




Pharmaceutical Assistance
Contract for the Elderly



Balanced information for better care

Don't let the pressure get to you:

An update on the changing recommendations for
treating hypertension



Don't let the pressure get to you:

An update on the changing recommendations for treating hypertension

Principal Consultant: Jing Luo, M.D., M.P.H.

Series Editors: Michael Fischer, M.D. (principal editor), Niteesh K. Choudhry, M.D., Ph.D., Jerry Avorn, M.D., M.S., Dae Kim, M.D., Sc.D., Gregory Curfman, M.D.; Ellen Dancel, PharmD, M.P.H.

Medical Writer: Jenny Cai

This document was produced by The Independent Drug Information Service (IDIS) of Alosa Health, supported by the Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly (PACE) Program of the Department of Aging of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Alosa Health is a nonprofit organization which is not affiliated with any pharmaceutical company. None of the authors accepts any personal compensation from any pharmaceutical manufacturer.

These are general recommendations only; specific clinical decisions should be made by the treating physician based on an individual patient's clinical condition.

© 2018 Alosa Health. All rights reserved. For more information, see AlosaHealth.org.

Don't Let the Pressure Get to You:

An update on the changing recommendations for treating hypertension

Accreditation:

This activity has been planned and implemented in accordance with the accreditation requirements and policies of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education through the joint providership of Harvard Medical School and Alosa Health. The Harvard Medical School is accredited by the ACCME to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

Credit Designation:

The Harvard Medical School designates this enduring material for a maximum of 1.25 *AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™*. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Activity Overview:

The goal of this activity is to educate prescribers about the most recent evidence relating to defining and diagnosing hypertension, recommended blood pressure targets, and the efficacy of different medications used to achieve blood pressure goals.

The educational program has several components, which include:

- Written evidence report (print monograph)
- Summary document of top 4-5 key messages
- “Academic detailing” educational sessions in physicians’ offices with trained outreach educators (pharmacists, nurses, physicians) who present the material interactively
- Reference cards for easy access to key materials
- Patient education information (brochure/tear-off sheets)

This program works to synthesize the current clinical information on this topic into accessible, non-commercial, evidence-based educational material, which is taught interactively to providers by specially-trained clinical educators.

Target Audience:

The educational program is designed for primary care physicians practicing internal medicine, primary care, family practice, and geriatrics, and other health care professionals who deliver primary care.

Learning Objectives:

Upon completion of this activity, participants will be able to:

- Perform accurate blood pressure measurement to identify and manage patients with hypertension

- Identify patients with hypertension who are more likely to benefit from intensive blood pressure lowering according to the latest guidelines
- Select drug and non-drug therapies with consideration of cardiovascular risk, risk of adverse events, blood pressure goals, and patient preferences
- Assess treatment response and intensify therapy to achieve the blood pressure goal
- Counsel patients about diet and medication adherence throughout treatment

Disclosure Policy:

Harvard Medical School has long held the standard that its continuing medical education courses be free of commercial bias.

In accord with the disclosure policy of the Medical School as well as standards set forth by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education, course planners, speakers, and content reviewers have been asked to disclose any relevant relationship they, or their spouse or partner, have to companies producing, marketing, re-selling or distributing health care goods or services consumed by, or used on, patients. In addition, faculty have been asked to list any off-label uses of pharmaceuticals and/or devices for investigational or non-FDA approved purposes that they plan to discuss. Such disclosure is not intended to suggest or condone bias in any presentation, but is elicited to provide the course director and participants with information that might be of potential importance to their evaluation of a given presentation.

Disclosures:

This material is provided by Alosa Health, a nonprofit organization which is not affiliated with any pharmaceutical company. No commercial support has been received for this activity. All individuals including planners, authors, reviewers, academic detailers, staff, etc., who are in a position to control the content of this educational activity have, on behalf of themselves and their spouse or partner, reported no financial relationships related to the content of this activity. The Independent Drug Information Service (IDIS) is supported by the PACE Program of the Department of Aging of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Faculty and Planners:

Jing Luo, M.D., MPH, is an Instructor of Medicine in the Division of Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacoeconomics and an urgent care physician at Brigham and Women's Hospital. Dr. Luo has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Michael Fischer, M.D., M.S. is an Associate Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School and a primary care internist who studies cost-effective drug use in outpatient practices. Dr. Fischer has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Niteesh K. Choudhry, M.D., Ph.D. is a Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School and a hospitalist at Brigham and Women's Hospital. His research focuses on the use of medications to treat common chronic conditions. Dr. Choudhry has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Jerry Avorn, M.D. is a Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School and Chief of the Division of Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacoeconomics at Brigham and Women's Hospital. An internist, he has

worked as a primary care physician and geriatrician and has been studying drug use and its outcomes for over 30 years. Dr. Avorn has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Dae Kim, M.D., Sc.D., is an Assistant Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School and a geriatrician and epidemiologist at Brigham and Women's Hospital. Dr. Kim has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Gregory Curfman, M.D., is an Assistant Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School and board-certified internal medicine physician and cardiologist. Dr. Curfman has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Ellen Dancel, PharmD, M.P.H., is the Director of Clinical Materials Development at Alosa Health. Dr. Dancel has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Jenny Cai, M.Sc., is a medical writer and curriculum specialist with over eight years of experience in medical education. Ms. Cai has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Reviewers:

Jennifer Lewey, M.D., is an Assistant Professor of Medicine at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania. She is the Director of the Penn Women's Cardiovascular Center and Co-Director of the Pregnancy and Heart Disease Program. Dr. Lewey has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Maria Scerri is the Accreditation Coordinator at Harvard Medical School Global and Continuing Education. Ms. Scerri has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Stacy Gavin is the Accreditation and Education Manager at Harvard Medical School Global and Continuing Education. Ms. Gavin has no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

Media used:

Printed educational material.

Instructions for Participation and Credit:

There are no fees to participate in this activity. To receive credit, participants must (1) read the statements on target audience, learning objectives, and disclosures, (2) study the educational activity, and (3) complete the post-test and activity evaluation. To receive *AMA PRA Category 1 Credit™*, participants must receive a minimum score of 70% on the post-test. Tests and evaluations should be submitted to Alosa Health via email, mail, or fax.

Tests and evaluations should be submitted to Alosa Health via email, mail or fax.

Email: cme@alosahealth.org

Mailing address:

Alosa Health
419 Boylston Street, 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02116

Fax: 857-350-9155

The activity will take approximately **1.25** hours to complete.

Activity publication date: **July 1, 2018**

Termination date: **July 1, 2021**

Please email any questions to **cme@alosahealth.org** or call **(617) 948-5997**.

Table of Contents


Introduction.....	1
Classifying blood pressure	4
Blood pressure definitions.....	4
Impact of new classification	5
Measuring blood pressure accurately.....	7
Best practices for blood pressure measurement	7
Types of blood pressure measurements.....	10
Variation of blood pressure measurement by setting.....	12
Patient evaluation.....	14
Managing hypertension	15
When to start treatment	15
Blood pressure treatment goals	17
Treatments for hypertension.....	20
Non-pharmacologic treatment.....	20
Pharmacologic treatment.....	22
Combination therapy	27
Practical steps for starting medications in patients with hypertension	28
Putting it all together.....	29
Appendix 1. Cost of antihypertensives	30
Appendix 2. Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial (SPRINT) key findings	31
Appendix 3. Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) key findings.....	35
Appendix 4. Secondary Prevention of Small Subcortical Strokes (SPS3) key findings.....	36
References	37

Introduction

Hypertension, or high blood pressure (BP), is the most common condition seen in primary care; over half of people 55 and older have a diagnosis of hypertension.^{1,2} According to national survey data, an estimated 34% of American adults have high blood pressure (historically defined for surveillance purposes as a systolic blood pressure (SBP) ≥ 140 mm Hg, diastolic blood pressure (DBP) ≥ 90 mm Hg, patient currently taking antihypertensive medicine, or patient told at least twice by a health care professional that he/she has hypertension), which corresponds to about 85.7 million people in total.²


A higher percentage of men than women have hypertension until 65 years of age, at which point the prevalence switches (Figure 1). Overall, more women (44.9 million) than men (40.8 million) have hypertension.² The American College of Cardiology and the American Heart Association (ACC/AHA) published 2017 hypertension guidelines in which the definition for stage 1 hypertension was reduced from 140/90 mm Hg to 130/80 mm Hg, which is expected to substantially increase these numbers.^{3,4}

Figure 1: Prevalence of hypertension among U.S. adults from 2011 to 2014²



The prevalence of hypertension rises dramatically with age.⁵ The components of blood pressure change differently during aging so that, on average, SBP usually increases with age while DBP decreases with age (Figure 2). For adults 45 years of age without hypertension, the 40-year risk of developing hypertension was 93% for African-American, 92% for Hispanic, 86% for white, and 84% for Chinese-American adults.⁶

Figure 2: Trends in SBP and DBP with age⁷



SBP and DBP by age and race or ethnicity for men and women over 18 years of age in the U.S. population. Data from NHANES III, 1988–1991.

Left untreated, hypertension raises the risk of heart attack, stroke, renal failure, and death.⁸ For individuals 40–70 years of age, across ranges of <115 mm Hg to >180 mm Hg for SBP and <75 mm Hg to >105 mm Hg for DBP, each increment of 20 mm Hg in SBP or 10 mm Hg in DBP doubles the risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD).⁹ Evidence from numerous clinical trials shows that treating patients for hypertension significantly reduces CVD and death.^{8,10}


Table 1: Impact of active antihypertensive treatment in reducing cardiovascular events^{7,11,12}

Outcome	Average percent relative reduction
Stroke	35-40%
Myocardial infarction	15-25%
Heart failure	Up to 64%

Randomized clinical trials among individuals with hypertension have demonstrated that for every 10 mm Hg SBP lowering with medical therapy, there was a relative reduction in CVD events by 20%, coronary heart disease (CHD) by 17%, stroke by 27%, and heart failure by 28%.¹³

Although the percentage of patients with hypertension who are receiving treatment and achieving adequate blood pressure control has been improving slowly over the past several decades,¹⁴ data from the 2011-2014 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) found that 16% of U.S. adults with hypertension are not aware they have the condition.² In addition, of those currently being treated for hypertension, only 54% have their hypertension under control, defined as BP <140/90 mm Hg (Figure 3).²

Figure 3: AHA statistics for hypertension awareness and treatment (2011-2014)²



Nonadherence to antihypertensive therapy is common, with significant disparities along racial/ethnic and geographic lines. A 2016 review of Medicare claims data of 18.5 million individuals found that 26.3% of patients (4.9 million) who had been started on antihypertensives were nonadherent to their regimen.¹⁵ Nonadherence differed by multiple factors, including medication class (range: 16.9% for angiotensin II receptor blockers to 28.9% for diuretics); race-ethnicity (24.3% for non-Hispanic whites, 33.8% for Hispanics, 35.7% for blacks, and 38.8% for American Indians/Alaska Natives); and state of residence (range 18.7% for North Dakota to 33.7% for the District of Columbia).¹⁵

In recent years, new evidence from large, well-controlled clinical trials has given clinicians valuable information about how to help patients set blood pressure goals and about the pharmacological and non-pharmacological options for reaching them.

