Effects of catheter-based renal denervation in hypertension:

a systematic review and meta-analysis

Davor Vukadinović¹, MD, Lucas Lauder¹, MD, David E. Kandzari², MD, Deepak L. Bhatt³, MD, MPH, MBA, Ajay Kirtane⁴, MD, SM, Elazer R. Edelman^{5,6}, MD, PhD, Roland E. Schmieder⁷, MD, Michel Azizi^{8,9} MD, PhD, Michael Böhm¹, MD, Felix Mahfoud^{1,5}, MD, MA

¹Klinik für Innere Medizin III, Kardiologie, Angiologie und Internistische Intensivmedizin, Universitätsklinikum des Saarlandes, Universität des Saarlandes, Homburg, Germany.

²Piedmont Heart Institute, Atlanta, GA, USA.

³ Mount Sinai Fuster Heart Hospital, Icahn School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA

⁴ Columbia University Medical Center/New York-Presbyterian Hospital and the Cardiovascular Research Foundation, New York, NY, USA.

⁵ IMES, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA.

⁶ Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.

⁷ Department of Nephrology and Hypertension, University Hospital Erlangen, Friedrich Alexander University Erlangen/Nuremberg, Germany.

⁸ Université Paris Cité, Paris, France.

⁹ Hypertension Department, AP-HP, Hopital, Georges-Pompidou, Paris, France.

Short title: Meta-analysis of renal denervation in hypertension

Total word count (Title Page, Abstract, Text, References, Tables and Figure Legends): 7,265.

Corresponding author: Davor Vukadinović, MD Saarland University Hospital Klinik für Innere Medizin III Kardiologie, Angiologie und Internistische Intensivmedizin Kirrberger Strasse 100, D-66421 Homburg, Germany Email: <u>Davor.Vukadinovic@uks.eu</u> Tel: +49 06841/ 16-15500 Fax: +49 06841/ 16-15995

1 Abstract: 256 words

Background: Several sham-controlled trials have investigated the efficacy and safety of
catheter-based renal denervation (RDN) with mixed outcomes.

4 Aim: To perform a comprehensive meta-analysis of all randomized, sham-controlled trials

5 investigating RDN with first- and second-generation devices in hypertension.

Methods: We searched MEDLINE and Cochrane Library for eligible trials. Outcomes included
both efficacy (24-hour and office systolic [SBP] and diastolic blood pressure [DBP]) and safety
(all-cause death, vascular complication, renal artery stenosis >70%, hypertensive crisis) of RDN.

9 We performed a study-level, pairwise, random-effects meta-analysis of the summary data.

10 Results: Ten trials comprising 2,478 patients with hypertension while being either off- or on-11 treatment were included. Compared with sham, RDN reduced 24-hour and office systolic BP by 4.4 mmHg (95%CI -6.1, -2.7, p<0.00001) and 6.6 mmHg (95%CI -9.7, -3.6, p<0.0001), 12 respectively. The 24-hour and office diastolic BP paralleled these findings (-2.6 mmHg, 95%CI -13 3.6, -1.5, p<0.00001; -3.5 mmHg, 95%CI -5.4, -1.6, p=0.0003). There was no difference in 24-14 15 hour and office SBP reduction between trials with and without concomitant antihypertensive 16 medication (p for interaction 0.62 and 0.73, respectively). There was no relevant difference 17 concerning vascular complications (OR 1.69, 95% CI 0.57-5.0, p=0.34), renal artery stenosis (OR 18 1.50, 95%CI 0.06-36.97, p=0.80), hypertensive crisis (OR 0.65, 95%CI 0.30-1.38, p=0.26) and all-cause death (OR 1.76, 95%CI 0.34-9.20, p=0.50) between RDN and sham groups. Change of 19 20 renal function based on eGFR was comparable between groups (p for interaction 0.84). There 21 was significant heterogeneity between trials.

- 1 **Conclusions:** RDN safely reduces ambulatory and office SBP/DBP vs. a sham procedure in the
- 2 presence and absence of antihypertensive medication.

3

4 Clinical Perspective

- 5 What is new?
- Several sham-controlled trials have investigated the efficacy and safety of catheter-based
 renal denervation (RDN) with mixed outcomes.
- This comprehensive meta-analysis comprising 2,478 patients shows that irrespective of
 the utilized method (radiofrequency-, ultrasound- or alcohol-mediated), renal denervation
 effectively reduced ambulatory and office systolic blood pressure.
- Renal denervation exhibited no additional risk concerning vascular injury or renal
 function impairment.
- 13 What are the clinical implications?
- This meta-analysis supports current guidelines/consensus statements that renal
 denervation represents an additive treatment option in carefully selected patients with
 uncontrolled hypertension.
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- _0
- 21

1 Introduction

Renal denervation (RDN) reduces blood pressure (BP) by modulating efferent and afferent 2 sympathetic renal nerve activity.¹ Although early unblinded studies suggested a pronounced BP-3 lowering effect of RDN in patients with severe treatment-resistant hypertension², the first 4 generation of sham-controlled randomized trials ³⁻⁵ was unable to prove the BP-lowering efficacy 5 6 of radiofrequency (RF) RDN using a mono-electrode catheter compared with a sham procedure. 7 Several procedural and methodological confounders were identified and subsequently addressed by well-designed second-generation sham-controlled trials.⁶⁻¹¹ Moreover, human cadaveric 8 anatomical studies provided important insights into renal sympathetic nerve distribution and 9 density that informed the design of revised procedural techniques and technologies.^{12, 13} These 10 second-generation clinical trials utilized refined catheter systems, such as multi-electrode RF, 11 12 ultrasound, and alcohol-mediated RDN, in patients with mild-to-moderate hypertension in the 13 presence and absence of antihypertensive medications to resistant hypertension despite singlepill triple agent combination therapy.¹⁴⁻¹⁸ Previous meta-analyses of sham-controlled trials 14 investigating the Spyral and Paradise RDN catheter systems ¹⁹ and a subgroup analysis (with 15 sham-controlled trials) of another meta-analysis ²⁰ consistently showed that RDN reduced office 16 and 24-hour SBP. We performed an updated comprehensive meta-analysis on summary data 17 from all published randomized, sham-controlled clinical trials investigating the effects of RDN 18 19 on BP across different devices.

20 Methods

21 Eligibility criteria, literature search, and study selection

A meta-analysis of the published randomized, sham-controlled trials (RCTs) was performed in
 line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)

statement. ²¹ The protocol for this analysis has been registered at PROSPERO 1 (CRD42022376504). Eligible publications were searched in MEDLINE and Cochrane Library 2 from 01/2000 to 01/2024 using the following keywords and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) 3 4 terms: [renal denervation OR renal sympathetic denervation AND randomized sham-controlled 5 clinical trial OR sham-controlled AND treatment arterial hypertension OR treatment 6 hypertension] (Supplement, Table 1 and 2). Furthermore, we had access to several randomized, yet unpublished trials (Netrod RDN ²², Iberis HTN ²³, TARGET BP I ²⁴) that have been released 7 at scientific meetings and were submitted for publication. These trials met the criteria for being 8 9 considered high-quality trials; therefore, we made the decision to include them in the present 10 analysis.

