

o analysis

Original article



found in daytime SBP (3.60, 95% CI: [-0.67-7.87], P = 0.10), nighttime DBP (1.65, 95% CI: [-0.57-3.86], P = 0.15) and in-office SBP (3.89, 95% CI: [-10.07-17.86], P = 0.60) and in 24-h DBP. Conclusion: Our study supports the efficacy of RDN, when combined with antihypertensive treatment when compared to sham treatment, in the management of resistant hypertension.

Introduction

ARTICLE INFO

Renal denervation

Meta-analysis

Intervention

Resistant hypertension

Keywords:

Hypertension is a significant global risk factor for cardiovascular disease and mortality.¹ While most patients can effectively manage their blood pressure through lifestyle adjustments and antihyperten-

sive medications, there exists a subset of patients with resistant hypertension. Resistant hypertension is defined as uncontrolled blood pressure despite the use of three or more antihypertensive drugs, including a diuretic.² In the US, this condition affects an estimated 12.8% of individuals and substantially increases the risk of target organ damage, cardiovascular events, and mortality.³ Consequently, there is a pressing need for innovative therapeutic approaches. Catheter-based renal denervation (RDN) has emerged as a promising

Corresponding author.

E-mail address: alraies@hotmail.com (M.C. Alraies).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nefro.2025.501333

Received 30 November 2024; Accepted 1 March 2025

Available online xxx

0211-6995/© 2025 Sociedad Española de Nefrología. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Please cite this article in press as: M. Adnan, H. Naveed, M. Hamza, et al., Efficacy of renal denervation with and without antihypertensives in patients with resistant hypertension: A systematic review and meta-analysis, Nefrologia, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nefro.2025.501333

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

ARTICLE IN PRES

M. Adnan, H. Naveed, M. Hamza et al.

solution for resistant hypertension.⁴ Renal sympathetic nerves contribute significantly to hypertension by influencing sodium retention, renin release, and renal blood flow.⁵ Ablating these nerves via endovascular radiofrequency energy delivery offers a novel approach to reducing sympathetic nervous system over activity. Renal denervation has demonstrated to be an effective non-pharmacological treatment for resistant and uncontrolled hypertension in the presence or absence of concomitant antihypertensive therapy.^{6,8} However, there have been conflicting results regarding the efficacy of renal denervation in resistant hypertension. Initial studies and registries have reported substantial reductions in in-office blood pressure, reductions typically averaging 25-30 mmHg.² Nevertheless, the Symplicity HTN-3 trial, a blinded sham-controlled study, did not demonstrate a significant advantage of RDN over placebo, possibly due to variations in denervation techniques and patient medication compliance.9 Recent sham-controlled trials have addressed the Symplicity HTN-3 trial limitations and demonstrated that RDN reduces 24-h ambulatory systolic blood pressure by approximately 5-10 mmHg compared to a sham procedure, both with and without antihypertensive medications.^{10,11} Therefore, RDN may complement medication therapy for resistant hypertension. Herein, we performed a comprehensive systematic review and updated network metaanalysis to compare the effectiveness of medical therapy, RDN, and their combination in managing resistant hypertension.

Methods

The search strategy and methodology of our systematic review and network meta-analysis is consistent with PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines. The checklist of these guidelines is shown in Supplemental S1. The methodological quality was assessed using the Assessing the methodological quality of systematic reviews-2 (AMSTAR-2) guidelines checklist. These are reported under Supplemental S2. This review was not registered.

Inclusion criteria for meta-analysis included papers in which patients between 18 and 80 years of age were diagnosed with resistant hypertension, with (1) In-office SBP from 140 to 180 mmHg despite a maximum tolerated dose of 3 or more different-class antihypertensive. (2) In-office DBP of at least 90 mmHg or higher. (3) 24-h SBP 140-170 mmHg. (4) Mean daytime SBP 135-149 mmHg or DBP 90-94 mmHg and (5) Stable renal artery anatomy on CT angiogram, magnetic resonance angiogram, or renal angiogram within the previous year.

Exclusion criteria for meta-analysis included patients with: (1) Stable or unstable angina or myocardial infarction within the prior 3 months, history of heart failure, atrial fibrillation, transient ischemic attack, or cerebrovascular accident. (2) Renal artery anatomy ineligible for treatment. (3) Renal artery stenting within 3 months. (4) > 50% stenosis in a treatable vessel. (5) Presence of fibromuscular dysplasia. (6) Previous renal denervation. (7) Secondary hypertension (Cushing disease, pheochromocytoma, hyperthyroidism, or aldosteronism, etc.). (8) Severe renal artery stenosis (diameter less than 4 mm). (9) Patients with eGFR < 40 mL/min/1.73 m². (10) Prerandomization serum potassium level at least 5.5 mmol/l. (11) Change in BP medication within 4 weeks from randomization. (12) Pregnancy or (13) Comorbidities with limited life expectancy. Patients were required to discontinue prior use of antihypertensives for at least 4 weeks.

Additionally, we excluded case reports, case series, and review articles. A literature search was conducted using the MEDLINE Portal (PubMed and EMBASE utilizing a systematic search strategy by 192 PRISMA mentioned previously for randomized clinical trials and 193 observational studies until April 2024. The search was performed 194 using titles and keywords utilizing Boolean Operators "OR" and

Nefrologia xx (2025) 501333

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

"AND" for terms including: "Renal Denervation", "Antihypertensives", or "Resistant Hypertension". The detailed strategy is given in Supplemental S3.

