

Review of the Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial for Hypertension Management

How Low to Go for Patients With Stroke?

Brian Silver, MD; Craig S. Anderson, MD, PhD

One of the great successes of modern medicine is the development of effective pharmacological treatments to lower blood pressure (BP). Of the modifiable risk factors for cardiovascular disease, elevated BP or hypertension has the highest population attributable risk,¹ and a near continuous relationship with rates of stroke and coronary heart disease from levels of 115 mmHg systolic and 75 mmHg diastolic BP.² Overviews of randomized trials are consistent in showing that lowering systolic BP by 5 to 10 mmHg reduces the risk of stroke by one third, irrespective of disease history, initial BP level, or type of agent used.³⁻⁵ Moreover, more intensive long-term BP lowering can result in additional benefits proportional to the size of fall in BP.⁴⁻⁶

Despite this body of evidence, there has been longstanding controversy (and consternation) over the levels to which BP should be brought down by treatment for the prevention of cardiovascular disease. Because there has been limited randomized evidence, guideline committees have been challenged in defining BP targets below 130 to 140 mmHg to manage individual patients.⁷ Concerns over diminishing net benefit being overtaken by excessive harm with increasing reductions in BP is supported by a physiological argument over critical thresholds for organ perfusion and secondary analysis of randomized trials suggesting a J-shaped relationship with cardiovascular events.⁸ Moreover, recent trials of more intensive BP lowering, including the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk on Type 2 Diabetes (ACCORD)⁹ and Secondary Prevention of Small Subcortical Strokes (SPS3),¹⁰ failed to show significant reductions in rates of ischemic stroke with systolic BP reductions below 120 and 130 mmHg, respectively.

The main result of the Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial (SPRINT)¹¹ has, therefore, created a new paradigm in hypertension management and is affecting on hypertension management guidelines around the world. The headline summary was that people at high cardiovascular risk who received more intensive BP-lowering treatment to target systolic levels below 120 mmHg had fewer cardiovascular events than those who were treated to a target of below 140 mmHg. For stroke

physicians, the key question is whether these results apply to their patients.

SPRINT was a carefully conducted clinical trial, sponsored by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of the United States, that involved 9361 hypertensive patients (mean age, 68 years) who were treated to 2 systolic BP treatment targets (<120 versus <140 mmHg). The key inclusion criteria were an age \geq 50 years, systolic BP of 130 to 180 mmHg, and evidence of increased cardiovascular risk based on either a 10-year Framingham risk estimate of at least 15% or markers of vascular disease including chronic renal disease in approximately one third of participants; but people with diabetes mellitus or stroke were specifically excluded. The study was stopped earlier than planned after a mean follow-up of 3.26 years, on the recommendation of the data and safety monitoring board. During the study period, a mean systolic BP reduction to 121.4 mmHg in the intensive-treatment group, when compared with a mean systolic BP to 134.6 mmHg in the standard-treatment group, resulted in a significant relative reduction in the primary composite cardiovascular end point (first occurrence of myocardial infarction, acute coronary syndrome, stroke, heart failure, or death caused by cardiovascular disease) by 25% (1.65% per year versus 2.19% per year; $P<0.01$), and in all-cause mortality by 27%.

The treatment effect was driven primarily by a reduction in heart failure and death; the annual stroke rate was 0.41% in the intensive-treatment group versus 0.47% in the standard-treatment group (hazard ratio, 0.89; 95% confidence interval, 0.63–1.25; $P=0.50$). The SPRINT Research Group noted their trial was comparable with ACCORD and SPS3 in showing a reduction in stroke with lower BP targets; the lack of statistical significance was most likely because of limited power to detect small effects in a population at relatively low risk of stroke (two thirds were aged <75 years and most had cardiovascular risk factors, rather than a previous cardiovascular event). As such, the absolute benefit with respect to this end point would equate to 6 strokes prevented per 10000 people treated annually.

Received February 7 2016; final revision received March 8, 2016; accepted March 9, 2016.

From the Department of Neurology, Rhode Island Hospital/Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence (B.S.); and The George Institute for Global Health, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia (C.S.A.).

Correspondence to Brian Silver, MD, Rhode Island Hospital, 593 Eddy St, APC 5, Providence, RI 02903. E-mail bsilver@lifespan.org

(*Stroke*. 2016;47:1692-1694. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.012402.)

© 2016 American Heart Association, Inc.