In conjunction with nine other health organizations, the ACC/AHA published the 2017 guidelines for the prevention, detection, evaluation and management of hypertension in adults.⁸ This was the first release of a major guideline in hypertension since the Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee (JNC7), which was published in 2003.⁷ The updated ACC/AHA recommendations address the framework for defining hypertension, blood pressure thresholds for initiation of antihypertensive medication, and blood pressure treatment goals.⁸

This evidence document consolidates all the available evidence for optimal management of hypertension and provides a clear roadmap for the diagnosis and treatment of this common cause of morbidity and mortality.

BOTTOM LINE: Hypertension is common and, if untreated, is the single most important cause of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular disease. Approximately 16% of U.S. adults with hypertension are not aware they have it, and only 54% have their hypertension under control. Primary care providers can play a vital role in helping to reduce the burden of untreated or under-treated hypertension.

Classifying blood pressure

Elevated blood pressure and hypertension are associated with increased risk of CVD, end stage renal disease (ESRD), subclinical atherosclerosis, and all-cause death. Accurate classification of a patient's blood pressure status allows for careful monitoring over time and facilitates both initial treatment decisions and assessment of the response to management interventions.


Definitions and classifications of hypertension have evolved over the past few decades. Since the 1970's, the Joint National Committee (JNC) guidelines were widely consulted for hypertension definitions and treatment approaches. JNC7 (2003) introduced the concept of "prehypertension" for SBP between 120 and 139 mm Hg, based on the idea that earlier adoption of healthy lifestyle may reduce progression to hypertension. The JNC8 never completed its work, but a subset of panelists published a guideline in 2014 that recommended raising target SBP goals from 140 to 150 mmHg in subjects aged ≥ 60 years, as well as removing prior recommendations for tighter blood pressure control in individuals with diabetes or chronic kidney disease. However, this report relied exclusively on systematic review of randomized controlled trials and omitted data from nonrandomized and observational studies. While it was endorsed by the American College of Physicians (ACP) and the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), it was not otherwise widely endorsed or implemented.^{1,7,16} The 2017 guidelines on hypertension from the ACC/AHA advocated a paradigm shift in the way blood pressure is defined and managed. These guidelines recommended lowering the blood pressure threshold for the diagnosis of hypertension and incorporation of CVD risk into decisions on treatment initiation and goals.⁸

Blood pressure definitions

The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines differ from previous reports by defining hypertension at a lower blood pressure level. In contrast to the previous JNC7 (2003) and JNC8 (2014) guidelines, in which hypertension was classified as a blood pressure of 140/90 mm Hg or higher, the AHA/ACC 2017 guidelines define hypertension as blood pressure of 130/80 mm Hg or higher, regardless of comorbidities. The new guidelines divide the JNC7-created category of "pre-hypertension" (SBP 120–139 mm Hg/DBP 80–89 mm Hg) into 2 categories: a new category of "elevated BP" (SBP 120–129 mm Hg/DBP < 80 mm Hg) and stage 1 hypertension (SBP 130–139 mm Hg/DBP 80–89 mm Hg) (Figure 4).^{7,8}

The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines recommend initiating medication for patients with stage 1 hypertension and either clinical CVD or an estimated 10-year atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) risk of $\geq 10\%$, as determined by the ACC/AHA pooled cohort equations.⁸ For individuals over the age of 79, the 10-year ASCVD risk is generally $> 10\%$, and thus the SBP threshold for antihypertensive drug treatment for these patients is 130 mm Hg.⁸ Stratifying by CVD risk in addition to blood pressure identifies patients facing greater risks of cardiovascular events and who are thus most likely to benefit from antihypertensive treatment.³

Figure 4: Categories of blood pressure classification in adults⁸




The redefinition of the hypertension categories was based on a pragmatic interpretation of blood pressure-related CVD risk and the benefit of blood pressure reduction in clinical trials, which demonstrated a gradient of progressively higher CVD risk going from normal to elevated blood pressure (Hazard ratio (HR): 1.1–1.5) and from elevated to stage 1 hypertension (HR: 1.5–2.0).⁸

Impact of new classification


The definitions in the new ACC/AHA guidelines substantially increase the proportion of U.S. adults defined as having hypertension. Nearly 14% more adults will be diagnosed with hypertension. Applying the 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines to the entire U.S. general population would result in an additional 4.2 million people who are now recommended to start an antihypertensive medication and an additional 8 million patients who need intensification of current pharmacologic management. The differing perception of who is considered hypertensive, and subsequently recommended for pharmacological antihypertensive treatment according to the 2017 ACC/AHA and the JNC7 guidelines is illustrated in Figure 5.³

Figure 5: Differing perception of hypertension, pharmacological needs, and treatment goals according to the 2017 ACC/AHA and the JNC7 guidelines³



Overall, 31.3% of U.S. adults with an SBP of 130 to 139 mm Hg or a DBP 80 to 89 mm Hg are recommended for antihypertensive medication according to the 2017 ACC/AHA guideline (Figure 6), with most older adults requiring an antihypertensive medication.⁸

Figure 6: Percentage of U.S. adults recommended for antihypertensive medication according to the 2017 ACC/AHA guideline³



BOTTOM LINE: The 2017 hypertension guidelines changed the definition of hypertension to a blood pressure of 130/80 mm Hg or higher, regardless of comorbidities, and advocate for incorporating CVD risk status into the decision to start antihypertensive medication.

Measuring blood pressure accurately

Blood pressure determination is one of the most important measurements in clinical medicine and yet it is often performed inaccurately.¹⁷ Surveys show that physicians and other health care providers rarely follow established guidelines for blood pressure measurement; however, when they do, the readings correlate much more closely with externally validated measures of blood pressure than the usual clinic readings.¹⁷ Accurate measurement and proper recording of blood pressure are essential for categorizing blood pressure level, ascertaining CVD risk, and guiding management of hypertension.

Best practices for blood pressure measurement

Measurement accuracy

Proper technique for blood pressure measurement is vital not just for proper diagnosis but because, when measurements are used to guide medication and dosing decisions, errors could result in either over- or under-treatment.⁸ Common mistakes that can lead to inaccurate blood pressure measurements include failure to allow for a rest period, talking with the patient during or immediately before the recording, inappropriate cuff size, improper patient positioning, rapid cuff deflation (for auscultatory readings), and measuring blood pressure only once.¹⁸

The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines recommend that healthcare providers follow a standard checklist of best practices when taking blood pressure measurements.⁸

Table 2: ACC/AHA checklist for accurate measurement of blood pressure⁸

Steps	Specific instructions
Properly prepare the patient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the patient relax, sitting in a chair (feet on the floor, back supported) for >5 min. • The patient should avoid caffeine, exercise, and smoking for at least 30 min before measurement. • Ensure patient has emptied his/her bladder. • Neither the patient nor the observer should talk during the rest period or during the measurement. • Remove all clothing covering the location of cuff placement. • Measurements made while the patient is sitting or lying on an examining table do not fulfill these criteria.
Use proper technique for BP measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use a BP measurement device that has been validated, and ensure that the device is calibrated periodically. • Support the patient's arm (e.g., resting on a desk) • Position the middle of the cuff on the patient's upper arm at the level of the right atrium (the midpoint of the sternum). • Use the correct cuff size, such that the bladder encircles 80% of the arm, and note if a larger or smaller than normal cuff size is used. • Either the stethoscope diaphragm or bell may be used for auscultatory readings.
Take the proper measurements needed for diagnosis and treatment of elevated BP/hypertension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the first visit, record BP in both arms. Use the arm that gives the higher reading for subsequent readings. • Separate repeated measurements by 1-2 min. • For auscultatory determinations, use a palpated estimate of radial pulse obliteration pressure to estimate SBP. Inflate the cuff 20-30 mm Hg above this level for an auscultatory determination of the BP level. • For auscultatory readings, deflate the cuff pressure 2 mm Hg per second, and listen for Korotkoff sounds.
Properly document accurate BP readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record SBP and DBP. If using the auscultatory technique, record SBP and DBP as onset of the first Korotkoff sound and disappearance of all Korotkoff sounds, respectively, using the nearest even number. • Note the time of most recent BP medication taken before measurements.
Average the readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use an average of ≥ 2 readings obtained on ≥ 2 occasions to estimate the individual's level of BP.
Provide BP readings to patient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide patient's SBP/DBP readings both verbally and in writing.

As busy health care providers often do not have time to follow each item on the official checklist, they can also refer to an abbreviated version during the procedure, such as the '3 R's' checklist (Table 3), which may increase the accuracy of measurement.

Table 3: Condensed checklist for taking blood pressure measurements

Rest.

Relax.

Repeat.


- **Have patient rest in a chair for 5 minutes**, with back supported and feet on the floor.
- **Place arm comfortably** on a flat surface at heart level.
- **Sit calmly** without conversation.
- **Make sure cuff size is correct** and BP device is calibrated.
- **Take at least two readings** with at least a minute between each reading.

Measurement frequency

Blood pressure varies within an individual over short time intervals, and recent expert panels have emphasized using multiple measurements for deciding the status of patients. In busy primary care practices, blood pressure is often only measured once. The ACC/AHA recommends repeating a blood pressure measurement at the same clinic visit with at least 1 minute between readings and using the average of two or more readings for classification instead of relying on a single value.⁸

A repeat blood pressure measurement during the same office visit may result in a lower SBP. In patients with hypertension, repeated measurement of an initially elevated blood pressure was associated with a median of 8 mm Hg improvement in SBP and increased hypertension control rate from 61% to 73%. This change in SBP is approximately equal to the effect of adding a new antihypertensive medication (i.e. clinically meaningful). The change in SBP was positively associated with the initial blood pressure value; the higher the initial SBP, the greater the change in final SBP (Figure 7).¹⁹ Since these results suggest that repeating a blood pressure measurement within the same clinic visit resulted in lower blood pressure, it is important to obtain repeat measurements for accurate assessment.

Figure 7: Median change in SBP on repeat measurement by initial SBP subgroup¹⁹



Types of blood pressure measurements

Types of non-invasive blood pressure measurements include office-based, home-based blood pressure monitoring (HBPM), ambulatory blood pressure monitoring (ABPM), and research protocol measurement. HBPM is used to obtain a record of out-of-office blood pressure measurements taken by a patient. ABPM is used to obtain automated out-of-office blood pressure readings at set intervals throughout the day to provide daytime, nighttime and 24-hour averages.

Both ABPM and HBPM can estimate blood pressure based on multiple measurements. Although ABPM is generally accepted as the best out-of-office measurement method, insurance coverage can be difficult to obtain, so HBPM is often more practical in routine settings.

