

The effect of renal denervation on central blood pressure and arterial stiffness in treatment resistant essential hypertension: a substudy of a randomized sham-controlled double-blinded trial (the ReSET trial)

> Christian Daugaard Peters, MD, PhD Department of Renal Medicine Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark Disclosures: None







Background & aim

- A recent Danish sham-controlled trial (ReSET)¹ showed no sustained effect of renal denervation (RDN) on 24-hour ambulatory blood pressure (BP) measurements (24h ABPM) in patients with treatment resistant hypertension
- Findings were similar to the neutral outcome of the SYMPLICITY HTN-3 trial² + German trial (Desch *et al.*³)
- The aim of this substudy was to determine whether RDN affects central blood pressure (C-BP) and arterial stiffness
 - 1) Mathiassen *et al*. J Hypertens 2016 Aug;34(8):1639-47.
 - 2) Bhatt et al. N Engl J Med. 2014 Apr 10;370(15):1393-401.
 - 3) Desch et al. Hypertension. 2015 Jun;65(6):1202-8.

ReSET = Renal Sympathectomy in Treatment Resistant Essential Hypertension, a Sham Controlled Randomized Trial

- Danish collaborative study initiated before the HTN-3 trial (Sept. 2011-February 2015)
- Investigator initiated and driven
- No company support
- Hypothesis: RDN reduces daytime systolic BP by 10 mmHg compared to SHAM in a double blinded RCT design
- Power calculation: n = 70 (2 x 35)

ClinicalTrials.gov NCT01459900 Mathiassen *et al*. J Hypertens 2016 Aug;34(8):1639-47.



ReSET study criteria

Inclusion

- Age [30 70] year
- 1 month of stable antihypertensive treatment with at least 3 antihypertensive agents including a diuretic (or in case of diuretics intolerance a minimum of 3 non-diuretic drugs)
- Daytime ABPM systolic blood pressure ≥ 145 mmHg, preceded by 14 days of scheduled drug intake showing at least 85% adherence

Exclusion

- Chronic renal failure (eGFR <30 ml/min per 1.73 m²)
- Secondary hypertension
- Coronary artery disease
- Permanent atrial fibrillation
- LV ejection fraction <50%
- Renal artery disease
- Multiple renal arteries
- Renal artery diameter < 4 mm
- Renal artery length <20 mm

Intervention

- Catheter-based RDN or a SHAM procedure (1:1 ratio) using the unipolar Medtronic Flex catheter
- Sedative drugs were administered (fentanyl and midazolam) prior to randomization
- RDN was performed by a single experienced invasive cardiologist qualified by 9 pre-trial RDN¹
- For the SHAM procedure the catheter was kept in situ and dummy radiograph scans were performed for 10 – 15 min
- Patients and caretaking physicians were blinded during the 6-month follow-up period



Methods

- Central BP and carotid-femoral pulse wave velocity (PWV) was obtained with the SphygmoCor device using brachial systolic and diastolic BP for calibration
- Aortic length was approximated by subtracting the distance between the suprasternal notch (S and the carotid artery from the distance betwee the SN and the femoral artery
- PWV were converted to direct distance (carotid artery–femoral artery x 0.8) using the equation developed by Vermeersch *et al.*
- All 24-h ABPM was done using either the SpaceLabs 90207 or 90217 ABPM monitor with BP readings every 20 min.





Van Bortel *et al.* J Hypertens 2012; 30: 445–448. Vermeersch *et al.* J Hypertens 2009; 27: 2377–2385.

Results

53 patients (77% of the ReSET cohort) were included in this substudy

Baseline demographics	SHAM	RDN	
	(n=27)	(n=26)	Ρ
Age (years)	59±9	54±8	0.04
Males (%)	78%	65%	0.32
BMI (kg/m ²)	30±3	28±5	0.15
Type 2 DM	27%	27%	0.99
eGFR (ml/min/1.73 m²)	77±17	82±13	0.23
Antihypertensive drugs (n)	4.2	4.4	0.48
Antihypertensive drugs (DDD)	7±2	7±3	0.97
Office systolic BP (mmHg)	165±19	160±19	0.37
Office diastolic BP (mmHg)	92±17	99±11	0.06
24h ABPM systolic (mmHg)	153±14	151±13	0.72
24h ABPM diastolic (mmHg)	88±11	92±9	0.14
Central systolic BP (mmHg)	146±20	143±17	0.55
Central diastolic BP (mmHg)	92±14	95±10	0.48
Aix (%)	26±9	28±13	0.66
PWV (direct distance) (m/s)	10.7±2.1	10.1±2.2	0.28

 Δ =Mean difference (6 months-baseline)



Δ =Mean difference (6 months-baseline)



Within and between group comparison (SHAM vs. RDN)

