

Reappraisal of European guidelines on hypertension management:

A European Society of Hypertension
Task Force document

Reappraisal of European guidelines on hypertension management:

A European Society of Hypertension
Task Force document

Reappraisal of European guidelines on hypertension management:

A European Society of

Hypertension Task Force document

Prof. Giuseppe Mancia

Clinica Medica, University of Milan-Bicocca

San Gerardo Hospital

Via Pergolesi 33, 20052, Monza, Milan, Italy

Prof. Stéphane Laurent

Department of Pharmacology and INSERM U970

European Hospital Georges Pompidou

Paris Descartes University, 20 rue Leblanc 75015 Paris, France

European Society of Hypertension Task Force Members

The Disclosure Forms of the Task Force Members are available on
the ESH web site (www.esholine.org)

Published by Springer Healthcare Ltd, 236 Gray's Inn Road, London, WC1X 8HB, UK.

www.springerhealthcare.com

©2011 Springer Healthcare, a part of Springer Science+Business Media.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

ISBN 978-1-907673-16-0

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Although every effort has been made to ensure that drug doses and other information are presented accurately in this publication, the ultimate responsibility rests with the prescribing physician. Neither the publisher nor the authors can be held responsible for errors or for any consequences arising from the use of the information contained herein. Any product mentioned in this publication should be used in accordance with the prescribing information prepared by the manufacturers. No claims or endorsements are made for any drug or compound at present under clinical investigation.

Designer: Joe Harvey

Artworker: Sissan Mollerfors

Production: Marina Maher

Printed in Great Britain by Latimer Trend

Contents

Task Force Members	vii
Trial acronyms	viii
Introduction	1
Assessment of subclinical organ damage for stratification of total cardiovascular risk	5
Heart	6
Blood vessels	8
Kidney	9
Additional measures of organ damage	10
Subclinical organ damage as a marker of high cardiovascular risk	12
Prognostic value of treatment-induced modifications of subclinical organ damage	14
Conclusions	16
Treatment approach	19
When to initiate antihypertensive treatment	20
Blood pressure goals	22
<i>Post-hoc</i> analysis of trials and trials on organ damage	23
The J-curve phenomenon	27
Are the 2007 recommendations still applicable?	28
Treatment strategies	33
Choice of antihypertensive drugs	34
Is ranking antihypertensive agents in order of choice useful or deceiving in practice?	42
Preferred drugs	43
Monotherapy and combination therapy	44
Therapeutic approach in special conditions	53
Elderly	54
Diabetes mellitus	57
Renal disease	60
Cerebrovascular disease	61
Coronary heart disease and heart failure	63
Atrial fibrillation	64
Hypertension and erectile dysfunction	66

Treatment of associated risk factors	67
Lipid lowering agents	68
Antiplatelet therapy	68
Glycaemic control	70
The issue of the polypill	71
New trials needed	73
Acknowledgement	77
References	78

European Society of Hypertension

Task Force Members

Giuseppe Mancia, Co-Chairperson, University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Stéphane Laurent, Co-Chairperson, Hopital Europeen Georges Pompidou, France

Enrico Agabiti-Rosei, University of Brescia, Italy

Ettore Ambrosioni, University of Bologna, Italy

Michel Burnier, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Switzerland

Mark J. Caulfield, Queen Mary University of London, UK

Renata Cifkova, Institute for Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Czech Republic

Denis Clément, University of Ghent, Belgium

Antonio Coca, University of Barcelona, Spain

Anna Dominiczak, University of Glasgow, UK

Serap Erdine, Istanbul University Cerrhpa, Turkey

Robert Fagard, University of Leuven, Belgium

Csaba Farsang, St. Imre Hospital, Hungary

Guido Grassi, University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Hermann Haller, Hannover Medical School, Germany

Antony Heagerty, Manchester Royal Infirmary, UK

Sverre E. Kjeldsen, Ullevaal University Hospital, Norway

Wolfgang Kiowski, Cardiovascular Center Zuerich, Switzerland

Jean Michel Mallion, CHU de Grenoble, France

Athanasios Manolis, Asklepeion General Hospital, Greece

Krzysztof Narkiewicz, Medical University of Gdansk, Poland

Peter Nilsson, University Hospital Malmö, Sweden

Michael H. Olsen, Glostrup University Hospital, Denmark

Karl Heinz Rahn, University of Münster, Germany

Josep Redon, University of Valencia, Spain

José Rodicio, University Complutense, Spain

Luis Ruilope, Hospital 12 de Octubre, Spain

Roland E. Schmieder, University Erlangen-Nuernberg, Germany

Harry A.J. Struijker-Boudier, University of Limburg in Maastricht, The Netherlands

Pieter A. van Zwieten, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Margus Viigimaa, North Estonia Medical Centre, Estonia

Alberto Zanchetti, University of Milan, Italy

Trial acronyms

ABCD	Appropriate Blood Pressure Control in Diabetes.
ACCESS	Acute Candesartan Cilixetil Therapy in Stroke Survivals.
ACCOMPLISH	Avoiding Cardiovascular Events in Combination Therapy in Patients Living with Systolic Hypertension.
ACCORD	Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes.
ACTION	A Coronary Disease Trial Investigating Outcome with Nifedipine gastrointestinal therapeutic system.
ADVANCE	Action in Diabetes and Vascular disease; Preterax and Diamicron-MR Controlled Evaluation.
ALLHAT	Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial.
ASCOT	Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial.
AUSTRALIAN	Australian Therapeutic Trial in Mild Hypertension.
BENEDICT	Bergamo Nephrologic Diabetic Complications Trial.
CAFE	Conduit Artery Function Evaluation.
CAMELOT	Comparison of Amlodipine versus Enalapril to Limit Occurrences of Thrombosis.
CAPRAF	Candesartan in the Prevention of Relapsing Atrial Fibrillation.
CASE-J	Candesartan Antihypertensive Survival Evaluation in Japan.
CHARM	Candesartan in Heart Failure-Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and Morbidity.
CHHIPS	Controlling Hypertension and Hypotension Immediately Poststroke.
COMET	Carvedilol or Metoprolol European Trial.
COOPER and WARRENDER	Treatment of Hypertension in Elderly Patients in Primary Care.
COOPERATE	Combination Treatment of Angiotensin-II Receptor Blocker and Angiotensin-Converting-Enzyme Inhibitor in Non-Diabetic Renal Disease.

DIRECT	Diabetic Retinopathy Candesartan Trials.
ELSA	European Lacidipine Study on Atherosclerosis.
EUROPA	European Trial on Reduction of Cardiac Events with Perindopril in Stable Coronary Artery Disease.
EWPHE	European Working Party on High Blood Pressure in the Elderly.
FEVER	Felodipine Event Reduction.
GEMINI	Glycemic Effect in Diabetes Mellitus: Carvedilol–Metoprolol Comparison in Hypertensives.
GISSI-AF	Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell'Infarto Miocardico–Atrial Fibrillation.
HDFP	Hypertension Detection and Follow-up Program.
HOPE	Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation.
HOT	Hypertension Optimal Treatment Study.
HYVET	Hypertension in the Very Elderly Trial.
IDNT	Irbesartan Diabetic Nephropathy Trial.
INSIGHT	International Nifedipine GITS Study Intervention as a Goal in Hypertension Treatment.
INVEST	International Verapamil SR/Trandolapril study.
I-PRESERVE	Irbesartan in Heart Failure with Preserved Systolic Function.
JATOS	Japanese Trial to Assess Optimal Systolic Blood Pressure in Elderly Hypertensive Patients.
JUPITER	Justification for the Use of Statins in Primary Prevention: An Intervention Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin.
LIFE	Losartan Intervention For Endpoint Reduction in Hypertension.
MDRD	Modification of Diet in Renal Disease.
MICROHOPE	Microalbuminuria, Cardiovascular and Renal Outcomes in the Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation.
MRC	Medical Research Council Trial of Treatment of Mild Hypertension.

MRC elderly	Medical Research Council Trial of Treatment of Hypertension in Older Adults.
ONTARGET	Ongoing Telmisartan Alone and in combination with Ramipril Global Endpoint Trial.
OSLO	Oslo Study of Treatment of Mild Hypertension.
PAMELA	Pressioni Arteriose Monitorate E Loro Associazioni.
PATS	Post-stroke Antihypertensive Treatment Study.
PEACE	Prevention of Events with Angiotensin Converting Enzyme Inhibition.
PHARAO	Prevention of Hypertension with the Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor Ramipril in Patients with High-Normal Blood Pressure.
PHYLLIS	Plaque Hypertension Lipid Lowering Italian Study.
PREVEND	Prevention of Renal and Vascular End Stage Disease.
PREVENT	Prospective Randomized Evaluation of the Vascular Effects of Norvasc Trial.
PROFESS	Prevention Regimen for Effectively Avoiding Second Strokes.
PROGRESS	Perindopril Protection against Recurrent Stroke Study.
RENAAL	Reduction of Endpoints in Noninsulin dependent diabetes mellitus with the Angiotensin II Antagonist Losartan.
SCOPE	Study on Cognition and Prognosis in the Elderly.
SCORE	Systematic Coronary Risk Evaluation.
SENIORS	Study of the Effects of Nebivolol Intervention on Outcomes and Rehospitalisation in Seniors
	with Heart Failure.
SHEP	Systolic Hypertension in the Elderly Program.
STOP	Swedish Trial in Old Patients with Hypertension.
Syst-China	Systolic Hypertension in China.
Syst-Eur	Systolic Hypertension in Europe.
TNT	Treating to New Targets.
TRANSCEND	Telmisartan Randomized Assessment Study in ACE-I Intolerant Subjects with Cardiovascular Disease.
TROPHY	Trial of Preventing Hypertension.

UKPDS	United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study.
VADT	Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial.
Val-HeFT	Valsartan Heart Failure Trial.
VALIANT	Valsartan In Acute Myocardial Infarction Trial.
VALUE	Valsartan Antihypertensive Long-term Use Evaluation.

Chapter 1

Introduction

In the 2 years since the publication of the 2007 guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) [1], research on hypertension has actively been pursued and the results of new important studies (including several large randomised trials of antihypertensive therapy) have been published. Some of these studies have reinforced the evidence on which the recommendations of the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines were based. However, other studies have widened the information available in 2007, modifying some of the previous concepts, and suggesting that new evidence-based recommendations could be appropriate. The aim of this document of the ESH is to address a number of studies on hypertension published in the last 2 years in order to assess their contribution to our expanding knowledge of hypertension. Furthermore, some critical appraisal of the current recommendations of the ESH/ESC, as well as of other guidelines, might be a useful step toward the preparation of a third version of the European guidelines in the future.

The most important conclusions are summarised in Tables. The points that will be discussed are reported in Table 1.

Issues

Assessment of subclinical organ damage from total CV risk stratification

- Heart
- Blood vessels
- Kidney
- Additional measures
- Subclinical organ damage as marker of a high cardiovascular risk
- Prognostic value of treatment induced organ damage changes
- Conclusion

Treatment approach

- When to initiate antihypertensive treatment
- BP goals
- *Post-hoc* analysis of trials and effects on organ damage
- The J curve phenomenon
- Are the 2007 recommendations still applicable?

Treatment strategies

- Choice of antihypertensive drugs
 - β -blockers
 - Thiazide diuretics
 - ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor antagonists
 - Calcium antagonists
 - New antihypertensive drugs
- Are ranking antihypertensive agents in order of choice useful or deceiving in practice?
- Preferred drugs
- Monotherapy and combination therapy
 - BP lowering with the two/approaches
 - Two drug combination as first step treatment
 - Preferred drug combinations
 - Fixed dose (or single pill) combinations
- Conclusion

Therapeutic approach in special conditions

- Elderly
- Diabetes mellitus
- Renal disease
- Cerebrovascular disease
- Coronary heart disease and heart failure
- Atrial fibrillation
- Hypertension in women
- Erectile dysfunction

Treatment of associated risk factors

- Lipid lowering agents
- Antiplatelet therapy
- Glycaemic control
- The issue of the polypill

New trials needed

Table 1

Chapter 2

Assessment of subclinical organ damage for stratification of total cardiovascular risk

Heart	6
Blood vessels	8
Kidney	9
Additional measures of organ damage	10
Subclinical organ damage as marker of a high cardiovascular risk	12
Prognostic value of treatment induced organ damage changes	14
Conclusion	16

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines recommend total cardiovascular risk be evaluated in each patient to decide about important aspects of treatment: the blood pressure (BP) threshold at which to commence drug administration, the target BP to be reached by treatment, the use of two-drug combinations as the initial treatment step, and the possible addition to the antihypertensive treatment regimen of lipid-lowering and antiplatelet agents [1]. Among the criteria to assess total cardiovascular risk, the European guidelines consider subclinical organ damage to be a very important component, because asymptomatic alterations of the cardiovascular system and the kidney are crucial intermediate stages in the disease continuum that links risk factors such as hypertension to cardiovascular events and death. On the basis of a number of criteria (prognostic importance, prevalence in the population, availability and cost of the assessment procedures, etc.), the 2007 European guidelines considered detection of organ damage as important for the diagnostic and prognostic evaluation of hypertensive patients. They further subdivided the different types of organ damage into (1) those that can be identified by relatively simple and cheap procedures (electrocardiogram, serum creatinine, estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR], and measurement of urinary protein excretion in order to detect microalbuminuria or proteinuria), which were thus regarded as suitable for routine search in the whole hypertensive population, and (2) those that require more complex procedures or instrumentations (echocardiogram, carotid ultrasonography, pulse wave velocity), which were for this reason only recommended for a more in-depth characterisation of the hypertensive patient. Since then, other studies have added useful information on the importance of detecting subclinical organ damage in the hypertensive population, strengthening the recommendation to use the most easily available and the least costly procedures in the routine examination of individuals with hypertension.

Heart

A few recent papers have revived interest in the power of the electrocardiogram to predict the risk of cardiovascular events. In a prospective survey including 7495 American adults, a new indicator of left ventricular hyper-

trophy (LVH), the Novacode estimate of left ventricular mass index that is based on both voltage and strain pattern criteria, has been reported to be significantly related to 10-year cardiovascular mortality [2]. The relation remained significant after adjusting for age, SBP, smoking, cholesterol, and diabetes. Furthermore, in the LIFE trial, the investigators have reported that in hypertensive patients with electrocardiographic LVH, left bundle branch block identifies individuals at increased risk of cardiovascular mortality (hazard ratio 1.6), sudden cardiovascular death (hazard ratio 3.5), and hospitalisation for heart failure (hazard ratio 1.7) [3]. Finally, a very recent prospective study [4] focused on the R-wave voltage in lead aVL as being rather closely associated with left ventricular mass (LVM), and additionally predictive of incident cardiovascular events even when hypertension is not accompanied by electrocardiographic LVH (9% higher risk for each 0.1mV higher R-wave).

Additional evidence is also available on the predictive power of cardiac abnormalities, as detected by echocardiography, an approach of continuing interest because of its ability to more directly and precisely quantify LVM and geometric LVH patterns. A retrospective study has recently updated information from more than 35 000 normotensive and hypertensive participants with normal left ventricular ejection fraction [5]. Despite normal left ventricular function, an abnormal left ventricular geometric pattern was found in 46% of the patients (35% left ventricular concentric remodelling and 11% LVH), and the associated risk of all-cause mortality was twice as large as that of patients with normal left ventricular geometry. Although in another study on an African–American population, the relationship between left ventricular geometric patterns and all-cause mortality was markedly attenuated after adjusting for baseline variables, and remained significant only in men [6], the increased risk associated with LVH has been confirmed by other observations. In a prospective study on a cohort of 1652 Greek hypertensive patients followed up for 6 years, echocardiographic LVH was significantly associated with either a composite of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular events (hazard ratio 1.53) and with stroke (hazard ratio 2.01), after adjustment for major cardiovascular risk factors [7]. Furthermore, a retrospective analysis of 1447 Japanese hypertensive patients who participated in the CASE-J

trial showed that cardiovascular events occurred about 2.6 times more frequently in patients with a LVM index 125 g/m² or more compared with those with a LVM index below this value [8]. Finally, in the PAMELA population, echocardiographic LVH was associated with a four-fold to five-fold significant increase in cardiovascular morbidity and mortality when data were adjusted for a large number of potential confounders, including office, home, and ambulatory BP values. A 10% increase in LVM increased the risk more markedly when baseline LVM was already abnormal, but an increasing risk was evident also when calculated from LVM values within the normal range [9].

Blood vessels

The relationship of carotid intima–media thickness (IMT) and plaques with subsequent cardiovascular events, already discussed in the 2007 guidelines, has been further strengthened by data from ELSA [10], which have shown that baseline carotid IMT predicts cardiovascular events independent of BP (clinic and ambulatory) and this occurs both for the IMT value at the carotid bifurcations and for the IMT value at the level of the common carotid artery. This suggests that both atherosclerosis (reflected by the IMT value at the bifurcations) and vascular hypertrophy (reflected by the common carotid IMT) exert an adverse prognostic effect in addition to that of high BP. An adverse prognostic significance of carotid plaques (hazard ratio 2.3) has also been reported in a sample of residents of the Copenhagen County free of overt cardiovascular disease, which was prospectively followed for about 13 years [11]. Evidence has also accrued on the adverse prognostic value of arterial stiffening. In the Copenhagen County population, an increased pulse wave velocity (PWV >12 m/s) was associated with a 50% increase in the risk of a cardiovascular event [11]. Furthermore, an independent predictive value of PWV for cardiovascular events has been shown in Japanese men followed for 8.2 years [12]. Finally, indirect indices of aortic stiffness and wave reflection, such as central BP and augmentation index, have been confirmed as independent predictors of cardiovascular events in two recent studies [13,14]. In particular, in one of these studies of 1272 normotensive and untreated hypertensive patients, only central SBP consistently and independently predicted cardiovascular

mortality after adjustment for various cardiovascular risk factors, including LVM and carotid IMT [14]. However, it should be emphasised that in most available studies, the additive predictive value of central BP beyond brachial pressure appears limited, which leaves the question whether central BP measurements should be regularly considered in the clinical profiling of hypertensive patients in need of further investigation.

Kidney

Several new data [15] reinforce the already solid evidence on the prognostic value of eGFR that was available at the time of the 2007 guidelines [1]. In the population of Gubbio (Italy), an eGFR in the lowest decile was associated with a significantly higher incidence of cardiovascular events (hazard ratio 2.14) [16], and in the abovementioned Greek study [7], an eGFR between 15 and 59 ml/min per 1.73m² was associated with a 66% increase in the composite endpoint of all cause mortality and cardiovascular events after adjustment for baseline cardiovascular risk and independent of LVH [7]. Likewise, in a post hoc analysis of data from the VALUE trial [17], eGFR according to the MDRD formula was significantly predictive of all outcomes except stroke (with hazard ratios between 1.23 and 1.70 according to the different outcomes) and was more sensitive than calculation of the creatinine clearance value according to the Cockcroft–Gault formula, which was only predictive of all-cause mortality.

The baseline eGFR by the MDRD formula turned out to be importantly predictive of both renal and cardiovascular events also in the large number (n¼11 140) of type 2 diabetic patients included in the ADVANCE trial, even when data were adjusted for many potential confounders, including the concomitant urinary protein excretion value. For every 50% reduction of baseline eGFR the risk of cardiovascular events significantly increased 2.2-fold, the concomitant increase in the risk of cardiovascular death and renal events being 3.6-fold and 63.6-fold, respectively [18].

New evidence is also available to support the already large amount of data in favour of the prognostic value of the moderate increase in urinary protein excretion, defined as microalbuminuria [19,20]. In two population studies, the Gubbio study [16] and the Copenhagen County study [11], microalbuminuria was confirmed as an important predictor of

cardiovascular outcome, the adjusted hazard ratio being, respectively, 2.15-fold and 3.10-fold greater in patients with microalbuminuria compared with those without. In the Gubbio study, the association of microalbuminuria with low eGFR had a multiplicative effect (hazard ratio 5.93). In the ADVANCE trial [18], a change from one clinical stage of albuminuria to the next was associated with a 1.6-fold, 2.0-fold, and 3.3-fold increase in the multivariate adjusted risk of cardiovascular events, cardiovascular death, and renal events, respectively, this being the case also when the change from normoalbuminuria to microalbuminuria was involved. The effects of higher baseline urinary protein excretion and reduced eGFR were independent of each other and the association of microalbuminuria and an eGFR value less than 60 ml/min per 1.73m² brought about an additional increase in risk: 3.2-fold for cardiovascular events, 5.9-fold for cardiovascular mortality, and 22.2-fold for renal events.

Additional measures of organ damage

The 2007 European guidelines mention a number of additional measures of organ damage for which evidence of prognostic relevance was available, but no use in the clinical practice could be foreseen because of drawbacks of practical relevance, such as the high cost and low availability of the devices involved, the complexity and time consumption inherent in the procedures, and in several instances the lack of standardisation of the values obtained between laboratories and across countries. Based on the evidence available in the last 2 years, no addition to the measures of organ damage included in the 2007 guidelines can be supported, although the growing availability of more sophisticated techniques and the reduced cost of their use brought about by technological progress, makes future additions likely.

In this context, the use of nuclear magnetic resonance deserves special mention. Although not prospective in nature, a very recent study systematically employing nuclear magnetic resonance imaging in a group of 142 hypertensive patients without overt cardiovascular disease has provided the interesting information that silent cerebrovascular lesions are even more prevalent (44%) than cardiac (21%) and renal (26%) subclinical damage, and do frequently occur in the absence of

other signs of organ damage [21]. Increasing evidence also relates these lesions to cognitive dysfunction [22,23], a problem of primary importance because of the senescence of the population [24]. With magnetic resonance imaging becoming more and more frequently employed in diagnostic procedures, silent cerebrovascular disease is likely to become more frequently investigated in prognostic and therapeutic studies in hypertension.

The prognostic value of structural alterations in small subcutaneous arteries has recently been confirmed by two independent studies [25,26]. However, the invasive nature of this measurement prevents larger scale application of this method. A new non-invasive method for assessing the media–lumen ratio of small retinal arteries seems promising for large-scale evaluation [27], although its predictive value remains to be investigated.

Evidence remains inconclusive on a marker of a vascular alteration that has been actively investigated in the past decade, namely endothelial dysfunction. In a population sample of individuals without overt cardiovascular disease (67% with hypertension and 22% with diabetes mellitus) from the Northern Manhattan study, measures of flow-mediated vasodilatation predicted the incidence of cardiovascular events, but this effect was not independent of traditional cardiovascular risk factors [28]. Likewise, in the large cohort of elderly patients of the Cardiovascular Health Study, flow-mediated vasodilatation added very little to the prognostic accuracy of traditional risk factors [29]. On the contrary, Muiesan et al. [30] have recently reported that in a small cohort ($n=172$) of uncomplicated hypertensive persons followed for about 8 years, flow-mediated vasodilatation of the brachial artery below the median value was significantly associated with a 2.7-fold increase in incident cardiovascular events even after adjusting for all major cardiovascular risk factors. However, the same group of investigators also have reported that endothelial dysfunction in the subcutaneous vessels of hypertensive patients was not predictive of cardiovascular events [31], possibly because endothelial dysfunction in different vascular beds may have a different prognostic significance. Clearly, the prognostic value of endothelial dysfunction in hypertension remains to be further elucidated.

It should be emphasised that the addition of new measures of organ damage to the assessment of total cardiovascular risk requires not only the demonstration of their prognostic importance, but it has to improve the power to predict the incidence of cardiovascular events. This is by no means easy to be documented, and indeed data are available that in some instances new risk factors of individual prognostic significance do not improve, when added to the others, the accuracy by which cardiovascular risk can be quantified, thus only making the diagnostic procedures more complex, time consuming, and costly. This is exemplified by the recent results of the Framingham study, which showed that inclusion of inflammatory markers did not lead to any substantial improvement in the accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) by which total cardiovascular risk was assessed [32].