Stroke is available at <http://stroke.ahajournals.org>

DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.012402

The main hazard observed with more intensive BP lowering in SPRINT was an increased risk of kidney dysfunction as measured by glomerular filtration rate (1.21% per year versus 0.35% per year; $P < 0.001$). Hypotension, syncope, electrolyte abnormalities, and acute renal failure also occurred more commonly in intensive-treatment group. These events are a potential concern in older people, but those aged ≥ 75 years (28% of participants) had similar benefit from more intensive treatment to those younger. Whether the benefits extend to octogenarians and nonagenarians, rapidly growing segments of the population at higher absolute risk of cardiovascular events than younger people, is unclear. Results of a cognitive function substudy are eagerly awaited as observational studies suggest a U-shaped relationship between BP and cognitive impairment. Some studies show clear benefits from lowering BP in those with systolic BP > 140 mmHg,¹² whereas others suggest potential harm with reductions below 126 to 128 mmHg^{13,14} and diastolic BP below 70 mmHg.¹³

Data from the 2007 to 2012 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey suggest that 7.6% of the US population meet the SPRINT eligibility criteria, which equates to > 16 million people.¹⁵ Thus, a large segment of the population who could potentially benefit from more intensive BP management. However, we recommend caution in generalizing the SPRINT results, and particularly so to patients with a history of stroke for the following reasons.

1. SPRINT specifically excluded patients with stroke. In SPS3, which compared a target systolic BP < 150 mmHg (mean 138 mmHg at 1 year) versus a target BP < 130 mmHg (mean 127 mmHg at 1 year) in patients with magnetic resonance imaging-proven lacunar stroke, there was no mortality benefit,¹⁰ nor any benefit on cognition over a median follow-up of 3 years.¹⁶
2. The intensive clinic assessments, with BP measurement taken with an automated device after 5 minutes rest in a seated position, every month for the first 3 months, and then every 3 months thereafter postrandomization in SPRINT, will be challenging to achieve in routine care around the world.
3. The balance of benefits and harms of more intensive BP lowering may be more critical in patients with stroke than in other types of patients with high cardiovascular risk.
4. The major cause-specific event reduced by intensive BP lowering in SPRINT was heart failure (38 heart failure events prevented of a total of 76 cardiovascular events prevented), which is not a common outcome in stroke survivors.

In summary, the SPRINT study provides good news about the effects of additional BP lowering in a broad high cardiovascular risk population and hypertension guidelines are likely to be updated accordingly. The results should also prompt additional research in secondary stroke prevention through the enrollment of patients into clinical trials of more intensive BP targets. Two such trials include the ongoing Stroke in Hypertension Optimal Treatment (SHOT) trial of the European Society of Hypertension and the Chinese Hypertension League,¹⁷ and the soon to commence Triple Therapy Prevention of Recurrent Intracerebral Disease Events

Trial (TRIDENT) funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia. HOT is an open trial which plans to enroll 7500 patients aged ≥ 65 years with a history of hypertension and stroke/transient ischemic attack to 3 systolic BP targets, < 135 to 145 mmHg, 125 to 135 mmHg, and < 125 mmHg, for the prevention of recurrent stroke. TRIDENT is a double-blind, placebo-controlled, trial using a fixed low-dose combination of BP-lowering agents (Triple Pill strategy) for stroke prevention in 4200 patients with intracerebral hemorrhage and systolic BP levels defined as high normal to borderline high. SPRINT provides a strong rationale for such research gaining complimentary data on the question of optimal BP control in patients with a history of stroke.

Disclosures

Dr Silver reports being a surveyor for the Joint Commission, and adjudicator for the Women's Health Initiative and SOCRATES (Acute Stroke or Transient Ischaemic Attack Treated With Aspirin or Ticagrelor and Patient Outcomes) trials; medico-legal expert review; and honoraria for Ebix, Medscape, and Medlink. Dr Anderson reports being a Principal Investigator of the Triple therapy prevention of Recurrent Intracerebral Disease Events Trial study supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia, is a member of advisory committees for Astra Zeneca and Medtronic, and he has received honoraria and travel reimbursement from Takeda China.