Study selection

Our study selection included randomized clinical trials, pilot trials, prospective and retrospective observational studies that met our inclusion criteria. Authors screened the articles and any potential fulltext article that met the screening requirements, was reviewed again as part of the second phase of screening for evaluation of the outcome of interest. The data screening was then reviewed by another author.

Data collection and statistical analysis

The data and baseline characteristics were arranged in binary outcome format for discrete variables and continuous outcomes for continuous variables using Microsoft Excel software. Baseline characteristics and data included age, gender, race, BMI, smoking, diabetes mellitus, dyslipidemia, stroke/cardiovascular disease, obstructive sleep apnea, peripheral arterial disease, coronary artery disease, in-office systolic and diastolic blood pressure, 24-h systolic and diastolic blood pressure, morning systolic and diastolic blood pressure, daytime systolic and diastolic blood pressure, nighttime systolic and diastolic blood pressure, in-office heart rate, 24-h heart rate, duration of hypertension, use of antihypertensive medications (including angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, direct renin blockers, beta-blockers, calcium channel blockers, diuretics, vasodilators, alpha 1 blockers, or centrally acting sympatholytic), serum creatinine, and estimated GFR. Data collection also included the type of blinding in the study design, country of study conduction, and duration of follow-up in study populations.

The outcomes studied were divided into primary and secondary outcomes. Primary outcomes included mean change in in-office blood pressure, along with, 24-h, morning, daytime, and nighttime systolic and diastolic blood pressure at 3-6 months from baseline with RDN in comparison to either antihypertensives alone or sham. While secondary outcomes included mean change in in-office, 24-h, morning, daytime, and nighttime systolic and diastolic blood pressure at 6-12 months from baseline with RDN compared to antihypertensives combined with either sham or RDN alone. Treatments were divided into the following categories:

- 1) Renal denervation and anti-hypertensive medication
- 2) Sham and anti-hypertensive medication
- 3) Anti-hypertensive medication
- 4) Renal denervation
- 5) Sham

We report the mean with standard deviations (SD) for baseline characteristics and study outcomes as extracted from the included clinical studies and randomized clinical trials. Statistical analysis was conducted by CRAN-R software (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). A netmeta module was used along with the random-effects model to pool the pre-calculated standard mean differences (SMD) along with standard errors (SE) with a probability value of P < 0.05 considered to be statistically significant. The overall net graph for this was also reported. Outcomes were reported as standard mean difference (SMD) with 95% confidence interval (CI). Since sham was used as a reference against which the efficacies of all other strategies were compared, it was given an RR (Risk Ratio) of 0.00. Treatments were ranked based on P values from a netrank module. We also did pairwise comparisons of treatment nodes using inverse variance and DerSimonian-Laird method to estimate between

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Adnan, H. Naveed, M. Hamza et al.

study variance.¹² Higgins *I*-squared (I^2) was determined as a measure of statistical heterogeneity where values of \leq 50% corresponded to low to moderate heterogeneity while values \geq 75% indicated high heterogeneity. The potential inconsistencies between the direct and indirect evidence within the network were evaluated by using the design by treatment approach. Assessment of global inconsistencies was done using a generalized Cochran's *Q* statistic and local inconsistencies by using the "separate the indirect from direct design evidence" approach".¹³ Publication bias was assessed by visually inspecting a funnel plot and mathematically using the Egger's test. The quality assessment for the included studies was performed using Cochrane Risk of Bias for the randomized clinical trials.¹⁴

Results

Study selection, trial characteristics, and quality assessment

An initial search of the PubMed/Medline and Embase databases yielded a total of 948 articles (PubMed: 191, Embase: 757). After exclusion based on the title, abstract and full text, a total of 20 randomized clinical trials (RCTs) were deemed eligible for inclusion in our meta-analysis^{6,15–30} (Fig. 1). The studies varied in sample size, experimental design, patients' characteristics, and follow-up duration. (Reported in Table 1 and Supplementary 4.) The follow-up duration in most of the included studies was 6 months while in other studies it ranged from 2 to 36 months. The net graph is shown in

Nefrologia xx (2025) 501333

Fig. 2 which is well connected. The results of this meta-analysis are presented as detailed forest plots (Figs. 1–8 in Supplementary S4 and Fig. 3A and B) and funnel plots with Egger's *p* test values (Supplemental S5). Three of the studies were given a full text review but not included in the trial as two of them compared types of renal denervation with each other^{31,32} and one of them had no comparison group.³³

Daytime systolic blood pressure: Our pooled analysis demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference in SBP among group 1 patients undergoing RDN and antihypertensives (3.60, 95% CI: [-0.67-7.87], P = 0.10), in group 2 patients undergoing sham and antihypertensives (-2.93, 95%CI: [-7.72-1.86], P = 0.23) and group 3 patients with antihypertensives (-1.49, 95%CI: [-4.72-1.73], P = 0.37). There was significant reduction in daytime SBP in group 4 patients undergoing renal denervation alone (4.78, 95%CI: [3.10-6.47], P < 0.0001). There was a significantly high heterogeneity (I2 = 96.8%) across these studies.