Subclinical organ damage as a marker of high cardiovascular risk

Although subclinical organ damage undoubtedly increases the level of cardiovascular risk, the question arises whether it always brings the patient into the high-risk category, that is, an absolute risk of at least 20 cardiovascular events in 10 years per 100 patients. The 2007 European guidelines classify hypertensive patients with subclinical organ damage among those with a high total cardiovascular risk. This is further supported by more recent evidence on the contribution of subclinical cardiac, vascular, and renal damage to the total cardiovascular risk. As regards to subclinical cardiac damage, analysis of the data provided by some of the major prospective studies indicates that in hypertensive patients, echocardiographic LVH, particularly if of the concentric variety, is associated with an incidence of cardiovascular events equal to or above 20% in 10 years [5,7,33]. An incidence greater than 20% in 10 years has also been reported for men, but not for women, with echocardiographic LVH in the Framingham population study [34]. Finally, in the hypertensive patients of the CASE-J trial, echocardiographic LVH was associated with a 10-year incidence of cardiovascular events of 24% compared with the 10% incidence seen in patients without LVH [8].

Similar evidence exists for vascular damage. In the elderly patients of the Cardiovascular Health Study [35], the 10-year incidence of major cardiovascular events was higher than 20% when the common carotid IMT was 1.06mm or more (fourth and fifth quintiles) and below 10% in those with an IMT in the first quintile (<0.87 mm). In the hypertensive patients of the ELSA study [10], the incidence of all (major and minor) cardiovascular events was greater than 20% in 10 years when IMT (common carotid plus bifurcation) was in the third and fourth quartiles (≥ 1.16 mm) or when at least one plaque had been detected. In contrast, patients with IMT in the first or the smallest IMT quartile (<0.98mm) had incident cardiovascular events below 10% in 10 years. In hypertensive patients, the 10-year incidence of major cardiovascular events was higher than 20% when carotid-femoral PWV (aortic stiffness) was 16.3 m/s or more (fifth quintile) and below 10% in those with an aortic stiffness in the first and second quintiles [36]. Furthermore, even asymptomatic peripheral vascular disease as detected by a positive ankle-brachial index has prospectively been found to be associated in men with an incidence of cardiovascular events approaching 20% in 10 years [37,38].

Finally, old and recent evidence leaves little doubt that in hypertensive individuals, renal subclinical organ damage is associated with a 10-year risk of cardiovascular events of 20% or more. It has already been reported some years ago that reduced renal function, defined by a serum creatinine more than 1.5 mg/dl is associated with a 10-year incidence of cardiovascular events 20% or more [39,40]. In the recent prospective cohort of Greek hypertensive patients [7], a low eGFR was associated with incident cardiovascular events of about 20% in 10 years, an even higher incidence being observed when low eGFR occurred together with LVH. Furthermore, in the hypertensive patients prospectively studied by Jensen et al. [41], the incidence of ischemic heart disease was 20% in 10 years in the presence of microalbuminuria and of only 5% in its absence. Also, in the Gubbio population study, the incidence of cardiovascular events was greater than 20% in 10 years, but only in those individuals in whom microalbuminuria in the highest decile was associated with eGFR in the lowest decile [16]. Over 78% of these patients had hypertension.

The 2007 European guidelines classify patients with subclinical organ damage as being at high risk also when BP is in the high normal range, but admittedly evidence that this is invariably the case is less clear. In the general population of the Framingham study, no information was made available on the prognostic value of echographic LVH, separately in the normotensive and hypertensive population [34]. Furthermore, in the same population, the association of renal dysfunction with cardiovascular events was lost after adjustment for cardiovascular risk factors, including BP [42]. In the PREVEND population study [43], microalbuminuria (20–200 mg/l) was associated with only a 4.7% cardiovascular mortality in 10 years, that is, a moderate absolute risk according to the SCORE classification [44], and in the nonhypertensive, nondiabetic individuals of the Framingham study, a microalbuminuria above the median value was associated with a rate of incident cardiovascular events of only 8.8% in 10 years compared with a 2.9% rate in individuals with microalbuminuria below the median value [45].

Prognostic value of treatment-induced modifications of subclinical organ damage

The 2007 European guidelines have emphasised that treatment-induced changes of organ damage affect the incidence of cardiovascular events, thereby recommending that organ damage be measured also during treatment. Reference was made to the data obtained in the LIFE study [46], in which hypertensive patients in whom treatment was accompanied by regression of echocardiographic LVH or a delayed increase in LVM had less incident cardiovascular events, including sudden death, than those in whom no regression from or earlier progression to LVH occurred. It was also mentioned that both in LIFE [47] and in other studies [48], a similar relationship was found between treatment-induced changes in proteinuria and renal or cardiovascular events. This means that, compared with patients in whom treatment had little or no antiproteinuric effect, reduction in proteinuria was associated with a reduced incidence of cardiovascular events and less progression to end-stage renal disease.

Since 2007, data on the relationship between treatment-induced changes in cardiac damage and cardiovascular protection have been

enriched by further analyses of the LIFE study, which have shown that also treatment-induced changes in left atrial dimension [49], left ventricular geometry [50], and in electrocardiographic signs of LVH correlate with incident cardiovascular event rate [51]. Furthermore, there have been reports that in hypertension, inappropriate changes in LVM during treatment adversely affect cardiovascular prognosis [52]. Finally, the predictive power of treatment-induced IMT changes in the carotid arteries has for the first time been investigated in a recent analysis of ELSA trial data. This analysis failed to show a predictive role of treatment-dependent IMT changes, but the smallness of these changes compared with the large individual differences in baseline IMT makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions [10].

The correlation of treatment-induced changes in proteinuria with cardiovascular event incidence has been challenged by some findings of the ONTARGET trial. In this trial on a large number of high or very high cardiovascular risk patients, the group treated with a combination of an angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor and an angiotensin receptor antagonist showed, throughout the study duration, less increase in proteinuria than the group on monotherapy with one or the other drug, but this relative antiproteinuric effect was not accompanied by a reduction in cardiovascular events and was even associated with an increase in renal events [53]. However, these results do not necessarily undermine the important concept that treatment-induced changes in proteinuria can be a marker of the more or less pronounced beneficial effects of treatment because alternative explanations for the ONTARGET results are possible. For example, in ONTARGET, most patients had a normal renal function and few (4%) exhibited overt proteinuria, which resulted in a very limited number of the endpoint that matters for renal protection, that is, chronic renal failure. Furthermore, in the very high cardiovascular risk population studied, the powerful blockade of the renin–angiotensin system provided by the ACE inhibitor and angiotensin receptor antagonist combination might have exhibited an adverse effect of its own that superseded and masked the beneficial influence associated with a reduction in proteinuria. In favour of this beneficial influence are some recent analyses of the ADVANCE study in patients with type 2 diabetes. In these patients, on-

treatment values of proteinuria showed a close independent association with both renal and cardiovascular events, the contribution of proteinuria being unrelated to the concomitant values of eGFR [18].

Conclusions

Evidence on the important prognostic role of subclinical organ damage continues to grow. In both hypertensive patients and the general population, the presence of electrocardiographic and echocardiographic LVH, a carotid plaque or thickening, an increased arterial stiffness, a reduced eGFR (assessed by the MDRD formula), or microalbuminuria or proteinuria substantially increases the total cardiovascular risk, usually moving hypertensive patients into the high absolute risk range. The changes in electrocardiographically or echocardiographically detected LVH induced by treatment reflect the effects on cardiovascular events, thereby offering valuable information on whether patients are more or less effectively protected by the adopted treatment strategy. Despite some recent inconsistent results [53], solid evidence suggests that this is the case also for treatment-induced changes in urinary protein excretion, although the problem remains open for treatment-induced vascular changes. Thus, assessing the presence of subclinical organ damage is of crucial importance in the hypertensive population. This assessment can make use of simple and cheap procedures that can provide routine information before and at various times during treatment. It can also rely on more sophisticated approaches that can further characterise patients' cardiac and vascular status. In all instances, multiple organ damage assessment is useful because of the evidence that in the presence of two signs of organ damage (even when inherent to the same organ), cardiovascular risk may be more markedly increased, with an almost inevitable upgrading to the high cardiovascular risk category [7,16].

It is not clear from published data whether subclinical organ damage can bring total cardiovascular risk to the high range also in patients with high normal BP. However, organ damage when it is particularly pronounced, or affects multiple organs, or is accompanied by metabolic risk factors, is associated with a two-fold or three-fold increase in relative risk also in normotensive individuals [11,54–56], and the 2007 guidelines

Subclinical organ damage in total cardiovascular risk stratification

- 1 In hypertension, assessment of total cardiovascular risk is important to optimise the decision about treatment initiation, intensity and goals.
- 2 Quantification of total cardiovascular risk must include a search for subclinical organ damage, which is common in hypertension and has independent prognostic significance.
- 3 In patients with hypertension, the presence of subclinical organ damage usually brings cardiovascular risk into the high range. Subclinical organ damage alone may not be sufficient to bring normotensive individuals into the high-risk category, although this may occur with multiple organ damage and the metabolic syndrome.
- 4 As detailed in the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines, several measures of renal, cardiac and vascular damage can be considered for total cardiovascular risk quantification. Because of their simplicity, wide availability and limited cost measures based on urinary protein excretion (including microalbuminuria), eGFR (MDRD formula), and ECG are suitable for routine use. Cardiac and vascular ultrasounds are more and more easily available in Europe, and their use in the evaluation of the hypertensive patient can be encouraged.
- 5 Subclinical organ damage should be assessed both at screening and during treatment because a number of treatment-induced changes in organ damage relate to cardiovascular and renal outcomes, thereby offering information on whether the selected treatment is protecting patients from progressing organ damage and potentially from cardiovascular events.
- 6 Several other measures of subclinical OD have been shown to have prognostic significance, but their complexity, low availability and high cost prevents their routine clinical use. It is likely that technological progress will make use of some of these measurements more common in the future. Any measure, however, should be considered only if it adds to the overall precision of CV risk quantification.

Table 2 Subclinical organ damage in total cardiovascular risk stratification.

recommend considering relative risk as a guide for the need of treatment in young and middle-aged patients. In this context, it is also important to emphasise that the occurrence of undetected organ damage in patients that doctors decide to treat probably explains the apparently paradoxical findings of several observational studies that the incidence of cardiovascular events is higher in treated than in untreated hypertensive patients even after adjustment for usual cardiovascular risk factors and past clinical history [57–62]. This is consistent with the concept that antihypertensive treatment even if beneficial cannot usually take a high total risk back to a low-risk category [63]. These findings presumably reflect the fact that in medical practice, BP lowering treatment is often deferred until organ damage occurs, when complete reversibility is not achievable [63,64].

More extensive use of organ damage assessment may thus help to reach a more timely decision about the initiation of treatment and thus favour its greater success.

Some of the issues discussed in 'Assessment of subclinical organ damage for stratification of total cardiovascular risk' section are summarised in Table 2.

Chapter 3

Treatment approach

When to initiate antihypertensive treatment	20
Blood pressure goals	22
<i>Post-hoc</i> analysis of trials and effects on organ damage	23
The J-curve phenomenon	27
Are the 2007 recommendations still applicable?	28

Major guidelines [1,65–70] on the management of hypertension recommend the initiation of antihypertensive drugs in all patients with a SBP 140mmHg or more and/or a DBP 90mmHg or more, and to adjust the treatment strategy in order for the patients to be below these values. They further recommend drug treatment to be initiated within a lower BP range, that is, a SBP between 130 and 139mmHg and a DBP between 85 and 89mmHg in patients with diabetes or a history of cardiovascular or renal disease, aiming at achieving SBP/DBP values <130/80 mmHg.

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1] have accompanied these recommendations with information on the evidence they are based upon, and a critical reappraisal of this issue has recently been undertaken by members of the present Task Force [71], in the light of further information provided by recent trials. The purpose of the present ESH document is to clarify the size and the type of evidence on which these recommendations are based, and thus help the planning and conduction of future studies which may fill possible evidence gaps.

When to initiate antihypertensive treatment

Guidelines recommend use of antihypertensive drugs in patients with grade 1 hypertension at low or moderate cardiovascular risk, that is, when BP is between 140 and 159mmHg SBP and/or 90 and 99mmHg DBP, provided nonpharmacological treatment has proved unsuccessful. However, it should be recognised that the evidence in favour of this recommendation is scant because older trials of ‘mild hypertension’ focused on patients whose BP could be higher than those defining grade 1 hypertension [72,73], or included high-risk patients [74]. Even the recent FEVER trial [75], which was mentioned in the 2007 guidelines to support intervention in grade 1 hypertensives with low/moderate cardiovascular risk, does not provide conclusive evidence because mean entry BP was just below 160mmHg (159 mmHg), there was a large proportion (89%) of patients receiving antihypertensive therapy at baseline, and a noticeable number of patients had evidence of organ damage or a history of cardiovascular disease, thereby not belonging to the low-risk or moderate-risk category [71].

Guidelines also point out that the BP threshold for drug treatment is not related to age and recommend starting antihypertensive drugs

at SBP at least 140mmHg or DBP at least 90mmHg in the elderly as well. However, as shown in Figure 1, there is no single trial on elderly hypertensive patients [76–85] that recruited patients with a SBP in the grade 1 hypertension range (i.e., <160mmHg) [71]. Therefore, it can be concluded that current guidelines recommendations on BP values at which to initiate drug treatment in the elderly are not based on results from trials, but derived from other findings (see below) and perhaps encouraged by the large benefits of antihypertensive therapy in all available trials in the elderly, admittedly at higher initial blood pressures.

Evidence is also scant for the guidelines recommendation to initiate drug treatment in the high normal BP range when patients have diabetes. Recommendations are substantially based on the results of the ‘normotensive’ component of the ABCD trial [86], which has important limitations, however: ‘normotension’ was defined as a SBP less than 160mmHg, the trial size was small (n¼480), the primary endpoint was the change in creatinine clearance (with no statistically significant difference between treatments), and a statistically significant reduction of cardiovascular events in the group randomised to more intensive treatment was limited to the incidence of stroke but did not extend to other cardiovascular events. Recommendations also derive from subgroup analyses of two large trials, MICROHOPE [87] and ADVANCE [88]. However, in MICROHOPE, normotension was defined by history, entry BP values were not mentioned, and the statistical significance of cardiovascular event reduction in the ‘normotensive group’ was not reported; in ADVANCE, the benefit of antihypertensive treatment was significant in patients with an entry SBP 140mmHg or more, but not in those in whom it was below this value. Similar findings were obtained when stratification was based on the presence or absence of a history of hypertension.

There have been strong recommendations to start antihypertensive treatment at high normal BP values also in patients with previous cerebrovascular disease. These have been based on the report from the PROGRESS trial [89] that in patients with a previous stroke or transient ischemic attack BP lowering was accompanied by a marked reduction in the incidence of recurrent stroke and cardiovascular events in both hypertensive and normotensive patients. However, in this study, hyperten-

sion was defined by SBP values of 160mmHg or more, and in a subsequent analysis, a significant reduction in recurrent stroke with treatment was only observed when entry SBP was 140mmHg or more [90]. Furthermore, entry BP values in PROGRESS were reported irrespective of background treatment (present in 50% of the patients [89,90]), and therefore they cannot be used to take decisions on initiation of treatment in untreated patients. Finally, the weight of evidence of PROGRESS has not been helped by the substantially negative results of a more recent large placebo-controlled trial of antihypertensive treatment in patients with cerebrovascular disease, the PROFESS study [91]. Although these negative results may be subject to various interpretations [71,92], they remain a disturbing finding requiring more straightforward investigation in a more simply designed trial.

As already discussed in the 2007 European guidelines [1] and further analysed in a recent review [71], although no less than five trials are available [93–97], the information whether drug treatment should be initiated at high normal BP values in patients with coronary disease is inconclusive. First, in most trials, attention was directed to the putative-specific effects of the drugs studied rather than to the BP-related ones, which were sometimes incompletely quantified. Second, in these trials, patients were subdivided for their higher or lower entry BP value on a background of antihypertensive drug administration, and thus the so-called ‘normotensive’ patients probably belonged to a higher BP category when untreated. Third, the results show considerable discrepancies between and even within trials [71].

Blood pressure goals

The evidence available on the BP targets of antihypertensive treatment has recently been reviewed by some members of this committee and is summarised in Fig. 1 [71]. As illustrated in the upper-left panel, in four out of five trials in uncomplicated hypertensive patients [72–75,98], SBP was reduced to less than 140mmHg in the actively treated group while remaining at or above this value in the placebo or control group. In three out of four trials, the BP difference was associated with a difference in outcome, and in FEVER [75] this occurred for on-treatment values that were just slightly below and slightly above 140mmHg. With the limitation

mentioned in a previous section (that patients were not invariably at low or moderate cardiovascular risk and with grade 1 hypertension), this evidence supports the recommendation of guidelines to reduce SBP to less than 140mmHg in the general population of patients with grade 1 or 2 hypertension and low or moderate total cardiovascular risk.

Whether this recommendation should also apply to elderly hypertensive patients is unproved by outcome trials, however. As shown in the upper-right panel of Fig. 1, although in all trials [76–84], but one [85], the groups of elderly hypertensive patients randomised to more active treatment had a significantly lower incidence of cardiovascular outcomes, in no trial (except the only one with negative results [85]) the on-treatment SBP values were lowered to less than 140mmHg. Thus, there is no trial evidence in support of the guidelines recommendation to adopt the less than 140mmHg SBP target in elderly patients. The lower panels of Fig. 1 show that the guidelines recommendation to lower BP less than 130/80mmHg in patients with diabetes [86–88,99–106] or a history of cardiovascular disease [89,91,93–97,107,108] is also not supported by incontrovertible trial evidence. For diabetes, the recommendation in favour of intense treatment was probably due to the enthusiasm generated by some trials, such as HOT [99] and Syst-Eur [102], showing a greater absolute reduction of cardiovascular outcomes for a small BP difference in diabetic patients than in nondiabetic hypertensive patients. As shown in the lower-left panel of Fig. 1, only in one small trial were SBP values less than 130mmHg actually achieved, and they were associated with a doubtful reduction in cardiovascular outcomes [86]. Similar results characterise trials in patients with a history of cerebrovascular or coronary disease with the additional confusing feature that in some trials in which SBP was lowered to less than 130mmHg, no benefit was observed compared with the group with higher on-treatment values (lower-right panel of Fig. 1).

Post-hoc analysis of trials and trials on organ damage

Information on BP thresholds and targets for drug treatment has also been derived from post hoc analyses of event-based trials and from studies on the effects of treatment on organ damage of prognostic importance, though, admittedly, this is weaker evidence.

Figure 1






Figure 1 Achieved SBP in patients randomised to a more active (lower part of histograms) or less active (upper part of histograms) treatment in trials on uncomplicated hypertension (left upper panel), elderly hypertensive patients (right upper panel), patients with diabetes mellitus (left lower panel) and patients with previous cardiovascular disease (CVD; right lower panel). The yellow part of the histogram indicates the between-group difference (D) in achieved SBP. The green, red and orange rectangles indicate, respectively, trials with significant benefits of more active treatment, trials without significant benefits, and trials with significant benefits of more active treatment limited to some secondary endpoints. CHD, coronary heart disease. Abbreviations at the bottom of the rectangles indicate trials as follows: OS, OSLO study; HDFF,



HDFP-stratum I; AUS, Australian; MRC, MRC-mild; FEV, FEVER; EW, EWPHE; CW, Coope and Warrander; SHEP, SHEP; STOP, STOP; MRC-E, MRC-elderly; S.Eur, Syst-Eur; S.Ch, Syst-China; SCOPE, SCOPE; HYVET, HYVET; JATOS, JATOS; HOT, HOT; UKPDS, UKPDS; M.HOPE; MICROHOPE; ABCD, ABCD (HT, hypertensives; NT, normotensives); IDNT, IDNT (IR, irbesartan; AM, amlodipine); REN, RENAAL; PROG, PROGRESS; ADV, ADVANCE; PATS, PATS; ACC, ACCESS; PROF, PROFESS; PREV, PREVENT; HOPE, HOPE; EU, EUROPA; ACT, ACTION; CAM, CAMELOT (AM, amlodipine; EN, enalapril); PEA, PEACE; TR, TRANSCEND. For trial acronyms see Acronym List section. Modified with permission from [71].

Post hoc analyses of the incidence of cardiovascular events in relation to the BP achieved by treatment have been performed in the large group of hypertensive patients of the HOT study [99], in the high cardiovascular risk patients recruited for the VALUE trial [109,110], the INVEST trial [111–114], and the ONTARGET trial [115,116], and in the patients with diabetic nephropathy of the IDNT trial [117,118]. In the HOT study, the lowest incidence of cardiovascular events occurred at a SBP of 138mmHg and a DBP of 82mmHg [99]. In the VALUE trial, hypertensive patients in whom the achieved BP was below 140/90mmHg showed a clearcut reduction in the incidence of cardiovascular events (stroke, myocardial infarction, and hospitalised heart failure) with respect to the patients in whom on-treatment BP remained above these values, independent of the type of treatment employed [109]. In the INVEST trial, the incidence of cardiovascular events was progressively smaller as the proportion of visits in which BP was found to be controlled (<140/90mmHg) increased even when data were adjusted for patients' demography, clinical conditions, and treatments [112]. The greater cardiovascular protection associated with on-treatment SBPs less than 140/90mmHg showed a trend for cardiovascular events to become even less common as the achieved SBP decreased to about 130mmHg [113]. On the contrary, in the ONTARGET, clear-cut beneficial effects of BP reductions were seen when initial SBPs were above 140mmHg, even when adjustments for potential confounders were made, and at each initial BP, a greater BP reduction was usually accompanied by a greater cardiovascular protection. However, in patients in whom initial SBP was in the 130mmHg range, the benefit was less pronounced and mainly evident for stroke [115]. Similar findings have recently been reported for the subgroup of diabetic patients recruited in ONTARGET [116]. Finally, in the patients with diabetic nephropathy of the IDNT reduction of SBP to less than 120mmHg was related to lower cardiovascular mortality [117] and to progressive reduction of proteinuria as well as in endstage renal disease [118].

As to the relationship between BP and subclinical organ damage, data from the LIFE trial have shown that the frequency of LVH regression is linearly related to the BP changes induced by treatment, the maximal efficacy being found for large BP reductions from the entry values [119].

A recently published study has also shown that presence of ECG-LVH is reduced by tighter as compared with less tight BP control (131.9/77.4 and 135.6/78.7mmHg, respectively) in nondiabetic hypertensive patients [120]. Furthermore, several studies have provided evidence that antihypertensive treatment is accompanied by a reduction or a delayed progression in urinary protein excretion, be it in the proteinuric or microalbuminuric range, even when initial BP is below 140/90mmHg [121,122]. The most recent evidence has been provided by the ADVANCE trial, which has shown that in diabetic patients, most of them under antihypertensive treatment, further BP lowering by the addition of an ACE inhibitor–diuretic combination significantly and markedly reduced the incidence of renal endpoints. These mainly consisted of the appearance, the progression, or the regression of urinary protein excretion, within a range of initial systolic or diastolic BP values from above 160/100 to below 120/70mmHg [123]. The hazard ratio for a renal endpoint was 0.81, 0.75, 0.85, and 0.70 in the actively treated as compared with the control group, at initial SBP values equal or above 160, 159–140, 139–120, and less than 120mmHg, respectively. Furthermore, this post hoc analysis of the ADVANCE data has shown the adjusted risk of a renal endpoint to decrease progressively as the SBP achieved during treatment decreased to values of about 110mmHg [123].

