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Abstract

Background: Previous studies of renal denervation (RDN) have mainly focused on the effect on office blood pressure (BP) and number of antihypertensive drugs although these are known as sub-optimal endpoints.

Aim: The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of RDN by combining 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure (ABP) measurements and quantified antihypertensive medication at 12 months after RDN.

Methods: Fifty-one patients (71% men, mean age 56 years) with resistant hypertension were treated with RDN. Office BP and ABP were measured at baseline and 6 and 12 months after RDN. Concomitantly the administration of antihypertensive drugs was assessed by their total defined daily dose (DDD). Results are presented as mean values (± SD).

Results: The change in daytime systolic ABP at 6 and 12 months was -8.6 (22.5) (P=0.01) and -4.2 (22.3) mmHg (P=NS). Quantified antihypertensive medication was assessed, and at 12 months after RDN there was no change in antihypertensive medication in 33% of patients using the DDD method versus 53% of patients using counts of number of antihypertensive drugs (NS). At 12 months after RDN a ≥5 mmHg reduction in MAP (24-hour ABP) was found in 36% of the patients in addition to an unchanged or reduced DDD, whereas this was seen in 42% of patients when number of antihypertensive drugs were used (NS).

Conclusions: There was no effect of RDN on ABP after 12 months. We have presented a method that embraces both ABP and quantitative assessment of antihypertensive medication to evaluate RDN by combined ∆DDD/24-hour ∆MAP.
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Introduction

Percutaneous catheter-based renal denervation (RDN) was introduced as a treatment option for patients with therapy resistant hypertension, initially with promising results [1,2]. A large sham-controlled trial, however, has questioned the benefit of RDN [3]. In a previous study, we observed that 41% of patients referred for RDN had a history of intolerance to antihypertensive agents or compliance problems and that only approximately 50% of those referred were actually eligible for the treatment [4]. A high baseline blood pressure (BP) has been shown to be a predictor of successful response to RDN [5-7]. The influence of renal function for RDN response has not been clarified. In one study lower estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) was associated with poor response to RDN [8], whereas another study has shown that RDN in CKD stages 3-4 (eGFR from 15 to 60 ml/min/1.73 m²) halts the decline in renal function [9]. Still there is much to learn about the effect of RDN and the role of patient selection.

Counting the number of BP lowering drugs has been the standard method to quantify the amount of antihypertensive medication [1-3]. Many studies have aimed - if possible - not to adjust antihypertensive medication during the follow up period. This approach, however, has in reality proven difficult. This is both due to changes in BP after RDN as well as patients desire to reduce or discontinue medication. Therefore, a single score quantifying antihypertensive medication and detecting all adjustments in medication would be beneficial. By adding the Defined Daily Dose (DDD) stated by WHO [10] for each prescribed antihypertensive drug a single score value can describe the total load of antihypertensive medication per day.

The primary endpoint in most studies evaluating the effect of RDN has been reductions in office BP [1-3]. Twenty-four hour ambulatory blood pressure (ABP) has a consistently stronger association with both mortality and long-term complications of hypertension than both office BP [11] and home BP [12], and thus greater attention should be paid to this variable when evaluating treatment of hypertension.

One of the challenges is to differentiate the BP lowering effects of RDN from changes induced by changes in antihypertensive medication during the follow-up. The aim of this study was to describe RDN evaluation by combining 24-hour ABP and quantified antihypertensive medication at 12 months after RDN in 51 consecutively treated patients. Furthermore, assess the effect of RDN on day- and nighttime BP was evaluated from the ABP analyses.

Material and Methods

Patients

We prospectively evaluated the first 51 patients having RDN
performed at Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Denmark from April 2011 to April 2013. Patient selection and clinical work up has previously been described [4]. We accepted patients for RDN who fulfilled the criteria from the European Society of Hypertensions position paper on RDN [13] as well as those who did not achieve a target BP on <3 antihypertensive drugs due to intolerance or side effects. No ethical approval was required, because the patients in this study were referred for routine treatment and follow-up.

Procedure

Patients had a RDN procedure performed with the use of radiofrequency energy delivered by either the Symplicity renal denervation catheter (Medtronic) or the EnligHTN renal denervation catheter (St. Jude Medical). The same two operators, one interventional cardiologist and one invasive electrophysiologist, both highly experienced, performed all RDN procedures in collaboration. None of the operators had performed RDN prior to the 51 patients included in this study and initial procedures were performed with a proctor present. During each procedure the same two operators participated during the whole procedure and each operator performed RDN on one renal artery in each patient (random which artery was treated by whom). This strategy was decided to increase the operator experience for this new treatment.