Daytime diastolic blood pressure: Our analysis showed a substantial reduction in daytime DBP among group 1 patients (3.90, 95% CI: [0.58–7.22], P = 0.02), and group 4 patients (3.46, 95%CI: [1.89– 5.02], P < 0.0001) compared to group 2 (1.41, 95%CI: [-2.30–5.13], P = 0.46), group 3 (0.42, 95%CI: [-2.16–2.99], P = 0.75), and group 5 patients (0.00) A significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 95.4\%$) was found across these studies.

Nighttime systolic blood pressure: Our analysis showed a statistically significant decrease in nighttime SBP among group 1 patients (5.31, 95% CI: [1.57–9.04], P = 0.005), and group



Fig. 1. PRISMA flow chart. This figure shows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flowchart of number of systematic search results and process of screening and study selection.

Table 1

4

First author	Year	Country	Blinding	Follow-up duration	Primary endpoints	Secondary endpoints	Renal denervation (RD)	Treatment 2 (T2)
D LBhatt	2014	International (Multi Center)	Single Blinded	6 months	Change in office systolic blood pressure at 6 months;	A secondary efficacy endpoint change in mean 24-h ambulatory systolic blood pressure.	Simplicity renal-denervation catheter (Medtronic).	Renal angiography
Лichel Azizi	2021	International (Multi Center)	Single Blinded	2 months	Change in mean 24-h ambulatory systolic blood pressure.	24-Ambulatory systolic and diastolic blood pressures, night- time ambulatory systolic and diastolic blood pressures, and daytime ambulatory diastolic blood pressure.	Ultrasonography renal denervation (Paradise System)	3 anti HTN in 1 pill (amlodipine 10 mg (or 5 mg in the event of severe leg edema), valsartan 160 mg (or olmesartan 40 mg depending upon medication availability in each country),and hydrochlorothiazide 25 mg.)
azuomi Kario	2015	17 sites in Japan	Open label	6 months	6-Month change in office and 24-h ambulatory systolic BP ¹ were compared	Hierarchical testing were change in average 24-h ambulatory BP	SymplicityTM Renal denervation system (Medtronic, Santa Rosa, CA, USA)	Standard pharmacotherapy
otte Jacobs	2017	3 Belgian Center	Open label	6 month	Baseline-adjusted changes in systolic BP, diastolic BP (office, 24 h, day and night time)		RDN by the EnligHTNTM multi-electrode system	Control group On 3 Hypertension meds
le N. Mathiassena	2016	Single center	Double blinded	6 months	Mean Change in 24 h ambulatory BP at 1 and 3 months	Systolic blood pressure, and average night-time ambulatory	Unipolar Medtronic Flex Catheter based renal denervation	Sham control with 3/4 antihypertensive including 1 diuretic
osa L. de Jager,	2017	multicenter RCT in 14 centers in Netherland	Open label	6 month	Change in daytime systolic ambulatory BP at 6 months.	Ambulatory diastolic blood pressure at 2 months, in this order.	Symplicity and EnligHTN catheter Ablation based Renal denervation	Usual care with >3 antihypertensive
elix Mehfoud	2022	25 International Centers	Single Blinded	36 months	Change in 24 h ambulatory SBP at 24 months	Outcomes were periprocedural complications.	Catheter based renal denervation	Sham Control
effen Desch	2015	Germany	Double blinded	6 months	Change in 24-h systolic BP at 6 months in intention to treat population.	Change in diastolic BP, mean BP at 6 months, change in 24-h mean systolic BP in the per-protocol population and safety events.	Renal sympathetic denervation with the Symplicity Flex Catheter (Medtronic)	Invasive sham procedure (renal angiography and a simulated procedure with 4–6 sham runs for each renal artery guided by 2- min acoustic signals)
nna Oliveras	2016	Multicentered	Double blinded	6 months	Change in 24-h SBP at 6 months		Renal denervation	Spironolactone
/lichel Azizi	2015	15 French tertiary care centers	Open label	6 months	Change in daytime ambulatory systolic blood pressure at 6 months	Adverse events and eGFR ² reduction at 6 months	Radiofrequency-based renal denervation added to a standardized stepped-care antihypertensive treatment (SSAHT)	SSAHT alone (spironolactone 25 mg per day, bisoprolol 10 mg per day, prazosin 5 mg per day, and rilmenidine 1 mg per day)
Roland E. Schmiedera	2017	International	Double blinded	13 months	Difference in office SBP, occurrence of adverse events during the first 6 weeks	Change in 24-h ambulatory SBP between baseline and 24 weeks posttreatment	Bilateral RDN using therapeutic levels of ultra- sound energy	Bilateral sham treatment using diagnostic levels of ultrasound energy.
Kazuomi Kario1	2021	Japan and South Korea	Single blinded	3 months	Between-group difference in change in 24-h ambulatory SBP from baseline at 3 months.	Change in daytime and nighttime ambulatory SBP from baseline at 3 months, change in 24-h, daytime and nighttime ambulatory diastolic BP (DBP) from baseline at 3 months, and change in seated office SBP and DBP from baseline at 3 months.	Two 7-s ultrasound sonications delivered bilaterally to the main renal artery; 6 French catheter	A renal angiogram without denervation

Table 1 (Continued)

л

Characteristics of included studies.