The J-curve phenomenon

Recently, there has been some withdrawal from a perhaps excessive enthusiasm for aggressive lowering of BP, based on the data of some trials [91,108] as well as post hoc analyses of the results of other trials on high-risk patients [113,115,124]. These data have raised the doubt that in patients at high cardiovascular risk, antihypertensive treatment regimens that reduce SBP to values close or below 120–125mmHg and DBP below 70–75mmHg may be accompanied by an increase (rather than a further reduction) in the incidence of coronary events, that is, by a J-curve phenomenon. This has led to readdressing the question as to whether BP is sometimes lowered too far, and in doing so, underperfusion of vital organs increases cardiovascular risk. The issue is open to the following considerations. First, although a BP value below which organ perfusion is compromised must exist, observational

studies in patients initially free of cardiovascular disease [125] show that the relationship between BP and cardiovascular event rate is substantially linear down to very low BP values (about 110/70mmHg), which are only exceptionally attained by antihypertensive treatment. Second, it is possible that in high cardiovascular risk patients, an impairment of the mechanisms that guarantee blood flow autoregulation elevates the BP threshold below which organ perfusion is reduced [92,126]. However, the extent of this elevation (which may be different between patients in relation to the degree of organ damage and age) has never been unequivocally established by trials specifically designed to explore the advantages of more versus less intense BP lowering. Third, despite adjustment for between-group initial demographics and clinical differences, post hoc analysis of trial results cannot escape the problem that in the group in which on-treatment BP was lowest, there could have been a greatest initial cardiovascular risk that caused both the excessive BP reduction and the increased incidence of cardiovascular events. Indeed, this is supported by the evidence of a similar J-curve phenomenon in placebo-treated groups of several trials [127]. Fourth, all these post hoc analyses consistently showed that, the nadir of cardiovascular outcome incidence was represented by a rather wide range of BP values, that is between 120 and 140mmHg SBP and 70–80mmHg DBP, suggesting that within this low BP range, the differences in achieved cardiovascular protection are small [71]. This is in line with the results of observational studies that the relationship between BP and cardiovascular events is linear when cardiovascular events are quantified on a logarithmic scale [125], which implies smaller absolute differences at lower BP values.

Are the 2007 recommendations still applicable?

Although the trial evidence is scant, it appears reasonable to reconfirm that, in grade 1 hypertensive patients at low and moderate risk, drug therapy should be started, if BP remains equal to or above 140/90 mmHg, after a suitable time period with appropriate lifestyle changes with the goal to bring BP below this cutoff value. Initiation of antihypertensive treatment in grade 1 hypertension (without waiting for BP to increase to grade 2 range or organ damage to develop) is also suggested by a recent analysis of all major trials with antihypertensive agents [63]. This analy-

sis has revealed that in trials on high cardiovascular risk patients, the 'residual risk', that is, the risk level attained by intense therapy (often including lipid-lowering and antiplatelet agents), can very rarely decrease below the cutoff defining a high-risk condition (i.e., 20% cardiovascular events in 10 years). This means that, although reduced by therapy, a high initial risk remains high. On the contrary, in trials involving hypertensive patients at initial low or moderate risk, the 'residual risk' could often be brought to less than 10% in 10 years, which implies that earlier initiation of antihypertensive therapy may be beneficial. These arguments favour similar threshold and target BPs for drug treatment in the elderly. With the current availability of well tolerated drugs, BP lowering does not appear to be associated with any substantial increase in adverse effects or in cardiovascular or noncardiovascular risk.

Initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy in diabetic patients with high normal BP is presently unsupported by prospective trial evidence. This is the case also for the lower BP goals (<130/80mmHg) recommended for diabetics but never really achieved in any single large trial and are even more rarely attained in medical practice. For the time being, monitoring subclinical organ damage, and particularly microalbuminuria and proteinuria, appears to be the best guidance to decide the BP values for treatment initiation as well as treatment goals in diabetic patients. Perhaps, and at least until the completion of studies such as ACCORD (in which the beneficial effects of targeting BP below either 140 or 120mmHg are prospectively examined [128]), it may be useful to recommend that in diabetes, SBP be reduced well below 140mmHg, without mentioning specific targets that are unproven. This would be in line with the results of the ADVANCE trial in which the macrovascular and microvascular benefits of antihypertensive treatment were seen in diabetic patients in whom SBP was brought down to less than 135mmHg compared with patients on placebo in whom SBP remained at approximately 140mmHg [88]. Similar cautious recommendations can be given to patients with previous cardiovascular events, for whom current trial evidence is controversial concerning both initiation of antihypertensive drug treatment when BP is in the high normal range, and the benefit of aiming at a BP target of less than 130/80mmHg.

No prospective outcome trial has ever been performed in those patients with a high normal BP that the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1] tentatively classified as being at high cardiovascular risk because of the presence of multiple risk factors, metabolic syndrome, or subclinical organ damage. It has previously been mentioned that within this BP range, subclinical organ damage may not invariably lead to a high cardiovascular risk, and it is unclear how often this may occur. The evidence in favour of BP-lowering interventions in these patients is limited to that reported by the TROPHY [129] and the PHARAO studies [130], in which administration of an antihypertensive drug delayed the onset of hypertension (i.e., the crossing of the 140/90mmHg cut-off). Whether this goal should be pursued mainly with lifestyle modifications or with addition of antihypertensive agents remains undetermined, however.

One last point deserves greater attention when making recommendations for medical practice. For a number of reasons (cost, progressively greater incidence of patient dropout, long-term management difficulties)

Treatment initiation

- 1 Although trial evidence is scant, it appears reasonable to recommend that, in grade 1 hypertensives (SBP \geq 140 or DPB \geq 90 mmHg) at low and moderate risk, drug therapy should be started after a suitable time period with life style changes. Prompter initiation of treatment is advisable if grade 1 hypertension is associated with a high level of risk, or if hypertension is grade 2 or 3.
- 2 In subjects with high normal BP (SBP 130-139 or DPB 85-89 mmHg) uncomplicated by diabetes or previous cardiovascular events, no trial evidence is available of treatment benefits, except for a delayed onset of hypertension (crossing the 140/90 mmHg cutoff).
- 3 Initiation of antihypertensive drug therapy in diabetic patients with high normal BP is presently unsupported by prospective trial evidence. For the time being, it appears prudent to recommend treatment initiation in high normal BP diabetics if subclinical organ damage (particularly microalbuminuria or proteinuria) is present.
- 4 Trial evidence concerning antihypertensive drug treatment in patients with previous CV events in absence of hypertension is controversial, and further trials must be completed before firm recommendations can be given.
- 5 In general, early BP lowering treatment, before organ damage develops or becomes irreversible or CV events occur, appears a prudent recommendation, because in high risk hypertensives even intense cardiovascular drug therapy, though beneficial, is nonetheless unable to lower total CV risk below the high risk threshold.

Table 3 Treatment initiation.

Blood pressure goals of treatment

- 1 On the whole, there is sufficient evidence to recommend that SBP be lowered below 140mmHg (and DBP below 90mmHg) in all hypertensive patients, both those at low moderate risk and those at high risk. Evidence is only missing in the elderly hypertensive patients, in whom the benefit of lowering SBP below 140mmHg has never been tested in randomised trials.
- 2 The recommendation of previous guidelines to aim at a lower goal SBP (<130mmHg) in diabetic patients and in patients at very high cardiovascular risk (previous cardiovascular events) may be wise, but it is not consistently supported by trial evidence. In no randomised trial in diabetic patients has SBP been brought down to below 130mmHg with proven benefits, and trials in which SBP was lowered to below 130 mmHg in patients with previous cardiovascular events have given controversial results.
- 3 Despite their obvious limitations and a lower strength of evidence, post hoc analyses of trial data indicate a progressive reduction of cardiovascular events incidence with progressive lowering of SBP down to about 120mmHg and DBP down to about 75mmHg, although the additional benefit at low BP values becomes rather small. At these low BP values also beneficial effects on organ damage have sometimes been observed. A J-curve phenomenon is unlikely to occur until lower values are reached, except perhaps in patients with advanced atherosclerotic artery diseases.
- 4 On the basis of current data, it may be prudent to recommend lowering SBP/DBP to values within the range 130–139/80–85mmHg, and possibly close to lower values in this range, in all hypertensive patients. More critical evidence from specific randomised trials is desirable, however.

Table 4 Blood pressure goals of treatment.

randomised trials can only run for a few years and therefore extrapolation of the results to the frequently much longer life expectancy of patients is not without limitations. The extrapolation may fail to take into account that the benefit of antihypertensive treatment may become progressively more evident with time, possibly because regression of organ damage has a slow time course, in parallel with the long-term remodelling of large arteries, small arteries, and cardiac structure associated with a BP elevation [131]. This appears to be supported by the results of the few trials in which patients were followed for a number of years after termination of randomised treatment. In the SYST-EUR and SHEP trials, for example, the beneficial effects of antihypertensive treatment on the incidence of cardiovascular events remained evident years after termination of the double-blind phase of the trial, despite the fact that antihypertensive treatment was started also in the placebo group [132,133]. A similar

phenomenon, which is referred to as the ‘legacy effect’, has also been reported for the Steno 2 trial [134], which reported a postinterventional benefit on the microvascular and macrovascular complications of type 2 diabetes after 13.3 years of follow-up with an intensive multifactorial therapy that included antihypertensive drugs and in the UKPDS trial [135] during a 10-year follow-up of the effect of a previous 10-year intensive blood glucose control in diabetes.

The most important points related to threshold and target BP values for treatment are summarised in Tables 3 and 4.

Chapter 4

Treatment strategies

Choice of antihypertensive drugs	34
Are ranking antihypertensive agents in order of choice useful or deceiving in practice?	42
Preferred drugs	43
Monotherapy and combination therapy	44

Choice of antihypertensive drugs

In their 2003 [136] and 2007 versions [1], the European guidelines reviewed the large number of randomised trials of antihypertensive therapy, both those comparing active treatment versus placebo and those comparing treatment regimens based on different compounds (Table 5). They concluded that the main benefits of antihypertensive treatment are due to lowering of BP per se, and are largely independent of the drugs employed. Therefore, thiazide diuretics (as well as chlorthalidone and indapamide), β -blockers, calcium antagonists, ACE inhibitors, and angiotensin receptor antagonists can adequately lower BP and significantly and importantly reduce cardiovascular outcomes. All these drugs are suitable for the initiation and maintenance of antihypertensive treatment either as monotherapy or in some combinations with each other.

Choice of antihypertensive drugs

- 1 Large-scale meta-analyses of available data confirm that major antihypertensive drug classes, that is, diuretics, ACE inhibitors, calcium antagonists, angiotensin receptor antagonists, and β -blockers do not differ significantly for their overall ability to reduce BP in hypertension.
- 2 There is also no undisputable evidence that major drug classes differ in their ability to protect against overall cardiovascular risk or cause-specific cardiovascular events, such as stroke and myocardial infarction. The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines conclusion that diuretics, ACE inhibitors, calcium antagonists, angiotensin receptor antagonists, and β -blockers can all be considered suitable for initiation of antihypertensive treatment, as well as for its maintenance, can thus be confirmed.
- 3 Because the percentage of patients responsive to any drug class is limited and patients responsive to one drug are often not those responsive to another drug, keeping the number of drug options large increases the chance of BP control in a larger fraction of hypertensives. This is of crucial importance because cardiovascular protection by antihypertensive treatment substantially depends on BP lowering per se, regardless of how it is obtained.
- 4 Each drug class has contraindications as well favourable effects in specific clinical settings. The choice of drug(s) should be made according to this evidence. The traditional ranking of drugs into first, second, third, and subsequent choice, with an average patient as reference, has now little scientific and practical justification and should be avoided.
- 5 Drugs acting via direct renin inhibition are the only new classes of antihypertensive agents that have recently become available for clinical use. Several additional new classes are under an early investigational phase. Selective antagonism of endothelin receptors holds some promise to improve rate of BP control in hypertensive patients resistant to multiple drug treatment.

Table 5 Choice of antihypertensive drugs.

The issue of the equivalence of the various classes of antihypertensive agents, and of various agents within a given class, has been a long debated one, heralded in the 1970s by the incautious suspicion of a role played by reserpine in breast cancer [137], and continuing in the 1990s with the campaign against calcium antagonists as responsible for coronary events, bleeding, and cancer [138,139]. After the acquittal of calcium antagonists, even by their prosecutors, attention has been recently focused by different groups of investigators on a possible inferiority of β -blockers and diuretics as well as on the possible inferiority of ACE inhibitors for stroke prevention and of angiotensin receptor antagonists for coronary disease prevention. Obviously, paying careful attention to possible adverse effects or limitations of both new and old drugs is an obligation of physicians and clinical epidemiologists and must be taken seriously by members of guidelines committees. On the contrary, unfounded suspicion should not be used to deprive patients of the benefits of drugs.

β -blockers

The evidence upon which β -blockers have been questioned as first choice antihypertensive drugs [140] and actually downgraded in the British recommendations [141] was discussed in the 2007 European guidelines. New arguments on the place of β -blockers in antihypertensive therapy have been added since then [142–144]. In a meta-analysis of nine of 22 randomised controlled trials of β -blockers [145], a significant inverse correlation has been reported between the heart rate achieved by β -blocker therapy and cardiovascular outcomes (i.e., the lower the achieved heart rate, the higher the incidence of outcomes), including myocardial infarction and heart failure, known to be favourably influenced by β -blockade [146,147]. On the contrary, a recent meta-analysis of 147 randomised trials (the largest meta-analysis so far available) reports only a slight inferiority of β -blockers in preventing stroke (17% reduction rather than 29% reduction with other agents), but a similar effect as other agents on preventing coronary events and heart failure, and a higher efficacy than other drugs in patients with a recent coronary event [148]. Furthermore, the recent publication of a 20-year follow-up of the UKPDS trial [149] comparing atenolol and captopril in diabetes has found the incidence

of cardiovascular outcomes to be similar in patients on the β -blocker or the ACE inhibitor, with a reduction in all-cause mortality favouring the β -blocker. This is consistent with retrospective observational data of large numbers of patients on different antihypertensive treatment regimens for longer periods than in randomised trials, showing that the incidence of cardiovascular outcomes was not higher on atenolol-based treatment than on other antihypertensive agents [150].

Finally, no systematic analysis has been made of the possible role of a smaller BP reduction by β -blocker-based treatment in those trials in which β -blockers appeared to have a smaller effect on stroke. For instance, interpolation of ASCOT data on stroke in the met regression analysis of the Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration [151] makes it clear that the odd ratio falls very close to the place expected because of the 2.7mmHg difference in SBP between β -blocker/diuretic and calcium antagonist/ACE inhibitor treatments [152]. On the whole, however, β -blockers do not appear to be systematically inferior to other antihypertensive agents in their ability to reduce BP. A recent pooling analysis from more than 40 000 hypertensive patients under different monotherapies has shown no inferiority (and, possibly, a numerical superiority) of β -blocker monotherapy [153] in lowering brachial BP. However, studies like CAFE' [154] suggest that, for the same brachial SBP, central SBP may be higher with β -blockers than with other antihypertensive agents because of a greater wave reflection due to bradycardia and/or peripheral vasoconstriction. This interesting observation deserves to be confirmed, although its real impact on antihypertensive management may be small because the difference between peripheral and central BPs is known to become attenuated at an older age [155,156], when hypertension and antihypertensive treatment are most common.

There is no doubt that β -blockers as well as diuretics (especially when combined together) have adverse metabolic effects and facilitate new-onset diabetes [157,158] in predisposed patients such as those with the metabolic syndrome or impaired glucose tolerance [55,159,160]. The importance of this phenomenon, however, may have been exaggerated by the way results of most prospective studies and trials have been analysed; that is, by limiting analyses of changes in plasma glucose or in antidiabetic

prescriptions to patients initially free of diabetes or with a blood glucose below 7.0mmol/l (126 mg/dl). Indeed, a recent analysis of data from the 3.8-year long ELSA trial has shown that new diagnoses of diabetes at the end of this study in patients without diabetes at baseline are accompanied by a number of cases in which diagnosis of diabetes at baseline was no longer confirmed at the end of the study. However, the overall balance remains positive for new-onset diabetes [160]. Furthermore, it is still unclear whether drug-induced diabetes carries the same negative prognosis as naturally occurring diabetes, with some authors emphasising studies showing that trial patients with new-onset diabetes do not have a higher incidence of cardiovascular outcomes during the trial and several years thereafter [133,161], whereas others underline the opposite conclusions in other studies [143,162–164].

It is also true that, when compared with other agents in trials using subclinical organ damage as an endpoint, β -blockers have been shown to be less powerful than ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor antagonists, and calcium antagonists in reducing an increased left ventricular mass [165], carotid IMT thickening [166], aortic stiffness [131], and increased small artery wall-to-lumen ratio [167–169], and this may be supposed to result in less cardiovascular protection in the long run. When discussing β -blockers, however, it should not be ignored that they are not a homogeneous class, and that vasodilating β -blockers, such as celiprolol, carvedilol, and nebivolol, appear not to share some of the negative properties described for other compounds. For instance, celiprolol lowers aortic stiffness and central pulse pressure [170], whereas atenolol does not [131]. Nebivolol, at doses producing the same BP reduction, lowers heart rate significantly less than atenolol [171], and because of the lesser bradycardia combined with peripheral vasodilatation, it has better effects on central BP than atenolol [172]. In the GEMINI study [173], carvedilol had less adverse effects on glycosylated haemoglobin, total cholesterol, and triglycerides than metoprolol; and nebivolol, at variance from metoprolol, has been found to improve insulin sensitivity [174] and to have the same metabolic effects as an ACE inhibitor [175]. Both carvedilol and nebivolol have been used in outcome trials in chronic heart failure (admittedly not in hypertension) and found capable of reducing the primary endpoint

of mortality and hospitalisation [176]: in COMET, carvedilol treatment was accompanied by less new-onset diabetes than metoprolol [177], and in the SENIORS trial, new onset diabetes had the same incidence on nebivolol or placebo [178]. When compared with metoprolol, carvedilol resulted in significantly less cases of microalbuminuria and progression to proteinuria in hypertensive diabetic patients [173], and nebivolol has recently been shown to improve coronary flow reserve and left ventricular filling pressure in the hypertensive heart [179]. Whether the protective cardiovascular action shown by carvedilol and nebivolol in patients with heart failure is also displayed in hypertension remains to be determined in a controlled trial.

Thiazide diuretics

A prominent role for thiazide-like diuretics in antihypertensive therapy, such as that given to these compounds in the JNC-7 report [66], is an object of continuing debate [143,161]. The evidence that a BP lowering induced by diuretics can reduce all types of cardiovascular events is robust [161], but it cannot be denied that most of the trials, the meta-analysis of which has been the basis for raising doubts on β -blockers, have also used thiazides. This makes it difficult to distinguish the separate role of these two drug classes. Likewise, the diabetogenic role of β -blockers and diuretics is difficult to discriminate, and when it has been dissociated diuretics appear worse than β -blockers [157]. Diuretics have rarely been studied in depth for their capacity to regress organ damage, and when tested have often been found inferior to calcium antagonists or ACE inhibitors [165,180,181]. Furthermore, all large studies that have explored the tolerability of various classes of antihypertensive agents on persistence to therapy have found diuretics to be, together with β -blockers, the least tolerated compounds [153] or those accompanied by the least persistence on treatment [182,183]. Finally, a recent meta-analysis has reported outcome benefit for low-dose but not for high-dose diuretics [184]. In addition, the results of the ACCOMPLISH trial (to be discussed in the preferred drug combinations section) have raised doubts as to whether thiazides are always the best protective component of combination therapy [185].

Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin receptor antagonists

The concept that ACE inhibitors may be somewhat inferior to other anti-hypertensive agents in preventing stroke has repeatedly been raised on the basis of some meta-analyses [148,186] and meta-regression analyses [187]. A pathophysiological hypothesis to support the claim that ACE inhibitors may be inferior to angiotensin receptor antagonists in preventing stroke has also been elaborated [188]. On the contrary, it has been suggested that angiotensin receptor antagonists would be inferior to ACE inhibitors in preventing myocardial infarction [189,190].

All these concepts, as well as their pathophysiological interpretations, have been undermined by the results of the very large ONTARGET, directly comparing cardiovascular outcomes under treatment with an ACE inhibitor (ramipril) or an angiotensin receptor antagonist (telmisartan) [191]. ONTARGET has shown telmisartan not to be statistically inferior to ramipril as far as the incidence of a composite endpoint including major cardiac outcomes are concerned. A similar incidence of strokes was also observed on both treatments. Recent meta-analyses including older and more recent trials confirm the conclusion that ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor antagonists have the same preventive effect on myocardial infarction [192,193].

The absolute benefit induced by the relatively small BP reduction produced by either treatment is more difficult to calculate, because ONTARGET was deliberately conducted in high-risk patients and for obvious ethical reasons could not include a placebo comparison arm. Therefore, it is difficult to decide whether the benefit has to be gauged from historical comparison with the placebo arm of the HOPE trial [93], carried out several years earlier, or with the placebo arm of the simultaneously run TRANSCEND, on patients intolerant to ACE inhibitors [108]. The patients of TRANSCEND treated with placebo had a slightly lower incidence of cardiovascular events than placebo-treated patients in HOPE, either because higher prevalence of concomitant therapies than in HOPE (but similar to that in ONTARGET) or because of a higher proportion of women.

ONTARGET [191] and TRANSCEND [108] have also provided some additional information on the respective role of an ACE inhibitor and an angiotensin receptor antagonist on the appearance of new diabetes in high-risk patients. Despite the fact that telmisartan has repeatedly been shown to possess PPAR- γ -activity [194], incidence of new diabetes was nonsignificantly different between telmisartan and ramipril in ONTARGET [191] and only slightly and nonsignificantly lower incidences were observed in TRANSCEND [108] and in PROFESS [91] with respect to the placebo group. However, most patients were also receiving other antihypertensive agents that may have obscured the specific antidiabetogenic effects of the drugs being tested. Despite these considerations, the claim that PPAR- γ -activity may give telmisartan a greater antidiabetogenic action remains unproven.

Calcium antagonists

Calcium antagonists have been cleared from the suspicion of causing a relative excess of coronary events by the same authors who had raised the suspicion [195]. On the contrary, some recent meta-analyses [148,186,187,196] suggest that these agents may have some additional advantage in preventing stroke, although it is not clear whether this can be ascribed to a specific protective effect or to a slightly better BP control, often achieved in the calcium-antagonist-treated patients. It is still unclear whether calcium antagonists are less effective in protecting against new-onset heart failure, as is apparent in several studies and large meta-analyses [148,186]. The recent meta-analysis by Law et al. [148], however, shows that trials in which a BP difference was sought between an antihypertensive agent and control, the efficacy of calcium antagonists in preventing heart failure was only slightly lower than that of other antihypertensive agents (19 versus 24%). The question revolves around how much of this apparent inferiority of calcium antagonists is a real limitation in their cardiovascular protection, the result of a difficulty in diagnosing a clinically relevant but soft outcome such as an incipient heart failure, or a consequence of trial designs preventing the use of diuretics and ACE inhibitors (agents essential in heart failure therapy) in patients randomised to calcium antagonists. It is relevant that in trials in which a calcium antagonist was always or

commonly administered in combination with a diuretic (FEVER [75]) or an ACE inhibitor (ASCOT [197]), there was no statistically significant excess of heart failure in the calcium antagonist arm. Incipient heart failure has also been found to be markedly reduced (-39%) in hypertensive patients on calcium antagonist treatment compared with those on placebo in the ACTION trial [96,198–200].

New antihypertensive drugs

The new drug that has substantially increased its database in the last 2 years is aliskiren, a direct inhibitor of renin at the site of its activation, which is now available for treating patients both in United States and Europe. The new data on aliskiren can be summarised as follows. First, although the specific advantages of interfering with the activation of renin are not yet clear [201,202], aliskiren has been shown to be effective in lowering SBP and DBP in hypertensive patients when given in monotherapy at a single daily dose. Second, the drug is effective also in combination with a thiazide diuretic, a calcium antagonist and an ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor antagonist [203–205]. Third, data have recently emerged on the ability of aliskiren to protect against subclinical organ damage when combined with an angiotensin receptor antagonist. In one study in diabetic hypertensive patients with proteinuria, this drug combination led to a greater reduction in urinary protein excretion than the administration of an angiotensin receptor antagonist alone [206], but in another study on hypertensive patients with LVH, the combination did not cause a LVM reduction significantly greater than that obtained by administration of an angiotensin receptor antagonist alone [207]. In a third study in heart failure patients, this combination was significantly superior to angiotensin receptor antagonist administration in causing a reduction in the plasma concentration of brain natriuretic peptide [208], a recognised prognostic marker for heart failure [209]. It remains to be seen whether greater effects on organ damage may also be obtained by increasing the dose of traditional blockers of the renin–angiotensin system. The completion of ongoing hard endpoints trials with aliskiren in mono and combination therapies is expected with interest. Meanwhile the available evidence justifies its use in hypertension, particularly in combination with other agents. This

is also supported by the favourable tolerance profile of aliskiren. The main side-effect appears to be an increased incidence of diarrhoea, but only at doses higher than the recommended dose [203].

