol improved survival and was well tolerated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1st endpoint</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packer M, et al., 2001 (140)</td>
<td>To assess survival in severe chronic HF pts by the use of carvedilol.</td>
<td>HF pts with dyspnea/exertion for 2 mo at least and left EF&lt;25% despite treatment clinically euvolemic; allowed on digalis, nitrates, hydralazine, spironolactone, or amiodarone. Hospitalized pts with no acute illness.</td>
<td>Carvedilol (1,156)</td>
<td>Death from any cause 130 vs. 190 deaths RR: 35%; 95% CI: 19%–48%; p=0.0013</td>
<td>• Study stopped early (1.3-y follow-up) due to benefit on survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPRICORN Dargie HJ, et al., 2001 (141)</td>
<td>To investigate outcomes after carvedilol after MI in pts with LV dysfunction.</td>
<td>Pts ≥18 y, MI within 3–21 d of entry, LVEF≤40%, concurrent ACEI stable dose for at least 24 h, HF pts treated and controlled with ACEI and diuretics but not inotropes.</td>
<td>Carvedilol (975)</td>
<td>All-cause mortality or hospital admissions for CV issues</td>
<td>• CV mortality, nonfatal MI reduced in the carvedilol group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 2,289 pts

**Comparator:** Placebo (1,133)

1° endpoint:
- Death from any cause
  - 130 vs. 190 deaths
  - RR: 35%; 95% CI: 19%–48%; p=0.0013
- Combined risk of death/hospitalization (24% lower risk in the carvedilol; 95% CI: 13%–33%; p<0.001

Safety endpoint: Lesser pts in carvedilol group required permanent discontinuation because of adverse events or for reasons other than death (p=0.02)

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 1,959 pts

**Comparator:** Placebo (984)

Results:
- 12% vs. 15%
- RR: 23%; 95% CI: 0.60–0.98; p=0.03
- No difference between groups for death or CV hospital admissions
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>1st endpoint</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MERIT-HF HTN</td>
<td>To assess metoprolol CR/XL influence on mortality and hospitalizations in HF and HTN pts.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>1,747 pts</td>
<td>Same as above MERIT-HF, 1999 study (HTN subgroup)</td>
<td>SBP&lt;90 mm Hg, uncontrolled HTN, bradycardia, insulin-dependent DM, BBs not for HF, Beta-2 agonists and steroids</td>
<td>Metoprolol CR/XL (871)</td>
<td>Placebo (876)</td>
<td>Total mortality</td>
<td>RR: 0.61; 95% Cl: 0.44–0.84; p=0.0022</td>
<td>Total mortality reduction was driven by reduction in the SCD and death from worsening HF. 12.5% pts had earlier discontinuation due to any cause. Lesser no. of pts in the metoprolol group (n=21) discontinued due to worsening HF. The mean reduction in BP (adjusted) was 1.7 mm Hg in the metoprolol group vs. 4.8 mm Hg in placebo group (p=0.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBIS-II</td>
<td>To determine efficacy of bisoprolol in reducing mortality in chronic HF.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>2,647 pts</td>
<td>Uncontrolled HTN, MI, UA &lt;3 mo revascularization, treatment, heart transplant, AV block &lt;1 degree, SBP &lt;100 mm Hg, renal failure, reversible obstructive lung disease</td>
<td>18–80 y, LVEF&lt;35%, dyspnea, orthopnea, fatigue, NYHA class III-IV</td>
<td>Bisoprolol (1,327)</td>
<td>Placebo (1,320)</td>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>Results: RR: 0.66; 95% CI: 0.54–0.81; p&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>The trial stopped early due to benefit. Bisoprolol group had significantly fewer SCDs. Mean age was 61 y so more data on elderly pts is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkayam U, et al., 1990</td>
<td>To assess comparative efficacy and safety of nifedipine and ISDN alone and the combination for treating for chronic CHF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18–75 y HF pts, NYHA class II and III, LVEF&lt;40%, clinically stable, maintenance dose of Digitalis and diuretics.</td>
<td>Nifedipine pts, NYHA class II and III, LVEF&lt;40%, clinically stable, maintenance dose of Digitalis and diuretics.</td>
<td>Nifedipine (21), ISDN (20), Nifedipine+ISDN (23)</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>HF-worsening: 9 in Nifedipine group vs. 3 in ISDN group (p&lt;0.09); and 21 in nifedipine-ISDN group (p&lt;0.001 vs. nifedipine, p&lt;0.0001 vs. ISDN)</td>
<td>In clinical deterioration nifedipine pts (8) vs. rest of the pts (No difference in LVEF or VO2 max). Although all the 3 drug regimens improved exercise capacity, nifedipine treatment alone or in combination resulted in clinical deterioration and worsening of CHF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT with a crossover design</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Pregnancy, nursing, history of MI &lt;1 mo before entry, valvular disease, Angina, significant pulmonary, hepatic, renal and hematologic disease, unable to walk on the treadmill, noncompliance</td>
<td><strong>Clinical deterioration discontinuation:</strong> Nifedipine 29% vs. ISDN group 5% (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td><strong>DBP:</strong> Nifedipine alone or combination with ISDN (reduction, p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 28 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Multicenter Diltiazem Postinfarction Research Group 1988 (145) 2899840**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess diltiazem effect on recurrent infarction and death after acute MI</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 25–75 y admitted to CCU, MI with enzyme confirmation.</th>
<th><strong>Intervention:</strong> Diltiazem 240 mg (1,234)</th>
<th><strong>1° endpoints and results:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Cardiogenic shock, Symptomatic hypotension, PH with right HF, 2nd/3rd degree heart block, HR &lt;50 bpm, Contraceptives, WPW syndrome, CCBs, Severe comorbidities or Cardiac surgery</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo (1,232)</td>
<td>Total mortality: identical in both groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 2,466 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiac death and nonfatal MI: 11% fewer in diltiazem but difference was NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MDPIT Goldstein RE, et al., 1991 (146) 1984898**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine if diltiazem increases late onset CHF in post-MI pts with early decline in EF.</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Same as above</th>
<th><strong>Intervention:</strong> Diltiazem 240 mg (1,234)</th>
<th><strong>1° endpoint and results:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Same as above</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo (1,232)</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 2,466 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up Results: Pts with BL EF<0.40, late CHF in Dilitizam group (21%) vs. Placebo (12%) [p=0.004].

• Life table analysis confirmed increased frequency of late CHF in pts taking dilitiazem (p=0.0017)
• Dilitiazem related CHF exclusively associated with systolic LVD with or without BBs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Reference</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freemantle N, et al., 1999 (147) 10381708</td>
<td>To evaluate BBs effectiveness for short-term treatment and long-term 2° prevention in acute MI.</td>
<td>RCTs with treatment lasting &gt;1 d and with follow-ups on clinical effectiveness in pts with MI</td>
<td>BBs (mostly propranolol, timolol, metoprolol)</td>
<td>All-cause mortality</td>
<td>Long-term trials RR reduction: 23% (95% CI: 15%–31%)</td>
<td>Cross-over RCTs</td>
<td>Meta-regression in long-term trials indicated a near significant trend for decreased benefit in drugs with ISA. NS in withdrawal between BBs of different cardio selectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Peuter OR, et al., 2009 (148) 19841485</td>
<td>To determine influence of beta-2 blockade in addition to beta-1 blockade for preventing vascular events in pts with ACS or HF.</td>
<td>RCTs comparing Beta-1 blockers vs. BBs 1 + 2 directly (5) RCTs comparing Beta-1 blockers vs. Beta 1 + 2 blockers with a control group (28)</td>
<td>Beta-1 blockers</td>
<td>Total mortality, vascular events.</td>
<td>Supplementary beta 2 blockade may be more beneficial. Indirect comparisons and heterogeneity among studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon MB, et al., 1981 (149) 7246435</td>
<td>To evaluate effectiveness of verapamil as a single agent and in combination with propranolol in pts with stable AP.</td>
<td>Symptomatic angina pectoris pts, 1) not sufficiently controlled on BBs and nitrates and noncardiac</td>
<td>Propranolol, verapamil, Combination of propranolol and verapamil</td>
<td>Large dose verapamil significantly lowered BP. Propranolol and verapamil combined (at best dose) further lowered BP, improved</td>
<td>HR and pressure-rate product lowered significantly on combination therapy PR interval increased on combination treatment Regarding antianginal properties, verapamil seemed to be more effective than propranolol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type:</td>
<td>RCT (triple crossover)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>11 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects from propranolol hindering treatment 2) who could stay 4 wk in hospital</td>
<td>Comparator: Placebo</td>
<td>exercise time by $4.7 \pm 0.7$ min ($p&lt;0.001$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria: LVD with CHF or LVEF&lt;30% at rest and &lt;25% for exercise, HR&lt;50 b/min, ≥first degree heart block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staessen JA, et al., 1997 (150) 9297994

| Aim: To determine if active treatment reduces complications from isolated systolic HTN in the elderly. | Inclusion criteria: Pts ≥60 y, sitting SPB 160–219 mm Hg, sitting DBP 95 mm Hg, and standing SBP ≥140 mm Hg. | Intervention: Active treatment (2,398) |
| Size: 4,965 pts | Exclusion criteria: Systolic HTN 2nd to a disorder, retinal hemorrhages/papilledema, CHF, aneurysms, serum Cr ≥180 µmol/L, history of nosebleed, stroke, MI <1 y, dementia, substance abuse, severe comorbidities | Comparator: Placebo (2,297) |
| 1° endpoint: Fatal and nonfatal strokes combined. | Results: 13.7 vs. 7.9 endpoints/1,000 pts-y (42% reduction; $p=0.003$) | |

Wright JT, et al., 2015 (114) 26551272

| Aim: To compare in pts with a SBP of 130–180 mm Hg and an increased CV risk but without DM the effect of a target SBP of <140 mm Hg vs. a target SBP of <120 mm Hg on the 1° composite outcome of MI, other ACSs, | Inclusion criteria: 9,361 pts, mean 67.9 y (28.2% ≥75 y; 35.6% women; 57.7% non-Hispanic white; 31.5% African American; 10.5% Hispanic) with a SBP of 130–180 mm Hg and an increased CV risk but without DM, history of stroke, symptomatic HF within | Intervention: 4,678 pts were randomized to intensive BP treatment |
| Size: 10,044 pts | | Comparator: 4,683 pts were randomized to standard BP treatment |
| 1° endpoint: | • At 1 y, the mean SBP was 121.4 mm Hg with intensive treatment (mean number of antihypertensive drugs was 2.8) and 136.2 mm Hg with standard treatment (mean number of antihypertensive drugs was 1.8) | |
| • At 3.26-y median follow-up, compared with standard BP treatment, intensive BP treatment reduced all-cause mortality 27% ($p=0.003$), HF 38% ($p=0.002$), CV mortality 43% ($p=0.005$), and the 1° composite outcome or death 22% ($p<0.001$) | • Intensive BP treatment reduced the 1° composite endpoint 33% (14% to 49%) in pts aged 75 y and older and 20% (0% to 36%) in pts 50–74 y | |
| • Serious adverse events were similar in both treatment groups. However, intensive BP treatment caused more hypotension (2.4% vs. 1.4%; $p=0.001$), more syncope (2.3% vs. 1.7%; $p=0.05$), more | | |
stroke, HF, or CV death
past 6 mo, LVEF <35%, and eGFR <20 mL/min/1.73 mm2; CVD was present in 20.1%, and the Framingham 10-y CVD risk score was ≥15% in 61.3% of pts

• At 3.26-y median follow-up, the 1° composite outcome was reduced 25% (p<0.001) by intensive BP treatment
electrolyte abnormality (3.1% vs. 2.3%; p=0.02), and more acute kidney injury or acute renal failure (4.1% vs. 2.5%; p<0.001). The incidence of bradycardia, injurious falls, and orthostatic hypotension with dizziness was similar in both treatment groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLHAT Collaborative Research Group, 2003</th>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> In a follow-up analysis, to compare diuretic vs. alpha-blocker as first step treatment of hypertension.</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Men and women ≥ 55 y with BP ≥140/90 mm Hg or on medications for hypertension with at least one additional risk factor for coronary heart disease.</th>
<th><strong>Intervention:</strong> 15,255 patients were randomized to chlorthalidone and 9,061 to doxazosin and followed for 3.2 y.</th>
<th><strong>Primary endpoint:</strong> Combined fatal coronary heart disease or non-fatal MI, analyzed by intention to treat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12925554</td>
<td>There was no difference in primary outcome between the arms (RR: 1.02; 95% CI: 0.94–1.13). However, the doxazosin arm compared with the chlorthalidone arm had a higher risk for stroke (RR: 1.26; 95% CI: 1.10–1.46) and combined cardiovascular disease (RR: 1.20; 95% CI: 1.13–1.27). The findings confirmed the superiority of diuretic-based over alpha blocker based antihypertensive treatment in the prevention of cardiovascular disease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Zanchetti A, et al., 2006 | **Aim:** To provide additional analyses of the primary endpoint in the VALUE trial, including sex, age, race, geographic region, smoking status, type 2 diabetes, total cholesterol, left ventricular hypertrophy, proteinuria, serum creatinine, history of coronary heart disease, stroke or transient ischemic attack and history of peripheral artery disease. | **Inclusion criteria:** The 15,245 patients participating in VALUE were divided into subgroups according to baseline characteristics. | **Statistical analysis:** Subgroup interaction analyses were conducted by the Cox proportion hazard model. Within each subgroup, treatment effects were assessed by hazard ratios and 95% CIs. | **Primary endpoint:** Combined fatal coronary heart disease or non-fatal MI, analyzed by intention to treat. |
| 17053536 | • For cardiac morbidity and mortality, the only significant subgroup by treatment interaction was of sex (p=0.016) with HR indicating a relative excess of cardiac events in women but not in men, but SBP differences in favor of amlodipine were greater in women. • In the VALUE cohort, in no subgroup of patients were there differences in the incidence of the composite cardiac endpoint with valsartan and amlodipine treatment despite greater BP reduction in the amlodipine group. |
### Aim
To compare the long-term relative safety and outcomes of ACE inhibitor- and CCB-based regimens in older hypertensive individuals in ALLHAT.

### Inclusion criteria
- Men and women age ≥55 y with untreated (BP 140–180/90–110 mm Hg) or treated hypertension (BP ≤160/100 mm Hg on ≤2 antihypertensive drugs) with ≥ 1 additional risk factor for coronary heart disease.

### Intervention
- Patients were randomized to amlodipine (9,048) or Lisinopril (9,054).

### Primary outcome
- Combined fatal coronary heart disease or non-fatal MI, analyzed by intention to treat.

### Follow-up
- 4.9 y

- Risk of coronary heart disease was similar between amlodipine and Lisinopril.
- For stroke, combined cardiovascular disease, gastrointestinal bleeding and angioedema, risks are higher with Lisinopril compared to amlodipine.
- For heart failure, risks are higher with amlodipine compared to Lisinopril.

---

### Data Supplement 31. Meta-analyses of ischemic heart disease (Section 9.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; and CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bundy JD, et al., 2017 28654682       | Study type: Network meta-analysis  
Size: 144,220 patients in 42 RCTs. | Inclusion criteria:  
- Random allocation into an antihypertensive medication, control or treatment target  
- Allocation to antihypertensive Antihypertensive treatment was independent of other treatment regimens  
- ≥100 patients in each treatment group  
- Trial duration ≥ 6 mo  
- One or more events for each treatment group reported  
- Minimum 5 mm Hg difference in SBP level between the 2 treatment groups  
- Outcomes included major CVD, stroke, CHD, CVD mortality or all-cause mortality | • There were linear associations between mean achieved SBP and risk of cardiovascular disease and mortality, with the lowest risk at 120 to 124 mm Hg. Randomized groups with a mean achieved SBP of 120 to 124 mm Hg had a hazard ratio (HR) for major cardiovascular disease of 0.71 (95% CI: 0.60–0.83) compared with randomized groups with a mean achieved SBP of 130 to 134 mm Hg, an HR of 0.58 (95% CI: 0.48–0.72) compared with those with a mean achieved SBP of 140 to 144 mm Hg, an HR of 0.46 (95% CI: 0.34–0.63) compared with those with a mean achieved SBP of 150 to 154 mm Hg, and an HR of 0.36 (95% CI: 0.26–0.51) compared with those with a mean achieved SBP of 160 mm Hg or more. | • This study suggests that reducing SBP to levels below currently recommended targets significantly reduces the risk of cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality and strongly support more intensive control of SBP among adults with hypertension. |
### Data Supplement 32. Nonrandomized Trials, Observational Studies, and/or Registries of Ischemic Heart Disease (Section 9.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; and 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVE IT-TIMI 22</strong> Bangalore S, et al., 2010 (151) 21060068</td>
<td><strong>Study type</strong>: Nonrandomized trial of optimal BP after ACS  <strong>Size</strong>: 4,162 pts</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria</strong>: Pts with acute MI or high-risk UA within 10 d randomized to pravastatin or atorvastatin and to gatifloxacin or placebo treated with standard medical and interventional treatment for ACS  <strong>Exclusion criteria</strong>: N/A</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint</strong>: Composite of all-cause death, MI, UA requiring rehospitalization, revascularization after 30 d, and stroke with a mean follow-up of 24 mo  <strong>Results</strong>: The relationship between SBP and DBP followed a J- or U-shaped curve association with the 1° outcome with increased events rates at both low and high BP values. A nonlinear Cox proportional hazards model showed a nadir of 136/85 mm Hg (range 130–140/80–90 mm Hg) at which the incidence of 1° outcome was lowest. There was a relatively flat curve for SBP of 110–130 mm Hg and for DBP of 70–90 mm Hg, suggesting a BP &lt;110/70 mm Hg may be dangerous.</td>
<td>• After an ACS, a J- or U-shaped association existed between BP and the incidence of new CV events. The lowest incidence of CV events occurred with a BP of 130–140/80–90 mm Hg and a relatively flat curve for SBP of 110–130 mm Hg and of DBP of 70–90 mm Hg, suggesting a BP &lt;110/70 mm Hg may be dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law MR, et al., 2009 (18) 19454737</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study type</strong>: Meta-analysis of use of BP-lowering drugs in prevention of CVD from 147 randomized trials  <strong>Size</strong>: Of 147 randomized trials of 464,000 pts, 37 trials of BBs in CAD included 38,892 pts, and 37 trials of other antihypertensive drugs in CAD included 85,395 pts</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria</strong>: The database search used Medline (1966 to Dec. 2007) to identify randomized trials of BP-lowering drugs in which CAD events or strokes were recorded. The search also included the Cochrane Collaboration and Web of Science databases and the citations in trials and previous meta-analyses and review articles.  <strong>Exclusion criteria</strong>: Trials were excluded if there were &lt;5 CAD events and strokes or if treatment duration was &lt;6 mo.</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint</strong>: CAD events; stroke  <strong>Results</strong>: In 37 trials of pts with a history of CAD, BBs reduced CAD events 29% (95% CI: 22%, 34%). In 27 trials in which BBs were used after acute MI, BBs reduced CAD events 31% (95% CI: 24%–38%), and in 11 trials in which BBs were used after long-term CAD, BBs insignificantly reduced CAD events 13%. In 7 trials, BBs reduced stroke 17% (95% CI: 1%–30%). CAD events were reduced 14% (95% CI: 2%–25%) in 11 trials of thiazide diuretics, 17% (95% CI: 11%–22%) in 21 trials of ACEIs, insignificantly 14% in 4 trials of angiotensin receptor blockers, and 15% (95% CI: 8%–22%) in 22 trials of CCBs. Stroke was reduced 38% (95% CI: 28%–47%) in 10 trials of thiazide diuretics, 22% (95% CI: 8%–34%) in 13 trials of ACEIs, and 34% (95% CI: 25%–42%) in 9 trials of CCBs.</td>
<td>• With the exception of the extra protective effect of BBs given shortly after a MI and the minor additional effect of CCBs in preventing stroke, all the classes of BP-lowering drugs have a similar effect in reducing CAD events and stroke for a given reduction in BP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Data Supplement 33. RCTs Comparing Heart Failure (Section 9.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym (if applicable)</th>
<th>Author Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; and 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LV J, et al., 2013 (127) 23798459</td>
<td>Study type: MA of RTC that randomly assigned individuals to different target BP levels <strong>Size</strong>: 37,348 pts</td>
<td>15 trials</td>
<td>7.5/4.5 mm Hg BP difference. Intensive BP lowering achieved. RR for: Major CV events: 11%; 95% CI: 1%–21%) MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–25% Stroke: 24%; 95% CI: 8%–37% ESRD: 11%; 95% CI: 3%–18% Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 4%–16% Retinopathy 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34% p=0.051</td>
<td>• More intensive strategy for BP control reduced cardio-renal endpoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xie X, et al., 2015 (21) 26559744</td>
<td>Study type: MA of RTC that randomly assigned individuals to different target BP levels <strong>Size</strong>: 44,989 pts</td>
<td>19 trials</td>
<td>Achieved BP 133/76 mm Hg (intensive) 140/81 (less intense) Major CV events: 14%; 95% CI: 4%–22% MI: 13%; 95% CI: 0%–24% Stroke: 22%; 95% CI: 10%–32% Albuminuria: 10%; 95% CI: 3%–16% Retinopathy progression: 19%; 95% CI: 0%–34% More intensive had no effects on HF: 15%; 95% CI: -11%–34% CV death: 9%; 95% CI: -11%–26% Total mortality: 9%; 95% CI: -3%–19% ESKD: 10%; 95% CI: -6%–23%</td>
<td>• More intensive approach reduced major CV events (stroke and MI) except heat failure, CVD, ESRD, and total mortality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomopolous C, et al., 2016 (54) 26848994</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis of RTCs of more vs. less intense BP control <strong>Size</strong>: (52,235 pts) compared more vs. less intense treatment 34 (138,127 pts) active vs. placebo</td>
<td>16 trials</td>
<td>More intense BP Stroke RR: 0.71; 95% CI: 0.60–0.84) CHD RR: 0.80; 95% CI: 0.68–0.95) Major CV events RR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.68–0.85 CV mortality RR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.63–0.97 Stratification of SBP cutoffs (150,140 and 130 mm Hg) showed that a SBP/DBP difference of 10/5 mm Hg across each cutoff reduced risk of all outcomes</td>
<td>• Intensive BP reduction improves CV outcomes compared to less intense Achieved BP &lt;130/80 may be associated with CV benefit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 34. RCTs Comparing HFrEF (Section 9.2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Herlitz J, et al., 2002 (142) 11862577 | **Aim:** To see effect of metoprolol vs. placebo on mortality and hospitalizations among pts with history of HTN and HF with reduced LVEF  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 1,747 pts | **Inclusion criteria:** NYHA class II–IV HF with LVEF ≤40% within 3 mo of enrollment; supine resting HR ≥68 bpm; stable clinical condition  
**Exclusion criteria:** Acute MI or UA within 28 d of randomization; indication or contraindication for treatment with BBs or drugs with beta-blocking properties; poor compliance; CABG surgery or PTCA in past 4 mo | **Intervention:**  
• Administration of metoprolol  
• 871 pts randomized to metoprolol  
**Comparator:**  
• Administration of placebo  
• 876 pts randomized to placebo | **1° endpoint:** At 1-y follow-up, compared with placebo, metoprolol reduced all-cause mortality 39% (95% CI: 16%–56%; p=0.002) and all-cause mortality or all-cause hospitalization 24% (95% CI: 11%–35%; p=0.0007)  
1° Safety endpoint: Early permanent cessation of drug was 12.5% for metoprolol and 15.9% for placebo (p=0.048); 21 pts on metoprolol and 35 pts on placebo had early cessation because of worsening | Relevant 2° endpoint: At 1-y follow-up, compared with placebo, metoprolol reduced CV death 41% (95% CI: 17%–57%; p=0.002), death from HF: 51% (95% CI: 1%–75%; p=0.042), sudden cardiac death 49% (95% CI: 21%–67%; p=0.002), all-cause mortality or HF hospitalization 28% (95% CI: 11%–42%; p=0.002), and cardiac death or nonfatal acute MI 44% (95% CI: 23%–60%; p=0.0003)  
Study limitations and adverse events: Early permanent cessation of drug was 12.5% for metoprolol and 15.9% for placebo (p=0.048); 21 pts on M and 35 pts on placebo had early cessation because of worsening HF; all-cause withdrawals were 22% less with metoprolol; (p=0.048); adverse events were 28% less with metoprolol (p=0.026); worsening HF was 41% less with metoprolol (p=0.056)  
Summary: In an RCT of pts with HF with reduced EF and a history of HTN, compared with placebo, metoprolol succinate reduced all-cause mortality and all-cause mortality or all-cause hospitalization |
| Packer M, et al., 2001 (140) 11386263 | **Aim:** To assess survival in severe | **Inclusion criteria:** HF pts with dyspnea/exertion for 2 mo at least and left EF<25% despite | **Intervention:** Carvedilol (1,156)  
**1° endpoint:** Death from any cause 130 vs. 190 deaths (RR: 35%; | **Study stopped early (1.3 y follow-up) due to benefit on survival** |
chronic HF pts by the use of carvedilol.  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 2,289 pts  
- Treatment clinically euvolemic; allowed on digitalis, nitrates, hydralazine, spironolactone, or amiodarone. Hospitalized pts with no acute illness.  
- **Exclusion criteria:** HF due to uncorrected prim. valvular disease or reversible cardiomyopathy, cardiac transplant pts., coronary revasc. <2 mo, acute MI or stroke, ventricular tachycardia, on alpha blocker or CCB or on antiarrhythmics class I <4 wk, SBP <85 mm Hg, serum Cr >2.8 mg/dL, change in body weight >1.5 kg during screening.  
- **Comparator:** Placebo (1,133)  
- 95% CI: 19%–48%; p=0.00013  
- Combined risk of death/hospitalization (24% lower risk in the carvedilol; 95% CI: 13%–33%; p<0.001)  
- **Safety endpoint:** Lesser pts in carvedilol group required permanent discontinuation because of adverse events or for reasons other than death (p=0.02)  
- Long-term treatment is very valuable.  
- Not all the pts with severe HF were allowed in the study

**CAPRICORN**  
Dargie HJ, et al., 2001 (141) 11356434  
**Aim:** To investigate outcomes after carvedilol after MI in pts with LV dysfunction.  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 1,959 pts  
- **Inclusion criteria:** Pts ≥18 y, MI within 3–21 d of entry, LVEF ≤40%, concurrent ACEI stable dose for at least 24 h, HF pts treated and controlled with ACEI and diuretics but not inotropes.  
- **Exclusion criteria:** SBP <90 mm Hg, uncontrolled HTN, bradycardia, insulin-dependent DM, BBs not for HF, Beta-2 agonists, and steroids  
- **Intervention:** Carvedilol (975)  
- **Comparator:** Placebo (984)  
- **1st endpoint:** All-cause mortality or hospital admissions for CV issues  
- **Results:** 12% vs. 15%; RR: 23% (95% CI: 0.60–0.98; p=0.03)  
- No difference between groups for death or CV hospital admissions  
- CV mortality, nonfatal MI reduced in the carvedilol group  
- No difference between groups sudden death and admission due to HF

Elkayam U, et al., 1990 (144) 2242521  
**Aim:** To assess comparative efficacy and safety of nifedipine and ISDN alone and the combination for treating for chronic CHF.  
**Inclusion criteria:** 18–75 y old HF pts, NYHA class II and III, LVEF<40%, clinically stable, maintenance dose of Digitalis and diuretics.  
**Exclusion criteria:** Pregnancy, nursing, history of MI <1 mo before entry, valvular disease, angina, significant pulmonary,  
**Intervention:** Nifedipine (21), ISDN (20), Nifedipine+ISDN (23)  
**Comparator:** Placebo  
**Endpoints and Results:**  
- HF-worsening: 9 in Nifedipine group vs. 3 in ISDN group (p<0.09); and 21 in nifedipine-ISDN group (p<0.001 vs. nifedipine, p=0.0001 vs. ISDN)  
- Clinical deterioration discontinuation:  
- In clinical deterioration nifedipine pts (8) vs. rest of the pts (No difference in LVEF or VO2 max.)  
- Although all the 3 drug regimens improved exercise capacity, nifedipine treatment alone or in combination resulted in clinical deterioration and worsening of CHF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Intervention/Comparator:</th>
<th>1st endpoint and results:</th>
<th>Follow-up Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crossover RCT</td>
<td>18–75 y HF pts, NYHA class II and III, LVEF &lt;40%, clinically stable, maintenance dose of digitalis and diuretics.</td>
<td>Diltiazem 240 mg (1,234)</td>
<td>HF-worsening: 9 in Nifedipine group vs. 3 in ISDN group (p&lt;0.09); and 21 in nifedipine-ISDN group (p&lt;0.001 vs. nifedipine, p&lt;0.0001 vs. ISDN)</td>
<td>Pts with BL EF&lt;0.40, late CHF in Dilitizam group (21%) vs. Placebo (12%) p=0.004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Pregnancy, nursing, history of MI &lt;1 mo before entry, valvular disease, Angina, significant pulmonary, hepatic, renal and hematologic disease., unable to walk on the treadmill, noncompliance</td>
<td>Placebo (1,232)</td>
<td>Life table analysis confirmed increased frequency of late CHF in pts taking dilitiazem (p=0.0017)</td>
<td>Treatment with valsartan resulted in improvements in NYHA class, LVEF, signs and symptoms of HF, and quality of life compared with placebo (p&lt;0.01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,466 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 pts</td>
<td>hepatic, renal and hematologic disease., unable to walk on the treadmill, noncompliance</td>
<td>Nifedipine 29% vs. ISDN group 5% (p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>DBP: Nifedipine alone or combination with ISDN (reduction, p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,010 pts, mean age 63 y, with NYHA class II-IV HF/HFrEF</td>
<td>5,010 pts on standard therapy for HF were randomized to valsartan or placebo</td>
<td>At 23-mo follow-up, mortality was similar in pts treated with valsartan or placebo</td>
<td>Treatment with valsartan resulted in improvements in NYHA class, LVEF, signs and symptoms of HF, and quality of life compared with placebo (p&lt;0.01).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,010 pts on standard therapy for HF were randomized to enalapril or placebo</td>
<td>The combined endpoint of mortality plus morbidity was reduced 13.2% (p=0.009) by valsartan because of a lower rate of HF hospitalization for HF (13.8% vs. 18.2%; p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>At 41.4-mo follow-up, compared with placebo, enalapril reduced mortality by 16% (p=0.0036)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,569 pts, mean age 61 y, with HF/HFrEF (90% with NYHA class II and III HF)</td>
<td>2,569 pts on standard therapy for HF were randomized to enalapril or placebo</td>
<td>At 41.4-mo follow-up, compared with placebo, enalapril</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,569 pts, mean age 61 y, with HF/HFrEF (90% with NYHA class II and III HF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MDPIT
Goldstein RE, et al., 1991 (146) 1984898

Aim: To determine if dilitiazem increases late onset CHF in post-MI pts with early decline in EF.

Study type: RCT
Size: 2,466 pts

Intervention: Dilitiazem 240 mg
Comparator: Placebo

Follow-up Results: Pts with BL EF<0.40, late CHF in Dilitizam group (21%) vs. Placebo (12%) p=0.004.

Cohn JN, et al., 2001 (152) 11759645

Aim: To determine the effect of valsartan vs. placebo on mortality plus morbidity in pts with HF/HFrEF

Study type: RCT
Size: 5,010 pts

Intervention/Comparator: 5,010 pts on standard therapy for HF were randomized to valsartan or placebo

Follow-up Results: At 23-mo follow-up, mortality was similar in pts treated with valsartan or placebo

SOLVD
Investigators, 1991 (153) 2057034

Aim: To determine the effect of enalapril vs. placebo on mortality and on mortality plus

Study type: RCT
Size: 2,569 pts

Intervention/Comparator: 2,569 pts on standard therapy for HF were randomized to enalapril or placebo

Follow-up Results: At 41.4-mo follow-up, compared with placebo, enalapril reduced mortality by 16% (p=0.0036)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Intervention/Comparator</th>
<th>1st Endpoint and Results</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993 (154) 8104270</td>
<td>Aim: To determine the effect of ramipril vs. placebo on mortality in pts with HF/EF</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 2,006 pts, mean age 65 y, with HF/EF after MI and without NYHA class 0 HF</td>
<td><strong>Intervention/Comparator:</strong> 2,006 pts were randomized to ramipril or placebo</td>
<td><strong>1st endpoint and results:</strong> At 15-mo mean follow-up, compared with placebo, ramipril reduced all-cause mortality 27% (p=0.002). Analysis of prespecified 2nd outcomes showed that ramipril reduced the first validated outcome (death, severe/resistant HF, MI, or stroke) by 19% (p=0.008).</td>
<td>The reduction in mortality was primarily due to a 31% (17%–42%) reduction in death from progressive HF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garg R, et al., 1995 (155) 7654275</td>
<td>Aim: A meta-analysis was performed to determine the effect of ACEIs vs. placebo on mortality and on mortality plus hospitalization for HF in pts with HF/EF</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> The meta-analysis included 32 trials of 7,105 pts with HF/EF treated with ACEIs vs. placebo</td>
<td><strong>Intervention/Comparator:</strong> In 25 trials, pts were treated with digoxin and/or diuretics, 4 trials only used diuretics, 1 trial used only digoxin, and 2 trials used no background therapy</td>
<td><strong>1st endpoint and results:</strong> Compared with placebo, ACEIs reduced all-cause mortality 23% (p&lt;0.001) and all-cause mortality or hospitalization for HF 35% (p&lt;0.001).</td>
<td>The incidence of adverse events causing discontinuation of drug was 5.8% with valsartan, 7.7% with captopril, and 9.0 % with valsartan plus captopril (p&lt;0.05 comparing valsartan with captopril and valsartan plus captopril with captopril).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeffer MA, et al., 2003 (156) 14610160</td>
<td>Aim: To determine the effect of valsartan, captopril, or both on mortality in pts with MI complicated by HF, LV dysfunction, or both</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 14,703 pts, mean age 65 y, with MI complicated by HF, LV dysfunction, or both</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> 4,909 pts were randomized to valsartan, 4,909 pts were randomized to captopril</td>
<td><strong>1st endpoint and results:</strong> At 24.7-mo median follow-up, mortality was similar in the 3 treatment groups.</td>
<td>Compared with placebo, valsartan reduced first hospital admission for HF 53% (p=0.0006).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggioni AP, et al., 2002 (157) 12392830</td>
<td>Aim: A subgroup analysis of the Val-HeFT study was performed to determine the effect of valsartan vs. placebo on mortality and on mortality plus morbidity in pts with HF/EF not receiving ACEIs</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 366 pts, mean age 67 y, with HF/EF not receiving ACEIs</td>
<td><strong>Intervention/Comparator:</strong> 185 pts were randomized to valsartan and 181 pts were randomized to placebo</td>
<td><strong>1st endpoint and results:</strong> Compared with placebo, valsartan reduced mortality 33% (p=0.017) and mortality plus morbidity 44% (p&lt;0.001).</td>
<td>Compared with placebo, valsartan reduced first hospital admission for HF 53% (p=0.0006).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Description</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Intervention/Compar</td>
<td>1° endpoint and results</td>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Granger CB, et al., 2003 (158)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effect of candesartan vs. placebo on mortality in pts with HF/EF intolerant to ACEIs</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: 2,028 pts, mean age 67 y, with HF/EF intolerant to ACEIs</td>
<td>Intervention/Comparator: 1,013 pts were randomized to candesartan and 1,015 pts were randomized to placebo</td>
<td>1° endpoint and results: At 33.7-mo median follow-up, compared with placebo, the 1° endpoint of CV death or hospital admission for HF was reduced 30% by candesartan (p&lt;0.0001).</td>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pitt B, et al., 2003 (159)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effect of eplerenone vs. placebo on mortality and on CV death or hospitalization for CV events in pts with MI complicated by HF</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: 6,632 pts, mean age 64 y, with HF/EF after MI</td>
<td>Intervention/Comparator: 3,313 pts were randomized to eplerenone and 3,319 pts were randomized to placebo</td>
<td>1° endpoint and results: At 16-mo mean follow-up, eplerenone reduced mortality 15% (p=0.008) and CV death or hospitalization for CV events 17% (p=0.005).</td>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taylor AL, et al., 2004 (160)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effect of ISDN plus hydralazine vs. placebo on mortality, first hospitalization for HF, and change in quality of life in black pts with HF/EF</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: 1,050 African American pts, mean age 57 y, with HF/EF and NYHA class III or IV HF.</td>
<td>Intervention/Comparator: 518 pts were randomized to ISDN plus hydralazine and 532 pts were randomized to placebo</td>
<td>1° endpoint and results: At 10-mo mean follow-up, compared with placebo, the mean 1° endpoint of mortality, first hospitalization for HF, and change in quality of life was reduced by ISDN plus hydralazine (p=0.01).</td>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Multicenter Dilitiazem Postinfarction Research Group, 1988 (145)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess dilitiazem effect on recurrent infarction and death after acute MI</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: 25–75 y admitted to CCU, MI with enzyme confirmation.</td>
<td>Intervention: Dilitiazem 240 mg (1,234) Comparator: Placebo (1,232)</td>
<td>1° endpoints and results:</td>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONTARGET Investigators, et al., 2008 (126)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Evaluate whether use of an ARB was noninferior to ACEI, and whether the combination was</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria:</td>
<td>Intervention: Ramipril 10 mg daily (n=8,576) Comparator:</td>
<td>1° endpoint:</td>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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superior to ACE alone in the prevention of vascular events in pts with CVD or DM but not HF.

**Study type:** Multi-center, double-blind, RCT

**Size:** 25,620 pts

with end-organ damage

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Inability to discontinue ACEI or ARB
- Known hypersensitivity or intolerance to ACEI or ARB
- Selected CVDs (congestive HF, hemodynamically significant valvular or outflow tract obstruction, constrictive pericarditis, complex congenital heart disease, syncopal episodes of unknown etiology <3 mo, planned cardiac surgery or PTCA <3 mo, uncontrolled HTN on treatment [e.g., BP >160/100 mm Hg], heart transplant recipient, stroke due to subarachnoid hemorrhage)
- Other conditions (significant renal artery disease, hepatic dysfunction, uncorrected volume or sodium depletion, 1° hyperaldosteronism, hereditary fructose intolerance, other major noncardiac illness or expected to reduce life expectancy or significant disability interfere with study participation, simultaneously taking another experimental drug, unable to provide written informed consent).

**Telmisartan 80 mg daily** (n=8,542)
- Combination of telmisartan and ramipril (n=8,502)

**Safety endpoint:**
- Combination therapy was associated with greater risk of hyperkalemia than ramipril monotherapy (480 pts vs. 283 pts; p<0.001)
- Hypotensive symptoms were cited as reason for permanent discontinuing more in telmisartan vs. ramipril (RR: 1.54; p<0.001) and combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy (RR: 2.75; p<0.001)
- Renal impairment was more common in combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy (RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.22–1.44)

**Composite outcome of death from CV causes, MI, stroke, or hospitalization for HF** (RR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.94–1.09 and RR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.92–1.07, respectively)

**Safety endpoint:**
- Combination therapy was associated with greater risk of hyperkalemia than ramipril monotherapy (480 pts vs. 283 pts; p<0.001)
- Hypotensive symptoms were cited as reason for permanent discontinuing more in telmisartan vs. ramipril (RR: 1.54; p<0.001) and combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy (RR: 2.75; p<0.001)
- Renal impairment was more common in combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy (RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.22–1.44)

adverse events without an increase in benefit
# Hypertension Guideline Data Supplements

## Data Supplement 35. RCTs Comparing HFpEF (Section 9.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TOPCAT Pfeffer MA, et al., 2015 (161) 25406305 | Aim: To investigate variation in pts and outcome in TOPCAT between pts from the Americas vs. Russia/Georgia  
**Study type:** Post-hoc analysis of prospective, double-blind, RCT  
**Size:** 3,445 pts | Inclusion criteria:  
NYHA class II–IV HF with LVEF ≤40% within 3 mo of enrollment; supine resting heart rate ≥68 bpm; stable clinical condition  
Exclusion criteria:  
Acute MI or UA within 28 d of randomization; indication or contraindication for treatment with BBs or drugs with beta-blocking properties; poor compliance; CABG surgery or PTCA in past 4 mo | Intervention:  
• Americas 886 on spironolactone  
• Russia/Georgia 836 on spironolactone  
• Spironolactone 15–45 mg daily  
Comparator:  
• Americas 881 on placebo  
• Russia/Georgia 842 on placebo  
• Placebo | 1° endpoint: Composite of CV death, aborted cardiac arrest, or HF hospitalization at 3.3 y follow-up was: Americas: 27.3% for spironolactone and 31.8% for placebo HR: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.69–0.98; p=0.026; Russia/Georgia 9.3% for spironolactone and 8.4% for placebo HR: 1.10; 95% CI: 0.79–1.51; p=0.58  
1° Safety endpoint:  
• Doubling of serum creatinine: Americas: 17.8% for spironolactone and 11.6% for placebo HR: 1.60; 95% CI: 1.25–2.05; p<0.001  
• Russia/Georgia 2.0% for S and 2.1% for p HR: 0.95; 95% CI: 0.49–1.85; p=0.89  
• Creatinine >3.0 mg/dL  
• Americas 9.8% for spironolactone and 9.1% for placebo HR: 1.10; 95% CI: 0.81–1.49; p=0.55  
• Russia/Georgia 0.2% for spironolactone and 0.4% for placebo HR: 0.5; 95% CI: 0.09–2.75; p=0.43  
• Hyperkalemia (potassium >5.5 mmol/L)  
• Americas 25.2% for spironolactone and 8.9% for placebo OR: 3.46; 95% CI: 2.62–4.56; p<0.001  
• Persistent symptoms or mortality due to worsening HF or other causes; Stroke: NS between groups | Relevant 2° endpoint: CV mortality: Americas 10.8% for spironolactone and 14.4% for placebo HR: 0.74; 95% CI 0.57–0.97; p=0.027; Russia/Georgia 7.7% for spironolactone and 5.8% for placebo HR: 1.31; 95% CI: 0.91–1.90; p=0.15. Aborted cardiac arrest: NS between groups. HF hospitalization: 20.8% for spironolactone and 24.5% for placebo HR: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.67–0.99; p=0.042; Russia/Georgia 2.6% for spironolactone and 3.4% for placebo HR: 0.76; 95% CI: 0.44–1.32; p=0.327; Recurrent HF: 361 events for spironolactone and 438 events for placebo (IRR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.58–0.96; p=0.024) Russia/Georgia 33 events for spironolactone and 37 events for placebo (IRR: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.42–1.62; p=0.58) All-cause mortality: NS between groups in Americas and Russia/Georgia. All-cause hospitalization: NS between groups in Americas and Russia/Georgia. MI: NS between groups; Stroke: NS between groups |
Aim: To determine effect of propranolol vs. no propranolol on mortality plus nonfatal MI in pts with prior MI and HFrEF

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts ≥62 y with MI and LVEF ≥40% and HF NYHA class II or III treated with diuretics and ACEIs for 2 mo

**Intervention:** 79 pts were randomized to treatment with propranolol

**Comparator:** 79 pts were randomized to no propranolol.

**1° endpoint:** At 32-mo mean follow-up, multivariate Cox regression analysis showed that compared with no propranolol, propranolol reduced mortality 35% (p=0.03) and mortality plus nonfatal MI 37% (p=0.018)

**Relevant 2° endpoint:** At 1-y follow-up, LVEF was increased by propranolol from 57% to 63% (p<0.001) and LV mass was decreased by propranolol from 312 grams to 278 grams (p=0.001). Propranolol was stopped because of adverse effects in 11 of 79 pts (14%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effect of nebivolol vs. placebo in pts with HFrEF and HFrEF</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts ≥70 y, history of HF, and HFrEF or HFrEF</th>
<th><strong>Intervention/Comparator:</strong> 1,359 pts with a history of HFrEF and 752 pts with a history of HFrEF were randomized to nebivolol or to placebo</th>
<th><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> At 21-mo follow-up, the 1° endpoint of all-cause mortality or CV hospitalization was reduced by nebivolol 14% (95% CI: 0.72–1.04) in pts with HFrEF and 19% (95% CI: 0.63, 1.04) in pts with HFrEF</th>
<th><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong> HR for reduction of all-cause mortality by nebivolol: 0.84 (95% CI: 0.86–1.08) for HFrEF and 0.91 (95% CI: 0.62–1.33) for HFrEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yusef S, et al., 2003 (166) 13678871</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effects of candesartan vs. placebo in pts with HFrEF</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 3,032 pts, mean age 67 y, with HF and NYHA class II–IV HF</td>
<td><strong>Intervention/Comparator:</strong> 3,032 pts were randomized to candesartan or placebo</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> At 36.6 m follow-up, the 1° outcome of CV death or hospitalization for HF was reduced 11% (p=0.118) by candesartan</td>
<td><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong> Hospitalization was reduced 16% (p=0.047) by candesartan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massie BM, et al., 2008 (167) 19001508</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effect of irbesartan vs. placebo on all-cause mortality or hospitalization for a CV cause in pts with HFrEF</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts 60 y and older with HFrEF and NYHA class II, III, or IV HF</td>
<td><strong>Intervention/Comparator:</strong> 4,128 pts were randomized to irbesartan or placebo</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> At 49.5-mo follow-up, the 1° outcome of all-cause mortality or hospitalization for CV cause was reduced 5% by irbesartan (p=0.35)</td>
<td><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong> Irbesartan did not significantly reduce the 2° outcomes of death from HF or hospitalization for HF, death from any cause and from CV causes, and quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piller LB, et al., 2011 (168) 21969009</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine mortality rates in pts who developed HF in ALLHAT</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 1,761 pts, mean age 70 y, developed HF during ALLHAT</td>
<td><strong>Intervention/Comparator At 8.9-y mean follow-up, 1,348 of 1,761 pts (77%) with HF died</strong></td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Post-HF all-cause mortality was similar for pts treated with chlorthalidone, amlodipine, and lisinopril. 10-y adjusted rates for mortality were 86% for amlodipine, 87% for lisinopril, and 83% for chlorthalidone</td>
<td><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong> All-cause mortality rates were similar for those with HFrEF (84%) and for those with HFrEF (81%) with no significant differences by randomized treatment arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law MR, et al., 2009 (18) 19454737</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis of use of BP-lowering drugs in prevention of CVD from 147 randomized trials</td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> Of 147 randomized trials of 646,000 pts, 37 trials of BBs in CAD included 38,892 pts, and 37 trials of</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> The database search used Medline (1966-Dec. 2007 in any language) to identify randomized trials of BP-lowering drugs in which CAD events or strokes were recorded. The search also included the Cochrane Collaboration and</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> CAD events; stroke <strong>Results:</strong> In 37 trials of pts with a history of CAD, BBs reduced CAD events 29% (95% CI: 22%–34%). In 27 trials in which BBs were used after acute MI, BBs reduced CAD events 31% (95% CI: 24%–38%), and in 11 trials in which BBs were used after long-term CAD, BBs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other antihypertensive drugs in CAD included 85,395 pts

Web of Science databases and the citations in trials and previous meta-analyses and review articles.