Blood pressure measurements vary based on the setting in which they are recorded; measurements taken in the office are higher than those taken by ABPM or HBPM, especially at higher blood pressure levels.⁸

Table 4: Equivalent corresponding values of SBP/DBP by measurement type and location⁸

Clinic	HBPM	Daytime ABPM	Nighttime ABPM	24-hour ABPM
120/80	120/80	120/80	100/65	115/75
130/80	130/80	130/80	110/65	125/75
140/90	135/85	135/85	120/70	130/80
160/100	145/90	145/90	140/85	145/90

In-office blood pressure measurement

In-office measurements are usually conducted with auscultatory or automated devices that are used without reference to rest, position, number of readings, or averaging method. Office-based measurements are generally higher than research setting measurements by 6 to 14/4 to 10 mm Hg (SBP/DBP).²⁰

Oscillometric devices have become the clinical standard for measuring blood pressure in the office, using a sensor that detects oscillations in pulsatile blood volume during inflation and deflation of the cuff. Many newer devices automatically inflate multiple times at set intervals, which allows patients to be undisturbed during measurement.⁸ Randomized controlled trials have shown that measuring blood pressure using an automated device better correlates with ambulatory blood pressure and reduces the likelihood of white coat hypertension compared to manual blood pressure measurement.²¹

In-office blood pressure measurement has been historically used for diagnosis and management of hypertension, and generally involves a patient, an administrator (usually doctor or nurse), and a device to measure blood pressure. Many factors can affect the levels of blood pressure measured, such as the number of visits, number of readings, sitting posture, device type and measurement method, administrator error and bias, administrator presence, and talking during rest period and measurement. For these reasons, in-office measurements are prone to multiple sources of error, such as inaccurate devices and failure to standardize the circumstances of measurement.¹⁸ The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines recommend in-office measurement solely as a screening method for the identification of hypertension and out-of-office blood pressure measurement (ABPM or HBPM) to confirm the diagnosis.⁸

Home-based blood pressure measurement

Self-monitoring of blood pressure (regular measurement by an individual at home or elsewhere outside the clinic setting) is recommended to confirm the diagnosis of hypertension and for titration of blood pressure-lowering medication. Self-measurement of blood pressure at home, work, or in a pharmacy can provide useful information about differences between in-office and out-of-office blood pressure as well as response to therapy. Patients who self-monitor blood pressure should be provided with clear instructions on blood pressure measurement and obtain blood pressures using a validated measurement device.⁸

For patients with suspected white coat hypertension (elevated office blood pressure with normal blood pressure when measured at home), self-monitoring should be used before or in place of ABPM. Patients should take duplicate morning and evening self-measurements using a validated upper arm blood pressure device for seven days and calculate the average after discarding measurements on the first day. Patients unable to use an upper arm device can use wrist devices instead. Finger devices are not recommended due to concerns that peripheral vasoconstriction can skew results.²² For additional information and resources on blood pressure measurement resources, such as a home blood pressure measurement patient instruction handout, visit AlosaHealth.org/Hypertension.

Ambulatory blood pressure monitoring

Automated ABPM is used to obtain out-of-office blood pressure measurements at set intervals (e.g., every 15 to 30 minutes during day and every 15 minutes to 1 hour during night), usually over a 24-hour period as individuals go about their normal daily activities. The most common indication for ABPM is suspected white coat hypertension.

ABPM may also be useful in evaluating patients with suspected masked hypertension (normal office blood pressure with elevated blood pressure when measured at home), drug-resistant hypertension, episodic hypertension, or hypotensive symptoms with antihypertensive medication.⁷ ABPM is reimbursed by Medicare for the evaluation of white coat hypertension (with appropriate documentation) but may not be covered for other indications depending on type of insurance.²³ Individual ABPM providers may be reluctant to bill insurance directly given the need for medical documentation prior to reimbursement by CMS.

ABPM provides a more comprehensive assessment of blood pressure and has been reported to better predict health outcomes than measurements taken in the clinic or at home. Specifically, it may predict long term CVD risk and all-cause mortality more accurately than office-based blood pressure monitoring. An analysis of data from the Spanish Ambulatory Blood Pressure Registry of a large cohort of patients in primary care (n= 63,910) examined the associations of blood pressure measured in the clinic and 24-hour ABPM with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. 24-hour SBP measurements from ABPM were found to be more strongly associated with all-cause mortality (HR 1.58 per 1-SD increase in pressure; 95% CI: 1.56-1.60) after adjustment for clinic blood pressure than clinic SBP (HR 1.02; 95% CI: 1.00-1.04) after adjustment for 24-hour blood pressure. Masked hypertension was more strongly associated with all-cause mortality (HR 2.83; 95% CI: 2.12-3.79) than sustained hypertension, defined as elevated clinic and elevated 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure (HR 1.80; 95% CI: 1.41-2.31) or white-coat hypertension (HR 1.79, 95% CI: 1.38-2.32). The ability to predict all-cause mortality was significantly better with ambulatory SBP than clinic SBP (discriminatory ability 0.94 vs. 0.79).²⁴

Research protocol blood pressure measurement

Monitoring blood pressure in clinical trials is conducted differently than in clinical practice. Measurement of blood pressure in the SPRINT trial, a pivotal trial of blood pressure lowering in patients with hypertension comparing an SBP goal of <120 mm Hg to a goal of <140 mm Hg, was representative of research protocol measurement.¹² Measurement was performed after a mandatory seated rest in a quiet room for 5 minutes, after which 3 recordings were made at 1-minute intervals. The average of these recordings was used to determine the blood pressure of study participants. See Appendix 2 for more information about SPRINT. In these types of measurements, methodology is carefully standardized, follows a protocol, and requires careful training. In everyday clinical office and home-based settings, these meticulous methods are likely not implemented.²⁵

Variation of blood pressure measurement by setting

Hypertension can be differentiated into several clinically useful categories depending on the setting of blood pressure measurement:⁸

Table 5: Blood pressure patterns based on office and out-of-office measurements

	Office/clinic/healthcare setting	Home/nonhealthcare/ABPM setting
Normotensive	No hypertension	No hypertension
Sustained hypertension	Hypertension	Hypertension
Masked hypertension	No hypertension	Hypertension
White coat hypertension	Hypertension	No hypertension

White coat hypertension is characterized by elevated office blood pressure but normal readings when measured outside the office with either ABPM or HBPM. The prevalence of white coat hypertension averages approximately 13% and as high as 35% in some hypertensive populations, such as the elderly, females, and nonsmokers.^{8,26}

White coat hypertension has been associated with an increased risk of CVD and all-cause mortality risk. In 1% to 5% of cases per year, white coat hypertension can convert to **sustained hypertension**, defined as elevated blood pressure readings in both office and out-of-office settings.²⁴ There is a higher incidence of conversion in patients with elevated blood pressure, older age, obesity, or black race. This may warrant the addition of antihypertensive drug therapy to lifestyle modification.


In adults with an untreated SBP >130 but <160 mm Hg or DBP >80 but <100 mm Hg, it is reasonable to screen for the presence of white coat hypertension using either daytime ABPM or HBPM before diagnosis of hypertension. In adults with white coat hypertension, periodic monitoring with either ABPM or HBPM can detect transition to sustained hypertension.⁸

Masked hypertension is characterized by office readings suggesting normal blood pressure accompanied by out-of-office (ABPM/HBPM) readings that are consistently above normal. The prevalence of masked hypertension varies from 10% to 26% (mean 13%) in population-based surveys and from 14% to 30% in normotensive clinic populations and increases with higher office blood pressure readings.⁸

Although masked hypertension is less prevalent than white coat hypertension, it is associated with a CVD and mortality risk twice as high as those seen in normotensive individuals. In patients with treated hypertension, this condition is referred to as masked uncontrolled hypertension. Patients with increased CVD risk or target end-organ damage should use HBPM to screen for masked uncontrolled hypertension. In adults with elevated office blood pressure (SBP 120-129 mm Hg and DBP <80 mm Hg) without a diagnosis of hypertension, screening for masked hypertension using HBPM may identify patients who would benefit from a more aggressive treatment approach. The decision to screen for masked hypertension should involve a conversation between patient and provider.

In-office blood pressure measurements are particularly vulnerable to being confounded by white coat and masked hypertension. In adults being treated for hypertension with office blood pressure readings above goal and HBPM readings at or below goal, confirmation of white coat hypertension diagnosis by ABPM can be useful. Out-of-office readings can confirm blood pressure control seen with office readings.

Figure 8: Approach for suspected white coat hypertension or masked hypertension in patients not on drug therapy⁸



BOTTOM LINE: Out-of-office methods such as home-based or ambulatory blood pressure monitoring are appropriate for both diagnosis and management of hypertension and may help distinguish between white coat hypertension and masked hypertension in untreated patients.

Patient evaluation

Once a patient has been identified as having hypertension, evaluation should include:

1. assessing potential lifestyle factors that may be elevating blood pressure,
2. identifying other cardiovascular risk factors or concomitant disorders that will guide treatment,
3. searching for identifiable secondary causes of high blood pressure, and
4. determining the presence and extent of end-organ damage.

Many lifestyle factors influence blood pressure, including diet, physical activity, and alcohol consumption. Some of the diet-related factors associated with high blood pressure include overweight and obesity, excess sodium intake, and insufficient intake of potassium, calcium, magnesium, protein, fiber, and fish fats.

There is a strong association between higher blood pressure and increased CVD risk, especially in older persons. The population-attributable risk of outcomes associated with hypertension, such as chronic heart disease, stroke, and end-stage renal disease (ESRD), is high.

Secondary causes of hypertension are uncommon. Consider a work-up for secondary hypertension in patients with any of the following: abdominal bruit, accelerated or resistant hypertension, recurrent flash pulmonary edema, renal failure, or onset of hypertension under age 30 without a family history.

Potential causes of secondary hypertension include:

- sleep apnea
- drug or alcohol-induced hypertension
- chronic kidney disease
- primary aldosteronism
- renovascular disease
- chronic steroid therapy or Cushing's syndrome
- pheochromocytoma
- coarctation of the aorta
- thyroid or parathyroid disease

Prescription or over-the-counter medications may raise blood pressure within the normal range or cause overt hypertension, as can stimulants used recreationally. The most common medications with this potential are oral contraceptives (particularly with higher doses of estrogen), NSAIDs, antidepressants, glucocorticoids, decongestants (especially pseudoephedrine), stimulants (including weight loss medications containing stimulants), and cyclosporine.

Laboratory testing is recommended in all patients newly diagnosed with hypertension in order to identify common comorbid conditions and prior to initiating medications. Recommended laboratory testing includes serum electrolytes and renal function, fasting glucose or hemoglobin A1c, urinalysis, and lipid profile. In addition, a baseline electrocardiogram should be obtained in order to assess for left ventricle hypertrophy (LVH) or silent ischemic heart disease.


BOTTOM LINE: Assess patients for modifiable risk factors, comorbidities, potential secondary causes, and end-organ damage prior to developing a treatment plan for hypertension.

Managing hypertension

When to start treatment

Lifestyle or non-drug therapies such as sodium reduction and weight loss are the backbone of any hypertension management plan (see page 21 for more detail on these interventions). The 2017 ACC/AHA guideline recommends these interventions for anyone with a BP >120/80 mm Hg.⁸ The decision to start pharmacologic therapy is based on blood pressure alone for all patients with stage 2 hypertension and for patients with stage 1 hypertension with either existing CVD or an elevated risk of developing CVD.