New antihypertensive agents that are currently under investigation include nitric oxide donors, vasopressin antagonists, neutral endopeptidase inhibitors, AT₂ angiotensin receptor agonists, and antagonists of endothelin receptors. Although their mechanisms of action hold promise of BP-lowering effectiveness and possibly of specific organ protection, their investigational phase is still far away from use in the clinical setting, and thus assessment of their pros and cons compared with current drug options is impossible. An exception is represented by endothelin receptor antagonists, because a compound of this class that selectively blocks ETA receptors, darusentan, has been recently tested in patients defined as resistant, because of lack of BP control on treatment with at least three drugs, including a diuretic. Administration of darusentan on the top of the existing treatment significantly reduced office and 24 h mean BP over a 14-week period, with a doubling of the percentage of patients achieving BP control and only a moderate increase in the rate of side-effects (mainly oedema and sodium retention) compared with placebo [210]. These results are potentially important because resistant hypertension is not a phenomenon of marginal proportion, the number of patients unable to achieve BP control despite multiple drug treatment being around 15–20% [211].

Is ranking antihypertensive agents in order of choice useful or deceiving in practice?

The 2007 European guidelines avoided ranking antihypertensive agents in order of choice. Ranking started with the first Joint National Committee report [212] and the 1978 WHO report [213], and was justified by the fact that the few available agents widely differed in tolerability and some of them could only be used in combination. With the development of several well tolerated classes of antihypertensive agents, the habit of ranking has continued for good reasons (such as the need to wait for the evidence of benefit by new agents) but also for less good reasons, such as the interest of pharmaceutical companies in having their drugs classified as ‘first choice’,

or the pleasure of investigators to see their studies capable of awarding ‘first rank’ to a drug [152].

However, once it is agreed that (1) the major mechanism of the benefits of antihypertensive therapy is BP lowering per se, (2) the effects on cause-specific outcomes of the various agents are similar or differ by a minor degree, (3) the type of outcome to occur in a given patient is unpredictable, and (4) all classes of antihypertensive agents have their pros and cons (well summarised in Tables 7 and 8 of the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines), it is obvious that any all-purpose ranking of drugs for general antihypertensive usage is unnecessary and probably deceiving [152]. It is on the basis of this striving for ranking that at different times investigators have been warning the media that millions of people may be dying every year because of the use of calcium antagonists, the use of β -blockers, or the use of angiotensin receptor antagonists. These campaigns cause lay people to wonder whether antihypertensive therapy is beneficial or dangerous. This behaviour should be discouraged. Even reasons based on costs, often used to justify ranking, have recently been weakened by the advent of generic compounds within every class of antihypertensive agents.

The 2007 European guidelines [1], rather than indulging in an all-purpose ranking, decided to prepare a table with drugs to be preferred in specific conditions, on the basis of the concept that different classes and sometimes different agents within the same class have some properties that can make them more or less suitable in given conditions. This fits well the general purpose of European guidelines, that of being ‘educational and not prescriptive or coercive for the management of individual patients who may differ widely in their personal, medical, and cultural characteristics’ [1], thus requiring decisions different from the average ones recommended in several other guidelines.

Preferred drugs

Box 11 in the 2007 European guidelines [1] is the core for the ranking of agents for specific conditions rather than for general usage. No single agent is generally proscribed, but each agent can be preferentially prescribed in specific conditions [152]. Only minor differences from what indicated

in the 2007 guidelines should be considered now, as discussed in specific sections below.

Monotherapy and combination therapy

Blood pressure lowering with the two approaches

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines underline that, no matter which drug is employed, monotherapy can effectively reduce BP in only a limited number of hypertensive patients, most of whom require the combination of at least two drugs to achieve BP control [1] (Table 6). A recent meta-analysis

Combination therapy

- 1 Evidence has continued to grow that in the vast majority of hypertensive patients, effective BP control can only be achieved by combination of at least two antihypertensive drugs.
- 2 Addition of a drug from another class to the initially prescribed one should thus be regarded as a recommendable treatment strategy, unless the initial drug needs to be withdrawn because of the appearance of side-effects or the absence of any BP-lowering effect.
- 3 The combination of two antihypertensive drugs may offer advantages also for treatment initiation, particularly in patients at high cardiovascular risk in which early BP control may be desirable.
- 4 Whenever possible, use of fixed dose (or single pill) combinations should be preferred, because simplification of treatment carries advantages for compliance to treatment.
- 5 As mentioned in the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines, several two-drug combinations are suitable for clinical use. However, trial evidence of outcome reduction has been obtained particularly for the combination of a diuretic with an ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor antagonist or a calcium antagonist, and in recent large-scale trials for the ACE inhibitor/calcium antagonist combination. The angiotensin receptor antagonist/calcium antagonist combination also appears to be rational and effective. These combinations can thus be recommended for priority use.
- 6 Despite trial evidence of outcome reduction, the β -blocker/diuretic combination favours the development of diabetes and should thus be avoided, unless required for other reasons, in predisposed patients. Use of an ACE inhibitor–angiotensin receptor antagonist combination presents a dubious potentiation of benefits with a consistent increase of serious side-effects. Specific benefits in nephropathic patients with proteinuria (because of a superior antiproteinuric effect) expect confirmation in event-based trials.
- 7 In no less than 15–20% of hypertensive patients, BP control cannot be achieved by a two-drug combination. When three drugs are required, the most rational combination appears to be a blocker of the renin–angiotensin system, a calcium antagonist, and a diuretic at effective doses.

Table 6 Combination therapy

of 42 studies has shown that combining two agents from any two classes of antihypertensive drugs increases the BP reduction much more than doubling the dose of one agent [153]. Admittedly, the advantage of combination therapy over monotherapy may partly be due to the fact that any agent used in monotherapy is ineffective or scarcely effective in a number of patients, so that its combination with an agent effective in these patients must induce a greater response than doubling the dose of an ineffective agent. However, although it is possible that the use of two drugs together implies the administration of a futile one, searching for the most effective monotherapy in every given patient is painstaking, and may discourage compliance (although pharmacogenetics may in future provide predictive clues). Furthermore, there are physiological and pharmacological synergies that justify the greater effectiveness of drug combinations, and this strategy appears to be that on which the selection of antihypertensive medication may be increasingly based. In a public health perspective, it seems desirable to foresee a substantial increase in the use of combination treatment in clinical practice from the relatively low prevalence of today [214]. This could help attain the goal of substantially improving BP control in the hypertensive population from its present low rate worldwide [215].

Two drug combinations as first step treatment

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1] recommend the combination of two drugs to be considered as initial treatment whenever hypertensive patients have a high initial BP or are classified as being at high/very high cardiovascular risk because of the presence of organ damage, diabetes, renal disease, or a history of cardiovascular disease. This recommendation was not based on evidence from morbidity/ mortality trials because in no study has the advantage of this approach been prospectively assessed. It was based on the arguments that (1) combination therapy can reduce BP to a greater extent and achieve the BP goal more promptly, (2) when a high-risk condition exists, an event may occur within a relatively short time interval, requiring protective interventions to be implemented without an excessive delay, (3) in several trials, the protective effect of BP reduction became manifest shortly after initiation of the BP-lowering treatment, and (4)

initial combination treatment may be associated with a lower degree of treatment discontinuation, possibly because treatment discontinuation (an extremely common phenomenon [182,183,216]) depends also on the frustration that originates from the patient's perception of the inability to reach BP control [217]. In a post hoc analysis of the VALUE trial [109], the cardiovascular event rate was less regardless of the type of treatment in patients in whom BP control (<140/90mmHg) was achieved within 1 month. Although suggestive, the VALUE data obviously do not provide indisputable evidence for the advantage of early BP control (and thus initiation of treatment with a two-drug combination), as it is possible, and even likely, that the immediate responders might have been at lower cardiovascular risk, which could also be the reason for the more prompt BP reduction obtained with treatment. In order to validate combination therapy as a first step strategy at least in high-risk hypertensive patients, an appropriate trial could be conducted comparing earlier BP control by a combination of two drugs to later control achieved by initial monotherapy followed by the two-drug combination in those patients requiring it. However, it appears doubtful that the issue really deserves trial evidence, and probably the choice between initiating with monotherapy or combination may better be based on the wisdom of the previously mentioned arguments.

Preferred drug combinations

Some of the large-scale trials published in the last 2 years importantly expanded information on the advantages and disadvantages of several two-drug combinations in hypertension. The new evidence available and its implications for guidelines recommendations are discussed below.

Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor–diuretic combinations

The combination of an ACE inhibitor, perindopril, and the diuretic indapamide had already been shown in the PROGRESS study to have a greater BP-lowering effect than the ACE inhibitor alone and, in parallel, a much greater preventive effect on recurrent stroke [89]. In ADVANCE [88], the same combination of indapamide and perindopril given to patients with type 2 diabetes (on top of continuation of pre-existing therapy) for

more than 4 years was followed by a significantly greater antihypertensive effect than administration of placebo (SBP and DBP difference -5.6 and -2.2mmHg, respectively). This was associated with a reduced incidence (-9%) of diabetes-related complications (composite endpoint of macrovascular and microvascular outcomes). In addition, the perindopril–indapamide combination was well tolerated with an overall rate of adverse effects only slightly greater than that observed in the placebo group, and a high number of patients (>80%) remaining on active drug treatment throughout the trial. Similarly, in the large majority of the very elderly patient of HYVET [84], the administration of the indapamide–perindopril combination resulted in a greater BP reduction as well as a lower rate of cardiovascular outcomes and serious side-effects compared with placebo.

Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor–calcium antagonist combinations

ACE inhibitor and a dihydropyridine calcium antagonist was the most widely used combination therapy in Syst-Eur and Syst-China [81,82], as well as in the HOT study [99] in order to achieve lower BP goals. INVEST used the combination of a nondihydropyridine calcium antagonist, verapamil, and the ACE inhibitor trandolapril with comparable beneficial effects as the combination of a β -blocker and a diuretic [111]. The combination amlodipine–perindopril was widely used in the ASCOT study, being more effective in lowering BP and cardiovascular events than the combination of a β -blocker with a thiazide [197].

In the ACCOMPLISH trial [185], more than 11 000 hypertensive patients with a relatively elevated cardiovascular risk were randomised, after stopping previous treatment, to receive an ACE inhibitor, benazepril, plus either the calcium antagonist amlodipine or hydrochlorothiazide. Over the 3 years of follow-up, both treatments reduced BP very effectively, the average on-treatment values being 132.5/74.4mmHg in the hydrochlorothiazide group and about 1mmHg lower (131.6/73.3mmHg) in the calcium antagonist group. The rate of serious side-effects was limited and similar between the two groups. In the group receiving the benazepril–amlodipine combination, however, the incidence of the primary endpoint (a composite

of several cardiovascular fatal and nonfatal events) was 20% less than in the group receiving the benazepril–hydrochlorothiazide combination, with a significant reduction also in cause-specific events such as myocardial infarction, although not heart failure. This provides outcome evidence in favour of the concomitant administration of an ACE inhibitor and a calcium antagonist that was hitherto unavailable. However, it would be premature to conclude from this trial that an ACE inhibitor–calcium antagonist combination is inherently and invariably superior to the combination of an ACE inhibitor and a diuretic. In ACCOMPLISH, the rate of cardiovascular outcomes was lower than expected in high-risk patients, possibly because of the extensive use of statins (68%), antiplatelet agents (65%), and revascularisation procedures (18–20%). The ACCOMPLISH findings may also depend on the large proportion of diabetic patients included (60%): indeed, in the STAR study [218], hypertensive patients with an impaired fasting glucose exhibited a worse metabolic response to the glucose load test (as well as a greater rate of new-onset diabetes) if treated with a combination of a blocker of the renin–angiotensin system and a diuretic than if treated with the combination of a renin–angiotensin system blocker and a calcium antagonist.

Combination of an angiotensin receptor antagonist with a calcium antagonist and a diuretic

An angiotensin receptor antagonist has been frequently combined with a diuretic in a number of trials, such as LIFE [219] and SCOPE [83,220], which have documented the protective effects of this treatment strategy. Until now, no outcome study has been conducted using the combination of an angiotensin receptor antagonist with a calcium antagonist. An exception is the RENAAL trial, in which the benefit of losartan (versus placebo) in delaying progression to end-stage renal disease was seen on the top of pre-existing antihypertensive therapy frequently including calcium antagonists [105]. Furthermore, a large body of evidence exists that combining an angiotensin receptor antagonist with a calcium antagonist or a diuretic provides an effective reduction of BP and a high rate of BP control in a variety of hypertension categories, has a tolerability profile even more favourable than that seen when an ACE inhibitor is used instead (because

cough and angioedema are much less frequently seen) and protects against subclinical organ damage [221–223]. Evidence has grown in particular on the combination of an angiotensin receptor antagonist with a calcium antagonist (usually amlodipine), which has been proved capable of most effectively reducing even severe hypertension [223,224].

Combinations of calcium antagonists with diuretics or β -blockers

Despite the fact that small pharmacologic studies have raised doubts on the synergistic effects of adding a diuretic to a calcium antagonist, this combination was included in the recent meta-analysis by Wald et al. [153] without detracting from the demonstration of a greater BP-lowering effect of combining calcium antagonists with other drugs compared with doubling the calcium antagonist dose in monotherapy. Even more importantly, the association of a calcium antagonist with a diuretic has been used in the FEVER, ELSA, and VALUE trials [75,166,225] with greater benefits. No outcome trial has explored the combination of a calcium antagonist with a β -blocker, but this has been the second used association in the HOT study [99].

Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor–angiotensin receptor antagonist combinations

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1] did not regard the combination of an ACE inhibitor and an angiotensin receptor antagonist among those best suited for widespread use because they act, though at a different level, on the same BP control mechanism, that is, the renin–angiotensin system. The 2007 European guidelines, however, reported some results in chronic kidney disease or diabetic patients [226], mostly with proteinuria, claiming a greater antiproteinuric effect than with administration of an ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor antagonist alone. The widespread use of this combination has now been questioned by the results of ONTARGET [53,191], in which the combination of full doses of telmisartan and ramipril reduced the initial BP values slightly more than the reduction seen with the administration of one or the other drug alone, without, however, any further reduction in cardiovascular or renal endpoints (except proteinu-

ria), and indeed with a greater number of renal side effects and a more frequent discontinuation of the initial treatment. As mentioned in a previous section, a post hoc analysis of the BP changes in ONTARGET [115] has elaborated the hypothesis that excessive lowering of BP in patients whose baseline BP was less than 130mmHg (either spontaneously or as effect of previous therapy) may have been responsible for an excess rather than a reduction of cardiovascular events. An alternative explanation that has been advanced [63] is that in ONTARGET, the multiple therapies used had already brought these high-risk patients to the bottom level of cardiovascular risk achievable, and that combination of the full doses of two blockers of the renin–angiotensin system could not further reduce the risk. However, the adverse effects of the administered drugs were free to manifest themselves. Furthermore, the reasons have been discussed that make it difficult to extrapolate the ONTARGET findings to the general population of hypertensive patients.

Nonetheless, the results of ONTARGET do not support large-scale use of this combination of drugs in hypertension and suggest that its use in proteinuric renal patients should be studied further and more critically. A recent meta-analysis of 49 studies, albeit small and mostly short term, has confirmed that the combination of the two blockers of the renin–angiotensin system has significantly greater antiproteinuric effect than either component [227]. However, although reduction of proteinuria is often considered to lead to and/or reflect renoprotection (i.e., delayed occurrence of end-stage renal disease) [228], proteinuria reduction, particularly in short-term studies, should not be taken as necessarily equivalent to renal function preservation and prevention of cardiovascular outcomes. An example of this are some findings of the ONTARGET study [53] already discussed.

In this context, it should be remembered that the results of the only study (the COOPERATE study) that reported a superior protective effect of double blockade of the renin–angiotensin system on renal outcomes [229] have been questioned [230,231]. Also, the widely quoted favourable results of concomitant ACE inhibitor and angiotensin receptor antagonist administration reported in trials on patients with left ventricular dysfunction or heart failure should be considered cautiously, as the

benefits were not seen in all trials (absent in VALIANT [232]), or they were small (Val-HeFT [233]) or evident only if hospitalisation was added to mortality (CHARM [234]). Finally, in all these trials, the combination markedly increased the incidence of side-effects such as hyperkalemia and an elevation in serum creatinine.

Fixed dose (or single pill) combinations

Guidelines have long favoured the use of combination of two antihypertensive drugs at fixed doses in a single tablet, because reducing the number of pills that have to be taken daily has been shown to improve compliance [235], which is low in hypertension. Use of fixed dose combinations of two drugs can directly follow initial monotherapy when addition of a second drug is required to control BP, or be the first treatment step when a high cardiovascular risk makes early BP control desirable. This approach is now facilitated by the availability of different fixed dose combinations of the same two drugs, which minimises one of its inconveniences, that is, the inability to only increase the dose of one drug but not that of the other.

Conclusions

New and old evidence strongly supports combination treatment as the most effective strategy to control BP, and therefore recommends treatment strategies largely based on the addition of a drug from another class to the initially prescribed agent, whenever BP control is not achieved, unless the starting drug needs to be changed because of side-effects or the absence of any BP reduction. It suggests that the combination of two antihypertensive drugs may offer advantages also as first step treatment, particularly in patients at high cardiovascular risk, in whom early BP control may be desirable. It favours, whenever possible, the use of fixed dose combinations of two drugs in a single tablet because of the advantage brought about by simplification of the treatment regimen. Finally, it warns against the use of a combination of an ACE inhibitor and an angiotensin receptor antagonist at least in very high cardiovascular risk patients such as those in ONTARGET. It remains to be established whether the latter combination may have a beneficial role in patients with chronic renal disease and proteinuria, or even in some lower risk hypertensives.

Because the 2007 European guidelines did not include the ACE inhibitor–angiotensin receptor antagonist combination between the preferred combinations, the scheme they presented does not appear to require substantial modification at present. It should be underlined, however, that outcome reduction has been documented in trials using the following combinations: ACE inhibitor and diuretic, angiotensin receptor antagonist and diuretic, calcium antagonist and diuretic, and ACE inhibitor and calcium antagonist. Successful trials have also used β -blocker and diuretic in association, but this is the combination more easily inducing new diabetes in predisposed patients [158].

Finally, it is important to remember that no less than 15–20% of the patients need more than two antihypertensive drugs to achieve an effective BP reduction. The combination of a blocker of the renin–angiotensin system, a calcium antagonist and a thiazide diuretic may be a rational three-drug combination, although other drugs, such as a β -blocker or an α -blocker, may be included in a multiple approach, depending on the clinical circumstances.

Chapter 5

Therapeutic approach in special conditions

Elderly	54
Diabetes mellitus	57
Renal disease	60
Cerebrovascular disease	61
Coronary heart disease and heart failure	63
Atrial fibrillation	64
Hypertension and Erectile dysfunction	66

Elderly

Both the 2003 [136] and 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1] regretted that, although there was overwhelming evidence of the benefits (outcome reduction) of pharmacological lowering of BP in the elderly, this evidence was inconclusive for patients aged 80 years or above, in whom only a meta-analysis of a limited number of patients from various trials [236] and the pilot HYVET [237] were available, suggesting beneficial effects for morbidity but not for mortality.

Now this gap in the evidence has been filled with the much expected publication of the results of the HYVET [84]. In HYVET, 3845 patients aged 80 years or more in whom entry SBP was 160mmHg or more (average 173mmHg) were randomised to receive either placebo or active treatment, consisting of indapamide (1.5mg daily) and the eventual addition of the ACE inhibitor perindopril (2 and 4mg daily) with the target to attain a SBP value below 150mmHg. Drug administration (with the indapamide–perindopril combination given in about three quarters of the patients) reduced BP to a value much lower than placebo, that is, 144/78 versus 161/84mmHg. This was accompanied by clear-cut beneficial effects, and, according to advice from the safety board, the trial was stopped after an average treatment duration of less than 2 years. The beneficial effects consisted of a 30% reduction in stroke (just short of statistical significance) and statistically significant reductions in congestive heart failure (64%), major cardiovascular events, and all-cause death (21%). These results indicate that even in the very elderly stratum of the population, antihypertensive treatment does not only prevent cardiovascular morbid events but also translates into prolongation of life.

On the basis of the important evidence provided by HYVET [84], guidelines can now more positively recommend that antihypertensive treatment be extended to hypertensive patients aged 80 years and above. However, in consideration of the very old age of the patients to which recommendations are directed, the characteristics of the population included in HYVET and the nature of the study should be given some attention, in order not to extend treatment recommendations to individuals or contexts different from those of HYVET.

HYVET deliberately recruited patients without cardiovascular disease, and in good physical and mental conditions, and excluded ill and frail individuals who are so frequent among octogenarians. Although alterations of baroreceptor control often occur in the very elderly [238], HYVET patients had similar BP values in the sitting and standing positions even on treatment, confirming the interpretation that particularly healthy individuals were enrolled. The report that incidence of adverse effects was lower in the active treatment arm than in the placebo arm, underlines the excellent tolerability of drugs used and the fact that the adverse effects were more likely to be due to the hypertension per se than to the treatment. Nonetheless, this supports once more the highly selected nature of the octogenarians enrolled. Finally, the premature interruption of the trial made its duration so short (1.8 years) as to leave unanswered the question whether the benefit of antihypertensive treatment persists for several years.

In conclusion, an evidence-based general recommendation can now be given to prescribe antihypertensive treatment to octogenarians with SBP above 160mmHg with the target to lower it below 150mmHg, but because of differences in the general health of very elderly patients, the decision to treat should be taken on an individual basis, and BP lowering should be in any case gradual and carefully monitored by the doctor.

Since the publication of the 2007 ESH-ESC guidelines, some additional useful information on the treatment of hypertension in the elderly has been added. A large prospective meta-analysis of major antihypertensive therapy trials has been published, showing that patients aged less or more than 65 years achieve the same proportional benefit from a given lowering of BP and there is no hint that different classes of antihypertensive drugs are more efficacious in reducing outcomes in younger or older patients [239]. The latter information confirms what was already pointed out in the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines, that in the elderly drug treatment can be initiated with thiazide diuretics, calcium antagonists, angiotensin receptor antagonists, ACE inhibitors, and β -blockers, which is in line with general guidelines. The HYVET adds further evidence to the role of diuretics and ACE inhibitors. For isolated systolic hypertension of the

elderly, there are three trials [78,81,82] that have used a diuretic [78] and a calcium antagonist [81,82], respectively, as first-line treatment.