Within & between	ΔSHAM		ΔRDN		ΔSHAM vs. ΔRI	DN
group changes	Mean (95% CI)	Ρ	Mean (95% Cl)	Ρ	Mean (95% CI)	Р
Office SysBP (mmHg)	-2 (-8; 5)	0.59	-8 (-15; -1)	0.03	6 (-3; 15)	0.19
Office DiaBP (mmHg)	-2 (-6; 2)	0.27	-5 (-9; -1)	0.01	3 (-2; 8)	0.25
24h Sys (mmHg)	-4 (-9; 1)	0.12	-5 (-12; 2)	0.18	1 (-8; 9)	0.84
24h Dia (mmHg)	-3 (-6; 0)	0.04	-3 (-6; 1)	0.11	-1 (-5; 4)	0.76
Central SysBP (mmHg)	-2 (-9; 4)	0.51	-8 (-14; -1)	0.02	5 (-3; 14)	0.22
Central DiaBP (mmHg)	-2 (-6; 2)	0.24	-5 (-8; -1)	0.01	3 (-2; 8)	0.29
Aix (%)	1 (-2; 3)	0.59	1 (-2; 4)	0.50	0 (-4; 4)	0.90
Aix@hr75 (%)	1 (-2; 3)	0.63	1 (-1; 3)	0.41	0 (-4; 3)	0.85
Time to reflection (ms)	-2 (-6; 2)	0.28	1 (-2; 5)	0.52	-3 (-8; 2)	0.21
SEVR (Buckberg ratio)	-4 (-11; 4)	0.32	-1 (-11; 10)	0.91	-3 (-16; 10)	0.62
PWV (m/s)	0.1 (-0.7; 0.9)	0.81	-0.6 (-1.1; -0.1)	0.03	-0.7 (-1.6; 0.2)	0.13

 Δ =Mean difference (6 months-baseline)

Conclusion

- In agreement with other sham-controlled studies no significant effect of RDN on BP (office BP & 24h AMBP)
- In a sham-controlled setting, there were no significant effects of RDN on central BP or arterial stiffness

Acknowledgements

- Co-authors and all participating hospitals:
- Ole N. Mathiassen, Henrik Vase, Jesper N. Bech, Kent L. Christensen, Anne P. Schroeder, Ole Lederballe, Hans Rickers, Ulla Kampmann, Per L. Poulsen, Sten Langfeldt, Gratien Andersen, Klavs W. Hansen, Hans E. Bøtker, Morten Engholm, Jannik B. Bertelsen, Jens F. Lassen, Erling B. Pedersen, Anne Kaltoft, and Niels H. Buus
- Dept. of Renal Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus
- Dept. of Cardiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus
- University Clinic in Nephrology and Hypertension, Holstebro
- Dept. of Cardiology, Viborg Hospital, Viborg
- Dept. of Cardiology, Randers Hospital, Randers
- Dept. of Endocrinology, Aarhus University Hospital
- Dept. of Radiology, Aarhus University Hospital
- Dept. of Internal Medicine, Silkeborg Hospital, Silkeborg
- Dept. of Nephrology, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg
- Funding: The study was supported by grants from the Danish Heart Foundation and the Danish Society of Nephrology
- Contact & further details: cdp@clin.au.dk

ReSET Study Hypothesis

RDN reduces systolic daytime BP by 10 mmHg compared to SHAM in a double blinded randomized trial design.

Power calculation: $n = 70 (2 \times 35)$



Vase et al. Dan Med J. 2012 Jun;59(6):A4439



ReSET daytime (9-21) ABPM changes (mmHg ± SD)

		RDN	SHAM
1 month	Systolic	-6,0 ± 11,0*	0,0 ± 15,0*
	Diastolic	-4,2 ± 6,6**	$0,2 \pm 8,4^{**}$
3 month	Systolic	-6,2 ± 18,8	-6,0 ± 13,5
	Diastolic	-2,4 ± 10,3	$-3,2 \pm 6,2$
6 month	Systolic	-6,1 ± 18,9	-3,2 ± 10,8
	Diastolic	-4,3 ± 15,1	-3,6 ± 8,3

* p = 0,08 ** p = 0,02

ReSET RDN procedure data



Duration (min):	42 ± 11	92 ± 38
Contrast (ml):	85 ± 25	77 ± 77
Ablations:	$10,9 \pm 1,1$ (5.4 ± 1.0 sin)	9,2 ± 1,0
	$(5.5 \pm 0.9 \text{dx})$	

ReSET Blinding

Blinding index at discharge: 0,83

Index value:

- 1 indicates perfect blinding
- < 0.5 indicates insufficient blinding

ReSET patients with changes in antihypertensiva (%)

ReSET

HTN3



ReSET Antihypertensiva (numbers)



ReSET Antihypertensiva DDD