**Exclusion criteria:** Trials were excluded if there were <5 CAD events and strokes or if treatment duration was <6 mo.

insignificantly reduced CAD events 13%. In 7 trials, BBs reduced stroke 17% (95% CI: 1%–30%). CAD events were reduced 14% (95% CI: 2%–25%) in 11 trials of thiazide diuretics, 17% (95% CI: 11%–22%) in 21 trials of ACEIs, insignificantly 14% in 4 trials of angiotensin receptor blockers, and 15% (95% CI: 8%–22%) in 22 trials of CCBs. Stroke was reduced 38% (95% CI: 28%–47%) in 10 trials of thiazide diuretics, 22% (95% CI: 8%–34%) in 13 trials of ACEIs, and 34% (95% CI: 25%–42%) in 9 trials of CCBs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Law MR, et al., 2009 (18) 19454737   | Study type: Meta-analysis of use of BP-lowering drugs in prevention of CVD from 147 randomized trials. Size: Of 147 randomized trials of 464,000 pts, 37 trials of BBs in CAD included 38,892 pts, and 37 trials other antihypertensive drugs in CAD included 85,395 pts | Inclusion criteria: The database search used Medline (1966–Dec. 2007 in any language) to identify randomized trials of BP-lowering drugs in which CAD events or strokes were recorded. The search also included the Cochrane Collaboration and Web of Science databases and the citations in trials and previous meta-analyses and review articles. | **1st endpoint:** CAD events; stroke

**Results:** In 37 trials of pts with a history of CAD, BBs reduced CAD events 29% (95% CI: 22%, 34%). In 27 trials in which BBs were used after acute MI, BBs reduced CAD events 31% (95% CI: 24%, 38%), and in 11 trials in which BBs were used after long-term CAD, BBs insignificantly reduced CAD events 13%. In 7 trials, BBs reduced stroke 17% (95% CI: 1%–30%). CAD events were reduced 14% (95% CI: 2%–25%) in 11 trials of thiazide diuretics, 17% (95% CI: 11%–22%) in 21 trials of ACEIs, insignificantly 14% in 4 trials of angiotensin receptor blockers, and 15% (95% CI: 8%–22%) in 22 trials of CCBs. Stroke was reduced 38% (95% CI: 28%–47%) in 10 trials of | • With the exception of the extra protective effect of BBs given shortly after a MI and the minor additional effect of CCBs in preventing stroke, all the classes of BP-lowering drugs have a similar effect in reducing CAD events and stroke for a given reduction in BP. |
**Exclusion criteria:** Trials were excluded if there were <5 CAD events and strokes or if treatment duration was <6 mo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MDRD Klahr S, et al., 1994 (169)     | Aim: To determine whether restricted protein intake or tighter HTN control would delay progression of CKD<br>Study type: Randomized management to low or usual BP goal and usual, low or very low protein intake<br>Size: • Total n=840 Study 1 n=585 Study 2 n=255 • Mean follow-up 2.2 y • Mean MAP, mm Hg (SD): Study 1: 98 (11) Study 2: 98 (11) • Mean SBP, mm Hg (SD): Study 1: 131 (18) Study 2: 133 (18) | Inclusion criteria: Adults 18–70 y, with renal insufficiency (serum Cr 1.2–7.0 mg/dL in women and 1.4–7.0 mg/dL in men or CrCl <70 mL/min per 1.73 m²) and MAP≤125 mm Hg (normotensives included)<br>Exclusion criteria: Pregnancy, body weight <80% or >160% of standard, DM requiring insulin, urine protein >10 g/d, history of renal transplant, chronic medical conditions, doubts regarding compliance. | Intervention: • Study 1 included subjects with GFR 25–55 mL/min 1.73 m² (n=585); • Study 2 included subjects with GFR 13–24 mL/min 1.73 m² (n=255) • Low MAP goal ≤92 mm Hg for those 18–60 y; ≤98 for those ≥61 y • Usual: MAP goal ≤107 mm Hg for those 18–60; MAP ≤113 for subjects ≥61 • 2 studies: Study 1: above BP goals plus usual or low protein diet (1.3 or 0.58 g protein per kg of body weight/d); Study 2: above BP goals plus low or very low protein diet (0.58 or 0.28 g per kg/d) • Between group difference in MAP, mm Hg 4.7; p<0.001 | 1° endpoint: Rate of decline in GFR, mL/min (95% CI) • Study 1 From baseline to 4 mo Low: 3.4; 95% CI: 2.6–4.1<br>Usual: 1.9; 95% CI: 1.1–2.7<br>p=0.010<br>4 mo to study end, Low: 2.8; 95% CI: 2.2–3.3<br>Usual: 3.9; 95% CI: 3.3–4.5<br>p=0.006<br>Baseline to 3 y, Low: 10.7; 95% CI: 9.1–12.4<br>Usual: 12.3; 95% CI: 10.6–14.0<br>p=0.18<br>Study 2 From baseline to end of study, Low: 3.7; 95% CI: 3.1–4.3<br>Usual: 4.2; 95% CI: 3.6–4.9<br>p=0.28<br>ESRD or death: Study 2 RR for low vs. usual: 0.85; 95% CI: 0.60–1.22<br>p=NR | Limitations: • Drug therapy was not randomized. Recommended ACEI ± diuretic then CCB and others. More subjects in the low BP goal groups received ACEIs (48%, 51% also reported elsewhere) compared to the usual BP goal group (28%, 32% also reported e/w) (not noted in 1° manuscript but reported in Peterson JC, et al., 1995 (170)). 1.9% study 1, 1.2% study 2 lost to follow-up.<br>• Rate of GFR decline was slower than expected in the control groups and was not constant.<br>Summary: No significant benefits overall from either low protein or lower BP target. There was a significant interaction between baseline urinary protein excretion and BP interventions (p=0.01) indicating that low BP was of benefit to subjects with >1 g proteinuria with slower progression of loss of GFR.
**Mean DBP, mm Hg (SD):**
- Study 1: 81 (10)
- Study 2: 81 (10)

**Comparator:** By BP and protein intake goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REIN-2</th>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine whether intensive BP control will achieve further renoprotection (delayed progression to ESRD) compared to standard BP control in pts with chronic nephropathies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Multicenter RCT of pts all placed on ACEI (ramipril) at maximum dose tolerated to achieve DBP &lt;90 then assigned to conventional or intensified BP control. Add-on drug was dihydropyridine felodipine 5–10 mg/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 335 (median time 19 mo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ruugeneti P, et al., 2005 (171) | **Inclusion criteria:**
- Adults, age 18–70 y, with nondiabetic nephropathy, persistent proteinuria (urinary protein excretion >1 g/24 h for ≥3 mo) and not on ACEIs in previous 6 wk
- Pts with proteinuria 1–3 g/24 h included if CrCl <70 mL/min/1.73 m²
- For overall population, mean SBP, mm Hg (SD):
  - Intensive: 137.0 (16.7)
  - Conventional: 136.4 (17.0)
- For overall population, mean DBP, mm Hg (SD):
  - Intensive: 84.3 (9.0)
  - Conventional: 83.9 (10.4) |
|        | **Exclusion criteria:** Urinary tract infection, CHF class III–IV, treatment with corticosteroids, NSAIDs, immunosuppression, acute MI or stroke in prior 6 mo, severe uncontrolled HTN, |
|        | **Intervention:**
- Intensive: BP goal <130/80 mm Hg
- Conventional: DBP goal <90 mm Hg, irrespective of SBP
- For baseline proteinuria subgroups, result BP values NR
- For the overall population, achieved BP, mm Hg (SD):
  - Intensive: 129.6/79.5 (10.9/5.3)
  - Conventional: 133.7/82.3 (12.6/7.1) |
|        | **1° endpoint**
- Time to ESRD; over 36 mo follow-up, median 19 mo
- **1° outcome:** ESRD in pts with baseline proteinuria 1–3 g/24 h
  - HR (95% CI): 1.06 (95% CI: 0.51–2.20)
  - p=0.89
- ESRD in pts with baseline proteinuria >3 g/24 h
  - HR (95% CI): 1.09 (95% CI: 0.55–2.19)
  - p=0.81
- 23% of intensive and 20% of conventional control groups progressed to ESRD. |
<p>|        | <strong>Limitations:</strong> The study was stopped at the 1st interim analysis for futility. Median time 19 mo |
|        | <strong>Summary:</strong> In pts with non-DM proteinuric nephropathies receiving background ACEI therapy, no additional benefits from further BP reduction by felodipine could be shown. Dihydropyridine CCBs do not offer additional renoprotection to ACEIs or ARBs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AASK</th>
<th>Wright JT, et al., 2002 (172) 12435255</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To compare the effects of 2 levels of BP and 3 antihypertensive drug classes on GFR decline in HTN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Randomized 3×2 factorial trial</td>
<td>Measured GFR with iothalamate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 1,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Adult African-Americans, 18–70 y, with HTN (DBP ≥95) and GFR of 20–65 mL/min/1.73 m², no DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At entry: mean MAP, mm Hg: Low: 115 (27) Usual: 113 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mean SBP, mm Hg (SD): Low:152 (25) Usual: 149 (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mean DBP, mm Hg: Low: 96 (15) Usual: 95 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> DBP&lt;95, history of DM, Urinary protein/creatinine ratio &gt;2.5, accelerated or malignant HTN, non-BP related cause of CKD, serious systemic disease, clinical CHF, specific indication or contraindication for a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Low: MAP goal ≤92 mm Hg Usual: MAP goal 102–107 mm Hg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial treatment with a B Blocker (metoprolol), and ACEI (ramipril) or a dihydropyridine (amlodipine) with open label agents added to achieve BP goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study duration: 3–6.4 y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BP similar across drug groups except 2 mm Hg lower in amlodipine group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mean from 3 mo to study end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MAP, mm Hg (SD): Low: 95.8 (8) Usual: 104 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SBP/DBP, mm Hg (SD) Low: 128/78 (12/8) Usual: 141/85 (12/7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MAP change, mm Hg Low: -20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> 1° outcome: difference in mean slopes, acute GFR slope, mL/min/1.73 m²/3 mo (SE): 1.82 (0.54) in low BP group p&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1° outcome: difference in mean slopes, chronic GFR slope, mL/min/1.73 m²/y (SE): 0.21 (0.22) p=0.33 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difference in mean slopes, total GFR slope, mL/min/1.73 m²/y (SE): -0.25 (0.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main 2° clinical composite outcome: GFR event, ESRD, or death, % risk reduction (95% CI): 2 (95% CI: -22–21) p=0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GFR event or ESRD, % Risk Reduction: -2; 95% CI: -31–20; p=0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ESRD or death, % risk reduction: 12; 95% CI: -13–32; p=0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ESRD alone, % risk reduction: 6; 95% CI: -29–31; p=0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> Based on DSMD recommendation, amlodipine arm halted early and those pts switched to open label Rx, continued study schedule and same BP goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> No difference in GFR decline with lower BP goal and no difference in composite clinical endpoints</td>
<td>Average rate of GFR decline 2 mL/min/y is similar or slower than previous reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a trend favoring the lower BP goal in subjects with higher baseline proteinuria and the opposite trend for those without proteinuria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramipril treatment group had slower progression compared with metoprolol and amlodipine combined, less evident between ramipril and metoprolol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study Drug or Procedure

#### Usual:
- SBP/DBP change, mm Hg
  - Low: -24/-8
  - Usual: -18/-10
- Achieved mean BP difference between groups, mm Hg
  - MAP: 11
  - SBP: 16
  - DBP: 8

#### Comparator: N/A

### 2nd Outcome: Urine Protein Excretion

### Safety Endpoint:
- Acute and chronic rate of change in GFR (slope):
  - NS for chronic and total slope in subgroup analyses by baseline proteinuria strata
- Acute slope: p=0.08 for interaction
- Total slope: p=0.04 for interaction
- Chronic slope: p=0.16 for interaction
- Clinical composite outcome: includes reduction in GFR by 50% or by 25 mL/min/m², ESRD, death; NS in subgroup analyses by baseline proteinuria strata; p=0.007 for interaction
- For above outcomes, trends favored the lower BP goal over the usual goal in participants with higher baseline proteinuria and opposite trends in participants with little or no proteinuria
- Within each drug group, risk reductions for any 2nd clinical outcome of the low vs. usual BP goal were not significantly different between pts with baseline urine protein to creatinine ratio ≤0.22 and >0.22 (p=NS)

### Study Type:
- Randomized 3×2 factorial trial
- Measured GFR with iothalamate

### Inclusion Criteria:
- Adult African Americans, ages 18–70, with HTN (DBP ≥95) and GFR of 20–65 mL/min/1.73 m², no DM
- Mean MAP, mm Hg:
  - Low, Amlodipine: 115.3 (18.3)
  - Usual, Amlodipine: 112.7 (14.7)
  - Low, Metoprolol: 114.5 (17.5)

### Intervention:
- Analysis by initial drug treatment group
- Low, Amlodipine: MAP goal ≤92 mm Hg, Amlodipine (5–10 mg/d)
- Usual, Amlodipine: MAP goal 102–107 mm Hg, Amlodipine (5–10 mg/d)
- Low, Metoprolol: MAP goal ≤92 mm Hg, Metoprolol (50–200 mg/d)
- Low, Ramipril: MAP goal 102–107 mm Hg, Metoprolol (50–200 mg/d)

### 1st Endpoint:
- GFR event, ESRD, or death prior to dialysis, Amlodipine, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: 32%; 95% CI: -14–60; p=0.14
- Metoprolol, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: 4%; 95% CI: -39–33; p=0.84
- Ramipril, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: -8%; 95% CI: -93–15; p=0.24
  - p for interaction=0.17
- GFR event or ESRD, Amlodipine, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: 26%; 95% CI: -33–58; p=0.32

### Limitations:
- Post-hoc analysis, effects on GFR may have been obscured by early rise and later fall with amlodipine, follow-up only 3–6.4 y, many comparisons so risk for type I error, unable to test ACEI – DHP CCB combination.

### Summary:
- BP effect was similar among drug groups for GFR slope and main clinical composite.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usual, Metoprolol: 112.4 (14.1)</th>
<th>Low, Ramipril: 115.2 (15.2)</th>
<th>Usual, Ramipril: 114.0 (16.7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low, Metoprolol: 152.0 (25.7)</td>
<td>Usual, Amlodipine: 147.7 (21.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low, Metoprolol: 151.0 (22.5)</td>
<td>Usual, Amlodipine: 96.55 (15.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low, Metoprolol: 96.90 (13.6)</td>
<td>Usual, Amlodipine: 94.87 (12.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual, Metoprolol: 94.47 (12.5)</td>
<td>Usual, Amlodipine: 94.45 (15.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual, Metoprolol: 95.12 (15.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td>DBP&lt;95, history of DM, Urinary protein/creatinine ratio &gt;2.5, accelerated or malignant HTN, non-BP related cause of CKD, serious systemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual, Metoprolol: MAP goal 102–107 mm Hg, Metoprolol (50–200 mg/d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low, Ramipril: MAP goal ≤92 mm Hg, Ramipril (2.5–10 mg/d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual, Ramipril: MAP goal 102–107 mm Hg, Ramipril (2.5–10 mg/d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Amlodipine arms terminated 1 y early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved MAP difference between groups, mm Hg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amlodipine, Low vs. Usual: 10.12 p=NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metoprolol, Low vs. Usual: 8.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramipril, Low vs. Usual: 10.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved DBP difference between groups, mm Hg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amlodipine, Low vs. Usual: 12.6 p=NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metoprolol, Low vs. Usual: 15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramipril, Low vs. Usual: 19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP effect differed among drug groups for composite of ESRD or death and ESRD alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher event rates for amlodipine and usual BP goal compared with other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low BP goal associated with reduced risk of ESRD or death and ESRD for amlodipine but not for other drug groups (in the absence of ACEI treatment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety endpoint:**

- ESRD alone, Amlodipine, Low vs. Usual Goal: RR: 54%; 95% CI: 8–77; p=0.028
- Metoprolol, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: 11%; 95% CI: -60–50; p=0.70
- Ramipril, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: -65%; 95% CI: -195–8; p=0.09; p for interaction=0.021
- Death alone (prior to dialysis), Amlodipine, Low vs. Usual Goal: RR: 48%; 95% CI: -59–83; p=0.25
- Metoprolol, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: -1; 95% CI: -110–5; p=0.97
- Ramipril, Low vs. Usual Goal RR: 21%; 95% CI: -92–67; p=0.61; p for interaction=0.61
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| Norris K, et al., 2006 (174) 17059993 | **Aim:** Compared effect of treatment on CV event rate during mean follow-up of 4.1 y by drug class and level of BP control. Determined baseline factors that predict CV outcomes  
**Study type:** Randomized 3×2 factorial trial  
**Measured GFR with iothalamate**  
**Size:** 1,094 |
| 2017 Hypertension Guideline Data Supplements |
|  | Disease, clinical CHF, specific indication or contraindication for a study drug or procedure |
|  | Ramipril, Low vs. Usual: 8.96 p=NR |
|  | Comparator: N/A |
|  | Proteinuria within each drug group, risk reductions for any 2° clinical outcome of the low vs. usual BP goal were not significantly different between pts with baseline urine protein to creatinine ratio ≤0.22 and >0.22 (p=NS) |
| Inclusion criteria:  
- Adult African Americans, 18–70 y, with HTN (DBP ≥95) and GFR of 20–65 mL/min/1.73 m², no DM  
- Mean MAP, mm Hg: 114 (16)  
- Mean SBP, mm Hg: 150 (24)  
- Mean DBP, mm Hg: 96 (14)  
| Interventions:  
- Achieved SBP/DBP, mm Hg (SD)  
  Low: 128/78  
  Usual: 141/85  
  p=NR  
- SBP/DBP change, mm Hg  
  Low: -23/-19  
  Usual: -8/-9  
  p=NR  
- Achieved mean BP difference between groups, mm Hg  
  SBP: 15  
  DBP: 10  
  p=NR  
| Comparator: N/A |
| **1° endpoint:**  
- Number of deaths before ESRD, n of events  
  Low: 38  
  Usual: 47; p=NR  
- Major CAD events, n of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 19 (0.008)  
  Usual: 23 (0.010); p=NS  
- Stroke events, number of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 26 (0.011)  
  Usual: 29 (0.013); p=NS  
- HF events, n of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 27 (0.012)  
  Usual: 23 (0.010)  
  p=NS  
- CV composite outcome, n of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 71 (0.032)  
  Usual: 78 (0.035); p=NS  
- Composite outcome or ESRD, n of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 143 (0.064)  
  Usual: 159 (0.072)  
  p=NS  
- Overall rate of CV events, n of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 108 (0.048)  
  Usual: 94 (0.042); p=NS  
- CV death, n of events (rate per person-y)  
  Low: 16 (0.007) |
| **Limitations:**  
- Limited power, only 202 CV events – low incidence. CV outcomes were 2° endpoints of high priority (prespecified).  
- >50% had a history of heart disease at entry, 40% with LVH by ECG. ⅓ smokers, almost 50% had income <15K.  
- CV outcome rate was not related to randomized interventions, either drug or BP target.  
- 7 baseline risk factors were independently associated with increased risk for CV composite outcome in multivariable analyses after controlling for age, sex, baseline GFR, baseline proteinuria: PP, duration of HTN, protein/creatinine ratio, urine sodium-potassium ratio and annual income <15,000.  
| **Summary:**  
- CV outcome rate was not related to randomized interventions, either drug or BP target.  
- 7 baseline risk factors were independently associated with increased risk for CV composite outcome in multivariable analyses after controlling for age, sex, baseline GFR, baseline proteinuria: PP, duration of HTN, protein/creatinine ratio, urine sodium-potassium ratio and annual income <15,000. |
### Amlodipine Versus Enalapril in Renal Failure (AVER trial) Esnault VL, et al., 2008 (175) 18405787

<p>| Aim: To compare GFR decline in nondiabetic, nonnephrotic adults with HTN and estimated CrCl 20–60 mL/min/1.73 m² when randomized to a CCB (amlodipine, 5–10 mg/d) or an ACEI (enalapril, 5–20 mg/d). <strong>Study type:</strong> RCT <strong>Size:</strong> Amlodipine: 132 Enalapril: 131 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> | <strong>Intervention:</strong> | Usual: 15 (0.006); p=NS |
| ● 18–80 y | ● Amlodipine: 5–10 mg/d | <strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Change in GFR from baseline to final assessment |
| ● CrCl 20–60 mL/min/1.73 m² (Cockcroft-Gault) | ● Enalapril: 5–20 mg/d | <strong>2° Outcome:</strong> Clinical composite of renal replacement therapy, discontinuation due to deterioration of renal function, 50% decrease in GFR, doubling of serum Cr, hospitalization for transient renal failure. &quot;Other 2° outcome measures&quot; included: changes in serum Cr, sitting DBP and SBP, heart rate, total and HDL cholesterol, 24-h urinary protein excretion, ambulatory BP monitoring, and safety measures. Composite Outcomes: 2° clinical composite |
| ● Nondiabetic | Therapy initiated with amlodipine 5 mg/d or enalapril 5 mg/d. Drugs up-titrated to amlodipine 10 mg/d or enalapril 20 mg/d at wk 8 and 12 if DBP &gt;90 mm Hg. After 18 wk, if maximal tolerated dose of study drug did not decrease BP to target, add on anti-HTN treatments were the following: atenolol (50–100 mg/d), loop diuretics (furosemide 20–500 mg/d or torsemide, 5–200 mg/d), alpha blockers (prazosin, 2.4–5 mg/d or doxazosin, 1–16 mg/d) and centrally acting drugs (rilmenidine (1–2 mg/d or methyldopa, 250–500 mg/d). | <strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> Proteinuria subgroup, &gt;1 g/d: protein excretion rate decreased significantly in pts taking enalapril plus diuretic (median -270 mg/d; p&lt;0.001) but not in pts taking amlodipine plus diuretic (-25 mg/d) at last obs |
| ● Enrollment confirmed at end of 4-wk placebo run-in if sitting DBP between 90 and 119 mm Hg | ● BP goal: Amlodipine: &lt;130/85 mm Hg Enalapril: &lt;130/85 mm Hg | <strong>Summary:</strong> No difference in GFR change or serum creatinine at trial end Last observation: mean change in GFR, mL/min/1.73 m² Amlodipine -4.92, Enalapril -3.98; p=NS |
| ● Mean SBP, mm Hg (SD): | Duration of treatment: Median follow-up 2.93 y in amlodipine group; 2.95 y in enalapril group | Last observation: mean change in Serum Cr from baseline (mg/d) Amlodipine +0.57, Enalapril +0.47; p=NS |
| ● Amlodipine: 102.0 (6.7) Enalapril: 102.5 (7.1) | | No difference in composite 2° endpoints. |
| ● Mean serum Cr, mg/dL (SD): | Mean BP (mm Hg): baseline to last observation Amlodipine 164.8/101.8 to 140.1/85.4, delta -24.7/16.4 Enalapril 165.0/102.5 to 140.3/86.4, delta -24.7/16.1 |
| ● Amlodipine: 2.00 (0.8) Enalapril: 2.05 (0.7) | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ESPIRAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> To investigate in a random comparison the capacity of an angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor (fosinopril), and that of a long-acting dihydropiridine (nifedipine GITS) to modify the decay in renal function in pts with primary renal disease, exhibiting a progressive increase in serum Cr during the previous 2 y.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Study type:** Randomized open label trial | **Inclusion criteria:**
- 18–75 y
- Serum Cr between 1.5 and 5 mg/dL (133–442 µmol/l)
- HTN defined as BP >140/90 mm Hg or by the use of antihypertensive agent(s)
- Proven progression of chronic renal failure in the previous 2 y, defined by increase by >25% or >0.5 mg/dL (44.2 µmol/l) in serum Cr
- Mean SBP, mm Hg (SD): Nifedipine GITS: 157.5 (20) Fosinopril: 155 (17)
- Mean DBP, mm Hg (SD): Nifedipine GITS: 96 (11) Fosinopril: 96 (8) |
| **Size:** 241 | **Intervention:**
- Nifedipine GITS: 30–60 mg QD
- Fosinopril: 10–30 mg QD
- Drugs added in step-wise fashion to achieve BP goal.
- Step 1: Randomized drug
- Step 2: Furosemide (up to 100 mg)
- Step 3: Atenolol (up to 100 mg)
- Step 4: Doxazosin (up to 12 mg)
- BP goal:
  - Nifedipine GITS: <140/90 mm Hg
  - Fosinopril: <140/90 mm Hg
- Duration of treatment: mean follow-up NR; authors report minimum follow-up of 3 y and this is when most outcome measures reported |
| **Nifedipine GITS: 112** | **1° endpoint:**
- 1° Outcome: Time elapsed until serum Cr values doubled, or the need to enter a dialysis program
- 2° Outcome: CV events (including MI, stroke, angina, and death), proteinuria evolution and serum Cr |
<p>| <strong>Fosinopril: 129</strong> | <strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> N/A |
| <strong>Limitations:</strong> SBP was 4–6 mm Hg lower with ACEI which may have impacted improved outcomes. Still positive effects remained from fosinopril after adjusted for BP levels. Sodium restriction may have favored the ACEI group. |
| <strong>Summary:</strong> Renal survival was significantly better if fosinopril used as first agent, unrelated to the primary renal disease. Proteinuria decreased by 57% in the fosinopril group and increased by 7% in the nifedipine GITS group while BP control did not differ between treatment groups for DBP. 3-y follow-up Doubling of serum Cr or entering dialysis N (%) Nifedipine GITS 40 (36%) Fosinopril 27 (21%) OR: 0.47 (0.26–0.84); p=0.01 Decrease in SBP, mm Hg (SD) Nifedipine GITS 14.0 (22.5) Fosinopril 19.8 (19.6), p NR Decrease in DBP, mm Hg (SD) Nifedipine GITS 14.9 (11.8) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1º endpoint</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMPLISH Bakris GL, et al., 2010 (177) 20170948</td>
<td>To examine the effect of initial antihypertensive therapy with benazepril plus amlodipine compared to benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide on progression of CKD</td>
<td>Males or females ≥55 y, with HTN, high CV risk (history of coronary events, MI, revascularization, stroke, CKD, PAD, LVH, DM)</td>
<td>Initial antihypertensive therapy with benazepril plus amlodipine compared to benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>Overall: time to first event of composite CV morbidity and mortality</td>
<td>Trial terminated early (mean follow-up 2.9 y [SD 0.4]) because of superior efficacy of benazepril plus amlodipine compared with benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide with 20% lower CV risk.</td>
<td>Initial antihypertensive treatment with benazepril plus amlodipine slowed progression of nephropathy to a greater extent compared to benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry BP for pts with CKD benazepril plus amlodipine: 145.178.6 (20.2/11.2)</td>
<td>BP after dose adjustment benazepril plus amlodipine: 131.6/78.6 (20.2/11.2) SD, 4119 (75%) controlled</td>
<td>BENAZEPRI plus hydrochlorothiazide: 145.178.1 (20.5/10.7)</td>
<td>Progression of CKD, a prespecified endpoint, was defined as doubling of serum creatinine concentration or ESRD (estimated glomerular filtration rate &lt;15 mL/min/1.73 m² or need for dialysis).</td>
<td>All randomized pts were included in the intention-to-treat analysis. There were 113 (2.0% x 0%) events of CKD progression in the benazepril plus amlodipine group compared with 215 (3.7% x 7%) in the benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide group HR: 0.52, (95% CI: 0.41–0.65), p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of DM same in CKD and non-CKD pts (58.9% vs. 60.5%; p=0.302)</td>
<td>Benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide: 132.5/74.4 (17.9/11.2 SD), 3963 (72%) controlled</td>
<td>Target &lt;140/90 and &lt;130/80 for DM or CKD</td>
<td>1º endpoints: CKD plus death, change in albuminuria, change in eGFR</td>
<td>Subset with more advanced CKD analyzed for rate of progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: N/A</td>
<td>BP after dose adjustment benazepril plus amlodipine</td>
<td>p&lt;0.0013</td>
<td>2º endpoints: CKD plus death, change in albuminuria, change in eGFR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparator: N/A</td>
<td>Target &lt;140/90 and &lt;130/80 for DM or CKD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOD Parving HH, et al.,</td>
<td>Compare effects of dual blockade of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pts with HTN, 18–85 y,</td>
<td>All on losartan then aliskiren or</td>
<td></td>
<td>No renal endpoints regarding function, survival, CV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interference: All on losartan then aliskiren or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Losartan plus aliskiren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Losartan plus aliskiren</td>
<td>Losartan plus aliskiren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Losartan plus aliskiren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rx of albumin to creatinine at 6 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 (178)</td>
<td>RAAS by aliskiren 300 mg/d added to maximal dose losartan 100 mg/d and optimal HTN therapy</td>
<td>and DM-2 and nephropathy (early morning alb/creat &gt;300 mg/g or &gt;200 mg/g in on RAAS blocker already</td>
<td>placebo added</td>
<td>● 2º: decline in eGFR, development of renal dysfunction (serum creatinine &gt;176.8 micromol/l (2.0 mg/dL)</td>
<td>2017 Hypertension Guideline Data Supplements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT, double-blinded, duration was 6 mo</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Non-DM kidney disease, &gt;3,500 mg/g alb/ Cr ratio, esterase, 30 mL/min/BSA, chronic urinary tract infections, baseline serum potassium &gt;5.1, severe HTN, major CVD in prior 6 mo</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> All on losartan, aliskiren or placebo added</td>
<td><strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> Hyperkalemia 5% in aliskiren group, 5.7% in placebo group but more frequent individual elevations &gt;5.5 in aliskiren group</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 805 entered open label, 599 randomized, 524 completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety endpoint:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts without adverse events on full dose losartan DM-2, eGFR 30–89.9 mL/min/1.73 m² by 4 variable MDRD formula, urinary albumin/creatinine ratio of ≥300 in a random sample</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Study stopped early due to safety concerns. Combination of ACEI and ARB was associated with increased risk of adverse events among pts with diabetic nephropathy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA NEPHRON-D</td>
<td>Aim: To test the efficacy of the combination of losartan with lisinopril as compared with standard treatment with losartan alone in slowing the progression of proteinuric diabetic kidney disease</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts without adverse events on full dose losartan DM-2, eGFR 30–89.9 mL/min/1.73 m² by 4 variable MDRD formula, urinary albumin/creatinine ratio of ≥300 in a random sample</td>
<td>Intervention: ● Pts with DM-2 already taking losartan 100 mg/d with albumin to creatinine ratio of ≥300 were randomized to either lisinopril 10–40 mg/d or placebo. ● 132 1º endpoints in the combination therapy group; No benefit to mortality or CV events. Combination therapy increase risk of hyperkalemia 6.3 events/100 person-y vs. 2.6 events/100 person-y (p&lt;0.001) and acute kidney injury 12.2 vs. 6.7 events/100 person-y (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: mortality, hyperkalemia, acute kidney injury</td>
<td>2010 (124)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fried LF, et al., 2010 (124)</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT, multi-center, double-blind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts with DM-2 already taking losartan 100 mg/d with albumin to creatinine ratio of ≥300 were randomized to either lisinopril 10–40 mg/d or placebo. ● 132 1º endpoints in the combination therapy group; No benefit to mortality or CV events. Combination therapy increase risk of hyperkalemia 6.3 events/100 person-y vs. 2.6 events/100 person-y (p&lt;0.001) and acute kidney injury 12.2 vs. 6.7 events/100 person-y (p&lt;0.001)</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Study stopped early due to safety concerns. Combination of ACEI and ARB was associated with increased risk of adverse events among pts with diabetic nephropathy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 1448 were randomized</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Known non-DM kidney disease, serum potassium &gt;5.5 mmol/L, current treatment with sodium polystyrene sulfonate or inability to stop prescribed medications increasing risk of hyperkalemia.</td>
<td>1º endpoint: First occurrence of decline in eGFR (a decline of ≥30 mL/min/1.73 m² if initial GFR ≥60 or a decline of ≥50% if initial eGFR &lt;60, ESRD or death</td>
<td>2º endpoint: First occurrence of decline in eGFR or ESRD</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Study stopped early due to safety concerns. Combination of ACEI and ARB was associated with increased risk of adverse events among pts with diabetic nephropathy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 38. Nonrandomized Trials, Observational Studies, and/or Registries of CKD (Section 9.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upadhyay A, et al., 2011 (179)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To summarize trials comparing lower vs. higher BP targets in pts with CKD; focus on proteinuria as an effect modifier. <strong>Study type:</strong> Systematic review <strong>Size:</strong> 2,272</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> &gt;50 pts/group, 1 y follow-up, outcomes of death, kidney failure, CV events, change in kidney function, number of antihypertensive agents, adverse events. 3 trials (MDRD, AASK, REIN-2; 8 reports)</td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> Overall trials did not show that BP target of &lt;125/75–130/80 is more beneficial than a target of &lt;140/90. Lower quality evidence suggests a low target may be beneficial in subgroups with proteinuria &gt;300–1,000/d</td>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> No pts with DM-1 included. Duration (mean follow-up 2–4 y) may be too short to detect differences in clinically important outcomes. Reporting of adverse events not uniform. <strong>Summary:</strong> Available evidence is inconclusive but does not prove a BP target &lt;130/80 improves clinical outcomes more than a target of &lt;140/90 in adults with CKD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lv, et al., 2013 (127)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess the renal and CV effects of intensive BP lowering in people with CKD <strong>Study type:</strong> Systematic review <strong>Size:</strong> 9,287 pts with CKD and 1,264 kidney failure events</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> • Randomized trials of pts with CKD assigned to different target BP that reported kidney failure and CV events. • 11 trials on 9,287 pts with CKD and 1,264 kidney failure events (doubling of serum creatinine, 50% decline in GFR or ESKD) • Included AASK, REIN-2, MDRD, Wuhl (children), Toto, Schrier plus 5 trials with CKD subgroups, also included the late nonrandomized follow-up studies for AASK and MDRD • BP targets varied substantially between trials. 2 trials targeted mean BP &lt;92 mm Hg for the intensive treatment arm, and 107 mm Hg in the standard treatment arm. 1 trial aimed for BP&lt;130/80 mm Hg vs. a DBP of 90 mm Hg, 1 study targeted &lt;120/80 mm Hg vs.</td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> Compared with standard regimens, more intensive BP lowering reduced risk of composite endpoint HR: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.68–0.98, and ESKD HR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.67–0.93. Effect was modified by proteinuria (p=0.006) and markers of trial quality. Intensive BP lowering reduced the risk of kidney failure HR: 0.73; 95% CI: 0.62–0.86 but not in pts without proteinuria at baseline HR: 1.12; 95% CI: 0.67–1.87. No clear effect on CV events or death.</td>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> All trials used open label, in 2 pts were blinded, substantial variability in design quality. There was substantial variability in BP targets by MAP, systolic and DBP or only DBP. Most trials did not include pts with diabetic kidney disease. <strong>Summary:</strong> • Renal outcomes: 7 trials (N=5,308) recorded a total of 1,264 kidney failure events. A -7.7 mm Hg difference in SBP and a -4.9 mm Hg difference in DBP seen between treatment arms. Overall, a more intensive regimen reduced risk of composite kidney failure events by 17% HR: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.68–0.98, reduced the risk of ESKD alone by 18% (pooled HR for composite outcomes: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.67–0.93). • Intensive BP lowering had no effect on kidney failure in pts who did not have proteinuria (3 trials involving 1,218 pts HR: 1.12; 95% CI: 0.67–1.87), but it did reduce the risk of progressive kidney failure by 27% (5 trials involving 1,703 pts HR: 0.73; 95% CI: 0.62–0.86 in people who did have proteinuria at baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jafar TH, et al., 2003 (180)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the levels of BP and urine protein excretion associated with lowest risk for progression of CKD during antihypertensive therapy with and without ACEIs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> 11 RCTs in pts with predominantly nondiabetic kidney disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 1,860 pooled in pt level meta-analysis; mean duration of follow-up 2.2 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Inclusion criteria:**
- Pt-level meta-analysis using data from the AIPRD Study Group database to assess relationships among pts with nondiabetic kidney disease across a wide range of urine protein excretion values during antihypertensive therapy with and without ACEIs.
- The AIPRD Study Group database included 1,860 pts with nondiabetic kidney disease enrolled in 11 RCTs of ACEIs to slow the progression of kidney disease. The database contained information on BP, urine protein excretion, serum creatinine, and onset of kidney failure during 22,610 visits.
- Included only randomized trials (with a minimum 1 y follow-up) that compared the effects of antihypertensive regimens that included ACEIs with the effects of regimens that did not include ACEIs. HTN or decreased kidney function was required for entry into all studies. |
| **Exclusion criteria:** Common to all studies: acute kidney failure, treatment with immunosuppressive meds, clinically significant chronic HF, obstructive uropathy, renal artery stenosis, active systemic disease, DM-1, history of transplantation, history of allergy to ACEIs. |
| **1° endpoint:** Progression of CKD defined as doubling of serum creatinine or onset of kidney failure |
| **Results:** Kidney disease progression documented in 311 pts, 124 (13.2%) in the ACEI group and 187 (20.5%) in the control group (p=0.001). 176 (9.5%) developed kidney failure: 70 (7.4%) in the ACEI group and 106 (11.6%) in the control group (p=0.002). SBP of 110–129 mm Hg and urine protein excretion <2.0 g/d were associated with lowest risk for kidney disease progression. ACEI beneficial after adjustment for BP and urine protein excretion (RR: 0.67; 95% CI: 0.53–0.84). The increased risk for kidney progression at higher SBP levels was greater in pts with urine protein excretion >1.0 g/d (p<0.006). |
| **Limitations:** Studies included were not designed to assess the effect of lowering BP and urine protein excretion on kidney disease progression. |
| **Conclusions:** Although reverse causation cannot be excluded with certainty, SBP goal between 110 and 129 mm Hg may be beneficial in pts with urine protein excretion >1.0 g/d. SBP <110 mm Hg may be associated with higher risk for kidney disease progression. |
### Giatras I, et al., 1997 (181) 9273824

**Aim:** To use meta-analysis to assess effects if ACEIs on development of ESRD in nondiabetic pts

**Study type:** Meta-analysis

**Size:** 1,594 pts from 10 studies

**Inclusion criteria:** All randomized studies comparing ACEIs with other antihypertensive agents, with at least 1 y of follow-up

**Exclusion criteria:** Studies of diabetic renal disease and renal transplants were excluded.

**Results:**
- Among 806 pts receiving ACEIs, 52 (6.4%) developed ESRD and 17 (2.1%) died.
- In 788 controls, 72 (9.1%) developed ESRD and 12 (1.5%) died. The pooled RR were 0.70; 95% CI: 0.51–0.97 for ESRD and 1.24; CI: 0.55–2.83 for death.
- The decreases in weighted mean systolic and DBPs during follow-up were 4.9 and 1.2 mm Hg greater, respectively, in the pts who received ACEIs.

**Limitations:** Included studies through 5/1996, published (7) and nonpublished (3) study results. Did not require that pts have HTN or renal insufficiency at baseline. Did not report results by severity of proteinuria related to the diseases included many of which are not characterized by proteinuria.

**Summary:** ACEIs are more effective than other antihypertensive agents in reducing the development of end-stage nondiabetic renal disease, and they do not increase mortality. It could not be determined whether this beneficial effect is due to the greater decline in BP or to other effects of ACE inhibition.

### ONTARGET Investigators, et al., 2008 (126) 18378520

**Aim:** Evaluate whether use of an ARB was noninferior to ACEI, and whether the combination was superior to ACE alone in the prevention of vascular events in pts with CVD or DM but not HF.

**Study type:** Multi-center, double-blind, RCT

**Size:** 25,620 pts

**Inclusion criteria:**
- ≥55 y
- Coronary, peripheral, or cerebrovascular disease or DM with end-organ damage

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Inability to discontinue ACEI or ARB
- Known hypersensitivity or intolerance to ACEI or ARB
- Selected CVDs (congestive HF, hemodynamically significant valvular or outflow tract obstruction, constrictive pericarditis, complex congenital heart disease, syncopal episodes of unknown etiology <3 mo, planned cardiac surgery or PTCA <3 mo, uncontrolled HTN on treatment [e.g., BP >160/100 mm Hg], heart transplant recipient, stroke due to subarachnoid hemorrhage)
- Other conditions (significant renal artery disease, hepatic dysfunction, uncorrected volume or sodium depletion,

**Intervention:** Ramipril 10 mg daily (n=8,576)

**Comparator:**
- Telmisartan 80 mg daily (n=8,542)
- Combination of telmisartan and ramipril (n=8,502)

**1° endpoint:** After a median follow-up of 56 mo, there was no difference between ramipril vs. telmisartan or combination therapy vs. ramipril in the 1° composite outcome of death from CV causes, MI, stroke, or hospitalization for HF RR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.94–1.09 and RR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.92–1.07, respectively

**Safety endpoint:**
- Combination therapy was associated with greater risk of hyperkalemia than ramipril monotherapy (480 pts vs. 283 pts; p<0.001)
- Hypotensive symptoms were cited as reason for permanent discontinuing more in telmisartan vs. ramipril RR: 1.54; p<0.001 and combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy RR: 2.75; p<0.001
- Renal impairment was more common in combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.22–1.44.
| **VALIANT**  
White HD, et al., 2005 (182)  
16301343 | **Aim:** Evaluate whether use of an ARB or the combination of an ACEI and an ARB was superior to a proven effective dose of an ACEI after AMI in pts with HF and/or LVEF <40%.  
**Study type:** Multi-center, double-blind, RCT  
**Size:** 14,703 pts | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- ≥18 y  
- Between 12 h and 10 d after AMI  
- Clinical or radiological signs of HF and/or evidence of depressed LV systolic function with EF<40% or reduced echo wall motion index  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Cardiogenic shock  
- Serum creatinine >2.5 mg/dL  
- Known hypersensitivity or intolerance to ACEI or ARB  
- SBP<100 mm Hg  
- Known or suspected bilateral renal artery stenosis  
- Stroke or TIA within previous 3 mo  
- Refractory ventricular arrhythmia  
- Refractory angina  
- Right ventricular MI  
- Mitral stenosis, mitral regurgitation, aortic stenosis, aortic regurgitation of hemodynamic significance  
- Obstructive cardiomyopathy  
- Previous major organ transplant  
- Conditions likely to lead to poor adherence | **Intervention:** Valsartan 160 mg bid  
**Comparator:**  
- Captopril 50 mg tid  
- Combination of captopril 50 mg tid and valsartan 160 mg bid  
- Analyzed by prespecified age groups of <65 y (n=6988) 65–74 y (n=4555) 75–84 y (n=2777) ≥85 y (n=383)  
**1° endpoint:** All-cause mortality  
**2° endpoint:**  
- Composite of CV mortality or emergency treatment or hospitalization for new or worsening HF, reinfarction, stroke, and resuscitated cardiac arrest  
- On 3-y multivariable analysis, each 10-y age increase was associated with HR: 1.49; 95% CI: 1.43–1.56; p<0.0001 for mortality and an OR: 1.38; 95% CI: 1.31–1.46; p<0.0001 for readmission with HF.  
- Similar but slightly smaller trend for composite endpoint, higher mainly in the oldest group.  
Valsartan was at least as effective as captopril in reducing mortality and other adverse outcomes in all age groups and combination therapy with both agents added no incremental benefit.  
- Combination therapy increased the incidence of adverse effects leading to discontinuation in all age groups  
**Safety endpoint:**  
- Adverse events associated with captopril and valsartan were more common in the elderly and in pts receiving combination therapy.  
- Renal dysfunction was more common with older age and combination therapy. |
### Data Supplement 39. RCTs Comparing Hypertension after Renal Transplantation (Section 9.3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim: To compare the effect of an ACEI (lisinopril) with a CCB (controlled release nifedipine) in the treatment of post-transplant HTN focusing on changes in LVH.</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midtvedt K, et al., 2001 (183) 11468543</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To compare the effect of an ACEI (lisinopril) with a CCB (controlled release nifedipine) in the treatment of post-transplant HTN focusing on changes in LVH.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> All RTx pts with HTN by DBP ≥95 in first 3 wk after transplant. <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Normotensive, isolated systolic HTN, refusal, requirement of ACEI for HF.</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Renal transplant recipients with HTN (DBP ≥95 mm Hg) in the first 3 wk after Transplant were randomized to double-blind nifedipine CR 30 mg or lisinopril 10 mg daily. <strong>Comparator:</strong> 2 treatment arms</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> BP controlled in both groups (mean 140 ± 16/87 ± 8 with nifedipine, 136 ± 17/85 ± 8 with lisinopril, NS). LV mass reduced by 15% (p&lt;0.001) in both groups (from 153 ± 43 to 131 ± 38 g/m² with nifedipine and from 142 ± 35 to 121 ± 34 g/m² with lisinopril) with no difference between groups at baseline or at follow-up.</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> In renal transplant pts with HTN with well-controlled BP, there is regression of LV mass after renal transplantation which is observed to be similar in pts treated with lisinopril or nifedipine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtvedt K, et al., 2001 (184) 11740389</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To examine whether graft function as determined by GFR was better maintained with a CCB (controlled release nifedipine) as compared to an ACEI (lisinopril) in hypertensive renal transplant recipients treated with cyclosporine.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> All renal transplant pts with HTN by DBP ≥95 in first 3 wk after transplant. <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Normotensive, isolated systolic HTN, refusal, requirement of ACEI for HF.</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Renal transplant pts with HTN (DBP ≥95 mm Hg) in the first 3 wk after transplant were randomized to double-blind nifedipine CR 30 mg or lisinopril 10 mg daily. <strong>Comparator:</strong> 2 treatment arms</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> GFR baseline at 3–5 wk after entry, and at 1 and 2 y. <strong>Nifedipine:</strong> baseline GFR 46 mL/min, at 1 y 56. <strong>Lisinopril:</strong> baseline GFR 43, at 1 y 44. delta N vs. L: 9.6 at 1 y (95% CI: 5.5–13.7 mL/min; p=0.0001), 10.3 at 2 y (95% CI: 4.0–16.6 mL/min; p=0.017) **Baseline GFR similar, change in GFR significant after 1 y and remained statistically significant after 2 y.</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Both nifedipine and lisinopril were safe and effective in treatment of HTN in renal transplant pts treated with cyclosporine. Pts receiving nifedipine but not lisinopril had improved renal function over 2 y.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Suwelack B, et al., 2000 (185)

**Aim:** To compare the structural and functional cardiac changes of quinapril vs. atenolol administered to hypertensive kidney transplant recipients

**Study type:** Prospective RCT

**Size:** 31 cyclosporine treated stable function recipients with HTN 6–12 wk after transplant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Intervention:</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; endpoint:</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclosporine-based immunosuppression, stable graft function with serum creatinine &lt;2.5 mg/dL.</td>
<td>Cyclosporine treated stable function pts with HTN 6–12 wk after transplant randomized to double-blinded quinapril or atenolol to target DBP&lt;90.</td>
<td>● BP was lower in the atenolol group, delta 10.7 ± 3.4 mm Hg vs. 4.5 ± 2.9 mm Hg with quinapril</td>
<td>● In hypertensive renal allograft recipients, quinapril in contrast to atenolol provided a sufficient reduction in LVH and a concomitant improvement in LV diastolic cardiac relaxation and these effects occurred independently from BP reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Pts with severe aortic or mitral regurgitation or with heart rates &gt;100 beats/min</td>
<td>● Echo within 24 h of first dose and at 24 mo</td>
<td>● E/A ratio (impaired relaxation) increased (improved) only in quinapril group (+0.11; p&lt;0.05) and decreased by 0.03 (p&gt;0.05 vs. start of treatment) in the atenolol group. Difference in E/A ratio alterations was significant (p&lt;0.05).</td>
<td>● While the conclusion was that quinapril showed a benefit not seen with atenolol, the actual numbers are very close (14.1 ± 10.1 atenolol, 15.8 ± 7.7 quinapril).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator:</td>
<td>Stepwise increase in dose, could then add furosemide 40–80 mg/d, third-line CCB</td>
<td></td>
<td>● BP reduction was twice as great in the atenolol group as in the quinapril group. Arterial BP did not correlate with cardiac mass reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 treatment arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paoletti E, et al., 2007 (186)

**Aim:** To assess the effectiveness of ACEIs in regressing LVH persisting after renal transplantation during an 18-mo observation period. To assess the impact of cyclosporine vs. tacrolimus in affecting LVH outcome.