Figure 9: Algorithm for initiating management based on blood pressure



*ASCVD (atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease) includes acute coronary syndrome, myocardial infarction, angina, revascularization, stroke, TIA, or peripheral arterial disease.

Role of cardiovascular risk assessment

Considering both absolute CVD risk and blood pressure levels to guide treatment has been shown to be effective at reducing risk of CVD.²⁷ However, use of global assessments to estimate CVD risk thresholds is still infrequent in routine clinical practice to date, as it does represent a more complex approach than using blood pressure measurements alone to guide treatment. The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines recommend initiating pharmacologic blood pressure treatment in the context of CVD risk by estimating

10-year risk of ASCVD with the pooled cohort equation to establish the blood pressure threshold for treatment.⁸

Thresholds for starting pharmacologic therapy

In line with their modified definitions of hypertension, the 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines maintain that the blood pressure threshold of 130/80 mm Hg can be used to determine whether a patient should be considered a candidate for treatment.^{3,8} Special comorbidities are also aligned with current blood pressure treatment thresholds, except when used in secondary prevention of non-lacunar strokes.

Table 6: Blood pressure thresholds for starting antihypertensive treatment by clinical condition^{3,8}

	JNC7 (2003) (mm Hg)	ACC/AHA (2017) (mm Hg)
General		
Clinical CVD or 10-year ASCVD risk $\geq 10\%$	*	$\geq 130/80$
No Clinical CVD and 10-year ASCVD risk $< 10\%$	$\geq 140/90$	$\geq 140/90$
Older persons (≥ 65 years of age; noninstitutionalized, ambulatory, community-living adults)	*	≥ 130 (SBP)
Special comorbidities		
Diabetes mellitus	$\geq 130/80$	$\geq 130/80$
Chronic kidney disease after renal transplantation	$\geq 130/80$	
Heart failure	*	
Stable ischemic heart disease	*	
Peripheral artery disease	*	
Secondary stroke prevention (lacunar)	*	
Secondary stroke prevention	*	$\geq 140/90$

*No specific BP threshold is provided in the guideline for this population. The other thresholds listed from the guideline should be applied, as appropriate. †High cardiovascular risk

BOTTOM LINE: Patients with BP $> 120/80$ mm Hg should receive non-drug therapy. Both blood pressure level and CVD risk factors should be used to guide the decision to start pharmacologic therapy in patients with stage 1 hypertension. Patients with stage 2 hypertension should receive drug and non-drug management.

Blood pressure treatment goals

A common blood pressure goal of 130/80 mm Hg was defined in the 2017 ACC/AHA guideline to simplify treatment targets for most patients.⁸ In patients aged 65 and over, the DBP goal was eliminated, but the common SBP goal of <130 mm Hg is retained. This goal is for patients who are ambulatory, community dwelling, and without morbidities such as dementia that would exclude them from clinical trials.

Table 7: Comparison of blood pressure goals recommended by JNC7 and ACC/AHA^{7,8}

	JNC7 (2003) (mm Hg)	ACC/AHA (2017) (mm Hg)
General population	<140/90 (aged <60)	<130/80 (aged <65)
Elderly population	<140/90 (aged ≥60)	<130* (aged ≥65)
Diabetes	<130/80	<130/80
Kidney disease (CKD)	<130/80	<130/80

*Isolated SBP goal for adults ≥65 years of age without a history of CVD, DM, or CKD and a 10-year predicted ASCVD risk <10%.

These same treatment goals apply to patients already on antihypertensive medication.^{2,8} Intensification of therapy may be required to meet new blood pressure goals.

Evidence supporting 2017 ACC/AHA blood pressure goals


The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines evaluated evidence emerging after the publication of the JNC7 guidelines from pivotal trials such as ACCORD BP, SPRINT, and SPS3. See appendices 2, 3, and 4 respectively for further explanation of the findings of SPRINT, ACCORD and SPS3 trials, respectively. In brief:

- ACCORD BP investigated a composite outcome of fatal and nonfatal major cardiovascular events, and found no difference in patients with intensive SBP lowering (<120 mm Hg) compared with standard SBP (<140 mm Hg) in patients with type 2 diabetes and elevated cardiovascular risk, although patients reported a significant increase in treatment-related side effects.^{8,28}
- SPRINT examined the incidence of myocardial infarction, other acute coronary syndromes, stroke, heart failure, or death from cardiovascular causes, and found a 25% relative risk reduction in patients with intensive SBP lowering to <120 mm Hg compared to standard SBP lowering (<140 mm Hg) in non-diabetic patients with elevated cardiovascular risk, and an even greater benefit in patients age 75 and over (relative risk reduction 34%).^{12,29} Side effects were more common in the intensive treatment group but the risk of injurious falls was not statistically different.
- SPS3 evaluated SBP lowering to <130 mm Hg vs. <140 mm Hg in patients with recent lacunar stroke, finding no difference in the risk of recurrent stroke between these two thresholds for most patients, but benefit in patients with lacunar strokes.³⁰

Emerging evidence has indicated that more aggressive reduction of SBP reduces CVD risk. A 2017 network meta-analysis of 42 trials including 144,220 patients assessed whether achieved SBP correlated with CVD or all-cause mortality in adults with hypertension who were treated with antihypertensive therapy. The study found a linear association between mean achieved SBP and risk of cardiovascular disease (Figure 10), as well as with SBP and all-cause mortality.⁴ All-cause mortality is lowest for an achieved SBP of 120 to 124 mm Hg (HR 0.73; 95% CI: 0.58-0.93) compared with those with a mean

achieved SBPs of 130 to 134 mm Hg, with even greater reductions when compared to 140 to 144 mm Hg, and ≥ 160 mm Hg.⁴ These results support tighter control of blood pressure among adults with hypertension, as long as the treatment is well tolerated.^{4,8}

Figure 10: Reducing blood pressure prevents CVD events, with even greater reductions at lower blood pressure targets.⁴



The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines took the above and other findings into consideration when establishing a common blood pressure goal. As blood pressure measurement technique in RCTs differs from routine clinical practice in way that can result in lower readings, the recommended SBP target (<130 mm Hg) was higher than what was used in SPRINT (<120 mm Hg). The AHA/ACC guidelines also provide a single SBP target for all conditions.⁸

BOTTOM LINE: In the general population of non-institutionalized, ambulatory adults, treating hypertension to a blood pressure goal of $<130/80$ mm Hg will reduce morbidity and mortality and prevent major cardiovascular events.

Response to the ACC/AHA guidelines

The “one size fits all” $<130/80$ mm Hg blood pressure target has been met with mixed reactions. Some organizations, such as the ACP/AAFP, have taken the position that a single blood pressure treatment target for a broad population of older adults is not supported by sufficient evidence and may result in suboptimal care. This is because the risks associated with high blood pressure form a continuum and patient individualization is critical to proper treatment. While some individuals may benefit from more stringent targets, these targets may also lead to unnecessary treatment and potential side effects in other individuals.^{16,31}

In 2017, the ACP/AAFP jointly published clinical guidelines based on the benefits and harms of higher versus lower blood pressure targets for the treatment of hypertension in adults aged 60 years or older.¹⁶ These guidelines support a relaxed SBP goal of <150 mm Hg in those without CV risk, diabetes, or prior stroke.¹⁶ Select data support this recommendation. For example, two randomized trials published prior to SPRINT, JATOS and VALISH, looked at whether an SBP target <140 mm Hg was better at reducing CV events than an SBP target <150 mm Hg. Both trials found no difference in the rate of CV events or side effects between the treatment groups.^{32,33} These results suggest that an SBP goal <150 mm Hg in low risk adults who are older than 60 years is reasonable, and that there is little reason to push for lower targets for these patients.

Table 8: Pivotal blood pressure trials that examine strict vs. less strict BP goals in older adults

Pivotal trial	Target BP (in mm Hg)	Patient characteristics	Results
VALISH (2010) ³³	<140 vs. 140-150	Mean age 76, 5% IHD, 13% DM	No difference HR: 0.89; 95% CI: 0.60-1.34; p=0.38
JATOS (2008) ³²	<140 vs. 140-160	Mean age 70s, 12%DM, 4%CVA, 3% CVD	No difference HR: ~1.00; 95% CI: 0.77-1.42; p=0.78

In general, the benefits of reducing the risk of CV events by lowering blood pressure must be weighed against increased risks of side effects with intensive therapy. The narrow therapeutic window associated with intensive treatment may require more frequent follow-up to maximize benefit while minimizing the risk of serious adverse events. The ACP/AAFP guidelines state that although some benefit is achieved by aiming for lower blood pressure targets, most benefit occurs with acceptable harms and costs in the pharmacologic treatment of patients who have an SBP of 150 mm Hg or greater. This includes patients who are 60 years of age or older.¹⁶ Blood pressure targets should be modified if they cannot be safely achieved without undue side effects, such as significant orthostatic hypotension. Blood pressure of older adults may decrease over time and require less antihypertensive therapy.¹⁶

It is important to realize that the SPRINT population consists of non-institutionalized, ambulatory, community-dwelling adults. Common reasons for exclusion from the trial included conditions that cause concern regarding safety of the protocol, such as CVD event or procedure, symptomatic heart failure, a medical condition likely to limit survival, or dementia, which resulted in exclusion of the majority of multimorbid, frail older adults who are at highest risk of adverse events from intensive blood pressure lowering.¹² Moreover, self-reported outcomes of physical and mental health did not differ significantly between intensive and standard blood pressure lowering groups.³⁴ Therefore, a target SBP <130 mmHg should not be routinely recommended without considering the individual's benefit, risk of adverse events, and preferences.

Taken together, the new blood pressure guidelines are a starting point, but do not represent a mandate that should be used for uniform evaluation of clinicians or systems. Rather than being imposed bluntly as a means of dictating decisions, they should be used to support clinical practice. Focusing on the larger goal of ensuring that those with substantially elevated blood pressures receive appropriate diagnosis and treatment rather than debates about specific blood pressure target values will yield the greatest overall improvements in health outcomes.³⁵

BOTTOM LINE: Competing recommendations for BP goals from various societies reflect the complexity of interpreting the many studies of hypertension but should not obscure the important benefits of hypertension treatment, especially for patients with very elevated BP. These position statements should be used to support clinical practice while incorporating the needs and preferences of individual patients, and are not intended to be used for performance evaluation for all patients.

Treatments for hypertension

Non-pharmacologic treatment

Clinicians should recommend modification of lifestyle factors that may be contributing to hypertension and these efforts should continue concurrently with any other treatments pursued. Modifications shown to reduce blood pressure and lower CV risk include weight loss, the DASH (Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension) diet, sodium reduction, potassium supplementation, increased physical activity, and reduced alcohol consumption. These interventions may be sufficient to prevent hypertension in patients with elevated blood pressure and contribute to reaching blood pressure goals in managing patients with stage 1 and 2 hypertension. Behavioral strategies that are aimed at lifestyle change can also reduce blood pressure.⁸

According to the 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines, non-pharmacologic lifestyle interventions are recommended in those with elevated blood pressure (SBP>120 mm Hg), with reassessment in 3 to 6 months. Individuals who would benefit from these modifications include those with hypertension, as well as those at risk of developing hypertension (black, overweight, high alcohol and sodium consumption, and physically inactive).⁸

Although the amount of blood pressure reduction that can be expected from any single lifestyle intervention is relatively modest, the cumulative effect of multiple interventions can be significant and may allow for the avoidance or minimization of pharmacological therapy in motivated patients.