As mentioned previously, a recent reappraisal of trials [71] has underlined that no single trial on hypertension in the elderly [76–85] has enrolled patients with grade 1 hypertension (i.e., SBP 140–159mmHg). Furthermore, in no placebo-controlled trial of antihypertensive treatment in the elderly [76–84], on-treatment SBP values have been lowered to less than 140mmHg, and the only trial comparing achieved SBP values below and above 140mmHg [85] is also the only one unable to demonstrate a benefit of more intense therapy, although the trial was underpowered because of a limited number of events. Although clearly not evidence based, the recommendations of the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines to initiate

Antihypertensive treatment in the elderly

- 1 Since the publication of the last guidelines, evidence from large meta-analyses of published trials confirms that in the elderly antihypertensive treatment is highly beneficial. The proportional benefit in patients aged more than 65 years is no less than that in younger patients.
- 2 Data from meta-analyses do not support the claim that antihypertensive drug classes significantly differ in their ability to lower BP and to exert cardiovascular protection, both in younger and in elderly patients. The choice of the drugs to employ should thus not be guided by age. Thiazide diuretics, ACE inhibitors, calcium antagonists, angiotensin receptor antagonists, and β -blockers can be considered for initiation and maintenance of treatment also in the elderly.
- 3 In the elderly, outcome trials have only addressed patients with an entry SBP at least 160mmHg, and in no trial in which a benefit was shown achieved SBP averaged less than 140mmHg. Evidence from outcome trials addressing lower entry and achieving lower on-treatment values are thus needed, but common sense considerations suggest that also in the elderly drug treatment can be initiated when SBP is higher than 140mmHg, and that SBP can be brought to below 140mmHg, provided treatment is conducted with particular attention to adverse responses, potentially more frequent in the elderly.
- 4 At variance from previous guidelines, evidence is now available from an outcome trial (HYVET) that antihypertensive treatment has benefits also in patients aged 80 years or more. BP-lowering drugs should thus be continued or initiated when patients turn 80, starting with monotherapy and adding a second drug if needed. Because HYVET patients were generally in good conditions, the extent to which HYVET data can be extrapolated to more fragile octogenarians is uncertain. The decision to treat should thus be taken on an individual basis, and patients should always be carefully monitored during and beyond the treatment titration phase.

Table 7 Antihypertensive treatment in the elderly.

antihypertensive therapy in the elderly according to the same criteria used for younger individuals (i.e., for SBP ≥ 140 mmHg) and to use the same SBP goal as in younger patients can still be considered as prudent recommendations, particularly when treatment is well tolerated. However, firm evidence on these two clinically important issues should be obtained through appropriately designed new trials.

A reassessment of recommendations on treatment of the elderly with hypertension is given in Table 7.

Diabetes mellitus

Reappraisal of antihypertensive treatment trials on diabetic patients [71] has strengthened the information provided in the 2007ESH/ESC guidelines, by clearly showing that the evidence in favour of initiating BP-lowering therapy in diabetic patients with high normal BP is quite scanty, and that favouring a SBP target below 130mmHg is almost nonexistent. Added to the recognised difficulty of achieving SBP values less than 130mmHg in diabetic patients [240], the critical reappraisal of trial data suggests that the recommendation commonly given to all hypertensives, to lower systolic BP as much as possible below 140mmHg, appears realistic and prudent for diabetic patients too. More complicated is a decision about initiation of pharmacological therapy when BP values are still in the high normal range. If deferring treatment due to the lack of solid evidence appears legitimate, it also seems reasonable to give due consideration to data showing prevention of progression or enhancement of regression of organ damage, particularly microalbuminuria, which is especially ominous in diabetic patients because it reflects a greater risk of end-stage renal disease and cardiovascular events [241]. In this context, the results of ADVANCE are interesting because a beneficial effect of treatment on microalbuminuria and proteinuria was seen at normotensive BP levels, although normotension was often achieved by the previous use of antihypertensive drugs, with a clear-cut reduction in the appearance of new microalbuminuria (-21%) [123]. This expands the evidence on the ability of antihypertensive drug treatment to exert a primary preventive influence against diabetic nephropathy [86,242,243]. However, the crucial issues of whether to initiate antihypertensive treatment in diabetic patients

Antihypertensive treatment in diabetic patients

- 1 In diabetic patients, antihypertensive treatment should be always initiated when BP is 140/90mmHg or more. Initiation of treatment in the high normal BP range is at present not sufficiently supported by outcome evidence from trials. It can, nevertheless, be recommended, particularly when microalbuminuria is present, based on the evidence of its favourable effect on regression and progression of this sign of organ damage.
- 2 The BP goal traditionally recommended in diabetes, that is, less than 130/80mmHg is also not supported by outcome evidence from trials, and has also been very difficult to achieve in the majority of the patients. Thus, it appears realistic to only recommend to pursue a sizeable BP reduction without indicating a goal which is unproven.
- 3 Meta-analyses of available trials show that in diabetes all major antihypertensive drug classes protect against cardiovascular complications, probably because of the protective effect of BP lowering per se. They can thus all be considered for treatment.
- 4 In diabetes, combination treatment is commonly needed to effectively lower BP. A renin–angiotensin receptor blocker should always be included because of the evidence of its superior protective effect against initiation or progression of nephropathy.
- 5 In hypertensive diabetic patients, tight blood glucose control (HbA1c to 6.5%) is beneficial, particularly on microvascular complications. Recent evidence suggests that combining effective blood glucose and BP control increases protection, particularly of the kidney.
- 6 Tight blood glucose control should not be pursued abruptly and patients should be monitored closely because of the increased risk of severe hypoglycaemic episodes.
- 7 Microvascular complications of diabetes in different organs are differently affected by treatment. Antihypertensive treatment exerts a major protective effect against renal complications, whereas evidence of a similar effect on eye and neural complications is less consistent.

Table 8 Antihypertensive treatment in diabetic patients.

with high normal BP and whether goal BP should be lower than that recommended in the general hypertensive population should be explored through suitably designed intervention trials.

As to antihypertensive drugs to be preferred in diabetes, the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines based their recommendation to use any agent capable of effectively lowering BP on the evidence of a large meta-analysis showing substantial equivalence of antihypertensive agents belonging to various classes in preventing cardiovascular outcomes in diabetes [186]. This recommendation was coupled to that of using combinations of drugs that include an agent blocking the renin–angiotensin system, because of the particular effectiveness of this type of agent on renal protein excretion and long-term preservation of renal function. The only large study exclusively devoted to diabetics completed after the 2007 guidelines, the

ADVANCE trial [88], used the combination of a diuretic, indapamide, and an ACE inhibitor, perindopril, often on top of pre-existing antihypertensive agents to produce some further BP decrease associated with a significant albeit modest reduction (9%) in the combined endpoint of macrovascular and microvascular complications, a significant 14% reduction of all cause mortality, and a significant 21% reduction of renal outcomes, such as proteinuria, microalbuminuria, doubling of serum creatinine, dialysis and renal transplantation. ACCOMPLISH, though not entirely devoted to diabetes, included 60% of diabetic patients among the more than 11 000 individuals enrolled. The study compared the use of an ACE inhibitor, benazepril, in association with either the calcium antagonist amlodipine or the diuretic hydrochlorothiazide and reported superiority of the ACE inhibitor–calcium antagonist combination [185].

Although diabetic-dependent microvascular complications are all related to BP within a wide range of values [244], antihypertensive treatment appears to affect them in a different fashion. BP reduction has a pronounced protective effect on renal complications (see ‘Renal disease’ section). However, it does not appear to substantially affect neuropathy [245], whereas data on the ability of BP-lowering strategies to protect against eye complications are not consistent. Several years ago, the UKPDS study [246] reported a reduced incidence of various eye lesions (and of eye interventions) in hypertensive type 2 diabetic patients under tight versus those under standard BP control, strengthening the favourable conclusion drawn from previous smaller or less controlled studies [86,247,248]. However, no significant beneficial effects of BP reduction by an ACE inhibitor–diuretic combination on eye complications has recently been reported in the hypertensive type 2 diabetic patients of ADVANCE [88,249], and substantially negative data have also resulted from the DIRECT trial in normotensive type 1 diabetic patients in whom BP was reduced by an angiotensin receptor antagonist [250]. Interestingly, the inconsistency between older and more recent studies extends to the effect of tight blood glucose control on eye complications, with favourable reports from UKPDS [251] and negative ones from ADVANCE [249]. Whether a protective effect of BP and glucose control on diabetic retinopathy may only be observed

in early phases of the disease and on appearance rather than progression of retinopathy remains to be tested by specific trials.

Recommendations on antihypertensive management of diabetes are summarised in Table 8.

Renal disease

As mentioned in previous sections, in the last 2 years, further evidence has accumulated in favour of targeting reduction of microalbuminuria and proteinuria, mostly through blockers of the renin–angiotensin system, in order to reduce end-stage renal disease and cardiovascular events. A post hoc analysis of RENAAL data indicates that the incidence of end-stage renal disease showed an independent relationship with SBP and albuminuria reduction, suggesting that improving renal outcomes in patients with diabetic nephropathy may require a dual strategy, targeting both BP and albuminuria [228]. Also, in the type 2 diabetic patients of ADVANCE, urinary protein excretion (both baseline and on-treatment values) has been reported to be closely correlated with the primary outcome of the study (macrovascular and microvascular events) [18]. On the contrary, ONTARGET has recently reported that the combination of full doses of the ACE inhibitor ramipril and the angiotensin receptor antagonist, telmisartan, though reducing BP a few mmHg more than therapy with either ramipril or telmisartan and influencing progress of proteinuria to a slightly but significantly greater extent, was accompanied by a greater incidence of renal outcomes (mostly acute dialysis and doubling of serum creatinine) and by no further reduction of cardiovascular outcomes [53,191]. As mentioned in a previous section, only a minority (about 4%) of ONTARGET patients had overt proteinuria at baseline, whereas worsening of renal outcomes mostly occurred in the patients without baseline microproteinuria or macroproteinuria, in whom changes in urinary protein excretion could only differ to a minor degree [53]. Finally, the changes in urinary protein excretion were small and so the between-treatment differences in renal outcomes were quite infrequent (2.03, 2.21, and 2.49% with ramipril, telmisartan, and the combination, respectively). Therefore, ONTARGET patients can hardly be compared to the more severe nephropathy cohorts in whom the role of urinary protein excretion in predicting end-stage renal

disease was mostly investigated. When the effects of telmisartan versus placebo on renal outcomes were studied in the TRANSCEND trial [108], no significant differences were found as far as rate of GFR decline and end-stage renal disease is concerned [252]. No data on renal outcomes are available from PROFESS [91], also comparing telmisartan with placebo.

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1] shared with other guidelines [66,253] the recommendation to lower BP below 130/80mmHg in renal patients, but it recognised that evidence from trials having renal patients randomised to more versus less intense BP lowering was scanty. Little additional evidence, either pro or con this lower BP target, has been accumulated since. No large trial completed in the last 2 years focused on patients with renal dysfunction, and in no instance SBP was brought below the target of 130mmHg. A meta-analysis, from randomised controlled trials of BP lowering in patients on dialysis, is of interest: BP-lowering treatment was associated with a significant reduction in cardiovascular events (29%), all-cause mortality (20%) and cardiovascular mortality (29%), for a SBP/DBP difference versus control of -4.5/-2.3mmHg [254]. Regretfully, no information was provided about the absolute BP values achieved with treatment, although the finding that the protective effects were significant only in the subgroup of hypertensive patients may suggest that on-treatment BP values were not particularly low. The matter is further complicated by the extensive use of blockers of the renin-angiotensin system in renal patients. These drugs are thought to possess specific renal protective properties, which make the effect attributable to BP reduction more difficult to unravel.

Cerebrovascular disease

Stroke and transient ischaemic attacks

It has been pointed out that the results of the PROGRESS trial, though clearly showing the benefits of lowering BP in patients with previous cerebrovascular events [89], cannot be taken to support a recommendation to initiate BP-lowering treatment in cardiovascular patients with BP in the high normal range, as in this trial the benefits of treatment were seen only in individuals with a baseline SBP of 140mmHg and above, who often were on antihypertensive drugs already [90]. Nor can the PROGRESS data be

taken to support a SBP target below 130mmHg, as the average SBP achieved on more intense treatment was 132mmHg. However, the trial did show that an on-treatment SBP of 132mmHg was better than an on-treatment SBP of 141mmHg, that is, the average SBP of the placebo patients. In the other trial that first showed the benefits of BP lowering in patients with cerebrovascular disease, the PATS study [255], SBP values remained too high (143 and 149mmHg in the active and placebo arms of the trial, respectively) to help clarify when to initiate treatment and to what level should BP be lowered in cerebrovascular patients. The same is the case for ACCESS [256]. Finally, it cannot be denied that the matter has been further confused by the recent publication of the negative results of the PROFESS study [91]. In this very large trial, in patients with previous stroke or transient ischemic attack, bringing SBP to 136mmHg by adding telmisartan, rather than to 140mmHg by adding placebo, was not accompanied by any significant reduction in recurrent strokes or major cardiovascular events. Various interpretations have been given for these unexpected negative findings: the small BP difference, in line with the evidence from the PROGRESS that the small BP difference in patients on monotherapy also failed to significantly reduce outcomes, the short duration of the follow-up (only 2.5 years), the frequent use of concomitant therapy (all patients were on antiplatelet agents and half of them were on lipid-lowering agents), the large dropout of patients during treatment, and the initiation of treatment very close to the qualifying cerebrovascular event. The fact remains that PROFESS has not really helped to clarify the remaining issues about antihypertensive treatment of the cerebrovascular patient.

A matter of continuing concern is the optimal BP management during the acute phase of stroke. The results of a small trial, the Controlling Hypertension and Hypotension Immediately Post-Stroke (CHHIPS), suggest a beneficial impact of administering lisinopril or atenolol in patients with acute stroke and a SBP more than 160mmHg [257], but many of the current uncertainties remain to be clarified.

Cognitive dysfunction and dementia

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines stressed the importance of better clarifying the role of high BP and BP-lowering treatment on the development of

cognitive dysfunction and dementia but acknowledged that the available evidence was scanty and confusing [1]. Little further evidence has been added in the past 2 years, except for the results of the HYVET on hypertensive octogenarians. All patients included in this trial were tested at baseline and yearly during treatment for cognitive function with the Mini-Mental State Exam (MMSE), and patients whose score fell to less than 24 or by more than three points in any one year, were assessed with further tests in order to investigate possible incident dementia. The results showed only a nonsignificant trend for reduction of both cognitive decline and dementia with active treatment (hazard ratio 0.86 with 95% confidence intervals of 0.67–1.09) [258]. Thus, the results of HYVET cannot help to clarify the matter, but the characteristics of the study have not been well suited for investigating dementia: indeed, at baseline, all individuals were rather healthy and with a good cognitive function and, in particular, the short duration of the follow-up (only 2 years) was unlikely to allow precise assessment of a slowly developing condition such as cognitive decline. The relationship between high BP, antihypertensive therapy, and cognitive loss is an important issue that deserves further studies, although it should be recognised these studies are difficult to design and conduct. In this context, it is promising, but by no means conclusive, that a meta-analysis that included HYVET and other placebo-controlled trials showed a small and statistically significant reduction in the incidence of dementia (-13%) in the actively treated patients [258].

Coronary heart disease and heart failure

It has already been extensively discussed whether the current recommendation to lower SBP below 130mmHg in patients with concomitant coronary heart disease is well founded. It has been pointed out that some of the analyses of recent trials raising the possibility that low achieved BP values are associated with increased rather than decreased risk of cardiovascular outcomes [113,115] are post hoc with well known limitations. It has also been recognised that a reappraisal of all trials of antihypertensive agents in patients with coronary heart disease has provided contradictory evidence on the presence or absence of benefits of lowering SBP below 130mmHg [71]. Until firmer evidence is provided by new trials, it appears

reasonable to lower SBP down to the 130–139mmHg range in patients with concomitant coronary heart disease.

The failure to significantly reduce heart failure with preserved systolic function in the I-PRESERVE study [259] has to be pointed out. Although this type of heart failure is most often related to hypertension, in I-PRESERVE randomisation to the angiotensin receptor antagonist, irbesartan, or to placebo, in more than 4000 patients with chronic heart failure and a left ventricular ejection fraction more than 0.45 (88% of whom had a history of hypertension) did not show any difference in the primary endpoint of death from any cause or hospitalisation for a cardiovascular cause as well as in the secondary outcome of a composite of heart failure events. This occurred despite a 3.5/2.0mmHg SBP/DBP difference in favour of irbesartan. The negative results of I-PRESERVE, however, should be seen in the context of the complex design of the trial, in which a background of intense antihypertensive therapy, including 25% of ACE inhibitors (39% during the trial), was maintained, and initial BP was only 136/79mmHg, thus further strengthening the question as to whether lowering SBP much below 140mmHg is of any further benefit. It should be noted that 59% of I-PRESERVE patients were on antiplatelet agents, 19% on oral anticoagulant therapy, and 30% on lipid-lowering agents.

The efficacy of angiotensin receptor antagonists in the prevention of heart failure has come under some discussion also as a result of the TRANSCEND [108] and PROFESS [91] studies. In both these placebo-controlled trials, randomisation to telmisartan did not reduce the incidence of hospitalisation for heart failure below that occurring on placebo. In ONTARGET [191], the number of hospitalisations for heart failure was lower (though not significantly) with ramipril than with telmisartan. However, the risk of heart failure in all these trials was rather low, and definitive conclusions cannot be reached at present.

Atrial fibrillation

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines summarise evidence from post hoc analyses of heart failure [233,260,261] and hypertension trials [262,263] showing a lower evidence of new atrial fibrillation in patients receiving an angiotensin receptor antagonist (in one trial [260] an ACE inhibitor). While

warning against the possible bias of post hoc analyses, nonetheless the guidelines suggested angiotensin receptor antagonists and ACE inhibitors as preferred drugs in hypertensive patients at risk of developing atrial fibrillation. A plausible explanation for this was the association between atrial enlargement and LVH, the favourable effects of blockers of the renin–angiotensin system on both cardiac alterations, and the relationship between LVH regression and reduction in new-onset atrial fibrillation [49,264]. However, data accumulated since then do not consistently support this recommendation. Although in ONTARGET [191] new atrial fibrillation was slightly less frequent with telmisartan than with ramipril, placebo-comparisons in TRANSCEND [108] and PROFESS [91] could not confirm a protective effect of this angiotensin receptor antagonist against new onset of atrial fibrillation. In TRANSCEND [108] the hazard ratio was 1.02, and in PROFESS [91] treatment discontinuation for atrial fibrillation occurred in 81 patients on telmisartan and in 50 patients on placebo. In I-PRESERVE [259], atrial arrhythmia is reported in 77 patients on irbesartan and 68 patients on placebo.

The 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines also reported the results of small studies suggesting that the angiotensin receptor antagonists may exert favourable effects on recurrent atrial fibrillation in patients with previous episodes of this arrhythmia [265,266]. Along the same lines, enalapril has been reported to facilitate maintenance of sinus rhythm after conversion treatment [267]. However, the guidelines stressed the small number of patients in these studies and concluded that more information was expected from ongoing specific trials with sufficient statistical power. Two specific trials have been completed quite recently (CAPRAF [268], GISSI-AF [269]) and their results are not supportive of protective effects from angiotensin receptor antagonists against recurrence of atrial fibrillation. In GISSI-AF 1442 patients (85% with a history of hypertension) having had at least two episodes of atrial fibrillation in the previous 6 months, need for DC conversion and frequently treated with ACE inhibitors and class I and III antiarrhythmic drugs were randomised to either valsartan (up to 320 mg/day) or placebo and followed up for a mean period of 223 days. Incidence of at least one episode of atrial fibrillation was 51.4% on valsartan and 52.1% on placebo (hazard ratio 0.99, P=0.84). A recent

meta-analysis of all studies of secondary prevention of atrial fibrillation with blockers of the renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system appears to indicate overall benefits of these agents, however (R. Schmieder et al., personal communication).

One further point deserves mention. In a recent meta-analysis [270] including almost 12,000 patients with systolic heart failure, and therefore at high risk of atrial fibrillation, β -blockers were found to significantly reduce (by about 27%) the incidence of atrial fibrillation. A history of atrial fibrillation and systolic heart failure may be a specific indication for using β -blockers. Hypertension in women This aspect deserves a brief comment because of the recent publication of a new meta-analysis from the Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration, investigating benefit of antihypertensive treatment in men and women [271]: both BP lowering and reduction in outcomes were similar in the two sexes and no sex-related differences in response to various classes of antihypertensive agents could be detected.

Hypertension and erectile dysfunction

Erectile dysfunction is a prevalent condition in hypertensive patients and a predictor of future cardiovascular events. Screening and treatment of erectile dysfunction improves management of cardiovascular risk factors. After initiating therapy with phosphodiesterase (PDE) 5 inhibitors, patients are more likely to take antihypertensive medication and BP control is improved [272]. Older antihypertensive drugs (diuretics, β -blockers, centrally acting drugs) exert negative effects, whereas newer drugs have neutral or beneficial effects (calcium antagonists, ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor antagonists, nebivolol) [273].

Chapter 6

Treatment of associated risk factors

Lipid lowering agents	68
Antiplatelet therapy	68
Glycaemic control	70
The issue of the polypill	71

Lipid lowering agents

The benefit of combining a statin with antihypertensive treatment in hypertensive patients was well established by the ASCOT-LLA study [274], as summarised in the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines [1]. The negative results obtained with another statin in the ALLHAT study [275] can be attributed to insufficient lowering of total cholesterol (11% in ALLHAT as compared with 20% in ASCOT). Further analyses of ASCOT have shown the addition of a statin to the amlodipine-based antihypertensive therapy can reduce the primary cardiovascular outcome even more markedly than addition of a statin to the atenolol-based antihypertensive therapy [276,277]. The beneficial effect of statin administration to patients without previous cardiovascular events has been strengthened by the findings of the JUPITER study [278], showing that lowering LDL-cholesterol by 50% in patients with baseline values less than 130 mg/dl (3.4 mmol/l), but elevated C-reactive protein (CRP), reduced cardiovascular events by 44%.

In conclusion, the recommendation given in the 2007 guidelines to consider statin therapy in hypertensive patients who have an estimated 10-year risk of cardiovascular events more than 20% can be reconfirmed, but the JUPITER study [278] suggests that statin benefits can be observed also in patients with elevated CRP and at moderate cardiovascular risk (about 15% cardiovascular events in 10 years).

Antiplatelet therapy

A large meta-analysis has just been published of serious cardiovascular outcomes and major bleeds in six primary prevention trials (95 000 individuals at low cardiovascular risk, 660 000 person-years) and 16 secondary prevention trials (17 000 individuals at high cardiovascular risk, 43 000 person-years) that compared long-term aspirin versus control [279]. In the primary prevention trials, aspirin allocation led to a significant 12% reduction in serious cardiovascular events (mostly nonfatal myocardial infarction). However, as a consequence of the overall low risk of the individuals, absolute event reduction amounted to only 0.06 events per 100 patient-years, which was counterbalanced by an absolute increase in major gastrointestinal and extracranial bleeds of 0.03 bleeds per 100 patient-years. In the secondary prevention trials, aspirin allocation yielded

a greater absolute reduction in serious cardiovascular events (1.5 events per 100 patient-years). Although only few secondary prevention trials carefully reported bleed incidence, data from trials reporting bleeds suggest an extracranial bleed excess of no more than 0.2 events per 100 patient-years. It can, therefore, be concluded that, although administration of aspirin has a clear benefit/harm ratio in patients with cardiovascular disease, there is only a very tiny excess of benefit over harm in the low-risk patients included in primary prevention trials.

Of course, the division between primary and secondary prevention is artificial and arbitrary, and individuals who have not yet experienced a cardiovascular event can be at very different levels of total risk. Attention has been directed to the possible benefits of aspirin in patients with diabetes but still free of overt cardiovascular disease. In the hypertensive patients with diabetes in the HOT study, cardiovascular outcome reduction by aspirin did not achieve statistical significance [280,281], nor was a clear benefit seen in diabetic patients included in other trials [281]. Furthermore, the recent findings of a large primary prevention study carried out on diabetic patients in Japan could only show that low-dose aspirin was associated with a nonsignificant reduction in cardiovascular outcomes [282]. Therefore, the benefits of antiplatelet therapy in diabetes remain to be established.

The finding that in the HOT study, the greatest benefit of low-dose aspirin and the best benefit/harm ratio occurred in patients with serum creatinine more than 1.3 mg/l [280] has been further elaborated by estimating GFR and calculating the effects of aspirin versus placebo in three groups with eGFR 60 ml/min per 1.73m² or more, 45–59 ml/min per 1.73m², and less than 45 ml/min per 1.73m². There was a significant trend for increasing reduction in major cardiovascular events and death with progressive decline in eGFR, the reduction being particularly marked in hypertensive patients with eGFR less than 45 ml/min per 1.73m². In this group of patients, the risk of bleeding was modest as compared with the cardiovascular benefit [283].