**Study type:** Prospective RCT

**Size:** 70 renal transplant recipients at 3–6 mo after transplant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Intervention:</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; endpoint:</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renal transplant pts with serum creatinine &lt;2.5 mg/dL, urine protein excretion not exceeding 1 g/d and with persistent LVH at 3–6 mo after transplant.</td>
<td>● RCT Lisinopril (n=36) vs. placebo (n=34), also used other agents to treat HTN</td>
<td>● Change in LV mass index at 18 mo.</td>
<td>LVMI regressed more in ACEI group but only in those on cyclosporine immunosuppression. Interaction of LVMI effect and cyclosporine immunosuppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously randomized to either cyclosporine or tacrolimus immunosuppression.</td>
<td>● Endpoint LVMI at 18 mo</td>
<td>● BP decreased in both groups (p=NS, between group differences SBP -1.7 ± 3.3 mm Hg; 95% CI: -4.8–8.2; and DBP 0.3 ± 2.2 mm Hg; 95% CI: -4.8–4.1).</td>
<td>Interaction of LVMI effect and cyclosporine immunosuppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All were pts of deceased donor transplants.</td>
<td>● Echo at 3–6 mo and at 18 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction of LVMI effect and cyclosporine immunosuppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
<td>Comparator: Treatment vs. placebo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interacton of LVMI effect and cyclosporine immunosuppression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| VA NEPHRON-D | **Aim:** To test the efficacy of the combination of losartan with lisinopril as compared with standard treatment with losartan alone in slowing the progression of proteinuric diabetic kidney disease  
**Study type:** RCT, multi-center, double-blind  
**Size:** 1,448 were randomized | **Inclusion criteria:** Pts without adverse events on full dose losartan DM-2, eGFR 30–89.9 mL/min/1.73 m² by 4 variable MDRD formula, urinary albumin/creatinine ratio of ≥300 in a random sample  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Known nondiabetic kidney disease, serum potassium >5.5 mmol/L, current treatment with sodium polystyrene sulfonate or inability to stop prescribed medications increasing risk of hyperkalemia.  
- Pts with DM-2 already taking losartan 100 mg/d with albumin to creatinine ratio of ≥300 were randomized to either lisinopril 10–40 mg/d or placebo.  
- 132 1º endpoints in the combination therapy group  
- No benefit to mortality or CV events.  
- Combination therapy increase risk of hyperkalemia 6.3 events/100 person-y vs. 2.6 events/100 person-y (p<0.001) and acute kidney injury 12.2 vs. 6.7 events/100 person-y (p<0.001)  
**Comparator:** 152 1º endpoints in monotherapy group | **1º endpoint:** First occurrence of a change in eGFR (a decline of ≥30 mL/min/1.73 m² if initial GFR ≥60 or a decline of ≥50% if initial eGFR <60, ESRD or death  
**2º endpoint:** First occurrence of decline in eGFR or ESRD  
**Safety endpoint:** Mortality, hyperkalemia, acute kidney injury  
**cyclosporine in post hoc analysis.  
- 74/104 had LVMI above normal.  
- Change in LVMI ACEIs vs. controls p<0.001  
- Number of meds comparable  
- Number using CCB/BBs/diuretic/others was 17/21/3/9 for ACEI, 24/26/3/15 controls  
- 74/104 had LVMI above normal.  
- Change in LVMI ACEIs vs. controls p<0.001  
- Number of meds comparable  
- Number using CCB/BBs/diuretic/others was 17/21/3/9 for ACEI, 24/26/3/15 controls | **Summary:** Study stopped early due to safety concerns. Combination of ACEI and ARB was associated with increased risk of adverse events among pts with diabetic nephropathy |
## Data Supplement 40. Nonrandomized Trials, Observational Studies, and/or Registries for Hypertension after Renal Transplantation (Section 9.3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cross NB, et al., 2009 (187) 19588343| Study type: Comparative assessment by drug class using RCTs and quasi-RCTs lasting at least 2 wk in kidney transplant pts  
Size:  60 studies, 3,802 pts, most taking cyclosporine based immunosuppression  
29 studies (n=2,262) compared CCB to placebo, 10 (n=445) ACEI to placebo, 7 (n=405) CCB to ACEI | Inclusion criteria: 21 studies for HTN, 6 for erythrocytosis, 2 CAN, 2 LVH, 30 not specified  
Exclusion criteria: N/A | 1st endpoint: To assess comparative effects of antihypertensive agents in kidney transplant pts  
Results: Used random effects meta-analysis, risk ratios for dichotomous outcomes and MD for continuous outcomes, both with 95% CI. Stratified analyses and meta-regression to investigate heterogeneity.  
● CCBs vs. placebo or no treatment had strongest results: improved GFR MD: 4.45 mL min (95% CI: 2.22–6.68), reduced graft loss RR: 0.75, (95% CI: 0.57–0.99).  
● ACEI vs. placebo inconclusive for GFR MD: -8.07 mL/min (95% CI: -18.57–2.43) and variable for graft loss.  
● Compared to CCB, ACEI decreased GFR MD: -11.48 mL/min; 95% CI: -5.75– -7.21, proteinuria MD: -0.28 g/24 h (95% CI: -0.47– -0.10), also reduced hemoglobin MD: -5.72 g/L (95% CI: -10.21) and increased hyperkalemia RR: 3.74 (95% CI: 1.89– 7.43). Graft loss data were inconclusive.  
● CCB may be preferred as first line for HTN after kidney transplant. ACEI may have some detrimental effects. There were not enough studies with other agents. | |
| Jennings DL, et al., 2008 (188) 18094340 | Study type: Literature review  
Size:  5 studies with 3 reporting safety endpoints and 2 reporting clinical efficacy endpoints | Inclusion criteria: Studies using either ACEI or ARB initiated within the first 12 wk after renal transplant | 1st endpoint: Safety or efficacy  
Results:  
● No significant increase in serum creatinine or potassium after up to 9 mo Rx  
● Early initiation of ACEI may be more effective than BB in reducing LVH and proteinuria after 24 mo treatment | Conclusion: Reasonable to consider RAAS inhibitors as first-line treatment in pts with HTN and compelling indications i.e., DM, HF in first 12 wk after renal transplant. |
| Ninomiya T, et al., 2013 (189) 24092942 | Aim: To define CV effects of lowering BP in pts with CKD  
Study type: | Inclusion criteria: Had to meet 1 of the following criteria: Pts randomized to a BP-lowering drug/regimen or a control group (placebo or less intensive BP lowering regimen) or pts randomized | Results: Compared with placebo, BP lowering regimens reduced the risk of major CV events by about a sixth per 5 mm Hg reduction in SBP in individuals with (HR: 0.83; 95% CI | Limitations:  
● Limited numbers with CKD and most were stage 3a:  
● There were 121,995 pts (80%) with eGFR ≥60 mL/min/1.73 m² (mean eGFR 81 (SD 17) |
Meta-analysis of RCTs
Individual pt data available for 23 trials, with summary data from another 3. Meta-analysis was performed according to baseline kidney function.

**Size:** 26 trials (152,290 pts), including 30,295 pts with reduced eGFR, defined as eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m².

Between regimens based on different classes of drugs to lower BP. Trials required to have at least 1,000 pt-y of planned follow-up in each randomized arm and not to have presented or published their main results before finalization of the overview protocol in July 1995.

**Exclusion criteria:** Trials prior to July 1995.

Aim: Evaluate whether use of an ARB was noninferior to ACEI, and whether the combination was superior to ACE alone in the prevention of vascular events in pts with CVD or DM but not HF.

**Study type:** Multi-center, double-blind, RCT

**Size:** 25,620

**Inclusion criteria:**
- ≥55 y
- Coronary, peripheral, or cerebrovascular disease or DM with end-organ damage

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Inability to discontinue ACEI or ARB
- Known hypersensitivity or intolerance to ACEI or ARB
- Selected CVDs (congestive HF, hemodynamically significant valvular or outflow tract obstruction, constrictive pericarditis, complex congenital heart disease, syncopal episodes of unknown etiology <3 mo, planned cardiac surgery or PTCA <3 mo, uncontrolled HTN on treatment [e.g., BP >160/100 mm Hg], heart transplant recipient,

**Intervention:** Ramipril 10 mg daily (n=8,576)

**Comparator:**
- Telmisartan 80 mg daily (n=8,542)
- Combination of telmisartan and ramipril (n=8,502)

**1° endpoint:** After a median follow-up of 56 mo, no difference between ramipril vs. telmisartan or combination therapy vs. ramipril in the 1° composite outcome of death from CV causes, MI, stroke, or hospitalization for HF RR: 1.01 (95% CI: 0.94–1.09) and RR: 0.99 (95% CI: 0.92–1.07), respectively.

**Safety endpoint:**
- Combination therapy was associated with greater risk of hyperkalemia than ramipril monotherapy (480 pts vs. 283 pts; p<0.001)
- Hypotensive symptoms were cited as reason for permanent discontinuing more in telmisartan vs. ramipril RR: 1.54, p<0.001; and combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy RR: 2.75, p<0.001
- Renal impairment was more common in combination therapy vs. ramipril monotherapy RR: 1.33; 95% CI: 1.22–1.44
stroke due to subarachnoid hemorrhage)
- Other conditions (significant renal artery disease, hepatic dysfunction, uncorrected volume or sodium depletion, 1° hyperaldosteronism, hereditary fructose intolerance, other major noncardiac illness or expected to reduce life expectancy or significant disability interfere with study participation, simultaneously taking another experimental drug, unable to provide written informed consent).

**VALIANT**
White HD, et al., 2005 (182)

**Aim:** Evaluate whether use of an ARB or the combination of an ACEI and an ARB was superior to a proven effective dose of an ACEI after AMI in pts with HF and/or LVEF <40%.

**Study type:** Multi-center, double-blind, RCT

**Size:** 14,703

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>Comparator:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ≥18 y</td>
<td>• Captopril 50 mg tid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Between 12 h and 10 d after AMI</td>
<td>• Combination of captopril 50 mg tid and valsartan 160 mg bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical or radiological signs of HF and/or evidence of depressed LV systolic function with EF&lt;40% or reduced echo wall motion index</td>
<td>• Analyzed by prespecified age groups of &lt;65 (n=6,988) 65 to 74 (n=4,555) 75 to 84 (n=2,777) ≥85 y (n=383)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1° endpoint:** All-cause mortality

**2° endpoint:**
- Composite of CV mortality or emergency treatment or hospitalization for new or worsening HF, reinfarction, stroke, and resuscitated cardiac arrest
- On 3-y multivariable analysis, each 10-y increase was associated with HR: 1.49 (95% CI: 1.43–1.56), p<0.0001 for mortality and OR: 1.38 (95% CI: 1.31–1.46; p<0.0001) for readmission with HF.
- Similar but slightly smaller trend for composite endpoint, higher mainly in the oldest group.

Valsartan was at least as effective as captopril in reducing mortality and other adverse outcomes in all age groups and combination therapy with both agents added no incremental benefit.

Combination therapy increased the incidence of adverse effects leading to discontinuation in all age groups

**Safety endpoint:**
- Adverse events associated with captopril and valsartan were more common in the elderly and in pts receiving combination therapy.
- Renal dysfunction was more common with older age and combination therapy.
### Conditions likely to lead to poor adherence

- Intensive SBP goal <120 mm Hg vs. standard (SBP goal <140)

| Study Acronym; Author; Year Published | Aim: To assess whether rapid lowering of elevated BP would improve the outcome in pts with ICH. | Study type: Phase III RCT | Study size: 2,839 pts | Inclusion criteria: Pts with spontaneous ICH within the previous 6 h with elevated SBP | Design: Intensive treatment to lower BP (with a target systolic level of <140 mm Hg within 1 h) vs. guideline-recommended treatment (with a target SBP <180 mm Hg) among pts with SBP between 150 and 220 mm using agents of the physician's choosing. | **1° outcome:** Death or major disability (score of 3 to 6 on the modified Rankin scale) at 90 d. | **Pre-specified 2° outcome:** Ordinal analysis of the modified Rankin score. | **Key findings:** Among the 2,794 pts for whom the 1° outcome could be determined, 719 of 1,382 participants (52.0%) receiving }

### Data Supplement 41. RCTs Comparing Acute Intracerebral Hemorrhage Outcomes (Section 9.4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| INTERACT2 Anderson CS, et al., 2013 (191) | To assess whether rapid lowering of elevated BP would improve the outcome in pts with ICH. | Phase III RCT | 2,839 pts | Intensive treatment to lower BP (with a target systolic level of <140 mm Hg within 1 h) vs. guideline-recommended treatment (with a target SBP <180 mm Hg) among pts with SBP between 150 and 220 mm using agents of the physician's choosing. | **1° outcome:** Death or major disability (score of 3 to 6 on the modified Rankin scale) at 90 d. | **Summary:** In pts with ICH, intensive lowering of BP did not result in a significant reduction in the rate of death or severe disability. However, there may be improved functional outcomes with intensive lowering of BP. INTERACT-2 is so far the largest (and only phase 3) RCT evaluating efficacy of intensive BP lowering.
### ATACH-1 2010 (192) 19770736

**Aim:** To determine the feasibility and acute (i.e., within 72 h) safety of 3 levels of SBP reduction in subjects with supratentorial ICH treated within 6 h after symptom onset.

**Study type:** Phase I, dose-escalation, multicenter prospective study.

**Study size:** 60

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with ICH with elevated SBP ≥170 mm Hg who presented to the ED within 6 h of symptom onset.

**Design:**
- IV nicardipine to reduce SBP to a target of:
  - #1: 170–200 mm Hg in the first cohort of pts
  - #2: 140–170 mm Hg in the 2nd cohort
  - #3: 110–140 mm Hg in the third cohort.
- Each subject was followed-up for 3 mo to preliminarily assess mortality and the clinical outcomes. A total of 18, 20, and 22 pts were enrolled in the respective 3 tiers of SBP treatment goals.

**1° outcome:** Treatment feasibility (achieving and maintaining the SBP goals for 18–24 h)

**2° outcomes:**
- #1: Neurologic deterioration within 24 h;
- #2: Serious adverse events within 72 h.

**Key findings:**
- Overall, 9 of 60 pts had treatment failures (all in the last tier). A total of 7 subjects with neurologic deterioration were observed: 1 (6%), 2 (10%), and 4 (18%) in tier 1, 2, and 3, respectively.
- Serious adverse events were observed in 1 subject (5%) in tier 2 and in 3 subjects (14%) in tier 3. However, the safety stopping rule was not activated in any of the tiers.
- 3 (17%), 2 (10%), and 5 (23%) subjects in tiers 1, 2, and 3, respectively, died within 3 mo

**Summary:**
- Observed proportions of neurologic deterioration and serious adverse events were below the prespecified safety thresholds, and the 3-mo mortality rate was lower than expected in all SBP tiers.

### INTERACT-1

**Aim:** To assess the safety and efficiency of Early intensive lowering of BP (target SBP

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with ICH

**Design:** Early intensive lowering of BP (target SBP

**1° outcome:** Proportional change in hematoma volume at 24 h.

**Summary:** Early intensive BP-lowering treatment is clinically
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Randomized pilot trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study size:</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### This treatment, as a run-in phase to a larger trial.

### Study type: Randomized pilot trial

### Study size: 404

### acute spontaneous ICH diagnosed by CT within 6 h of onset, elevated SBP (150–220 mm Hg), and no definite indication or contraindication to treatment

### 140 mm Hg; n=203 vs. standard guideline-based management of BP (target SBP 180 mm Hg; n=201).

### 2° outcomes: Measurements of hematoma volume.

### Safety and clinical outcomes: Assessed for up to 90 d.

### Key findings:

- Mean hematoma volumes were smaller in the guideline group (12.7 mL, SD 11.6) than in the intensive group (14.2 mL, SD 14.5).
- From randomization to 1 h, mean SBP was 153 mm Hg in the intensive group and 167 mm Hg in the guideline group (difference 13.3 mm Hg (95% CI: 8.9–17.6) mm Hg; p<0.0001); from 1 h to 24 h, BP was 146 mm Hg in the intensive group and 157 mm Hg in the guideline group (10.8 mm Hg; 95% CI: 7.7–13.9 mm Hg; p<0.0001).
- Mean proportional hematoma growth was 36.3% in the guideline group and 13.7% in the intensive group (difference 22.6%; 95% CI: 0.6%–44.5%; p=0.04) at 24 h.
- After adjustment for initial hematoma volume and time from onset to CT, median hematoma growth differed between the groups with p=0.06; the absolute difference in volume between groups was 1.7 mL (95% CI: -0.5–3.9; p=0.13). RR of hematoma growth ≥33% or ≥12.5 mL was 36% lower (95% CI: 0%–59%; p=0.05) in the intensive group than in the guideline group. Adjusted RR: 8% (95% CI: -1.0%–17%; p=0.05).
- Intensive BP-lowering treatment did not alter the risks of adverse events or 2° clinical outcomes at 90 d.

### feasible, well tolerated, and might reduce hematoma growth in ICH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsivgoulis G, et al., 2014 (194) <strong>25239836</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: To evaluate the safety and efficacy of intensive BP reduction in pts with acute-onset ICH</td>
<td>Pts with acute ICH randomized to either intensive or guideline BP-reduction protocols.</td>
<td><strong>Key findings</strong>:  ● Death rates similar between pts randomized to intensive BP-lowering treatment and those receiving guideline BP-lowering treatment OR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.83–1.23; p=0.914  ● Intensive BP-lowering treatment associated with strong trend towards lower 3-mo death or dependency vs. guideline treatment OR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.76–1.01; p=0.062.  ● Intensive BP reduction was also associated with a greater attenuation of absolute hematoma growth at 24 h (standardized MD± standard error: -0.110 ± 0.053; p=0.038).</td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong>:  ● Intensive BP management in pts with acute ICH is safe.  ● Intensively treated ICH pts tended to have more favorable 3-mo functional outcome.  ● Intensive BP reduction associated with a greater attenuation of absolute hematoma growth at 24 h.  ● Starting antihypertensive treatment in the initial 5–10 d after ICH may have a different outcome from that seen after an ischemic stroke because of 2º edema formation and hemodynamic changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATACH2 Qureshi AI, et al., 2016 <strong>27276234</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: To determine the relative efficacy of intensive vs. standard antihypertensive treatment that was initiated within 4.5 H after symptom onset and continued for the next 24 H in patients with spontaneous supratentorial intracerebral hemorrhage</td>
<td>Pts with spontaneous ICH (volume, &lt;60 cm³) and a Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score of 5 or more</td>
<td><strong>1º outcome</strong>:  Moderately severe or severe disability or who had died (modified Rankin scale score, 4 to 6) at 3 months</td>
<td><strong>Summary</strong>: Treatment of patients with spontaneous ICH to achieve a target systolic BP of 110 to 139 mm Hg did not result in a lower rate of death or disability compared to conventional reduction to a target of 140–179 mm Hg. Furthermore, there was more than twice the frequency of renal adverse events in the more intensely treated arm within a week of treatment initiation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 42. RCTs Comparing Acute Ischemic Stroke Outcomes (Section 9.4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| COSSACS Robinson TG, et al., 2010 20621562 | **Aim:** Assess the efficacy and safety of continuing or stopping pre-existing antihypertensive drugs in patients with acute stroke  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 763 | **Inclusion criteria:** Acute ischemic stroke (or ICH) within previous 48 h  
**Exclusion criteria:**  
- Impaired level of consciousness  
- Unable to swallow  
- Hypertensive emergency  
- BP >200/120 mm Hg  
- Premorbid disability  
- Intravenous alteplase | **Intervention:** Continue previous antihypertensive medication/s (n=379)  
**Comparator:** Stop previous antihypertensive medication/s (n=384) | **1° endpoint:** Death or major disability (mRS 3–6) at 14 d: RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.65–1.14; p=0.3)  
**Safety endpoint:** Adverse events, minor and serious: p>0.05 for all | **Relevant 2° endpoint**  
- 2-wk NIHSS: p=0.46 and 2-wk Barthel Index: p=0.30  
- 2-wk BP: significantly lower in the continue arm (mean difference of -13 mm Hg in SBP and -8 mm Hg in DBP) p<0.0001  
- 6-month mortality: p=0.98; 6-month disability p<0.05  
**Study limitations**  
- Trial was terminated early because of slow recruitment, and consequently it was underpowered  
- Treatment was not homogeneous (different drugs, no specific BP target)  
- No differences when analysis restricted to patients with ischemic stroke  
**Summary/conclusions**  
- Early reinitiation of antihypertensive medications was safe but ineffective to prevent death or dependency  
- Early reinitiation of antihypertensives was associated with better BP control at 2 wk |
### CATIS

**He J, et al., 2014 [24240777]**

**Aim:** Evaluate whether immediate blood pressure reduction in patients with acute ischemic stroke would reduce death and major disability at 14 d or hospital discharge.

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 4071

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Age >22 y
- Acute ischemic stroke within previous 24 h
- Impaired level of consciousness
- Hypertensive emergency
- BP >220/120
- Atrial fibrillation
- Intravenous alteplase

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Hypertensive emergency
- BP >220/120
- Atrial fibrillation
- Intravenous alteplase

**Intervention:**
- Antihypertensive medication to maintain BP <140/90 for the first wk (n=2038)

**Comparator:**
- No antihypertensive medication for the first wk (n=2033)

**1st endpoint:**
- Death or major disability (mRS 3–6) at 14 d: OR: 1.0 (95% CI: 0.88–1.14; p=0.98)

**Safety endpoint:**
- Vascular disease events p=0.28
- Recurrent stroke p=0.07

**1° outcomes:**
- Early BP lowering after acute stroke onset compared with placebo

**Key findings:**
- Early BP lowering after acute stroke onset associated with more death within 30 d compared with placebo RR: 1.34; 95% CI: 1.02–1.74; p=0.03.
- Early BP lowering after acute stroke onset not associated with early neurological deterioration, early death within 7 d, long-term death, early and long-term dependency, early and long-term combination of death or dependency, long-term stroke recurrence, long-term MI and long-term CVE.

**Relevant 2° endpoint**
- Death or major disability (mRS 3–5) at 90 d: OR: 0.99 (95% CI: 0.86–1.15; p=0.93)
- Lower blood pressure at 14 d (mean difference of -8.6 mm Hg in SBP and -3.9 mm Hg in DBP; p<0.001) and at 90 d (mean difference of -2.9 mm Hg in SBP and -1.4 mm Hg in DBP; p<0.001) in the active arm

**Study limitations**
- Antihypertensive regimen was not standardized

**Summary/conclusions**
- Early treatment of hypertension was safe but ineffective to prevent death or dependency
- Early initiation of antihypertensives was associated with better BP control at 2 wk

---

### Wang H, et al., 2014 [195] [24853087]

**Aim:** To assess the effects of early BP lowering on early and long-term outcomes after acute stroke.

**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs.

**Study size:** 17 trials (n=13,236 pts)

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Prospective RCTs of pts ≥18 y with acute ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke; intervention compared with placebo was initiated within 7 d of stroke onset; intervention aimed to lower BP or intervention achieved BP reduction;1 or more functional outcomes reported, such as death or dependency.

**Exclusion criteria:**
- No antihypertensive medication for the first wk (n=2033)

**Intervention:**
- Antihypertensive medication to maintain BP <140/90 for the first wk (n=2038)

**Comparator:**
- No antihypertensive medication for the first wk (n=2033)

**1st outcomes:**
- Early (within 30 d) and long-term (from 3–12 mo).

**Key findings:**
- Early BP lowering after acute stroke onset associated with more death within 30 d compared with placebo RR: 1.34; 95% CI: 1.02–1.74; p=0.03.
- Early BP lowering after acute stroke onset not associated with early neurological deterioration, early death within 7 d, long-term death, early and long-term dependency, early and long-term combination of death or dependency, long-term stroke recurrence, long-term MI and long-term CVE.

**Relevant 2° endpoint**
- Death or major disability (mRS 3–5) at 90 d: OR: 0.99 (95% CI: 0.86–1.15; p=0.93)
- Lower blood pressure at 14 d (mean difference of -8.6 mm Hg in SBP and -3.9 mm Hg in DBP; p<0.001) and at 90 d (mean difference of -2.9 mm Hg in SBP and -1.4 mm Hg in DBP; p<0.001) in the active arm

**Study limitations**
- Antihypertensive regimen was not standardized

**Summary:** Results do not support early BP lowering after acute stroke. Early BP lowering may be associated with greater risk of death within 30 d after acute stroke.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhao R, et al., 2015 (196) 26061309</td>
<td>To determine whether lowering BP during the acute phase of an ischemic stroke improves short- and long-term outcomes. <strong>Aim:</strong></td>
<td>Pts with acute stroke (ischemic or hemorrhagic) treated with an antihypertensive agent or placebo. <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td>Early BP lowering after acute stroke onset compared with placebo. <strong>1st outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Treatment groups had a greater decrease in BP than control groups, and this effect was seen with different classes of antihypertensive drugs.</td>
<td>Antihypertensive agents effectively reduce BP during the acute phase of an ischemic stroke, but seem to confer no benefit with regard to short- and long-term dependency and mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed N, et al., 2000 (197) 10835440</td>
<td>To investigate outcome in INWEST subgroups with increasing levels of BP reduction. <strong>Aim:</strong></td>
<td>Pts with a diagnosis of ischemic stroke in the carotid artery territory within 24 h. <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td>Neurological outcome per the Orgogozo scale and functional outcome per the Barthel scale at d 21. <strong>1st outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Nimodipine treatment resulted in a significant reduction in BP from baseline vs. placebo during the first few d.</td>
<td>DBP, but not SBP, reduction was associated with neurological worsening after the IV high-dose nimodipine after acute stroke. For low-dose nimodipine, the results were inconclusive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aim

### Study type
Meta-analysis of RCTs of interventions that aimed to alter BP compared with control in pts within 1 wk of acute ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke.

### Inclusion criteria:
RCTs of interventions that aimed to alter BP compared with control in pts with 1 wk of acute ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke.

### 1st outcome:
Functional outcome

### Key findings:
- At 24 h after randomization #1: Oral ACEIs reduced SBP MD: -8 mm Hg (95% CI: -17–1) and DBP MD: -3 mm Hg (95% CI: -9–2), sublingual ACEIs reduced SBP MD: -12.00 mm Hg (95% CI: -26–2) and DBP MD: -2 (95% CI: -10–6).
- Oral angiotensin receptor antagonists reduced SBP MD: -1 mm Hg (95% CI: -3–2) and DBP MD: -1 mm Hg (95% CI: -3–1).
- Oral BBs reduced SBP MD: -14 mm Hg (95% CI: -27–-1) and DBP MD: -1 mm Hg (95% CI: -9–7), IV BBs reduced SBP MD: -5 mm Hg (95% CI: -18–8) and DBP MD: -5 mm Hg (95% CI: -13–3).
- Oral CCBs reduced SBP MD: -13 mm Hg (95% CI: -43–17) and DBP MD: -6 mm Hg (95% CI: -14–2), IV CCBs reduced SBP MD: -32 mm Hg (95% CI: -65–1) and DBP MD: -13 (95% CI: -31–6).
- Nitric oxide donors reduced SBP MD: -12 mm Hg (95% CI: -19–-5) and DBP MD: -3 (95% CI: -4–-2).

### Summary:
- No current evidence showing that lowering BP during the acute phase of stroke improves functional outcome.
- It seems reasonable to withhold BP-lowering drugs until pts are medically and neurologically stable, after which drugs can then be reintroduced.
- CCBs, ACEI, angiotensin receptor antagonists, BBs and nitric oxide donors each lower BP in acute stroke while phenylephrine appears to increase BP.
### Size:
26 trials involving 17,011 pts (8,497 pts were assigned active therapy and 8,514 pts received placebo/control). Not all trials contributed to each outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITS-ISTR</th>
<th>Ahmed N, et al., 2009 (199) 19461022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the association of BP and antihypertensive therapy with clinical outcomes after thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Retrospective analysis of prospectively maintained thrombolysis registry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pts with acute ischemic stroke treated with IV rtPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BP values were recorded at baseline, 2 h, and 24 h after thrombolysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categories:</strong> By history of HTN and antihypertensive therapy within 7 d after thrombolysis:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group 1, HTN treated with antihypertensives (n=5,612)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st outcomes:</strong> Symptomatic (National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale score deterioration ≥4) ICH Type 2, mortality, and independence at (modified Rankin Score 0 to 2) 3 mo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key findings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High SBP 2–24 h after thrombolysis as a continuous variable was associated with worse outcome (p&lt;0.001) and as a categorical variable had a linear association with symptomatic hemorrhage and a U-shaped association with mortality and independence with SBP 141–150 mm Hg associated with most favorable outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No difference in symptomatic hemorrhage OR: 1.09 (95% CI: 0.83–1.51; p=0.58) and independence OR: 1.03 (95% CI: 0.93–1.10; p=0.80) but lower mortality OR: 0.82 (95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong association of high SBP after thrombolysis with poor outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher BPs during the initial 24 h were associated with greater risk of ICH in a linear fashion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U-shaped relation found between BP during initial 24 h and death or dependency at 3 mo, with best outcomes associated with SBP of 141–150 mm Hg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● Phenylephrine, nonsignificantly increased SBP MD: 21 mm Hg (95% CI: -13–55) and DBP MD: 1 mm Hg (95% CI: -15–16).
● BP lowering did not reduce death or dependency either by drug class OR: 0.98 (95% CI: 0.92–1.05), stroke type OR: 0.98 (95% CI: 0.92–1.05) or time to treatment OR: 0.98 (95% CI: 0.92–1.05).
● Treatment within 6 h of stroke appeared effective in reducing death or dependency OR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.76–0.99) but not death OR: 0.70 (95% CI: 0.38–1.26) by trial end.
● While death or dependency did not differ between pts who continued pre-stroke antihypertensive treatment vs. those who stopped it temporarily (worse outcome with continuing treatment OR: 1.06; 95% CI: 0.91–1.24), disability scores at the end of the trial were worse in pts randomized to continue treatment (Barthel Index MD: -3.2 (95% CI: -5.8 - -0.6).
## ACCESS

**Schrader J, et al., 2003 (200)**

| **Aim:** To assess safety of modest BP reduction by candesartan in early treatment of stroke; and provide an estimate of the number of cases required to perform a larger phase III efficacy study. |
| **Study type:** Prospective, double-blind, RCT; multicenter phase II study. |
| **Size:** 342 pts |
| **Inclusion criteria:** Motor deficit, a cerebral CT scan excluding ICH, and necessity to treat HTN per prevailing recommendation |
| **Exclusion criteria:** >85 y, disorders in consciousness preventing acquisition of consent, occlusion or >70% stenosis of the internal carotid artery, malignant HTN, manifest cardiac failure, high-grade aortic or mitral stenosis, UA pectoris, or contraindications against candesartan. |
| **Design:** 4 mg candesartan daily or placebo on d 1. On d 2, dosage was increased to 8 or 16 mg candesartan or placebo if BP >60 mm Hg SPB or 100 mm Hg DBP. Treatment was targeted to a 10%–15% BP reduction within 24 h. |
| **1º outcome:** Trial was stopped prematurely when 342 pts (339 valid) had been randomized because of an imbalance in endpoints. |
| **Key findings:** Cumulative 12 mo mortality and the number of vascular events differed significantly in favor of the candesartan cilexetil group (OR: 0.475; 95% CI: 0.252–0.895). |
| **Summary:** Early antihypertensive therapy with candesartan might be a safe therapeutic option in acute stroke, but study sample size very small. |

## SCAST

**Sandset EC, et al., 2011 (201)**

| **Aim:** To examine whether careful BP-lowering treatment with the candesartan is |
| **Inclusion criteria:** Pts >18 y with acute stroke (ischemic or hemorrhagic) and SBP of ≥140 mm Hg were |
| **Design:** Pts randomized to candesartan (n=1,017) or placebo (1,012) (1:1) for 7 d, with doses |
| **1º effect variables:** Composite of vascular death, MI, or stroke during the first 6 mo; and functional outcome at 6 mo, as measured by the modified Rankin Scale. |
| **Relevant 2º endpoint:** Similar effects for all prespecified 2º endpoints. |
| During follow-up, 9 (1%) pts on candesartan and 5 (<1%) on
**CATIS**  
He J, et al., 2014 (202)  
24240777  

**Aim:** To evaluate whether immediate BP reduction in pts with acute ischemic stroke would reduce death and major disability at 14 d or hospital discharge.  

**Study type:** Single-blind, blinded end-points RCT.  

**Study size:** 4,071 pts  

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with nonthrombolysed ischemic stroke within 48 h of onset and elevated SBP  

**Design:** Pts (n=2,038) randomized to antihypertensive treatment (aimed at lowering SBP by 10% to 25% within first 24 h, achieving BP <140/90 mm Hg within 7 d, and maintaining this level during hospitalization) vs. to discontinue all antihypertensive medications (control) during hospitalization (n=2,033).  

**1° outcome:** Combination of death and major disability (modified Rankin Scale score ≥3) at 14 d or hospital discharge.  

**Key findings:**  
- Mean SBP was reduced from 166.7 mm Hg to 144.7 mm Hg (-12.7%) within 24 h in the antihypertensive treatment group and from 165.6 mm Hg to 152.9 mm Hg (-7.2%) in the control group within 24 h after randomization (difference, -5.5% (95% CI: -4.9–-6.1%); absolute difference, -9.1 mm Hg (95% CI: -10.2–-8.1), p=0.001).  
- 1° outcome did not differ between treatment groups (OR: 1.00; 95% CI: 0.88–1.14; p=0.98) at 14 d or hospital discharge.  
- BP at 14 d and 90 d: significantly lower in the active arm (mean difference of -2.9 mm Hg in systolic BP and -1.4 mm Hg in diastolic BP)  

**Relevant 2° endpoint:** Death and major disability at 3-mo posttreatment follow-up did not differ between treatment groups (500 events [antihypertensive treatment] vs. 502 events [control]; OR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.86–1.15; p=0.93).  

**Summary:** Among pts with acute ischemic stroke, BP reduction with antihypertensive medications, vs. absence of hypertensive medication, did not reduce the likelihood of death and major disability at 14 d or hospital discharge.  
- Early initiation of antihypertensives was associated with better BP control at 2 wk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>1st outcome</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COSSACS</td>
<td>To assess the efficacy and safety of continuing or stopping pre-existing antihypertensive drugs in pts who recently had a stroke.</td>
<td>Pts &gt;18 y taking antihypertensive drugs enrolled within 48 h of stroke and last dose of antihypertensive drug.</td>
<td>Continue (n=379) or stop (n=384) pre-existing antihypertensive drugs for 2 wk.</td>
<td>Death or dependency at 2 wk.</td>
<td>● 72 of 379 pts in the continue group and 82 of 384 pts in the stop group reached the 1st endpoint RR: 0.86; 95% CI: 0.65–1.14; p=0.3. &lt;br&gt;● Difference in SBP at 2 wk between the continue group and the stop group was 13 mm Hg (95% CI: 10–17); difference in DBP was 8 mm Hg (6–10; difference between groups; p&lt;0.0001). &lt;br&gt;● No substantial differences were observed between groups in rates of serious adverse events, 6-mo mortality, or major CV events.</td>
<td>Continuation of antihypertensive drugs did not reduce 2-wk death or dependency, CV event rate, or mortality at 6 mo &lt;br&gt;Early reinitiation of antihypertensives was associated with better BP control at 2 wk &lt;br&gt;Lower BP levels in those who continued antihypertensive treatment after acute mild stroke were not associated with an increase in adverse events. Of note, COSSACS was likely underpowered due to early termination of the trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHIPS</td>
<td>To assess feasibility, safety, and effects of 2 regimens for lowering BP in pts who with acute stroke.</td>
<td>Pts with cerebral infarction or cerebral hemorrhage who were hypertensive SBP &gt;160 mm Hg</td>
<td>Within 36 h of symptom onset: &lt;br&gt;#1: Oral labetalol, lisinopril vs. placebo if they were nondysphagic; &lt;br&gt;#2: IV labetalol, sublingual lisinopril, or placebo if they had dysphagia. &lt;br&gt;● Labetalol (n=58), lisinopril (n=58), or placebo (n=63). &lt;br&gt;● Doses were titrated up if target BP was not reached.</td>
<td>Death or dependency at 2 wk.</td>
<td>1° outcome occurred in 61% (69) of the active vs. 59% (35) of the placebo group (RR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.80–1.33; p=0.82) &lt;br&gt;● No evidence of early neurological deterioration with active treatment (RR: 1.22; 95% CI: 0.33–4.54; p=0.76) despite greater drop in SBP within the first 24 h in this group vs. placebo (21 [17–25] mm Hg vs. 11 [5–17] mm Hg; p=0.004). &lt;br&gt;● No rise in serious adverse events with active treatment (RR: 0.91; 95% CI: 0.69–1.12; p=0.50) but 3-mo mortality was halved (9.7% vs. 20.3%; HR: 0.40; 95% CI: 0.2–1.0; p=0.05).</td>
<td>Labetalol and lisinopril are effective antihypertensive drugs in acute stroke that do not raise risk of serious adverse events. Early lowering of BP with lisinopril and labetalol after acute stroke may be a promising approach to lower mortality and disability. However, pilot nature and very small sample size limit generalizability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath PM</td>
<td>To assess outcomes after stroke in pts given</td>
<td>Pts admitted to hospital with an acute ischemic</td>
<td>7 d of transdermal glyceryl trinitrate (5 mg)</td>
<td>Function, assessed with the modified Rankin Scale at 90 d</td>
<td></td>
<td>In pts with acute stroke and high BP transdermal glyceryl trinitrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
drugs to lower their BP.

**Study type:** Multicenter, randomized partial-factorial trial

**Study size:** 4,011 pts

or hemorrhagic stroke and raised SBP (140–220 mm Hg) per d), started within 48 h of stroke onset vs. No glyceryl trinitrate (control group).

- Pts taking antihypertensive drugs before index stroke randomly assigned to continue vs. stop taking these drugs.

**Key findings:**
- Mean BP was 167 (SD: 19) mm Hg/90 (13) mm Hg at baseline (median 26 h (16–37) after stroke onset), and was significantly reduced on d 1 in 2,000 pts allocated to glyceryl trinitrate vs. 2,011 controls (difference: -7.0 (95% CI: -8.5– -5.6) mm Hg/ -3.5 [-4.4– -2.6] mm Hg; both p<0.0001), and on d 7 in 1,053 pts allocated to continue antihypertensive drugs compared with 1,044 pts randomized to stop them (difference: -9·5 (95% CI: -11.8– -7.2) mm Hg/-5.0 [-6.4– -3.7] mm Hg; both p<0.0001).
- D-90 functional outcome did not differ in either treatment comparison-glyceryl trinitrate vs. no glyceryl trinitrate (OR: 1.01; 95% CI 0.91–1.13; p=0·83), and with continue vs. stop antihypertensive drugs (OR: 1.05; 95% CI: 0.90–1.22; p=0.55).

ATACH-1

**Aim:** To determine the feasibility and acute (i.e., within 72 h) safety of 3 levels of SBP reduction in subjects with supratentorial ICH treated within 6 h after symptom onset.

**Study type:** Phase I, dose-escalation, multicenter prospective study.

**Study size:** 60

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with ICH with elevated SBP ≥170 mm Hg who presented to the ED within 6 h of symptom onset.

**Design:**
- IV nicardipine to reduce SBP to a target of:
  - #1: 170–200 mm Hg in the first cohort of pts
  - #2: 140–170 mm Hg in the 2nd cohort
  - #3: 110–140 mm Hg in the third cohort.
- Each subject was followed-up for 3 mo to preliminarily assess mortality and the clinical outcomes. A total of 18, 20, and 22 pts were enrolled in the respective 3 tiers of SBP treatment goals.

**Key findings:**
- Overall, 9 of 60 pts had treatment failures (all in the last tier). A total of 7 subjects with neurologic deterioration were observed: 1 (6%), 2 (10%), and 4 (18%) in tier 1, 2, and 3, respectively.
- Serious adverse events were observed in 1 subject (5%) in tier 2 and in 3 subjects (14%) in tier 3. However, the safety stopping rule was not activated in any of the tiers.
- 3 (17%), 2 (10%), and 5 (23%) subjects in tiers 1, 2, and 3, respectively, died within 3 mo

**Summary:** Observed proportions of neurologic deterioration and serious adverse events were below the prespecified safety thresholds, and the 3-mo mortality rate was lower than expected in all SBP tiers.

Results formed the basis of an ongoing larger randomized trial (ATACH-2) addressing the efficacy of SBP reduction in pts with ICH.
### INTERACT-1

**Anderson CS, et al., 2008 (193) 18396107**

**Aim:** To assess the safety and efficiency of this treatment, as a run-in phase to a larger trial.

**Study type:** Randomized pilot trial

**Study size:** 404

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with acute spontaneous ICH diagnosed by CT within 6 h of onset, elevated SBP (150–220 mm Hg), and no definite indication or contraindication to treatment

**Design:** Early intensive lowering of BP (target SBP 140 mm Hg; n=203) vs. standard guideline-based management of BP (target SBP 180 mm Hg; n=201).

**1° outcome:** Proportional change in hematoma volume at 24 h.

**2° outcomes:** Measurements of hematoma volume.

**Safety and clinical outcomes:** Assessed for up to 90 d.

**Key findings:**
- Mean hematoma volumes were smaller in the guideline group (12.7 mL, SD 11.6) than in the intensive group (14.2 mL, SD 14.5).
- From randomization to 1 h, mean SBP was 153 mm Hg in the intensive group and 167 mm Hg in the guideline group (difference 13.3 mm Hg (95% CI: 8.9–17.6) mm Hg; p<0.0001); from 1 h to 24 h, BP was 146 mm Hg in the intensive group and 157 mm Hg in the guideline group (10.8 mm Hg; 95% CI: 7.7–13.9 mm Hg; p<0.0001).
- Mean proportional hematoma growth was 36.3% in the guideline group and 13.7% in the intensive group (difference 22.6%; 95% CI: 0.6%–44.5%; p=0.04) at 24 h.
- After adjustment for initial hematoma volume and time from onset to CT, median hematoma growth differed between the groups with p=0.06; the absolute difference in volume between groups was 1.7 mL (95% CI: -0.5–3.9; p=0.13). RR of hematoma growth ≥33% or ≥12.5 mL was 36% lower (95% CI: 0%–59%; p=0.05) in the intensive group than in the guideline group. Adjusted RR: 8% (95% CI: -1.0%–17%; p=0.05).
- Intensive BP-lowering treatment did not alter the risks of adverse events or 2° clinical outcomes at 90 d.

**Summary:** Early intensive BP-lowering treatment is clinically feasible, well tolerated, and appears to reduce hematoma growth in ICH.