Table 9: Nonpharmacological interventions for prevention and treatment of hypertension⁸


Intervention	Goal	Approximate reduction in BP	
		Hypertension	Normotension
Weight loss	Aim for at least a 1-kg reduction in body weight for most adults who are overweight. Expect about 1 mm Hg for every 1-kg reduction in body weight	5 mm Hg	2-3 mm Hg
Healthy diet	DASH dietary pattern: Consume a diet rich in fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and low-fat dairy products, with reduced content of saturated and total fat	11 mm Hg	3 mm Hg
Reduced intake of dietary sodium	At least a 1000-mg/d reduction in most adults (ideally <1500 mg/d)	5-6 mm Hg	2-3 mm Hg

Enhanced intake of dietary potassium	3500–5000 mg/d	4-5 mm Hg	2 mm Hg
Physical activity	90–150 min/week aerobic activity	5-6 mm Hg	2-4 mm Hg
Moderation in alcohol intake	Men: ≤2 drinks daily Women: ≤1 drink daily	4 mm Hg	3 mm Hg

The positive effects of aerobic exercise on blood pressure were demonstrated in a meta-analysis of 54 randomized, controlled trials (2419 participants) involving aerobic exercise interventions such as walking, jogging, or biking for time durations varying from 32 – 350 minutes weekly, with the most common duration of exercise being about 120 minutes weekly.³⁶ Aerobic exercise was associated with a reduction in mean SBP and DBP (-3.84 mm Hg [95% CI, -4.97 to -2.72 mm Hg] and -2.58 mm Hg [95% CI, -3.35 to -1.81 mm Hg], respectively). Blood pressure reductions were seen in patients with and without hypertension, as well as in overweight and normal-weight participants.

Counseling patients on reducing dietary sodium can produce clinically significant results. The Trials of Hypertension Prevention (TOHP I and II) tested the efficacy of non-pharmacological interventions for reducing blood pressure in people with high-normal blood pressure, including counseling on how to identify sodium in the diet, and how to prepare lower sodium foods. The people randomized to the sodium reduction arm (n = 327) had a 25% - 30% reduction in cardiovascular events compared to those in the control arm (n = 417).³⁷

Figure 11: Reduction in CV events with sodium restriction³⁷



BOTTOM LINE: Weight loss may decrease the risk of developing hypertension among those at increased risk. Both counseling and adherence to a low sodium diet may also reduce blood pressure and improve CV outcomes. Although the amount of blood pressure reduction that can be expected from any single lifestyle intervention is relatively modest, the cumulative effect of multiple interventions can be significant.

Pharmacologic treatment


Hypertension can be treated with medications from multiple classes, each with different mechanisms of action. Four classes of antihypertensive medications are recommended: thiazide type-diuretics, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs), angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs), and calcium channel blockers (CCBs). Over two-thirds of patients with hypertension will eventually require more than one medication.³⁸ For example, in the SPRINT trial, patients randomized to intensive treatment required on average three medications to achieve a target SBP <120 mm Hg.¹² According to the 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines, for patients with stage 2 hypertension or baseline blood pressure more than 20/10 mm Hg above target, it may be appropriate to start 2 first-line agents, either separately or as a fixed-dose combination.⁸

In the past four decades, numerous clinical trials have compared individual antihypertensive medications to placebo, using blood pressure lowering as a major outcome.^{39,40,41} Meta-analyses have combined these data to calculate the average effect on blood pressure of each of the four main classes of antihypertensive medication. The results show similar blood pressure-lowering effects for standard-dose anti-hypertensives in each major drug class.^{42,43}

In general, unless other compelling indications exist (e.g., the use of beta-blockers for patients with recent myocardial infarction), there is no strong evidence to favor any one particular antihypertensive drug or class over another for initial therapy. One meta-analysis published in 2009 examined the 46 trials that directly compared one drug class against another for the prevention of coronary heart disease events (defined as fatal or nonfatal MI or sudden cardiac death) or stroke.⁴⁴ Those authors concluded that all the classes of blood pressure lowering drugs have a similar effect for a given reduction in blood pressure.

On the basis of this meta-analysis and the protocols of more recently-published large pivotal trials, we suggest that **the choice of pharmacologic agent is less important than achieving the appropriate blood pressure goal**. Calcium channel blockers (CCBs) may have minor additional benefits for stroke prevention compared to other antihypertensive agents (see CCB section below).

Figure 12. Relative risk estimates of CHD events in 46 drug comparison trials⁴⁴



Thiazide-type diuretics

Thiazide-type diuretics inhibit about 5% of sodium reabsorption and are longer-acting and exert greater antihypertensive effect than loop diuretics. The landmark Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT) trial randomized nearly 40,000 patients with hypertension into one of four treatment groups and compared clinical outcomes.⁴⁵ The four drug classes were diuretics, calcium-channel blockers, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs), and alpha-blockers. The alpha-blocker arm was stopped early because of increased risk of CVD, especially heart failure compared with diuretic arm.

The ALLHAT trial found that thiazide-type diuretics were equivalent to ACEIs and CCBs for preventing the primary CV outcome. However, **thiazides were superior to either ACEIs or CCBs in preventing heart failure** (a secondary outcome). At the time the study was conducted, thiazides were substantially less expensive than the other two drug classes and thus the JNC7 guidelines recommended thiazides as the initial drug of choice. See Appendix 1 for the costs of various antihypertensives by class.

The blood pressure lowering effect of thiazides is not immediate. Most patients will respond with a reduction in blood pressure within 4 weeks, although a minority of patients will not achieve maximum reduction for up to 12 weeks.³² If blood pressure control is inadequate after a reasonable time period, rather than increase the dose of the diuretic, it is better to add another drug from a different class, and to re-emphasize the importance of lifestyle changes. For patients who require more than one drug to control their hypertension, thiazides should generally be part of the regimen.

Few head-to-head trials have compared different thiazides with one another in terms of clinical outcomes, although both chlorthalidone and hydrochlorothiazide (HCTZ) lower blood pressure effectively.⁴⁶ Indirect comparisons of thiazides suggest that both agents have equal effects on reducing rates of serious CV events, and both appear equally safe.⁴⁷ Increasing the dose achieves little additional gain in blood pressure control, but does increase the rate of adverse effects.

Concerns about metabolic side effects of thiazides such as hypokalemia, hyperglycemia, hyperuricemia, or hyponatremia were based on early studies in which higher doses of thiazides were used (e.g., 50–100 mg/d of HCTZ). At lower doses (e.g., 12.5 mg/day of HCTZ), thiazides provide very effective blood pressure control and side effects rates that are indistinguishable from other classes of anti-hypertensives (and only 2% more than placebo).^{48,49}

Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs)

No randomized head-to-head trials have compared the effect of different ACEIs on clinical outcomes in patients with hypertension, although many studies have compared specific ACEIs with placebo, or with drugs from other antihypertensive classes. These trials have not found any consistent advantage of any one ACEI over another.⁵⁰ Several trials compared the rates of adverse events from ACEIs in patients with hypertension and found no important differences among them in rates of common side effects such as hypotension, cough, angioedema, hyperkalemia, or elevated serum creatinine.⁵¹

- A meta-analysis of 26 trials, involving 152,290 patients, found no difference in CV events between ACEIs or ARBs when compared against other antihypertensives in patients with reduced glomerular filtration rates (eGFR).⁵²
- Among patients with diabetes, a meta-analysis of 19 RCTs involving over 25,000 patients with diabetes that compared Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone-System (RAAS) antagonists against other

antihypertensives showed no differences in the risk for adverse clinical outcomes such as death, CV outcomes, or end stage renal disease.⁵³

- ACEIs may not be preferred monotherapy for patients with a history of stroke. Based on the results of PROGRESS⁵⁴, ACEIs were no different than placebo in reducing recurrent stroke.
- When compared with angiotensin-receptor blockers (ARBs), ACE inhibitors have several-fold higher incidence of side effects at most doses, the most common being a dry, irritating cough.⁵⁵ In a meta-analysis of 125 studies including 198,130 patients, the pooled weighted incidence of cough for enalapril was found to be 11.48% (95% CI: 9.54%-13.41%). The pooled weighted withdrawal rate resulting from cough for enalapril was 2.57% (95% CI: 2.40%-2.74%).⁵⁶

Many clinicians have been taught that RAAS inhibitors are efficacious for patients with CKD based on the results from some older clinical trials. For example, the African American Study of Kidney Disease and Hypertension (AASK) trial showed that ramipril was superior to metoprolol or amlodipine among hypertensive African-Americans with renal impairment in reducing a composite outcome that included GFR decline, ESRD and death.⁵⁷ Unfortunately, these findings on renoprotection have either not been consistently replicated or do not extend to hard clinical outcomes such as CV events or ESRD. However, the 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines recommend treatment with an ACE inhibitor to slow kidney disease progression in adults with hypertension and CKD (stage 3 or higher or stage 1 or 2 with albuminuria [≥ 300 mg/d, or ≥ 300 mg/g albumin-to-creatinine ratio or the equivalent in the first morning void]).⁸

An observational study suggests that ACEI may be worse than CCBs or diuretics in some populations. This 2015 propensity-score matched cohort study of community-dwelling African-Americans on a range of antihypertensives found that ACEIs were associated with a higher risk of cardiovascular events (death, myocardial infarction, and stroke) compared with CCBs or thiazide diuretics.⁵⁸

In particular, the RAAS in blacks has typically been perceived to be less active than in whites, as evidenced by a lower average BP reduction to monotherapy with ACEIs and ARBs in blacks. Some evidence suggests that thiazide-type agents are superior to drugs that inhibit the RAAS (i.e., ACE inhibitors, ARBs, renin inhibitors, and beta blockers) for prevention of selected clinical outcomes in blacks.^{8,59} For example, in ALLHAT, lisinopril (an ACEI) was less effective than chlorthalidone (a thiazide-type diuretic) and a CCB in lowering BP and in preventing many major clinical outcomes in black participants.⁵⁹ Therefore, in black adults with hypertension but without heart failure or CKD, including those with diabetes mellitus, initial antihypertensive treatment should include a thiazide-type diuretic or CCB.⁸

Angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs)


ARBs were studied and introduced into routine practice more recently than ACEIs. Compared to ACEIs, ARBs present a lower risk for inducing cough (approximately 10% vs. 3%) or angioedema.¹ Common side effects include dizziness, headache, drowsiness, nausea, and diarrhea. There have been no head-to-head trials of the different ARBs that have measured clinical outcomes or safety.⁶⁰ The existing data do not suggest any meaningful differences among different ARBs.⁶¹

Many trials have found that ACEIs and ARBs are equally effective at lowering blood pressure.⁶² A systematic review also found that ACEIs and ARBs had similar effects on quality of life, progression to diabetes, progression of renal disease, left ventricular function, cardiovascular events, and mortality.⁶² One trial (LIFE) compared the ARB losartan against a beta-blocker atenolol among over 9000 patients

with hypertension and left-ventricular hypertrophy. That trial found that losartan was more effective at preventing a composite CV endpoint than atenolol (HR 0.87; 95%CI: 0.77-0.98).