Blood pressure measurements

Office BP as well as ABP were measured prior to RDN, and during follow-up at 6 and 12 months after RDN. Office BP measurement was achieved with a semi automated device (UA-852 device, A&D Company Limited, Higashi-Ikebukuro, Japan) after five minutes of rest in the sitting position with a fitted cuff at both arms to exclude any difference. Three measurements were performed, and the average of the latter two was registered.

ABP was done with an electronic device (Spacelab 90202 or 90207 device, Spacelabs Inc. Redmonds, Wash, USA) with a fitted cuff on the upper arm with the highest office BP measuring BP every 15 minutes during daytime (7AM to 11PM), and every half hour during night time (11PM to 7AM). At least 70% successful readings during both day and night were considered sufficient [14] with a minimum of 21 readings in total and at least 7 readings during nighttime. Patients were instructed to engage in normal activities while being monitored, but to avoid strenuous exercise, and during measuring keep the arm still and instructed to engage in normal activities while being monitored, but to avoid strenuous exercise, and during measuring keep the arm still and the cuff at heart level [14]. Nightly BP dipping was defined as a >10% drop in both systolic and diastolic BP during night-time compared to the cuff at heart level [14]. Nightly BP dipping was defined as a >10% drop in both systolic and diastolic BP during night-time compared to the cuff at heart level [14].

Quantification of antihypertensive agents

The DDD is stated by the World Health Organisation [16,17] to be the assumed average maintenance dose per day of a drug used for its main indication in adults. From the patient's list of medication all antihypertensive agents were converted to a DDD-value for each medication, and combination therapies were calculated for each agent. Finally all DDD were added to give a single score value. Total DDD calculation was performed prior to RDN, and at 6 and 12 months after the treatment. Changes to antihypertensive medication during follow-up were limited in line with the protocol of SymplicityHTN-3.

Example on calculating the total DDD for a patient:

- Hydrochlorothiazide; dosage 25 mg/day (DDD: 25 mg) = 1 DDD
- ACE inhibitor (Enalapril); dosage 20 mg/day (DDD: 10 mg) = 2 DDD

Table 1. Demographics and clinical characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics and clinical characteristics</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Median 65 (IQR 55-75)</td>
<td>Median 65 (IQR 55-75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (male)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index (kg/m²)</td>
<td>Median 28 (IQR 24-32)</td>
<td>Median 28 (IQR 24-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of hypertension</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension controlled with medication</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example on calculating the total DDD for a patient:

- Hydrochlorothiazide; dosage 25 mg/day (DDD: 25 mg) = 1 DDD
- ACE inhibitor (Enalapril); dosage 20 mg/day (DDD: 10 mg) = 2 DDD

Summary

Forty-one out of 51 patients had RDN performed with the Symplicity Renal Denervation System (Medtronic) and in 10 patients (20%) the EnligHTN renal denervation system (St. Jude Medical, Inc.) was used. Patients received in average 12 (3) ablations in total, equally distributed in right and left renal arteries. There were no difference in either ΔABP (24-hour average MAP) (P=0.425) or ΔDDD (P=0.094) at 12 months vs. baseline between patients who had RDN performed with the two catheter systems (unpaired t-test).

Combined changes in BP and antihypertensive therapy

Changes in 24-hour average MAP and antihypertensive medication,
and their relation are illustrated in Figure 1. Figure IA exhibits the correlation between ∆DDD vs. ∆MAP at 12 month minus baseline after RDN. 16 of 45 (36%) patients had a ≥ 5 mmHg ∆MAP and an unchanged or reduced DDD. Figure IB exhibits the correlation between ∆ number of antihypertensive drugs vs. ∆MAP at 12 month minus baseline after RDN. Nineteen out of forty-five (42%) patients had a ≥ 5 mmHg ∆MAP and an unchanged or reduced number of antihypertensive drugs. There was no statistical difference between the two approaches to assessing antihypertensive medication in combination with ∆MAP (P=0.52, NS). When comparing rates of change in medication by DDD or the number of antihypertensive drugs, no change in medication was recorded in 33% (15/45) vs. 53% (24/45) of the patients at 12 months (P=0.056, NS).

Additional blood pressure results

Results for office BP as well as ABP are summarized in Table 2, and graphic illustration of office BP and ABP changes are given in Figure 2.

The cut-off value of BP reduction defining a responder could obviously influence the number of responders. If the definitions of a responder in the present study, had been ±10 mmHg reduction in systolic office BP combined with unchanged or decreased DDD at 12 months after RDN 44% (n=20) of patients would have been responders, whereas a ≥ 5 mmHg systolic ABP reduction combined with unchanged or decreased DDD was seen in 47% (n=21) of the patients.