References

1. O'Donnell MJ, Xavier D, Liu L, Zhang H, Chin SL, Rao-Melacini P, et al; INTERSTROKE investigators. Risk factors for ischaemic and intracerebral haemorrhagic stroke in 22 countries (the INTERSTROKE study): a case-control study. *Lancet*. 2010;376:112–123. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60834-3.
2. Prospective Studies Collaboration. Blood cholesterol and vascular mortality by age, sex, and blood pressure: a meta-analysis of individual data from 61 prospective studies with 55,000 vascular deaths. *Lancet* 2007;370:1829–39.
3. Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. Effects of different blood-pressure-lowering regimes on major cardiovascular events: results of prospectively-designed overviews of randomised trials. *Lancet* 2003;362:1527–1535.
4. 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.
5. Ettehad D, Emdin C, Kiran A, Anderson SG, Callender T, Emberson J, et al. Blood pressure lowering for prevention of cardiovascular disease and death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. [published online ahead of print December 23, 2015]. *Lancet*. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)01225-8. [http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(15\)01225-8/abstract](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(15)01225-8/abstract). Accessed February 20, 2016.
6. Lv J, Neal B, Ehteshami P, Ninomiya T, Woodward M, Rodgers A, et al. Effects of intensive blood pressure lowering on cardiovascular and renal outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*. 2012;9:e1001293. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001293.
7. Ram CV. Hypertension guidelines in need of guidance. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2014;16:251–254. doi: 10.1111/jch.12306.
8. Mancia G, Grassi G. Aggressive blood pressure lowering is dangerous: the J-curve: pro side of the argument. *Hypertension*. 2014;63:29–36. doi: 10.1161/01.hyp.0000441190.09494.e9.
9. Cushman WC, Evans GW, Byington RP, Goff DC Jr, Grimm RH Jr, et al. Effects of intensive blood-pressure control in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1575–1585.
10. SPS3 Group. Blood-pressure targets in patients with recent lacunar stroke: the SPS3 randomised trial. *Lancet* 2013;382:507–515.
11. The SPRINT Research Group. A randomized trial of intensive versus standard blood-pressure control. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2103–2116.

12. Haring B, Wu C, Coker LH, Seth A, Snetselaar L, Manson JE, et al. Hypertension, Dietary Sodium, and Cognitive Decline: Results From the Women's Health Initiative Memory Study. *Am J Hypertens*. 2016;29:202–216. doi: 10.1093/ajh/hpv081.
13. Ganguli M, Lee CW, Snitz BE, Hughes TF, McDade E, Chang CC. Rates and risk factors for progression to incident dementia vary by age in a population cohort. *Neurology*. 2015;84:72–80. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000001113.
14. Mossello E, Pieraccioli M, Nesti N, Bulgaresi M, Lorenzi C, Caleri V, et al. Effects of low blood pressure in cognitively impaired elderly patients treated with antihypertensive drugs. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2015;175:578–585. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.8164.
15. Bress AP, Tanner RM, Hess R, Colantonio LD, Shimbo D, Muntner P. Generalizability of SPRINT Results to the U.S. Adult Population. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;67:463–472. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2015.10.037.
16. Pearce LA, McClure LA, Anderson DC, Jacova C, Sharma M, Hart RG, et al; SPS3 Investigators. Effects of long-term blood pressure lowering and dual antiplatelet treatment on cognitive function in patients with recent lacunar stroke: a secondary analysis from the SPS3 randomised trial. *Lancet Neurol*. 2014;13:1177–1185. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70224-8.
17. Zanchetti A, Liu L, Mancia G, Parati G, Grassi G, Stramba-Badiale M, et al. Blood pressure and LDL-cholesterol targets for prevention of recurrent strokes and cognitive decline in the hypertensive patient: design of the European Society of Hypertension-Chinese Hypertension League Stroke in Hypertension Optimal Treatment randomized trial. *J Hypertens*. 2014;32:1888–1897. doi: 10.1097/HJH.0000000000000254..

KEY WORDS: clinical trial ■ blood pressure ■ hypertension ■ review ■ stroke

Review of the Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial for Hypertension Management: How Low to Go for Patients With Stroke?

Brian Silver and Craig S. Anderson

Stroke. 2016;47:1692-1694; originally published online April 19, 2016;
doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.012402

Stroke is published by the American Heart Association, 7272 Greenville Avenue, Dallas, TX 75231
Copyright © 2016 American Heart Association, Inc. All rights reserved.
Print ISSN: 0039-2499. Online ISSN: 1524-4628

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the
World Wide Web at:

<http://stroke.ahajournals.org/content/47/6/1692>

Permissions: Requests for permissions to reproduce figures, tables, or portions of articles originally published in *Stroke* can be obtained via RightsLink, a service of the Copyright Clearance Center, not the Editorial Office. Once the online version of the published article for which permission is being requested is located, click Request Permissions in the middle column of the Web page under Services. Further information about this process is available in the [Permissions and Rights Question and Answer](#) document.

Reprints: Information about reprints can be found online at:
<http://www.lww.com/reprints>

Subscriptions: Information about subscribing to *Stroke* is online at:
<http://stroke.ahajournals.org/subscriptions/>