A 2018 meta-analysis of ACEI and ARB clinical trials compared outcomes and adverse events between ACE inhibitors and ARBs in patients with hypertension, and found no difference in efficacy between the 2 classes with regard to the surrogate endpoint of blood pressure and outcomes of all-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality, myocardial infarction, heart failure, stroke, and end-stage renal disease. However, ARBs showed the highest reduction in SBP and DBP compared with ACEIs and direct renin inhibitors. Additionally, withdrawal rates because of adverse events are lower with ARBs than with ACE inhibitors. Although historically ACEIs had been preferred as first-choice therapy patients with CVD, and ARBs were considered an alternative for ACE inhibitor–intolerant patients, the results from this study suggest that starting with an ARB may be preferred.⁵⁵

Figure 13: Efficacy and safety of ACEIs vs. ARBs⁵⁵



Calcium channel blockers (CCBs)

Two types of CCBs exist: dihydropyridine CCBs (e.g., amlodipine, felodipine) and non-dihydropyridine CCBs (e.g., diltiazem, verapamil). While both are approved for the treatment of hypertension, non-dihydropyridine CCBs are also used for other compelling indications like rate control in atrial fibrillation.

Although no trials have compared CCBs to one another in the treatment of hypertension, trials of CCBs to treat other conditions do not suggest any important differences in efficacy.⁶³ Indirect comparisons of CCBs suggest they are all relatively safe when used to treat hypertension.⁶³ A 2009 meta-analysis that included data for both dihydropyridines and non-dihydropyridine CCBs suggests that CCBs may be more effective than the other antihypertensive classes in preventing stroke.⁴⁴ Common side effects for dihydropyridine CCBs include peripheral edema, fatigue, and pulmonary edema, while dizziness, constipation, first degree AV block, and bradycardia are more common with non-dihydropyridine CCBs. CCBs should be started at a lower dose in older patients or patients with hepatic impairment.

BOTTOM LINE: In general, thiazides, ACEIs/ARBs, and CCBs are equally effective first line antihypertensives. Achieving the blood pressure goal is more important than the specific first-line drug class used to get there. Thiazides may reduce the risk of heart failure compared to an ACEI or CCB. ACEIs are not recommended for monotherapy for secondary prevention of stroke. There are no clinically significant differences between ACEIs and ARBs outcomes, but ARBs show a more favorable safety profile.

Beta-blockers

In early versions of the JNC guidelines, beta-blockers were recommended as first-line agents for treating uncomplicated hypertension. But since 2005 several reviews have highlighted limitations of beta-blockers as agents to reduce high blood pressure in patients without a history of myocardial infarction.^{64,65,66} These analyses found that while beta-blockers were superior to placebo for lowering blood pressure, they were inferior to the other major antihypertensive drug classes in preventing stroke, and were borderline inferior to other drug classes in preventing other cardiovascular outcomes such as MI. These differences were especially notable for older patients.⁶⁴

Side effects of beta blockers include fluid retention, fatigue, sexual dysfunction, bradycardia, heart block, and hypotension. Absolute contraindications include third degree heart block and a history of severe bronchospasm (although patients with mild-to-moderate bronchospasm may tolerate a beta-1 selective beta blocker). Relative contraindications include bradycardia, symptomatic hypotension, and severe peripheral artery disease.

Beta-blockers continue to have an important role in treating patients with both hypertension and a compelling indication such as CAD or heart failure (HF), but they are no longer considered a first choice agent for uncomplicated hypertension.¹

Renin inhibitors

Direct renin inhibitors block the conversion of angiotensinogen to angiotensin I. Aliskiren was approved by the FDA in 2007 for treatment of primary hypertension. Direct renin inhibitors have the purported advantage of not affecting kinin metabolism, and therefore posing a lower risk for cough or angioedema than ACEIs.⁶⁷ A meta-analysis found that standard doses of aliskiren lower SBP to an extent similar to other anti-hypertensive classes.⁶⁸

Aliskiren has not been compared in head-to-head trials with either ACEIs or ARBs for efficacy or safety, however the ALTITUDE⁶⁹ and ATMOSPHERE⁷⁰ trials showed that adding aliskiren to standard RAAS therapy (an ACEI or ARB) increased the risk of adverse events, including hypotensive symptoms, elevated serum creatinine, and elevated potassium levels. Aliskiren reduces the albumin-to-creatinine ratio in diabetics when added to an ARB, indicating it could have reno-protective effects independent of blood pressure control,⁶⁹ however the ALTITUDE trial showed no benefit on cardiorenal outcomes and possible increases in adverse events in patients with diabetes.⁶⁹

Other agents

A number of agents may be considered for patients with resistant hypertension, defined as suboptimal blood pressure control despite treatment with at least three antihypertensive agents.⁷¹ Alternative agents may be particularly useful for patients with hypertension and comorbid conditions for which these agents may be prescribed: alpha-blockers (e.g., doxazosin, prazosin, terazosin); centrally-acting drugs (e.g., clonidine, methyldopa, reserpine, guanfacine); or direct vasodilators (e.g., hydralazine, minoxidil). Evidence from a double-blind placebo-controlled trial of 230 patients suggests that the potassium-sparing diuretic spironolactone can be effective in patients with resistant hypertension.⁷¹

BOTTOM LINE: Beta-blockers and renin inhibitors are not considered first-line antihypertensives, although each may have utility for patients with selected comorbidities. Spironolactone is effective therapy for many patients with resistant hypertension.

Combination therapy

Since most antihypertensive medications at standard doses will lower SBP by 9-10 mm Hg, combination therapy is often required to achieve blood pressure goals. In the SPRINT trial, patients in the intensive treatment arm used an average of three medications to achieve the target blood pressure levels. In the ALLHAT trial, only about a quarter of patients were controlled on monotherapy.⁷²

Most hypertension clinical trials allow for the addition of a second medication to reach target blood pressure levels. The combined data from these trials provide estimated effects of such combination therapy. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses have demonstrated that for the vast majority of antihypertensive combinations, the effect of combining two drug different classes equals the additive impact of each individual agent.^{42,73}

Combination therapy requires a careful evaluation of each drug's dose-response relationship and dose-side effect relationship. Fortunately, most side effects are not additive across drug classes. The important exceptions to this include the increased risk of bradycardia with beta-blocker/CCB combinations, and the risk of hyperkalemia, hypotension, syncope, and renal dysfunction with ACEI/ARB combinations.

A 2008 randomized controlled trial of an ACEI and an ARB in high-risk patients (vascular and patients with diabetes), found that combination therapy did not reduce rates of a composite outcome (cardiovascular death, MI, stroke, or HF hospitalization).⁷⁴ However, the combination did produce significantly higher rates of adverse events than did either single agent, including hypotension, syncope, and renal dysfunction.⁷⁴

One large trial (ACCOMPLISH) randomized 11,506 patients with hypertension at high risk of CV events to the combination of a ACEI+CCB or the combination of a ACEI+thiazide. Forty percent of patients were over 70 years old and over 60% had diabetes. This trial was stopped early because interim results showed that the ACEI+CCB was significantly better than the ACEI+thiazide. On the basis of ACCOMPLISH, assuming no other compelling indications, it is reasonable to start patients requiring two antihypertensives on an ACEI+CCB.

The PROGRESS trial also explored combination therapy in patients who had a stroke in the previous 5 years.⁵⁴ 3051 patients were randomized to active treatment of either an ACEI + thiazide or an ACEI alone; another 3054 patients were randomized to placebo.


Active treatment reduced blood pressure by 9/4 mm Hg (achieved BP: 138/82 mm Hg). 307 (10%) individuals assigned active treatment suffered a stroke, compared with 420 (14%) assigned placebo (relative risk reduction [RRR] 28%; 95% CI: 17–38; $p < 0.0001$). Active treatment also reduced the risk of total major vascular events (RRR 26%; 95% CI: 16–34). Combination therapy produced larger blood pressure reductions and larger risk reductions than did single drug therapy (ACEI alone was no better than placebo).

Practical steps for starting medications in patients with hypertension

For most patients who are over their blood pressure goal by >20 mm Hg, initiating two antihypertensives will be required to achieve blood pressure target. For many patients who are age 75 or over, it may be reasonable to start one agent at a time. Titration upwards of doses at the subsequent visits will likely be required to achieve blood pressure goals. This practice is in accordance with the SPRINT protocol. This stepped approach is reasonable in a patient population that has higher risk of adverse events.

With 26% of Medicare beneficiaries not adhering to antihypertensive regimens, factors such as reducing the number of pills (using combinations when clinically appropriate) and having one prescriber managing blood pressure treatment increase the likelihood of patients adhering to therapy. Patients should be educated about non-pharmacological interventions such as reduced salt diet, exercise, weight loss and medication adherence throughout their treatment.

Figure 14. Initiating and managing patients on pharmacologic therapy



* For African Americans, initiate a thiazide or CCB.

† Combining an ACEI and an ARB confers no additional benefit and may increase adverse events.

†† For older patients, start one medication and intensify therapy at the first follow-up visit.

For patients on long-standing pharmacologic treatment for hypertension, prescribed medications should be reviewed to determine if patients will require de-escalation or discontinuation of medications based on

their current status. Re-evaluation is critical for patients who experience changes such as weight loss, renal dysfunction, and/or hepatic impairment, which are all factors that could impact drug efficacy.

BOTTOM LINE: Many patients will require more than one antihypertensive agent to achieve their blood pressure goal. Absent other clinical indications or contraindications, ACCOMPLISH provides evidence to support choosing an ACEI+CCB when 2-drug therapy is needed.

Putting it all together

Hypertension is the most common condition seen in primary care. Because many effective treatments are available, hypertension represents one of the most important opportunities for clinicians to significantly reduce patients' risk of illness and disability. Healthcare teams should review their procedures for assessing blood pressure to accurately identify patients needing treatment.


The available evidence provides a solid foundation for the creation of an evidence-based algorithm that can help guide clinical decision making. The process involves assessing each patient, then setting a reasonable, individualized blood pressure goal. The common goal of 130/80 mm Hg can be used as a clinical benchmark for treatment efficacy, to be modified at the discretion of the healthcare provider based on individual factors, such as diabetes, prior stroke, overall CV risk, and older age.

Once patients are determined to have hypertension, a management plan should be created. Non-drug approaches such as a low sodium diet, aerobic exercise as tolerated, and weight loss are key components of a comprehensive treatment plan to lower blood pressure.