At baseline, and at 6 and 12 months, the rate of nightly dipping was 9/51 (18%), 5/47 (11%) and 0/45 (0%), respectively.

Heart rate did not differ between baseline, 6 and 12 months neither in 24-hour average, day or night-time.

Antihypertensive mediation

The monitoring of antihypertensive medication is summarized in Table 3 including an overview of class of antihypertensive medications. Figure 3 shows the correlation between number of antihypertensive drugs and DDD at baseline. The graphs for both 6 and 12 months are similar, and they clearly illustrates that antihypertensive medication is predominantly given in supra-DDD-value dosage, a tendency that increases with increasing number of drugs administered.

Other parameters

Blood-hemoglobin concentration and plasma-creatinine levels did not change during 6-month follow-up. Plasma-creatinine, however, increased within the normal range from 86 (26) µmol/L at baseline to 92 (33) µmol/L at 12-month follow-up (P ≤ 0.01).

Discussion

ABP, MAP and DDD

In the present study there was no overall significant change in ABP 12 months after RDN. When evaluating RDN results by combining 24-hour MAP and the total load of antihypertensive medication by DDD we have reduced some of the uncertainties with medication changes during follow-up. The ≥ 5 mmHg reduction of 24-hour MAP as part of the responder definition was chosen as it reflects a clinical meaningful reduction in an overall measurement of BP. More patients tended to be incorrectly categorized as having no change in medication when the number of antihypertensive drugs is counted (53%) is compared to the DDD-method (33%). This difference was only nearly significant, P=0.056, but still illustrates how changes in antihypertensive medication can be made without affecting the number of antihypertensive agents. Therefore, we believe that using DDD combined with 24-hour MAP is more accurate than using the number of antihypertensive drugs combined with 24-hour MAP, although it is not significant. This approach might be helpful to obtain an accurate knowledge of the interactions of various contributors to BP reductions after RDN and the inevitably change in medication. Used in a larger scale this method may be helpful to identify what characterizes the responders vs. non-responders after treatment with RDN.

Antihypertensive medication

In the Symplicity HTN-3 trial almost 40% of the patients in both groups had a change in antihypertensive medication during the follow-up period, equally distributed in the actively treated and the sham group [3]. Interestingly, it is stated in the Symplicity HTN-3 protocol that a full dose of an antihypertensive drug “may differ among patients depending on co-morbidities and concomitant medications”, which is basically the problem with counting the number of antihypertensive drugs. A change in medication can be a reduction in a drug before complete discontinuation, and many multi-drug regimens are based on sub-maximal levels to limit the discomfort of side effects. The number of antihypertensive medications used as part of the evaluation of the RDN effect is very vulnerable tool, since a reduction in the dose of one drug – primarily considered as a success – may camouflage an increase in dose of the remaining antihypertensive drugs. On the other hand a total DDD per day the amount of antihypertensive treatment is included across medication classes and doses. By using DDD we exclude this problem and get a single score that is unaffected of doses, and yet very sensitive to even small changes in antihypertensive medication.

Office BP and ABP

The most pronounced BP lowering effect of RDN is recorded during daytime, which could be ascribed to a higher level of sympathetic nervous activity compared with the level at night-time [18]. The proportion of ‘nightly’ dippers was reduced from 18% at baseline to 0% at 12 months after RDN, which partly may be explained by the concept, that RDN has the greatest influence on BP affected by the sympathetic nervous system.

Table 1: Demographics and Clinical Characteristics (N=51).

Overview of the baseline demographics and clinical data of the first 51 patients having RDN performed from April 2011 to April 2013 at our institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male gender (%)</th>
<th>71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, years (SD)</td>
<td>56 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, kg/m² (SD)</td>
<td>29 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office BP, systolic/diastolic, mmHg (SD)</td>
<td>171(28)/99(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-hour BP, systolic/diastolic, mmHg (SD)</td>
<td>157(22)/90(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>161(22)/95(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime</td>
<td>147(23)/81(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of hypertension history, years (SD)</td>
<td>14 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr-EDTA clearance ml/min*1,73m² (SD)</td>
<td>80 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma creatinine, µmol/L (SD)</td>
<td>88 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes, % (n)</td>
<td>20 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AML, % (n)</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG/PCI, % (n)</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke, % (n)</td>
<td>18 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA, % (n)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Demographics and Clinical Characteristics (N=51).

Overview of the baseline demographics and clinical data of the first 51 patients having RDN performed from April 2011 to April 2013 at our institution.