First author	Year	Country	Blinding	Follow-up duration	Primary endpoints	Secondary endpoints	Renal denervation (RD)	Treatment 2 (T2)
Rosa J. et al.	2015	Multicenter	Open label	36 months	The differences in systolic and diastolic BP recorded between baseline and 6 months post- randomization	Office and 24-h BP differences between baseline and 1-, 2-, and 3- year post-randomization	Symplicity Renal Denervation System	Pharmacological treatment
Warchol-Celinska et al.	2018	Poland	Open label	6 months	Difference in mean change in office systolic BP from baseline to 3 months between the Renal Denervation group and the control group.	Difference in mean change in office diastolic BP from baseline to 3 months and systolic and diastolic BP from baseline to 6 months, the difference in mean change in ambulatory systolic and diastolic BP	Renal denervation was performed using Symplicity Catheter System	Control
O. U. Bergland et al.	2020	Norway	Open label	84 months	The differences in systolic and diastolic BP recorded by 24-h ABPM between baseline and 6 months post-randomization	Change in diastolic BP, mean BP at 6 months, change in 24-h mean systolic BP in the per-protocol population and safety events.	Renal denervation was performed using Symplicity Catheter System	Pharmacological treatment
Michael A. Weber	2020	Multicentre	Single blinded	12 months	8 week change in 24 h ambulatory systolic BP	6 month, 12 month change in 24:h systolic BP	Bipolar radio frequency renal denervation	Sham procedure
Michel Azizi	2018	Multicenter	Single blinded	2 months	Change in daytime ambulatory systolic blood pressure at 2 months	Change in average 24-h ambulatory systolic blood pressure, average 24-h ambulatory diastolic blood pressure, average night-time ambulatory systolic blood pressure, and average night- time ambulatory diastolic blood pressure at 2 months,	Renal denervation with the Paradise system	Renal angiography only
Michael Bohm	2020	44 study cites internationally	Single Blinded	3 months	Baseline adjusted change in 24 h SBP at 3 months	Baseline adjusted change in office SBP at 3 months	Flex catheter	Sham
Atul Pathak	2023	25 centers in Europe and USA	Single blinded	12 month	Change in mean 24 h ambulatory systolic blood pressure	Occurrence of major adverse effects	Alcohol based peregrine catheter	Sham
David E. Kandzari	2024	International	Double blinded	3 month	Mean 24 h ambulatory systolic BP change	Change in office systolic BP in 3 months	Alcohol based peregrine catheter	Sham

This table shows characteristics of included trials, the year of study conduction, the first author, the type of blinding, the intervention groups, the primary and secondary endpoints and duration of follow up. 1. Blood pressure. 2. Glomerular Filtration Rate.

В

Nefrologia xx (2025) 501333



Fig. 2. Net diagram. This figure shows a network diagram to show the connection and strength of direct evidence in our outcomes. The width of the edges corresponds to the strength of the direct evidence (estimated by number of studies) between the treatment modalities which are represented by nodes.

24 hours DBP A

Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham' (Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication	*	2.31 0.68 5.88 0.00 4.24	[0.10; 4.52] [-0.41; 1.77] [3.02; 8.74] [0.97; 7.51]

Nighttime DBP

Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham' (Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication		-0.10 1.65 4.78 0.00 2.74	[-3.63; 3.44] [-0.57; 3.87] [0.21; 9.34] [-2.42; 7.90]

-HTN medication		-0.10 [-3.63; 3.44]
al Denervation		1.65 [-0.57; 3.87]
al Denervation + Anti-HTN medication		- 4.78 [0.21; 9.34]
m		0.00
m + Anti-HTN medication		2.74 [-2.42; 7.90]
	F 0 F	

24 hours SBP

Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham' (Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication	-5 0 5	0.63 2.82 5.67 0.00 -0.65	[-2.45; 3.70] [1.24; 4.41] [1.67; 9.68] [-5.11; 3.81]

Nighttime SBP

Office SBP

Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham' (Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI	Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham'	SMD	95% CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication		-0.30 [2.87 5.31 0.00 2.80 [[-3.15; 2.55] [1.43; 4.31] [1.57; 9.04] [-1.49; 7.10]	Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication		-2.99 6.09 3.89 0.00 -1.02	[-13.97; 8.00] [0.20; 11.98] [-10.07; 17.86] [-17.79; 15.74]

Fig. 3. Outcomes of renal denervation and antihypertensives in patients with resistant hypertension. (A) Forest plots showing diastolic blood pressure outcomes (DBP = diastolic blood pressure, SMD = standardized mean difference, HTN = hypertension, CI = confidence interval). (B) Forest plots showing systolic blood pressure outcomes (SBP = systolic blood pressure, SMD = standardized mean difference, HTN = hypertension, CI = confidence interval).

4 patients (2.87, 95%CI: [1.43-4.31], P < 0.0001), in comparison to group 2 (2.80, 95%CI: [-1.49-7.10], P = 0.20), group 3 (-0.30, 95%) CI: [-3.15-2.55], P = 0.84), group 5 patients (0.00). We found a significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 93.2\%$) across these studies.

Nighttime diastolic blood pressure: Our analysis showed a statistically significant decrease in nighttime DBP among group 1 patients (4.78, 95% CI: [0.21-9.34], P = 0.04) compared to group 2 patients (2.74, 95%CI: [-2.42-7.90], P = 0.30), group 3 (-0.10, 95%CI: [-3.63-3.44], P = 0.96), group 4 (1.65, 95%CI: [-0.57-3.87], P = 0.20), and group 5 patients (0.00). There was a significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 97.4\%$) across these studies.