All major classes of hypertension medications lower blood pressure by a similar degree (~8-10 mm Hg) and have similar, though not identical, risks of adverse events. Some drug classes may be preferred for specific comorbid conditions. Overall, achieving the blood pressure goal is more important than the choice of drug. Clinicians should regularly assess response to treatment by asking about adherence, screening for side effects, and intensifying treatment with the goal of achieving a patient's target blood pressure.

Appendix 1. Cost of antihypertensives

Price of a 30-day supply of drug classes commonly used to treat hypertension.



Prices from goodrx.com, April 2018. Listed doses are based on Defined Daily Doses by the World Health Organization, and should not be used for dosing in all patients. All prices shown are for generic products unless otherwise noted. These prices are a guide; patient costs may be subject to copays, rebates, and other incentives.

Appendix 2. Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial (SPRINT) key findings


The results from both the SPRINT trial¹² and the SPRINT 75 subgroup trial²⁹ show that among patients at high risk for cardiovascular events but *without* diabetes or prior stroke, targeting an SBP <120 mm Hg, as compared <140 mm Hg, resulted in lower rates of fatal and nonfatal major cardiovascular events and death. The trial randomized 4678 patients to intensive therapy (SBP ≤120 mm Hg) and 4683 patients to standard therapy (SBP ≤140 mm Hg). The primary outcome was a composite outcome of myocardial infarction (MI), acute coronary syndrome (ACS), stroke, acute decompensated heart failure or death from CV causes.

Table A1: Key inclusion and exclusion criteria for the SPRINT trial

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Age ≥50 years• SBP 130-180 mm Hg• Increased CV risk<ul style="list-style-type: none">— clinical or subclinical CVD, except stroke— chronic kidney disease (eGFR 20-59 mL/min/1.73m²)— Framingham risk score ≥15%— age ≥75 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Patients with:<ul style="list-style-type: none">— diabetes— dementia— prior stroke— heart failure— end stage renal disease• Life expectancy <3 years• Residence in a nursing home

The trial was stopped early, after a median follow-up of 3.3 years, due to the significantly lower numbers of CV outcomes in the intensive group. At the end of the study, patients in the intensive treatment arm had a 1.6% absolute risk reduction in cardiovascular outcomes, corresponding to a 25% relative risk reduction (HR 0.75; 95% CI: 0.64-0.89; p<0.001).

Figure A1: Primary efficacy outcome for SPRINT¹²




The open label trial design allowed for medication selection from a formulary, with most patients in the study receiving ACEIs/ARBs, thiazide diuretics, and CCBs. Intensive treatment required more medications (mean 2.8 vs. 1.8) and was associated with an increased risk of adverse events including: hypotension, syncope, acute kidney injury, and electrolyte abnormalities, although the higher risk of such events did not offset the observed decreases in the risk of cardiovascular outcomes. Serious adverse events, defined as those requiring hospitalization, were more common in those randomized to intensive therapy among all participants in SPRINT (number need to harm: 45). However, the rate of orthostatic hypotension (with or without dizziness) and injurious falls was not more common with intensive treatment. See Figure A3).

Older patients

Twenty-eight percent of the SPRINT trial comprised patients age ≥ 75 , and these older individuals were evaluated in a pre-specified subgroup analysis. The results indicate that these patients benefitted from intensive SBP lowering even more than younger patients did. Lower BP goals reduced risk of CV events by about a third in many patients over 75 years of age (Figure A2).


In SPRINT, the 2636 enrolled patients age 75 and over* had a greater relative risk reduction in CV outcomes that overall study participants from intensive (goal SBP <120 mm Hg) than standard (goal SBP <140 mm Hg) treatment.

Figure A2: Compared to the overall study and younger patients, fewer patients ≥ 75 need to be treated to prevent one CV event.



The rates of serious adverse events in both the intensive and standard treatment groups were high, with 48.4% and 48.3% of patients in the intensive and standard arms, respectively, reporting serious adverse events. There was no significant difference between the treatment arms in the rates of individual adverse events, including hypotension, syncope and the risk of falls.

Figure A3. Serious adverse events in SPRINT by age group¹²



While the results of SPRINT offer convincing evidence for lower SBP targets in patients who are either >75 or at increased cardiovascular risk, some important caveats must be kept in mind:

- The results of SPRINT do not re-define the threshold for diagnosing hypertension to an SBP greater than 120 mm Hg.
- SPRINT did not compare pharmacologic agents, hence the trial results do not provide guidance for medication choices.
- Randomization of the trial did not follow age stratification
- The trial was stopped early due to clinical impact, which limits evaluation of long term safety

Patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD)


CKD affects 10-15% of the general adult population and is associated with an increased risk of kidney failure and CV disease. Blood pressure is often elevated in patients with CKD and previous guidelines have recommended lower blood pressure goals in these patients.⁷

Until the publication of results from SPRINT, most guidelines for blood pressure targets in patients with CKD favored treatment to a blood pressure of <140/90 mm Hg, with consideration of the lower target of <130/80 mm Hg for those with more severe proteinuria (≥ 300 mg albuminuria in 24 hours or equivalent), if tolerated. In SPRINT, intensive blood pressure management in patients with stage 3 to 4 CKD (eGFR of 20 to <60 mL/minute/1.73 m²), which comprised 28% of the SPRINT study population, seemed to provide the same benefits for reduction in the CVD composite primary outcome and all-cause mortality as were seen in the full study cohort. The 2017 ACC/AHA guidelines cites evidence from SPRINT to suggest a lower target of <130/80 mm Hg for all patients with CKD.⁸

Appendix 3. Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) key findings

The U.K. Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS 38) found that a BP <150/85 mm Hg reduced diabetes-related endpoints, stroke, and microvascular disease compared to less intensive control (BP <180/105 mm Hg). The ACCORD BP trial was designed to investigate whether additional blood pressure lowering effect would provide additional cardiovascular benefit. This study randomized 4733 older patients with diabetes to intensive therapy (<120 mm Hg) or standard therapy (<140 mm Hg).²⁸ Mean age was 62 and mean SBP was 139. The mean follow-up was 4.7 years.

Figure A4. Intensive treatment to an SBP <120 mm Hg did not prevent more CV events than an SBP <140 mm Hg.⁷⁵



The major results of ACCORD revealed:

- no difference in the primary outcome of major CV events comparing intensive versus standard blood pressure control.
- some reduction in stroke risk (a prespecified secondary outcome) in the intensive treatment group (HR 0.59; 95% CI: 0.39-0.89; p=0.01).
- lower blood pressure goal required more medications (3.4 vs. 2.4 in the intensive vs. standard, respectively) and patients experienced more adverse events attributed to blood pressure medications (3.3% vs. 1.27% in the intensive vs. standard groups, respectively). These events included: hypotension, syncope, bradycardia or arrhythmia, hypokalemia and elevations in serum creatinine.

Appendix 4. Secondary Prevention of Small Subcortical Strokes (SPS3) key findings

The Secondary Prevention of Small Subcortical Strokes (SPS3) study examined whether targeting an SBP <130 mm Hg was beneficial for patients with recent lacunar stroke.³⁰ 1519 patients were randomized to intensive therapy (SBP target <130 mm Hg), and 1501 patients were randomized to standard therapy (SBP target 130-149 mm Hg). The primary endpoint was reduction in all recurrent stroke (including ischemic strokes and intracranial hemorrhages).

After a mean follow-up of 3.7 years, the rate of recurrent stroke in the intensive therapy group was 2.25% (n=125) compared to 2.77% (n=152) in the standard therapy group, a difference that did not reach statistical significance (p=0.08). Similar trends were observed for reductions in disabling/fatal stroke and in the composite outcome of stroke, myocardial infarct or vascular death. Intracerebral hemorrhage, however, was reduced by 63% in those assigned to intensive therapy (HR 0.37; 95% CI: 0.14-0.89; p=0.03). Serious complications of blood pressure lowering were infrequent and not significantly different in frequency between groups.

References

1. James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, et al. 2014 evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the Eighth Joint National Committee (JNC 8). *JAMA*. 2014;311(5):507-520.
2. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2018 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018;137(12):e67-e492.
3. Muntner P, Whelton PK. Using Predicted Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Conjunction With Blood Pressure to Guide Antihypertensive Medication Treatment. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2017;69(19):2446-2456.
4. Bundy JD, Li C, Stuchlik P, et al. Systolic Blood Pressure Reduction and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease and Mortality: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-analysis. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2017;2(7):775-781.
5. Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics--2015 update: a report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2015;131(4):e29-322.
6. Carson AP, Howard G, Burke GL, Shea S, Levitan EB, Muntner P. Ethnic differences in hypertension incidence among middle-aged and older adults: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *Hypertension*. 2011;57(6):1101-1107.
7. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al. The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7 report. *JAMA*. 2003;289(19):2560-2572.
8. Whelton PK, Carey RM, Aronow WS, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Hypertension*. 2018;71(6):1269-1324.
9. Lewington S, Clarke R, Qizilbash N, Peto R, Collins R, Prospective Studies C. 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(9349):1903-1913.
10. Sundstrom J, Arima H, Woodward M, et al. Blood pressure-lowering treatment based on cardiovascular risk: a meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Lancet*. 2014;384(9943):591-598.
11. Beckett NS, Peters R, Fletcher AE, et al. Treatment of hypertension in patients 80 years of age or older. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(18):1887-1898.
12. SPRINT Research Group, Wright JT, Jr., Williamson JD, et al. A Randomized Trial of Intensive versus Standard Blood-Pressure Control. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(22):2103-2116.
13. Ettehad D, Emdin CA, Kiran A, et al. Blood pressure lowering for prevention of cardiovascular disease and death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10022):957-967.
14. Egan BM, Zhao Y, Axon RN. US trends in prevalence, awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension, 1988-2008. *JAMA*. 2010;303(20):2043-2050.
15. Ritchey M CA, Powers C, et al. Vital Signs: Disparities in Antihypertensive Medication Nonadherence Among Medicare Part D Beneficiaries — United States, 2014. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. ePub: 13 September 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6536e1>.
16. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, Rich R, et al. Pharmacologic Treatment of Hypertension in Adults Aged 60 Years or Older to Higher Versus Lower Blood Pressure Targets: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians and the American Academy of Family Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166(6):430-437.
17. Pickering TG, Hall JE, Appel LJ, et al. Recommendations for blood pressure measurement in humans and experimental animals: part 1: blood pressure measurement in humans: a statement for professionals from the Subcommittee of Professional and Public Education of the American Heart Association Council on High Blood Pressure Research. *Circulation*. 2005;111(5):697-716.
18. Stergiou G, Kollias A, Parati G, O'Brien E. Office Blood Pressure Measurement: The Weak Cornerstone of Hypertension Diagnosis. *Hypertension*. 2018;71(5):813-815.
19. Einstadter D, Bolen SD, Misak JE, Bar-Shain DS, Cebul RD. Association of Repeated Measurements With Blood Pressure Control in Primary Care. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(6):858-860.