All randomized, sham-controlled trials investigating catheter-based RDN using various methods of nerve ablation (radiofrequency, ultrasound, alcohol-mediated) in patients with hypertension only were considered eligible. Two authors (DV and LL) reviewed the full texts of potentially eligible studies, thereby cross-checking the presence of inclusion criteria. A reference manager software (Zotero, Corporation for Digital Scholarship, Vienna, VA, USA) was used to remove duplicate.

17 Data extraction

18 Two authors (DV, LL) extracted data of interest using a predefined template and assessed risk of 19 bias at study level using the revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool (RoB 2.0) ²⁵, under final 20 supervision of a third investigator (FM). For each included study we assessed the risk of bias for 21 the following domains: randomization process, deviation from intended intervention, reporting of 22 missing data, measurement of outcome, selection of the reported results, single or multicenter

trial. Each domain was judged as low, moderate or high risk of bias based on the results of the assessment that were stated as support of judgement. To assess small-study effects, we planned to use funnel plots if at least 10 trials were available. If asymmetry in the funnel plot was detected, we planned to review the characteristics of the trials to assess whether the asymmetry was likely due to publication bias or other factors such as methodological or clinical heterogeneity of the trials.

7 The following data were extracted: i) baseline characteristics, study design, primary outcome, 8 duration of follow-up, sample size, utilized method of RDN and RDN device; ii) mean change 9 from baseline to primary endpoint assessment in office and ambulatory systolic and diastolic BP 10 (SBP/DBP), daytime and nighttime SBP/DBP, number of antihypertensive drugs at 11 randomization and at the time of primary endpoint assessment; iii) safety data, including the number of events of all-cause death, vascular complication, renal artery stenosis >70%, 12 13 hypertensive crisis, stroke, hospitalization for heart failure (HF), embolic event, new end-stage-14 renal-disease (ESRD) and mean change from baseline to primary endpoint assessment renal 15 function according to estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR by CKD-EPI).

16 **Outcomes of interest**

The main efficacy outcomes were between-group (RDN vs sham) difference concerning changes from baseline in mean 24-hour SBP and DBP as well as office SBP and DBP. Additional efficacy outcomes were changes from baseline in daytime and night-time SBP/DBP. Safety outcomes included the between-group difference in incidence of previously mentioned safety events and changes in eGFR. Furthermore, we compared the number of antihypertensive drugs at the time of primary endpoint assessment between the groups, to assess whether RDN may impact

medication burden. Also, we looked for the number of patients who met escape criteria and experienced antihypertensive medication adjustments (addition/cessation of new drugs or changes in drug doses) due to very high or low BP values during or after the follow-up in the included trials.

5 Statistical analysis

6 A study-level, pairwise, random-effects meta-analysis was performed based on the intention-to-7 treat or modified intention-to-treat analysis (depending on how data were reported) of the summary data. For efficacy outcomes, we pooled the mean changes of BP with its corresponding 8 9 SD at the time of primary outcome assessment and applied the inverse variance statistical 10 method. If SD was not reported in the trials, we used the reported 95% confidence intervals (CI) 11 or the standard error of the mean (SEM) to calculate SD. For safety outcomes, we determined 12 odds ratios (ORs) by applying the Mantel-Haenszel method. In case the outcomes had 13 documented null events in one arm (RDN or sham), a fixed value (typically 0.5) would be added (routinely performed by software included in RevMan) to avoid computational error.²⁶ 14 Heterogeneity between the trials was assessed using Cochran's Q test and I² statistic. Relevant 15 statistical heterogeneity was assumed if $I^2 > 50\%$. In case of relevant heterogeneity for main 16 17 outcomes, jackknife sensitivity analyses, such as running the analysis after excluding each trial 18 in turn would have been performed to identify outliers. To increase the reliability of the summary findings, we only included high-quality trials according to our assessment and in accordance 19 with the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Council on Hypertension and the European 20 Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI) clinical consensus statement 21 in the main analyses. ⁶ As part of sensitivity analyses, all eligible trials were included for which 22 main (change of ambulatory and office SBP and DBP) and additional efficacy outcomes like 23

change of day- and nighttime SBP/DBP were analyzed. To evaluate the long-term efficacy of
 RDN, we pooled the longest available follow-up 24-hour and office SBP data.

3 Further subgroup analyses were conducted to investigate the potential moderator effects of certain factors on the ultimate outcomes regarding the primary efficacy measures. These 4 5 included only high-quality trials as defined by the ESC/EAPCI clinical consensus document. We determined p for interaction/heterogeneity²⁷ concerning effects of RDN on ambulatory and 6 office systolic/diastolic BP between trials in the following settings: effects of RDN in the 7 presence and absence of antihypertensive medication (i.e., ON- and OFF-medication trials 8 9 design), first-generation RF device vs second-generation devices, and RDN modality (i.e. radio-10 frequency vs ultrasound ablation vs alcohol-mediated techniques). Study-specific and summary 11 effect estimates with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and p-values were visualized using forest plots. All statistical analyses were performed using RevMan Version 5.4 (The 12 13 Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark) and GraphPad Prism Version 6 (GraphPad Software, Boston, Massachusetts, USA). All p-values were two-sided, with p less than 0.05 14 considered significant. 15

16 **Results**

The search identified 145 records (Supplement, Figure 1), of which 13 trials were considered eligible. Ten trials ^{3, 16-18, 22-24, 28-30} comprising 2,478 patients, were graded as high-quality trials (Supplement, Table 3-15) (Table 1). Three additional randomized, sham-controlled trials ^{4, 5, 31} graded as moderate risk of bias ⁶ were added to the main analysis and analyzed as a part of sensitivity analysis comprising 2,690 patients. Long-term data on 24-hour and office SBP were available for 5 trials. ³²⁻³⁴ The baseline characteristics of all trials are summarized in Table 1. Small study effects have been evaluated using funnel plots for following outcomes: 24-hour

SBP/DBP and office SBP/DBP. ³⁵ The median follow-up duration to primary endpoint
 assessment was 3 months, ranging from 2 to 6 months across trials.

3 Effects of renal denervation on ambulatory blood pressure

Independent of the method utilized for renal nerve ablation and compared with a sham 4 procedure, RDN reduced mean 24-hour ambulatory SBP by -4.4 mmHg (95% CI -6.1, -2.7, 5 6 p<0.00001, Figure 1) as well as 24-hour ambulatory DBP by -2.6 mmHg (95% CI -3.6, -1.5, 7 p<0.00001, Figure 1). There was relevant heterogeneity for both 24-hour ambulatory SBP and DBP ($I^2=68\%$, and $I^2=60\%$, respectively). The Iberis-HTN ²³ and Netrod RDN ²² trials were 8 identified as sources of heterogeneity. After excluding these trials, heterogeneity was no longer 9 present (SBP, $I^2=5\%$; DBP, $I^2=42\%$) and the 24-hour ambulatory SBP/DBP reductions vs. sham 10 11 remained statistically significant (mean difference for 24-hour SBP: -3.3 mmHg, 95% CI -4.3, -2.2, p<0.00001; mean difference for 24-hour DBP: -2.0 mmHg, 95% CI -2.9, -1.0, p<0.0001). 12 Funnel plots for 24-hour SBP and DBP showed no signs of asymmetry (Supplement, Figure 2A 13 14 and 2B).