24-h systolic blood pressure: Our analysis demonstrated a statistically significant reduction in 24-h SBP among group 1 patients (5.67, 95% CI: [1.67-9.68], P = 0.006), and group 4 patients (2.82,

Daytime DBP

Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham' (Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication	6.4.2.0.2.4.6	0.42 [- 3.45 [3.90 [0.00 1.41 [-	2.16; 2.99] 1.89; 5.02] 0.58; 7.22] 2.30; 5.13]

Office DBP

Treatment	(Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication		0.98 2.70 4.95 0.00 1.54	[-2.35; 4.31] [1.04; 4.36] [0.63; 9.28] [-3.63; 6.70]

Davtime SBP

Treatment	Comparison: other vs 'Sham' (Random Effects Model)	SMD	95%-CI
Anti-HTN medication Renal Denervation Renal Denervation + Anti-HTN medication Sham Sham + Anti-HTN medication		-1.49 4.78 3.60 0.00 -2.93	[-4.72; 1.73] [3.10; 6.47] [-0.67; 7.87] [-7.72; 1.85]

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Adnan, H. Naveed, M. Hamza et al.

95%CI: [1.24–4.41], P = 0.001). However, no statistical difference in group 2 (-0.65, 95%CI: [-5.12–3.81], P = 0.78), group 3 (0.63, 95% CI: [-2.45–3.70], P = 0.69), and group 5 patients (0.00). There was a significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 96.2\%$) across these studies.

24-h diastolic blood pressure: Our analysis demonstrated a statistically significant decrease in 24-h DBP among group 1 (5.88, 95% CI: [3.02–8.74], P < 0.0001), group 2 (4.24, 95%CI: [0.97–7.51], P = 0.011), and group 3 patients (2.31, 95%CI: [0.10–4.52], P = 0.04). There was no statistically difference found in group 4 (0.68, 95%CI: [-0.41–1.78], P = 0.22), and group 5 patients (0.00). A significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 97.1\%$) was found across these studies.

In-office systolic blood pressure: Our analysis revealed no statistically significant change in in-office SBP among group 1 (3.89, 95% CI: [-10.07-17.86], *P* = 0.60), group 2 (-1.02, 95%CI: [-17.80-15.74], *P* = 0.91), group 3 (-2.99, 95%CI: [-13.97-8.00], *P* = 0.59), and group 5 patients (0.00). However, there is statistically significant reduction in in-office SBP in group 4 patients (6.09, 95%CI:

[0.20–11.98], P=0.04). There was significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2=99.7\%)$ across these studies.

In-office diastolic blood pressure: Our analysis also revealed a statistically significant decrease in in-office DBP among group 1 (4.95, 95% CI: [0.63–9.28], P = 0.03), and group 4 patients (2.70, 95%CI: [1.04–4.36], P = 0.002) compared to group 2 (1.54, 95%CI: [-3.63–6.70], P = 0.56), group 3 (0.98, 95%CI: [-2.35–4.31], P = 0.56), and group 5 patients (0.00). There was significantly high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 98.3\%$) across these studies.

High heterogeneity was observed across all outcomes. This could be explained by the different types of renal denervation used, the difference in follow up duration and the difference in antihypertensive medication regimen and dose.

The risk of bias assessment for included trials is given in Supplemental S6. Furthermore, we included pairwise comparisons of treatment groups in Supplemental S7. The graphs of Fig. 4 show outcomes of pairwise comparison of RDN with sham and of RDN and antihypertensives with sham and antihypertensives. In the compari-

A: Chart shows the random effect SMDs of pairwise comparison between Renal Denervation and Sham



B: Chart shows the random effect SMDs of pairwise comparison between Renal Denervation + AHTs and Sham + AHTs



Fig. 4. A and B show the random effects model standardized mean difference of pairwise comparison of interventions (SMD = standardized mean difference, CI = confidence interval, SBP = systolic blood pressure, DBP = diastolic blood pressure, AHT = anti-hypertensives, BP = blood pressure).

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Adnan, H. Naveed, M. Hamza et al.

son of renal denervation and antihypertensive versus sham and antihypertensive, the SMD was 1.53(95% CI: 0.63–2.42) for 24 h DBP, 6.59 (95% CI: 2.61–10.6) for 24 h SBP and 2.35 (95% CI: 1.01–3.70) for daytime DBP. However, in most of pairwise comparisons heterogeneity was high. The direct and indirect estimates of assessed outcomes are shown in Supplemental S8.

Moreover, the *p*-score ranking of treatment groups in all outcomes is depicted in bar charts in Supplemental S9. The treatment group of renal denervation and antihypertensive medication ranked highest in 24 h DBP, 24 h SBP, nighttime DBP, daytime DBP, office DBP and nighttime SBP. The results of Higgin's I squared for heterogeneity are given in Supplemental S10.

Discussion

The management of resistant hypertension remains a challenge in clinical practice, and various therapeutic interventions have been explored to achieve better blood pressure control.³⁴ Among these interventions, RDN has emerged as a potential treatment option.³⁵ This network meta-analysis aimed to systematically evaluate the efficacy of RDN, employed alone in conjunction with antihypertensive medications, in patients with resistant hypertension.