20. Myers MG. A Short History of Automated Office Blood Pressure - 15 Years to SPRINT. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2016;18(8):721-724.
21. Myers MG, Godwin M, Dawes M, et al. Conventional versus automated measurement of blood pressure in primary care patients with systolic hypertension: randomised parallel design controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2011;342:d286.
22. Parati G, Stergiou GS, Asmar R, et al. European Society of Hypertension guidelines for blood pressure monitoring at home: a summary report of the Second International Consensus Conference on Home Blood Pressure Monitoring. *Journal of hypertension*. 2008;26(8):1505-1526.
23. O'Brien E, Parati G, Stergiou G. Ambulatory blood pressure measurement: what is the international consensus? *Hypertension*. 2013;62(6):988-994.
24. Banegas JR, Ruilope LM, de la Sierra A, et al. Relationship between Clinic and Ambulatory Blood-Pressure Measurements and Mortality. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(16):1509-1520.
25. Agarwal R. Implications of Blood Pressure Measurement Technique for Implementation of Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial (SPRINT). *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2017;6(2).
26. Piper MA, Evans CV, Burda BU, Margolis KL, O'Connor E, Whitlock EP. Diagnostic and predictive accuracy of blood pressure screening methods with consideration of rescreening intervals: a systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;162(3):192-204.
27. Karmali KN, Lloyd-Jones DM. Global Risk Assessment to Guide Blood Pressure Management in Cardiovascular Disease Prevention. *Hypertension*. 2017;69(3):e2-e9.
28. Accord Study Group, Cushman WC, Evans GW, et al. Effects of intensive blood-pressure control in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(17):1575-1585.
29. Williamson JD, Supiano MA, Applegate WB, et al. Intensive vs Standard Blood Pressure Control and Cardiovascular Disease Outcomes in Adults Aged ≥ 75 Years: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2016;315(24):2673-2682.
30. SPS Study Group, Benavente OR, Coffey CS, et al. Blood-pressure targets in patients with recent lacunar stroke: the SPS3 randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9891):507-515.
31. Wilt TJ, Kansagara D, Qaseem A, Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of P. Hypertension Limbo: Balancing Benefits, Harms, and Patient Preferences Before We Lower the Bar on Blood Pressure. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;168(5):369-370.
32. Jatos Study Group. Principal results of the Japanese trial to assess optimal systolic blood pressure in elderly hypertensive patients (JATOS). *Hypertension research : official journal of the Japanese Society of Hypertension*. 2008;31(12):2115-2127.
33. Ogihara T, Saruta T, Rakugi H, et al. Target blood pressure for treatment of isolated systolic hypertension in the elderly: valsartan in elderly isolated systolic hypertension study. *Hypertension*. 2010;56(2):196-202.
34. Berlowitz DR, Foy CG, Kazis LE, et al. Effect of Intensive Blood-Pressure Treatment on Patient-Reported Outcomes. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(8):733-744.
35. Krumholz HM. Blood pressure guidelines as starting point in clinical decisions. *BMJ*. 2018;360:j5862.
36. Whelton SP, Chin A, Xin X, He J. Effect of aerobic exercise on blood pressure: a meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials. *Ann Intern Med*. 2002;136(7):493-503.
37. Cook NR, Cutler JA, Obarzanek E, et al. Long term effects of dietary sodium reduction on cardiovascular disease outcomes: observational follow-up of the trials of hypertension prevention (TOHP). *BMJ*. 2007;334(7599):885-888.
38. Cushman WC, Ford CE, Cutler JA, et al. Success and predictors of blood pressure control in diverse North American settings: the antihypertensive and lipid-lowering treatment to prevent heart attack trial (ALLHAT). *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2002;4(6):393-404.
39. Staessen JA, Fagard R, Thijs L, et al. 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(9080):757-764.
40. Staessen JA, Wang JG, Thijs L. Cardiovascular prevention and blood pressure reduction: a quantitative overview updated until 1 March 2003. *Journal of hypertension*. 2003;21(6):1055-1076.
41. Neal B, MacMahon S, Chapman N, Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists C. Effects of ACE inhibitors, calcium antagonists, and other blood-pressure-lowering drugs: results of prospectively designed overviews of randomised trials. Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. *Lancet*. 2000;356(9246):1955-1964.

42. Law MR, Wald NJ, Morris JK, Jordan RE. Value of low dose combination treatment with blood pressure lowering drugs: analysis of 354 randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2003;326(7404):1427.
43. Musini VM, Tejani AM, Bassett K, Wright JM. Pharmacotherapy for hypertension in the elderly. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009(4):CD000028.
44. 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:b1665.
45. ALLHAT Officers 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(23):2981-2997.
46. Sica DA. Current concepts of pharmacotherapy in hypertension: thiazide-type diuretics: ongoing considerations on mechanism of action. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2004;6(11):661-664.
47. Psaty BM, Lumley T, Furberg CD. Meta-analysis of health outcomes of chlorthalidone-based vs nonchlorthalidone-based low-dose diuretic therapies. *JAMA*. 2004;292(1):43-44.
48. Savage PJ, Pressel SL, Curb JD, et al. Influence of long-term, low-dose, diuretic-based, antihypertensive therapy on glucose, lipid, uric acid, and potassium levels in older men and women with isolated systolic hypertension: The Systolic Hypertension in the Elderly Program. SHEP Cooperative Research Group. *Arch Intern Med*. 1998;158(7):741-751.
49. Grimm RH, Jr., Flack JM, Grandits GA, et al. Long-term effects on plasma lipids of diet and drugs to treat hypertension. Treatment of Mild Hypertension Study (TOMHS) Research Group. *JAMA*. 1996;275(20):1549-1556.
50. Heran BS, Wong MM, Heran IK, Wright JM. Blood pressure lowering efficacy of angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors for primary hypertension. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008(4):CD003823.
51. Chou R, M. Helfand, and S. Carson, Drug class review on angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors. 2005, Oregon Evidence-based Practice Center.
52. Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists C, Ninomiya T, Perkovic V, et al. Blood pressure lowering and major cardiovascular events in people with and without chronic kidney disease: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*. 2013;347:f5680.
53. Bangalore S, Fakheri R, Toklu B, Messerli FH. Diabetes mellitus as a compelling indication for use of renin angiotensin system blockers: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *BMJ*. 2016;352:i438.
54. Progress Collaborative Group. Randomised trial of a perindopril-based blood-pressure-lowering regimen among 6,105 individuals with previous stroke or transient ischaemic attack. *Lancet*. 2001;358(9287):1033-1041.
55. Messerli FH, Bangalore S, Bavishi C, Rimoldi SF. Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors in Hypertension: To Use or Not to Use? *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;71(13):1474-1482.
56. Bangalore S, Kumar S, Messerli FH. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor associated cough: deceptive information from the Physicians' Desk Reference. *Am J Med*. 2010;123(11):1016-1030.
57. Wright JT, Jr., Bakris G, Greene T, et al. Effect of blood pressure lowering and antihypertensive drug class on progression of hypertensive kidney disease: results from the AASK trial. *JAMA*. 2002;288(19):2421-2431.
58. Bangalore S, Ogedegbe G, Gyamfi J, et al. Outcomes with Angiotensin-converting Enzyme Inhibitors vs Other Antihypertensive Agents in Hypertensive Blacks. *Am J Med*. 2015;128(11):1195-1203.
59. Flack JM, Sica DA, Bakris G, et al. Management of high blood pressure in Blacks: an update of the International Society on Hypertension in Blacks consensus statement. *Hypertension*. 2010;56(5):780-800.
60. Furmaga E, et al., Drug class review on angiotensin II receptor antagonists. 2006, Southern California Evidence-based Practice Center.
61. Heran BS, Musini VM, Bassett K, Taylor RS, Wright JM. Angiotensin receptor blockers for heart failure. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012;4:CD003040.
62. Matchar DB, McCrory DC, Orlando LA, et al. Systematic review: comparative effectiveness of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin II receptor blockers for treating essential hypertension. *Ann Intern Med*. 2008;148(1):16-29.

63. McDonagh M, Eden KB, Peterson K. Drug class review on calcium channel blockers. *Oregon Evidence-based Practice Center: Oredon*. 2005.
64. Khan N, McAlister FA. Re-examining the efficacy of beta-blockers for the treatment of hypertension: a meta-analysis. *CMAJ*. 2006;174(12):1737-1742.
65. Lindholm LH, Carlberg B, Samuelsson O. Should beta blockers remain first choice in the treatment of primary hypertension? A meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2005;366(9496):1545-1553.
66. Wiysonge CS, Volmink J, Opie LH. Beta-blockers and the treatment of hypertension: it is time to move on. *Cardiovasc J Afr*. 2007;18(6):351-352.
67. Riccioni G. The role of direct renin inhibitors in the treatment of the hypertensive diabetic patient. *Ther Adv Endocrinol Metab*. 2013;4(5):139-145.
68. Musini VM, Fortin PM, Bassett K, Wright JM. Blood pressure lowering efficacy of renin inhibitors for primary hypertension. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008(4):CD007066.
69. Parving HH, Persson F, Lewis JB, Lewis EJ, Hollenberg NK, Investigators AS. Aliskiren combined with losartan in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(23):2433-2446.
70. McMurray JJ, Krum H, Abraham WT, et al. Aliskiren, Enalapril, or Aliskiren and Enalapril in Heart Failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(16):1521-1532.
71. Williams B, MacDonald TM, Morant S, et al. Spironolactone versus placebo, bisoprolol, and doxazosin to determine the optimal treatment for drug-resistant hypertension (PATHWAY-2): a randomised, double-blind, crossover trial. *Lancet*. 2015;386(10008):2059-2068.
72. Cushman WC, Ford CE, Einhorn PT, et al. Blood pressure control by drug group in the Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT). *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2008;10(10):751-760.
73. Chen JM, Heran BS, Wright JM. Blood pressure lowering efficacy of diuretics as second-line therapy for primary hypertension. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009(4):CD007187.
74. 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(15):1547-1559.
75. Accord Study Group. Effects of combination lipid therapy in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(17):1563-1574.

About this publication

These are general recommendations only; specific clinical decisions should be made by the treating physician based on an individual patient's clinical condition.



The Independent Drug Information Service (IDIS) is supported by the PACE Program of the Department of Aging of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.



This material is provided by **Alosa Health**, a nonprofit organization which is not affiliated with any pharmaceutical company. IDIS is a program of Alosa Health.

This material was produced by Jing Luo, M.D., M.P.H., Instructor in Medicine; Michael A. Fischer, M.D., M.S., Associate Professor of Medicine (principal editor); Niteesh K. Choudhry, M.D., Ph.D., Professor of Medicine; Jerry Avorn, M.D., Professor of Medicine; Dae Kim, M.D., M.P.H., Sc.D., Assistant Professor of Medicine; Gregory Curfman, M.D., Assistant Professor of Medicine; all at Harvard Medical School, and Ellen Dancel, PharmD, M.P.H., Director of Clinical Materials Development at Alosa Health. Drs. Avorn, Choudhry, Fischer, and Luo are physicians at the Brigham and Women's Hospital, and Dr. Kim practices at the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, both in Boston. None of the authors accepts any personal compensation from any drug company.

Medical writer: Jenny Cai



Pharmaceutical Assistance
Contract for the Elderly