### Hack W, et al., 2008 (206)

**Aim:** To assess the efficacy and

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts 18–80 y, who had

**Design:**

**1° outcome:** Disability at 90 d, dichotomized as a favorable outcome (a score of 0 or 1 on

**Summary:** Compared with placebo, IV alteplase administered between 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18815396</td>
<td>Safety of alteplase administered between 3 and 4.5 h after the onset of a stroke.</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>821 pts</td>
<td>Received a clinical diagnosis of acute ischemic stroke, and were able to receive the study drug within 3–4 h after the onset of symptoms.</td>
<td>SBP &gt;185 mm Hg or DBP &gt;110 mm Hg or aggressive treatment (IV medication) necessary to reduce BP to these limits</td>
<td>Double-blind RCT</td>
<td>Eligible pts were randomly assigned 1:1 to receive 0.9 mg of alteplase per kg, administered IV (with an upper limit of 90 mg), or placebo. 418 pts were assigned to receive alteplase and 403 pts were assigned to receive placebo</td>
<td>1° outcome: Clinical outcome at 3 mo, according to scores on the Barthel index, modified Rankin scale, Glasgow outcome scale, and NIH stroke scale. 2° outcome: Global outcome analysis of 4 neurologic and disability scores combined. Safety outcomes: Death, symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage, and other serious adverse events. Key findings: More pts had a favorable outcome with alteplase than with placebo (52.4% vs. 45.2%; OR: 1.34; 95% CI: 1.02–1.76; p=0.04. Incidence of ICH was higher with alteplase than with placebo (for any ICH, 27.0% vs. 17.6%; p=0.001; for symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage, 2.4% vs. 0.2%; p=0.008). Mortality did not differ significantly between the alteplase and placebo groups (7.7% and 8.4%, respectively; p=0.68). No significant difference in the rate of other serious adverse events.</td>
<td>Despite an increased incidence of symptomatic ICH, treatment with IV t-PA within 3 h of the onset of ischemic stroke improved clinical outcome at 3 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINDS rt-PA Stroke Study Group, 1995 (207) 7477192</td>
<td>Aim: To assess the difference in clinical efficacy between IV t-PA and placebo among pts with an acute ischemic stroke</td>
<td>Double-blind RCT</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with an ischemic stroke with a clearly defined time of onset (&lt;3 h), a deficit measurable on the NIH stroke scale, and a base-line CT scan of the brain that showed no evidence of ICH.</td>
<td>Design: RCT with acute ischemic stroke pts randomized to t-PA vs. placebo</td>
<td>1° outcome: Clinical outcome at 3 mo, according to scores on the Barthel index, modified Rankin scale, Glasgow outcome scale, and NIH stroke scale. Key findings: As compared with pts given placebo, pts treated with t-PA were at least 30% more likely to have minimal or no disability at 3 mo on the assessment scales. Symptomatic ICH within 36 h after the onset of stroke occurred in 6.4% of pts given</td>
<td>Summary: Despite an increased incidence of symptomatic ICH, treatment with IV t-PA within 3 h of the onset of ischemic stroke improved clinical outcome at 3 mo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 43. RCTs Comparing Secondary Stroke Prevention (Section 9.4.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Post-stroke Antihypertensive Treatment Study (PATS) 1995 (208) 8575241 | Aim: To assess whether lowering BP prevents the recurrence of stroke in Chinese pts with history of cerebrovascular disease | Inclusion criteria: Pts with history of stroke or TIA Exclusion criteria: N/A | Intervention: Indapamide 2.5 mg daily (n=2,840 pts) Comparator: Placebo (n=2,825 pts) | 1° outcome: Recurrence of fatal or nonfatal stroke.  
Key findings: Average SBP/DBP at randomization was 153.8/92.8 mm Hg. At median follow-up (2 y), BP was 6.8/3.3 mm Hg lower in pts on active treatment. 143 pts on indapamide vs. 219 pts on placebo had recurrent strokes (HR: 0.69; 95% CI: 0.54–0.89; p<0.001).  
2° outcome:  
● Major fatal and nonfatal CV events In addition, 199 pts on indapamide and 258 pts on placebo had a CV event (HR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.89–0.62; p=0.002).  
● 2,825 pts received a placebo and 2,840 pts received.  
Summary: For pts with a history of stroke or TIA, BP reduction of 5/2 mm Hg with 2.5 mg of indapamide lowered the first incidence of fatal and nonfatal stroke by 29%, with 3-y absolute benefit of 29 events per 1,000 pts. |
| PROGRESS 2001 (209) 11589932 | Aim: To determine effects of a BP-lowering regimen in hypertensive and nonhypertensive pts with a history of stroke or TIA.  
Study type: Double-blind, placebo-controlled trial  
Size: 6,105 | Inclusion criteria: Pts with history of stroke (evidence of an acute disturbance of focal neurological function with symptoms lasting more than 24 h and  
| Intervention: Active treatment comprised a flexible regimen based on the ACEI perindopril (4 mg daily), with addition of diuretic indapamide at discretion of treating physicians (n=3,051)  
Comparator: Placebo (n=3,054) | 1° outcome: Total stroke (fatal or nonfatal)  
Key findings:  
● Over 4 y of follow-up, active treatment reduced BP by 9/4 mm Hg. 307 (10%) pts assigned active treatment suffered a stroke, vs. 420 (14%) assigned placebo (RR reduction: 28% [95% CI: 17, 38], p<0.0001).  
● Combination therapy with perindopril plus indapamide reduced BP by 12/5 mm Hg and stroke risk by 43% (95% CI: 30–54%). Single-drug therapy reduced | Relevant 2° endpoint:  
Active treatment also reduced the risk of total major vascular events (26% [16–34]). There were similar reductions in the risk of stroke in hypertensive and nonhypertensive subgroups (all p<0.01).  
Summary:  
● This BP-lowering regimen reduced the risk of stroke among both hypertensive and nonhypertensive pts with a history of stroke or TIA. Combination therapy with perindopril and indapamide produced larger BP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOSES</th>
<th>Schrader J, et al., 2005 (210) 15879332</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess among hypertensive stroke pts, whether for the same level of BP control, eprosartan would be more effective than nitrendipine in reducing cerebrovascular and CV morbidity and mortality.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> High-risk hypertensives with cerebral event during the last 24 mo (proven by cerebral CT scan or nuclear magnetic resonance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Study type:** PROBE design | **Exclusion criteria:** Internal carotid artery occlusion or stenosis >70%, manifest HF (NYHA grade III–IV), age >85 y at the time of | **Intervention:** Eprosartan 600 mg (n=681)  
**Comparator:** Nitrendipine 10 mg (n=671) | **1° endpoint:** Composite of total mortality and all CV and cerebrovascular events, including all recurrent events. |
| **Size:** 1,405 | | | **Key findings:** BP reduced to comparable extent without significant differences between 2 groups during study period (150.7/84 mm Hg vs. 152.0/87.2 mm Hg with eprosartan and nitrendipine therapy to 137.5/80.8 mm Hg and 136.0/80.2 mm Hg, respectively). 75.5% reached values <140/90 mm Hg with eprosartan regimen and 77.7% with nitrendipine. During follow-up, 461 1° events occurred: 206 eprosartan and 255 nitrendipine (IDR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.66–0.96; p=0.014. |
|  |  |  | **Relevant 2° endpoint:** CV events were: 77 eprosartan and 101 nitrendipine (IDR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.55–1.02; p=0.06); cerebrovascular events: 102 eprosartan and 134 nitrendipine (IDR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.58–0.97; p=0.03). |
|  |  |  | **Summary:**  
- The combined 1° endpoint was significantly lower in the eprosartan group.  
- However, it was a reduction in TIAs that accounted for most of the benefit in cerebrovascular events, with no significant difference in ischemic strokes.  
- Also a more traditional analysis of time to first cerebrovascular event did not show a benefit of eprosartan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; endpoint</th>
<th>Relevant 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSION Yusuf S, et al., 2008 (211) 18753639</td>
<td>To evaluate the effects of therapy with an ARB, telmisartan, initiated early after a stroke</td>
<td>Pts ≥55 y with an ischemic stroke &lt;90 d before randomization</td>
<td>Telmisartan 80 mg daily (n=10,146)</td>
<td>Recurrent stroke</td>
<td>Major CV events (death from CV causes, recurrent stroke, MI, or new or worsening HF) occurred in 1,367 pts (13.5%) in telmisartan group vs. 1,463 pts (14.4%) in placebo group (HR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.87–1.01; p=0.11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study type: Double-blind RCT</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; hemorrhagic stroke, severe disability after the qualifying stroke</td>
<td>Comparator: Placebo (n=10,186)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size: 20,332 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; outcome: All stroke (including ischemic strokes and intracranial hemorrhages).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key findings: During mean follow-up of 2.5 y, mean BP was 3.8/2.0 mm Hg lower in telmisartan group vs. placebo group. 880 pts (8.7%) in telmisartan group vs. 934 pts (9.2%) in placebo group had a subsequent stroke (HR: 0.95; 95% CI: 0.86–1.04; p=0.23).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS-3 Benavente OR, et al., 2013 (212) 23726159</td>
<td>To investigate effects of different BP targets on rate of recurrent stroke in pts</td>
<td>Pts with recent, MRI-defined symptomatic</td>
<td>SBP target of 130–149 mm Hg (n=1,519)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No difference between target groups in disabling or fatal stroke 0.81, (95% CI: 0.53–1.23; p=0.32) or composite outcome of MI or vascular death 0.84 (95% CI: 0.68–1.04; p=0.32). However,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with recent, MRI-defined symptomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with recent lacunar stroke.

**Study type:** Randomized open-label trial

**Size:** 3,020 pts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lacunar infarctions.</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> SBP target of &lt;130 mm Hg (n=1,501)</td>
<td>Rashid P, et al., 2003 (213) 14576382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Exclusion criteria:** Pts with cortical strokes, cardioembolic disease, or carotid stenosis were excluded. | ● After 1 y, mean SBP was 138 mm Hg (95% CI: 137–139) in the higher-target group and 127 mm Hg (95% CI: 126–128) in the lower-target group.  
 ● Recurrent stroke was observed in 152 pts assigned to higher-target group (2.8% per y) vs. 125 assigned to the lower-target group (2.3% per y; HR: 0.81; 95% CI: 0.64–1.03). | |
| Comparator: SBP target of <130 mm Hg (n=1,501) | 1° outcome: Recurrent stroke  
 **Key findings:** Antihypertensive drug therapy associated with a 24% reduction in recurrent stroke risk (RR: 0.76; 95% CI: 0.63–0.92)  
 Recurrent stroke risk reduction seen in both hypertensive and normotensive (as defined by the respective trials) pts and linked to magnitude of reduction in SBP | |
<p>| Inclusion criteria: Pts with a history of ischemic stroke, TIA, or ICH | 2° outcomes: Nonfatal stroke OR: 0.79 (95% CI: 0.65–0.95), MI OR: 0.79 (95% CI: 0.63, 0.98), and total vascular events OR: 0.79 (95% CI: 0.66–0.95). No effect seen on vascular or all-cause mortality. ACEIs and diuretics separately, and particularly together, reduced vascular events, while beta-receptor antagonists had no discernable effect. | |
| Exclusion criteria: N/A | <strong>Summary:</strong> Use of antihypertensive agents to lower BP for the prevention of vascular events in pts with previous stroke or TIA is efficacious. | |
| Rashid P, et al., 2003 (213) 14576382 | |
| Lakhan SE, et al., 2009 (214) 19843330 | <strong>Aim:</strong> To examine the role of BP reduction using antihypertensive | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with a history of ischemic stroke, TIA, or ICH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1° outcome: Recurrent stroke</td>
<td>Lakhan SE, et al., 2009 (214) 19843330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP-lowering agents reduced recurrent stroke OR: 0.71 (95% CI: 0.59–0.86; p=0.0004) and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2°outcomes: BP-lowering agents did not affect the rate of MI or all-cause mortality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Use of a SBP target of less than 130 mm Hg was not significantly better than a target of 130–149 mm Hg for preventing any recurrent stroke. However, the lower target appeared to confer benefit for prevention of hemorrhagic stroke.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>1st Outcome</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>2nd Outcomes</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review and meta-analysis</td>
<td>10 RCTs</td>
<td>Pts with a history of ischemic stroke, TIA, or ICH Followed up 2 to 5 y.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Recurrent stroke</td>
<td>Antihypertensive drugs associated with significant reduction in recurrent strokes (RR: 0.78; 95% CI: 0.68–0.90). Impact of antihypertensive treatment after ischemic stroke was similar in a restricted group of subjects with HTN and when all subjects, including those with and without HTN, were included. Pooled OR: 0.63 (95% CI: 0.54–0.73; p&lt;0.0001) for trials involving diuretics as a component of therapy and 0.93 (95% CI: 0.87–1.01; p=0.086) for trials in which treatment included renin system inhibitors (p&lt;0.0001 for heterogeneity).</td>
<td>Significant reduction in recurrent stroke seen with diuretics (alone or in combination with ACEIs) but not with renal artery stenosis inhibitors, BBs, or CCBs used alone; however, statistical power was limited, particularly for the assessment of BBs and CCBs.</td>
<td>Achieving an SBP &lt;130 mm Hg vs. 130–139 mm Hg appears to provide additional stroke protection only among pts with risk factors but no established CVD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liu L, et al., 2009 (215) 19798097

Aim: To examine role of BP reduction using antihypertensive agents to prevent recurrent stroke.

Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Size: 10 RCTs

Lee M, et al., 2012 (216) 21796663

Aim: To compare impact of achieving tight vs. usual SBP control on stroke prevention

Study size: 11 studies with 42,572 pts and 794 stroke events.

Inclusion criteria: (1) Achieved SBP<130 mm Hg in an active treatment group and SBP 130 to 39 mm Hg in a comparator group by trial; (2) trial duration at least 6 mo; (3) total pts and number of stroke events reported separately for active treatment and comparator groups.

Exclusion criteria: (1) Nonrandomized trials; (2) trials in which either the

1st outcome: Association of future stroke risk and achieved level of different SBP (intensive vs. usual)

Key findings:
- Final SBPs, weighted for trial size, were a mean of 126.5 mm Hg in the intensive treatment arms and 132.6 mm Hg in the conventional arms (mean SBP reduction, 6.1 mm Hg).
- In subgroup analyses, those with established (symptomatic) CVD at entry did not experience stroke risk reduction with tight control (0.92; 95% CI: 0.83–1.03).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>1º outcome</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee M, et al., 2012 (217) 22052520</td>
<td>To evaluate whether use of ACEIs or ARBs reduces future vascular events in persons with prior stroke.</td>
<td>(1) RCT design; (2) pts had a history of stroke or TIA; (3) active treatment consisted of ACEIs or ARBs; (4) follow-up duration at least 6 mo; (5) total pts and number of future major vascular events and/or recurrent stroke were reported separately for active treatment and comparator groups.</td>
<td>Major vascular event (nonfatal stroke, nonfatal MI, or death from CV causes) or stroke (ischemic or hemorrhagic)</td>
<td>Use of ACEIs or ARBs in persons with prior stroke was associated with lower risks of future major vascular events RR: 0.91 (95% CI: 0.87–0.97; p=0.001); NNT=71 and recurrent stroke RR: 0.93 (95% CI: 0.86–0.99; p=0.03); NNT=143. Treatment with an ACEI or ARB has a clear but rather modest effect on reducing vascular risk in persons with prior stroke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arima H, et al., 2006 (218) 16685221</td>
<td>To investigate the effects of randomized treatment on recurrent stroke by baseline BP levels</td>
<td>Pts with history of cerebrovascular event (stroke or TIA) within the previous 5 y</td>
<td>Total stroke (fetal or nonfatal)</td>
<td>These analyses provide no evidence of a J-curve relationship between BP level and stroke risk among pts with cerebrovascular disease. However, ischemic stroke, TIA, and hemorrhagic pts were all enrolled and within 5 y of the index event suggesting that these pts were generally neurologically stable and not acknowledging the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key findings:**
- Smaller BP differences between active vs. placebo groups (p<0.0001) and corresponding lesser risk reductions (p trend=0.05) with lower baseline BPs.
- Association of stroke incidence with achieved
### Study 1

**Between achieved follow-up BP levels and recurrent stroke risk.**

**Study type:** Post-hoc analysis of PROGRESS trial.

**Size:** 6,105 pts

Follow-up SBP level was strong and continuous with no evidence of a J-curve in the range of achieved follow-up SBP from 112–168 mm Hg (p trend <0.0001 RR of study treatment on the discontinuation of randomized treatment increased progressively across the subgroups with lower baseline SBP levels at entry (p trend=0.04), but there was no corresponding difference in effects of randomized treatment on the risks of death or hospital admission (both p trend >0.2) or hypotension, renal dysfunction, electrolyte disturbance, hip fracture, or depression between pts with different levels of baseline BP at baseline (all p trend >0.1).

- Minor side-effects were progressively more common at lower BP levels (p homogeneity=0.04).

### Study 2

**Aim:** To determine safety and tolerability of lowering BP in older adults with lacunar stroke

**Study type:** Post-hoc analysis of randomized trial

**Study Size:** 494 pts

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts with lacunar stroke ≥75 y

**1st outcome:** Rates of side effects related to lowering SBP

**2nd outcome:** Stroke recurrence and death from vascular causes

**Key findings:**
- Older pts achieved SBP levels similar to younger pts (mean SBP of 125 mm Hg in lower SBP target group and 137 mm Hg in higher target group).
- 3.5 y of follow-up 21% reported dizziness and 15% reported lightheadedness when standing; only significant difference between younger and older groups was unsteadiness when standing (23% vs. 32%, p<0.001). No difference in recurrent stroke by target SBP level among the older subjects (HR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.59–1.73), but the differences in pathophysiologic mechanism between stroke types.
- First analysis showed that the effectiveness of antihypertensive treatment for 2nd stroke prevention diminished as baseline BP declined (relative RRs were 39%, 31%, 14%, and 0%, respectively, in the groups defined previously). This trend of decreasing effect was despite successful reduction of mean SBP in each active-treatment group compared with placebo (11.1, 9.2, 7.6, and 7.4 mm Hg reductions, respectively, in the groups defined previously).
- Also of note, 40% of pts with a baseline BP<140 mm Hg were taking antihypertensive therapy at baseline.

**Summary:** Pts ≥75 y with a recent lacunar stroke who achieved a lower SBP target (<130 mm Hg) were significantly more likely to report unsteadiness on standing than their younger counterparts. Lower SBP was not related to a decrease in recurrent stroke risk in elderly pts with lacunar stroke but there was a potential protective advantage from vascular death.
| Ovbiagele B, et al., 2011 (220) 22089721 | **Aim:** To assess the association of maintaining low-normal vs. high-normal SBP levels with risk of recurrent stroke.  
**Study type:** Post hoc analysis of a multicenter trial involving 20,330 pts (age ≥50 y) with recent noncardioembolic ischemic stroke followed up for 2.5 y  
**Study Size:** 20,330 pts | **Inclusion criteria:** Pts 55 y or older with an ischemic stroke <90 d before randomization  
**Categories:** Based on mean SBP level was very low-normal (<120 mm Hg), low-normal (120≤130 mm Hg), high-normal (130≤140 mm Hg), high (140≤150 mm Hg), and very high (>150 mm Hg).  
● 1° outcome was recurrent stroke and the 2° outcome was a composite of recurrent stroke, MI, and death due to vascular causes | **1° outcome:** First recurrence of stroke of any type  
**2° outcome:** Composite of stroke, MI, or death from vascular causes  
**Key findings:** Recurrent stroke rates were 8.0% (95% CI: 6.8%–9.2%) for the very low-normal SBP level group, 7.2% (95% CI: 6.4%–8.0%) for the low-normal SBP group, 6.8% (95% CI: 6.1%–7.4%) for the high-normal SBP group, and 14.1% (95% CI: 13.0%–15.2%) for the very high SBP group. Compared with pts in the high-normal SBP group, the risk of 1° outcome was higher for pts in the very low-normal SBP group AHR: 1.29 (95% CI: 1.07–1.56), in the high SBP group AHR: 1.24 (95% CI: 1.11–1.39), and in the very high SBP group AHR: 1.94 (95% CI: 1.74–2.16).  
**Summary:** Among pts with recent noncardioembolic ischemic stroke, SBP levels during follow-up in the very low-normal (<120 mm Hg), high (140≤150 mm Hg), or very high (≥150 mm Hg) range were associated with increased risk of recurrent stroke. | **Relevant 2° endpoint:** Compared with pts in the high-normal SBP group, the risk of 2° outcome was higher for pts in the very low-normal SBP group AHR: 1.31 (95% CI: 1.13–1.52), in the low-normal SBP group AHR: 1.16 (95% CI: 1.03–1.31), in the high SBP group AHR: 1.24 (95% CI: 1.11–1.39), and in the very high SBP group AHR: 1.94 (95% CI: 1.74–2.16).  
**Summary:** Among pts with recent noncardioembolic ischemic stroke, SBP levels during follow-up in the very low-normal (<120 mm Hg), high (140≤150 mm Hg), or very high (≥150 mm Hg) range were associated with increased risk of recurrent stroke. |
| Ovbiagele B, et al., 2013 (221) 22244715 | **Aim:** To assess association of maintaining low-normal vs. high-normal SBP levels with risk of recurrent stroke.  
**Study type:** Post hoc analysis of a multicenter trial involving 3,680 pts with recent noncardioembolic ischemic stroke followed up for 2 y  
**Study Size:** 20,330 pts | **Inclusion criteria:** Pts with an ischemic stroke <120 d before randomization  
**Categories:** Based on mean in-trial SBP value was low-normal (<120 mm Hg), high-normal (120 to <140 mm Hg), or high (≥140 mm Hg).  
● 1° outcome was stroke  
**Key findings:** Rate of recurrent stroke was 9.1% in the low-normal group, 6.7% in the high-normal group, and 10% in the high group. Difference in recurrent stroke rate between low-normal and high-normal groups was more prominent within the first 6 mo (low-normal, 4.5%; high-normal, 2.5%; high, 3.4%) vs. after 6 mo (low-normal, 4.6%; high-normal, 4.2%; high, 6.6%). Over study period, compared with the high-normal group, risk of the 1° outcome trended higher in the low-normal group AHR: 1.29 (95% CI: 1.07–1.56), in the high SBP group AHR: 1.23 (95% CI: 1.07–1.41), and in the very high SBP group AHR: 2.08 (95% CI: 1.83–2.37).  
**Summary:** Results support a possible pattern of increased risk of recurrent stroke in pts with low-normal SBP levels, especially within the first 6 mo after first stroke. However, this study likely was not sufficiently powered to detect more than a strong statistical trend underlying this relationship. | **1° outcome:** First recurrence of stroke of any type  
**Key findings:** Rate of recurrent stroke was 9.1% in the low-normal group, 6.7% in the high-normal group, and 10% in the high group. Difference in recurrent stroke rate between low-normal and high-normal groups was more prominent within the first 6 mo (low-normal, 4.5%; high-normal, 2.5%; high, 3.4%) vs. after 6 mo (low-normal, 4.6%; high-normal, 4.2%; high, 6.6%). Over study period, compared with the high-normal group, risk of the 1° outcome trended higher in the low-normal group AHR: 1.47 (95% CI: 0.94–2.29; p=0.09) and was higher in the high group AHR: 1.39 (95% CI: 1.08–1.79; p=0.01). | **Summary:** Results support a possible pattern of increased risk of recurrent stroke in pts with low-normal SBP levels, especially within the first 6 mo after first stroke. However, this study likely was not sufficiently powered to detect more than a strong statistical trend underlying this relationship. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) and Year</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>1° outcomes</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lin MP, et al., 2015 (222)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess link between SBP and mortality after stroke.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Adults ≥20 y with self-reported stroke.</td>
<td>Baseline SBP was as low to normal (&lt;120 mm Hg), normal (120–140 mm Hg), and high (≥140 mm Hg).</td>
<td>All-cause and vascular mortality</td>
<td>2 y after assessment, the low to normal SBP group tended to have the highest cumulative all-cause mortality (11.5%), compared with mortality rates of 8.5% and 7.5% in the normal and high SBP groups, respectively. Similar patterns were seen with vascular mortality. After adjusting for covariates, compared with the high SBP group, the low to normal group had higher all-cause mortality AHR: 1.96 (95% CI: 1.13–3.39; p=0.017) and trended toward higher vascular mortality AHR: 2.08 (95% CI: 0.93–4.6; p=0.075). Compared with the normal BP group, the risk of all-cause and vascular mortality trended higher in low to normal BP group but did not achieve statistical significance.</td>
<td>After stroke, compared with SBP in the high range, low to normal SBP may be associated with poorer mortality outcomes. Study limited by self-reported nature and retrospective design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim J, et al., 2014 (223)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To investigate the association between BP and vascular events up to 10 y after stroke.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 5-y survivors of stroke</td>
<td>Stratification by quartiles of SBP</td>
<td>Composite of all-cause death or nonfatal vascular event (stroke or AMI); and all-cause death alone.</td>
<td>In 5-y survivors of stroke, compared to a SBP of 131–141 mm Hg, SBP of 120 mm Hg or less was associated with a 61% greater risk of stroke, acute MI and death (HR: 1.61; 95% CI: 1.08–2.41; p=0.019). Compared to the reference category of SBP 131–141 mm Hg, there were no differences in outcome in the pts with SBP 121–130 mm Hg (p=0.491) or 142–210 mm Hg (p=0.313). Findings were not modified after adjusting for antihypertensive drug prescriptions.</td>
<td>There appears to be a greater risk of poor outcome in long-term survivors of stroke with low SBP. This is further evidence that low SBP may result in poor prognosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang WT, et al., 2016 (224)</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To investigate the relative effects of BP-lowering therapies [ACEI, ARB, BB, CCBs, diuretics, and</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> • RCTs comparing the effects of any of the 6 most commonly used BP-lowering drug classes [ACEI, ARB, alpha-blocker, BB, diuretics, and CCB] vs. placebo</td>
<td>• Recurrent stroke</td>
<td><strong>2° outcome:</strong> CHD, and MACCE</td>
<td>Virtually all BP-lowering medication classes reduced vascular events including recurrent stroke. • The higher the average BP reduction between the treatment vs. control groups the larger the risk reduction in recurrent stroke events and MACCE.</td>
<td>• Compared with placebo, ACEI plus diuretic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1st outcome: Recurrent stroke

- **Study size:** 15 RCTs composed of 39,329 participants previous stroke
- **Inclusion criteria:** RCTs reporting outcomes of interest with a follow-up of more than a month.
- **Exclusion criteria:** RCTs not including diuretics, diuretics-based treatments resulted in a significantly larger reduction in BP (12.0 mm Hg; 95% CI: 7.0–16.9).
- **Treatment regimens including diuretics had a RR of 0.619 (95% CI: 0.515–0.743) for recurrent stroke, which was significantly lower than treatments that did not include diuretics (RR=0.882; 95% CI: 0.800–0.973) with a p value for interaction of 0.0008.
- **None of the between-drug comparisons showed significant differences in effect on outcomes.**

### 2nd outcome: MI, death from any cause, and risk of CV death

- **Key findings:**
  - SBP reduction linearly associated with lower risk of recurrent stroke (regression slope, 0.02; 95% CI: 0.01–0.04; p=0.049), MI (regression slope, 0.022; 95% CI: 0.002–0.041; p=0.024), death from any cause (regression slope, 0.02; 95% CI: 0.01–0.03; p=0.001), and CV death (regression slope, 0.05; 95% CI: 0.03–0.07; p=0.001).
  - No relation was observed between the degree of SBP reduction and the risk of disabling or fatal stroke (regression slope, 0.001; 95% CI: −0.024–0.022; p=0.944).
  - Relation of SBP reduction with ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke was not assessed due to the small number of studies with available data (<10).

### Summary

- Diuretic-based treatments lowered the risk of recurrent stroke more than treatments that did not include diuretics.
- There were no significant differences in effect on 2<sup>nd</sup> stroke reduction between the various individual antihypertensive medication classes.

### Aim: To assess the association of BP reduction with recurrent stroke and CV events using available RCT data on 2<sup>nd</sup> stroke prevention

- **Study size:** 14 studies with 42,736 pts

### Inclusion criteria: RCTs of antihypertensives for 2<sup>nd</sup> stroke prevention pts that reported achieved BP values during the follow-up period.

### Exclusion criteria:

- Observational studies, case series, case reports, RCTs in non-IS/TIA population, and studies not reporting data on finally achieved BP values

---

**Katsanos AH, et al., 2017 (225) 27802419**
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## Data Supplement 45. RCTs and Meta-analysis Comparing PAD (Section 9.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim: To assess the impact of ramipril compared to placebo on the prevention of major CV events in PAD pts in the HOPE study.</th>
<th>Study Type: Multicenter, double-blind RCT</th>
<th>Size: 9,541 randomized in HOPE (1,725 randomized who had baseline PAD, defined by ABI with pulse detection by either Doppler or palpation)</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOPE Östergren J, et al., 2004 (226) 14683738</td>
<td>• ≥55 y • Existing CVD (CAD, stroke, PAD) or DM with an additional CVD risk factor (smoking, HTN, hypercholesterolemia, low HDL, microalbuminuria)</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Ramipril (10 mg/d): 4,645 randomized</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Placebo: 4,652 randomized</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Combined CV death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In pts with history of symptomatic PAD, comparing ramipril to placebo: RR: 0.75; 95% CI: 0.61–0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In pts with no history of symptomatic PAD, but severe subclinical disease defined as ABI &lt;0.6, comparing ramipril to placebo: RR: 0.77; 95% CI: 0.55–1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In pts with no history of symptomatic PAD, but moderate subclinical disease defined as ABI 0.6–0.9, comparing ramipril to placebo: RR: 0.72; 95% CI: 0.56–0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1° Safety endpoint:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Ramipril prevented clinical events in pts with clinical evidence of PAD as well as in those without PAD. The relative benefit was similar in pts classified by levels of ABI, even though event rates were higher in pts with subclinical and clinical ABI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual components of composite endpoint, all-cause mortality, hospitalizations for HF, DM complications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In pts with history of symptomatic PAD, comparing ramipril to placebo: for MI, RR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.58–0.98); for stroke, RR: 0.72 (95% CI: 0.50–1.05); for CVD mortality, RR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.56–0.99); for total mortality, RR: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.68–1.07); for DM complications, RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.74–1.09); for HF, RR: 0.81 (95% CI: 0.53–1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In pts with no history of symptomatic PAD, but severe subclinical disease defined as ABI &lt;0.6, comparing ramipril to placebo: for MI, RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.48–1.11); for stroke, RR: 0.99 (95% CI: 0.52–1.89); for CVD mortality, RR: 0.76 (95% CI: 0.46–1.25); for total mortality, RR: 0.81 (95% CI: 0.55–1.19); for DM, RR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.50–1.39); for HF, RR: 0.66 (95% CI: 0.34–1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In pts with no history of symptomatic PAD, but moderate subclinical disease defined as ABI 0.6–0.9, comparing ramipril to placebo: for MI, RR: 0.81 (95% CI: 0.60–1.09); for stroke, RR: 0.44 (95% CI: 0.26–0.77); for CVD mortality, RR: 0.62 (95% CI: 0.42–0.90); for total mortality, RR: 0.58 (95% CI: 0.42–0.79); for diabetic complications, RR: 0.80 (95% CI: 0.53–1.21); for HF, RR: 0.69 (95% CI: 0.38–1.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>PTCA</th>
<th>Relevant 2° endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlack A, et al., 1994 (227) 8059778</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine the effect of perindopril compared to placebo on various clinical outcomes in pt subgroups.</td>
<td>• Mild newly diagnosed essential HTN in addition to 1 concomitant diseases or therapies: hyperlipidemia, DM-2, IHD, cardiac arrhythmias, PAD, nephropathy with proteinuria, COPD, or degenerative join disease with NSAIDs</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Perindopril (4 mg/d): 253 randomized</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo: 237 randomized</td>
<td><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Multicenter, double-blinded RCT (3 wk placebo run-in period, 6 wk double-blind phase)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 490 (54 with PAD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schweizer J, et al., 1998 (228) 9581724</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine whether treatment with high dose verapamil prevents restenosis in pts with PAD at high risk for reoccurrence after successful PTCA.</td>
<td>• PAD (based on arterial angiography and color-coded duplex ultrasound) present for &gt;6 mo</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Verapamil (240 mg/twice/d): 49 randomized</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo: 49 randomized</td>
<td><strong>Relevant 2° endpoint:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Double-blind RCT (6 mo duration)</td>
<td>• Primary success of PTCA treatment (≥30% reduction of initial lumen constriction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stable angina pectoris, mild HTN and at least1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study Implications

**1st Safety endpoint:** N/A

**Summary:** In pts with PAD at increased risk for restenosis, the administration of high dose verapamil prevented recurrent stenosis for 6 mo after successful peripheral angioplasty and was well tolerated.

**Study limitations and adverse events:** Short follow-up, unable to assess hard clinical outcomes

---

**NORMA**

**Espinola-Klein C, et al., 2011 (229) 21646599**

**Aim:** Evaluate the effects of treatment with the endothelium-dependent vasodilating beta 1-selective blocker nebivolol, as compared with the nonvasodilating beta 1-selective blocker metoprolol, on clinical parameters of PAD and endothelial function, and to compare the

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Stable intermittent claudication for ≥6 mo and an ABI of <0.9
- Stage 1 arterial HTN (SBP: 140–159 mm Hg, DBP: 90–99 mm Hg) untreated, or treated stage 1 arterial HTN
- SBP at time of enrollment 100–160 mm Hg

**Intervention arms:**
- Nebivolol (5 mg/d): 65 randomized
- Metoprolol (95 mg/d): 63 randomized

**1st endpoint:**
- Change in ABI measured by Doppler
- In nebivolol: initial ABI 0.62 (SD: 0.16), post-treatment ABI 0.68 (SD: 0.20), p-value for change: 0.002
- In metoprolol: initial ABI 0.63 (SD: 0.17), post-treatment ABI 0.67 (SD:

**Relevant 2nd endpoint:**
- Change in absolute claudication distance were 32.7 m in nebivolol (p-value 0.03) vs. 39.7 m in metoprolol (p-value 0.01), but no difference between 2 groups (p-value 0.54)
- Changes in SBP were -5.2 mm Hg in nebivolol (p=0.001) and -3.9 mm Hg in metoprolol (p=0.01), no difference between groups
tolerability of both drugs in pts with PAD

**Study type:** Double-blinded RCT (48 wk)

**Size:** 128

- DBP at time of enrollment <100 mm Hg

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Premenopausal women
- Critical limb ischemia with rest pain, leg ulcer, gangrene, severe angina pectoris that limits exercise capacity, severe HF that limits exercise capacity, hyperthyroidism, poorly controlled DM (HbA1c>10%)
- Contraindications for BBs
- Acute MI within 6 mo before screening
- Previous treatment with nebivolol or carvedilol

*Concomitant treatment with calcium antagonists, ACEIs, angiotensin II type 1 receptor antagonists, aspirin, clopidogrel, statins, estrogens was permitted if no change in dosage had been made in the previous 3 mo before screening

0.21), p-value for change: 0.04
- Comparing ABI change in nebivolol to metoprolol: 0.02 (p=0.69).

**1st safety endpoint:** N/A

**Summary:** BB therapy was well tolerated in pts with intermittent claudication and HTN during a treatment period of 1 y. In the direct comparison, there was no significant difference between nebivolol and metoprolol.

**Study limitations and adverse events:**
- Absence of placebo group
- 21 total adverse events, 10 in nebivolol, 11 in metoprolol (adverse events: bradycardia, tachycardia, blurred vision, worsening HTN, edema, worsening claudication, blurred vision, erectile dysfunction, edema, vertigo, temporary dysesthesia of the hands, dyspnea, skin irritation, headache, moderate diarrhea)

---

**INVEST**
Bavry AA, et al., 2010 (230) 19996066

**Aim:** To examine the effect of average treated BP on adverse outcomes in PAD pts with CAD and to compare 2 antihypertensive medications

**Study type:** Post hoc analysis of international

**inclusion criteria:**
- ≥50 y
- HTN, clinically stable CAD
- Pt reported PAD

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Contraindications to the treatment groups

**Interventions:**
- Calcium antagonist-based strategy: verapamil with or without trandolapril
- BB-based strategy: atenolol with or without hydrochlorothiazide

*2º medications only given to achieve BP of 120/80

**1º endpoint:**
- Composite outcome: all-cause death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke
- No statistically significant difference in composite 1º outcome OR: 0.90 (95% CI: 0.76, 1.07) comparing calcium antagonist based group to BB based group in fully adjusted model

**Relevant 2º endpoint:** N/A
- This trial also notes the J-shaped relationship between BP achieved and clinical outcomes
- Risk of 1º outcome was reduced most when SBP was treated to 130–140 mm Hg and DBP 60–90, as opposed to <130/80 as 2005 guidelines suggest in PAD pts

**Study limitations and adverse events:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim: To examine the effect of valsartan vs. amlodipine on cardiac morbidity and mortality in hypertensive pts at high CV risk</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study type: Prespecified additional analyses of international randomized, double-blind, parallel-group trial</td>
<td>• ≥50 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 15,245 in total trial (2,114 with PAD)</td>
<td>• HTN (untreated: 160–210/115 mm Hg, treated: &lt;210/115 mm Hg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE Zanchetti A, et al., 2006 (231) 17053536</td>
<td>• High risk for cardiac events (male sex, verified DM, current smoking, high cholesterol, LV hypertrophy by ECG, proteinuria on dipstick, serum creatinine 150–265 micromol/L, coronary disease diagnosis, cerebrovascular disease diagnosis, or PAD diagnosis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Renal artery stenosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AMI, coronary angioplasty or CABG in last 3 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Severe hepatic disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Severe chronic renal failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions:</td>
<td>• Valsartan: 7,649 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amlodipine: 7,596 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° endpoint:</td>
<td>• No PAD-specific numbers available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composite of sudden cardiac death, fatal MI, death during/after percutaneous coronary intervention or CAGB, HF requiring hospitalization, nonfatal MI, or emergency procedure to prevent MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st safety endpoint: ---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: The effects of treatments on occurrence of the 1° outcome did not differ by PAD status.</td>
<td>Relevant 2° endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study limitations and adverse events:</td>
<td>• Limited subgroup analyses, only 1° outcome reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High-risk population limits generalizability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 1**

randomized, blinded-endpoint trial (48 wk)

**Size:** 22,576 in total trial (2,699 with PAD in this analysis)

<140/90 mm Hg in all participants except for those with renal impairment or DM, BP<130/85 mm Hg

Kaplan–Meier curve for 1° outcome shows slightly lower cumulative incidence in calcium antagonist group (log rank p=0.26)

**1st safety endpoint:** N/A

**Summary:** Among PAD pts, the incidence of the 1° outcome was not significantly different between treatment groups.

**Part 2**

PAD was not uniformly measured or adjudicated (only based on pt report)

Asymptomatic PAD was not captured
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Reference</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention arms</th>
<th>1º endpoint</th>
<th>Relevant 2º endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piller LB, et al., 2014 (232) 25002161</td>
<td>To compare, by randomized treatment groups (amlodipine, lisinopril, chlorthalidone) hospitalized or revascularized PAD rates and subsequent morbidity and mortality.</td>
<td>BP of 140–180/90–110 for untreated, 160/100 for treated pts</td>
<td>Amlodipine: 8,898 randomized, Lisinopril: 8,904 randomized, Chlorthalidone: 15,002 randomized</td>
<td>PAD requiring hospitalization or outpatient revascularization procedure, 830 cases of PAD over 8.8 y follow-up; no significant difference between treatment groups after adjustment</td>
<td>Post-PAD morbidity and mortality, comparing amlodipine to chlorthalidone, no difference in post-PAD morbidity or mortality: MI, HR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.48, 1.40), Stroke, HR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.41, 1.79), Cardiac Revascularization, HR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.41, 1.79); Comparing lisinopril to chlorthalidone, no difference in post-PAD morbidity or mortality: MI, HR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.41, 1.79), Stroke, HR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.41, 1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson AM, et al., 2011 (113) 21364140</td>
<td>To evaluate the effect of antihypertensive treatment on 2º prevention of CVD events and all-cause mortality among pts</td>
<td>Any antihypertensive treatment among pts with BP &lt;140/90 mm Hg for the prevention of CVD events.</td>
<td>Any antihypertensive agent compared with placebo or no treatment.</td>
<td>Compared with controls, pts receiving antihypertensive medications had a pooled RR of 0.77 (95% CI: 0.61, 0.77) for stroke: 0.80 (95% CI: 0.69, 0.93)</td>
<td>PAD not specifically collected at baseline, thus cannot detect actual incidence (however, randomization presumably resulted in equal number of baseline PAD cases in each group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study limitations and adverse events:

- PAD not specifically collected at baseline, thus cannot detect actual incidence (however, randomization presumably resulted in equal number of baseline PAD cases in each group)
- Asymptomatic PAD likely missed (definition used in this study based on hospitalization, likely only capturing very severe cases)
without clinically defined HTN.

**Study type:** Meta-analysis including 25 RCTs

**Size:** 64,162 pts without HTN.

**Exclusion criteria:** CVD events were not reported by HTN status that included participants with and without HTN; study population did not include persons with BP in the normal or prehypertensive ranges; study population did not include persons with preexisting CVD or CVD equivalents, such as DM; antihypertensive medication was not a part of the intervention; treatment allocation was not random; measure of variance not reported; participants were <18 y; there were differences between intervention and control groups other than antihypertensive treatment. Preexisting CVD included PAD.

- 0.93) for MI: 0.71 (95% CI: 0.65, 0.77) for CHF: 0.85 (95% CI: 0.80, 0.90) for composite CVD events: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.69, 0.99) for CVD mortality and 0.87 (95% CI: 0.80, 0.95) for all-cause mortality from random effect models. Results did not differ according to trial characteristics or subgroups defined by clinical history, although no specific PAD subgroup was defined.

**Summary:** Among pts with clinical history of CVD, including PAD, but without HTN, antihypertensive treatment was associated with reduced risk of stroke, CHF, composite CVD events and all-cause mortality.

---

**Data Supplement 46. RCTs and Meta-analyses Comparing BP Targets in DM (Section 9.6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# pts / Study Comparator (# pts))</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE Kaplan NM, et al., 2007 (233) 17765962</td>
<td>Aim: To assess the effects of an ACEI perindopril and a diuretic indapamide combination on serious vascular events in pts with DM-2 pts 30–55 y. <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> At least 1 of the following: history of major CVD, (stroke, MI, admission for TIA, UA, coronary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM-2 pts 30–55 y. <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> At least 1 of the following: history of major CVD, (stroke, MI, admission for TIA, UA, coronary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1° endpoints:</strong> Composite of CV death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, new or worsening nephropathy, or retinopathy. <strong>Results:</strong> After 4.3 y follow-up, pts assigned to active therapy had a reduction of SBP of 5.6 mm Hg.. RR of major macro- or micro-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> • This large RCT provides evidence that routine administration of fixed combination ACEI and thiazide-type diuretic therapy reduces risk of major CV events in those with at least 1 risk factor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Type: RCT</td>
<td>DM irrespective of initial BP levels or the use of other BP-lowering drugs.</td>
<td>revascularization, or amputation for PVD) or at least 1 other risk factor (history of microvascular disease, microalbuminuria, proliferative diabetic retinopathy, retinal photocoagulation therapy, macular edema, blindness, cigarette smoking, high cholesterol, low HDL cholesterol, diagnosis of DM at least 10 y before enrollment or ≥65 y at entry</td>
<td>vascular events decreased by 9% (HR: 0.91; (95% CI: 0.83, 1.00), p&lt;0.04). Death from CVD decreased by 18%; RR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.68, 0.98) and death from any cause decreased by 14%; RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.75, 0.98). The effects of study treatment did not differ by initial BP or concomitant use of other treatments at baseline. The pts had at least 1 CV risk factor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 11,140 pts, 4.3 y follow-up</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: HbA1c target ≤ 6.5% or indication for insulin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCORD**

Cushman WC, et al., 2010 (234) 20228401

| Aim: To assess whether therapy targeting normal SBP (<120 mm Hg) reduces major CV events in DM-2 at high risk for CV events. |
| Study Type: RCT |
| Size: 4,733 pts, 4.7 y follow-up |

| Inclusion Criteria: DM-2 with HgbA1c ≥ 7.5%; ≥40 y with CVD or ≥55 y with anatomical evidence of atherosclerosis, albuminuria, LVH, or ≥2 additional risk factors for CVD. |
| Exclusion Criteria: BMI ≥ 45, serum creatinine >1.5, and other serious illness. |

| 1º outcomes: Nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or CV death. |

| Results: Mean SBP in the intensive therapy group was 119.3 mm Hg and in the standard therapy group was 133.5 mm Hg. The annual 1º outcome 1.87% in the intensive therapy group and 2.09% in the standard therapy group (HR: 0.88; 95% CI: 0.073–1.06; p=0.20). The annual rates of death from any cause were 1.28% and 1.19% in the 2 groups, respectively (HR: 0.59; 95% CI: 0.39–0.89; p=0.01). Serious adverse events attributed to antihypertensive treatment occurred in 3.3% of the intensive therapy group and 1.3% of the standard therapy group (p<0.001). |

| Limitations: This trial had an open label design. The rate of adverse events in the standard therapy group was less than expected. Pts younger than 40 y or older than 79 y were not included. |

<p>| Summary: In pts with DM-2 and high risk for CV events, targeting SBP of &lt;120 as compared with &lt;140 mm Hg did not reduce the rate of composite outcome of fatal and nonfatal major CV events and was associated with greater risk for adverse events. |
| Margolis KL et al., 2014 (235) | <strong>Aim:</strong> To compare effects of combinations of standard and intensive treatment of glycemia and BP in the ACCORD trial. | <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Type 2 DM with HgbA1c ≥7.5%; ≥40 y with CVD or ≥55 y with anatomical evidence of atherosclerosis, albuminuria, LVH, or at least 2 additional risk factors for CVD. | <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> BMI ≥45, serum creatinine &gt;1.5, and other serious illness. | <strong>Pts were randomly assigned to intensive therapy SBP&lt;120 mm Hg or standard therapy SBP&lt;140 mm Hg.</strong> | <strong>1° outcomes:</strong> Nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or CV death. | <strong>Results:</strong> In the BP trial, risk of the 1° outcome was lower in the groups intensively treated for glycemia HR: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.50, 0.91), BP HR: 0.74 (95% CI: 0.55, 1.00), or both HR: 0.71 (95% CI: 0.52, 0.96) compared with combined standard BP and glycemia treatment. For 2° outcomes, MI was significantly reduced by intensive glycemia treatment and stroke by intensive BP treatment; most other HRs were neutral or favored intensive treatment groups. | <strong>Limitations:</strong> 2° analysis; results analyzed across individual cells of a factorial design with shorter follow-up than originally intended reducing power to detect meaningful differences and interactions; results may not apply to younger, healthier diabetics. | <strong>Conclusions:</strong> Either intensive BP or glycemia control reduced major CVD compared with combined standard treatment, but the combination was no better than the individual intensive interventions. |
| Soliman EZ et al., 2015 (236) | <strong>Aim:</strong> To compare effects of combinations of standard and intensive control of BP on the risk of LVH in the ACCORD trial. | <strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> DM-2 with HgbA1c ≥7.5%; ≥40 y with CVD or ≥55 y with anatomical evidence of atherosclerosis, albuminuria, LVH, or at least 2 additional risk factors for CVD. | <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> BMI ≥45, serum creatinine &gt;1.5, and other serious illness. | <strong>Pts were randomly assigned to intensive therapy SBP&lt;120 mm Hg or standard therapy SBP&lt;140 mm Hg.</strong> | <strong>1° outcomes:</strong> Nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or CV death. | <strong>Results:</strong> The outcome measures were electrocardiographic LVH defined by Cornell voltage (binary variable) and mean Cornell index (continuous variable). The baseline prevalence of LVH (5.3% vs. 5.4%; p=0.91) and the mean Cornell index (1.456 vs. 1.470 µV; p=0.45) were similar in the intensive (n=2,154) and standard (n=2,177) BP-lowering arms, respectively. However, after median follow-up of 4.4 y, intensive, compared with standard, BP lowering was associated with a 39% lower risk of LVH (OR: 0.61; 95% CI: 0.43–0.88; p=0.008) and a significantly lower adjusted mean Cornell index (1.352 vs. 1.447 µV; p&lt;0.001). The lower risk of LVH associated with intensive BP lowering during follow-up was because of more regression of baseline LVH and lower rate of developing new LVH, compared with standard BP lowering. No interactions by age, sex, or race were observed. | <strong>Limitations:</strong> 2° analysis; open-label design; LVH defined by EKG and not by echo or cardiac MRI; results may not apply to younger, healthier diabetics. | <strong>Conclusions:</strong> Targeting a SBP of &lt;120 mm Hg when compared with &lt;140 mm Hg in pts with HTN and DM produces a greater reduction in LVH. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim: To assess the efficacy and safety of intensive BP lowering strategies.</th>
<th>Study type: Systematic review and meta-analysis</th>
<th>Size: 19 trials with 44,989 pts; 3.8 y of follow-up.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCTs with different BP targets or different BP changes between more vs. less intense therapy with at least 6 mo follow-up.</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Trials that did not assess a different target or relevant outcome.</td>
<td><strong>5 RCTs (6,960 pts) enrolled only pts with DM and 6 trials (2,809 pts) specifically recruited pts with CKD.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st outcomes:</strong> Major CV events, defined as MI, stroke, HF or CV death, separately and combined; nonvascular and all-cause mortality; ESKD; and adverse events; new onset microalbuminuria/macroalbuminuria or change from micro- to macroalbuminuria and retinopathy in pts with DM.</td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong> Pts in the more intensive BP-lowering treatment group had mean BP 133/76 mm Hg compared with 140/81 mm Hg in the less intensive group. Intensive BP-lowering treatment achieved RR reductions for major CV events: 14% (95% CI: 4–22), MI: 13% (95% CI: 0–24), stroke: 22% (95% CI: 10–32), albuminuria: 10% (95% CI: 3–16), and retinopathy progression: 19% (95% CI: 0–34). However, more intensive treatment had no clear effects on HF: RR: 15% (95% CI: -11–34), CV death: 9% (-11–26), total mortality: 9% (95% CI: -3–19), or ESKD: 10% (95% CI: -6–23). The reduction in major CV events was consistent across pt groups, and additional BP lowering had a clear benefit even in pts with SBP &lt;140 mm Hg. The absolute benefits were greatest in trials in which all enrolled pts had vascular disease, renal disease or DM. Serious adverse events associated with BP lowering were only reported by 6 trials and had an event rate of 1%–2% per y in intensive BP lowering group pts, compared with 0.9% in the less intensive treatment group (RR: 1.35; 95% CI: 0.93–1.97). Severe hypotension was more frequent in the more intensive treatment regimen (RR: 2.68; 95% CI: 1.21–5.89; p=0.015), but the absolute excess was small (0.3% vs. 0.1% per pt-y for the duration of follow-up).</td>
<td><strong>Study limitations:</strong> Only 6,960 pts with DM were included in the total study size of 44,989 pts. <strong>Conclusions:</strong> The absolute CV benefits were greatest in trials in which all enrolled pts had vascular disease, renal disease or DM. However, only 6,960 of the 44,989 pts had DM and no sub-analysis for DM was provided; however, the outcome benefits were qualitatively most striking for pts with DM, CKD and/or vascular disease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACCOMPLISH

**Weber MA, et al., 2010 (237)** 20620720

**Aim:** To determine which combination therapy in pts with HTN and DM most effectively decreases CV events.

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 2,842 pts with DM from the ACCOMPLISH study of 6,946 pts; 30 mo follow-up

**Inclusion criteria:** HTN and DM with high risk for CV events.

**Exclusion criteria:** BMI >45; serum Cr >1.5; other serious illness

- Pts were randomly assigned to benazepril plus amlodipine or benazepril plus hydrochlorothiazide. BPs were 145/79 at baseline.