15 Effects of renal denervation on office blood pressure

Office SBP and DBP was significantly reduced following RDN (mean difference vs. sham: -6.6 mmHg, 95% CI -9.7, -3.6, p<0.0001 and -3.5 mmHg, 95% CI -5.4, -1.6, p=0.0003, respectively) with relevant heterogeneity (I^2 =82%, Figure 2). The Netrod RDN ²² trial was identified as a source of heterogeneity for office SBP and Netrod RDN ²² and TARGET BP I ²⁴ trials for office DBP. After omitting the data from Netrod RDN ²² for SBP and both trials for DBP, the heterogeneity was no longer present with a sustained relevant reduction in systolic and diastolic BP (-5.2 mmHg, 95% CI -6.5, -3.8, p<0.00001, I²=0%; -3.1 mmHg, 95% CI -4.0, -2.2,

p<0.00001, I²=0%, respectively). Funnel plot for office SBP showed presence of asymmetry
caused by statistical heterogeneity (Supplement, Figure 3A). The outcomes of the Netrod RDN ²²
trial were the cause of heterogeneity due the extensive office SBP reductions reported herein.
Funnel plot for DBP showed no signs of asymmetry (Supplement, Figure 3B).

5 Effects of renal denervation on daytime and nighttime blood pressure

6 RDN reduced daytime SBP (mean difference vs. sham: -5.2 mmHg, 95% CI -7.6, -2.8, p < 0.0001) with relevant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 76\%$) and daytime DBP (mean difference vs. sham: -7 2.9 mmHg, 95% CI -4.5, -1.3, p=0.0004) with relevant heterogeneity (I^2 =73%; Figure 3). When 8 data from the Iberis-HTN ²³ and Netrod RDN ²² trial were excluded, the relevant heterogeneity 9 for daytime SBP was still present ($I^2=51\%$) and a significant SBP reduction observed (mean 10 difference vs. sham: -3.6 mmHg, 95% CI -5.5, -1.7, p=0.0002). Nighttime SBP was also 11 significantly reduced by RDN (mean difference vs. sham: -4.5 mmHg, 95% CI -6.1, -2.8, 12 p < 0.00001) without relevant heterogeneity (I²=32%). Nighttime DBP paralleled these findings 13 14 (mean difference vs. sham -2.6 mmHg, 95% CI -3.7, -1.5, p<0.00001) without heterogeneity $(I^2=30\%; Figure 4).$ 15

16 Effects of renal denervation on heart rate

The changes of 24-hour ambulatory heart rate at the time of primary endpoint collection compared with baseline were reported in five trials. ^{3, 17, 18, 22, 24, 28} Heart rate was mildly lowered in the RDN groups (mean difference vs. baseline -2 beats per minute, 95% CI -3.7, -0.2, p=0.03) but not the sham group (mean difference vs. baseline -1.3 beats per minute, 95% CI -3.2, 0.6, p=0.18), without relevant heterogeneity between groups (p for interaction 0.64) (Supplement, Figure 4).

1 Sensitivity analysis with long-term data for 24-hour and office SBP

2 Exploring the long-term data from the SYMPLICITY HTN-3 (36-months of follow up), 3 SPYRAL HTN-ON MED (36-months of follow up), and RADIANCE-HTN and RADIANCE II trials (6-months of follow up) together with other high-quality trials, RDN reduced 24-hour SBP 4 5 (mean difference -5.4 mmHg, 95% CI -7.8, -3, p<0.00001) and office SBP (mean difference -6.9 mmHg, 95% CI -11.2, -2.6, p=0.001), both with relevant heterogeneity (I²=72%, for 24-hour 6 SBP; $I^2=86\%$, for office SBP) (Supplement, Figure 5). Of note, after the primary outcome 7 8 assessment, in certain trials, patients were unblinded and medication changes were allowed to 9 achieve BP control.

10 Sensitivity analysis with all eligible trials

11 When performing a sensitivity analysis with all published sham-controlled trials, including those 12 not fulfilling the quality criteria of the ESC/EAPCI clinical consensus statement, RDN reduced 24-hour SBP (mean difference vs. sham: -4.0 mmHg, 95% CI -5.5, -2.4, p<0.00001) and 24-13 hour DBP (mean difference vs. sham: -2.1 mmHg, 95% CI -3.1, -1.1, p<0.0001), both with 14 relevant heterogeneity ($I^2=62\%$ for SBP; $I^2=60\%$ for DBP) (Supplement, Figure 6). RDN also 15 reduced office SBP (mean difference vs. sham: -6.3 mmHg, 95% CI -9.2, -3.4, p<0.0001) and 16 17 DBP (mean difference vs. sham: -3.2 mmHg, 95% CI -5.0, -1.4, p=0.0005) with relevant heterogeneity (I^2 =80% for SBP; I^2 =81% for DBP) (Supplement, Figure 7). 18

19 RDN reduced daytime SBP (mean difference vs. sham:-4.6 mmHg, 95% CI -6.8, -2.6, 20 p<0.00001) and DBP (mean difference vs. sham: -2.4 mmHg, 95% CI -3.7, -1.0, p=0.0005) with 21 relevant heterogeneity (I²=68% for SBP; I²=67% for DBP) (Supplement, Figure 8). RDN also 22 reduced nighttime SBP (mean difference vs. sham:-3.5 mmHg, 95% CI -5.4, -1.7, p=0.0001) and

DBP (mean difference vs. sham: -1.6 mmHg, 95% CI -3.0, -0.2, p=0.02) with relevant
 heterogeneity (I²=48% for SBP; I²=59% for DBP) (Supplement, Figure 9).

3 Effects of renal denervation in the absence or presence of antihypertensive medications

There was no relevant difference in 24-hour SBP reduction with RDN vs. sham between trials 4 with or without concomitant antihypertensive medications (-4.8 mmHg, 95% CI -7.7, -2.0, 5 6 p=0.001, $I^2=79\%$ vs. -4.0 mmHg, 95% CI -5.7, -2.3, p<0.00001, $I^2=32\%$, respectively; p for 7 interaction 0.62) (Supplement, Figure 10). Similar outcomes were observed for 24-hour DBP 8 reductions (Supplement, Figure 10). There were neither relevant differences in office SBP and 9 DBP reduction between trials with or without concomitant antihypertensive drugs (Supplement, 10 Figure 11) nor were there relevant differences concerning the number of antihypertensive 11 medications prescribed during follow-up (Supplement, Figure 12).

12 There were more patients in the sham than in the RDN groups with medication adjustments due13 to safety concerns of meeting escape BP levels (Supplement, Table 16).