Keeping in mind that reproducibility of the dipping pattern is low [19], non-dipping in patients with resistant HTN is related to several factors such as endothelial dysfunction [20] and timing of antihypertensive drug administration [21]. The Symplicity HTN-3 has- in a separate publication [22] -split their ABP data up into day and night, and found a BP lowering effect in both day and night-time. Our data suggest that RDN has a more pronounced effect on daytime than nighttime ABP which is supported by Völz et al. [23]. Daytime ABP could therefore be a more appropriate endpoint. Although guidelines from the European Society of Hypertension [14] state (mostly due to vast availability), they do acknowledge superiority of the accuracy of ABP. When introducing a new treatment for hypertension, like RDN, we suggest ABP as the proper measure of changes in BP. The discrepancy between reductions in office BP and ABP – with effect on office BP being more pronounced than ABP - is a phenomenon also seen in pharmacological studies of severe hypertension [24,25].

**Strengths and limitations**

Limitations of this study are the relatively small number of patients, its observational nature, the use two different RDN systems and unverified adherence to antihypertensive medication. It would have been ideal to have a more accurate evaluation on compliance, such as pill counting, urine or plasma analysis of concentrations of antihypertensive medication or their metabolites. Regression towards the mean could also explain the relative small reductions in BP.

The strengths of the study are that all patients went through a thorough clinical work up to exclude secondary causes of hypertension, the same two operators performed all RDN procedures, and there was a close follow-up of each patient.

**Conclusion**

In a consecutive cohort of patients with resistant hypertension we did not see the previously described consistent BP reduction from RDN in office BP and ABP. Using the ΔDDD/24-hour ΔMAP method,
Table 2: The Effect of RDN on Blood Pressure

P-values of 0.05 or less were considered significant. MAP: Mean Arterial Pressure. CI: Confidence interval. SD: ± Standard deviation.

Figure 2: Office and Abp changes during Follow Up

Upper panel: Systolic blood pressures. Lower panel: Diastolic pressures. Values are presented at baseline, 6 and 12 months follow-up. Green color indicates a reduction and red indicates an increase in blood pressure compared to baseline. Data is shown as mean and SD. *P-value ≤ 0.05. **P-value ≤ 0.01. BP: Blood Pressure. ABP: Ambulatory Blood Pressure. SD: Standard deviation.
Table 3a: Antihypertensive drugs I
Antihypertensive medication by number of antihypertensive agents and DDD (daily defined dose). P values of 0.05 or less were considered significant. CI: Confidence interval. SD: ± Standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (n=51)</th>
<th>6 months follow-up (n=47)</th>
<th>12 months follow-up (n=45)</th>
<th>Change between baseline and 6 months Mean (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Change between baseline and 12 months Mean (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of antihypertensive drugs (SD)</td>
<td>3.9 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.7 (1.9)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.7)</td>
<td>-1.0 (-1.5 to 0.5)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-1.0 (-1.5 to -1.1)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDD per day (SD)</td>
<td>6.8 (4.0)</td>
<td>6.3 (3.6)</td>
<td>5.6 (3.3)</td>
<td>-0.6 (-1.3 to 0.1)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.2 (-1.9 to -0.4)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3b: Antihypertensive Drugs II
Antihypertensive medication by drug classes. ACE: Angiotensin Converting Enzyme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Class</th>
<th>Baseline (n=51)</th>
<th>6 months follow-up (n=47)</th>
<th>12 months follow-up (n=45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diuretics</td>
<td>38 (75%)</td>
<td>34 (72%)</td>
<td>32 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldosterone antagonist</td>
<td>14 (27%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>12 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angiotensin-receptor blocker</td>
<td>27 (53%)</td>
<td>26 (55%)</td>
<td>26 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>21 (41%)</td>
<td>18 (38%)</td>
<td>14 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct renin inhibitor</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium-channel blocker</td>
<td>39 (76%)</td>
<td>33 (70%)</td>
<td>29 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β blocker</td>
<td>19 (37%)</td>
<td>16 (34%)</td>
<td>14 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α and β blocker</td>
<td>8 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α blocker</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally acting sympatholytic (eg. moxonidine)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoxidil</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Correlation between DDD and number of Antihypertensive drugs
Figure 3 illustrates the correlations between number of antihypertensive agents and DDD given at baseline, and is comparable to both 6 and 12 months (not shown). The red line indicates the line corresponding to antihypertensive drugs given at their maximal dosages equal to their DDD value.
however, it is possible to identified responders and non-responders using a combination of ABP and quantified antihypertensive medication. When evaluating non-pharmacological therapy pharmacological antihypertensive treatment must be quantified to untangle the BP lowering effect from the pharmacological induced due to changes in medication.
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