**1° outcomes:** Composite of death from CV causes, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, hospitalization for angina, resuscitation after sudden cardiac arrest, and coronary revascularization.

**Results:** The mean achieved BP was 131.5/72.6 and 132.7/73.7 in the B + A and B + H groups, respectively, during the 30 mo of follow-up. There were 8.8% and 11% 1° events, respectively (HR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.684–0.92; p=0.003). In the pts with DM there were clear coronary benefits with B + A, including both acute clinical events (p=0.013 and revascularizations (p=0.024). There were no unexpected adverse events.

**Summary:** In pts with DM and HTN, combining an ACEI with a CCB, compared with hydrochlorothiazide, was superior in reducing CV events.

### ASCOT

**Ostergren J, et al., 2008 (238)** 18854748

**Aim:** To compare the effects of an amlodipine-based regimen vs. and atenolol-based regimen on CV outcomes in pts with DM

**Study type:** RCT (BP lowering arm of ASCOT)

**Size:** 5,137 pts with DM, minimum 4 y follow-up

**Inclusion criteria:** Pts 40–65 y with HTN (>160/100 mm Hg) or treated HTN and DM plus 2 additional CV risk factors: PAD, previous stroke or TIA, male sex, ≥55 y, microalbuminuria, smoking, total cholesterol to HDL ratio ≥6, or family history of CHD.

- Pts were randomly assigned to an amlodipine-based regimen with addition of perindopril as required or an atenolol-based regimen with addition of a thiazide as required to achieve target BP of 130/80 mm Hg.

**1° outcomes:** Fatal CHD and nonfatal MI.

**Results:** BPs were 136/75 (amlodipine and 137/76 (atenolol) at the end of study. There was a 3/1.9 mm Hg lower BP in pts on amlodipine. The amlodipine-based regimen reduced CV events and procedures compared to the atenolol-based regimen (HR 0.86; 0.76-0.98; p=0.026). Fatal and nonfatal strokes were reduced by 25% (p=0.017), PAD by 48% (p=0.004) and noncoronary vascularization procedures by 57% (p=0.001).

**Summary:** In the large DM subgroup of the BP-lowering arm of ASCOT, the benefits of an amlodipine-based treatment compared with an atenolol-based treatment on the incidence of total CV events and procedures was significant.

### SHEP

**Kostis JB, et al., 2005 (239)** 15619390

**Aim:** To assess the long-term mortality rate of pts with DM pts in the SHEP trial randomly assigned to stepped care with chlorthalidone or placebo.

**Inclusion criteria:** Isolated systolic HTN (SBP 160–219 mm Hg) with DBP <90 mm Hg.

**Exclusion criteria:** Pts with insulin–dependent DM and those who

- Pts were randomly assigned to chlorthalidone or placebo. If BP remained above goal, atenolol or placebo was added.

**1° outcomes:** CV mortality rate

**Results:** BP was 11.1/3.4 mm Hg lower in the active treatment group at the end of the study. There was a 2/1.9 mm Hg lower BP in pts on amlodipine. The amlodipine-based regimen reduced CV events and procedures compared to the atenolol-based regimen (HR 0.86; 0.76-0.98; p=0.026). Fatal and nonfatal strokes were reduced by 25% (p=0.017), PAD by 48% (p=0.004) and noncoronary vascularization procedures by 57% (p=0.001).

**Summary:** Chlorthalidone-based treatment improved long-term outcomes in pts with DM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>1(^\circ) outcome</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROADMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menne J, et al., 2012 (240) 22418908</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>4,732 pts; follow-up 14.3 y</td>
<td>required diuretic therapy.</td>
<td>0.848) and total mortality rate: 0.805 (95% CI: 0.680, 0.952).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: To assess whether olmesartan compared to placebo delays the onset of albuminuria in pts with DM and HTN.</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with HTN defined as BP ≥130/80 mm Hg and at least 1 CV risk factor.</td>
<td>• Pts were randomly assigned to olmesartan or placebo. Additional antihypertensive therapy except for ACEs and ARBs to lower BP.</td>
<td>1(^\circ) outcome: Time to onset of microalbuminuria.</td>
<td>Results: Average BP was 126.3/74.7 and 129.5/76.6, respectively (significant not stated). Olmesartan delayed the onset of microalbuminuria by 25% (0.75; 95% CI: 0.61–0.92; p=0.007). CV events were comparable in the 2 groups.</td>
<td>Summary: Pts with better BP reduction are less likely to develop microalbuminuria. Treatment with an ARB delayed the onset of microalbuminuria independently of baseline BP and degree of BP reduction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBCD</td>
<td>RCT – open label</td>
<td>4,020 pts; follow-up 3.2 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estacio RO, et al., 1998 (241) 9486993</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>472 pts; follow-up 5 y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: To compare the effects of “intensive” compared with “moderate” BP treatment on 24-h creatinine clearance (GFR) in pts with DM and HTN.</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with HTN defined as DBP ≥90 mm Hg and DM-2</td>
<td>• Pts were randomly assigned to “intensive” treatment (DBP&lt;75 mm Hg) and “moderate” treatment (DBP 80–89 mm Hg) with a combination of nisoldipine and enalapril as the initial antihypertensive medication.</td>
<td>1(^\circ) outcome: Change in 24-h creatinine clearance.</td>
<td>Results: • The mean BP achieved was 132/78 in the intensive group and 138/86 in the moderate control group. During the 5-y follow-up period, there was no difference in GFR between the groups. After the first y of antihypertensive treatment, GFR stabilized in both the intensive and moderate groups with normal albumin excretion or microalbuminuria. In contrast, pts with overt albuminuria demonstrated steady decline in GFR whether on intensive or moderate therapy. Neither was there a significant difference in the progression from normal to micro- or micro-to overt albuminuria. • Intensive therapy demonstrated a lower overall incidence of deaths, 5.5% vs. 10.7%; p=0.037 (2(^\circ) endpoint).</td>
<td>Limitations: Open-label design; the definition of DM was 2 fasting blood glucose measurements &gt;140 mg/dL as opposed to &gt;126 today; serious side effects were not reported. Risk of bias due to a greater proportion of pts with established CVD at baseline assigned to the standard BP target.</td>
<td>Summary: BP control of 138/86 or 132/78 with either nisoldipine or enalapril as the initial antihypertensive agent appeared to stabilize renal function in HTN pts with type 2 DM without overt albuminuria over a 5-y period. For the ABCD trials, only ABDC (H) included strictly pts with HTN and DM. The quality of evidence is low due to imprecision and risk of bias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension Optimal Treatment (HOT trial)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>1 of 3 DBP target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: To assess the optimum target DBP</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with HTN defined as DBP ≥90 mm Hg and DM-2</td>
<td>• Pts were randomly assigned to 1 of 3 DBP target</td>
<td>1(^\circ) outcomes: Major CV events, MI, stroke, CV mortality and total mortality.</td>
<td>Limitations: Open-label design; the definition of DM-2 fasting blood glucose measurements &gt;140 mg/dL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansson L, et al., 1998 (242)</td>
<td>To determine if &quot;lower&quot; BP targets (any target &lt;130/85) are beneficial in the treatment of HTN.</td>
<td>Pts with HTN and DM were randomly assigned to the RCTs in which individuals were</td>
<td>Pts were randomized to &quot;lower&quot; BP targets; history of MI in the previous y; current angina or HF; &gt;1 major vascular episode; serum creatinine concentration &gt;175 µmol/l; retinopathy requiring laser treatment; malignant HTN; an uncorrected endocrine abnormality; an occupation that would preclude insulin treatment; a severe concurrent illness; inadequate understanding or unwillingness to enter the study.</td>
<td>DBP 100–115 mm Hg and DM. Results: In the group randomized to ≤80 mm Hg, the risk of major CV events was halved in comparison to the target ≤90. CV mortality was lower in the ≤80 group compared to the other groups.</td>
<td>as opposed to &gt;126 today; serious side effects were not reported; potential bias due to subgroup analysis.</td>
<td>Summary: In pts with DM and HTN, intensive lowering of BP was associated with a low rate of CV events. The quality of evidence is low to very low due to imprecision and risk of bias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKPDS 1998 (243)</td>
<td>To determine whether tight control of BP prevents macrovascular and microvascular complications in pts with DM-2.</td>
<td>Fasting plasma glucose concentration &gt;6 mmol/l in 2 mornings.</td>
<td>Ketonuria &gt;3 mmol/l; history of MI in the previous y; current angina or HF; &gt;1 major vascular episode; serum creatinine concentration &gt;175 µmol/l; retinopathy requiring laser treatment; malignant HTN; an uncorrected endocrine abnormality; an occupation that would preclude insulin treatment; a severe concurrent illness; inadequate understanding or unwillingness to enter the study.</td>
<td>BP in the tight BP control group was 144/82 compared with the group assigned less tight control (154/87), p&lt;0.0001. Reductions in risk in the group assigned tight BP control compared with those of the less tight control group were 24% (95% CI: 8%–38%; p=0.0046) in DM related endpoints; 32% in deaths related to DM (95% CI: 6%–51%; p&lt;0.019; 44% in strokes (95% CI: 11%–65%; p&lt;0.013; and 37% (95% CI: 11%–36%; p&lt;0.0092 in microvascular endpoints, predominantly due to risk of retinal photoagulation.</td>
<td>DBP targets were high (85 mm Hg in the tight control group and 105 mm Hg in the less tight control group) and similar to the cutoffs for the no treatment groups in trials comparing treatment with no treatment. UKPDS evaluated lowering both SBP and DBP so it is impossible to separate the outcomes effects of DBP. Therefore, the evidence is of low quality.</td>
<td>Summary: Tight BP control in pts with HTN and DM-2 achieved a clinically important reduction in the risk of death related to DM, complications related to DM, progression of DM retinopathy and deterioration of visual acuity, but the quality of evidence is low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguedas JA, et al., 2013 (244)</td>
<td>To determine if &quot;lower&quot; BP targets (any target &lt;130/85) are beneficial in the treatment of HTN.</td>
<td>RCTs in which individuals were</td>
<td>Pts with HTN and DM were randomly assigned to the RCTs in which individuals were</td>
<td>DBP 100–115 mm Hg and DM. Results: In the group randomized to ≤80 mm Hg, the risk of major CV events was halved in comparison to the target ≤90. CV mortality was lower in the ≤80 group compared to the other groups.</td>
<td>as opposed to &gt;126 today; serious side effects were not reported; potential bias due to subgroup analysis.</td>
<td>Summary: In pts with DM and HTN, intensive lowering of BP was associated with a low rate of CV events. The quality of evidence is low to very low due to imprecision and risk of bias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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mm Hg) are associated with reduction in mortality and morbidity compared to "standard" BP targets (<140–160/90–100 mm Hg) in pts with DM.

Study type: Meta-analysis of RCTs.

Size: 5 RCTs recruiting a total of 7,314 ps.

Mean follow-up: 4.5 y

randomized to a "lower" compared with a "standard" BP target.

Exclusion criteria: Studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria. Excluded studies were UKPDS 1998, HTN in Diabetes Study IV 1996, SANDS 2008, Lewis 1999 and the Steno-2 study.

Results: Only 1 trial (ACCORD) compared outcomes associated with "lower" (<120 mm Hg) or "standard" (<140 mm Hg) SBP targets in 4734 pts. Despite achieving a significantly lower BP (119.3/64.4 mm Hg vs. 133.5/70.5 mm Hg, p<0.0001), and using more antihypertensive medications, the only significant benefit in the group assigned to 'lower' SBP was a reduction in the incidence of stroke: RR: 0.58; (95% CI: 0.39–0.88; p=0.009), absolute risk reduction 1.1%. The effect of SBP targets on mortality was compatible with both a reduction and increase in risk: RR: 1.05 (95% CI: 0.84, 1.30), low quality evidence. Trying to achieve the 'lower' SBP target was associated with a significant increase in the number of other serious adverse events: RR: 2.58, (95% CI: 1.70–3.91; p<0.00001, absolute risk increase 2.0%. 4 trials (ABCD-H, ABCD-N, ABCD-2V, and a subgroup of HTN Optimal Treatment) specifically compared clinical outcomes associated with 'lower' vs. 'standard' targets for DBP in pts with DM. The total number of pts included in the DBP target analysis was 2580. Pts assigned to 'lower' DBP had a significantly lower achieved BP: 128/76 mm Hg vs. 135/83 mm Hg; p<0.0001. There was a trend towards reduction in total mortality in the group assigned to the 'lower' DBP target: RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.53–1.01), mainly due to a trend to lower non-CV mortality. There was no difference in stroke: RR: 0.67, (95% CI: 0.42–1.05), in MI: RR: 0.95 (95% CI: 0.64–1.40) or in CHF: RR: 1.06 (95% CI: 0.58–1.92), low-quality evidence. End-stage renal failure and total serious adverse events were not reported in any of the trials. A sensitivity analysis of trials comparing DBP targets <80 mm Hg (as suggested in clinical guidelines) than standard targets in pts with HTN and DM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1° outcomes</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmer SC, et al., 2015 (245) 26009228</td>
<td>To investigate the benefits and harms of BP-lowering drugs in adults with DM</td>
<td>Pts ≥18 y with DM and CKD and were treated in clinical trials that compared any orally administered antihypertensive agent alone or in combination with a 2nd antihypertensive agent or combination, placebo, or control.</td>
<td>Pts who underwent kidney transplantation or dialysis.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All-cause mortality and ESKD (need for dialysis or transplantation).</td>
<td>Effects of BP treatment on CV events and related mortality were uncertain. Data for the outcome of ESKD were restricted largely to pts with macroalbuminuria. Acute kidney injury was poorly defined with low quality of evidence.</td>
<td>No BP-lowering strategy prolonged survival in adults with DM and CKD. ACEIs and ARBs, alone or in combination, were the most effective strategies against ESKD. Any benefits of combined ACEI and ARB treatment need to be balanced against potential harms of hyperkalemia and acute kidney injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull F, et al., 2005 (246) 15983291</td>
<td>To determine the benefits associated with different treatment regimens in pts with and without DM and whether there are important differences in the effects of different BP-lowering regimens in these 2 pt groups.</td>
<td>Randomization of pts between a BP-lowering agent and a control (placebo or less intensive BP-lowering regimen) or randomization of pts between regimens based on different classes of BP-lowering drugs.</td>
<td>Studies not meeting the above criteria.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nonfatal stroke or death from cerebrovascular disease; nonfatal MI or death from CAD; HF causing death or requiring hospitalization; total CV events; total CV deaths; and total mortality.</td>
<td>No analysis of renal outcomes, risk of new DM or progression of existing DM; combined comparison of persons taking diuretics and BBs; some studies selected pts on the basis of the presence or absence of DM.</td>
<td>Effects of BP-lowering agents on major CV events were broadly comparable for pts with and without DM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 47. Nonrandomized Trials, Observational Studies, and/or Registries in DM (Section 9.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ALLHAT** Whelton PK, et al., 2005 (247) | **Aim:** To determine the optimal first step antihypertensive drug therapy in DM-2 or impaired fasting blood glucose levels and specifically whether treatment with a CCB or ACEI decreases clinical complications compared to treatment with a thiazide type diuretic.  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 31,512 pts stratified into type 2 DM (13,101), IFG (1,399) and normoglycemia (17,012) | **Inclusion criteria:** Pts ≥55 y with HTN and at least 1 other risk factor for CHD.  
**Exclusion criteria:** No history of DM or no fasting glucose measurement or nonfasting glucose level ≥110 mg/dL. | **1° outcomes:** Fatal CHD and nonfatal MI  
**Results:** There was no significant difference in RR (RR) for the 1° outcome in DM or NG pts assigned to amlodipine or lisinopril vs. chlorthalidone or in IFG pts assigned to lisinopril vs. chlorthalidone RR: 1.73 (95% CI: 1.10, 2.72). A significantly higher RR was noted for the 1° outcome in IFG pts assigned to amlodipine vs. chlorthalidone. Stroke was more common in NG pts assigned to lisinopril vs. chlorthalidone RR: 1.31 (95% CI: 1.10, 1.57). HF was more common in DM and NG pts assigned to amlodipine RR: 1.39 (95% CI: 1.22, 1.59) and 1.30 (95% CI: 1.12, 1.51), respectively or lisinopril: 1.15 (95% CI: 1.00–1.32) and 1.19 (95% CI: 1.02, 1.39), respectively vs. chlorthalidone. | **Limitations:** Microalbuminuria was not measured.  
**Summary:** Our results provide no evidence of superiority for treatment with CCBs or ACEIs compared with a thiazide-type diuretic during first-step antihypertensive therapy in DM, IFG, or NG. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANCE</strong></td>
<td>Hata J, et al., 2013 (248) 23926207</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: To assess the effects of visit-to-visit SBP variability and maximum SBP on the risks of macrovascular or microvascular outcomes by using data from the ADVANCE trial.</td>
<td>Pts had not experienced major macro- or microvascular events during first 2 y of the ADVANCE trial</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Composite of CV death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, new or worsening nephropathy, or retinopathy.</td>
<td>Major macro- and micro-vascular events were associated with SBP variability even after adjustment for mean SBP and other confounding factors. For the highest 10% variability, HR: 1.54 (95% CI: 0.99, 2.39) for macrovascular events; for microvascular events, HR: 1.84 (95% CI: 1.19, 2.84).</td>
<td>Visit-to-visit SBP variability and maximum SBP are independent risk factors for macro- and micro-vascular events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANCE-ON</strong></td>
<td>Zoungas S, et al., 2014 (249) 25234206</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: To determine whether the mortality benefit that had been observed among pts originally assigned to BP-lowering therapy were still evident at the end of 6-y follow-up</td>
<td>Pts with DM who participated in post-trial follow-up for 6 y</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>Death from any cause and major macrovascular complications (a composite of nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or death from any CV cause.</td>
<td>The reductions in the risk of death from any cause and of death from CV causes that had been observed in the group receiving active BP-lowering treatment during the ADVANCE trial were attenuated but significant at the end of the post-trial follow-up. HRs were 0.95 (95% CI: 0.84–0.99; p=0.03) and 0.88 (95% CI: 0.77–0.99; p=0.04), respectively.</td>
<td>Benefits were attenuated but still present at the end of 6 y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADMAP</strong></td>
<td>Mene J, et al., 2014 (250) 24772521</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: To determine whether the ROADMAP olmesartan medoxomil treatment resulted in a potential long-term micro- and macro-vascular benefit.</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>The original ROADMAP study showed a 23% reduction in microalbuminuria despite good and comparable BP control in both groups. Pts who developed microalbuminuria had a higher incidence of cardio- and cerebrovascular events. OR: 1.77 (95% CI: 1.03–3.03; p=0.039) compared to those in whom this was not the case. DM retinopathy and HF requiring hospitalization also were reduced.</td>
<td>renal artery stenosis blockade might cause a sustained reduction in micro- and macro-vascular events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmin C, et al., 2015 (251)</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: Determine associations between BP-lowering</td>
<td>All RCTs of BP-lowering treatment in</td>
<td>BP-lowering drug vs. placebo: 26 RCTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations: Reliability of this meta-analysis is limited by the scarcity of large trials with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
treatment and presence of vascular disease in DM-2

**Study type:** Large meta-analysis of 40 high quality RCTs (1/1966–10/2014) judged low risk of bias

**Size:** 100,354 pts with DM; all trials >1,000 pt-y of follow-up BP-lowering drug vs. placebo: 26 RCTs

- More intensive vs. less intensive BP lowering: 7 RCTs
- BP-lowering vs. another drug: 17 RCTs

which entire trial population had DM-2 or in which the results of a DM subgroup were obtained. Studies were included regardless of the presence or absence of defined HTN.

**Exclusion criteria:** Trials conducted predominantly in pts with type 1 DM were excluded.

**Results:** Baseline BP: A 10-mm Hg SBP reduction was associated with a significantly lower risk of all-cause mortality RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.78–0.96), CVD events RR: 0.89 (95% CI: 0.80–0.98), and stroke events RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.64–0.83). The associations for HF and renal failure were not significant. For microvascular events, a 10-mm reduction in SBP was associated with a lower risk of retinopathy RR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.76–0.99) and albuminuria RR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.79–0.87).

**Stratified by initial SBP:**
Trials stratified by SBP >140 to <140 mm Hg showed significant interactions for all-cause mortality RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.64–0.84) vs. 1.07 (95% CI: 0.92–1.26), CVD RR: 0.74 (95% CI: 0.65–0.85) vs. RR: 0.96 (95% CI: 0.88–1.05), CHD RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.61–0.87) vs. RR: 0.97 (95% CI: 0.86–1.10), HF RR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.59–0.94) vs. RR: 0.97 (95% CI: 0.79–1.19) and albuminuria RR: 0.71 (95% CI: 0.63–0.79) vs. RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.81–0.99).

**Stratified by achieved SBP:**
Trials stratified by SBP achieved in the treatment group ≥130 or <130 mm Hg and the associations of a 10-mm Hg SBP reduction compared between the strata showed significant interactions for all-cause mortality RR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.65–0.86) vs. RR: 1.08 (95% CI: 0.90–1.26), CVD RR: 0.74 (95% CI: 0.64–0.85) vs. RR: 0.96 (95% CI: 0.88–1.05), CHD RR: 0.70 (95% CI: 0.58–0.83) vs. RR: 0.97 (95% CI: 0.85–1.10), HF

achieved SBP levels in the 120–130 mm Hg range. The relatively short follow-up of included trails may have prevented associations of BP-lowering treatment with vascular outcomes from being observed, particularly for outcomes such as HF and renal failure, which are often a consequence of MI or albuminuria, respectively.

**Summary:**
- This large meta-analysis of 40 RCTs provides evidence that BP lowering is associated with lower risks of outcomes in pts with initial mean SBP ≥140 mm Hg compared with those <140 mm Hg with the exception of stroke, albuminuria and retinopathy. When trials were stratified by achieved SBP treatment was associated with lower risks only in the <130 mm Hg stratum for stroke and albuminuria.
- This meta-analysis shows that although BP lowering was not associated with a lower risk of CVD or CHD events at a baseline SBP <140 mm Hg, it does observe lower risks of stroke, retinopathy and progression of albuminuria.
- This study provides evidence that for individuals at high risk for these outcomes (history of cerebrovascular disease or mild nonproliferative retinopathy), commencement of therapy below an initial SBP of 140 mm Hg and treatment to SBP <130 may be indicated.
RR: 0.75 (95% CI: 0.59–0.95) vs. RR: 1.00 (95% CI: 0.81–1.23) and albuminuria RR: 0.71 (95% CI: 0.64–0.79) vs. RR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.81–0.90) with higher risk in the ≥130 mm Hg group.

**Stratified by class of medications:** Few differences were observed in the association between BP-lowering treatment and outcomes for regimens based on different classes of medications, except HF, in which diuretics were associated with lower RR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.72–0.95) than all other classes. This was driven largely by the results of ALLHAT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author et al., 2014</th>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> To separately evaluate the effects of ACEIs and ARBs on all-cause mortality, CV deaths, and major CV events in pts with DM</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCTs including post hoc analyses and subgroups for DM with median follow-up of at least 12 mo. Comparisons with placebo, no treatment or other antihypertensive drugs, including ACEIs and ARBs.</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCTs in which individuals were randomized to a “lower” compared with a “standard” BP target.</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCTs in which individuals were randomized to a “lower” compared with a “standard” BP target.</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong> • RCTs comparing ACEs vs. active drugs/placebo/no treatment: 26 RCTs (12 active drugs, 11 placebo) • RCTs comparing ARBs vs. active drugs/placebo/no treatment: 13 RCTs (3 active drugs, 10 placebo) • This meta-analysis provides evidence that ACEIs reduce all-cause mortality, CV mortality, and major CV events in pts with DM, whereas ARBs had no benefits on these outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheng J, et al., 2014 (252) 24687000</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis of 35 high quality RCTs (1966–2012) <strong>Size:</strong> 56,444 pts with DM; all trials had follow-up of at least 12 mo. <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Cross-over trials</td>
<td>• ACEIs significantly reduced the risk of all-cause mortality by 13% (RR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.78–0.98), CV deaths by 17% (RR: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.70–0.99), and major CV events by 14% (RR: 0.86; 95% CI: 0.77–0.95), including MI by 21% (RR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.65–0.95) and HF by 19% (RR: 0.81; 95% CI: 0.71–0.93). Treatment with ARBs did not significantly affect all-cause mortality (RR: 0.94 (95% CI: 0.82–1.08), CV death rate (RR: 1.21 (95% CI: 0.81–1.80) and major CV events (RR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.85–1.01) with the exception of HF (RR: 0.70; 95% CI: 0.59–0.82).</td>
<td>• ACEIs significantly reduced the risk of all-cause mortality by 13% (RR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.78–0.98), CV deaths by 17% (RR: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.70–0.99), and major CV events by 14% (RR: 0.86; 95% CI: 0.77–0.95), including MI by 21% (RR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.65–0.95) and HF by 19% (RR: 0.81; 95% CI: 0.71–0.93). Treatment with ARBs did not significantly affect all-cause mortality (RR: 0.94 (95% CI: 0.82–1.08), CV death rate (RR: 1.21 (95% CI: 0.81–1.80) and major CV events (RR: 0.94; 95% CI: 0.85–1.01) with the exception of HF (RR: 0.70; 95% CI: 0.59–0.82).</td>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> Evidence from RCTs does not support BP targets lower than standard targets in pts with HTN and DM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguedas JA, et al., 2013 (244) 24170669</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To determine if “lower” BP targets (any target &lt;130/85 mm Hg) are associated with reduction in mortality and morbidity compared to “standard” BP targets (&lt;140–160/90–100 mm Hg) in pts with DM. <strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis of RCTs. <strong>1st outcomes:</strong> Total mortality, total serious adverse events, MI, stroke, CHF, and ESRD.</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria. Excluded studies were UKPDS 1998, HTN in Diabetes Study IV</td>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> Evidence from RCTs does not support BP targets lower than standard targets in pts with HTN and DM.</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria. Excluded studies were UKPDS 1998, HTN in Diabetes Study IV</td>
<td><strong>Conclusions:</strong> Evidence from RCTs does not support BP targets lower than standard targets in pts with HTN and DM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean follow-up: 4.5 y</td>
<td>of stroke: RR: 0.58 (95% CI: 0.39–0.88; p=0.009), absolute risk reduction 1.1%. The effect of SBP targets on mortality was compatible with both a reduction and increase in risk: RR: 1.05 (95% CI: 0.84–1.30), low-quality evidence. Trying to achieve the 'lower' SBP target was associated with a significant increase in the number of other serious adverse events: RR: 2.58 (95% CI: 1.70–3.91; p&lt;0.0001), absolute risk increase 2.0%. 4 trials (ABCD-H, ABCD-N, ABCD-2V, and a subgroup of HOT) specifically compared clinical outcomes associated with 'lower' vs. 'standard' targets for DBP in pts with DM. The total number of pts included in the DBP target analysis was 2580. Pts assigned to 'lower' DBP had a significantly lower achieved BP: 128/76 mm Hg vs. 135/83 mm Hg, p&lt;0.0001. There was a trend towards reduction in total mortality in the group assigned to the 'lower' DBP target: RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.53–1.01), mainly due to a trend to lower non-CV mortality. There was no difference in stroke: RR: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.42–1.05), in MI: RR: 0.95 (95% CI: 0.64–1.40) or in CHF: RR: 1.06 (95% CI: 0.58–1.92), low quality evidence. End-stage renal failure and total serious adverse events were not reported in any of the trials. A sensitivity analysis of trials comparing DBP targets &lt;80 mm Hg (as suggested in clinical guidelines) vs. &lt;90 mm Hg showed similar results. There was a high risk of selection bias for every outcome analyzed in favor of the 'lower' target in the trials included for the analysis of DBP targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cushman WC, et al., 2010 (234) 20228401 | **Aim:** To assess whether therapy targeting normal SBP (<120 mm Hg) reduces major outcomes of stroke: RR: 0.58 (95% CI: 0.39–0.88; p=0.009), absolute risk reduction 1.1%. The effect of SBP targets on mortality was compatible with both a reduction and increase in risk: RR: 1.05 (95% CI: 0.84–1.30), low-quality evidence. Trying to achieve the 'lower' SBP target was associated with a significant increase in the number of other serious adverse events: RR: 2.58 (95% CI: 1.70–3.91; p<0.0001), absolute risk increase 2.0%. 4 trials (ABCD-H, ABCD-N, ABCD-2V, and a subgroup of HOT) specifically compared clinical outcomes associated with 'lower' vs. 'standard' targets for DBP in pts with DM. The total number of pts included in the DBP target analysis was 2580. Pts assigned to 'lower' DBP had a significantly lower achieved BP: 128/76 mm Hg vs. 135/83 mm Hg, p<0.0001. There was a trend towards reduction in total mortality in the group assigned to the 'lower' DBP target: RR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.53–1.01), mainly due to a trend to lower non-CV mortality. There was no difference in stroke: RR: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.42–1.05), in MI: RR: 0.95 (95% CI: 0.64–1.40) or in CHF: RR: 1.06 (95% CI: 0.58–1.92), low quality evidence. End-stage renal failure and total serious adverse events were not reported in any of the trials. A sensitivity analysis of trials comparing DBP targets <80 mm Hg (as suggested in clinical guidelines) vs. <90 mm Hg showed similar results. There was a high risk of selection bias for every outcome analyzed in favor of the 'lower' target in the trials included for the analysis of DBP targets. |

**Inclusion criteria:** Type 2 DM with HgbA1c $\geq$ 7.5%; $\geq$40 y with CVD or $\geq$55 y with anatomical evidence of

Pts were randomly assigned to intensive therapy SBP<120 mm Hg or standard therapy SBP<140 mm Hg. | **Limitations:** This trial had an open label design. The rate of adverse events in the standard therapy group was less than

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 4,733 pts, 4.7 y follow-up  
**Inclusion criteria:** Atherosclerosis, albuminuria, LVH, or at least 2 additional risk factors for CVD.  
**Exclusion criteria:** BMI ≥ 45, serum creatinine > 1.5, and other serious illness.  
**1° outcomes:** Nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or CV death.  
**Results:** Mean SBP in the intensive therapy group was 119.3 mm Hg and in the standard therapy group was 133.5 mm Hg. The annual 1° outcome 1.87% in the intensive therapy group and 2.09% in the standard therapy group HR: 0.88 (95% CI: 0.073–1.06; p=0.20). The annual rates of death from any cause were 1.28% and 1.19% in the 2 groups, respectively (HR: 0.59; 95% CI: 0.39–0.89; p=0.01). Serious adverse events attributed to antihypertensive treatment occurred in 3.3% of the intensive therapy group and 1.3% of the standard therapy group (p<0.001).  
**Limitations:** Expected. Pts younger than 40 y or older than 79 y were not included.  
**Summary:** In pts with type 2 DM and high risk for CV events, targeting SBP of <120 as compared with <140 mm Hg did not reduce the rate of composite outcome of fatal and nonfatal major CV events and was associated with greater risk for adverse events.

| Hartley L, et al., 2014 (253) 25436436 | **Aim:** To determine the effectiveness of transcendental meditation for the 1° prevention of CVD  
**Study type:** Literature review of RCTs  
**Size:** 4 trials with a total of 430 pts  
**Inclusion criteria:** ≥3 mo duration, healthy adults or adults at high risk of CVD, comparison of no or minimal intervention.  
**Exclusion criteria:** Multi-factorial interviews  
**1° outcomes:** Clinical CVD events and major CVD risk factors  
**Results:** No conclusions of the effectiveness of transcendental meditation for the 1° prevention of CVD  
**Limitations:** Limited evidence  
**Summary:** No conclusions as to the effectiveness of transcendental meditation for the 1° prevention of CVD. There was considerable heterogeneity between trials and the included studies were small, short-term, and at overall serious risk of bias. |

| Schmieder RE, et al., 2007 (254) 17416265 | **Study type:** Topic review  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A  
**1° outcomes:** N/A  
**Limitations:** N/A  
**Summary:** N/A |

| Lv, et al., 2013 (127) 23798459 | **Aim:** To assess the renal and CV effects of intensive BP lowering in people with CKD  
**Study type:** Systematic review  
**Size:** 9,287 pts with CKD and 1,264 kidney failure events  
**Inclusion criteria:** Randomized trials of pts with CKD assigned to different target BP that reported kidney failure and CV events.  
11 trials on 9,287 pts with CKD and 1,264 kidney failure events (doubling of serum creatinine, 50% decline in GFR or ESKD)  
Included AASK, REIN-2,  
**Results:** Compared with standard regimens, more intensive BP lowering reduced risk of composite endpoint HR: 0.82 (95% CI: 0.68–0.98) and ESKD HR: 0.79 (95% CI: 0.67–0.93). Effect was modified by proteinuria (p=0.006) and markers of trial quality. Intensive BP lowering reduced the risk of kidney failure HR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.62–0.86) but not in pts without proteinuria at baseline HR: 1.12 (95% CI: 0.67–1.87). No clear effect on CV events or death.  
**Limitations:** All trials used open label, in 2 pts were blinded, substantial variability in design quality. There was substantial variability in BP targets by MAP, SBP and DBP or only DBP. Most trials did not include pts with diabetic kidney disease  
**Summary:** Renal outcomes: 7 trials (N=5308) recorded a total of 1,264 kidney failure events. A -7.7 mm Hg difference in SBP and a -4.9 mm Hg |
MDRD, Wuin (children), Toto, Schrier plus 5 trials with CKD subgroups, also included the late nonrandomized follow-up studies for AASK and MDRD

- BP targets varied substantially between trials. 2 trials targeted mean BP <92 mm Hg for the intensive treatment arm, and 107 mm Hg in the standard treatment arm. 1 trial aimed for BP <130/80 mm Hg vs. a DBP of 90 mm Hg, 1 study targeted <120/80 mm Hg vs. 135–140/85–90 mm Hg, and 4 studies had DBP <75–80 mm Hg vs. from 80–90 mm Hg. A trial involving pediatric pts targeted a 24-h mean BP <the 50th percentile, compared with the 50th to 95th percentiles in the control group. 2 trials had more liberal targets for intensive treatment (<140–150 mm Hg SBP, 85 mm Hg DBP)

| difference in DBP seen between treatment arms. Overall, a more intensive regimen reduced risk of composite kidney failure events by 17% (HR: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.68, 0.98), reduced the risk of ESKD alone by 18% (pooled HR for composite outcomes: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.67, 0.93).
- Intensive BP lowering had no effect on kidney failure in pts who did not have proteinuria (3 trials involving 1,218 pts (HR: 1.12; 95% CI: 0.67–1.87), but it did reduce the risk of progressive kidney failure by 27% (5 trials involving 1,703 pts (HR: 0.73; 95% CI: 0.62–0.86) in pts who did have proteinuria at baseline.
- CV outcomes: major CV events reported in 5 trials (472 CV events in 5,308 pts with CKD). Intensive BP lowering did not reduce risk of CV events in pts with CKD, but the CIs remained wide (RR: 1.09 (95% CI: 0.83, 1.42). 6 trials reported stroke outcomes (197 events in 5,411 pts), 5 trials reported MI (138 events in 4,317 pts), and 5 trials reported HF (118 events in 5,308 pts). They saw no clear effect of intensive treatment on any of these vascular outcomes.
- Death: 10 trials involving 6,788 pts reported 846 deaths. There was no clear effect of intensive BP lowering on risk of all-cause death (RR: 0.94 (95% CI: 0.84, 1.05) or CV death (RR: 1.20 (95% CI: 0.82, 1.75).
# Data Supplement 48. Atrial Fibrillation (Section 9.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>P Value; OR, HR, or RR; &amp; 95% CI</th>
<th>Study Limitations &amp; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jibrini, et al., 2008 (255) 18223352</td>
<td>Aim: To assess the effectiveness of ACEIs and ARBs in the prevention of AF, and to identify those clinical entities in which RAAS inhibition would most likely benefit the pts.</td>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Meta-analysis</td>
<td>• 11 published studies; 55,989 pts (26,973 pts in intervention, 29,016 pts in comparator)</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Studies of RAAS blockade in CHF, MI, electrical cardioversion, and HTN with incidence of AF noted during follow-up. <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Studies without the measurement of AF or use of RAAS blockade.</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> RAAS blockade <strong>Intervention:</strong> Placebo, amlodipine, BB or thiazide diuretic</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint (efficacy) and results:</strong> AF occurrence or reoccurrence.</td>
<td>Treatment with RAAS blockers reduced RR of AF in pts with HTN by 23% (p&lt;0.001), by 11% in pts after MI (p&lt;0.05), by 51% after electrical cardioversion (p&lt;0.001), by 32% in pts with HF (p&lt;0.001) and by 19% overall (p&lt;0.001).</td>
<td>• Not a comprehensive analysis of all antihypertensive. Adverse events not catalogued in meta-analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao et al., 2015 (256) 26668582</td>
<td>Aim: To investigate the effectiveness and safety of ACEIs or angiotensin II receptor blockers (ARBs) on preventing AF in essential hypertensive pts.</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> RAAS blockade, n=20,491 <strong>Comparator:</strong> BB/calcium antagonist, n=22,401</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> RCTs on the effects of ACEI/ARBs on essential hypertensive pts. <strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Non-RCTs, subjects who were not treated with ACEI or ARB, and trials not <strong>1° endpoint:</strong> AF occurrence or reoccurrence.</td>
<td><strong>ACEI/ARBs reduced the incidence of AF recurrence compared to calcium antagonists (RR: 0.48; 95% CI: 0.40–0.58; p&lt;0.00001) or b-blockers (RR: 0.39; 95% CI: 0.20–0.74; p=0.005). ACEI/ARBs may reduce the incidence of AF recurrence and CHF, with fewer serious adverse effects, but did not prevent new onset of AF.</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Doxazosin was associated with a higher incidence (2%) of AF/AFL prior to having the drug discontinued by the trial. Excluding doxazosin, there was no relationship between treatment drug and AF/AFL incidence.</td>
<td>• 2° analysis of RCT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Data Supplement 49. Valvular Heart Disease (Section 9.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>P Value; OR, HR, or RR; &amp; 95% CI</th>
<th>Study Limitations &amp; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Healey et al., 2005 (257)            | Aim: Systematic review of all RCT evaluating the benefit of trials of ACEI and ARBs in prevention of AF | **Intervention:** n=27,089 RAAS blockade  
**Comparators:** n=29,220 placebo or active control antihypertensive | **Inclusion criteria:** Studies of RAAS blockade in CHF, MI, electrical cardioversion, and HTN with incidence of AF noted during follow-up  
**Exclusion criteria:** Studies without the measurement of AF or use of RAAS blockade. | **1° endpoint:** AF occurrence or reoccurrence | • ACEIs and ARBs reduced RR of AF by 28% (p=0.0002), greatest in pts with HF [RR reduction: 44%; p=0.007]. No significant reduction in AF in pts with HTN (RR reduction: 12%; p=0.4), but 1 trial found a significant 29% reduction in pts with LVH. Following cardioversion there was a large effect (48% RR reduction; 95% CI: 21%–65%). | • ACEIs and ARBs appear to be effective in prevention of AF probably limited to pts with systolic LV dysfunction or HTN LVH |
| Jibrini et al., 2008 (255)           | Aim: To assess the effectiveness of ACEIs and ARBs in the prevention of AF, and to identify those clinical entities in which RAAS inhibition would most likely benefit the pts. | **Intervention:** n=26,973 RAAS blockade  
**Comparators:** n=29,016 placebo, amlodipine, BB or thiazide diuretic | **Inclusion criteria:** Studies of RAAS blockade in CHF, MI, electrical cardioversion, and HTN with incidence of AF noted during follow-up  
**Exclusion criteria:** Studies without the measurement of AF or use of RAAS blockade. | **1° endpoint:** AF occurrence or reoccurrence. | • Treatment with RAAS blockers reduced RR of AF in pts with HTN by 23% (p<0.001), by 11% in pts after MI (p<0.05), by 51% after electrical cardioversion (p<0.001), by 32% in pts with HF (p<0.001) and by 19% overall (p<0.001). | N/A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Size: 11 studies, 55,989 pts</th>
<th>Intervention: RAAS blockade, n=20,491</th>
<th>Comparator: BB/calcium antagonist, n=22,401</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria: RCTs on the effects of ACEI/ARBs on essential hypertensive pts.</th>
<th>1° endpoint: AF occurrence or reoccurrence.</th>
<th>ACEI/ARBs reduced the incidence of AF recurrence compared to calcium antagonists (RR: 0.48; 95% CI: 0.40–0.58; p&lt;0.00001) or b-blockers (RR: 0.39; 95% CI: 0.20–0.74; p=0.005). ACEI/ARBs may reduce the incidence of AF recurrence and CHF, with fewer serious adverse effects, but did not prevent new onset of AF.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhao et al., 2015 (256)</td>
<td>26668582</td>
<td>Aim: To investigate the effectiveness and safety of ACEIs or angiotensin II receptor blockers (ARBs) on preventing AF in essential hypertensive pts.</td>
<td>Study type: Meta-analysis</td>
<td>Size: 10 studies, n=42,892</td>
<td>Intervention: RAAS blockade, n=20,491</td>
<td>Comparator: BB/calcium antagonist, n=22,401</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: RCTs on the effects of ACEI/ARBs on essential hypertensive pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansson et al., 1999 (258)</td>
<td>10030325</td>
<td>Aim: CAPP Trial was designed to compare the effects of ACE inhibition and conventional therapy on CV morbidity and mortality in pts with HTN.</td>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td>Size: 10,985</td>
<td>Intervention: Captopril, n=5,592</td>
<td>Comparator: 5,493 pts were allocated to diuretics or BBs</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts aged 25–66 y with a measured DBP of ≥100 mm Hg on 2 occasions were included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansson et al., 1999 (259)</td>
<td>10577635</td>
<td>Aim: STOPH-2 aimed to compare the effects of conventional and newer antihypertensive drugs on CV mortality and morbidity in elderly pts.</td>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td>Size: 10,985</td>
<td>Intervention: n=2205 pts treated with ACEI</td>
<td>Comparator: n=2,213 pts treated with BB or diuretic combination or n=2,196 pts treated with CCB</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: HTN with BP ≥ 180 mm Hg systolic, aged 70–84 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: RCT</td>
<td>Size: 6,614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wachtell et al., 2005 (260)</strong>&lt;br&gt;15734615</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> LIFE trial aimed to determine whether angiotensin II receptor blockade is better than beta-blockade in preventing new-onset AF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> n=4,298 treated with losartan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> n=4,182 treated with atenolol</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Hypertensive pts with LVH by echo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Prior AF history in 342 pts</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> new onset of AF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2° endpoint:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haywood et al., 2009 (261)</strong>&lt;br&gt;19926008</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To investigate incidence of development of AF/AFL in pts enrolled in this comparative trial of antihypertensives (ALLHAT).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> RCT</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> n=42,418 on diuretics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> n=39,056</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Essential HTN with BP &gt;140/90 without medications, &gt;180 systolic if on medications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Not meeting inclusion criteria</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> ECG evidence of AF/AFL on follow-up of HTN and dyslipidemia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2° endpoint:</strong> AF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Julius et al., 2004 Julius, 2004 610}</strong>&lt;br&gt;15207952</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> The Valsartan Antihypertensive Long-term Use Evaluation (VALUE) trial: does valsartan reduce cardiac morbidity and mortality more than amlodipine for the same degree of BP reduction in hypertensive pts at high CV risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> n=7,649 on valsartan</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Hypertensive pts, ≥50 y with DM, current smoking, high total cholesterol, LVH by ECG, proteinuria on dipstick and CKD (not end-stage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> n=7,596 on amlodipine</td>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> ESRD, renal artery stenosis, pregnancy, AMI, PTCA or CABG within the past 3 mo, clinically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Cardiac mortality, morbidity, HF, stroke, all-cause death, new onset DM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> Hypotension, syncope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2° endpoint:</strong> AF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study type: RCT

**Size:** 15,245

relevant valvular disease, cerebrovascular accident in the past 3 mo, severe hepatic disease, severe chronic renal failure, CHF requiring ACEI therapy and pts on monotherapy with blockers for both CAD and HTN.

---

### Data Supplement 50. RCTs and Meta-analysis Comparing Valvular Heart Disease (Section 9.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients)/Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>P Value; OR, HR, or RR; &amp; 95% CI</th>
<th>Study Limitations &amp; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE-AS Chockalingam A, et al., 2004 (262)</td>
<td>Aim: To determine the clinical tolerance and efficacy of the ACEI enalapril in the setting of symptomatic severe AS. <strong>Study type:</strong> RCT <strong>Size:</strong> 56 pts</td>
<td>Intervention: Enalapril 2.5 mg BID increasing to 10 mg BID (37 pts) Comparator: Placebo (19 pts)</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Severe aortic stenosis (aortic valve area &lt;0.75 cm², mean aortic gradient &gt;50 mm Hg, or aortic valve Doppler jet &gt;4.5 m/s) and symptomatic NYHA class III or IV dyspnea or angina Exclusion criteria: Persistent hypotension (SBP &lt;90 or mean BP &lt;60), severe mitral stenosis (mitral valve orifice &lt;1.0 cm²), known intolerance for ACEI, and renal dysfunction (serum creatinine &gt;2.5 mg/dL).</td>
<td>1° endpoint: Improvements in Borg dyspnea index and 6-min walk distance at 1 mo Safety endpoint: Development of hypotension 2° endpoint: Minor ACEI intolerance, cough, presyncope, improvement in NYHA class, and echo parameters</td>
<td>• Pts who tolerated enalapril (n=34) had significant improvement in NYHA class, Borg index (5.4 ± 1.2 vs. 5.6 ± 1.7; p=0.03), and 6-min walk distance (402 ± 150 vs. 376 ± 174; p=0.003) compared with control pts. • Treatment with enalapril resulted in hypotension in 3 of 5 pts with LV dysfunction and congestive HF had hypotension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>PMID</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>Rieck ÅE</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>22647889</td>
<td>To determine the impact of HTN on LV structure and outcome during progression of aortic valve stenosis</td>
<td>Intervention: 1,340 pts with HTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleid MF, et al.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>23956211</td>
<td>Aim: To evaluate the hemodynamic effects of vasodilator therapy in pts with LGSAS</td>
<td>Intervention: Infusion of IV sodium nitroprusside to reduce BP and arterial afterload (18 pts with hypertensive LGSAS)</td>
<td>Comparator: Baseline hemodynamics (6 pts with low EF LGSAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAS Trial</td>
<td>Bull S, et al.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>25796267</td>
<td>Aim: To determine if ACEIs improve outcomes in AS.</td>
<td>Intervention: Ramipril ramped up from 2.5 to 5 to 10 mg for 1 y (50 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and who did not have indications for valve replacement surgery.  