14 Effects of renal denervation with first- versus second-generation devices

The magnitude of 24-hour SBP and DBP reduction with RDN vs. sham between secondgeneration versus first-generation RDN devices was not significantly different (SBP: -4.7/-2.0 and DBP: -2.7/-1.0 mmHg, respectively, p for interaction p=0.14 for SBP and p=0.11 for DBP) (Supplement, Figure 13). Similar findings were observed for office SBP (p for interaction 0.10) and DBP (p for interaction 0.30) between second-generation versus first-generation RDN devices (Supplement, Figure 14).

21 Effects of radiofrequency- , ultrasound- and alcohol-mediated renal denervation devices

Ambulatory SBP and DBP were significantly reduced in trials investigating RF (mean difference vs sham: -5.2 mmHg, p=0.001 and -2.8 mmHg, p=0.0007, respectively), and ultrasound RDN (mean difference vs. sham: -4.8 mmHg, p<0.00001 and -2.5 mmHg, p=0.02, respectively). Ambulatory SBP was also significantly reduced in alcohol-mediated RDN trials (mean difference -2.4 mmHg, p=0.03), but not DBP (mean difference vs. sham:-1.7 mmHg, p=0.09). There was no relevant interaction between subgroups concerning ambulatory SBP (p for interaction 0.18) and DBP (p for interaction 0.72) (Supplement, Figure 15).

8 Office SBP was significantly reduced in trials with RF (mean difference vs. sham: -7.9 mmHg, 9 p=0.004), ultrasound (mean difference vs. sham: -6.1 mmHg, p<0.0001) and alcohol-mediated RDN (mean difference vs. sham: -3.6 mmHg, p=0.02), respectively. Similarly, office DBP was 10 significantly reduced in trials with RF (mean difference vs. sham: -4.6 mmHg, p=0.001), 11 12 ultrasound (mean difference vs. sham: -3.6 mmHg, p=0.0001) but not alcohol-mediated RDN 13 (mean difference vs. sham: -0.4 mmHg, p=0.85), respectively. There was no relevant interaction between subgroups concerning systolic (p for interaction 0.32) and diastolic BP (p for interaction 14 0.18) (Supplement, Figure 16). 15

16 Safety outcomes

There was no significant difference in the predefined safety outcomes between the RDN and sham groups (Table 2). For all safety outcomes, there were no signs of heterogeneity ($I^2=0\%$). Furthermore, there was no significant interaction (p for interaction 0.90) regarding change in renal function assessed by change in eGFR from baseline between the RDN (-0.75 ml/min/1.73 m², 95% CI -2.0, 0.5, p=0.24) and sham groups (-0.62 ml/min/1.73 m², 95% -2.2, 1.0, p=0.43) (Supplement, Figure 17).

1 Discussion

In this comprehensive, updated meta-analysis, catheter-based RDN was associated with significantly reduced office and 24-hour BP, including daytime and nighttime SBP and DBP. Subgroup analyses indicated no relevant differences in BP-lowering efficacy regardless of whether individuals were taking or not antihypertensive medication at baseline, or the method or device employed for renal nerve ablation. Moreover, adverse safety events were rare and comparable between the RDN and sham groups.

Hypertension represents the leading modifiable cause of death worldwide. ³⁶ The absolute 8 number of people with hypertension is increasing globally and is estimated to reach 1.5 billion 9 by 2025. ³⁷ Despite the availability of effective antihypertensive drugs ³⁸, guideline-10 recommended BP targets are often not achieved. ^{37, 39} Device-based antihypertensive treatments 11 have been developed as adjunct treatment options in addition to lifestyle interventions and drugs. 12 ⁴⁰ Several randomized, sham-controlled clinical trials have shown the ability of catheter-based 13 14 RDN to lower BP in patients with and without antihypertensive medication with mixed outcomes.^{14-18, 28} Herein, RDN was associated with significantly reduced office and ambulatory 15 BP, including daytime and nighttime BP. The latter has been strongly associated with 16 cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. ⁴¹ 17

This meta-analysis reports modest but clinically meaningful 24-hour and office SBP reductions of 4.4 mmHg and 6.6 mmHg, respectively. A sensitivity analysis of long-term data suggests that the BP decrease was maintained, if not even continued, following primary outcome assessment after 2-6 months. Indeed, an individual-patient level meta-analysis has shown that a 5 mmHgreduction in office SBP with antihypertensive drugs reduced the risk for major cardiovascular

events (defined as a composite of fatal and non-fatal stroke, fatal or non-fatal myocardial
infarction or ischemic heart disease or heart failure causing death or requiring hospital
admission) by 10%, regardless of previously diagnosed cardiovascular disease and even in
participants with normal or high-normal BP. ⁴²

Given the safety and efficacy of RDN, the 2022 ESC Clinical Consensus Statement, the 2023 5 European Society of Hypertension Guidelines and the 2023 SCAI consensus statement ⁴³ 6 7 recommend that RDN can be considered in patients with resistant hypertension and preserved renal function (eGFR >40 ml/min/1.73 m²). ^{6, 44} In line with the 2023 ESH Guidelines for the 8 9 management of arterial hypertension and the 2022 ESC Clinical Consensus Statements, RDN 10 represents an alternative treatment option for patients with resistant hypertension but also 11 patients with uncontrolled hypertension on fewer drugs if first-line drugs are either not tolerated or patients are non-adherent.⁶ For most patients, initial antihypertensive therapy should be 12 13 centered on medications that have been demonstrated to decrease cardiovascular events and mortality. ⁶ Importantly, the decision-making process should involve a multidisciplinary 14 15 hypertension team and consider the preference of a well-informed patient. Additionally, in the presence of high cardiovascular risk or hypertension-mediated organ damage, RDN should be 16 considered as an additional approach.⁶ However, it is essential to emphasize that patients must 17 18 be thoroughly informed by their treating physicians about the potential risks of the invasive 19 procedure. The findings from this meta-analysis support these recommendations since RDN was 20 associated with clinically relevant BP reductions in trials with and without concomitant 21 antihypertensive medication and irrespective of the utilized RDN-modality (RF-, ultrasound- or 22 alcohol-mediated). Thus, these data strongly underpin that RDN as a mechanism earned its 23 unequivocal role in BP control in hypertensive patients.

1 There was a relevant statistical heterogeneity in several endpoints (24-hour SBP/DBP, office SBP/DBP). According to the sensitivity analysis, the Netrod RDN trial ²² alone (for the 2 endpoints office SBP and DBP) and in combination with the Iberis-HTN trial²³ (for the endpoint 3 4 24-hour SBP) have been identified as sources of heterogeneity due to numerically greater BP 5 reductions following RDN when compared with other trials. One may speculate that this is 6 related to the population included since both trials were conducted in China and studied patients with different background medication, severity of hypertension, and ethnicity. The Iberis-HTN 7 trial, for instance, purposely included younger patients (mean age 45 years) with elevated heart 8 9 rate (mean of 79 bpm). It has been suggested that RDN may be more effective in younger 10 patients because of a lower incidence of arterial stiffness and an increased sympathetic tone as the leading mechanism of hypertension.⁴⁵ However, in trials encompassing patients across a 11 12 wider age spectrum, such as the Radiance HTN trials (which included patients aged 20-75 years) ³⁴, sensitivity analyses did not indicate a significant interaction between age and the BP lowering. 13

Overall, number of vascular complications events was very low (0.5% across all included patients) and did not differ between RDN and sham groups. In a previous meta-analysis, the annual incidence rate of renal artery³⁴ stent implantation following RF RDN was 0.2% ⁴⁶, which appears comparable with the natural incidence of renal artery stenosis in patients with arterial hypertension. ⁴⁷ While the analysis suggested a favorable safety profile for RDN, it is crucial to note that the procedures were carried out by experienced physicians, and the data are derived from a relatively small patient cohort.