A previous meta-analysis compares RDN with anti-hypertensives and has concluded that RDN is a superior in blood pressure reduction.³⁶ Another recent meta-analysis has compared RDN with sham procedure and its finding revealed that RDN reduced ambulatory blood pressure and daytime systolic blood pressure significantly.³⁷ Although earlier meta-analyses have been published on this objective,³⁸ we utilized a *netmeta* module to provide more definitive results with more inclusive treatment categories. Our metaanalysis includes the comparison of RDN and antihypertensive combination compared to RDN or antihypertensives alone, upon which pooled effect from different trials has not been compared before.

Our findings revealed several significant findings in blood pressure measurements and outcomes with an RDN alone and with a combination of RDN and antihypertensive medications. These statistically significant reductions underscore the potential clinical significance of RDN as an adjunctive therapy for resistant hypertension.

A significant reduction in daytime DBP suggests that treatment with both RDN alone and as an adjunctive therapy to antihypertensives leads to better control of DBP during waking hours. However the daytime SBP was found to be significantly reduced with RDN alone. This improvement translates into a reduced risk of cardiovascular events and target organ damage associated with hypertension.³⁹ Additionally, nighttime hypertension is a known risk factor for adverse cardiovascular outcomes⁴⁰ and our analysis revealed a substantial reduction in nighttime SBP and DBP with the adjunctive treatment of RDN and antihypertensive therapy. This finding is particularly noteworthy as it addresses the need for effective nighttime blood pressure management in patients with resistant hypertension. Furthermore, 24-h systolic and diastolic blood pressure showed reductions with the adjunctive treatment of RDN and antihypertensives. These findings underscore the sustained efficacy of RDN and anti-hypertensives over a day, potentially mitigating the risks associated with fluctuations in blood pressure levels.41 Additionally, RDN and anti-hypertensives demonstrated a substantial reduction in-office SBP and DBP. Our results suggest that RDN, in conjunction with antihypertensive therapy, can lead to improved blood pressure control during healthcare visits, which may enhance patient compliance and satisfaction.⁴²

The findings of this network meta-analysis provide robust evidence supporting the efficacy of RDN in conjunction with antihypertensive treatment for the management of resistant hypertension. The

Nefrologia xx (2025) 501333

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

significant reductions in blood pressure observed throughout the day, including daytime, nighttime, 24-h monitoring, and in-office measurements, suggest that RDN when combined with antihypertensive medications, offers a promising approach to managing resistant hypertension. These results are consistent with a growing body of research that underscores the potential of RDN as a valuable adjunctive therapy in this challenging clinical scenario, especially for patients who struggle to achieve blood pressure control with conventional treatments. However, it is crucial to interpret these findings with a consideration of certain limitations.

Firstly, as this is a study-level meta-analysis, addressing individual confounding was difficult due to the lack of patient-specific data. Secondly, there was notable variance in the duration of the follow-up period across the included studies, which may have contributed to the observed heterogeneity in our analysis.

Furthermore, individual patient characteristics, diverse medication regimens, and long-term safety considerations necessitate further investigation. Variability in patient responses, potential adverse effects, and the durability of the observed blood pressure reductions should be carefully evaluated. The included trials have compared antihypertensives with RDN but the number, dosage and type of antihypertensive medication is not entirely same. A personalized approach considering these factors is essential when considering RDN as a therapeutic option for patients with resistant hypertension. Further research, including long-term follow-up and assessment of safety and adverse events, is warranted to establish the role of RDN definitively in the management of resistant hypertension, and clinical trials are needed to validate these findings and provide comprehensive guidance for clinicians managing patients with resistant hypertension.

In conclusion, clinical trials demonstrating long-term effects in decreasing blood pressure in individuals with stage I–II hypertension who have never received treatment, a modest risk factor profile, and sympathetic over-activity will further determine the future of RDN.⁴³ By focusing on these individuals, comorbidities and irreversible target organ damage—such as conduit artery stiffness and microcirculation remodeling—would be eliminated. The patients can be maintained off pharmaceuticals, preventing ambiguity from non-adherence and changes in drug therapy, because current guidelines suggest lifestyle interventions for these patients for a few weeks to months.⁴¹ The procedure's safety may provide another justification for the ethics of these experiments. Such trials, potentially stratified by the RDN system or energy delivery site, might establish or eliminate RDN as a method for treating resistant hypertension.

Conclusion

The results of our study revealed that RDN in combination with antihypertensive medications can be used in the management of resistant hypertension. Our network meta-analysis demonstrated substantial evidence supporting the efficacy of RDN, when combined with antihypertensive treatment, with significant reduction in both systolic and diastolic blood pressure measurements at different time points. These findings align with the recent research highlighting the role of RDN as a potential adjuvant therapy option in patients with resistant hypertension. Patients who have struggled to achieve adequate blood pressure control with conventional treatments may particularly benefit from this approach. However, individual patient characteristics, medication regimens, and long-term safety considerations warrant further investigation. Further research and clinical trials are needed to validate these findings.

Conflict of interest

All authors have nothing to declare.