**Exclusion criteria:** Any other significant (>mild) VHD, excess hypo- or HTN (BP <100/40 or >200/110 mm Hg). Intolerance of ACEIs or ARBs or their prescription over the previous 3 mo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BNP</strong></th>
<th>and change in distance walked on exercise tolerance testing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\( p=0.04 \); trend to less progression of the aortic stenosis (valve area 0.0 cm\(^2\) vs. -0.2 cm\(^2\) in the placebo arm; \( p=0.067 \)).

---

**Scognamiglio R, et al., 1994 (266) 8058074**

**Aim:** To assess whether vasodilator therapy reduces or delays the need for valve replacement

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 143

**Intervention:** Nifedipine 20 mg Q12 H (69 pts)

**Comparator:** Digoxin 0.25 mg daily (74 pts)

**Inclusion criteria:** Asymptomatic pts with isolated, chronic, severe aortic regurgitation and normal LV systolic function

**Exclusion criteria:** Worsening aortic regurgitation within 6 mo, DBP above 90 mm Hg, CAD, aortic valve gradient \( \geq 20 \) mm Hg, other valvular or CHD, poor quality echo or an LV EF <50%.

**1\(^{o}\) endpoint:** Frequency of valve replacement

\( P<0.001 \)

---

**Evangelista A, et al., 2005 (267) 16192479**

**Aim:** To identify the possible beneficial effects of vasodilator therapy on LV function and the need for aortic-valve replacement.

**Study type:** RCT

**Size:** 95 pts

**Intervention:** Nifedipine 20 mg Q12 H or enalapril 20 mg daily (32 pts nifedipine, 32 pts enalapril)

**Comparator:** Placebo (31 pts)

**Inclusion criteria:** Consecutive pts with asymptomatic, chronic, severe aortic regurgitation and normal LV function

**Exclusion criteria:** LVEF <50%, AF, CAD or other nonaortic VHD

**1\(^{o}\) endpoint:** Frequency of valve replacement

\( P<0.001 \)

---

- At 6 y, a 34% of the digoxin group had undergone valve replacement, but only 15% of the nifedipine group (\( P<0.001 \))
- No placebo group, and digoxin is a poor comparator due to toxicity which is now recognized.
### Scognamiglio R, et al., 1994 (266) 8058074

**Aim:** To assess whether vasodilator therapy delays need for valve replacement in pts with asymptomatic severe AR.  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 143 pts  
**Intervention:** 69 pts received nifedipine  
**Comparator:** 74 pts received digoxin  
**Inclusion criteria:** Severe aortic regurgitation without symptoms  
**Exclusion criteria:** DBP >90, recent worsening of aortic regurgitation, mixed aortic stenosis / aortic regurgitation or any additional valve disease, LVEF <50.  
**1° endpoint:** Worsening symptoms, LVEF decline to <50% or both, requiring valve replacement surgery  
- 15% met criteria for valve replacement with nifedipine, but 34% did with digoxin (p<0.001)  
- No placebo control.

### Evangelista A, et al., 2005 (14) 16192479

**Aim:** To assess whether vasodilator therapy delays need for valve replacement in pts with asymptomatic severe AR.  
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 95 pts  
**Intervention:** 32 pts received enalapril; 32 pts received nifedipine  
**Comparators:** 31 pts received placebo  
**Inclusion criteria:** Severe aortic regurgitation without symptoms  
**Exclusion criteria:** Not listed.  
**1° endpoint:** Worsening symptoms, LVEF decline to <50% or both, requiring valve replacement surgery  
- 41% met criteria for valve replacement with nifedipine, 50% did with enalapril, and 39% in the control group (p=0.62)  
- BP of 145/75 average between the 3 groups, indicate lack of severity. Post-Rx BP is not reported.

### Data Supplement 51. RCTs Comparing Race/Ethnicity (Section 10.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leenen F, et al., 2006 (268) 16864749 | **Study type:** RCT comparison of an alpha blocker, ACEI, or CCB, each compared to a thiazide-type diuretic. This is post hoc comparison between  
- >50 y  
- Lisinopril (n=9,054); Amlodipine (9,048)  
- African American 15,085 (35.5%)  
- White 11,580 (47.0%)  
- Amlodipine vs. Lisinopril  
- No significant difference in 1° outcome (nonfatal MI and fatal CHD) or other prespecified outcomes:  
- CHD, 1° outcome plus revascularization and hospitalized  
- In African Americans, Lisinopril less effective than amlodipine for BP reduction (mean follow-up BP 2.7/1.6 mm Hg higher with Lisinopril) and in reducing strokes (RR:1.51; 95% CI: 1.22–1.86) and |
### CCB vs. ACEI incl in race subgroup.

**Size:** 42,418

#### Wright JT et al. 2008 (269)

**Study type:** Race subgroup comparison of RCT comparison of an ACEI or CCB compared to a thiazide-type diuretic on nonfatal or fatal CHD in pts with metabolic syndrome

- **Population:**
  - >50 y
  - African American: n=12,818
  - Non-African American: n=24,473

- **Intervention:**
  - Chlorthalidone vs. Amlodipine, or Lisinopril

- **Comparison:**
  - No difference in 1° outcome (nonfatal MI and fatal CHD). Other prespecified outcomes:
    - CHD, 1° outcome plus revascularization and hospitalized angina, composite CVD, stroke, HF, ESRD
  - In African Americans with metabolic/cardiovascular syndrome: Amlodipine similar for chlorthalidone for all outcomes but inferior for HF (HR: 1.50; 95% CI: 1.18–1.90) and combined CVD (HR: 1.14; 95% CI: 1.00–1.29). Lisinopril less effective for SBP reduction by 4 mm Hg; combined CHD (HR: 1.19 (95% CI: 1.01, 1.40); combined CVD (HR: 1.24; 95% CI: 1.09–1.40); stroke (HR: 1.37; 95% CI: 1.07–1.76); HF (HR: 1.49; 95% CI: 1.17–1.90); and ESRD (HR: 1.70; 95% CI: 1.13–2.55).

#### Wright JT, et al., 2009 (270)

**Study type:** Race subgroup comparison of RCT comparison of an alpha blocker vs. a thiazide-type diuretic

- **Population:**
  - >50 y
  - (35.5% African American)

- **Intervention:**
  - Chlorthalidone vs. Doxazosin

- **Comparison:**
  - No difference in 1° outcome (nonfatal MI and fatal CHD). Other prespecified outcomes:
    - CHD, 1° outcome plus revascularization and hospitalized angina, composite CVD, stroke, HF, ESRD
  - In African Americans: combined CVD (HR: 1.28; 95% CI: 1.16–1.42); HF (HR: 1.84; 95% CI: 1.51–2.24); stroke HR (CI): 1.10–1.73.

### SPRINT

**Aim:** To test the effectiveness of a goal SBP<120 mm Hg vs. a goal SBP<140 mm Hg for the prevention of CVD in pts with SBP≥130 mm Hg at baseline.

**Study type:** RCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>SBP≥130 mm Hg, with upper limit varying as number of pre-trial BP-lowering meds increased. Age ≥50 y Presence of at least 1 of the following: Clinical or subclinical CVD CKD stage 3 or greater Age≥75 y</th>
<th>Intervention:</th>
<th>Intensive BP-lowering treatment to goal SBP&lt;120 mm Hg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison:</strong></td>
<td>Standard BP-lowering treatment to goal SBP&lt;140 mm Hg Net treatment difference ~3 drugs (2.8) on average vs. 2 drugs (1.8) on average</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong></td>
<td>CVD (MI, ACS, stroke, HF, CVD death) HR: 0.75 (0.64–0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other endpoints:</strong></td>
<td>Total deaths: 0.73 (0.60–0.90) 1° or death: 0.78 (0.67–0.90) Components of 1° composite mostly consistent in direction other than ACS – no difference.</td>
<td><strong>CKD outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>More intensive SBP lowering to a goal of &lt;120 mm Hg with achieved mean of ~121 mm Hg resulted in less CVD and lower total mortality over 3.26 y in comparison with a goal SBP&lt;140 mm Hg and achieved SBP of ~135 mm Hg. There were small increases in some expected SAEs. Perhaps unexpected, a sizable increase in all-cause mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>More intensive SBP lowering to a goal of &lt;120 mm Hg with achieved mean of ~121 mm Hg resulted in less CVD and lower total mortality over 3.26 y in comparison with a goal SBP&lt;140 mm Hg and achieved SBP of ~135 mm Hg. There were small increases in some expected SAEs. Perhaps unexpected, a sizable increase in all-cause mortality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT to examine effect of treatment of severe HTN</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>RCT to examine effect of treatment of mild to moderately severe HTN</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 (262) 4862069</td>
<td>9361 participants followed median of 3.26 y</td>
<td>1970 (271) 4914579</td>
<td>• Framingham General CVD risk≥15% in 10 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54% African American</td>
<td>• Framingham General CVD risk≥15% in 10 y</td>
<td>• 1° in CKD pts: reduction in GFR of ≥50% or ESRD 0.89 (0.42–1.87)</td>
<td>DBP 115–129 mm Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCTZ, Reserpine, Hydralazine vs. placebo</td>
<td>• 1° in CKD pts: reduction in GFR of ≥50% or ESRD 0.89 (0.42–1.87)</td>
<td>1.7% fewer pts had orthostatic hypotension in intensive group; p=0.01.</td>
<td>CVD or stroke events, Grade 3 or 4 retinopathy, doubling of creatinine or BUN. Study terminated early for 27 events vs. 2 events (placebo vs. active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42% African American</td>
<td>DBP 90–115 mm Hg</td>
<td>HCTZ, Reserpine, Hydralazine vs. placebo</td>
<td>CVD or stroke events, Grade 3 or 4 retinopathy, doubling of creatinine or BUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HTN Detection and Follow-up Program (HDFP)</strong> 1979 6480895 (272)</td>
<td>RCT; comparison of stepped care at academic centers vs. usual care provided by community</td>
<td>10,950 pts</td>
<td>44% African American, 30–69 y, Chlorthalidone, Reserpine, Hydralazine, Guanethidine vs. referral to community care, 23% decrease in mortality in African Americans on Stepped Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIFE</strong> Dahlof B, et al. 2002 11937178 (14)</td>
<td>RCT comparison of an ARB compared to a BB on CVD</td>
<td>55–80 y (mean 66.9 y), African American 533 (6), White 8,503 (92), Asian 43 (0.5), Hispanic 100 (1), Other 14 (0.2)</td>
<td>Losartan vs. Atenolol, Interaction of race and treatment on CVD events (p=0.005) CVD increased 55% in African Americans in the Losartan group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALUE</strong> Julius S, et al. 2006 (265) 16864741 (273)</td>
<td>RCT comparison of an ARB vs. a CCB on CVD</td>
<td>&gt;50 y (mean 67.3 y), African American 658 (4.3), White 13,643 (89.1), Asian 535 (3.5), Other 474 (3.1)</td>
<td>Valsartan vs. Amlodipine, CVD increased ~20% (NS) in African Americans in Valsartan group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AASK</strong> Norris K, et al. 2006 17059993 (174)</td>
<td>RCT comparison of 2 BP targets and 3 drug regimens on renal outcomes</td>
<td>18–70 y; African Americans, eGFR: 25–65 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>MAP of &lt;92 mm Hg compared to MAP 102–107 mm Hg and an ACEI or CCB each compared to a BB, No difference between BP targets. ACEI &gt; BB &gt; CCB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALLHAT</strong> 2002 (274) 12479763</td>
<td>RCT comparison of an alpha blocker, ACEI, or CCB, each compared to a thiazide-type diuretic</td>
<td>&gt;50 y, African American 15,085 (35.5), White 19,977 (47.0), Hispanics 5,299 (12.5)</td>
<td>Chlorthalidone vs. Doxazosin, Amlodipine, or Lisinopril, No difference in 1° outcome (nonfatal MI and fatal CHD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVEST</strong> Pepine CJ, et al., 2003 (275)</td>
<td>RCT comparison of CCB plus an ACEI</td>
<td>≥50 y with HTN and CHD, 36% Hispanic, Verapamil/trandolapril vs. Atenolol/HCTZ</td>
<td>No difference in 1° outcome (nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, all-cause mortality). Mean SBP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compared to a BB plus a thiazide diuretic

Size: 22,576

- 13% African American
- 49% White

-13% decrease Hispanics vs. non-Hispanic pts (-21.3 vs. -17.4 mm Hg; p<0.001)

Wright JT, et al., 2005 (276)

Study type: Race subgroup comparison of RCT comparison of an alpha blocker, ACEI, or CCB compared to a thiazide-type diuretic

- >50 y
- African American, n=11,792
- Non-African American, n=21,565

Chlorthalidone vs. Amlodipine, or Lisinopril

- No difference in 1o outcome (nonfatal MI and fatal CHD). Other prespecified outcomes: CHD, 1o outcome plus revascularization and hospitalized angina, composite CVD, stroke, HF, ESRD

- In African Americans: Amlodipine similar to chlorthalidone for all outcomes but inferior for HF (HR: 1.37; 95% CI: 1.24–1.51). Lisinopril less effective for SBP reduction by 4 mm Hg, stroke (HR: 1.40; 95% CI: 1.17–1.68), combined CVD (HR: 1.19; 95% CI: 1.09–1.30), HF (HR: 1.30; 95% CI: 1.10–1.54).

Data Supplement 52. RCTs Comparing Women With Hypertension (Section 10.2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2o Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull F, et al., 2008 (277)</td>
<td>Aim: Assess sex differences in response to BP treatment</td>
<td>Mean ages: • Women: 63.0 y • Men: 61.7 y</td>
<td>Intervention: N/A Comparator: N/A</td>
<td>1o endpoint: Nonfatal stroke or death from cerebrovascular disease (ICD 430–438); (ii) nonfatal MI or deaths from CHD, excluding SCD (ICD 410–414); (iii) HF causing death or requiring hospitalization (ICD 428); (iv) total major CV events (stroke, CHD events, HF, other CV death); (v) total CV deaths (ICD 396–459); and (vi) total mortality</td>
<td>Summary: Achieved BP reductions were comparable for men and women in every comparison made. For the 1o outcome of total major CV events there was no evidence that men and women obtained different levels of protection from BP-lowering or that regimens based on ACEIs, calcium antagonists, ARBs, or diuretics/BBs were more effective in1 sex than the other (all p-homogeneity &gt;0.08).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing L, et al., 2003 (278)</td>
<td>Aim: Comparison of ACE vs. Diuretic on incident CVD</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts 65–84 y</td>
<td>Intervention: ACE Comparator: Diuretic</td>
<td>Endpoint: All CV events or death from any cause</td>
<td>Summary: Among male subjects, HR: 0.83 (95% CI: 0.71–0.97; p=0.02); among female subjects, HR: 1.00 (95% CI: 0.83–1.21; p=0.98); the p value for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type: Practice-based RCT open label treatment, blinded event</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: Life-threatening illness, contraindication to an ACEI or diuretic, a plasma creatinine concentration of more than 2.5 mg per deciliter (221 micromol per liter), malignant hypertension, or dementia</td>
<td>Note: Clinicians chose which ACE or diuretic the interaction between sex and treatment-group assignment was 0.15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 6,083 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fletcher A, et al., 1988 (279)  
2907053

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim: Monitoring event rates in pts assigned to treatment by clinicians</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria: Age &gt;18 y</th>
<th>1° endpoint: Total mortality incident “IHD”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study type: Observational</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: N/A</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 2,607</td>
<td>Interventions: N/A</td>
<td>Summary: BBs reduced mortality in men but not women (p&lt;0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forette F, et al., 2002 (280)  
12374512

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim: Legacy follow-up for dementia prevention</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria: Age ≥60 y</th>
<th>1° endpoint: Incidence of dementia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study type: RCT with legacy follow-up</td>
<td>Exclusion criteria: HTN 2° to a disorder that needed specific medical or surgical treatment; congestive HF; dissecting aortic aneurysm; serum creatinine concentration at presentation of 180 micromol/l or more; stroke or MI in the y before the study; dementia; substance abuse; any disorder prohibiting a sitting or standing position; any severe concomitant or non-CVD</td>
<td>2° endpoint: Cognitive decline measured by MMSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 2,902 in the legacy follow-up</td>
<td>Intervention: Nitrendipine + HCTZ</td>
<td>Safety endpoint: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparator: Placebo</td>
<td>• Cases Active: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cases Placebo: 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rate 3.3 vs. 7.4 cases/1,000 pt y 0.38 (95% CI: 0.23–0.64; p&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MMSE: No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Study discontinued early for CVD benefit so a legacy follow-up with both groups (off protocol) yielded a follow-up of 3.7 y SBP was 149 mm Hg in treatment vs. 156 mm Hg in control arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary dementia:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compared with the controls, long-term antihypertensive therapy reduced the risk of dementia by 55%, from 7.4–3.3 cases per 1,000 pt-y (43 vs. 21 cases; p&lt;0.001). After adjustment for sex, age, education, and entry BP, the relative HR associated with the use of nitrendipine was 0.38 (95% CI: 0.23, 0.64), p&lt;0.001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of impact on MMSE not surprising given low sensitivity to change and large sample size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Supplement 53. RCTs Comparing Pregnancy (Section 10.2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym (if applicable) Author Year</th>
<th>Study Type/Design*; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Size:** N/A | Inclusion criteria: Pregnant women receiving ACE/ARB in the 1st trimester of pregnancy only and comparable controls  
Exclusion criteria: Use of ACE/ARB later in pregnancy | **1° endpoint:** Adverse outcomes of pregnancy  
**Results:** Adverse events are higher in pregnancies of women who receive ACE/ARB in the first trimester of pregnancy but results are not independent of known confounders | • Fetotoxicity in the first trimester of pregnancy cannot be definitely attributed to ACE/ARB treatment; data are inconclusive.  
• Other known causes of fetotoxicity may be responsible for increased risk in the first trimester (HTN, obesity, undiagnosed DM, other anti-hypertensives) |
| Moretti ME, et al., 2012 22203847 (282) | Study type: Case control comparing pts exposed to ACE/ARB in the first trimester to healthy controls and those on other anti-hypertensives  
**Size:** 388 total pts (equally divided) | Inclusion criteria: Mothers calling into the Mother Risk Program re: medication toxicity during pregnancy  
Exclusion criteria: Non-English speaking | **1° endpoint:** Malformations and adverse fetal outcomes  
**Results:** No difference among groups but study under-powered | • Supportive of above review |
| Ferrer RL, et al., 2000 (283) 11094241   | Study type: Meta-analysis  
**Size:** 46 observational studies and randomized control trials | Inclusion criteria: Pre-specified quality entrance criteria  
Exclusion criteria: N/A | **1° endpoint:** Adverse pregnancy outcomes  
**Results:**  
• Maternal HTN increases risk for 1) perinatal mortality (OR: 3.4:1) and 2) placental abruption (2.1:1)  
• ACEIs are associated with fetopathy (fetal renal failure) | • HTN by itself is associated with adverse perinatal outcomes  
• ACEIs independently are responsible for some outcomes |

*Quality assessment analysis may need to be applied on a case-by-case basis for controversial studies (by ERC chairs).*
### Data Supplement 54. RCT for Older Persons (Section 10.3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2nd Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SPRINT Senior Williamson JD, et al., 2016 (190) 27195814 | Aim: Intensive SBP goal <120 mm Hg vs. standard (SBP goal <140)  
Study type: RCT  
Size: 2,636; 30% met criteria for being classified as ambulatory frail  
Mean follow-up: 3.1 y | Inclusion criteria: Men and women age 75+; mean age 79.8 y; 38% women; 17% black, 74% Caucasian  
Exclusion criteria: Nursing home residents; prevalent DM, stroke, Class III/IV HF, dementia | Intervention: Medications and dietary advice to achieve SBP of <120 mm Hg  
Comparator: Medications and dietary advice to achieve SBP of <140 mm Hg  
• Achieved SBP: Intensive=123.4 mm Hg Standard=134.8 mm Hg | 1st endpoint: Composite CVD outcome (AMI, non-MI ACS, stroke, HF, CVD death.  
Results:  
• 102 events in the intensive treatment group vs. 148 events in the standard treatment group; HR: 0.66; 95% CI: 0.51–0.85 and all-cause mortality (73 deaths vs. 107 deaths, respectively; HR: 0.67; 95% CI: 0.49–0.91. No difference in falls, orthostatic hypotension, or overall SAEs.  
• NNT for 1st outcome=27 and NNT for all-cause mortality=41 | Limitations: Does not apply to nursing home pts or those with dementia or advance  
Conclusions: Intensive SBP is safe and effective for lowering CVD events and total mortality in adults ≥75 y |

### Data Supplement 55. RCTs Comparing Hypertensive Crises and Emergencies (Section 11.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2nd Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CLUE Peacock WF, et al., 2011 (284) 21707983 | Aim: Compare safety and efficacy of IV nicardipine vs. labetalol in the management of acute HTN.  
Study type: RCT | Inclusion criteria: SBP >180 mm Hg on 2 consecutive occasions 10 min apart in the ED.  
• 110 pts randomized to nicardipine; 116 to labetalol. End-organ damage preceded randomization in 63% with no difference between the groups. The target BP range (TR; at the discretion of the | Results: Within 39 min, nicardipine pts reached TR than labetalol pts (91.7 vs. 82.5%; p=0.039). Of 6 BP measurements taken 5 min apart, nicardipine pts had a higher rate of 5 and 6 BP measures in the TR than labetalol pts (47.3 vs. 32.8%);  
Limitations: Study unblinded; large number of pts without end-organ damage (which usually defines a hypertensive emergency); physicians ordered fewer dose titrations of labetalol than nicardipine; thus, lack of BP decline might have been due to insufficient dosing by physicians hesitant to administer successively increasing doses of labetalol as recommended by the FDA. | Limitations: Study unblinded; large number of pts without end-organ damage (which usually defines a hypertensive emergency); physicians ordered fewer dose titrations of labetalol than nicardipine; thus, lack of BP decline might have been due to insufficient dosing by physicians hesitant to administer successively increasing doses of labetalol as recommended by the FDA. |
### Aim

**Liu-DeRyke X, et al., 2013**

- **Aim:** Compare ability of IV nicardipine and labetalol to lower BP in acute hemorrhagic or ischemic stroke.
- **Study type:** RCT (pseudo-randomization)
- **Size:** 54 pts

#### Inclusion criteria:
Pts with acute hemorrhagic or ischemic stroke who were at or exceeded AHA guidelines BP recommendations.

#### Exclusion criteria:
Traumatic brain injury; intracranial neoplasm, received antihypertensive medication within previous 24 h, brain stem herniation, immediate brain death, acute MI, or bradycardia <50 bpm.

#### Results:

- 28 pts randomized to labetalol and 26 to nicardipine. Goal BP defined using the latest consensus recommendations.
- All pts receiving nicardipine achieved BP goal Compared with 61% in the labetalol group (p<0.001). 89% of the nicardipine group achieved goal within 60 min vs. 25% in the labetalol group (p<0.001). The nicardipine group had better maintenance of BP, greater percent of time spent within goal and less BP variability compared with the labetalol group (p<0.001). Less rescue medication had to be given to the nicardipine than the labetalol group (p<0.001).

### Conclusions

Pts treated with nicardipine are more likely to reach the physician-specified TR than those treated with labetalol. In this study (2014), initial SBP was not a predictor of the ability to achieve the pre-specified TR in 30 min. Subgroup analysis demonstrated the similar results for sub-populations with end-organ damage (n=141) and renal dysfunction (n=104). **Limitations:** Very small; pseudo-randomization.

### Conclusions

In acutely hypertensive stroke pts, a superior BP-lowering response was achieved with nicardipine over labetalol. Despite this, there was no significant difference in clinical outcomes.

### Aim

**CATIS**

- **Aim:** Evaluate whether immediate BP reduction in pts with acute ischemic stroke would reduce death and major disability in 14 d or hospital discharge.
- **Study type:** RCT
- **Size:** 4,071 pts

#### Inclusion criteria:
Pts had nonthrombolysed ischemic stroke within 48 h of onset and elevated SBP. Baseline SBP was 166.7 mm Hg in the antihypertensive treatment group and 165.6 mm Hg in the control group.

#### Results:

- This was a Chinese multicenter, single-blinded, blinded endpoints RCT conducted in 26 hospitals in China. 2,038 pts were randomized to receive antihypertensive treatment and 2,033 were randomized to the control group. The trial was designed to test a BP
- In the antihypertensive treatment group, SBP was reduced from 166.7 to 144.7 mm Hg (-12.7%) within 24 h and in the control group from 165.6 to 152.9 mm Hg (-7.2%) (absolute difference -9.1 mm Hg; 95% CI: -10.2– -8.1; p<0.001). Mean SBP was 137.3 mm Hg in the antihypertensive treatment group.

### Limitations:

Study excluded pts with BP ≥220/120 mm Hg, so the results do not apply to such pts. Pts treated acutely with thrombotic therapy were excluded. Trial performed exclusively in Chinese pts.

### Conclusions:

Among pts with acute ischemic stroke, BP reduction with antihypertensive medications, compared to absence of antihypertensive medications, did not reduce the likelihood of death and major disability at 14 d or hospital discharge.
| Study type: RCT | INTERAC-2 | Anderson CS, et al., 2013 (191) | • To compare the management strategy of targeting SBP<140 mm Hg within 1 h with the current guideline strategy of targeting SBP to <180 mm Hg with the use of agents of the physicians’ choosing. | • This was an international, multicenter, prospective randomized open-treatment, blinded endpoint trial. The pts had onset of spontaneous ICH within 6 h of enrollment. | • This outcome: Death or major disability, defined as a score of 3-6 on the modified Rankin scale, at 90 d. | Results: 719 of 1,382 pts receiving intensive treatment as compared to 785 of 1,412 pts receiving guideline-recommended treatment had a 1° outcome event [OR with intensive treatment: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.75–1.01; p=0.06]. Ordinal analysis showed significantly lower modified Rankin scores with intensive treatment (OR for greater disability: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.77–1.00; p=0.04). Mortality was 11.9% in the group receiving intensive treatment and 12.0% in the group receiving guideline-recommended treatment. Nonfatal serious events were not significantly different between the groups. | Limitations: No major limitations. | Conclusions: In pts with ICH, intensive lowering of BP resulted in a borderline significant reduction in the rate of death or severe disability at 90 d. An ordinal analysis of modified Rankin scores indicated improved functional outcomes with intensive lowering of BP. Intensive BP reduction was shown to be safe and to result in significantly better health-related quality of life. |
| Size: 2,839 pts | | | | | | | |
**Study type:** RCT  
**Size:** 104 pts  

- To determine the efficacy and safety of clevidipine vs. standard-of-care (SOC) iv antihypertensive therapy in hypertensive acute HF.  
- This was a randomized, open-label, active control study of clevidipine vs. standard-of-care in ED pts with acute HF with SBP ≥160 mm Hg.

**1° outcome:** Co-1° endpoints were median time to and % attaining a SBP within a prespecified TR at 30 min.

**Results:** More clevidipine pts reached target BP reduction (71%) than did those receiving standard-of-care (37%) and clevidipine was faster to target (p=0.0006). Serious adverse events were similar between clevidipine and standard-of-care.

**Limitations:** Small study, open-label design.

**Conclusions:** In hypertensive acute HF, clevidipine safely and rapidly reduced BP and improved dyspnea more effectively than standard-of-care.

---

**Study Acronym:** SHEP  
**Author:** Applegate WB, et al.  
**Year Published:** 1994 (288)  
**Study Type:** RCT  
**Study Size (N):** 79448

**Aim:** Compare loss of instrumental activities of daily living by SBP  

**Inclusion criteria:** 60–80 y (mean 71.6 y)  

**Intervention:** Chlorothalidone + Atenolol or reserpine  

**1° endpoint:** Loss of dementia-related functions (instrumental activities of daily living)  

**Relevant 2° endpoint:** Incidence of surrogate markers for dementia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Treatment vs. placebo</th>
<th>Study type: RCT</th>
<th>Size: 4,736</th>
<th>Duration: 5 y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td>History and/or signs of major CVDs (e.g., previous MI, coronary artery surgery, major arrhythmias, conduction defect, recent stroke, carotid artery disease, ≥2 TIAs and signs or symptoms in a single neurological distribution); other major diseases (e.g., cancer, alcoholic liver disease, established renal dysfunction) with competing risk factors for the 1° endpoint; stroke; presence of medical management problems (e.g., insulin dependent DM, history of dementia, evidence of alcohol abuse); bradycardia; people maintained on BBs, diuretics, other antihypertensive drugs, anticoagulants.</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo</td>
<td><strong>SBP Treatment/Placebo difference:</strong> -12 mm Hg</td>
<td><strong>Cases:</strong> • Active: 37 • Placebo: 44 • p=0.84 (0.54,1.31) • No cognitive function instrument included in trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Nonsignificant 16% lower incidence of incident instrumental activity of daily living disability. However, assignment to the placebo group and the resulting occurrence of CV events independently predicted missed assessments. However, when 20%–30% and 40%–80% of the subjects who missed the assessment were assumed to be cognitively/functionally impaired, assignment to active treatment reduced the risk of these outcomes. Thus, in the SHEP study, the cognitive and functional evaluations were biased toward the null effect by differential dropout. This might have obscured the appraisal of a protective effect of treatment on the cognitive and functional decline of older hypertensive adults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aims: Incident dementia</th>
<th>Study type: RCT</th>
<th>Size: 2,418 pts</th>
<th>Duration: 2 y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td>HTN 2° to a disorder that needed specific medical or surgical treatment; congestive HF; dissecting aortic aneurysm; serum creatinine concentration at presentation of 180 micromoles/l or more; stroke or MI in the y before the study; dementia; substance abuse; any disorder prohibiting a sitting or standing position; any severe concomitant or non-CVD</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Placebo</td>
<td><strong>SBP Treatment/placebo difference:</strong> -8.3 mm Hg</td>
<td><strong>Cases:</strong> • Active: 11 • Placebo: 21 • (3.8 vs. 7.7 per 1,000 pt-y) • p=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Trial stopped early for positive effect on CVD outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Syst-Eur* Forette F, et al., 1998 (289) 9802273
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Endpoint 1</th>
<th>Endpoint 2</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up)</td>
<td>Legacy follow-up for dementia prevention</td>
<td>≥60 y</td>
<td>Open label follow-up of Syst-Eur pts originally assigned to Nitrendipine ± enalapril ± HCTZ vs. placebo</td>
<td>Incidence of dementia</td>
<td>Cognitive decline measured by MMSE</td>
<td>This legacy follow-up with both groups (off protocol) yielded a follow-up of 3.7 y SBP was 149 mm Hg in treatment vs. 156 mm Hg in control arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forette F, et al., 2002 (280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE</td>
<td>Incident dementia (cognitive decline as 2º outcome)</td>
<td>70–89 y (mean 76 y)</td>
<td>Candesartan ± HCTZ</td>
<td>Incident dementia</td>
<td>Also decline in MMSE</td>
<td>Compared with the controls, long-term antihypertensive therapy reduced the risk of dementia by 55%, from 7.4–3.3 cases per 1,000 pt-y (43 vs. 21 cases; p&lt;0.001). After adjustment for sex, age, education, and entry BP, the RH rate associated with the use of nitrendipine was 0.38; 95% CI: 0.23–0.64; p&lt;0.001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithell H, et al., 2003 (290)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparator: Placebo ± Rx for community based SPB standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>Dementia with or without recurrent stroke</td>
<td>Prior stroke or TIA, any adult age</td>
<td>Perindopril ± indapamide</td>
<td>Dementia alone or with recurrent stroke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dementia alone was not affected in this trial. Only dementia associated with incident cerebrovascular accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tzourio C, et al., 2003 (291)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparator: Placebo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): ≥60 y
- SCOPE: 70–89 y (mean 76 y)
- PROGRESS: Prior stroke or TIA, any adult age

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): HTN 2ºary to a disorder that needed specific medical or surgical treatment; congestive HF; dissecting aortic aneurysm; serum creatinine concentration at presentation of 180 micromoles/l or more; stroke or MI in the y before the study; dementia; substance abuse; any disorder prohibiting a sitting or standing position; any severe concomitant or non-CVD
- SCOPE: Prevalent dementia; 2º HTN, SBP >180 mm Hg, orthostatic hypotension, need for antihypertensive treatment other than hydrochlorothiazide during run-in; stroke or MI within 6 mo; decompensated HF; serum creatinine >180 micromole/l (men) or >140 micromole/l (women);
- PROGRESS: Prior stroke or TIA, any adult age

**Intervention:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): Open label follow-up of Syst-Eur pts originally assigned to Nitrendipine ± enalapril ± HCTZ vs. placebo
- SCOPE: Candesartan ± HCTZ
- PROGRESS: Perindopril ± indapamide

**SBP Treatment/Placebo difference:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): -7.0 mm Hg
- SCOPE: -3.2 mm Hg
- PROGRESS: Not provided in the table

**SBP:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): Treatment arm 149 mm Hg, placebo arm 156 mm Hg
- SCOPE: Achieved SBP in 149 mm Hg in treatment arm, 156 mm Hg in placebo arm
- PROGRESS: Not provided in the table

**1º endpoint:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): Incidence of dementia
- SCOPE: Incident dementia
- PROGRESS: Dementia alone or with recurrent stroke

**Endpoint:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): Cognitive decline measured by MMSE
- SCOPE: Also decline in MMSE
- PROGRESS: Dementia alone or with recurrent stroke

**Dementia Cases:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): Only stroke-related dementia reduction of 34% (95% CI: 3–55), p=0.03.

**Safety endpoint:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): N/A
- SCOPE: N/A
- PROGRESS: N/A

**Cases:**
- Syst-Eur (legacy follow-up): 21 cases active, 43 cases placebo; rate 3.3 vs. 7.4 cases/1,000 pt-y
- SCOPE: 62 cases active, 57 cases placebo; rate 3.8 vs. 7.4 cases/1,000 pt-y
- PROGRESS: N/A
Hypertension in the Very Elderly Trial cognitive function assessment (HYVET-Cog)
Peters R, et al., 2008 (292) 18614402

**Aim:** Incident dementia 2° aim
**Study type:** RCT
**Size:** 3,336
**Duration:** 2.2 y

**Inclusion criteria:** ≥80 y

**Exclusion criteria:** Prevalent dementia

**Intervention:** Indapamide ± Perindopril
**Comparator:** Placebo

**SBP treatment/placebo difference:**
- 15 mm Hg
  - Target SBP 150 mm Hg
  - Achieved SPB in treatment arm=146 mm Hg

**1° endpoint:** Incident dementia

**Events:**
- Treatment=126
- Placebo=137
- 14% reduction not significant
  HR: 0.86 (95% CI: 0.67–1.09)

**Summary:** Stopped early due to benefit in 1° outcome.

---

**Study Acronym; Author; Year Published**

**POISE Study Group, et al., 2008 (293) 16875901**

**Aim:** Definitively establish the effects of BB therapy in pts undergoing noncardiac surgery

**Study Type; Study Size (N)**

**Patient Population**

**Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)**

**Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; & 95% CI)**

**1° endpoint:** Composite of CV death, NF MI, NF cardiac arrest
**Results:** Fewer pts taking metoprolol succinate than placebo reached the 1° endpoint, HR: 0.84; 95% CI 0.70–0.99; p=0.0399.

**Limitations:** No data for pts <45 y, no data for pts undergoing cardiac surgery

**Conclusions:** This study highlights combined benefits and
### Study 1: RCT

**Study type:** A systematic review and meta-analysis  
**Size:** 30 observational studies  
**Patient Population:** Inclusion criteria: Available crude OR for association between HTN and periop CV complications along with variance  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A. Studies defining HTN solely on admission BP  

#### 1st endpoint: Periop CV complications  
**Results:** Pts with SBP >180 or DBP >110 mm Hg more prone to periop ischemia, arrhythmias, and CV lability OR: 1.35 (1.17–1.56). But there was no evidence that deferring surgery in such pts reduces periop risk.  
**Summary/Conclusion:** Pts with SBP >180 or DBP >110 mm Hg more prone to periop ischemia, arrhythmias, and CV lability OR: 1.35 (1.17–1.56). But there was no evidence that deferring surgery in such pts reduces periop risk. Conclude that planned surgery should not be deferred on basis of single admission BP. History of target organ damage more important than preop BP in predicting complications.

### Study 2: Literature review

**Study type:** Literature review  
**Size:** 72 pts BB s, 148 pts Clonidine  
**Inclusion criteria:** Symptoms on cessation of BBs or clonidine  
**Exclusion criteria:** CP Bypass, carotid endarterectomy  

#### 1st endpoint: CV symptoms or events after abrupt cessation of BBs or clonidine  
**Results:** Symptoms of anxiety, chest pain with tachycardia, HTN, myocardial ischemia; less frequently MI may occur on abrupt withdrawal of BB or Clonidine  
**Summary/Conclusion:** Summary of case reports. CV events such as tachycardia, HTN, angina, myocardial ischemia or infarction can occur after abrupt withdrawal of BB or Clonidine. No information on incidence.

### Study 3: Prospective observational study

**Study type:** Prospective observational study  
**Size:** 140 pts  
**Inclusion criteria:** Review of 140 pts undergoing vascular surgery at university hospitals  
**Exclusion criteria:** N/A  

#### 1st endpoint: In-hospital mortality  
**Results:** 50% mortality in 8 pts with BB discontinued vs. 1.5% mortality in pts with BB continued. OR: 65.0; p=0.001  
**Summary/Conclusion:** Discontinuing BB immediately after vascular surgery may increase the risk of postoperative CV morbidity and mortality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindenauer PK, et al., 2005 (297)</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort</td>
<td>122,338 pts</td>
<td>Age &gt;18 y, major noncardiac surgery</td>
<td>In-hospital mortality</td>
<td>On BB therapy, mortality in low risk (RCRI =0) OR: 1.43 (1.29–1.58) to high risk (RCRI) OR 4 or higher OR 0.57 (0.42–0.76)</td>
<td>Periop BB therapy is associated with a reduced risk of in-hospital death among high-risk, but not low-risk pts undergoing major noncardiac surgery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace AW, et al., 2010 (298)</td>
<td>Retrospective study</td>
<td>38,779 operations</td>
<td>All surgical pts at SF VAMC</td>
<td>30-d and 1-y mortality</td>
<td>Addition of BB therapy associated with reduction in 30-d OR: 0.52 (0.33–0.83; p=0.006) and 1-y OR: 0.64 (0.51–0.79; p&lt;0.0001) mortality</td>
<td>Periop BB therapy based upon periop Cardiac Risk Reduction protocol is associated with a reduction in 30-d and 1-y mortality. Periop withdrawal of BB is associated with increased mortality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersson C, et al 2014 (299)</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>28,263 pts</td>
<td>Pts with IHD undergoing noncardiac surgery</td>
<td>30-d risk of MACE and all-cause mortality</td>
<td>Among pts with HF BB Rx HR: 0.78 (0.67–0.90) for MACE and all-cause mortality 0.80 (0.70-0.92) all-cause mortality; and with recent Hx MI HR: 0.60 (0.42–0.86) MACE, 0.80 (0.53–1.21) all-cause mortality</td>
<td>Among pts with IHD undergoing noncardiac surgery, use of BB associated with lower risk of 30-d MACE and mortality only among those with HF or recent MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoeks SE, et al., 2007 (300)</td>
<td>Prospective survey</td>
<td>771 pts</td>
<td>Pts 18 y and older undergoing peripheral vascular surgery</td>
<td>1-y mortality</td>
<td>1 y BB use had lower mortality c/w non-BB users (HR: 0.4; 95% CI: 0.2–0.7); BB withdrawal had increased mortality c/w nonusers (HR: 2.7; 95% CI: 1.2–5.9)</td>
<td>Periop BB use was independently associated with lower risk of 1-y mortality while periop withdrawal was associated with higher risk of 1-y mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett TW, et al 2007 (301)</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort study</td>
<td>3,062 pts</td>
<td>Pts undergoing vascular surgery</td>
<td>Long-term mortality, median follow-up 2.7 y</td>
<td>Use of BB over study period c/w no BB reduced mortality (HR: 0.84; 95% CI: 0.73–0.96; p=0.0106)</td>
<td>The use of propensity-adjusted BB c/w use reduced long-term mortality by 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London MJ, et al. 2013 (302)</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort analysis</td>
<td>136,745 pts</td>
<td>Pts undergoing major noncardiac surgery</td>
<td>All-cause 30-d mortality and cardiac morbidity (cardiac arrest, or non-Q wave MI</td>
<td>BB therapy was associated with lower rates of 30-d all-cause mortality in pts with ≥2 Revised Cardiac Index Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exclusion criteria
N/A

### Results
BB exposure lower 30-d mortality in pts with 2 or more RCIF (RR: 0.63; 95% CI: 0.50–0.80; p<.001)

### Study type: Matched observational study

#### Size: 79,228 pts

#### Inclusion criteria: Pts with noncardiac surgery

#### Exclusion criteria: N/A

#### 1° endpoint: Intraoperative and post-operative upper airway complications, in-hospital complications, and 30-d mortality

#### Results: ACEI usage was not associated with either 30-d mortality (OR: 0.93; 95% CI: 0.73–1.19; p=0.22)

- No association found between use of ACEIs and intraoperative or postoperative upper airway complications, in-hospital complications, or 30-d mortality

### Study type: Review of observational and randomized studies

#### Size: 434 pts

#### Inclusion criteria: Adult pts, most >18 y, nonemergent surgery, using ACEI or ARA chronically

#### Exclusion criteria: N/A

#### 1° endpoint: Hypotension requiring vasopressors at or shortly after induction of anesthesia

#### Results: Pts receiving preoperative ACEI or ARA were more likely to develop hypotension requiring vasopressors at or shortly after induction of anesthesia. Sufficient data were not present to assess other outcomes.

### Study type: International prospective cohort

#### Size: 14,687 pts

#### Inclusion criteria: Pts at least 44 y undergoing noncardiac surgery requiring overnight hospital admission

#### Exclusion criteria: N/A

#### 1° endpoint: 30-d all-cause death, stroke, or myocardial injury

#### Results: ACEI/ARB users who withheld ACEI/ARB in the 24 H before surgery were less likely to suffer death, MI or stroke 0.82; 95% CI: 0.70–0.96; p=0.01

- Withholding ACEI/ARB before major noncardiac surgery was associated with a lower risk of death and postoperative vascular events.

### Data Supplement 59. RCTs of Adherence and Compliance with Fixed Dose Combinations Regimens (Section 12.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
**COMFORT**
Matsumura K, et al., 2012 (306) 22447014

**Aim:** Evaluate whether a combination pill of antihypertensive drugs improves medication adherence in hypertensive pts vs. use of single agents.

**Inclusion criteria:**
- ≥20 y agent with HTN
- Could be treated with an ARB and diuretic

**Exclusion criteria:**
- Extremely high BP (≥200 mm Hg SBP or ≥120 mm Hg DBP)
- Serious renal or liver dysfunction
- Taking >4 tablets, excluding study drugs

**Intervention:** Combination tablet of (Losartan 50 mg/HCTZ 12.5 mg; n=103)

**Comparator:** ARB and a thiazide diuretic as separate agents (n=104)

**1° endpoint:** Adherence rates as assessed by pill count 98% in both groups (p=0.89) over entire study period (0–6 mo).

**2° endpoint:** No significant difference in mean SBP and DBP (0.3 and 0.1 mm Hg respectively; p=0.84/0.96).

**Study limitations:**
- Adherence rate very high for both groups and likely does not represent real-world rates.
- Short duration (6 mo) and thus does not provide much information on medication persistence (continuation of drug therapy long-term)
- Possible selection bias with 2 run-in phases
- Different healthcare system (Japan) with medications provided through public medical insurance

---

**Data Supplement 60. Nonrandomized Trials, Observational Studies, and/or Registries of Antihypertensive Medication Adherence Strategies**
(Section 12.1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Schroeder K, et al., 2004 (307) 15078641 | Study type: Systematic review of RCTs. Size: 38 studies testing 58 different interventions containing data on 15,519 pts; 9 studies assessed simplification of dosing regimen | Inclusion criteria:
- Database search for all RCTs, all languages, in Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, MEDLINE, EMBASE, and CINAHL (all y through 2002)
- Population of interest were pts with essential HTN in primary care, outpatient, or community setting
- Interventions aimed to increase adherence to BP-lowering medication
- Reported outcome was adherence | 1° endpoints: Adherence as assessed by pill counts, self-report, or electronic monitoring system

**Results:**
- 9 studies assessed simplification of dosing regimen, 7 of which compared adherence associated with frequency of administration (twice daily vs. once daily [n=6] or 3 times daily vs. twice daily [n=1]).
- All studies examining effect of dosing frequency demonstrated improved adherence (range: 8%, 19.6% improvement; p<0.01 for all).

- Adherence to antihypertensive medication was significantly improved with once daily vs. multiple daily dosing regimens. Most studies used an electronic monitoring system. Limitations in the systematic review include heterogeneity in pts, interventions, and outcomes, and the majority of studies were of low quality. In addition, different definitions of adherence in the RCTs make it difficult to examine the precise relationship of adherence to BP control. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type: Meta-analysis</th>
<th>Study type: Systematic review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 8 studies involving a total of 11,485 observations (1,830 for once daily dosing, 4,405 for twice daily dosing, 4,147 for &gt;twice daily dosing, 9,655 for maximum daily dose).</td>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 76 studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1º studies that compared adherence rates between different dosing regimens</td>
<td>- Compliance rates assessed using electronic monitoring device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prospective trials (e.g., RCTs, cohort studies), retrospective studies, database analyses</td>
<td>- Data pooled to calculate mean compliance with once daily, twice daily, 3 times daily, and 4 times daily dosing regimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Any published study using an instrument to measure adherence, but must have used some measurement tool in each comparison group.</td>
<td>1º endpoints: Mean compliance rates by prescribed dose regimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adherence rates to solid, oral dosage form for treatment of HTN of at least 10 wk duration</td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1º endpoints:</strong> Medication adherence rates compared between once daily and maximum daily dose, once daily and twice daily, twice daily and &gt;twice daily</td>
<td>- 26 studies evaluated CVD; 17 HTN only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average adherence rates with once daily dosing were greater compared to maximum daily dose regimens (91.4% [SD=2.2%] vs. 83.2% [SD=3.5%]; z=4.46; p&lt;0.001.)</td>
<td>- For all studies, mean dose-taking compliance defined as number of appropriate doses taken during each d was 79% for once daily, 69% for twice daily, 65% for 3 times daily and 51% for 4 times daily dosing (p≤0.001 for once daily vs. 3 times daily, once daily vs. 4 times daily, and twice daily vs. 4 times daily; no statistically significant between once daily vs. twice daily or twice daily vs. 3 times daily dosing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average adherence rates with once daily dosing were greater compared to twice daily dosing regimens (92.7% [SD=2.3%] vs. 87.1% [SD=2.9%]; z=2.22; p=0.026.)</td>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was no difference in adherence rates between regimens dosed twice daily or greater than twice daily (90.8% [SD=4.7%] vs. 86.3% [SD=6.7%]; z=1.82; p=0.069).</td>
<td>- Antihypertensive regimens dosed once daily were associated with significantly improved adherence compared to twice daily or maximum daily dose regimens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iskedjian M, et al., 2002 (308) 11911560

Claxton AJ, et al., 2001 (309) 11558866
### Sherrill B, et al., 2011 (310) 22142349

**Study type:** Meta-analysis to compare health resource use cost, adherence, and persistence between groups of pts taking antihypertensives as SPCs vs. free-equivalent components.