21 Limitations

1 All included trials excluded patients with known secondary hypertension. Most trials excluded patients with isolated systolic hypertension; thus, limiting generalizability to this hypertension 2 phenotype. However, data from the Global Symplicity Registry ⁴⁸ and a single-center 3 randomized controlled trial comparing different catheter technologies ⁴⁹ suggest that the BP 4 5 reductions following RDN are not different between patients with isolated systolic hypertension 6 and combined systolic-diastolic hypertension. The maximal follow-up for the assessment of the primary outcome was 6 months. Trials including drug-naïve patients or requiring a washout of 7 antihypertensive drugs had even shorter follow-up durations of 2 to 3 months. The possibility of 8 9 reinnervation of the renal sympathetic nerves raised the question of whether this would mitigate 10 the effects on BP at the long term. Preclinical studies showed partial, but non-functional, nerve regrowth 30 months after RDN in sheep ⁵⁰ and sustained denervation after 180 days in porcine 11 models.⁵¹ Investigating longer-term follow-up is challenging due to several factors. These 12 13 include the unblinding of patients and outcome assessors, potential crossover of sham patients to RDN, age- and body weight-dependent longitudinal BP changes, the addition of antihypertensive 14 medications to facilitate BP control, and dynamic changes in drug adherence over time.⁶ In line, 15 the long-term three years results from the Global SYMPLICITY Registry ⁵², the SPYRAL HTN-16 ON MED³³, the RADIANCE-HTN SOLO ⁵³ and the SYMPLICITY HTN-3 ³² trials 17 demonstrated sustained and even progressive effects for at least 3 years. Results of our 18 19 sensitivity analysis with long-term data of these hallmark trials support these findings. Moreover, 20 this study-level meta-analysis is not based on individual patient data which limits the possibility of performing more detailed subgroup analysis to identify predictors of BP response to RDN. 21

22 Conclusion

1 This comprehensive meta-analysis of ten randomized sham controlled trials comprising 2,478 2 patients demonstrated that catheter-based RDN safely reduced 24-hour and office BP up to 6 3 months compared with sham in hypertensive patients with and without concomitant 4 antihypertensive medication irrespective of the utilized RDN modality.

5 Acknowledgements

6 None.

7 Funding

8 ERE is funded in part by R01HL161069 from the US National Institutes of Health

9 None.

10 **Conflicts of interest**

11 DV has no disclosures related to this article. ERE was supported, in part, by the NIH (R01 12 HL161069). LL received speaker honoraria from AstraZeneca, Medtronic, Pfizer, and ReCor 13 Medical. FM is supported by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Kardiologie (DGK), Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB TRR219, Project-ID 322900939), and Deutsche Herzstiftung. 14 Saarland University has received scientific support from Ablative Solutions, Medtronic and 15 16 ReCor Medical. Until May 2024, FM has received speaker honoraria/consulting fees from 17 Ablative Solutions, Amgen, Astra-Zeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Inari, Medtronic, 18 Merck, ReCor Medical, Servier, and Terumo. DLB discloses the following relationships -19 Advisory Board: Angiowave, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, CellProthera, Cereno Scientific, 20 Elsevier Practice Update Cardiology, High Enroll, Janssen, Level Ex, McKinsey, Medscape 21 Cardiology, Merck, MyoKardia, NirvaMed, Novo Nordisk, PhaseBio, PLx Pharma, Stasys;

1 Board of Directors: American Heart Association New York City, Angiowave (stock options), 2 Bristol Myers Squibb (stock), DRS.LINQ (stock options), High Enroll (stock); Consultant: Broadview Ventures, Hims, SFJ, Youngene; Data Monitoring Committees: Acesion Pharma, 3 4 Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris, Baim Institute for Clinical Research (formerly Harvard 5 Clinical Research Institute, for the PORTICO trial, funded by St. Jude Medical, now Abbott), 6 Boston Scientific (Chair, PEITHO trial), Cleveland Clinic, Contego Medical (Chair, 7 PERFORMANCE 2), Duke Clinical Research Institute, Mayo Clinic, Mount Sinai School of 8 Medicine (for the ENVISAGE trial, funded by Daiichi Sankyo; for the ABILITY-DM trial, 9 funded by Concept Medical; for ALLAY-HF, funded by Alleviant Medical), Novartis, Population Health Research Institute; Rutgers University (for the NIH-funded MINT Trial); 10 11 Honoraria: American College of Cardiology (Senior Associate Editor, Clinical Trials and News, ACC.org; Chair, ACC Accreditation Oversight Committee), Arnold and Porter law firm (work 12 13 related to Sanofi/Bristol-Myers Squibb clopidogrel litigation), Baim Institute for Clinical 14 Research (formerly Harvard Clinical Research Institute; RE-DUAL PCI clinical trial steering committee funded by Boehringer Ingelheim; AEGIS-II executive committee funded by CSL 15 Behring), Belvoir Publications (Editor in Chief, Harvard Heart Letter), Canadian Medical and 16 17 Surgical Knowledge Translation Research Group (clinical trial steering committees), CSL Behring (AHA lecture), Cowen and Company, Duke Clinical Research Institute (clinical trial 18 19 steering committees, including for the PRONOUNCE trial, funded by Ferring Pharmaceuticals), 20 HMP Global (Editor in Chief, Journal of Invasive Cardiology), Journal of the American College of Cardiology (Guest Editor; Associate Editor), K2P (Co-Chair, interdisciplinary curriculum), 21 22 Level Ex, Medtelligence/ReachMD (CME steering committees), MJH Life Sciences, Oakstone 23 CME (Course Director, Comprehensive Review of Interventional Cardiology), Piper Sandler,