In conclusion, the prudent recommendations of the 2007 ESH/ESC guidelines can be reconfirmed: antiplatelet therapy, in particular low-dose aspirin, should be prescribed to hypertensive patients with previous

cardiovascular events; it can also be considered in hypertensive patients without a history of cardiovascular disease with reduced renal function or with a high cardiovascular risk. In patients receiving aspirin, careful attention should always be given to the increased possibility of bleeding, particularly gastrointestinal.

Glycaemic control

The 2007 European guidelines reviewed the data on the target blood glucose and HbA1c values to be reached in diabetic patients, an issue of practical importance because of the highly prevalent association of type 2 diabetes with hypertension [1]. They indicated a tight blood glucose control, that is, a glycaemic value less than 6.0mmol/l (108 mg/dl) and an HbA1c less than 6.5%, to be desirable as a means to minimise the blood glucose-related macrovascular and microvascular complications, as shown in observational studies [1,284]. Since then, two major large-scale randomised trials, ADVANCE and ACCORD, focused on the effects of tight versus standard blood glucose control in type 2 diabetes, have been published with inconsistent results [285,286]. In ADVANCE, the factorial design included assessment of the effects of tight blood glucose control (goal HbA1c<6.5%) via administration of gliclazide-MR as well as other available pharmacological means versus standard blood glucose control in patients with or without the additional administration of the indapamide/perindopril combination, as mentioned in the previous sections. In patients with tight blood glucose control, the average on-treatment HbA1c was 6.5%, a value definitely lower than that seen in the standard treated group (7.3%). This was accompanied by a significant, although modest, reduction (-10%) in the composite primary endpoint (microvascular and macrovascular events) of the trial, which was entirely due to reductions of the microvascular component, as macrovascular endpoints did not show any significant between-group difference. In ACCORD, the goal was to lower HbA1c to less than 6.0%, which led to a 6.5% average on-treatment HbA1c value reached by patients on tight blood glucose control (versus 7.5% of the comparison group). This was associated with a reduction in the incidence of myocardial infarction, which was accompanied, however, by a significant and marked increase (p35%) in all-cause mortality, leading

the tight blood glucose control arm to a premature termination. The reasons for the different results of the two trials are unclear, although the most likely hypothesis seems to be that, compared with ADVANCE, tight blood glucose control in ACCORD was obtained much more abruptly (less than 6 months versus 2 years) by a much larger use of antidiabetic drugs (thiazolidinediones 91.7 versus 16.8%, insulin 77.3 versus 40.5%, and metformin 86.6 versus 73.8%), which might have favoured hypoglycaemic-related events as indirectly shown by the exceedingly high number of hypoglycaemic episodes reported in the tight blood glucose as compared to the control group.

The blood glucose goals recommended in the 2007 guidelines [1] can thus remain unchanged, although with the caveat that tight blood glucose control should probably be pursued gently and values well below 6.5% HbA1c should be avoided. Further support to this unchanged recommendation comes from the ADVANCE findings that in the group in which tight blood glucose control was combined with more intense antihypertensive treatment, the magnitude of the beneficial effects was significantly greater because of a reduced rate of all-cause mortality as well as of new-onset microalbuminuria [287]. It should be emphasised that in a recent meta-analysis that pooled data from the four randomised trials so far available on tight blood glucose control (ADVANCE, ACCORD, UKPDS, and VADT) [285,286,288,289], this group showed a risk of severe hypoglycaemic episodes that was about 2.5 times greater than that of the group under standard glucose control strategy [290]. This calls for the tight blood glucose control strategy to be applied with close monitoring of the patients.

The issue of the polypill

A recent study [291] has tested the effects on various cardiovascular risk factors of a pill containing three antihypertensive drugs (an ACE inhibitor, a β -blocker, and a diuretic), a statin, and aspirin at low dose in individuals free of cardiovascular disease but just with one cardiovascular risk factor. At the end of the 12-week treatment, there was a reduction in BP, serum cholesterol, and urinary thromboxane 2 (as an index of antiplatelet action), as expected from the effects of the single polypill components. There was

also no increment of the side-effects due to the individual components when given together in the single pill. It should be emphasised, however, that the rationale upon which the polypill has been developed is not the reasonable one of assembling together several drugs in order to facilitate treatment in those very high risk patients requiring multiple therapies [292]. The rationale for the polypill, as heralded by Wald and Law (who have even patented the concept), is that the polypill, containing all types of agents shown capable of reducing cardiovascular risk, may reduce cardiovascular risk by more than 80% in all individuals and should be given to all individuals 55 years and older, irrespective of previous cardiovascular disease [293]. This can be criticised due to various aspects: as reported previously, aspirin in low-risk individuals has only small cardiovascular benefits counterbalanced by excess bleeding [279]; antihypertensive agents lower BP only very moderately in normotensive individuals (as also found in the recent polypill trial [291]), statins are generally well tolerated but sometimes accompanied by serious adverse events; and furthermore, the extent of their benefit in individuals without any risk factors is unproven. Furthermore, the concept of treating 'cardiovascular risk' as an entity without targeting and monitoring the individual risk factors appears unsound.

Chapter 7

New trials needed

In the past 10–15 years, several trials of antihypertensive therapy have been completed, but these have mostly centred on comparisons between different agents or focused on high cardiovascular risk patients, and have used so complex designs and so numerous concomitant therapies as to often make interpretation of their results difficult and controversial (Table 9). Although these trials have nevertheless added further useful information, some major issues have not been explored or have been insufficiently clarified. As a consequence, many important decisions on hypertension management are currently taken only on the basis of post hoc analyses of trial data relating cardiovascular events to achieved BP values, which have notorious limitations because of loss of randomised design and potential differences in baseline risk of patients achieving different BP values. Therefore, it appears highly desirable that recommendations on the BP threshold for initiation of drug treatment and on BP targets in different groups of patients are supported by information from prospective randomised trials designed to address persisting gaps in current knowledge.

The following issues appear in urgent need to be approached by simply designed trials:

1. Should antihypertensive drugs be prescribed to all individuals with grade 1 hypertension (SBP 140–159mmHg or DBP 90–99 mmHg), even when total cardiovascular risk is relatively low or moderate? It is obvious that a randomised trial of active versus placebo treatment based on hard cardiovascular outcomes would be very difficult to perform in truly low cardiovascular risk patients with grade 1 hypertension, because in such patients, the very low rate of cardiovascular events would make it necessary to plan a study of a size and/or duration of unrealistic proportions. However, a placebo-controlled trial using intermediate endpoints such as LVH, microalbuminuria, or other signs of organ damage of recognised prognostic importance would be feasible, ethical, and clinically relevant.
2. Should antihypertensive drugs be prescribed to the elderly with grade 1 hypertension and should antihypertensive treatment achieve a goal of below 140/90mmHg also in the elderly? All successful trials on elderly hypertensive patients have recruited patients with SBP

160mmHg or above, and in most of them, the mean entry value has been above 170mmHg. Likewise, in all trials conducted so far, the achieved SBP has always been above 140mmHg. Because elderly hypertensive patients are characterised by a greater cardiovascular risk (and thus by a greater number of events within the few years of a trial duration), these trials could make use of hard cardiovascular outcomes and could be placebo controlled.

3. All guidelines suggest to initiate antihypertensive treatment in diabetic patients or in those with previous cerebrovascular or cardiovascular disease when BP is in the high normal level (SBP 130–139mmHg or DBP 85–89mmHg) and recommend to achieve a goal SBP below 130mmHg. Although these recommendations may be wise, they are not founded on trial evidence. For instance, in no successful trial of antihypertensive treatment in diabetic patients has SBP values less than 130mmHg been achieved. In most trials on high cardiovascular risk patients, the randomised treatment was started on the background of heavy pre-existing antihypertensive drug regimens, because the wrong assumption was made that all these patients anyway required very aggressive BP lowering (the results of taking wisdom for evidence [71]). In other trials, a large proportion of patients was concomitantly treated with agents that may have interfered with the agents to be tested. For example, in the I-PRESERVE trial [259] on chronic heart failure with preserved systolic function, 39% of the patients in whom the effect of an angiotensin receptor antagonist was tested were also concurrently treated with an ACE inhibitor, although no evidence is available that an ACE inhibitor is beneficial in this type of heart failure. Here again, a relatively simple trial design specifically aimed at answering these questions in patients with previous stroke or coronary event or with diastolic heart failure would be needed.
4. Identification of the lowest safe BP values on treatment under different clinical conditions is of obvious clinical importance, deserving to be addressed by an ‘ad hoc’ prospective trial that compares more versus less intense BP-lowering treatment strategies in patients with different cardiovascular risk levels.

5. Several types of lifestyle changes have been shown to be capable of reducing BP, but they are unproven to reduce mortality and morbidity in hypertension. Although a morbidity/mortality study with lifestyle changes in grade 1 hypertensive patients may not be a feasible task, a controlled randomised trial using intermediate endpoints (organ damage) would be feasible and desirable.

New trials needed

Many important decisions on hypertension management must currently be taken without the support of evidence from large randomised controlled trials. The following issues appear in urgent need to be approached by simply designed trials.

- 1 Should antihypertensive drugs be prescribed to all patients with grade 1 hypertension, even when total cardiovascular risk is relatively low or moderate? Because of the very low rate of cardiovascular events expected in these patients, a placebo-controlled trial using intermediate endpoints such as signs of organ damage of recognised prognostic importance would be feasible, ethical, and clinically relevant.
- 2 Should antihypertensive drugs be prescribed to the elderly with grade 1 hypertension, and should antihypertensive treatment achieve a goal of below 140/90mmHg also in the elderly? These trials could make use of hard cardiovascular outcomes and could be placebo-controlled.
- 3 Should antihypertensive drug treatment be started in diabetic patients or in patients with previous cerebrovascular or cardiovascular disease when BP is still in the high normal level, and should BP goal be below 130/80mmHg in these patients? These issues can be approached by placebo-controlled trials because no trial evidence is still available on the benefit of lowering high normal BP or of achieving BP goals below 130/80mmHg.
- 4 What are the lowest safe BP values to achieve by treatment in different clinical conditions? This issue should be approached by trials comparing more or less intense BP-lowering treatment strategies in patients with different cardiovascular risk levels.
- 5 Are lifestyle measures known to reduce BP also capable of reducing morbidity and mortality in hypertension? A controlled randomised trial using intermediate endpoints (organ damage) would be feasible and desirable in patients with high normal BP or grade 1 hypertension.

Table 9 New trials needed.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Fosca Quarti-Trevano, MD, Ms Clara Sincich, Ms Cinzia Tiberi and Ms Donatella Mihalich for their valuable help.

References

- 1 Mancia G, De Backer G, Dominiczak A, et al. 2007 Guidelines for the Management of Arterial Hypertension: The Task Force for the Management of Arterial Hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:1105–1187.
- 2 Havranek EP, Froshaug DB, Emserman CD, et al. Left ventricular hypertrophy and cardiovascular mortality by race and ethnicity. *Am J Med* 2008; 121:870–875.
- 3 Li Z, Dahlöf B, Okin PM, et al. Bundle branch block and cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in hypertensive patients with left ventricular hypertrophy: the Losartan Intervention For Endpoint Reduction in Hypertension study. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:1244–1249.
- 4 Verdecchia P, Angeli F, Cavallini C, et al. The voltage of R wave in lead aVL improves risk stratification in hypertensive patients without ECG left ventricular hypertrophy. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1697–1704.
- 5 Milani RV, Lavie CJ, Mehra MR, et al. Left ventricular geometry and survival in patients with normal left ventricular ejection fraction. *Am J Cardiol* 2006; 97:959–963.
- 6 Taylor HA, Penman AD, Han H, et al. Left ventricular architecture and survival in African-Americans free of coronary heart disease (from the Atherosclerosis Risk In Communities [ARIC] study). *Am J Cardiol* 2007; 99:1413–1420.
- 7 Tsioufis C, Vezali E, Tsiachris D, et al. Left ventricular hypertrophy versus chronic kidney disease as predictors of cardiovascular events in hypertension: a Greek 6-year-follow-up study. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:744–752.
- 8 Yasuno S, Ueshima K, Oba K, et al. Clinical significance of left ventricular hypertrophy and changes in left ventricular mass in high-risk hypertensive patients: a subanalysis of the Candesartan Antihypertensive Survival Evaluation in Japan trial. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1705–1712.
- 9 Bombelli M, Facchetti R, Carugo S, et al. Left ventricular hypertrophy increases cardiovascular risk independently of in- and out-of office blood pressure values. *J Hypertens* 2009. [Epub ahead of print]
- 10 Zanchetti A, Hennig M, Hollweck R, et al. Baseline values but not treatment induced changes in carotid intima media thickness predict incident cardiovascular events in treated hypertensives. Findings in the ELSA. *Circulation* 2009; 120:1084–1090.
- 11 Sehestedt T, Jeppesen J, Hansen TW, et al. Which markers of subclinical organ damage to measure in individuals with high normal blood pressure? *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1165–1171.
- 12 Inoue M, Maeda R, Kawakami H, et al. Aortic pulse wave velocity predicts cardiovascular mortality in middle-aged and elderly Japanese men. *Circ J* 2009; 73:549–553.
- 13 Jankowski P, Kawecka-Jaszcz K, Czarnecka D, et al.; Aortic blood pressure and survival study group. Pulsatile but not steady component of blood pressure predicts cardiovascular events in coronary patients. *Hypertension* 2008; 51:848–855.
- 14 Wang KL, Cheng HM, Chuang SY, et al. Central or peripheral systolic or pulse pressure: which best relates to target organs and future mortality? *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:461–467.
- 15 Cuspidi C. Cardio-renal organ damage and cardiovascular outcomes in hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:702–706.

- 16 Cirillo M, Lanti MP, Menotti A, et al. Definition of kidney dysfunction as a cardiovascular risk factor: use of urinary albumin excretion and estimated glomerular filtration rate. *Arch Intern Med* 2008; 168:617–624.
- 17 Ruilope LM, Zanchetti A, Julius S, et al; VALUE Investigators. Prediction of cardiovascular outcome by estimated glomerular filtration rate and estimated creatinine clearance in the high-risk hypertension population of the VALUE trial. *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:1473–1479.
- 18 Ninomiya T, Perkovic V, de Galan BE, et al; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Albuminuria and kidney function independently predict cardiovascular and renal outcomes in diabetes. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009; 20:1813–1821.
- 19 Waeber B, de la Sierra A, Ruilope LM. Target organ damage: how to detect it and how to treat it? *J Hypertens* 2009; 27 (Suppl 3):S13–S18.
- 20 de Zeeuw D. Albuminuria: a target for treatment of type 2 diabetic nephropathy. *Semin Nephrol* 2007; 27:172–181.
- 21 Kearney-Schwartz A, Rossignol P, Bracard S, et al. Vascular structure and function is correlated to cognitive performance and white matter hyperintensities in older hypertensive patients with subjective memory complaints. *Stroke* 2009; 40:1229–1236.
- 22 Henskens LH, van Oostenbrugge RJ, Kroon AA, et al. Detection of silent cerebrovascular disease refines risk stratification of hypertensive patients. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:846–853.
- 23 Stewart R, Xue QL, Masaki K, et al. Change in blood pressure and incident dementia. A 32-Year Prospective Study. *Hypertension* 2009; 54:233–240.
- 24 World Health Organization. *Life in the 21st century: a vision for all: the World Health Report*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1998.
- 25 De Ciuceis C, Porteri E, Rizzoni D, et al. Structural alterations of subcutaneous small arteries may predict major cardiovascular events in hypertensive patients. *Am J Hypertens* 2007; 20:846–852.
- 26 Mathiassen ON, Buus NH, Sihm I, et al. Small artery structure is an independent predictor of cardiovascular events in essential hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:1021–1026.
- 27 Harazny JM, Ritt M, Baleanu D, et al. Increased wall:lumen ratio of retinal arterioles in male patients with a history of a cerebrovascular event. *Hypertension* 2007; 50:623–829.
- 28 Shimbo D, Grahame-Clarke C, Miyake Y, et al. The association between endothelial dysfunction and cardiovascular outcomes in a populationbased multiethnic cohort. *Atherosclerosis* 2007; 192:197–203.
- 29 Yeboah J, Crouse JR, Hsu F-C, et al. Brachial flow-mediated dilation predicts incident cardiovascular events in older adults: the Cardiovascular Health Study. *Circulation* 2007; 115:2390–2397.
- 30 Muijsan ML, Salvetti M, Paini A, et al. Prognostic role of flow-mediated dilatation of the brachial artery in hypertensive patients. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:1612–1618.
- 31 Rizzoni D, Porteri E, De Ciuceis C, et al. Lack of prognostic role of endothelial dysfunction in subcutaneous small resistance arteries of hypertensive patients. *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:867–873.
- 32 Wang TJ, Gona P, Larson MG, et al. Multiple biomarkers for the prediction of first major cardiovascular events and death. *N Engl J Med* 2006; 355:2631–2639.

- 33 Koren MJ, Devereux RB, Casale PN, et al. Relation of left ventricular mass and geometry to morbidity and mortality in uncomplicated essential hypertension. *Ann Intern Med* 1991; 114:345–352.
- 34 Levy D, Garrison RJ, Savage DD, et al. Prognostic implications of echocardiographically determined left ventricular mass in the Framingham Heart Study. *N Engl J Med* 1990; 322:1561–1566.
- 35 O'Leary DH, Polak JF, Kronmal RA, et al. Carotid-artery intima and media thickness as a risk factor for myocardial infarction and stroke in older adults. Cardiovascular Health Study Collaborative Research Group. *N Engl J Med* 1999; 340:14–22.
- 36 Laurent S, Cockcroft J, Van Bortel L, et al. Expert consensus document on arterial stiffness: methodological issues and clinical applications. *Eur Heart J* 2006; 27:2588–2605.
- 37 Fowkes GF, and the Ankle Brachial Index Collaboration. Ankle brachial index combined with Framingham Risk Score to predict cardiovascular events and mortality: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2008; 300:197–200.
- 38 De Buyzere M, Clement DL. Management of hypertension in peripheral arterial disease. *Progress Cardiovasc Dis* 2008; 50:238–263.
- 39 Ruilope LM, Salvetti A, Jamerson K, et al. Renal function and intensive lowering of blood pressure in hypertensive participants of the Hypertension Optimal Treatment (HOT) study. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2001; 12:218–225.
- 40 de Leeuw PW, Ruilope LM, Palmer CR, et al. Clinical significance of renal function in hypertensive patients at high risk: results from the INSIGHT trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2004; 164:2459–2464.
- 41 Jensen JS, Feldt-Rasmussen B, Strandgaard S, et al. Arterial hypertension, microalbuminuria, and risk of ischemic heart disease. *Hypertension* 2000; 35:898–903.
- 42 Culeton BF, Larson MG, Wilson PW, et al. Cardiovascular disease and mortality in a community-based cohort with mild renal insufficiency. *Kidney Int* 1999; 56:2214–2219.
- 43 Hillege HL, Fidler V, Diercks GF, et al.; Prevention of Renal and Vascular End Stage Disease (PREVEND) Study Group. Urinary albumin excretion predicts cardiovascular and noncardiovascular mortality in general population. *Circulation* 2002; 106:1777–1782.
- 44 Conroy RM, Pyörälä K, Fitzgerald AP, et al.; SCORE project group. Estimation of ten-year risk of fatal cardiovascular disease in Europe: the SCORE project. *Eur Heart J* 2003; 24:987–1003.
- 45 Arnlöv J, Evans JC, Meigs JB, et al. Low-grade albuminuria and incidence of cardiovascular disease events in nonhypertensive and nondiabetic individuals: the Framingham Heart Study. *Circulation* 2005; 112:969–975.
- 46 Devereux RB, Wachtell K, Gerds E, et al. Prognostic significance of left ventricular mass change during treatment of hypertension. *JAMA* 2004; 292:2350–2356.
- 47 Ibsen H, Olsen MH, Wachtell K, et al. Reduction in albuminuria translates to reduction in cardiovascular events in hypertensive patients: Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in hypertension study. *Hypertension* 2005; 45:198–202.
- 48 de Zeeuw D, Parving HH, Henning RH. Microalbuminuria as an early marker for cardiovascular disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2006; 17:2100–2105.

- 49 Gerds E, Wachtell K, Omvik P, et al. Left atrial size and risk of major cardiovascular events during antihypertensive treatment: Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in hypertension trial. *Hypertension* 2007; 49:311–316.
- 50 Gerds E, Cramariuc D, de Simone G, et al. Impact of left ventricular geometry on prognosis in hypertensive patients with left ventricular hypertrophy (the LIFE study). *Eur J Echocardiogr* 2008; 9:809–815.
- 51 Okin PM, Devereux RB, Jern S, et al.; LIFE Study Investigators. Regression of electrocardiographic left ventricular hypertrophy during antihypertensive treatment and the prediction of major cardiovascular events. *JAMA* 2004; 292:2343–2349.
- 52 Muiesan ML, Salvetti M, Painsi A, et al. Inappropriate left ventricular mass changes during treatment adversely affects cardiovascular prognosis in hypertensive patients. *Hypertension* 2007; 49:1077–1083.
- 53 Mann JF, Schmieder RE, McQueen M, et al.; ONTARGET Investigators. Renal outcomes with telmisartan, ramipril, or both, in people at high vascular risk (the ONTARGET study): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008; 372:547–553.
- 54 Mancia G, Bombelli M, Corrao G, et al. Metabolic syndrome in the Pressioni Arteriose Monitorate E Loro Associazioni (PAMELA) study: daily life blood pressure, cardiac damage, and prognosis. *Hypertension* 2007; 49:40–47.
- 55 Mancia G, Bombelli M, Facchetti R, et al. Long-term risk of diabetes, hypertension and left ventricular hypertrophy associated with the metabolic syndrome in a general population. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:1602–1611.
- 56 Norton GR, Maseko M, Libhaber E, et al. Is prehypertension an independent predictor of target organ changes in young-to-middle-aged persons of African descent? *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:2279–2987.
- 57 Isles CG, Walker LM, Beevers GD, et al. Mortality in patients of the Glasgow Blood Pressure Clinic. *J Hypertens* 1986; 4:141–156.
- 58 Lindholm L, Ejlertsson G, Scherstén B. High risk of cerebrocardiovascular morbidity in well treated male hypertensives. A retrospective study of 40–59-year-old hypertensives in a Swedish primary care district. *Acta Med Scand* 1984; 216:251–259.
- 59 Thürmer HL, Lund-Larsen PG, Tverdal A. Is blood pressure treatment as effective in a population setting as in controlled trials? Results from a prospective study. *J Hypertens* 1994; 12:481–490.
- 60 Benetos A, Thomas F, Bean KE, Guize L. Why cardiovascular mortality is higher in treated hypertensives versus subjects of the same age, in the general population. *J Hypertens* 2003; 21:1635–1640.
- 61 Almgren T, Persson B, Wilhelmsen L, et al. Stroke and coronary heart disease in treated hypertension: a prospective cohort study over three decades. *J Intern Med* 2005; 257:496–502.
- 62 Asayama K, Ohkubo T, Yoshida S, et al.; Japan Arteriosclerosis Longitudinal Study (JALS) group. Stroke risk and antihypertensive drug treatment in the general population: the Japan Arteriosclerosis Longitudinal Study. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:357–364.
- 63 Zanchetti A. Bottom blood pressure or bottom cardiovascular risk? How far can cardiovascular risk be reduced? *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1509–1520.