**Size:** 15 retrospective database studies in HTN

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Database search of PubMed, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library, and EconLit (no limit on publication dates)
- English-language publications
- Clinical trial or observational study (e.g., database or registry) that compared SPC with free-equivalent components
- Data on compliance, adherence, persistence, and/or health care costs and/or resource use (unadjusted cost analyses)

**1° endpoints:** Health care costs, adherence, persistence

**Results:**
- All-cause total costs were estimated to be lower with SPC vs. free-equivalent components free-equivalent components by $2,039 (95% CI: $1030, $3047) in 2009 dollars and HTN/CV-related costs were lower by $709 (95% CI: $117, $1,032), 2009 dollars.
- Adherence as measured by MPR was greater for SPC vs. free-equivalent components (total inverse variance 13.31; 95% CI: 8.26–18.35).
- Persistence to therapy was greater with SPC than free-equivalent components (risk ratio: 2.13, 95% CI: 1.11–4.09).

**Endpoints:**

- This large observational study found that medication compliance/persistence to antihypertensives was improved with SPC compared to FC using an adjusted multivariate regression model. All-cause medical costs were also decreased with the use of SPC antihypertensives, although prescription costs were greater.

### Yang W, et al., 2010 (311) 20629600

**Study type:** Observational analysis using multivariate regression-adjusted analysis to compare compliance/persistence, health care resources, and cost associated with SPC or FC antihypertensives over 6 mo study period both nationally and at the state level.

**Size:** 579,581 pts (382,476 SPC and 197,375 FC) identified in MarketScan Database (2006–2008)

**Inclusion criteria:**
- Pts in MarketScan Database
- Diagnosis of HTN based on ICD-9 codes 401.xx and 405.xx
- Pts initiated on any of the following SPC treatments or the same FC: ARB + CCB, ARB + HCTZ, ACEI + HCTZ
- For SPC cohort, at least 1 prescription filled in observational window
- For FC cohort, pts filled individual components separately within 15 d of each other and with 15 d overlap of supply
- ≥18 y

**Endpoints:**

- 1° outcome: Compliance and persistence with the index therapy (SPC or FC) measured by MPR within 6 mo of index date
- 2° outcomes: Healthcare resource utilization (number of all-cause hospitalizations, number ER visits, number CV hospitalizations, and CV-related ER visits) and health care costs (all cause medical costs, all-prescription drug costs, CV-related medical service costs, and HTN prescription-related drug costs)

**Results:**
- Compliance nationally as assessed by MPR was improved in pts taking SPC vs. FC antihypertensives (difference=11.6%; 95% CI: 11.4%–11.7%).
| Gupta, et al., 2010 (312) | **Study type:** Meta-analysis to assess compliance, adherence, persistence, BP control, and safety with FDC antihypertensives compared to their free components  
**Size:** 15 studies (n=32,331) with ≥1 evaluated outcome; 3 cohort studies and 2 trials of compliance (n=17,999); 3 cohort studies on persistence (n=12,653); 5 trials of adverse drug effects of FDCs (n=1,775); 9 trials of BP change (n=1,671)  
**Inclusion criteria:**  
- Database search of PubMed (1966–February 2008), Web of Science (1970 to April 2008), and the Cochrane Controlled Trial (1800–April 2008).  
- Clinical trials or cohort studies included if published in English and compared an FDC of hypertensive agents with free-drug combination of its components.  
- Extractable data reported including compliance (or adherence), persistence, BP-lowering effects, adverse effects | **Inclusion criteria:**  
- Continuous eligibility in database for 6 mo after index date  
- Valid 3-digit zip code in database  
- Treatment discontinuation rates were lower with SPC vs. FC antihypertensives (40.7% vs. 59.3%; 95% CI: 0.46–0.48).  
- There were fewer all-cause hospitalizations and ER visits in SPC vs. FC pts IRR: 0.77 (95% CI: 0.75–0.79) and IRR: 0.87 (95% CI: 0.86, 0.89), respectively.  
- All-cause medical costs were reduced with SPC vs. FC (-$208; 95% CI: -$302– -$114), but antihypertensive prescription costs were greater ($53; 95% CI: $51–$55).  
- **1st endpoint:**  
  - Compliance (or adherence) and persistence to therapy  
  - BP-lowering efficacy  
  - Adverse effects  

**Results:**  
- Use of FDC therapy was associated with a 21% increase in compliance, both in the cohort studies (n=5) and clinical trials (OR: 1.21; 95% CI: 1.00–1.47) and (OR: 1.21; 95% CI: 1.03–1.43). There was a 50% increase in persistence with therapy, but this was not statistically significant (OR: 1.54; 95% CI: 0.95–2.49). Analysis of all 6 retrospective cohort studies indicated that FDC therapy was associated with a 29% increase in compliance and persistence to therapy (OR: 1.29; 95% CI: 1.11–1.50). No sign of heterogeneity of publication bias.  
- FDC therapy was associated with a nonsignificant reduction in SBP (-4.1 mm Hg; 95% CI: -9.8–1.5 mm Hg; p=0.15) and DBP (-3.1 mm Hg; 95% CI: -7.1–0.9 mm Hg; p=0.13) compared to free-drug combinations. Strong evidence of heterogeneity but no evidence of publication bias.  
- FDC therapy was associated with a 20% nonsignificant decrease in adverse effects (OR: 0.80; 95% CI: 0.67–0.95).  

- Use of FDC therapy is associated with significant improvements in compliance and persistence to antihypertensive therapy and possible improvement in BP control and decreased risk of adverse effects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria:</th>
<th>1st endpoint:</th>
<th>Results:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analysis to assess if compliance is improved with FDC therapy compared to free-drug regimens in chronic diseases including HTN, HIV, tuberculosis, and DM</td>
<td>Database search of MEDLINE (1966–2005)</td>
<td>Compliance, considered as either adherence or persistence to medication therapy</td>
<td>Use of FDC therapy was associated with a 26% decreased risk of noncompliance vs. free-drug combinations (pooled RR: 0.74 (95% CI: 0.69, 0.80), p&lt;0.0001) in all diseases states. There was no evidence of heterogeneity. In hypertensive pts, FDC was associated with 24% decreased risk of noncompliance (pooled RR: 0.76 (95% CI: 0.71, 0.81), p&lt;0.0001) compared to free-drug regimen. There was no evidence of publication bias. Marked heterogeneity in how compliance was measured among studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 studies total (n=20,242), 4 of which were in hypertensive populations (n=17,175)</td>
<td>Studies included if published in English and compared an FDC with free-drug combination of its components and reported medication compliance (adherence) or persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type:</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria:</td>
<td>Endpoints:</td>
<td>Results:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective, multicenter, observational study of pts converted from free-drug combinations of an ARB and amlodipine to the same product as a FDC.</td>
<td>Outpatients with essential HTN</td>
<td>Adherence to antihypertensive therapy as measured by self-reporting</td>
<td>Use of FDC with an ARB and amlodipine was associated with improved adherence, lower BP, and decreased health care costs compared to free-drug combination therapy. Limitations to this study include the observational design, low numbers of pts, use of self-reported adherence, short follow-up period, non-U.S. country with a different health care system (Japan), and very high baseline rate of adherence (~95%) as well post-switch to FDC (~99%), which is not what is seen in usual practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size: 196 pts</td>
<td>Self-measured home BP</td>
<td>Self-monitored BP measurements and clinical BP measurements before and after switch to FDC antihypertensive therapy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prescribed FDC of an ARB (8 mg candesartan, 80 mg valsartan, or 40 mg telmisartan) and 5 mg) and 5 mg amlodipine</td>
<td>Drug costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pts divided into 2 groups: Group 1 received an ARB and amlodipine in the morning as free drug combinations and Group 2 took ARB in the morning and amlodipine in the evening. After 1 mo, both groups converted to once daily FDC product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe renal or liver dysfunction</td>
<td>Self-monitoring BP measurements taken during early morning was lower with FDC compared to free-drug combinations (-5 mm Hg SBP, -2 mm Hg DBP; p&lt;0.01 for both)</td>
<td>Use of FDC with an ARB and amlodipine was associated with improved adherence, lower BP, and decreased health care costs compared to free-drug combination therapy. Limitations to this study include the observational design, low numbers of pts, use of self-reported adherence, short follow-up period, non-U.S. country with a different health care system (Japan), and very high baseline rate of adherence (~95%) as well post-switch to FDC (~99%), which is not what is seen in usual practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe HF</td>
<td>Average clinic BP was lower with FDC compared to free-drug combination (-5 mm Hg SBP, -2 mm Hg SBP; p&lt;0.01).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prescription of time-specific packs</td>
<td>Self-reported adherence was improved with FDC vs. free-combination agents (~99% vs. 95% p&lt;0.01). SBP was significantly lower in the group with improved adherence (~7.5 mm Hg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
| Mazzaglia G, et al., 2009 (315) 19805653 | **Study type:** Retrospective cohort study | **Inclusion criteria:** Newly diagnosed and treated hypertensive pts ≥35 y initially free of CVD identified from Italian general pt registry. | **1° endpoint:** Describe adherence to antihypertensive therapy and its associate with concurrent drug use, comorbidities, and CV risk factors. Adherence was estimated by calculating the proportion of days which pt had pills available during the follow-up. **Results:** At baseline (6 mo after index diagnosis), adherence rates were high (≥80% proportion of days covered) in 8.1% of pts, intermediate (40-79% proportion of d covered) in 4.5%, and low (≤40% proportion of d covered) in 51%. Multiple drug treatment (1.62; 95% CI: 1.43–1.83), dyslipidemia (1.52; 95% CI: 1.24–1.87), DM (1.40; 95% CI: 1.15–1.71), obesity (1.50; 95% CI: 1.26–1.78) and antihypertensive combination therapy (1.29; 95% CI: 1.15–1.45) were associated with high adherence to treatment (p<0.001). |
| Jackson KC, et al., 2008 (316) 18803997 | **Study type:** Retrospective cohort study | **Inclusion criteria:** ≥18 y and diagnosis of HTN • Benefit-eligible for pharmacy claims • Antihypertensive naive (no prescription fill for antihypertensive drug ≥110 d prior to index date) • Received 1 of 3 regimens: 1.) 2 pill regimen with valsartan + amlodipine, 2.) 2-pill regimen with valsartan/HCTZ in FDC + amlodipine, 3.) 3-pill regimen with valsartan + HCTZ + amlodipine as free-drug components | **1° endpoint:** Adherence as measured by MPR **Results:** 224 pts received valsartan + amlodipine, 619 received valsartan/HCTZ + amlodipine, and 65 received valsartan + HCTZ + amlodipine. MPR ratios were 75.4% with valsartan + amlodipine, 73.1% with valsartan/HCTZ + amlodipine, and 60.5% with valsartan + HCTZ + amlodipine (p=0.005). Older age was associated with improved MPR (75.2% for those ≥64 y. vs. 69.6% for 18 to <36 y; p=0.023). |

• Health care costs were decreased by 31% per pt from 17,075 yen ($216.93 USD; Aug. 2012) to 11,815 yen ($150.10 USD; Aug. 2012) over the 3 mo period.
Exclusion criteria: Pts who received <2 prescription fills, did not continuously have prescriptions refilled for each medication, or switched from 1 medication to another without a time overlap.

Dickson M, et al., 2008 (317) 18303937

Study type: Retrospective cohort study
Size: 5,704 pts

Inclusion criteria:
- 65–100 y on index date
- Received at least 2 prescriptions for study drugs (amlodipine/benazepril FDC n=2336) or DHP-CCB and ACEI as separate agents [n=3368] between 1997–2001
- Continuously eligible for Medicaid for 12 mo following index date

Exclusion criteria:
- >180 d of hospitalization
- <30 d of study drug supply
- Any nursing home claims during the 12 mo follow-up period

1° endpoint: Determine rates of compliance (MPR) and total costs of care (defined as sum of payments for Medicaid claims for ambulatory care, hospital claims, prescription drug claims, and Medicare ross claims) in pts treated with FDC amlodipine/benazepril vs. a DHP-CCB and ACEI prescribed as free-combination agents.

Results: MPR was significantly higher for pts receiving FDC compared with free-combination therapy (63.5% vs. 49%; p<0.05). Average total cost of care (2002 value) was $3,179 with FDC compared to $5,236 with free-combination agents (p<0.0001). Multivariate regression analysis indicated an increase of 0.5% for each 1-unit increase in MPR, and for each comorbidity there was a 10.4% increase. Total cost of care for FDC group was 12.5% lower than free-combination group (p<0.003)

FDC combination therapy with amlodipine/benazepril was associated with better compliance than a DHP-CCB and ACEI as free-combination agents. FDC was also associated with lower total costs of care.

Data Supplement 61. RCTs and Meta-analysis on Strategies to Promote Lifestyle Modification (Section 12.1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint; Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artinian NT, et al., 2010 (318) 20625115</td>
<td>Aim: To provide evidence-based recommendations on implementing PA and dietary interventions among adults,</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Included studies were limited to adult pts ≥18 y; English language; randomized controlled or quasi-experimental designs</td>
<td>Cognitive-behavioral strategies for promoting behavior change including Goal Setting, Self-Monitoring, Frequent and Prolonged Contact, Feedback and Reinforcement, Self-Efficacy Enhancement, Incentives, Modeling, Problem Solving, Relapse Prevention, Motivational</td>
<td>• Variable, too numerous to summarize here.</td>
<td>• Variable, too numerous to summarize here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including adults of racial/ethnic minority and/or socioeconomically disadvantaged populations.

**Study type:** Literature review, evidence synthesis and recommendations using ACC/AHA evidence grading.

**Size:** 70 studies, including 65 RCTs published from 1997–2007.

**Exclusion criteria:** Feeding trials, observational studies of specific nutrients, and observational studies of aerobic capacity were excluded. Given the varying goals and outcomes of the different identified intervention studies, when possible we used a common measure of effect size to quantify and compare the success of each intervention.

**Comparator:** Usual care or other comparison group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Usual care or other comparison group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Supplement 62. RCTs, Meta-analyses, and Systematic Reviews on the Effect of Structured, Team-based Care Interventions for Hypertension Control (Section 12.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eckel RH, et al., 2013 (319) 24239922</td>
<td>Document: Guideline</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: N/A</td>
<td>Comparator: Usual care or other comparison group</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownstein JN, et al., 2007 (320) 17478270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Examine the effectiveness of community health workers in supporting the care of pts with HTN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Systematic review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong> 14 studies, including 8 RCTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Studies examining the effects of an intervention involving community health workers on the care of pts with HTN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> Studies that focused exclusively on outcomes among community health workers and those involving peers who merely led support groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> Community health workers as HTN care team members. Community health workers were broadly defined as health workers who were trained as part of an intervention, had no formal paraprofessional designation, and had relationship with the community being served. The community health workers, predominantly women, were recruited from the community, and resembled the pts in race/ethnicity and socioeconomic background. Roles included: (1) providing health education and information to pts and families; (2) ensuring that pts received services necessary for BP control; (3) providing direct services, including measuring and monitoring BP; (4) providing social support to the pts and their family members; and (5) serving as mediators between pts and the healthcare and social service systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> Usual care or other comparison group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Differences between groups in BP control groups favored community health worker groups over control and ranged from 4%–46% over 6–24 mo, across 7 RCTs; though 1 RCT showed no difference between groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2° endpoints:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appointment keeping: significant improvements ranging from 19%–39% (relative changes) over 12–24 mo in community health worker intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adherence to medications: Range of findings included significant improvement in community health worker intervention group compared with control, between-group differences ranged from 8%–14%; 26% greater compliance among pts receiving intense community health worker interventions; and 17% significant improvement in adherence to medication with counseling by community health workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> High level of heterogeneity of the populations, settings, interventions, and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Including community health workers as part of the HTN care team resulted in significant improvements BP control, appointment keeping, and adherence to antihypertensive medications, primarily among low income, urban African Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1° endpoint</td>
<td>1° Safety endpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter BL, et al., 2009 (321) 198548431</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: Determine potency of interventions for BP involving nurses and pharmacists</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria</strong>: RCT of team-based HTN care involving nurse or pharmacist intervention</td>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong>: Team-based HTN care involving nurse or pharmacist intervention in nearly all studies involving nurses or pharmacists in clinics, consistent and dedicated case management activities were provided that were distinct from traditional nursing or pharmacist duties. However, pharmacists in community pharmacies usually had to incorporate the intervention with traditional medication dispensing functions.</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint</strong>: OR (95% CI) for controlled BP were nurses: 1.69 (1.48, 1.93); pharmacists within primary care clinics: 2.17 (1.75, 2.68); and community pharmacists: 2.89 (1.83, 4.55). Mean (SD) reductions in SBP were: nurse intervention, 5.84 (8.05) mm Hg; pharmacists in clinics, 7.76 (7.81) mm Hg; and community pharmacists, 9.31 (5.00) mm Hg. There were no significant differences between nurse and pharmacist effects (p≥0.19).</td>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong>: Usual care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark CE, et al., 2010 (322) 20732968</td>
<td><strong>Aim</strong>: Review trials of nurse led interventions for HTN in primary care to clarify the evidence base, establish whether nurse prescribing is an important intervention</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria</strong>: RCT of nursing intervention for HTN</td>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong>: Interventions were categorized as nurse support delivered by either telephone, community monitoring or nurse led clinics. These were held in either primary care or 2º care. 1 study used alternate</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint</strong>: Compared with usual care, interventions that included a stepped treatment algorithm showed greater reductions in SBP (weighted MD -8.2 mm Hg [95% CI: -11.5—-4.9]);</td>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong>: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type:</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>32 RCTs of nursing intervention for HTN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sessions with nurses at home and in general practice. 14 studies included a stepped treatment algorithm and 9 included nurse prescribing in the protocol.  

**Comparator:** Usual care

- Nurse prescribing showed greater reductions in SBP, −8.9 mm Hg, (95% CI: −12.5–−5.3), and DBP, −4.0 mm Hg, (95% CI: −5.3–−2.7);
- Telephone monitoring showed higher achievement of BP targets (RR: 1.24; 95% CI: 1.08–1.43);
- Community monitoring showed greater reductions in (weighted MD) SBP, −4.8 mm Hg, (95% CI: −7.0–−2.7), and DBP, −3.5 mm Hg, (95% CI: −4.5–−2.5).

**Safety endpoint:** N/A

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Systematic review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>52 studies of team-based primary care for pts with 1° HTN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aim: Examine current evidence on the effectiveness of team-based care in improving BP outcomes (update of prior systematic review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type:</th>
<th>Systematic review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Inclusion criteria:** Study of team-based care; conducted in a high-income economy; reported at least 1 BP outcome of interest; included a comparison group or had an interrupted time-series design with at least 2 measurements before and after the intervention; targeted populations with 1° HTN or populations with comorbid conditions such as DM as long as the 1° focus of the intervention was BP control; and did not interfere with usual care.

**Intervention:** Team-based care was defined as adding new staff or changing the roles of existing staff to work with a PCP for HTN care. Team members who collaborated with pts and PCPs were predominantly nurses (28 studies); pharmacists (15 studies); both nurses and pharmacists (5 studies); or community health workers, integrated care managers, or behavioral interventionists (4 studies). Key roles included HTN medication management, active pt follow-up, and adherence and self-management support. Interventions were usually 1° endpoint:

- Proportion with controlled BP: Absolute percentage point (pct pt) change in pts with controlled BP from 33 studies comparing team-based care to usual care: median effect estimate was 12 pct pts (IQI=3.2–20.8 pct pts). Most individual effect estimates in the favorable direction were significant (p<0.05).
- Reduction in SBP (44 studies): The key estimate was 5.4 mm Hg (IQI=2.0–7.2 mm Hg). Most individual effect estimates were significant (p<0.05).
- Reduction in DBP: The overall median reduction in SBP, greater reductions in SBP and DBP, and, although pooling of data was not possible, greater achievement of study BP targets.

**2° endpoints:** Compared with pts in usual care, the proportion of pts receiving team-based care with “high” medication adherence (defined as taking medications as prescribed >80% of the time) increased by a median of 16.3 pct pts (9 studies).

**Stratified analyses for BP outcomes:**

- Team member role in medication management: Larger improvements in BP outcomes than overall estimates were demonstrated when team members could make changes to medications independent of the PCP or team members could provide medication recommendations and make changes with the PCP’s approval as compared to team members providing only adherence support and information on medication and HTN.

---

Proia KK, et al., 2014 (323) 24933494

2° endpoints: Compared with pts in usual care, the proportion of pts receiving team-based care with “high” medication adherence (defined as taking medications as prescribed >80% of the time) increased by a median of 16.3 pct pts (9 studies).

**Stratified analyses for BP outcomes:**

- Team member role in medication management: Larger improvements in BP outcomes than overall estimates were demonstrated when team members could make changes to medications independent of the PCP or team members could provide medication recommendations and make changes with the PCP’s approval as compared to team members providing only adherence support and information on medication and HTN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santschi V, et al., 2014 (324)</td>
<td>Assess effect of pharmacists interventions on BP and determine potential determinants of heterogeneity</td>
<td>RCT of pharmacist intervention delivered by a pharmacist alone or in collaboration with other healthcare professionals</td>
<td>Pharmacist intervention delivered by a pharmacist alone or in collaboration with other healthcare professionals. Pharmacist interventions mainly included pt education, feedback to physician, and medication management.</td>
<td>Pharmacist interventions were associated with a large reduction in systolic and DBP of -7.6 mm Hg (95% CI: -9.0--6.3 mm Hg) and -3.9 mm Hg (95% CI: -5.9--2.8 mm Hg), respectively</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Included studies reported significant differences in pt demographics between intervention and comparison groups at baseline, possible contamination within intervention and comparison groups, and issues related to inadequate description of populations and implemented interventions.</td>
<td>There is strong evidence that team-based care is effective in improving BP outcomes, especially when pharmacists and nurses are part of the team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exclusion criteria:** Inclusion of populations with 2° HTN (e.g., pregnancy) or with a history of CVD (e.g., MI)

**Comparator:** Usual care

DBP was 1.8 mm Hg (IQR=0.7–3.2 mm Hg) from 38 studies.

Safety endpoint: No harm to pts was identified from team-based care interventions in the included studies or the broader literature.

- Number of team members added: Adding ≥2 members demonstrated larger improvements in the proportion of pts with controlled BP and reduction in DBP compared to adding only 1; median reductions in SBP were similar regardless of team size.
- Improvement in the proportion of pts with controlled BP was similar for studies from both healthcare and community settings.

**Limitations:**

- Studied variance in approaches to BP monitoring and management.
- Potential for selection bias due to sample size.
- Limited data on long-term outcomes.

**Summary:**

- There is strong evidence that team-based care is effective in improving BP outcomes, especially when pharmacists and nurses are part of the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>1° endpoint</th>
<th>Safety endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Shaw RJ, et al., 2014 (325) 25023250

**Aim:** Determine whether nurse-managed protocols are effective for outpatient management of pts with DM, HTN, and hyperlipidemia (HTN RCT outcomes only included here)

**Study type:** Meta-analysis

**Size:** 12 RCTs, with 10,362 pts, of nurse-managed protocols for outpatient management of HTN

**Inclusion criteria:** RCT of nurse-managed protocols for outpatient management of HTN

**Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above

**Intervention:** Involvement of a registered nurse or a licensed practical nurse functioning beyond the usual scope of practice, such as adjusting medications and conducting interventions based on a written protocol. All studies used a nurse who titrated medications by following a protocol.

**Comparator:** Usual care

**1° endpoint:**
- SBP and DBP decreased by 3.68 mm Hg (95% CI: 1.05–6.31 mm Hg) and 1.56 mm Hg (95% CI: 0.36–2.76 mm Hg), respectively, with high variability (I²>70%)
- Nurse-managed protocols were more likely to achieve target BP than control protocols (OR: 1.41; 95% CI: 0.98–2.02), though difference was not significant and treatment effects were highly variable (Q 35.20; I²=74%).

**Safety endpoint:** N/A

### Carter BL, et al., 2015 (326) 25805647

**Aim:** Evaluate if a physician/pharmacist collaborative model would be implemented as determined by improved BP control and whether long-term BP control could be sustained

**Study type:** Cluster RCT

**Size:** 32 primary care offices from 15 states enrolled 625 pts with uncontrolled HTN; 54% from racial/ethnic minority groups and 50% with DM or CKD

**Inclusion criteria:** Offices were required to have an onsite clinical pharmacist who have practiced in the office. Pts were eligible if they were English or Spanish speaking, ≥18 y with uncontrolled BP as measured by the SC on the baseline visit.

**Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above

**Intervention:** Pharmacist conducted medical record review and a structured interview with the subject, including 1) a medication history; 2) an assessment of knowledge of BP medications, dosages and timing, and potential side effects; and 3) other barriers to BP control (e.g., side effects and nonadherence). The model recommended a telephone call at 2 wk, structured face-to-face visits at baseline, 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 mo and additional visits if BP remained uncontrolled. The pharmacist created a care plan with recommendations for the physician to adjust

**Comparator:** Usual care

**1° endpoint:**
- BP control at 9 mo was 43% in intervention offices compared with 34% in control group (adjusted OR: 1.57 (95% CI: 0.99, 2.50), p=0.059).

**Safety endpoint:** N/A

**2° endpoints:**
- The adjusted difference in mean SBP/DBP between the intervention and control groups for all pts at 9 mo was −6.1/−2.9 mm Hg (p=0.002 / p=0.005, respectively), and it was −6.4/−2.9 mm Hg (p=0.009 / p=0.044, respectively) in pts from racial or ethnic minorities.
- BP control and mean BP were significantly improved in pts from racial minorities in intervention offices at 18 and 24 mo (p=0.048 and p<0.001) compared with the control group.

**Summary:** Although the results of the 1° outcome (BP control) were negative, the key 2° endpoint (mean BP) was significantly improved in the intervention group. Thus, the findings for 2° endpoints suggest that team-based care using clinical pharmacists significantly
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therapy based on the JNC-7, and the BP goals were <140/90 mm Hg for uncomplicated HTN or <130/80 mm Hg for pts with DM or CKD. The pharmacists did not follow algorithms or protocols other than JNC-7. Physicians were free to accept or to reject any recommendation or to modify the plan. Recommendations to pts focused on medication education, improving adherence, and strategies to implement lifestyle modifications.

**Comparator:** Pharmacists in control offices were instructed to avoid intervention for study pts with HTN, but they could provide usual care curbside consultations if physicians specifically asked questions.

### Data Supplement 63. Electronic Health Records and Patient Registries (Section 12.3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym</th>
<th>Aim: To assess the effect of P4P incentives on quality in EHR-enabled small practices in the</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bardach NS, et al., 2013 (327) 24026600</td>
<td>Participating clinics (n=42 for each group) had similar baseline characteristics, with</td>
<td>A city program provided all participating clinics with the same EHR software with decision support</td>
<td>Intervention clinics had greater adjusted absolute improvement in rates of appropriate antithrombotic prescription (12.0% vs.</td>
<td>Although the effect of the intervention was lower than the 10% improvement that we estimated a priori, the absolute risk reduction for BP control among pts with DM was 7.8% (NNT, 13). This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Study type and size:**  A cluster-randomized trial of small (<10 clinicians) primary care clinics in New York City from April 2009 through March 2010.

A mean of 4,592 (median, 2,500) pts at the intervention group clinics and 3,042 (median, 2,000) at the control group clinics.

---

**Study type:** 3-y, cross-sectional sample using pt EHRs.

- 251,590 pts ≥18 y. Underlying HTN was defined as 2 or more abnormal BP readings ≥140/90 mm Hg and/or pharmaceutical treatment. Appropriate HTN diagnosis was defined by the reporting of ICD-9 codes (401.0–)

To identify prevalent and incident HTN cases in a large outpatient healthcare system, examine the diagnosis rates of prevalent and incident HTN, and identify clinical and demographic factors

- The prevalence of HTN was 28.7%, and the diagnosis rate was 62.9%. The incidence of HTN was 13.3%, with a diagnosis rate of 19.9%. Predictors of diagnosis for prevalent HTN included older age, Asian, African American, higher BMI, and increased number of comorbidities.

- Outpatient EHR diagnosis rates are suboptimal, yet EHR diagnosis of HTN is strongly associated with treatment. Targeted efforts to improve diagnosis should be a priority.

---

**Limitations:** Some clinics exited the program after randomization, with more control clinics leaving than intervention clinics. Additionally, this intervention occurred in the setting of a voluntary QI program. This may reflect a high level of intrinsic motivation to improve among practices in the study, as demonstrated by engagement with the QI specialists.

---

**Quality reports were given quarterly to both the intervention and control groups.**

- 6.1%, difference: 6.0% (95% CI: 2.2%, 9.7%), p=0.001 for interaction term), BP control (no comorbidities: 9.7% vs. 4.3%, difference: 5.5% (95% CI: 1.6%, 9.3%), p=0.01 for interaction term; with DM: 9.0% vs. 1.2%, difference: 7.8% (95% CI: 3.2%, 12.4%), p=0.007 for interaction term; with DM or ischemic vascular disease: 9.5% vs. 1.7%, difference: 7.8% (95% CI: 3.0%, 12.6%), p=0.01 for interaction term), and in smoking cessation interventions (12.4% vs. 7.7%, difference: 4.7% (95% CI: -0.3%, 9.6%), p=0.02 for interaction term). Intervention clinics performed better on all measures for Medicaid and uninsured pts except cholesterol control, but no differences were statistically significant.

---

**Suggests that, for every 13 pts seeing incentivized clinicians, 1 more pt would achieve BP control. The 7.8% absolute change in BP control for pts with DM represents a 46% relative increase in BP control among intervention pts compared with the baseline of 16.8%. Further research is needed to determine whether this effect of the P4P intervention on BP control increases or decreases over time. However, this NNT to achieve BP control through incentives, taken together with the large relative increase in percentage of pts with BP control and the potential effect of BP control on risk of ischemic vascular events, suggests a reasonable opportunity to reduce morbidity and mortality through P4P as structured in this study.**
Factors associated with HTN diagnosis were assessed through multivariate analyses of pt clinical and demographic characteristics.

Variables associated with appropriate HTN diagnosis.

Predictors for incident HTN diagnosis were similar. In pts with 2 or more abnormal BP readings, HTN diagnosis was associated with significantly higher medication treatment rates (92.6% vs. 15.8%; p<0.0001).

### Aim:
Study the effect of a multipronged, system-based, QI approach on HTN control.

**Study type:** Observational

**Size:** All pts with HTN in the KPNC system were included.

### Inclusion criteria:
350,000 pts in the KPNC system with HTN in 2001, increasing to 650,000 in 2009

**Eligibility:**
- ≥2 HTN diagnoses coded in primary care visits in the prior 2 y
- ≥1 primary care HTN diagnoses and 1 or more hospitalizations with a 1° or 2° HTN diagnosis in the prior 2 y
- ≥1 primary care HTN diagnoses and 1 or more filled prescriptions for HTN medication within the prior 6 mo, or
- ≥1 primary care HTN diagnoses and 1 or more stroke-related hospitalizations or a history of coronary disease, HF, or DM

### Intervention:
KPNC HTN Program includes:
- HTN registry
- HTN control monitoring and feedback system
- Evidence-based practice guidelines
- Medical assistant BP recheck program
- Promotion of single polypill formulation (lisinopril-hydrochlorothiazide)

### Comparator:
- Insured pts in California from 2006–2009 who were included in the HEDIS commercial measurement by California health insurance plans participating in the NCQA quality measure reporting process. A 2° comparison group was included to obtain the reported national mean NCQA HEDIS commercial rates of HTN control.

### 1° endpoint:
- HTN control rates in KPNC pts with HTN improved from 43.6% (95% CI: 39.4%, 48.6%) in 2001 to 80.4% (95% CI: 75.6%, 84.4%) by the end of the study period (p<0.001 for trend).
- By comparison, national mean NCQA HEDIS commercial measurement HTN control increased from 55.4% to 64.1%.
- California mean NCQA HEDIS commercial rates of HTN control were similar to those reported nationally from 2006–2009 (63.4%–69.4%).

### 1° Safety endpoint:
N/A

### Additional Information:
- A system-based approach to HTN control that includes performance measurement and QI strategies led to a significant improvement in HTN control (80%, compared to 44% baseline control) in a large population of pts in a managed care health plan.
Aim: The goal of this study was to develop a technology-based strategy to identify pts with undiagnosed HTN in 23 primary care practices and integrate this innovation into a continuous QI initiative in a large, integrated health system.

- Of the 139,666 active adult primary care pts in these 23 practices, 47,822 already had a diagnosis of HTN, white-coat HTN, pre-HTN, or elevated BP. The 3 screening algorithms for undiagnosed HTN were applied to the remaining pts' EHRs. There were 1,586 pts who met the criteria of 1 or more of the algorithms and were therefore considered at risk for undiagnosed HTN.

- In phase 1, we reviewed EHRs using algorithms designed to identify pts at risk for undiagnosed HTN. We then invited each at-risk pt to complete an automated office BP protocol. In phase 2, we instituted a QI process that included regular physician feedback and office-based computer alerts to evaluate at-risk pts not screened in phase 1. Study pts were observed for 24 additional mo to determine rates of diagnostic resolution. After phase 1, we established a continuous QI initiative to further evaluate pts who remained at risk for undiagnosed HTN. In this 24-mo follow-up phase (phase 2), all primary care physicians received monthly lists of their pts who continued to be at risk for undiagnosed HTN.

- Of the 1,033 at-risk pts who remained active during phase 2, 740 (72%) were classified by the end of the follow-up period: 361 had HTN diagnosed, 290 had either white coat HTN, pre-HTN, or elevated BP diagnosed, and 89 had normal BP. By the end of the follow-up period, 293 pts (28%) had not been classified and remained at risk for undiagnosed HTN.

- Although we used multiple algorithms to identify pts with elevated BP readings, it is unlikely that we identified all pts with undiagnosed HTN.
| Borden WB, et al., 2014 (331) 25447261 | **Aim:** The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of the 2014 expert panel BP management recommendations on pts managed in U.S. ambulatory CV practices. | • Using the National CV Data Registry PINNACLE Registry, we assessed the proportion of 1,185,253 pts who met the 2003 and 2014 panel recommendations, highlighting the populations of pts for whom the BP goals changed. | N/A | • Of 1,185,253 pts in the study cohort, 706,859 (59.6%) achieved the 2003 JNC-7 goals. Using the 2014 recommendations, 880,378 (74.3%) pts were at goal. Among the 173,519 (14.6%) for whom goal achievement changed, 40,323 (23.2%) had a prior stroke or TIA, and 112,174 (64.6%) had CAD. In addition, the average Framingham risk score in

---

These pts were contacted by staff via telephone or letter to arrange a follow-up appointment. These pts remained on the physicians' lists until an automated office BP evaluation was completed or an ICD-9 diagnosis was entered into the chart that indicated the pt's at-risk status had been resolved. In addition, when an at-risk pt arrived for an office visit for any reason, a best practice advisory was prominently displayed on that pt's EHR screen to notify the medical assistant and physician that an automated office BP measurement was needed.

---

• Among U.S. ambulatory cardiology pts with HTN, nearly 1 in 7 who did not meet JNC-7 recommendations would now meet the 2014 treatment goals.
this group was 8.5 ± 3.2%, and the 10-y atherosclerotic CVD risk score was 28.0 ± 19.5%.

### Data Supplement 64. RCTs, Meta-analyses, and Systematic Reviews on the Effect of Telehealth Interventions to Improve Hypertension Control (Section 12.3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Burke LE, et al., 2015 (332) 26271892 | **Aim**: Review of the Scientific Literature on mHealth Tools Related to CVD Prevention  
**Study type**: Systematic review  
**Size**: 69 studies of the use of mobile technologies to reduce CVD risk behaviors  
**Inclusion criteria**: Studies of electronic and mobile technology tools in CV prevention; published from 2004–2014 in English language; enrolling adults except for smoking cessation, for which adolescents were also included; conducted in the U.S. and in developed countries.  
**Exclusion criteria**: Absence of above.  
**Intervention**: Mobile technologies to reduce CVD risk behaviors–varied across studies  
**Comparator**: Varied across studies.  
**1° endpoint**: Varied across studies.  
**1° Safety endpoint**: N/A | **Summary**: mHealth or mobile technologies have the potential to transform the delivery of health-related messages and ongoing interventions targeting behavior change. Moreover, the use of monitoring devices (e.g., Bluetooth-enabled BP monitors and blood glucose monitors) permits the sharing of important pt self-management parameters with healthcare providers in real time and the delivery of feedback and guidance to pts when they need it. Furthermore, using mHealth tools for monitoring provides the clinician data that far exceed what can be measured in the brief clinical encounter and reflect the status of physiological or behavioral measures in the person’s natural setting. |
| Liu S, et al., 2013 (333) 23618507 | **Aim**: Assess the efficacy of e-counselling in reducing BP  
**Inclusion criteria**: 1) Trials that investigated the effect of Internet-based lifestyle interventions on SBP and DBP; 2) trials that included | **Intervention**: Internet-based intervention as preventive e-counselling or advice using Web sites or e-mails to modify exercise or diet as a | **1° endpoint**: MD in BP reduction (Internet-based – usual care); SBP: -3.8 mm Hg (95% CI: -5.63--2.06), P²=61 | **Summary**: Behavior change techniques that were used in more than 50% of the successful internet-based interventions included the following: providing information on consequences of behavior in general. |
**Study type:** Systematic review, meta-analysis

**Size:** 13 RCTs or case-control studies

| Supplemental components such as mobile text messages, telephone, or in-person support, 3) intervention duration of at least 8 wk, and 4) SBP and DBP reported as 1° or 2° outcome, measured at a clinic or office. | means of improving BP control. These Internet-based interventions were primarily self-guided, and access was gained via desktop computer, laptop, tablet, or smartphone. The duration of each intervention had to be at least 8 wk in order to achieve clinically meaningful outcomes, including the pt’s ability to learn and adhere to complex new behaviors, and to allow for sufficient time to demonstrate a stable reduction in BP. The majority (9/13) of interventions had supplemental components that were not internet-based, such as text messages, in-person visits, and live support and 10/13 targeted both exercise and diet behaviors. |

**Inclusion criteria:**
- English language
- Published up to Feb. 2012
- RCT testing HBPT vs. usual care.

**Intervention:** HBPT had to be based on the use of an electronic automated BP monitor storing values obtained at the pt’s home and transferring them to a remote computer

**1° endpoint:** Compared to usual care, HBPT improved:
- Office SBP by 4.71 mm Hg (95% CI: 6.18–3.24; p<0.001; I²=52.2%; p=0.003)
- Office DBP by 2.45 mm Hg (95% CI: 3.33–1.57; p<0.001; I²=40.4%; p=0.048)

**2° endpoint:**
- Comparison with usual care: HBPT reduced:
  - SBP by 3.51 mm Hg (95% CI: -3.51–0.65; p=0.003; I²=57)

**Influence of intervention attributes:**
- **Intervention duration:**
  - Long-term (≥6 mo) intervention: SBP -5.8 mm Hg (95% CI: -4.3–-4.1) / DBP -2.45 mm Hg (95% CI: -3.50–-1.41)
  - Short-term (<6 mo) intervention: SBP -3.47 mm Hg (95% CI: -5.2–-1.7) / DBP mean reduction: results not reported, not statistically significant.
- **# of behavior change techniques:**
  - ≥5 behavior change techniques: SBP -5.92 mm Hg (95% CI: -7.43–-4.42) / DBP -2.45 mm Hg (95% CI: -3.50–-1.41)
  - <5 behavior change techniques: SBP -2.69 mm Hg (95% CI: -4.61–-0.78) / DBP -0.02 mm Hg (95% CI: -1.20–1.17)

**Safety endpoint:** N/A

**Aim:** Review data from RCTs on the effectiveness of HBPT vs. usual care with respect to improvement of BP control, healthcare resources utilization and costs.

**Limitations:**
- HBPT intervention features (telemointering systems and self-monitoring programs) as well as inclusion criteria and demographic and clinical characteristics of the comparative groups varied across

Omboni S, et al., 2013 (334) 23299557
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pt's quality of life and adverse events.

**Study type:** Meta-analysis

**Size:** 23 unique RCTs with 7037 pts (though not all studies reported on all outcomes of interest)

**Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above through a telephone line (wired or wireless), a modem or an Internet connection. At least 1 self BP measurement had to be available for each pt in the intervention group.

**Comparator:** Usual care

- **Office BP Control (<140/90 mm Hg nondiabetic pts and <130/80 mm Hg diabetic pts):** RR: 1.16 (95% CI: 1.04–1.29; p<0.001); I²=69%; p<0.001

**2º endpoint:** Compared to usual care, HBPT improved:
- Greater prescription of antihypertensive medications: weighted MD 0.40 (95% CI: 0.17–0.62; p<0.001); I²=84.2%; p<0.001
- Lower number of office visits: weighted MD -0.18 (95% CI: -0.37–0.00); I²=32.7%; p=0.146
- Quality of life physical component of SF-12 or SF-36 questionnaire: weighted MD 2.87 (95% CI: 1.15–4.41); I²=0.0%; p=0.853
- There was no difference between HBPT and usual care in:
  - Therapeutic adherence [92% HBPT vs. 90% usual care; between-group difference +1.30% (95% CI: -2.31–4.90; p=0.481), I²=0.00%; p=0.888]
  - Quality of life mental component of SF-12 or SF-36 questionnaire: weighted MD -0.11 (95% CI: -1.65–1.43); I²=0.0%; p=0.984

**Cost:**
- Healthcare costs were significantly higher in the studies and contributed to the high heterogeneity of the studies
- Most studies were powered to test differences in BP lowering, not 2º outcomes

**Summary:** HBPT yielded greater SBP and DBP reductions and a larger proportion of pts achieving BP control than usual care. HBPT vs. usual care resulted in greater prescription of antihypertensive medications and fewer office visits but no difference in therapeutic adherence. Healthcare costs were higher with HBPT than usual care, but when HBPT-related costs were excluded, medical costs were similar between groups. Use of HBPT vs. usual care improved quality of life physical component but not mental. Authors note that the amount of office BP reduction attributable to HBPT was in line with that observed in RCTs of antihypertensive drugs compared with placebo. The estimate was also larger than that usually related to HBP self-monitoring, which speaks in favor of a possible added value of the teletransmission approach.
Verberk W, et al., 2011 (335)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Examine the usefulness of telecare for HTN management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>9 RCTs with 2,501 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusion criteria:** 1) Published in the English language, 2) pts were diagnosed as hypertensive and performed BP self-measurement at home, 3) RCTs that compared telecare of BP with usual care, 4) data were transmitted to healthcare providers by telephone, modem, Internet, or mail, and 5) either change in BP or the number of pts that reached their target BP was an outcome and was provided in the study. Date restrictions not reported.

**Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above

**Intervention:** Telecare for HTN management (treatment and/or coaching). Telecare involved a data transmission process to collect data on a pt's health status to allow remote HTN management. Procedures varied in length and frequency of contact and method of delivery (i.e., often telephone or cell phone with or without internet/computer; with or without behavioral counseling by nurse or pharmacist), often as an adjunct to “usual care” clinical visits.

**Comparator:** Usual care

**1° endpoint:** Difference in BP Reduction (Telecare-Usual care):
- SBP 5.2 ± 1.5 mm Hg (95% CI: 2.31–8.07)
- DBP 2.1 ± 0.8 mm Hg (95% CI: 0.52–3.69)

**Safety endpoint:** N/A

**Limitations:** Telecare intervention methods varied greatly across studies

**Summary:** Telecare led to a greater decrease in SBP and DBP compared with usual care. Telecare seems a valuable tool to support HTN management.

HBPT group vs. usual care: weighted MD 662.92 (95% CI: 540.81–785.04) euros per pt; $I^2=99.6$%; $p<0.001$, but costs were similar when only medical costs (excluding HBPT-related costs) were considered (-12.4; 95% CI: -930.52–906.23) euros; $p=0.767$.

**Safety endpoint:** No difference was observed in the risk of adverse events (RR: 1.22; 95% CI: 0.86–1.71; $p=0.111$)
### Aim: Quantify both the magnitude and mechanisms of benefit (including effect on therapeutic inertia) of home BP monitoring on BP reduction. Therapeutic inertia was defined as no change in medications combined with uncontrolled BP.

#### Study type:
Systematic review and meta-analysis

#### Size:
37 RCTs with 9,446 pts. Trial settings included community (n=5), dialysis unit (n=2), general practices (n=18), hospitals and general practice (n=1), and hospital-based outpatient units (n=11).

### Inclusion criteria:
Studies that randomized pts to control or home BP monitoring group

### Exclusion criteria:
Absence of above

### Intervention:
Home BP monitoring as an adjunct to usual care for HTN

### Comparator:
Usual care with BP monitoring in clinic

### 1° endpoint:
Compared with usual care alone, home-based BP monitoring:
- Reduced SBP: -2.63 mm Hg (95% CI: -4.24 – -1.02)
- Reduced DBP: -1.68 mm Hg (95% CI: -2.58– -0.79)
- Greater reduction in SBP by HBPM interventions was seen with added telemonitoring (effect size -3.20; 95% CI: -4.66– -1.73) vs. home BP monitoring (effect size -1.26; 95% CI: -2.20– -0.31; p=0.029). This finding is relevant to telemonitoring.

### 2° endpoints:
- More frequent reductions in antihypertensive medication (presumably due to identification of white coat HTN): RR: 2.02 (95% CI: 1.32–3.11)
- Lowered therapeutic inertia (i.e., unchanged medication despite elevated BP: RR for unchanged medication 0.82 (95% CI: 0.68–0.99)

### Limitations:
Different inclusion and exclusion criteria, different BP measurement techniques, drug titration protocols, pt populations, and duration of follow-up across studies likely introduced significant heterogeneity in effect size.

### Summary:
Home BP monitoring leads to a small but significant reduction in SBP and DBP. Greater reduction in SBP is seen when HBPM is accompanied by specific programs to titrate antihypertensive drugs. 1 such strategy is telemonitoring, in which BP readings obtained at home are relayed to the provider who can then take appropriate action, thus reducing therapeutic inertia.