1 Population Health Research Institute (for the COMPASS operations committee, publications committee, steering committee, and USA national co-leader, funded by Bayer), WebMD (CME 2 3 steering committees), Wiley (steering committee); Other: Clinical Cardiology (Deputy Editor); 4 Patent: Sotagliflozin (named on a patent for sotagliflozin assigned to Brigham and Women's 5 Hospital who assigned to Lexicon; neither I nor Brigham and Women's Hospital receive any 6 income from this patent); Research Funding: Abbott, Acesion Pharma, Afimmune, Aker 7 Biomarine, Alnylam, Amarin, Amgen, AstraZeneca, Bayer, Beren, Boehringer Ingelheim, Boston Scientific, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cardax, CellProthera, Cereno Scientific, Chiesi, 8 9 CinCor, Cleerly, CSL Behring, Eisai, Ethicon, Faraday Pharmaceuticals, Ferring 10 Pharmaceuticals, Forest Laboratories, Fractyl, Garmin, HLS Therapeutics, Idorsia, Ironwood, 11 Ischemix, Janssen, Javelin, Lexicon, Lilly, Medtronic, Merck, Moderna, MyoKardia, NirvaMed, Novartis, Novo Nordisk, Otsuka, Owkin, Pfizer, PhaseBio, PLx Pharma, Recardio, Regeneron, 12 Reid Hoffman Foundation, Roche, Sanofi, Stasys, Synaptic, The Medicines Company, 13 14 Youngene, 89Bio; Royalties: Elsevier (Editor, Braunwald's Heart Disease); Site Co-Investigator: Abbott, Biotronik, Boston Scientific, CSI, Endotronix, St. Jude Medical (now Abbott), Philips, 15 SpectraWAVE, Svelte, Vascular Solutions; Trustee: American College of Cardiology; Unfunded 16 17 Research: FlowCo. RES received speaker and advisor honoraria from Ablative Solutions, Medtronic, and Recor and grants to the Institution from Ablative Solution, Medtronic and Recor. 18 19 DEK discloses the following relationships: personal consulting honoraria: Medtronic, Ablative 20 Solutions, HyperQure; Institutional Research/Grant Support: Ablative Solutions, Biotronik, Medtronic, Orchestra Biomed, Orbus Neich, Teleflex; Equity: BioStar Ventures (none related to 21 22 Ablative Solutions). MB is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German 23 Research Foundation; TTR 219, project number 322900939) and reports personal fees from

- 1 Abbott, Amgen, Astra Zeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Cytokinetics, Edwards, Medtronic,
- 2 Novartis, Recor, Servier and Vifor. MA reports receiving grants from the European Horizon
- 3 2020 program; grants from Recor Medical, Idorsia, Novartis and AstraZeneca; and personal fees
- 4 from Alnylam Pharmaceuticals, Recor Medical Cincor, Medtronic, AstraZeneca, and Novartis.
- 5 All other authors have nothing to declare.

1 References

DiBona GF. Physiology in perspective: The Wisdom of the Body. Neural control of the
 kidney. *Am J Physiol Regul Integ Comp Physiol.* 2005;289:R633-41.

4 2. Krum H, Schlaich MP, Sobotka PA, Böhm M, Mahfoud F, Rocha-Singh K, Katholi R

5 and Esler MD. Percutaneous renal denervation in patients with treatment-resistant hypertension:

6 final 3-year report of the Symplicity HTN-1 study. *Lancet*. 2014;383:622-9.

7 3. Bhatt DL, Kandzari DE, O'Neill WW, D'Agostino R, Flack JM, Katzen BT, Leon MB,

8 Liu M, Mauri L, Negoita M, et al. A controlled trial of renal denervation for resistant
9 hypertension. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;370:1393-401.

10 4. Mathiassen ON, Vase H, Bech JN, Christensen KL, Buus NH, Schroeder AP, Lederballe

11 O, Rickers H, Kampmann U, Poulsen PL, et al. Renal denervation in treatment-resistant essential

12 hypertension. A randomized, SHAM-controlled, double-blinded 24-h blood pressure-based trial.

13 J Hypertens. 2016;34:1639-47.

Desch S, Okon T, Heinemann D, Kulle K, Röhnert K, Sonnabend M, Petzold M, Müller
U, Schuler G, Eitel I, et al. Randomized sham-controlled trial of renal sympathetic denervation in
mild resistant hypertension. *Hypertension*. 2015;65:1202-8.

Barbato E, Azizi M, Schmieder RE, Lauder L, Böhm M, Brouwers S, Bruno RM, Dudek
 D, Kahan T, Kandzari DE, et al. Renal denervation in the management of hypertension in adults.
 A clinical consensus statement of the ESC Council on Hypertension and the European
 Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions (EAPCI). *Eur Heart J.* 2023;44:1313 1330.

Kandzari DE, Mahfoud F, Weber MA, Townsend R, Parati G, Fisher NDL, Lobo MD,
 Bloch M, Böhm M, Sharp ASP, et al. Clinical Trial Design Principles and Outcomes Definitions

for Device-Based Therapies for Hypertension: A Consensus Document From the Hypertension
 Academic Research Consortium. *Circulation*. 2022;145:847-863.
 8. Mahfoud F, Azizi M, Ewen S, Pathak A, Ukena C, Blankestijn PJ, Böhm M, Burnier M,
 Chatellier G, Durand Zaleski I, et al. Proceedings from the 3rd European Clinical Consensus
 Conference for clinical trials in device-based hypertension therapies. *Eur Heart J*. 2020;41:1588-

6 1599.

Mahfoud F, Schmieder RE, Azizi M, Pathak A, Sievert H, Tsioufis C, Zeller T, Bertog S,
 Blankestijn PJ, Böhm M, et al. Proceedings from the 2nd European Clinical Consensus
 Conference for device-based therapies for hypertension: state of the art and considerations for
 the future. *Eur Heart J.* 2017;38:3272-3281.

10. Mahfoud F, Böhm M, Azizi M, Pathak A, Durand Zaleski I, Ewen S, Tsioufis K,
Andersson B, Blankestijn PJ, Burnier M, et al. Proceedings from the European clinical consensus
conference for renal denervation: considerations on future clinical trial design. *Eur Heart J*.
2015;36:2219-27.

15 11. Kandzari DE, Bhatt DL, Brar S, Devireddy CM, Esler M, Fahy M, Flack JM, Katzen BT,
16 Lea J, Lee DP, et al. Predictors of blood pressure response in the SYMPLICITY HTN-3 trial.
17 *Eur Heart J*. 2015;36:219-27.

18 12. Sakakura K, Ladich E, Cheng Q, Otsuka F, Yahagi K, Fowler DR, Kolodgie FD, Virmani
19 R and Joner M. Anatomic assessment of sympathetic peri-arterial renal nerves in man. *J Am Coll*20 *Cardiol.* 2014;64:635-43.

Struthoff H, Lauder L, Hohl M, Hermens A, Tzafriri AR, Edelman ER, Kunz M, Böhm
M, Tschernig T and Mahfoud F. Histological examination of renal nerve distribution, density,
and function in humans. *EuroIntervention*. 2023;19:612-620.