M. Adnan, H. Naveed, M. Hamza et al.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

Nefrologia xx (2025) 501333

1053	Q4 Uncited reference	20.	Desch S, Okon T, Heinemann D, Kulle K, Röhnert K, Sonnabend M, et al.	1119
1054			resistant hypertension. Hypertension. 2015;65:1202–8.	1120
1055	7.	21.	Oliveras A, Armario P, Clarà A, Sans-Atxer L, Vá Zquez S, Pascual J, et al.	1121
1057			Spironolactone versus sympathetic renal denervation to treat true resistant	1122
1058	Acknowledgements	22.	Azizi M, Sapoval M, Gosse P, Monge M, Bobrie G, Delsart P, et al. Optimum and	1120
1059			stepped care standardised antihypertensive treatment with or without renal	1125
1060	None.		denervation for resistant hypertension (DENERHTN): a multicentre, open-label, randomised controlled trial Lancet 2015;385:1957–65	1126
1061		23.	Schmieder RE, Ott C, Toennes SW, Bramlage P, Gertner M, Dawood O, et al. Phase II	1127
1062	Appendix A. Supplementary data		randomized sham-controlled study of renal denervation for individuals with	1128
1063		24	uncontrolled hypertension-WAVE IV. J Hypertens. 2018;36:680–9. Kario K. Yokoi Y. Okamura K. Fujihara M. Ogovama Y. Yamamoto F. et al. Catheter-	1129
1064	Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in		based ultrasound renal denervation in patients with resistant hypertension: the	1130
1065	the online version, at doi:10.1016/j.netro.2025.501333.	25	randomized, controlled REQUIRE trial. Hypertens Res. 2022;45:221.	1131
1066	References	25.	comparison of renal denervation versus intensified pharmacotherapy including	1132
1067			spironolactone in true-resistant hypertension: six-month results from the prague-15	1133
1068	1. Ettehad D, Emdin CA, Kiran A, Anderson SG, Callender T, Emberson J, et al. Blood	26	study. Hypertension. 2015;65:407–13. Warehol Celineka F. Breibiez A. Kadziela I. Florezak F. Januezawicz M.	1134
1069	pressure lowering for prevention of cardiovascular disease and death: a systematic	20.	Michalowska I, et al. Renal denervation in resistant hypertension and obstructive	1135
1070	2. Esler MD, Krum H, Sobotka PA, Schlaich MP, Schmieder RE, Böhm M, et al. Renal		sleep apnea. Hypertension. 2018;72:381–90.	1136
1071	sympathetic denervation in patients with treatment-resistant hypertension (The	27.	Bergland OU, Søraas CL, Larstorp ACK, Halvorsen LV, Hjørnholm U, Hoffman P,	1137
1072	Symplicity HTN-2 Trial): a randomised controlled trial. Lancet (London England).		adjustments: efficacy and safety through 7 years of follow-up. Blood Pressure.	1138
1073	3. Persell SD. Prevalence of resistant hypertension in the United States, 2003–2008.		2021;30:41–50.	1139
1074	Hypertension. 2011;57:1076–80.	28.	Weber MA, Kirtane AJ, Weir MR, Radhakrishnan J, Das T, Berk M, et al. The	1140
1075	4. Krum H, Schlaich M, Whitbourn R, Sobotka PA, Sadowski J, Bartus K, et al.		radiofrequency renal denervation for the treatment of hypertension. JACC:	1141
1076	multicentre safety and proof-of-principle cohort study. Lancet (London England).		Cardiovasc Intervent. 2020;13:461–70.	1142
1077	2009;373:1275-81.	29.	A Kandzari DE, Weber MA, Pathak A, et al. Effect of alcohol-mediated renal denervation on blood pressure in the presence of antibypertensive medications:	1143
1078	 Schlaich MP, Krum H, Sobotka PA, Esler MD. Renal denervation and hypertension. Am J Hypertension 2011;24:635–42 		primary results from the TARGET BP I randomized clinical trial. Circulation. 2024,	1144
1079	6. Azizi M, Schmieder RE, Mahfoud F, Weber MA, Daemen J, Davies J, et al.		http://dx.doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.124.069291. Published online	1145
1080	Endovascular ultrasound renal denervation to treat hypertension (RADIANCE-HTN	30	April 8. Pathak A. Rudolph UM. Saxena M. et al. Alcohol-mediated renal denervation in	1146
1081	SOLO): a multicentre, international, single-blind, randomised, sham-controlled trial Lancet (London England), 2018;391:2335–45		patients with hypertension in the absence of antihypertensive medications.	1147
1082	7. Böhm M, Kario K, Kandzari DE, Mahfoud F, Weber MA, Schmieder RE, et al.	21	EuroIntervention. 2023;19:602–11, http://dx.doi.org/10.4244/EIJ-D-23-00088	1148
1083	Efficacy of catheter-based renal denervation in the absence of antihypertensive	31.	arm randomized trial of different renal denervation devices and techniques in	1149
1004	controlled trial Lancet, 2020:395:1444–51.		patients with resistant hypertension (RADIOSOUND-HTN). Circulation.	1150
1005	8. Mahfoud F, Kandzari DE, Kario K, Townsend RR, Weber MA, Schmieder RE, et al.	22	2019;139:590–600. Bekarekiy SE, Baey AE, Mordovin VE, Semke GV, Pipp TM, Folkovskova AU, et al.	1151
1087	Long-term efficacy and safety of renal denervation in the presence of	32.	Denervation of the distal renal arterial branches vs. conventional main renal artery	1152
1082	trial. Lancet (London England). 2022:399:1401–10.		treatment: a randomized controlled trial for treatment of resistant hypertension. J	1153