---

### Data Supplement 65. RCTs and Observational Studies that Report on the Effect of Performance Measures and on Hypertension Control (Section 12.4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal R, et al., 2011 (27) 21115879</td>
<td>Aim: Quantify both the magnitude and mechanisms of benefit (including effect on therapeutic inertia) of home BP monitoring on BP reduction. Therapeutic inertia was defined as no change in medications combined with uncontrolled BP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>Physician Intervention</td>
<td>1° endpoint</td>
<td>Safety endpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svetkey LP, et al., 2009 (336) [19920081]</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Study the effect of physician intervention and/or pt intervention vs. usual care, to assess the impact of education, monitoring, and feedback protocol to help improve HTN control</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Practices: matched pairs (intervention vs. usual care) by specialty (internal medicine vs. family physician) and by pt socioeconomic mix. All physicians were invited to participate. Pt eligibility: ≥25 y, hypertensive by billing code. Pt exclusion: Self-reported CKD, CVD event within past 6 mo, pregnant, breastfeeding, or planning a pregnancy.</td>
<td><strong>Physician Intervention:</strong> 18 mo of online training, self-monitoring, quarterly feedback reports. <strong>Pt Intervention:</strong> 20 weekly group sessions for 6 mo, followed by 12 monthly telephone counseling contacts, focused on weight loss, DASH dietary pattern, exercise, and reduce sodium intake.</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> Pt intervention + physician intervention group had greatest BP lowering at 6 mo (-9.7 mm Hg ± 12.7), but at 18 mo there was no significant difference between groups.</td>
<td><strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffe MG, et al., 2013 (329) [23989679]</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> Study the effect of a multipronged, system-based, QI approach on HTN control.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> 350,000 pts in the KPNC system with HTN in 2001, increasing to 650,000 in 2009</td>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> KPNC HTN Program includes: HTN registry, HTN control monitoring and feedback system, evidence-based practice guidelines, medical assistant BP recheck program, and promotion of single polypill formulation (lisinopril-hydrochlorothiazide)</td>
<td><strong>1° endpoint:</strong> HTN control rates in KPNC pts with HTN improved from 43.6% (95% CI: 39.4%–48.6%) in 2001 to 80.4% (95% CI: 75.6%–84.4%) by the end of the study period (p&lt;0.001 for trend). By comparison, national mean NCQA HEDIS commercial rates of HTN control increased from 55.4%–64.1%. California mean NCQA HEDIS commercial rates of HTN control were similar to those reported nationally from 2006–2009 (63.4%–69.4%).</td>
<td><strong>Safety endpoint:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This trial suggests that pt level monitoring and feedback, in combination with physician level monitoring and feedback, provides additional 6 mo BP control above and beyond usual care. The impact of the intervention diminished after the weekly pt group sessions ended and monthly telephone calls began instead.

* A system-based approach to HTN control that includes performance measurement and QI strategies led to a significant improvement in HTN control (80%, compared to 44% baseline control) in a large population of pts in a managed care health plan.

© 2017 American College of Cardiology Foundation and American Heart Association, Inc.
### Data Supplement 66. RCTs, Meta-analyses, and Systematic Reviews on Quality Improvement Strategies on Hypertension Treatment Outcomes (Section 12.4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2° Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Walsh JM, et al., 2006 (338) 16799359 | **Aim:** Assess the effectiveness of QI strategies in lowering BP  
**Study type:** Systematic review | **Inclusion criteria:** Trials, controlled before–after studies, and interrupted time series evaluating QI interventions targeting HTN control and reporting BP outcomes.  
**Intervention:** QI interventions targeting some component of provider behavior or organizational change to improve HTN control  
**Comparator:** Contemporaneous | • The majority of articles described interventions consisting of more than 1 strategy with the median number of QI strategies per comparison =3. Results are organized below by type of QI strategy.  
• Variety of strategies used  
| **Limitations:** Studies varied by design, population, sample size, setting, and methodological quality. Definition of each QI strategy varied across studies. Few studies assessed a single QI strategy; because most studies included more than 1 QI strategy, it could not be discerned which individual QI strategies had the...
| **Size:** 44 articles reporting 57 comparisons | **Exclusion criteria:** Articles focusing only on 2nd HTN or specialized subpopulations (e.g., HTN in pts with alcoholism) | **observation of cohorts differing primarily with respect to exposure to the QI intervention** | **SBP/DBP, median reduction:** 4.5 mm Hg (IQR: 1.5–11.0)/ 2.1 mm Hg (IQR: -0.2–5.0)  
SBP/DBP control: 16% (IQR: 10.3–32.2)/ 6% (IQR: 1.5–17.5)  
• Provider reminders  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 1.2 mm Hg (IQR: 1.0–1.9)/ 0.3 mm Hg (IQR: -0.2–1.7)  
DBP control: 5% (IQR: 2.0–7.0)  
• Facilitated relay of clinical data  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 8.0 mm Hg (IQR: 2.5–12.3)/ 1.8 mm Hg (IQR: -0.1–4.5)  
SBP/DBP control: 25% (IQR: 17.0–34.2)/ 2% (IQR: 1.6–5.0)  
• Audit and feedback  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 1.5 mm Hg (IQR: 1.2–1.7)/ 0.6 mm Hg (IQR: 0.4–1.0)  
SBP/DBP control: -3.5% (IQR: -5.7–1.4)/ 2.0% (IQR: 1.7–4.3)  
• Provider education  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 3.3 mm Hg (IQR: 1.2–5.4)/ 0.6 mm Hg (IQR: -0.7v3.4)  
SBP/DBP control: 11% (IQR: 1.4–13.1)/ 4% (IQR: 1.7–11.3)  
• Pt education  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 8.1 mm Hg (IQR: 3.3–11.8)/ 3.8 mm Hg (IQR: 0.6–6.7)  
SBP/DBP control: 19% (IQR: 11.4–33.2)/ 17% (IQR: 11.4–24.5)  
• Promotion of self-management | **greatest effects or whether certain combinations of individual QI strategies were more “potent” than others.**  
**Summary:** QI strategies are associated with improved HTN control. QI strategies improved SBP and the proportion of pts achieving SBP control and had a more modest effect on DBP and the proportion of pts achieving DBP control. Team change (i.e., a focus on HTN by someone in addition to the pt’s physician) had the largest effect on both SBP and DBP. All of the strategies assessed may be beneficial in terms of clinically meaningful reductions in BP under some circumstances and in varying combinations. |
| Carter BL, et al., 2009 (321) 19858431 | **Aim:** Determine potency of interventions for BP involving nurses and pharmacists  
**Study type:** Meta-analysis  
**Size:** 37 RCTs of team-based HTN care involving nurse or pharmacist intervention  
**Inclusion criteria:** RCT of team-based HTN care involving nurse or pharmacist intervention  
**Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above  
**Intervention:** Team-based HTN care involving nurse or pharmacist intervention  
In nearly all studies involving nurses or pharmacists in clinics, consistent and dedicated case management activities were provided that were distinct from traditional nursing or | **SBP/DBP, median reduction:** 3.3 mm Hg (IQR: 2.6–10.1)/ 2.8 mm Hg (IQR: 0.4–6.7)  
**SBP/DBP control:** 13%/ 9% (IQR: 5.3–11.4)  
**Pt reminders**  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 3.3 mm Hg (IQR: 2.3–4.5)/ 0.4 mm Hg (IQR: -2.4–5.0)  
DBP control: 2% (IQR: 1.1–9.4)  
**Team change**  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: 9.7 mm Hg (IQR: 4.2–14.0) (p<0.05)/ 4.2 mm Hg (IQR: 0.2–6.8) (p<0.05)  
SBP/DBP control: 22% (IQR: 9.0–33.8)/ 17% (IQR: 5.7–24.5)  
**Financial incentives**  
SBP/DBP, median reduction: -13.3 mm Hg/ 0.0 mm Hg (IQR: -2.0–2.5)  
DBP control: 4% (IQR: -1.1–9.4)  
**Safety endpoint:** N/A | **1° endpoint:**  
- OR (95% CI) for controlled BP were: nurses: 1.69 (1.48, 1.93); pharmacists within primary care clinics: 2.17 (1.75, 2.68); and community pharmacists: 2.89 (1.83, 4.55).  
- Mean (SD) reductions in SBP were: nurse intervention: 5.84 (8.05) mm Hg; pharmacists in clinics: 7.76(7.81) mm Hg; and  
- Stepwise regression was used to compare studies that included a given intervention strategy with studies that did not. Several individual components of the interventions were associated with significant reductions in mean SBP including pharmacist recommended medication to physician (-27.21 mm Hg; p=0.002), counseling about lifestyle modification (-12.63 mm Hg; p=0.03), pharmacist performed the intervention (-11.70 mm Hg; p=0.03), use of a treatment
| Agarwal R, et al., 2011 (27) 21115879 | **Aim:** Quantify both the magnitude and mechanisms of benefit (including effect on therapeutic inertia) of home BP monitoring on BP reduction. Therapeutic inertia was defined as no change in medications combined with uncontrolled BP. | **Study type:** Systematic Review and Meta-analysis | **Inclusion criteria:** Studies that randomized pts to control or home BP monitoring group | **Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above | **Intervention:** Home BP monitoring as an adjunct to usual care for HTN | **Comparator:** Usual care with BP monitoring in clinic | **1° endpoint:** Compared with usual care alone, home-based BP monitoring:  
- Reduced SBP: -2.63 mm Hg (95% CI: -4.24-- (-1.02) and  
- Reduced DBP: -1.68 mm Hg (95% CI: -2.58-- (-0.79)  
- Greater reduction in SBP by home BP monitoring interventions was seen with added telemonitoring effect size: -3.20 (95% CI: -4.66-- (-1.73) vs. home BP monitoring effect size: -1.26, 95% CI: -2.20-- (-0.31; p=0.029. | **Safety endpoint:** N/A | **2° endpoints:**  
- More frequent reductions in antihypertensive medication (presumably due to identification of white coat HTN): RR: 2.02; 95% CI: 1.32--3.11  
- Lowered therapeutic inertia (i.e., unchanged medication despite elevated BP: RR for unchanged medication 0.82 (95% CI: 0.68--0.99) | **Limitations:** Different inclusion and exclusion criteria, different BP measurement techniques, drug titration protocols, pt populations, and duration of follow-up across studies likely introduced significant heterogeneity in effect size. |
### Anchala R, et al., 2012 (339) 23071713

**Aim:** Evaluate the role of decision support systems in prevention of CVD among pts

**Study type:** Systematic review and meta-analysis

**Size:** 10 studies with 5 studies reporting effect on BP (BP results only reported here)

**Inclusion criteria:** 1) Cross-sectional, case control, cohort, and RCTs, 2) Studies conducted among adult pts ≥18, 3) studies on prevention of CV disorders (MI, stroke, CHD, peripheral vascular disorders and HF) and management of HTN, 4) studies on interventions including: decision support systems, clinical decision supports systems, computerized decision support systems, clinical decision making tools and medical decision making

**Exclusion criteria:** Absence of above

**Intervention:** Decision support systems, clinical decision supports systems, computerized decision support systems, clinical decision making tools and medical decision making in the management of HTN

**Comparator:** Usual care

**1° endpoint:**  
- Reduction in SBP (5 studies): 2.32 mm Hg (95% CI: -3.96– -0.69)  
- Reduction in DBP (2 studies): 0.42 mm Hg (95% CI: -2.30–1.47)

**Safety endpoint:** N/A

**Limitations:**  
- Small number of studies of varied quality.  
- Interventions varied across studies.

**Summary:** Clinical decision support resulted in modest reduction of SBP and no significant reduction of DBP.

### Proia KK, et al., 2014 (323) 24933494

**Aim:** Examine current evidence on the effectiveness of team-based care in improving BP outcomes (update of

**Inclusion criteria:** Study of team-based care; conducted in a high-income economy; reported at least 1 BP outcome of interest; included a comparison group or had

**Intervention:** Team-based care was defined as adding new staff or changing the roles of existing staff to work with a PCP for HTN care. Team members who

**1° endpoint:**  
- Proportion with controlled BP: Absolute percentage point (pct pt) change in pts with controlled BP from 33 studies comparing team-based care to usual care: median effect

**2° endpoints:** Compared with pts in usual care, the proportion of pts receiving team-based care with "high" medication adherence (defined as taking medications as prescribed >80% of the time) increased by a median of 16.3 pct pts (9 studies).
prior systematic review)

**Study type:** Systematic review

**Size:** 52 studies of team-based primary care for pts with 1° HTN

**Exclusion criteria:** Inclusion of populations with 2° HTN (e.g., pregnancy) or with a history of CVD (e.g., MI) and did not collaborate with pts and PCPs were predominantly nurses (28 studies); pharmacists (15 studies); both nurses and pharmacists (5 studies); or community health workers, integrated care managers, or behavioral interventionists (4 studies). Key roles included HTN medication management, active pt follow-up, and adherence and self-management support. Interventions were usually implemented across multiple settings in the healthcare system and in the community, where they were implemented in pharmacies and through home outreach visits.

**Comparator:** Usual care estimate was 12 pct pts (IQI=3.2–20.8 pct pts). Most individual effect estimates in the favorable direction were significant (p<0.05).

- **Reduction in SBP (44 studies):** The median reduction in SBP was 5.4 mm Hg (IQI=2.0–7.2 mm Hg). Most individual effect estimates were significant (p<0.05).
- **Reduction in DBP:** The overall median reduction in DBP was 1.8 mm Hg (IQI=0.7–3.2 mm Hg) from 38 studies.

**Safety endpoint:** No harm to pts was identified from team-based care interventions in the included studies or the broader literature.

**Stratified analyses for BP outcomes:**

- Team member role in medication management: Larger improvements in BP outcomes than overall estimates were demonstrated when team members could make changes to medications independent of the PCP or team members could provide medication recommendations and make changes with the PCP’s approval as compared to team members providing only adherence support and information on medication and HTN.
- Number of team members added: Adding ≥2 members demonstrated larger improvements in the proportion of pts with controlled BP and reduction in DBP compared to adding only 1; median reductions in SBP were similar regardless of team size.
- Improvement in the proportion of pts with controlled BP was similar for studies from both healthcare and community settings.

**Limitations:** Included studies reported significant differences in pt demographics between intervention and comparison groups at baseline, possible contamination within intervention and comparison groups, and issues related to inadequate description of populations and implemented interventions.

**Summary:** There is strong evidence that team-based care is effective in...
Data Supplement 67. Nonrandomized Trials, Observational Studies, and/or Registries of Effect of Quality Improvement Strategies on Hypertension Treatment Outcomes (Section 12.4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Study Type/Design; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Primary Endpoint and Results (include P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Summary/Conclusion Comment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Thomas KL, et al., 2014 (340) 25351480 | **Study type:** Community-based HTN QI program [multifaceted BP control program using a web-based health portal (Heart360), community health coaches, and PA guidance] to improve HTN control in a diverse community setting  
**Design:** Pre-post study without a concurrent control  
**Size:** 1756 pts with HTN from 8 clinics:  
- Median age, 60 y  
- Female, 65.6%  
- African American, 76.1%  
**Inclusion criteria:** Individuals from pt sites >18 y with a previous billing diagnosis of HTN (ICD-9 code 401.x) or a previous clinical diagnosis of HTN in the medical record  
**Exclusion criteria:** Did not reside in Durham County or had a neurocognitive disorder that prevented enrollment  
**1st endpoint:** 1) Difference in SBP and DBP from enrollment (BP obtained in the clinic at enrollment) to the last BP as measured in clinic within 6 mo after enrollment, 2) proportion of pts that achieved BP <140/90 mm Hg by last clinic visit within 6 mo, and 3) proportion of pts with BP <140/90 mm Hg or drop in SBP ≥10 mm Hg by last visit relative to their enrollment BP.  
**Results:**  
- Mean change in BP: -4.7 mm Hg (SD ± 21.4) / -2.8 mm Hg (SD ± 11.8) after 6 mo  
- BP control (<140/90 mm Hg) rate: Increased from 51% at baseline to 63% at 6 mo  
- Proportion with BP<140/90 or ≥10 mm Hg decrease in SBP at 6 mo was 69%  
- Among those who were in tiers 1 (BP=140/90–159/99 mm Hg) and 2 (BP≥159/99 mm Hg) at enrollment (n=889), BP change was -8.8 mm Hg (SD ± 15.8) / -5.0 mm Hg (SD ± 10.0) and -23.7 mm Hg (SD ± 26.5) / -10.1 mm Hg (SD ± 14.1), respectively.  
**Summary:** A multicomponent-tiered HTN program that included team-based care with PAs and community health coaches was associated with improved BP control in a diverse community-based population. Though the web-based approach presented technical challenges for some pts, there was a direct association between higher use of Heart360 and larger recorded BP declines as entered into Heart360. This provides some indirect evidence that those pts who were more engaged with their BP self-monitoring achieved better BP control. |
| Jaffe MG, et al., 2013 (329) 23989679 | **Study type:** Quasi-experimental evaluation of multi-faceted QI program that included 1) Health system-wide HTN registry, 2) HTN control rates (with provider audit and feedback), 3)  
**Inclusion criteria:** Pts identified with HTN within an integrated health care delivery system (KPNC) from 2001–2009  
**1st endpoint:** BP control using NCQA HEDIS measures  
**Results:** BP control increased from 44%–80% from 2001–2009 with the KPNC QI program compared to 55.4% to 64.1% for the national mean and 63.4% to 70.2% for the state mean.  
**Summary:** Implementation of a large-scale HTN program was associated with a significant increase in HTN control compared with state and national control rates. |
Data Supplement 68. RCTs Comparing Financial Incentives (Section 12.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Acronym; Author; Year Published</th>
<th>Aim of Study; Study Type; Study Size (N)</th>
<th>Patient Population</th>
<th>Study Intervention (# patients) / Study Comparator (# patients)</th>
<th>Endpoint Results (Absolute Event Rates, P value; OR or RR; &amp; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Relevant 2nd Endpoint (if any); Study Limitations; Adverse Events Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peterson LA, et al., 2013 (341) 24026599</td>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To test the effect of explicit financial incentives to reward guideline recommended HTN care. <strong>Study type:</strong> Cluster randomized trial of 12 VA Outpatient clinics with 5 performance periods and a 12-mo washout</td>
<td>• Study population was providers, not pts: a minimum of 5 fulltime PCPs from 12 hospital-based primary care clinics in 5 A Networks. Then, the clinics were randomized to 1 of 4 study groups, 1) physician level (individual) incentives, 2) practice-level incentives, 3) physician-level plus practice-level (combined) incentives, and 4) no incentives (control).</td>
<td><strong>Interventions:</strong> Education, Financial Incentives, Audit and Feedback; Intervention group pts received up to 5 incentive payments in their paychecks ~every 4 mo and were notified each time a payment was posted. <strong>Comparator:</strong> 4 different groups, 1 paid incentives at the practice level, 1 paid incentives at the physician level, 1 paid</td>
<td><strong>1st endpoint:</strong> In unadjusted analyses, the percentage of pts either with controlled HTN or receiving an appropriate response increased for each incentive group between baseline and final performance period, 75% to 84% in the individual group, 80% to 85% in the practice group, and 79% to 88% in the combined group. Performance did not change in control group, 86%. The adjusted estimated absolute change over the study of the pts meeting the combined BP or</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> • Mean (SD) total payments over the study were $4,270 ($459), $2672 ($153), and $1,648 ($248) for the combined, individual, and practice-level interventions, respectively. Change in BP control or appropriate response to uncontrolled BP compared with the control group was significantly greater only in the individual incentives group. Change in guideline-recommended medication use was not significant compared with the control group. The effect of the incentive was not sustained after a washout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karunaratne K, et al., 2013 (343) 23658247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> The aim of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of renal indicators outlined in P4P on the management of HTN in primary care. To estimate the cost implications of the resulting changes in prescribing patterns of antihypertensive medication following introduction of such indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Prospective cohort study using a large primary care database.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> A total of 10,040 pts had confirmed stage 3–5 CKD in the 2 y pre-QOF and formed the study cohort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention:</strong> The implementation of national estimated GFR reporting and the inclusion of renal-specific indicators in a primary care P4P system since April 2006 has promoted identification and better management of risk factors related to CKD. In the UK, the P4P framework is known as the QOF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mean age of the cohort at the start of the study period was 64.8 y, 55% were female. In those pts with stage 3–5 CKD 83.9% were hypertensive, defined by a pre-P4P BP of >140/85 or currently taking antihypertensive medication. The proportion of pts with CKD 3–5 attaining the BP target of 145/80 increased from 41.5% in the pre-QOF period to 50.0% in the post-QOF period. This increase was even more marked for those with HTN in the pre-QOF period (28.8%–45.1%). In the hypertensive pts, mean BP fell from 146/79 mm Hg to 140/76 in the first 2 y post-P4P ($p<0.01$, analysis of variance). |
- **Summary:** Population BP control has improved since the introduction of P4P renal indicators, and this improvement has been sustained. This was associated with a significant increase in the use of antihypertensive medication, resulting in increased prescription cost. Longer-term follow-up will establish whether or not this translates to improved outcomes in terms of progression of CKD, CVD and pt mortality.

**Main Outcomes and Measures:** Among a random sample, number of pts achieving guideline-recommended BP thresholds or receiving an appropriate response to uncontrolled BP, number of pts prescribed guideline-recommended medications, and number who developed hypotension.

- for both levels and the 4th paid no incentives. (19–20 physicians in each group)
- appropriate response measure was 8.84% (95% CI: 4.20%–11.80%) for the individual group, 3.70% (95% CI: 0.24%, 7.68%) for the practice group, 5.54% (95% CI: 1.92%–9.52%) for the combined group, and 0.47% (95% CI: −3.12%–4.04%) for the control group. The adjusted estimated absolute difference over the study in the change between the proportion of the physician’s pts achieving BP control or receiving an appropriate response for the individual incentive group and the controls was 8.36% (95% CI: 2.40%–13.00%; $p=0.005$).

| 1° Safety endpoint: N/A |

- Financial incentives may constitute an insufficiently strong intervention to influence goal commitment when providers attribute performance to external forces beyond their control.
This cohort was taken from a database collated as part of a clinical decision support system used to assist the management of CKD in primary care. **Size:** 90,250 pts on general practitioner registers with a valid serum creatinine estimation in the 6-y study period. A total of 10,040 pts had confirmed stage 3–5 CKD in the 2 y pre-QOF and formed the study cohort.

BP reduction was sustained in the last 2 y of the study, 139/75 (p<0.01, analysis of variance). The proportion of hypertensive pts taking ACEIs or angiotensin blockers increased, this was also sustained in the third time period. An increase in the prescribing of diuretics, CCBs and BBs was also observed. The additional cost of increased prescribing was calculated to be euro 25.00 per hypertensive pt based on GP prescription data.

Serumaga B, et al., 2011 (344)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aim:</strong> The aim of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of renal indicators outlined in P4P on the management of HTN in primary care. To estimate the cost implications of the resulting changes in prescribing patterns of antihypertensive medication following introduction of such indicators.</th>
<th><strong>Inclusion criteria:</strong> Pts with HTN diagnosed between Jan. 2000–Aug. 2007.</th>
<th><strong>Intervention:</strong> The UK P4P incentive (the Quality and Outcomes Framework), which was implemented in April 2004 and included specific targets for general practitioners to show high quality care for pts with HTN (and other diseases).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion criteria:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Comparator:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> After accounting for secular trends, no changes in BP monitoring: level change: 0.85 (95% CI: −3.04–4.74), p=0.669 and trend change: −0.01 (95% CI: −0.24–0.21), p=0.615, control: −1.19 (95% CI: −2.06–1.09), p=0.109 and −0.01 (95% CI: −0.06–0.03), p=0.569, or treatment intensity; 0.67: (95% CI: −1.27–2.81), p=0.412 and 0.02 (95% CI: −0.23–0.19, p=0.706 were attributable to P4P. P4P had no effect on the cumulative incidence of stroke, MI, renal failure, HF, or all-cause mortality in both treatments experienced and newly treated subgroups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study type:</strong> Interrupted time series study</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Good quality of care for HTN was stable or improving before P4P was introduced. P4P had no discernible effects on processes of care or on HTN related clinical outcomes. Generous financial incentives, as designed in the UK P4P policy, may not be sufficient to improve quality of care and outcomes for HTN and other common chronic conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bardach NS, et al., 2013 (327) 24026600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess the effect of P4P incentives on quality in EHR-enabled small practices in the context of an established QI initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Type &amp; Size:</strong> A cluster-randomized trial of small (&lt;10 clinicians) primary care clinics in New York City from April 2009–March 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating clinics (n=42 for each group) had similar baseline characteristics, with a mean of 4,592 (median, 2,500) pts at the intervention group clinics and 3,042 (median, 2,000) at the control group clinics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A city program provided all participating clinics with the same EHR software with decision support and pt registry functionalities and QI specialists offering technical assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentivized clinics were paid for each pt whose care met the performance criteria, but they received higher payments for pts with comorbidities, who had Medicaid insurance, or who were uninsured (maximum payments: $200/pt; 100,000/clinic). Quality reports were given quarterly to both the intervention and control groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention clinics had greater adjusted absolute improvement in rates of appropriate antithrombotic prescription 12.0% vs. 6.1%, difference: 6.0% (95% CI: 2.2%–9.7%; p=0.001 for interaction term), BP control (no comorbidities): 9.7% vs. 4.3%, difference: 5.5% (95% CI: 1.6%–9.3%; p=0.01 for interaction term); with DM: 9.0% vs. 1.2%, difference: 7.8% (95% CI: 3.2%–12.4%; p=0.007 for interaction term); with DM or ischemic vascular disease: 9.5% vs. 1.7%, difference: 7.8% (95% CI: 3.0%–2.6%; p=0.01 for interaction term), and in smoking cessation interventions (12.4% vs. 7.7%, difference: 4.7% (95% CI: –0.3%–9.6%; p=0.02 for interaction term). Intervention clinics performed better on all measures for Medicaid and uninsured pts except cholesterol control, but no differences were statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> In our study, although the effect of the intervention was lower than the 10% improvement that we estimated a priori, the absolute risk reduction for BP control among pts with DM was 7.8% (NNT, 13). This suggests that, for every 13 pts seeing incentivized clinicians, 1 more pt would achieve BP control. The 7.8% absolute change in BP control for pts with DM represents a 46% relative increase in BP control among intervention pts compared with the baseline of 16.8%. Further research is needed to determine whether this effect of the P4P intervention on BP control increases or decreases over time. However, this NNT to achieve BP control through incentives, taken together with the large relative increase in percentage of pts with BP control and the potential effect of BP control on risk of ischemic vascular events, suggests a reasonable opportunity to reduce morbidity and mortality through P4P as structured in this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong> Some clinics exited the program after randomization, with more control clinics leaving than intervention clinics. Additionally, this intervention occurred in the setting of a voluntary QI program. This may reflect a high level of intrinsic...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Aim
To assess strategies for influencing HTN care including procurement of essential medications, the existence of simple national guidelines for HTN management, introduction of financial incentives for health care practitioners to diagnose or treat HTN, and enhanced health insurance coverage.

### Study type
Systematic review examining the effect of national or regional health system arrangements on HTN care and control

### Study selection criteria based on:
1) HTN awareness. Defined as pts with clinically measured hypertensives who have been diagnosed by a health care professional as hypertensive. 2) HTN treatment. Defined as the use of at least 1 antihypertensive medication in a pt with known HTN. 3) Antihypertensive medication adherence. Defined as consistently taking the antihypertensive medication regimen as prescribed by the health care provider. 4) HTN control: defined as the achievement of BP<140/90 mm Hg (or other explicitly defined threshold) in individuals being treated for HTN, or, alternatively, measured by the mean BP amongst individuals with HTN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies conducted</th>
<th>Outcomes observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 quantitative studies, 2 qualitative</td>
<td>15 cross-sectional studies reported comparisons of HTN outcomes in insured and uninsured pts. 8 of these 15 studies reported that insurance was associated with improved HTN treatment, control or medication adherence. The 7 other cross-sectional studies that compared HTN outcomes in insured pts and uninsured pts, reported no significant negative or positive associations between insurance status and HTN outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Health insurance status:**
  - All 6 of these studies reported significant associations between reduced co-payments or costs and improved HTN control or medication adherence.
  - **Co-payments for medical care:**
    - 14 quantitative studies measured the association of medication co-payments or costs with HTN control or treatment adherence, 9 of which were set in the U.S., and 1 in each of Cameroon, China, Finland, Israel, and Brazil. 2 of the 14 studies had a low risk of bias. 7 of the 14 studies were cohort studies, 1 was a case-control study, and 6 were cross-sectional studies. All 7 cohort

- **Medication costs or medication co-payments:**
  - All 6 of these studies reported significant associations between reduced co-payments or costs and improved HTN control or medication adherence.

- Although lacking longitudinal studies, we found a large positive association between having a routine physician or place of care for HTN management and treatment, awareness, control, and adherence to antihypertensive treatment, again in the U.S. publication and reporting bias noted by authors.
countries, and 1 in a low-income country. Studies reported associations between increased medication costs or co-payments and reductions in HTN control or reduced adherence to antihypertensive medication, although for 1 of these 7 cohort studies, the association between increased copayments and reduced medication adherence was only found for low medication co-payments, and at high co-payment levels medication adherence was actually found to increase (OR for medication adherence vs. baseline of 1 for $0 co-payments was 0.72 for $1–$9 co-payments (p=0.05), 1.02 for $10–$29 co-payments (p=0.05), and 1.32 for co-payments > $30 (p=0.05).

- Physician remuneration models: 2 studies evaluated the association of physician remuneration models with HTN control or treatment adherence, 1 an ecological study set in Canada, and 1 a U.S. cross-sectional study. Neither study had a low risk of bias. The U.S. study reported improved rates of HTN control amongst pts treated under a capitation model compared to fee-for-service pts (adjusted OR for HTN control: 1.82 (95% CI: 1.02–3.27) for capitation vs. fee-for-service pts). The Canadian study reported highest rates of HTN
| treatment and control among practices using a capitation model, compared to fee-for-service and salary model. HTN awareness levels were highest in practices with a fixed salary remuneration model. |
Additional Data Supplement Tables and Figures

Data Supplement A. Treatment of HFrEF Stages C and D

Colors correspond to COR in Table 1. For all medical therapies dosing should be optimized and serial assessment exercised.

*See text for important treatment directions.

†Hydral-Nitrates Green Box- The combination of ISDN/HYD with ARNI has not been robustly tested. BP response should be carefully followed.

‡See 2013 HF guideline.

§Participation in investigational studies is also appropriate for stage C, NYHA class II and III HF.

ACEI indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; ARNI, angiotensin receptor-neprilysin inhibitor; BP, blood pressure; bpm, beats per minute; C/I, contraindication; CRT-D, cardiac resynchronization therapy-device; COR, class of recommendation; Dx, diagnosis; GDMT, guideline-directed management and therapy; HFrEF, heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; ICD, implantable cardioverter-defibrillator; ISDN/HYD, isosorbide dinitrate hydral-nitrates; LBBB, left bundle-branch block; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction.
Data Supplement B. Medication Adherence Assessment Scales

Hill-Bone Compliance Scale (346)

How often do you:
1. Forget to take your high BP medicine?
2. Decide NOT to take your high BP medicine?
3. Eat salty foods
4. Shake salt on your food before you eat it?
5. Eat fast food?
6. Make the next appointment before you leave the doctor’s office?
7. Miss scheduled appointments?
8. Forget to get prescriptions filled?
9. Run out of high BP pills?
10. Skip your high BP medicine before you go to the doctor?
11. Miss taking your high BP pills when you feel better?
12. Miss taking your high BP pills when you feel sick?
13. Take someone else’s high BP pills?
14. Miss taking your high BP pills when you are careless?

Response:
1. All of the Time
2. Most of the Time
3. Some of the Time
4. None of the Time

Medication taking subscale: Items 1,2, 8,9,10,11,12,13,14.
Reducing sodium intake subscale: Items 3,4,5.
Appointment keeping subscale: Items 6,7.

Data Supplement C. Categories Defining Normal BP, Elevated BP, and Stages 1, 2, and 3 Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBP (mm Hg)</th>
<th>&lt;120</th>
<th>120–129</th>
<th>130–139</th>
<th>140–159</th>
<th>160+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;80</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–89</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90–99</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure.
Stages 1, 2, and 3 refer to the stage of hypertension.

BP indicates blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.
### Data Supplement D. Fixed-Dose Combination Antihypertensive Drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dosage Strengths (mg/mg)</th>
<th>Daily Frequency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-drug combinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Inhibitors + Thiazide</td>
<td>Benazepril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>10/12.5, 20/12.5, 20/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captopril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>25/15, 50/15, 25/25, 50/25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enalapril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>5/12.5, 10/25</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fosinopril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>10/12.5, 20/12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisinopril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>10/12.5, 20/12.5, 20/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moexipril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>7.5/12.5, 15/12.5, 15/25</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quinapril/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>10/12.5, 20/12.5, 20/25</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBs + Thiazide</td>
<td>Azilsartan/Chlorthalidone</td>
<td>40/12.5, 40/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candesartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>16/12.5, 32/12.5, 32/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eprosartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>600/12.5, 600/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irbesartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>150/12.5, 300/12.5, 300/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Losartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>50/12.5, 100/12.5, 100/25</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olmesartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>20/12.5, 40/12.5, 40/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telmisartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>40/12.5, 80/12.5, 80/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valsartan/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>80/12.5, 160/12.5, 320/12.5, 160/25, 320/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB – dihydropyridine + ACEIs</td>
<td>Amlodipine/Benazepril</td>
<td>2.5/10, 5/10, 5/20, 10/20, 5/40, 10/40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enalapril/Felodipine</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perindopril/Amlodipine</td>
<td>3.5/2.5, 7.5/14/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB – dihydropyridine + ARB</td>
<td>Amlodipine/Olmesartan</td>
<td>5/20, 10/20, 4/40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amlodipine/Valsartan</td>
<td>5/160, 10/160, 5/320, 10/320</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telmisartan/Amlodipine</td>
<td>40/5, 80/5, 40/10, 80/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB – nondihydropyridine + ACEIs</td>
<td>Trandolapril/Verapamil</td>
<td>2/180, 1/250, 2/240, 4/240</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blocker + Thiazide</td>
<td>Atenolol/Chlorthalidone</td>
<td>50/25, 100/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bisoprolol/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>2.5/6.25, 5/6.25, 10/6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metoprolol succinate/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>25/12.5, 50/12.5, 100/12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metoprolol tartrate/ Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>50/25, 100/25, 100/50</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nadolol/Bendroflumethiazide</td>
<td>40/5, 80/5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propranolol/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>40/25, 80/25</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct renin inhibitor + CCB – dihydropyridine</td>
<td>Aliskiren/amlo dipine</td>
<td>150/5, 150/10, 300/5, 300/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct renin inhibitor + Thiazide</td>
<td>Aliskiren/ Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>150/12.5, 150/25, 300/12.5, 300/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct renin inhibitor + CCB – dihydropyridine</td>
<td>Aliskiren/Amlodipine</td>
<td>150/5, 150/10, 300/5, 300/10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct renin inhibitor + Thiazide</td>
<td>Aliskiren/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>150/12.5, 150/25, 300/12.5, 300/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central acting agent + Thiazide</td>
<td>Clonidine/Chlorthalidone</td>
<td>0.1/15, 0.2/15, 0.3/15</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methyl dopa/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>250/15, 250/25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretic- potassium sparing + Thiazide</td>
<td>Amlorolide/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>5/50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triamterene/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>37.5/25, 75/50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretic- aldosterone antagonist + Thiazide</td>
<td>Spironolactone/ Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>25/25</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-drug combinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olmesartan/Amlodipine/ Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>20/5/12.5, 40/5/12.5, 40/5/25, 40/10/12.5, 40/10/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct renin inhibitor + CCB – dihydropyridine + Thiazide</td>
<td>Aliskiren/Amlodipine/Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>150/5/12.5, 300/5/12.5, 300/5/25, 300/10/12.5, 300/10/25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACE indicates angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker; and CCB, calcium channel blocker.

From Chobanian et al. JNC 7. (347)

**Data Supplement E. Examples of Hypertension Quality Improvement Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit and feedback on performance</td>
<td>• Feedback of performance to individual providers&lt;br&gt;• Benchmarking – provision of outcomes data from top performers for comparison with provider’s own data&lt;br&gt;• Performance measures, quality indicators and reports&lt;br&gt;• Use of registries to track BP control status at system and provider levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider education</td>
<td>• In person, online, or other education to improve BP measurement and management skills&lt;br&gt;• Training to improve communication, cultural competency, and ability to inspire and support lifestyle modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>• Intensive education strategies promoting hypertension self-management&lt;br&gt;• Cultural and linguistic tailoring of materials to increase acceptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of self-management</td>
<td>• Reduce barriers for patients to receive and adhere to medications and to implement lifestyle modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient reminder systems (for follow-up appointments, BP checks, and self-management)</td>
<td>• Postcards, calls, texts, or emails to patients&lt;br&gt;• Telehealth-delivered reminders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System change</td>
<td>• Standardization of BP measurement using an automated device and standardized protocol&lt;br&gt;• Screening to identify all patients eligible for hypertension management&lt;br&gt;• Systematic follow-up of patients for the initiation and intensification of antihypertensive therapy&lt;br&gt;• Decision support to providers to guide protocol-based treatment decisions&lt;br&gt;• Physician or other clinical champion designated to lead hypertension care improvement initiatives&lt;br&gt;• Hypertension specialist available for consult&lt;br&gt;• Partner with community resources to support BP management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure.

Adapted with permission from Walsh et al. (348).
Data Supplement F. Barriers and Improvement Strategies in Antihypertensive Medication Adherence (349-353)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Level</th>
<th>Improvement Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple comorbid conditions requiring complex medication regimens</td>
<td>• Educate patients about hypertension, consequences of hypertension, and possible adverse effects of medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convenience factors (e.g., dosing frequency)</td>
<td>• Collaborate with patient to establish goals of therapy and plan of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health beliefs</td>
<td>• Maintain contact with patients; consider telehealth approaches (Section 12.3.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Behavioral factors</td>
<td>• Integrate pill-taking into daily routine activities of daily living with adherence support tools such as reminders, pillboxes, packaging, or other aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of involvement in the treatment decision–making process</td>
<td>• Use motivation interventions to support medication adherence and lifestyle modification efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issues with treatment of asymptomatic diseases (e.g., treatment side effects)</td>
<td>• Use medication adherence scales to facilitate identification of barriers and facilitators to and behaviors associated with adequate adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource constraints</td>
<td>• Address health literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suboptimal health literacy</td>
<td>o Teach-back method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Empower patients to ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Use visual, interactive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Health literacy universal precautions tool kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Provide medication list/pictorial medication schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider and Health System Levels</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Prescription of complex drug regimens</td>
<td>• Assess for nonadherence and explore barriers to medication adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate communication with patient about regimen, adverse effects, treatment goals</td>
<td>• Use a multifactorial approach to optimize adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate communication among multiple providers</td>
<td>• Participate in training to enhance communication skills and increase cultural competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office visit time limitations</td>
<td>• Use a multifactorial approach to optimize adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited access to care, pharmacies, prescription refills</td>
<td>• Reduce complexity of medication regimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilize agents that are dosed once daily over those which require multiple daily doses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilize fixed-dose combination agents when available and simplify drug regimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider overall side effect profile and preferentially use agents that are well tolerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use low-cost and generic antihypertensives from drug classes where RCTs have demonstrated a reduction in cardiovascular events when appropriate (354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use team-based care approaches (Section 12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use health information technology-based approaches (Section 12.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RCTs indicate randomized controlled trials.
Data Supplement G. Examples of Strategies to Promote Lifestyle Modification Interventions in Patients With Hypertension (318, 319, 355-361)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifestyle Modification Intervention</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tobacco Cessation** | • Ask all adults about tobacco use  
• Advise them to stop using tobacco  
• Provide behavioral interventions  
• Consider pharmacotherapy for tobacco cessation | (361, 362) |
| **Weight Loss** | • Offer or refer obese adults to intensive cognitive and behavioral interventions aimed at to improve weight status and other risk factors for important health outcomes. | (355, 356) |
| **Sodium Reduction** | • Offer or refer to behavioral counselling aimed at reduced intake of dietary sodium  
• Encourage use of food labels to choose lower sodium products |  |
| **Alcohol** | • Screen adults ≥18 y of age for alcohol misuse and provide persons engaged in risky or hazardous drinking with behavioral counseling interventions to reduce alcohol misuse. | (357, 358) |
| **Physical Activity and Diet** | • Use medium- to high-intensity behavioral counseling interventions to improve intermediate health outcomes; addressing barriers, such as lack of access to affordable healthier foods, transportation barriers and poor local safety. | (359, 360) |
Data Supplement H. Responsibilities and Roles of the Hypertension Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypertension Team Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communication and care coordination among various team members, the patient and family members or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other support persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective use of evidence-based diagnosis and management guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular, structured follow-up mechanisms and reminder systems to monitor patient progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engage patients in their care by shared decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medication adherence support and appropriate education about hypertension medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medication addition and titration using evidence-based treatment algorithms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of evidence-based tools and resources designed to maximize self-management (including health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior change, lifestyle modification, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follow a single, personalized plan of care based upon patient characteristics and needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Hypertension Team Members</th>
<th>Roles (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care Physician, Physician</td>
<td>Routine and complex hypertension care, managing primary care issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant, Advanced Practice Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiologist</td>
<td>Routine and complex hypertension care, especially for patient with cardiac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disease or high risk for major cardiovascular events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrologist, Endocrinologist,</td>
<td>Management of complex hypertension care, especially due to secondary causes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension Specialist</td>
<td>and/or resistant hypertension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse (including in-office, home care,</td>
<td>Accurate assessment of BP, medication reconciliation, patient education,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal and external population health</td>
<td>self-management, lifestyle modification and adherence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Pharmacist</td>
<td>Comprehensive medication management, which involves identification and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentation of medication-related problems, initiating, modifying, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discontinuing medication to address identified problems, and educating patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on their medication regimen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td>Ongoing patient-centered counseling to assess dietary habits and preferences,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>set and monitor goals for healthy lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Assess for psychosocial, cultural and financial barriers, find solutions to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overcome these barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Providers</td>
<td>Assess for psychosocial, cultural and financial barriers, identify and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promote acceptable community-based resources to overcome these barriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure.
Data Supplement I. Examples of Telehealth Strategies and Technologies to Promote Effective Hypertension Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telehealth strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Automated BP data capture and transmission of the patient’s self-measured BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-management support including education, reminders, and feedback that is automated or delivered by a healthcare professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medication titration and follow-up monitoring protocols/algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prescription refill reminders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medication adherence assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-monitoring of lifestyle behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration of behavior change techniques, including in person or e-counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Case/care/population health management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commonly used telehealth technologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Wired “land line” telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wireless smart phone applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internet-based website via computers and handheld devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Text messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-mail messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social networking and social media websites/applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wireless BP measurement devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electronic pill dispensers/counters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure.
## Data Supplement J. Publicly Available Performance Measures Used to Assess Hypertension Care Quality Services (363-367)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Controlling High BP  
PQRS Measure #236; NQF #0018 | NCQA | Percentage of patients 18–85 y of age who had a diagnosis of hypertension and whose BP was adequately controlled (<140/90 mm Hg during the measurement period) | Used in the CMS, PQRS, MSSP, Medicare Advantage “Stars” ratings; component of Commercial Health Plan HEDIS quality measure set |
| Comprehensive Diabetes Care: BP Control (<140/90 mm Hg)  
NQF #0061 | NCQA | The percentage of patients 18–75 y of age with DM (type 1 and type 2) whose most recent BP level taken during the measurement y is <140/90 mm Hg | Used for:  
• Accreditation  
• Decision-making by businesses about health plan purchasing  
• Decision-making by consumers about health plan/provider choice  
• External oversight/Medicaid  
• External oversight/Medicare  
• External oversight/State government program  
• Internal quality improvement  
• Public reporting |
| Adult Kidney Disease: BP Management  
PQRS #122 | PCPI, RPA | Percentage of patient visits for those patients ≥18 y of age with a diagnosis of CKD (stage 3, 4, or 5, not receiving renal replacement therapy) with a BP<140/90 mm Hg OR ≥140/90 mm Hg with a documented plan of care | Used in PQRS |
| Percentage of patients ≥18 y of age with BP documented in the medical record (every 2 y if <120/80 mm Hg, every y if 120–139/80–89 mm Hg) | ICSI | This measure is used to assess the percentage of patients age 18 y of age and older with BP documented in the medical record (every 2 y if <120/80 mm Hg, every y if 120–139/80–89 mm Hg) | Used for internal quality improvement |
| Controlling High BP for People with Serious Mental Illness  
NQF #2602 | NCQA | The percentage of patients 18–85 y of age with serious mental illness who had a diagnosis of hypertension and whose BP was adequately controlled during the measurement | Current Use:  
• Accreditation  
• Decision-making by businesses about health plan purchasing  
• Decision-making by consumers about health plan/provider choice  
• External oversight/Medicaid  
• External oversight/state government program  
• Internal quality improvement |
| Diabetes Care for People with Serious Mental Illness: BP Control (<140/90 mm Hg)  
NQF #2606 | NCQA | The percentage of patients 18–75 y of age with a serious mental illness and DM (type 1 and type 2) whose most recent BP reading during the measurement year is <140/90 mm Hg | Current Use:  
• Accreditation  
• Decision-making by businesses about health plan purchasing  
• Decision-making by consumers about health plan/provider choice  
• External oversight/Medicaid |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension diagnosis and treatment: percentage of adult patients ≥18 y of age diagnosed with hypertension who are not at goal for hypertension and have received counseling on diet and physical activity in the past 12 mo</td>
<td>ICSI</td>
<td>Used to assess the percentage adult patients ≥18 y of age diagnosed with hypertension who are not at goal for hypertension and have received counseling on diet and physical activity in the past 12 mo</td>
<td>Used for Internal Quality Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulatory care sensitive conditions: age-standardized acute care hospitalization rate for conditions where appropriate ambulatory care prevents or reduces the need for admission to the hospital per 100,000 population &lt;75 y of age</td>
<td>CIHI</td>
<td>Used to assess the age-standardized acute care hospitalization rate for conditions where appropriate ambulatory care prevents or reduces the need for admission to the hospital per 100,000 population &lt;75 y of age</td>
<td>Used for: Monitoring health state(s) National health policymaking National reporting State/Provincial health policymaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension: the relative resource use by members with hypertension during the measurement y</td>
<td>NCQA</td>
<td>Used to assess the relative resource use by members with hypertension by reporting total standard cost and service frequency for all services for which the organization has paid or expects to pay during the measurement y</td>
<td>Used for: Accreditation External oversight/Medicaid External oversight/Medicare External oversight/State government program Monitoring and planning Public reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP indicates blood pressure; CIHI, Canadian Institute for Health Information; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CMS, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; DM, diabetes mellitus; HEDIS, healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set; ICSI, Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement; MSSP, Medicare Shared Savings Program; NCQA, National Committee for Quality Assurance; NQF, National Quality Forum; OR, odds ratio; PCPI, Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement; and PQRS, Physician Quality Reporting System; and RPA, Renal Physicians Association.
Data Supplement K. Online Quality Improvement Resources for Treatment and Control of Hypertension

**American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association/Centers for Disease Control** Science Advisory for the Effective Approach to High Blood Pressure Control


**American Medical Association** Measure, Act and Partner (M.A.P.) to help patients control blood pressure and ultimately prevent heart disease


**United States Health and Human Services (HHS)/Centers for Disease Control (CDC)** Million Hearts Campaign Evidence-based Treatment Protocols for Improving Blood Pressure Control

[http://millionhearts.hhs.gov/resources/protocols.html](http://millionhearts.hhs.gov/resources/protocols.html)

**Department of Defense/Veterans’ Affairs**


**Kaiser Permanente** Hypertension Management programs to improve blood pressure control

[http://kpcmi.org/how-we-work/hypertension-control/](http://kpcmi.org/how-we-work/hypertension-control/)

**Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI)** Hypertension Diagnosis and Treatment Guidelines

[https://www.icsi.org/guidelines_more/catalog_guidelines_and_more/catalog_guidelines/catalog_cardiovascular_guidelines/hypertension/](https://www.icsi.org/guidelines_more/catalog_guidelines_and_more/catalog_guidelines/catalog_cardiovascular_guidelines/hypertension/)

**New York Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)** Hypertension Collaborative Care Pathway
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