1	14. Townsend RR, Mahfoud F, Kandzari DE, Kario K, Pocock S, Weber MA, Ewen S,
2	Tsioufis K, Tousoulis D, Sharp ASP, et al. Catheter-based renal denervation in patients with
3	uncontrolled hypertension in the absence of antihypertensive medications (SPYRAL HTN-OFF
4	MED): a randomised, sham-controlled, proof-of-concept trial. Lancet. 2017;390:2160-2170.
5	15. Kandzari DE, Böhm M, Mahfoud F, Townsend RR, Weber MA, Pocock S, Tsioufis K,
6	Tousoulis D, Choi JW, East C, et al. Effect of renal denervation on blood pressure in the
7	presence of antihypertensive drugs: 6-month efficacy and safety results from the SPYRAL HTN-
8	ON MED proof-of-concept randomised trial. Lancet. 2018;391:2346-2355.
9	16. Böhm M, Kario K, Kandzari DE, Mahfoud F, Weber MA, Schmieder RE, Tsioufis K,
10	Pocock S, Konstantinidis D, Choi JW, et al. Efficacy of catheter-based renal denervation in the
11	absence of antihypertensive medications (SPYRAL HTN-OFF MED Pivotal): a multicentre,
12	randomised, sham-controlled trial. Lancet. 2020;395:1444-1451.
13	17. Azizi M, Schmieder RE, Mahfoud F, Weber MA, Daemen J, Davies J, Basile J, Kirtane
14	AJ, Wang Y, Lobo MD, et al. Endovascular ultrasound renal denervation to treat hypertension
15	(RADIANCE-HTN SOLO): a multicentre, international, single-blind, randomised, sham-
16	controlled trial. Lancet. 2018;391:2335-2345.
17	18. Azizi M, Sanghvi K, Saxena M, Gosse P, Reilly JP, Levy T, Rump LC, Persu A, Basile J,
18	Bloch MJ, et al. Ultrasound renal denervation for hypertension resistant to a triple medication
19	pill (RADIANCE-HTN TRIO): a randomised, multicentre, single-blind, sham-controlled trial.

20 Lancet. 2021;397:2476-2486.

Stavropoulos K, Patoulias D, Imprialos K, Doumas M, Katsimardou A, Dimitriadis K,
 Tsioufis C and Papademetriou V. Efficacy and safety of renal denervation for the management of

1	arterial hypertension: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, sham-controlled,
2	catheter-based trials. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich). 2020;22:572-584.
3	20. Agasthi P, Shipman J, Arsanjani R, Ashukem M, Girardo ME, Yerasi C, Venepally NR,
4	Fortuin FD and Mookadam F. Renal Denervation for Resistant Hypertension in the
5	contemporary era: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Sci Rep. 2019;9:6200.
6	21. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer
7	L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline
8	for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71.
9	22. Zhou Y-J. Effectivness and Safety of the Netrod TM Six-Electrode Radiofrequency Renal
10	Denervation System for the Treatment of Uncontrolled Essential Hypertension. Paper presented
11	at: EURO PCR, May 17, 2023; Paris, France 2023.
12	23. X Jiang, Rao G. Effectiveness and Safety of The Multi-Electrode Iberis Radiofrequency
13	Renal Denervation System for the treatment of Uncontrolled Primary Hypertension (Iberis-HTN
14	study). Paper presented at: China Interventional Therapeutics (CIT); June 29 - July 2, 2023.
15	Beijing, China.
16	24. Kandzari DE, Weber MA, Pathak A, Zidar JP, Saxena M, David SW, Schmieder RE,
17	Janas AJ, Langer C, Persu A, et al. Effect of Alcohol-Mediated Renal Denervation on Blood
18	Pressure in the Presence of Antihypertensive Medications: Primary Results from the TARGET
19	BP I Randomized Clinical Trial. Circulation. 2024 Apr 8. Online ahead of print.

- 20 25. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, Cates CJ, Cheng
- HY, Corbett MS, Eldridge SM, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in
 randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019;366:14898.

Deeks JJ, Higgings JPT, Altman DG. Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta analyses. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch
 VA. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August
 2023). Cochrane, 2023.

5 27. Altman DG and Bland JM. Interaction revisited: the difference between two estimates.
6 *BMJ*. 2003;326:219.

Azizi M, Saxena M, Wang Y, Jenkins JS, Devireddy C, Rader F, Fisher NDL, Schmieder
RE, Mahfoud F, Lindsey J, et al. Endovascular Ultrasound Renal Denervation to Treat
Hypertension: The RADIANCE II Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2023;329:651-661.

10 29. Pathak A, Rudolph UM, Saxena M, Zeller T, Müller-Ehmsen J, Lipsic E, Schmieder RE,

Sievert H, Halbach M, Sharif F, et al. Alcohol-mediated renal denervation in patients with
hypertension in the absence of antihypertensive medications. *EuroIntervention*. 2023;19:602611.

30. Kandzari DE, Townsend RR, Kazuomi Kario, Felix Mahfoud, Michael A Weber, Roland
E Schmieder, Stuart Pocock, Konstantinos Tsioufis, Dimitrios Konstafntinidis, James Choi, et al,
on behalf of the SPYRAL HTN-ON MED Investigators*. Safety and Efficacy of Renal
Denervation in the Presence of Antihypertensive Medications: SPYRAL HTN-ON MED. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2023;82:1809-1823.

19 31. Kario K, Yokoi Y, Okamura K, Fujihara M, Ogoyama Y, Yamamoto E, Urata H, Cho
20 JM, Kim CJ, Choi SH, et al. Catheter-based ultrasound renal denervation in patients with
21 resistant hypertension: the randomized, controlled REQUIRE trial. *Hypertens Res.* 2022;45:22122 231.

1	32. Bhatt DL, Vaduganathan M, Kandzari DE, Leon MB, Rocha-Singh K, Townsend RR,
2	Katzen BT, Oparil S, Brar S, DeBruin V, et al. Long-term outcomes after catheter-based renal
3	artery denervation for resistant hypertension: final follow-up of the randomised SYMPLICITY
4	HTN-3 Trial. Lancet. 2022;400:1405-1416.
5	33. Mahfoud F, Kandzari DE, Kario K, Townsend RR, Weber MA, Schmieder RE, Tsioufis
6	K, Pocock S, Dimitriadis K, Choi JW, et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of renal denervation
7	in the presence of antihypertensive drugs (SPYRAL HTN-ON MED): a randomised, sham-
8	controlled trial. Lancet. 2022;399:1401-1410.
9	34. Azizi M, Sharp ASP, Fisher NDL, Weber MA, Lobo MD, Daemen J, Lurz P, Mahfoud F,
10	Schmieder RE, Basile J, et al. Patient-Level Pooled Analysis of Endovascular Ultrasound Renal
11	Denervation or a Sham Procedure 6 Months After Medication Escalation: The RADIANCE
12	Clinical Trial Program. Circulation. 2024;149:747-759.
13	35. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, Carpenter J, Rücker G,
14	Harbord RM, Schmid CH, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot
15	asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. BMJ. 2011;343:d4002.
16	36. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic
17	analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet. 2020;396:1223-1249.
18	37. Worldwide trends in hypertension prevalence and progress in treatment and control from
19	1990 to 2019: a pooled analysis of 1201 population-representative studies with 104 million
20	participants. Lancet. 2021;398:957-980.
21	38. Ettehad D, Emdin CA, Kiran A, Anderson SG, Callender T, Emberson J, Chalmers J,
22	Rodgers A and Rahimi K. Blood pressure lowering for prevention of cardiovascular disease and
23	death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2016;387:957-967.