- 64 Ibsen H. Antihypertensive treatment and risk of cardiovascular complications: is the cure worse than the disease? *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:221–223.
- 65 Guidelines Sub-Committee. 1999 World Health Organization/International Society of Hypertension Guidelines for the management of hypertension. *J Hypertens* 1999; 17:151–183.
- 66 Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al.; Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; National High Blood Pressure Education Program Coordinating Committee. Seventh report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. *Hypertension* 2003; 42:1206–1252.
- 67 Rosendorff C, Black HR, Cannon CP, et al.; American Heart Association Council for High Blood Pressure Research; American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology; American Heart Association Council on Epidemiology and Prevention. Treatment of hypertension in the prevention and management of ischemic heart disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Council for High Blood Pressure Research and the Councils on Clinical Cardiology and Epidemiology and Prevention. *Circulation* 2007; 115:2761–2788.
- 68 Sanchez RA, Ayala M, Baglivo H, et al.; Latin America Expert Group. Latin American Guidelines on Hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:905–922.
- 69 Ogihara T, Kikuchi K, Matsuoka H, et al. The Japanese Society of Hypertension Guidelines for the Management of Hypertension (JSH 2009). *Hypertens Res* 2009; 32:3–107.
- 70 Graham I, Atar D, Borch-Johnsen K, et al. European guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice: executive summary. Fourth Joint Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology and other societies on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice (constituted by representatives of nine societies and by invited experts). *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2007; 14 (Suppl 2):E1–E40.
- 71 Zanchetti A, Grassi G, Mancia G. When should antihypertensive drug treatment be initiated and to what levels should systolic blood pressure be lowered? A critical reappraisal. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:923–934.
- 72 Medical Research Council trial of treatment of mild hypertension: principal results. MRC Working Party. *BMJ* 1985; 291:97–104.
- 73 Management Committee. The Australian therapeutic trial in mild hypertension. *Lancet* 1980; 1:1261–1267.
- 74 Hypertension Detection and Follow-up Program Cooperative Group: The effect of treatment on mortality in 'mild' hypertension: results of the Hypertension Detection and Follow-up Program. *N Engl J Med* 1982; 307:976–980.
- 75 Liu L, Zhang Y, Liu G, et al.; FEVER Study Group. The Felodipine Event Reduction (FEVER) Study: a randomized long-term placebo-controlled trial in Chinese hypertensive patients. *J Hypertens* 2005; 23:2157–2172.
- 76 Amery A, Birkenhäger W, Brixko P, et al. Mortality and morbidity results from the European Working Party on High Blood Pressure in the Elderly trial. *Lancet* 1985; 1:1349–1354.
- 77 Coope J, Warrender TS. Randomised trial of treatment of hypertension in elderly patients in primary care. *BMJ (Clin Res Ed)* 1986; 293:1145–1151.

- 78 SHEP Cooperative Research Group. Prevention of stroke by antihypertensive drug treatment in older persons with isolated systolic hypertension. Final results of the Systolic Hypertension in the Elderly Program (SHEP). *JAMA* 1991; 265:3255–3264.
- 79 Dahlöf B, Lindholm LH, Hansson L, et al. Morbidity and mortality in the Swedish Trial in Old Patients with Hypertension (STOP-Hypertension). *Lancet* 1991; 338:1281–1285.
- 80 MRC Working Party. Medical Research Council trial of treatment of hypertension in older adults: principal results. *BMJ* 1992; 304:405–412.
- 81 Staessen JA, Fagard R, Thijs L, et al.; for The Systolic Hypertension in Europe (Syst-Eur) Trial Investigators. Randomised double-blind comparison of placebo and active treatment for older patients with isolated systolic hypertension. The Systolic Hypertension in Europe (Syst-Eur) Trial Investigators. *Lancet* 1997;350:757–764.
- 82 Liu L, Wang JG, Gong L, et al.; for the Systolic Hypertension in China (Syst-China) Collaborative Group. Comparison of active treatment and placebo in older Chinese patients with isolated systolic hypertension. *J Hypertens* 1998; 16:1823–1829.
- 83 Lithell H, Hansson L, Skoog I, et al.; SCOPE Study Group. The Study on Cognition and Prognosis in the Elderly (SCOPE). Principal results of a randomised double-blind intervention trial. *J Hypertens* 2003; 21:875–886.
- 84 Beckett NS, Peters R, Fletcher AE, et al.; HYVET Study Group. Treatment of hypertension in patients 80 years of age or older. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358:1887–1898.
- 85 JATOS Study Group. Principal results of the Japanese trial to assess optimal systolic blood pressure in elderly hypertensive patients (JATOS). *Hypertens Res* 2008; 31:2115–2127.
- 86 Schrier RW, Estacio RO, Esler A, Mehler P. Effects of aggressive blood pressure control in normotensive type 2 diabetic patients on albuminuria, retinopathy and strokes. *Kidney Int* 2002; 61:1086–1097.
- 87 Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation (HOPE) Study investigators. Effects of ramipril on cardiovascular and microvascular outcomes in people with diabetes mellitus: results of the HOPE study and MICROHOPE substudy. *Lancet* 2000; 355:253–259.
- 88 ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Effects of a fixed combination of perindopril and indapamide on macrovascular and microvascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (the ADVANCE trial): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2007; 370:829–840.
- 89 PROGRESS Collaborative Study Group. Randomised trial of perindopril based blood pressure-lowering regimen among 6108 individuals with previous stroke or transient ischaemic attack. *Lancet* 2001; 358:1033–1041.
- 90 Arima H, Chalmers J, Woodward M, et al.; for the PROGRESS Collaborative Group. Lower target blood pressures are safe and effective for the prevention of recurrent stroke: the PROGRESS trial. *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:1201–1208.
- 91 Yusuf S, Diener HC, Sacco RL, et al.; PROGRESS Study Group. Telmisartan to prevent recurrent stroke and cardiovascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359:1225–1237.
- 92 Zanchetti A, Mancia G, Black HR, et al. Facts and fallacies of blood pressure control in recent trials: implications in the management of patients with hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:673–679.

- 93 The Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation Study Investigators. Effects of an angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor, ramipril, on cardiovascular events in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 2002; 342:145–153.
- 94 EUROpean trial On reduction of cardiac events with Perindopril in stable coronary Artery disease Investigators. Efficacy of perindopril in reduction of cardiovascular events among patients with stable coronary artery disease: randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial (the EUROPA study). *Lancet* 2003; 362:782–788.
- 95 Nissen SE, Tuzcu EM, Libby P, et al.; CAMELOT Investigators. Effect of antihypertensive agents on cardiovascular events in patients with coronary disease and normal blood pressure: the CAMELOT study – a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004; 292:2217–2225.
- 96 Poole-Wilson PA, Lubsen J, Kirwan BA, et al. A Coronary disease Trial Investigating Outcome with Nifedipine gastrointestinal therapeutic system investigators. Effect of long-acting nifedipine on mortality and cardiovascular morbidity in patients with stable angina requiring treatment (ACTION trial): randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004; 364:849–857.
- 97 The PEACE trial investigators. Angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibition in stable coronary artery disease. *New Engl J Med* 2004; 351:2058–2068.
- 98 Helgeland A. Treatment of mild hypertension: a five year controlled drug trial. The Oslo study. *Am J Med* 1980; 69:725–732.
- 99 Hansson L, Zanchetti A, Carruthers SG, et al. Effects of intensive blood-pressure lowering and low-dose aspirin in patients with hypertension: principal results of the Hypertension Optimal Treatment (HOT) randomised trial. HOT Study Group. *Lancet* 1998; 351:1755–1762.
- 100 Curb JD, Pressel SL, Cutler JA, et al. Effect of diuretic-based antihypertensive treatment on cardiovascular disease risk in older diabetic patients with isolated systolic hypertension. Systolic Hypertension in the Elderly Program Cooperative Research Group. *JAMA* 1996; 276:1886–1892.
- 101 UK Prospective Diabetes Study Group. Tight blood pressure control and risk of macrovascular and microvascular complications in type 2 diabetes: UKPDS 38. *BMJ* 1998; 317:703–713.
- 102 Tuomilehto J, Rastenyte D, Birkenhäger WH, et al. Effects of calcium-channel blockade in older patients with diabetes and systolic hypertension. Systolic Hypertension in Europe Trial Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1999; 340:677–684.
- 103 Estacio RO, Jeffers BW, Gifford N, Schrier RW. Effect of blood pressure control on diabetic microvascular complications in patients with hypertension and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2000; 23 (Suppl 2): B54–B64.
- 104 Lewis EJ, Hunsicker LG, Clarke WR, et al.; Collaborative Study Group. Renoprotective effect of the angiotensin-receptor antagonist irbesartan in patients with nephropathy due to type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2001; 345:851–860.
- 105 Brenner BM, Cooper ME, de Zeeuw D, et al.; RENAAL Study Investigators. Effects of losartan on renal and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2001; 345:861–869.
- 106 Berthet K, Neal BC, Chalmers JP, et al.; Perindopril Protection Against Recurrent Stroke Study Collaborative Group. Reductions in the risks of recurrent stroke in patients with and without diabetes: the PROGRESS Trial. *Blood Press* 2004; 13:7–13.

- 107 Pitt B, Byington RP, Furberg CD, et al. Effect of amlodipine on the progression of atherosclerosis and the occurrence of clinical events. PREVENT Investigators. *Circulation* 2000; 102:1503–1510.
- 108 Telmisartan Randomised Assessment Study in ACE intolerant subjects with cardiovascular Disease (TRANSCEND) Investigators. Effects of the angiotensin-receptor blocker telmisartan on cardiovascular events in high-risk patients intolerant to angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008; 372:1174–1183.
- 109 Weber MA, Julius S, Kjeldsen SE, et al. Blood pressure dependent and independent effects of antihypertensive treatment on clinical events in the VALUE Trial. *Lancet* 2004; 363:2049–2051.
- 110 Mancia G, Messerli FH, Weber MA, et al. Association between the proportion of time under blood pressure (BP) control and cardiovascular (CV) morbidity and mortality in the VALUE trial. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27 (Suppl 4): S327.
- 111 Pepine CJ, Handberg EM, Cooper-DeHoff RM, et al.; INVEST Investigators. A calcium antagonist vs a noncalcium antagonist hypertension treatment strategy for patients with coronary artery disease. The International Verapamil-Trandolapril Study (INVEST): a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2003; 290:2805–2816.
- 112 Mancia G, Messerli F, Bakris G, et al. Blood pressure control and improved cardiovascular outcomes in the International Verapamil SR-Trandolapril Study. *Hypertension* 2007; 50:299–305.
- 113 Messerli FH, Mancia G, Conti CR, et al. Dogma disputed: can aggressively lowering blood pressure in hypertensive patients with coronary artery disease be dangerous? *Ann Intern Med* 2006; 144:884–893.
- 114 Bakris GL, Gaxiola E, Messerli FH, et al.; INVEST Investigators. Clinical outcomes in the diabetes cohort of the International Verapamil SR-Trandolapril study. *Hypertension* 2004; 44:637–642.
- 115 Sleight P, Redon J, Verdecchia P, Mancia G, et al.; ONTARGET investigators. Prognostic value of blood pressure in patients with high vascular risk in the Ongoing Telmisartan Alone and in combination with Ramipril Global Endpoint Trial study. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1360–1369.
- 116 Redon J, Sleight P, Mancia G, et al. Safety and efficacy of aggressive blood pressure lowering among patients with diabetes: subgroup analyses from the ONTARGET trial. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27 (Suppl 4):S16.
- 117 Berl T, Hunsicker LG, Lewis JB, et al.; Collaborative Study Group. Impact of achieved blood pressure on cardiovascular outcomes in the Irbesartan Diabetic Nephropathy Trial. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2005; 16:2170–2179.
- 118 Pohl MA, Blumenthal S, Cordonnier DJ, et al. Independent and additive impact of blood pressure control and angiotensin II receptor blockade on renal outcomes in the Irbesartan Diabetic Nephropathy Trial: clinical implications and limitations. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2005; 16:3027–3037.
- 119 Okin PM, Devereux RB, Jern S, et al.; Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in hypertension Study Investigators. Regression of electrocardiographic left ventricular

- hypertrophy by losartan versus atenolol: The Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in hypertension (LIFE) Study. *Circulation* 2003; 108:684–690.
- 120 Verdecchia P, Staessen JA, Angeli F, et al.; Cardio-Sis investigators. Usual versus tight control of systolic blood pressure in nondiabetic patients with hypertension (Cardio-Sis): an open-label randomised trial. *Lancet* 2009; 374:525–533.
- 121 The ACE Inhibitors in Diabetic Nephropathy Trialist Group. Should all patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus and microalbuminuria receive angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors? A meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Ann Int Med* 2001; 134:370–379.
- 122 Parving HH, Hommel E, Jensen BR, Hansen HP. Long-term beneficial effect of ACE inhibition on diabetic nephropathy in normotensive type 1 diabetic patients. *Kidney Int* 2001; 60:228–234.
- 123 de Galan BE, Perkovic V, Ninomiya T, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Lowering blood pressure reduces renal events in type 2 diabetes. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009; 20:883–892.
- 124 Bangalore S, Messerli FH, Wun C, et al.; Treating to New Targets Steering Committee and Investigators. J-Curve revisited: an analysis of the Treating to New Targets (TNT) Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2009; 53:A217.
- 125 Lewington S, Clarke R, Qizilbash N, et al.; Prospective Studies Collaboration. Age-specific relevance of usual blood pressure to vascular mortality: a meta-analysis of individual data for one million adults in 61 prospective studies. *Lancet* 2002; 360:1903–1913.
- 126 Polese A, De Cesare N, Montorsi P, et al. Upward shift of the lower range of coronary flow autoregulation in hypertensive patients with hypertrophy of the left ventricle. *Circulation* 1991; 83:845–853.
- 127 Boutitie F, Gueyffier F, Pocock S, et al. J-shaped relationship between blood pressure and mortality in hypertensive patients: new insights from a meta-analysis of individual-patient data. *Ann Intern Med* 2002; 136:438–448.
- 128 Buse JB, Bigger JT, Byington RP, et al. Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial: design and methods. *Am J Cardiol* 2007; 99 (12A):21i–33i.
- 129 Julius S, Nesbitt SD, Egan BM, et al.; Trial of Preventing Hypertension (TROPHY) Study Investigators. Feasibility of treating prehypertension with an angiotensin-receptor blocker. *N Engl J Med* 2006; 354:1685–1697.
- 130 Lüders S, Schrader J, Berger J, et al. The PHARAO study: prevention of hypertension with the angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor ramipril in patients with high-normal blood pressure: a prospective, randomized, controlled prevention trial of the German Hypertension League. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:1487–1496.
- 131 Laurent S, Briet M, Boutouyrie P. Large/small artery cross talk and recent morbidity-mortality trials in hypertension. *Hypertension* 2009; 54:388–392.
- 132 Staessen JA, Thijs L, Fagard R, et al.; Systolic Hypertension in Europe (Syst-Eur) Trial Investigators. Effects of immediate versus delayed antihypertensive therapy on outcome in the Systolic Hypertension in Europe Trial. *J Hypertens* 2004; 22:847–857.
- 133 Kostis JB, Wilson AC, Freudenberger RS, et al.; SHEP Collaborative Research Group. Long-term effect of diuretic-based therapy on fatal outcomes in subjects with isolated systolic hypertension with and without diabetes. *Am J Cardiol* 2005; 95:29–35.

- 134 Gaede P, Lund-Andersen H, Parving HH, Pederson O. Effect of a multifactorial intervention on mortality in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358:580–591.
- 135 Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, et al. 10-years followup of intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359:1577–1589.
- 136 Guidelines Committee. 2003 European Society of Hypertension–European Society of Cardiology guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2003; 21:1011–1053.
- 137 Jick H, Slone D, Shapiro S, et al.; Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program. Reserpine and breast cancer. *Lancet* 1974; II:669–677.
- 138 Psaty BM, Heckbert SR, Koepsell TD, et al. The risk of myocardial infarction associated with antihypertensive drug therapies. *JAMA* 1995; 274:620–625.
- 139 Pahor M, Guralnik JM, Corti MC, Foley DJ, Carbonin P. Long-term survival and uses of antihypertensive medications in older persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1995; 49:1191–1197.
- 140 Lindholm LH, Carlberg B, Samuelsson O. Should beta blockers remain first choice in the treatment of primary hypertension? A meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2005; 366:1545–1553.
- 141 Hypertension: management of hypertension in adults in primary care NICE/BHS; 2006. www.nice.org.uk/CG034.
- 142 Opie LH. Beta-blockade should not be among several choices for initial therapy of hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:161–163.
- 143 Messerli FH, Bangalore S, Julius S. Risk/benefit assessment of betablockers and diuretics precludes their use for first-line therapy in hypertension. *Circulation* 2008; 117:2706–2715.
- 144 Mancia G. Prevention of risk factors: beta-blockade and hypertension. *Eur Heart J Suppl* 2009; 11:A3–A8.
- 145 Bangalore S, Sawhney S, Messerli FH. Relation of beta-blocker-induced heart rate lowering and cardioprotection in hypertension. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008; 52:1482–1489.
- 146 Cucherat M. Quantitative relationship between resting heart rate reduction and magnitude of clinical benefits in postmyocardial infarction: a meta-regression of randomized clinical trials. *Eur Heart J* 2007; 28:3012–3019.
- 147 Houghton T, Freemantle N, Cleland JG. Are beta-blockers effective in patients who develop heart failure soon after myocardial infarction? A meta-regression analysis of randomised trials. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2000; 2:333–340.
- 148 Law MR, Morris JK, Wald NJ. Use of blood pressure lowering drugs in the prevention of cardiovascular disease: meta-analysis of 147 randomised trials in the context of expectations from prospective epidemiological studies. *BMJ* 2009; 338:1665–1683.
- 149 Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, et al. Long-term follow-up after tight control of blood pressure in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359:1565–1576.
- 150 Blackburn DF, Lamb DA, Eurich DT, et al. Atenolol as initial antihypertensive therapy: an observational study comparing first-line agents. *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:1499–1505.
- 151 Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. Effects of different blood-pressure-lowering regimens on major cardiovascular events: results of prospectively-designed overviews of randomised trials. *Lancet* 2003; 362:1527–1535.
- 152 Mancia G, Zanchetti A. Choice of antihypertensive drugs in the European Society of Hypertension–European Society of Cardiology guidelines: specific indications rather than ranking for general usage. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:164–168.

- 153 Wald DS, Law M, Morris JK, et al. Combination therapy versus monotherapy in reducing blood pressure: meta-analysis on 11,000 participants from 42 trials. *Am J Med* 2009; 122:290–300.
- 154 Williams B, Lacy PS, Thom SM, et al.; CAFE Investigators; Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial Investigators; CAFE Steering Committee and Writing Committee. Differential impact of blood pressure lowering drugs on central aortic pressure and clinical outcomes: principal results of the Conduit Artery Function Evaluation (CAFE) study. *Circulation* 2006; 113:1213–1225.
- 155 Dart AM, Cameron JD, Gatzka CD, et al.; Similar effects of treatment on central and brachial blood pressures in older hypertensive subjects in the Second Australian National Blood Pressure Trial. *Hypertension* 2007; 49:1242–1247.
- 156 Mitchell GF, Conlin PR, Dunlap ME, et al. Aortic diameter, wall stiffness, and wave reflection in systolic hypertension. *Hypertension* 2008; 51:105–111.
- 157 Elliott WJ, Meyer PM. Incident diabetes in clinical trials of antihypertensive drugs: a network meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2007; 369:201–207.
- 158 Mancia G, Grassi G, Zanchetti A. New-onset diabetes and antihypertensive drugs. *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:3–10.
- 159 Bangalore S, Parkar S, Grossman E, Messerli FH. A meta-analysis of 94,492 patients with hypertension treated with beta blockers to determine the risk of new-onset diabetes mellitus. *Am J Cardiol* 2007; 100:1254–1262.
- 160 Zanchetti A, Hennig M, Baurecht H, et al. Prevalence and incidence of the metabolic syndrome in the European Lacidipine Study on Atherosclerosis (ELSA) and its relation with carotid intima-media thickness. *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:2463–2470.
- 161 Cutler JA, Davis BR. Thiazide-type diuretics and beta-adrenergic blockers as first-line drug treatments for hypertension. *Circulation* 2008; 117:2691–2704.
- 162 Barr EL, Zimmet PZ, Welborn TA, et al. Risk of cardiovascular and all-cause mortality in individuals with diabetes mellitus, impaired fasting glucose, and impaired glucose tolerance: the Australian Diabetes, Obesity, and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab). *Circulation* 2007; 116:151–157.
- 163 Mozaffarian D, Marfisi R, Levantesi G, et al. Incidence of new-onset diabetes and impaired fasting glucose in patients with recent myocardial infarction and the effect of clinical and lifestyle risk factors. *Lancet* 2007; 370:667–675.
- 164 Alderman MH, Cohen H, Madhavan S. Diabetes and cardiovascular events in hypertensive patients. *Hypertension* 1999; 33:1130–1134.
- 165 Klingbeil AU, Schneider M, Martus P, et al. A meta-analysis of the effects of treatment on left ventricular mass in essential hypertension. *Am J Med* 2003; 115:41–46.
- 166 Zanchetti A, Bond MG, Hennig M, et al.; European Lacidipine Study on Atherosclerosis investigators. Calcium antagonist lacidipine slows down progression of asymptomatic carotid atherosclerosis: principal results of the European Lacidipine Study on Atherosclerosis (ELSA) – a randomized, double-blind, long-term trial. *Circulation* 2002; 106:2422–2427.
- 167 Schiffrin EL, Deng LY. Comparison of effects of angiotensin I-converting enzyme inhibition and beta-blockade for 2 years on function of small arteries from hypertensive patients. *Hypertension* 1995; 25 (4 Pt 2):699–703.