1089	9. Bhatt DL, Kandzari DE, O'Neill WW, D'Agostino R, Flack JM, Katzen BT, et al. A	33	Hypertens. 2017;35:369–75. Mahfoud F. Benkin J. Sievert H. et al. Alcohol-mediated renal denervation using the	1155
1090	controlled trial of renal denervation for resistant hypertension. N Engl J Med.	55.	peregrine system infusion catheter for treatment of hypertension [published	1156
1091	10. Townsend RR, Mahfoud F, Kandzari DE, Kario K, Pocock S, Weber MA, et al. Catheter-		correction appears in JACC Cardiovasc Interv 2020 Nov 23;13(22):2717]. JACC	1157
1092	based renal denervation in patients with uncontrolled hypertension in the absence of		Cardiovasc Interv. 2020;13:471–84, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.	1158
1093	antihypertensive medications (SPYRAL HTN-OFF MED): a randomised, sham-	34.	Hasan MA, Stewart MH, Lavie CJ, Ventura HO. Management of resistant	1159
1094	11. Kandzari DE, Böhm M, Mahfoud F, Townsend RR, Weber MA, Pocock S, et al. Effect	05	hypertension. Curr Opin Cardiol. 2019;34:367–75.	1160
1095	of renal denervation on blood pressure in the presence of antihypertensive drugs: 6-	35.	hypertension, Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017:2017.	7 1161
1096	month efficacy and safety results from the SPYRAL HTN-ON MED proof-of-concept randomised trial Lancet (London England), 2018;391:2346–55	36.	Sobreira LER, Bezerra FB, Sano VKT, et al. Efficacy and safety of radiofrequency-	1162
1097	12. Jackson D, White IR, Riley RD. A matrix-based method of moments for fitting the		based renal denervation on resistant hypertensive patients: a systematic review and	1163
1098	multivariate random effects model for meta-analysis and meta-regression.		org/10.1007/s40292-024-00660-2	1164
1099	Biometric J. 2013;55:231–45. 13. Effhimiou O. Rücker G. Schwarzer G. Higgins JPT. Egger M. Salanti G. Network	37.	Dantas CR, De Oliveira Macena Lôbo A, De Almeida AM, De Moraes FCA, Sano VKT,	1165
1100	meta-analysis of rare events using the Mantel-Haenszel method. Stat Med.		Kelly FA. Systematic review and meta-analysis of second-generation Sham-	1166
1101	2019;38:2992–3012.		hypertension. High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev. 2024;12, http://dx.doi.org/	1167
1102	Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ.		10.1007/s40292-024-00675-9. Published online October.	1168
1103	2011;343:d5928, http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d5928. PMID: 22008217;	38.	rernances A, David C, Pinto FJ, Costa J, Ferreira JJ, Caldeira D. The effect of catheter-based sham renal depervation in hypertension: systematic review and	1169
1104	PMCID: PMC3196245		meta-analysis. BMC Cardiovasc Disord. 2023;23:1–13.	1170
1105	Japan – first randomized controlled trial of catheter-based renal denervation in	39.	Vasan RS, Song RJ, Xanthakis V, Beiser A, Decarli C, Mitchell GF, et al.	1171
1106	Asian patients. Circ J. 2015;79:1222–9.		community. Hypertension. 2022:79:505–15.	1172
1107	 Azizi M, Sanghvi K, Saxena M, Gosse P, Reilly JP, Levy T, et al. Ultrasound renal dependence of the provided and the provided and	40.	Presta V, Figliuzzi I, D'agostino M, Citoni B, Miceli F, Simonelli F, et al. Nocturnal	1173
1108	TRIO): a randomised, multicentre, single-blind, sham-controlled trial. Lancet.		blood pressure patterns and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with masked	1174
1109	2021;397:2476-86.	41.	Parati G, Ochoa JE, Lombardi C, Salvi P, Bilo G. Assessment and interpretation of	1175
1110	17. Jacobs L, Persu A, Huang QF, Lengele JP, Thijs L, Hammer F, et al. Results of a randomized controlled pilot trial of intravascular renal denervation for		blood pressure variability in a clinical setting. Blood Pressure. 2013;22:345-54.	1176
1111	management of treatment-resistant hypertension. Blood Pressure. 2017;26:321–	42.	. Hamrahian SM, Maarouf OH, Fülöp T. A critical review of medication adherence in hypertension: harriers and facilitators clinicians should consider. Patient Profes	1177
1112	31. 19. Mathiassan ON Vasa H. Pash IN Christopson VI. Duus NII. Cabras day AD et al.		Adher. 2022;16:2749.	1178
1113	Renal denervation in treatment-resistant essential hypertension. A randomized.	43.	Mancia G, Fagard R, Narkiewicz K, Redon J, Zanchetti A, Böhm M, et al. 2013 ESH/	11/9
1115	SHAM-controlled, double-blinded 24-h blood pressure-based trial. J Hypertens.		ESC guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension: the Task Force for the Management of Arterial Hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension	1100
1116	2016;34:1639–47. 19 De Jager RI De Beus F Beeffink MMA Sanders MF Vonken FI Vockuil M et al.		(ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Eur Heart J. 2013;34:2159–	1182
1117	Impact of medication adherence on the effect of renal denervation: the SYMPATHY		219.	1183
1118	trial. Hypertension. 2017;69:678-84.			1184
		0		
		,		