- 168 Schiffrin EL, Pu Q, Park JB. Effect of amlodipine compared to atenolol on small arteries of previously untreated essential hypertensive patients. *Am J Hypertens* 2002; 15:105–110.
- 169 Smith RD, Yokoyama H, Averill DB, et al. Reversal of vascular hypertrophy in hypertensive patients through blockade of angiotensin II receptors. *J Am Soc Hypertens* 2008; 2:165–172.
- 170 Boutouyrie P, Bussy C, Hayoz D, et al. Local pulse pressure and regression of arterial wall hypertrophy during long term antihypertensive treatment. *Circulation* 2000; 101:2601–2606.
- 171 Zanchetti A. Clinical pharmacodynamics of nebivolol: new evidence of nitric oxide-mediated vasodilating activity and peculiar haemodynamic properties in hypertensive patients. *Blood Press* 2004; 13 (Suppl 1):18–33.
- 172 Dhakam Z, Yasmin, McEniery CM, et al. A comparison of atenolol and nebivolol in isolated systolic hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:351–356.
- 173 Bakris GL, Fonseca V, Katholi RE, et al.; GEMINI Investigators. Metabolic effects of carvedilol vs metoprolol in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and hypertension: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004; 292:2227–2236.
- 174 Celik T, Iyisoy A, Kursaklioglu H, et al. Comparative effects of nebivolol and metoprolol on oxidative stress, insulin resistance, plasma adiponectin and soluble P-selectin levels in hypertensive patients. *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:591–596.
- 175 Kaiser T, Heise T, Nosek L, et al. Influence of nebivolol and enalapril on metabolic parameters and arterial stiffness in hypertensive type 2 diabetic patients. *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:1397–1403.
- 176 Dickstein K, Cohen-Solal A, Filippatos G, et al. ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2008: the Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2008 of the European Society of Cardiology. Developed in collaboration with the Heart Failure Association of the ESC (HFA) and endorsed by the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine (ESICM). *Eur J Heart Fail* 2008; 10:933–989.
- 177 Torp-Pedersen C, Metra M, Charlesworth A, et al.; COMET investigators. Effects of metoprolol and carvedilol on preexisting and new onset diabetes in patients with chronic heart failure: data from the Carvedilol Or Metoprolol European Trial (COMET). *Heart* 2007; 93:968–973.
- 178 Agabiti-Rosei E, Rizzoni D. Metabolic profile of nebivolol, a beta-adrenoceptor antagonist with unique characteristics. *Drugs* 2007; 67:1097–1107.
- 179 Galderisi M, D'Enrico A, Sidiropulos M, et al. Nebivolol induces parallel improvement of left ventricular filling pressure and coronary flow reserve in uncomplicated arterial hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:2106–2113.
- 180 Simon A, Gariepy J, Moyses D, Levenson J. Differential effects of nifedipine and co-amlozide on the progression of early carotid wall changes. *Circulation* 2001; 103:2949–2954.
- 181 Zanchetti A, Crepaldi G, Bond MG, et al.; on behalf of PHYLLIS Investigators. Different effects of antihypertensive regimens based on fosinopril or hydrochlorothiazide with or without lipid lowering by pravastatin on progression of asymptomatic carotid

- atherosclerosis: principal results of PHYLLIS: a randomized double-blind trial. *Stroke* 2004; 35:2807–2812.
- 182** Corrao G, Zambon A, Parodi A, et al. Discontinuation of and changes in drug therapy for hypertension among newly-treated patients: a population-based study in Italy. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:819–824.
- 183** Burke TA, Sturkenboom MC, Lu SE, et al. Discontinuation of antihypertensive drugs among newly diagnosed hypertensive patients in UK general practice. *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:1193–1200.
- 184** Wright GM, Musini VM. First-line drugs for hypertension. *Cochrane Library* 2009; CD001841:e1–e59.
- 185** Jamerson K, Weber MA, Bakris GL, et al.; ACCOMPLISH Trial Investigators. Benazepril plus amlodipine or hydrochlorothiazide for hypertension in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359:2417–2428.
- 186** Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. Effects of different blood pressure-lowering regimens on major cardiovascular events in individuals with and without diabetes mellitus: results of prospectively designed overviews of randomized trials. *Arch Intern Med* 2005; 165:1410–1419.
- 187** Verdecchia P, Reboldi G, Angeli F, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and calcium channel blockers for coronary heart disease and stroke prevention. *Hypertension* 2005; 46:386–392.
- 188** Boutitie F, Oprisiu R, Achard JM, et al. Does a change in angiotensin II formation caused by antihypertensive drugs affect the risk of stroke? A meta-analysis of trials according to treatment with potentially different effects on angiotensin II. *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:1543–1553.
- 189** Verma S, Strauss M. Angiotensin receptor blockers and myocardial infarction. *BMJ* 2004; 329:1248–1249.
- 190** Strauss MH, Hall AS. Angiotensin receptor blockers may increase risk of myocardial infarction: unraveling the ARB-MI paradox. *Circulation* 2006; 114:838–854.
- 191** ONTARGET Investigators, Yusuf S, Teo KK, Pogue J, et al. Telmisartan, ramipril, or both in patients at high risk for vascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358:1547–1559.
- 192** Reboldi G, Angeli F, Cavallini C, et al. Comparison between angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers on the risk of myocardial infarction, stroke and death: a meta-analysis. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:1282–1289.
- 193** Volpe M, Tocci G, Sciarretta S, et al. Angiotensin II receptor blockers and myocardial infarction: an updated analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:941–946.
- 194** Schupp M, Janke J, Clasen R, et al. Angiotensin type 1 receptor blockers induce peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma activity. *Circulation* 2004; 109:2054–2057.
- 195** The ALLHAT Officers and Coordinators for the ALLHAT Collaborative Research Group. Major outcomes in high-risk hypertensive patients randomized to angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor or calcium channel blocker vs diuretic: The Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering treatment to prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT). *JAMA* 2002; 288:2981–2997.

- 196 Costanzo P, Perrone-Filardi P, Petretta M, et al. Calcium channel blockers and cardiovascular outcomes: a meta-analysis of 175,634 patients. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1136–1151.
- 197 Dahlöf B, Sever PS, Poulter NR, et al.; ASCOT Investigators. Prevention of cardiovascular events with an antihypertensive regimen of amlodipine adding perindopril as required versus atenolol adding bendroflumethiazide as required, in the Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial-Blood Pressure Lowering Arm (ASCOT-BPLA): a multicentre randomized controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005; 366:895–906.
- 198 Lubsen J, Wagener G, Kirwan BA, et al.; ACTION (A Coronary disease Trial Investigating Outcome with Nifedipine GITS) investigators. Effect of long-acting nifedipine on mortality and cardiovascular morbidity in patients with symptomatic stable angina and hypertension: the ACTION trial. *J Hypertens* 2005; 23:641–648.
- 199 Fagard RH. Benefits and safety of long-acting calcium antagonists in coronary artery disease: the ACTION Trial. *J Hypertens* 2005; 23:489–491.
- 200 Sutton GC, Erik Otterstad J, Kirwan BA, et al.; ACTION (A Coronary disease Trial Investigating Outcome with Nifedipine GITS) investigators. The development of heart failure in patients with stable angina pectoris. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2007; 9:234–242.
- 201 Stanton A. Therapeutic potential of renin inhibitors in the management of cardiovascular disorders. *Am J Cardiovasc Drugs* 2003; 3:389–394.
- 202 Azizi M, Webb R, Nussberger J, Hollenberg NK. Renin inhibition with aliskiren: where are we now, and where are we going? *J Hypertens* 2006; 24:243–256.
- 203 O'Brien E, Barton J, Nussberger J, et al. Aliskiren reduces blood pressure and suppresses plasma renin activity in combination with a thiazide diuretic, an angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor, or an angiotensin receptor blocker. *Hypertension* 2007; 49:276–284.
- 204 Villamil A, Chrysant SG, Calhoun D, et al. Renin inhibition with aliskiren provides additive antihypertensive efficacy when used in combination with hydrochlorothiazide. *J Hypertens* 2007; 25:217–226.
- 205 Littlejohn TW 3rd, Trenkwalder P, Hollanders G, et al. Longterm safety, tolerability and efficacy of combination therapy with aliskiren and amlodipine in patients with hypertension. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2009; 25:951–959.
- 206 Parving HH, Persson F, Lewis JB, et al.; AVOID Study Investigators. Aliskiren combined with losartan in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358:2433–2446.
- 207 Solomon SD, Appelbaum E, Manning WJ, et al.; Aliskiren in Left Ventricular Hypertrophy (ALLAY) Trial Investigators. Effect of the direct renin inhibitor aliskiren, the angiotensin receptor blocker losartan, or both on left ventricular mass in patients with hypertension and left ventricular hypertrophy. *Circulation* 2009; 119:530–537.
- 208 Seed A, Gardner R, McMurray J, et al. Neurohumoral effects of the new orally active renin inhibitor, aliskiren, in chronic heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2007; 9:1120–1127.
- 209 Gardner RS, Ozalp F, Murday AJ, et al. N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide. A new gold standard in predicting mortality in patients with advanced heart failure. *Eur Heart J* 2003; 24:1735–1743.
- 210 Weber MA, Black H, Bakris G, et al. A selective endothelin-receptor antagonist to reduce blood pressure in patients with treatment-resistant hypertension: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2009; 374:1423–1431

- 211 Sarafidis PA, Bakris GL. Resistant hypertension: an overview of evaluation and treatment. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2008; 52:1749–1757.
- 212 Report of the Joint National Committee on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. A cooperative study. *JAMA* 1977; 237:255–261.
- 213 Arterial hypertension. Report of a WHO expert committee. *World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser* 1978; 628:7–56.
- 214 Amar J, Vaur L, Perret M, et al.; PRATIK study investigators. Hypertension in high-risk patients: beware of the underuse of effective combination therapy (results of the PRATIK study). *J Hypertens* 2002; 20:779–784.
- 215 Kearney PM, Whelton M, Reynolds K, et al. Global burden of hypertension: analysis of worldwide data. *Lancet* 2005; 365:217–223.
- 216 Nicotra F, Wettermark B, Sturkenboom MC, et al. Management of antihypertensive drugs in three European countries. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:1917–1922.
- 217 Ambrosioni E, Leonetti G, Pessina AC, et al. Patterns of hypertension management in Italy: results of a pharmacoepidemiological survey on antihypertensive therapy. Scientific Committee of the Italian Pharmacoepidemiological Survey on Antihypertensive Therapy. *J Hypertens* 2000; 18:1691–1699.
- 218 Bakris G, Molitch M, Hewkin A, et al.; STAR Investigators. Differences in glucose tolerance between fixed-dose antihypertensive drug combinations in people with metabolic syndrome. *Diabetes Care* 2006; 29:2592–2597.
- 219 Dahlof B, Devereux RB, Kjeldsen SE, et al.; Wedel H, LIFE Study Group. LIFE Study Group. Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in the Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in hypertension study (LIFE): a randomised trial against atenolol. *Lancet* 2002; 359:995–1003.
- 220 Lithell H, Hansson L, Skoog I, et al. The Study on Cognition and Prognosis in the Elderly (SCOPE): Outcomes in patients not receiving add-on therapy after randomization. *J Hypertens* 2004; 22:1605–1612.
- 221 Kaneshiro Y, Ichihara A, Sakoda M, et al. Add-on benefits of amlodipine and thiazide in nondiabetic chronic kidney disease stage 1/2 patients treated with valsartan. *Kidney Blood Press Res* 2009; 32:51–58.
- 222 Ichihara A, Kaneshiro Y, Takemitsu T, Sakoda M. Effects of amlodipine and valsartan on vascular damage and ambulatory blood pressure in untreated hypertensive patients. *J Hum Hypertens* 2006; 20:787–794.
- 223 Sanford M, Keam SJ. Olmesartan medoxomil/amlodipine. *Drugs* 2009; 69:717–729.
- 224 Flack JM, Hilkert R. Single-pill combination of amlodipine and valsartan in the management of hypertension. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 2009; 10:1979–1994.
- 225 Julius S, Kjeldsen SE, Weber M, et al. Outcomes in hypertensive patients at high cardiovascular risk treated with regimens based on valsartan or amlodipine: the VALUE randomised trial. *Lancet* 2004; 363:2022–2031.
- 226 Ferrari P, Marti HP, Pfister M, Frey FJ. Additive antiproteinuric effect of combined ACE inhibition and angiotensin II receptor blockade. *J Hypertens* 2002; 20:125–130.
- 227 Kunz R, Friedrich C, Wolbers M, Mann JF. Meta-analysis: effect of monotherapy and combination therapy with inhibitors of the renin angiotensin system on proteinuria in renal disease. *Ann Intern Med* 2008; 148:30–48.

- 228** Eijkelkamp WB, Zhang Z, Remuzzi G, et al. Albuminuria is a target for renoprotective therapy independent from blood pressure in patients with type 2 diabetic nephropathy: post hoc analysis from the Reduction of Endpoints in NIDDM with the Angiotensin II Antagonist Losartan (RENAAL) trial. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2007; 18:1540–1546.
- 229** Nakao N, Yoshimura A, Morita H, et al. Combination treatment of angiotensin-II receptor blocker and angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitor in nondiabetic renal disease (COOPERATE): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2003; 361:117–124.
- 230** Vogt L, Laverman GD, de Zeeuw D, Navis G. The COOPERATE trial. *Lancet* 2003; 361:1055–1056.
- 231** Kunz R, Wolbers M, Glass T, Mann JF. The COOPERATE trial: a letter of concern. *Lancet* 2008; 371:1575–1576.
- 232** Pfeffer MA, McMurray JJ, Velazquez EJ, et al.; Valsartan in Acute Myocardial Infarction Trial Investigators. Valsartan, captopril, or both in myocardial infarction complicated by heart failure, left ventricular dysfunction, or both. *N Engl J Med* 2003; 349:1893–1896.
- 233** Cohn JN, Tognoni G, Valsartan Heart Failure Trial Investigators. A randomized trial of the angiotensin-receptor blocker valsartan in chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2001; 345:1667–1675.
- 234** McMurray JJ, Ostergren J, Swedberg K, et al.; CHARM Investigators and Committees. Effects of candesartan in patients with chronic heart failure and reduced left-ventricular systolic function taking angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibitors: the CHARM-Added trial. *Lancet* 2003; 362:767–771.
- 235** Bangalore S, Kamalakkannan G, Parkar S, Messerli FH. Fixed-dose combinations improve medication compliance: a meta-analysis. *Am J Med* 2007; 120:713–719.
- 236** Gueyffier F, Bulpitt C, Boissel JP, et al. Antihypertensive drugs in very old people: a subgroup meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *INDANA Group. Lancet* 1999; 353:793–796.
- 237** Bulpitt CJ, Beckett NS, Cooke J, et al. Results of the pilot study for the Hypertension in the Very Elderly Trial. *J Hypertens* 2003; 21:2409–2417.
- 238** Brown CM, Hecht MJ, Weih A, et al. Effects of age on the cardiac and vascular limbs of the arterial baroreflex. *Eur J Clin Invest* 2003; 33:10–16.
- 239** Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. Effects of different regimens to lower blood pressure on major cardiovascular events in older and younger adults: meta-analysis of randomised trials. *BMJ* 2008; 336:1121–1123.
- 240** Mancia G, Grassi G. Systolic and diastolic blood pressure control in antihypertensive drug trials. *J Hypertens* 2002; 20:1461–1464.
- 241** Atkins RC, Briganti EM, Lewis JB, et al. Proteinuria reduction and progression to renal failure in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and overt nephropathy. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2005; 45:281–287.
- 242** Viberti G, Wheeldon NM, MicroAlbuminuria Reduction With Valsartan (MARVAL) Study Investigators. Microalbuminuria reduction with valsartan in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a blood pressure-independent effect. *Circulation* 2002; 106:672–678.
- 243** Estacio RO, Coll JR, Tran ZV, Schrier RW. Effect of intensive blood pressure control with valsartan on urinary albumin excretion in normotensive patients with type 2 diabetes. *Am J Hypertens* 2006; 19:1241–1248.

- 244 Adler AI, Stratton IM, Neil HA, et al. Association of systolic blood pressure with macrovascular and microvascular complications of type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 36): prospective observational study. *BMJ* 2000; 321:412–419.
- 245 Watkins PJ, Edmonds ME. Diabetic autonomic failure. In: Mathias CJ, Bannister R, editors. *Autonomic failure: a textbook of clinical disorders of the autonomic nervous system*. Oxford: University Press; 1999. pp. 378–386.
- 246 Matthews DR, Stratton IM, Aldington SJ, et al.; UK Prospective Diabetes Study Group. Risks of progression of retinopathy and vision loss related to tight blood pressure control in type 2 diabetes mellitus: UKPDS 69. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2004; 122:1631–1640.
- 247 Klein R, Klein BE, Moss SE, et al. The Wisconsin Epidemiologic Study of Diabetic Retinopathy. IX: Four-year incidence and progression of diabetic retinopathy when age at diagnosis is less than 30 years. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1989; 107:237–243.
- 248 Gaede P, Vedel P, Larsen N, et al. Multifactorial intervention and cardiovascular disease in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2003; 348:383–393.
- 249 Beulens JW, Patel A, Vingerling JR, et al.; on behalf of the AdRem project team and ADVANCE management committee. Effects of blood pressure lowering and intensive glucose control on the incidence and progression of retinopathy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia* 2009; 52:2027–2036.
- 250 Chaturvedi N, Porta M, Klein R, et al.; DIRECT Programme Study Group. Effect of candesartan on prevention (DIRECT-Prevent 1) and progression (DIRECT-Protect 1) of retinopathy in type 1 diabetes: randomised, placebo-controlled trials. *Lancet* 2008; 372:1394–1402.
- 251 UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Effect of intensive blood-glucose control with metformin on complications in overweight patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 34). *Lancet* 1998; 352:854–865.
- 252 Mann JF, Schmieder RE, Dyal L, et al.; TRANSCEND (Telmisartan Randomised Assessment Study in ACE Intolerant Subjects with Cardiovascular Disease) Investigators. Effect of telmisartan on renal outcomes: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2009; 151:1–10.
- 253 Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative (K/DOQI). K/DOQI clinical practice guidelines on hypertension and antihypertensive agents in chronic kidney disease. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2004; 43(5 Suppl 1):S1–S290.
- 254 Heerspink HJ, Ninomiya T, Zoungas S, et al. Effect of lowering blood pressure on cardiovascular events and mortality in patients on dialysis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet* 2009; 373:1009–1015.
- 255 PATS Collaborating Group. Poststroke antihypertensive treatment study. A preliminary result. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 1995; 108:710–717.
- 256 Schrader J, Lüders S, Kulschewski A, et al. The ACCESS Study: evaluation of Acute Candesartan Cilexetil Therapy in Stroke Survivors. *Stroke* 2003; 34:1699–1703.
- 257 Potter JF, Robinson TG, Ford GA, et al. Controlling hypertension and hypotension immediately poststroke (CHHIPS): a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind pilot trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2009; 8:48–56.
- 258 Peters R, Beckett N, Forette F, et al. Incident dementia and blood pressure lowering in the Hypertension in the Very Elderly Trial cognitive function assessment (HYVET-COG): a double-blind, placebo controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2008; 7:683–689.

- 259** Massie BM, Carson PE, McMurray JJ, Komajda M, McKelvie R, Zile MR, Anderson S, Donovan M, Iverson E, Staiger C, Ptaszynska A, IPRESERVE Investigators. Irbesartan in patients with heart failure and preserved ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359:2456–2467.
- 260** Vermes E, Tardif JC, Bourassa MG, et al. Enalapril decreases the incidence of atrial fibrillation in patients with left ventricular dysfunction: insight from the Studies Of Left Ventricular Dysfunction (SOLVD) trials. *Circulation* 2003; 17:2926–2931.
- 261** Ducharme A, Swedberg K, Pfeffer MA, et al. Prevention of atrial fibrillation in patients with symptomatic chronic heart failure by candesartan in the Candesartan in Heart failure: Assessment of Reduction in Mortality and morbidity (CHARM) program. *Am Heart J* 2006; 152:86–92.
- 262** Wachtell K, Lehto M, Gerds E, et al. Angiotensin II receptor blockade reduces new-onset atrial fibrillation and subsequent stroke compared to atenolol: the Losartan Intervention For End Point Reduction in Hypertension (LIFE) study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2005; 45:712–719.
- 263** Schmieder RE, Kjeldsen SE, Julius S, et al.; VALUE Trial Group. Reduced incidence of new-onset atrial fibrillation with angiotensin II receptor blockade: the VALUE trial. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:403–411.
- 264** Okin PM, Wachtell K, Devereux RB, et al. Regression of electrocardiographic left ventricular hypertrophy and decreased incidence of new-onset atrial fibrillation in patients with hypertension. *JAMA* 2006; 296:1242–1248.
- 265** Madrid AH, Bueno MG, Rebollo JM, et al. Use of irbesartan to maintain sinus rhythm in patients with long-lasting persistent atrial fibrillation: a prospective and randomized study. *Circulation* 2002; 106:331–336.
- 266** Fogari R, Mugellini A, Destro M, et al. Losartan and prevention of atrial fibrillation recurrence in hypertensive patients. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol* 2006; 47:46–50.
- 267** Ueng KC, Tsai TP, Yu WC, et al. Use of enalapril to facilitate sinus rhythm maintenance after external cardioversion of long-standing persistent atrial fibrillation. Results of a prospective and controlled study. *Eur Heart J* 2003; 24:2090–2098.
- 268** Tveit A, Grundvold I, Olufsen M, et al. Candesartan in the prevention of relapsing atrial fibrillation. *Int J Cardiol* 2007; 120:85–91.
- 269** GISSI-AF Investigators. Valsartan for prevention of recurrent atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med* 2009; 360:1606–1617.
- 270** Nasr IA, Bouzamondo A, Hulot JS, et al. Prevention of atrial fibrillation onset by beta-blocker treatment in heart failure: a meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2007; 28:457–462.
- 271** Turnbull F, Woodward M, Neal B, et al.; Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. Do men and women respond differently to blood pressure-lowering treatment? Results of prospectively designed overviews of randomized trials. *Eur Heart J* 2008; 29:2669–2680.
- 272** Scranton RE, Lawler E, Botteman M, et al. Effect of treating erectile dysfunction on management of systolic hypertension. *Am J Cardiol* 2007; 100:552–553.
- 273** Manolis A, Doumas M. Sexual dysfunction: the 'prima ballerina' of hypertension-related quality-of-life complications. *J Hypertens* 2008; 26:2074–2084.
- 274** Sever PS, Dahlöf B, Poulter NR, et al.; the ASCOT investigators. Prevention of coronary and stroke events with atorvastatin in hypertensive patients who have average or lower-

- than-average cholesterol concentrations, in the Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial – Lipid Lowering Arm (ASCOT-LLA): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2003; 361:1149–1158.
- 275** ALLHAT Officers and Coordinators for the ALLHAT Collaborative Research Group. The Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial. Major outcomes in moderately hypercholesterolemic, hypertensive patients randomized to pravastatin vs usual care: The Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT-LLT). *JAMA* 2002; 288:2998–3007.
- 276** Sever P, Dahlöf B, Poulter N, et al.; ASCOT Steering Committee Memberset. Potential synergy between lipid-lowering and blood-pressure-lowering in the Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial. *Eur Heart J* 2006; 27:2982–2988.
- 277** Sever PS, Poulter NR, Dahlof B, Wedel H, on behalf of the ASCOT Investigators. Antihypertensive therapy and the benefits of atorvastatin in the Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial: lipid-lowering arm extension. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27:947–954.
- 278** Ridker PM, Danielson E, Fonseca FA, et al.; for the JUPITER Study Group. Rosuvastatin to prevent vascular events in men and women with elevated C-reactive protein. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359:2195–2207.
- 279** Antithrombotic Trialists' (ATT) Collaboration. Aspirin in the primary and secondary prevention of vascular disease: collaborative meta-analysis of individual participant data from randomised trials. *Lancet* 2009;373:1849–1860.
- 280** Zanchetti A, Hansson L, Dahlöf B, et al. Benefit and harm of low-dose aspirin in well treated hypertensives at different baseline cardiovascular risk. *J Hypertens* 2002; 20:2301–2307.
- 281** Zanchetti A. Aspirin and antiplatelet drugs in the prevention of cardiovascular complications in diabetes. In Mogensen CE, editor. *Pharmacotherapy of diabetes: new developments*. New York: Springer; 2007. pp. 211–218, chapter 19.
- 282** Ogawa H, Nakayama M, Morimoto T, et al. Low-dose aspirin for primary prevention of atherosclerotic events in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2008; 300:2134–2141.
- 283** Jardine MJ, Ninomiya T, Cass A, et al. Aspirin benefit increases with declining renal function among people with hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2009; 27 (Suppl 4):S178; (abstract).
- 284** Saudek CD, Derr RL, Kalyani RR. Assessing glycemia in diabetes using self-monitoring blood glucose and hemoglobin A1c. *JAMA* 2006; 295:1688–1697.
- 285** ADVANCE Collaborative Group, Patel A, MacMahon S, Chalmers J, et al. Intensive blood glucose control and vascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358:2560–2572.
- 286** Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group, Gerstein HC, Miller ME, Byington RP, et al. Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358:2545–2559.
- 287** Zoungas S, de Galan BE, Ninomiya T, et al.; on behalf of the ADVANCE Collaborative Group. The combined effects of routine blood pressure lowering and intensive glucose control on macrovascular and microvascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes; new results from ADVANCE. *Diabetes Care* 2009. [Epub ahead of print]

- 288** UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998; 352:837–853.
- 289** Duckworth W, Abraira C, Moritz T, et al. Glucose control and vascular complications in veterans with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2009; 360:129–139.
- 290** Ray KK, Seshasai SR, Wijesuriya S, et al. Effect of intensive control of glucose on cardiovascular outcomes and death in patients with diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet* 2009; 373:1765–1772.
- 291** Indian Polycap Study (TIPS). Effects of a polypill (Polycap) on risk factors in middle-aged individuals without cardiovascular disease (TIPS): a phase II, double-blind, randomised trial. *Lancet* 2009; 373:1341–1351.
- 292** Yusuf S. Two decades of progress in preventing cardiovascular disease. *Lancet* 2002; 360:2–3.
- 293** Wald NJ, Law MR. A strategy to reduce cardiovascular disease by more than 80%. *BMJ* 2003; 326:1419.