1 39. Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, Clement DL, 2 Coca A, de Simone G, Dominiczak A, et al. 2018 ESC/ESH Guidelines for the management of 3 arterial hypertension. Eur Heart J. 2018;39:3021-3104. 4 40. Lauder L, Azizi M, Kirtane AJ, Böhm M and Mahfoud F. Device-based therapies for 5 arterial hypertension. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2020;17:614-628. 41. 6 Staplin N, de la Sierra A, Ruilope LM, Emberson JR, Vinyoles E, Gorostidi M, Ruiz-7 Hurtado G, Segura J, Baigent C and Williams B. Relationship between clinic and ambulatory 8 blood pressure and mortality: an observational cohort study in 59124 patients. Lancet. 9 2023;401:2041-2050. 10 42. Pharmacological blood pressure lowering for primary and secondary prevention of 11 cardiovascular disease across different levels of blood pressure: an individual participant-level 12 data meta-analysis. Lancet. 2021;397:1625-1636.

43. Swaminathan RV, East CA, Feldman DN, Fisher ND, Garasic JM, Giri JS, Kandzari DE,
Kirtane AJ, Klein A and Kobayashi T. SCAI position statement on renal denervation for
hypertension: patient selection, operator competence, training and techniques, and organizational
recommendations. *Journal of the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography & Interventions*.
2023;2:101121.

44. Mancia G, Kreutz R, Brunström M, Burnier M, Grassi G, Januszewicz A, Muiesan ML,
Tsioufis K, Agabiti-Rosei E, Algharably EAE, et al. 2023 ESH Guidelines for the management
of arterial hypertension The Task Force for the management of arterial hypertension of the
European Society of Hypertension Endorsed by the European Renal Association (ERA) and the
International Society of Hypertension (ISH). *J Hypertens*. 2023;41:1874-2071.

1	45. Böhm M, Tsioufis K, Kandzari DE, Kario K, Weber MA, Schmieder RE, Townsend RR,
2	Kulenthiran S, Ukena C, Pocock S, et al. Effect of Heart Rate on the Outcome of Renal
3	Denervation in Patients With Uncontrolled Hypertension. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;78:1028-
4	1038.
5	46. Townsend RR, Walton A, Hettrick DA, Hickey GL, Weil J, Sharp ASP, Blankestijn PJ,
6	Böhm M and Mancia G. Review and meta-analysis of renal artery damage following
7	percutaneous renal denervation with radiofrequency renal artery ablation. EuroIntervention.
8	2020;16:89-96.
9	47. Chrysochou C and Kalra PA. Epidemiology and natural history of atherosclerotic
10	renovascular disease. Prog Cardiovasc Dis. 2009;52:184-95.
11	48. Mahfoud F, Mancia G, Schmieder R, Narkiewicz K, Ruilope L, Schlaich M, Whitbourn
12	R, Zirlik A, Zeller T, Stawowy P, et al. Renal Denervation in High-Risk Patients With
13	Hypertension. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2020;75:2879-2888.
14	49. Fengler K, Rommel KP, Lapusca R, Blazek S, Besler C, Hartung P, von Roeder M,
15	Kresoja KP, Desch S, Thiele H, et al. Renal Denervation in Isolated Systolic Hypertension Using
16	Different Catheter Techniques and Technologies. Hypertension. 2019;74:341-348.
17	50. Singh RR, McArdle ZM, Iudica M, Easton LK, Booth LC, May CN, Parkington HC,
18	Lombardo P, Head GA, Lambert G, et al. Sustained Decrease in Blood Pressure and Reduced
19	Anatomical and Functional Reinnervation of Renal Nerves in Hypertensive Sheep 30 Months
20	After Catheter-Based Renal Denervation. Hypertension. 2019;73:718-727.
21	51. Sharp ASP, Tunev S, Schlaich M, Lee DP, Finn AV, Trudel J, Hettrick DA, Mahfoud F
22	and Kandzari DE. Histological evidence supporting the durability of successful radiofrequency

renal denervation in a normotensive porcine model. J Hypertens. 2022;40:2068-2075. 23

1	52. Mahfoud F, Böhm M, Schmieder R, Narkiewicz K, Ewen S, Ruilope L, Schlaich M,
2	Williams B, Fahy M and Mancia G. Effects of renal denervation on kidney function and long-
3	term outcomes: 3-year follow-up from the Global SYMPLICITY Registry. Eur Heart J.
4	2019;40:3474-3482.
5	53. Rader F, Kirtane AJ, Wang Y, Daemen J, Lurz P, Sayer J, Saxena M, Levy T, Scicli AP,
6	Thackeray L, et al. Durability of blood pressure reduction after ultrasound renal denervation:
7	three-year follow-up of the treatment arm of the randomised RADIANCE-HTN SOLO trial.
8	EuroIntervention. 2022;18:e677-e685.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the included trials

Study and publication year	Study design	Sample size (RDN/Sham)	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Primary efficacy endpoint	Catheter (Modality)	Link to the public trial registry
SYMPLICITY HTN-3 2014 ³	Randomized 2:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med	364/171	18-80 y, severe resistant hypertension, office SBP >160 mmHg on ≥3 med	Known secondary hypertension, >1 hypertensive crisis, unsuitable renal artery anatomy, eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73 m ²	Change in office SBP after 6 months	Symplicity Flex (radiofrequency)	NCT01418261
Desch et al. 2014 ⁵	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med	35/36	18-75 y, resistant hypertension, daytime BP 135-149/90-94 mmHg on ≥3 med	Severe comorbidities, unsuitable renal artery anatomy, eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73 m ²	Change in 24-h SBP after 6 months	Symplicity Flex (radiofrequency)	NCT01656096
ReSET 2016 ⁴	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on	36/33	30-70 y, resistant hypertension, daytime SBP	Secondary hypertension, congestive HF, unsuitable	Change in daytime ambulatory SBP after 3	Symplicity Flex (radiofrequency)	NCT01762488

Study and publication year	Study and publication yearStudy designSample size (RDN/Sham)Inclusion criteriaExclusion criteria		Primary efficacy endpoint	Catheter (Modality)	Link to the public trial registry		
	med		>145 mmHg on ≥3 med	renal artery anatomy, eGFR ≤30 ml/min/1.73 m ²	months		
RADIANCE- HTN SOLO 2018 ¹⁷	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, off med	74/72	18-75 y, office BP ≥ 140/>90 and <180/110 mmHg	History of CV or cerebrovascular events, unsuitable renal artery anatomy, eGFR <40 ml/min/1.73 m ²	Change in daytime ambulatory SBP after 2 months	Paradise (ultrasound)	NCT02649426
SPYRAL HTN-OFF MED Pivotal 2020 ¹⁶	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, off med	166/165	20-80 y, office SBP >150 mmHg and <180 mmHg, DBP >90 mmHg	Angina pectoris, MI within last 3 months, unsuitable renal artery anatomy, eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73 m ²	Change in 24-h SBP after 3 months	Spyral (radiofrequency)	NCT02439749
RADIANCE-	Randomized	69/67	18-75 y, office	History of	Change in	Paradise	NCT02649426

Study and publication year	Study design	Sample size (RDN/Sham)	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Primary efficacy endpoint	Catheter (Modality)	Link to the public trial registry
HTN TRIO 2021 ¹⁸	1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med		BP ≥140/>90 mmHg on 3- drug single- pill combination	cerebrovascular or severe CV event, unsuitable renal artery anatomy, eGFR <40 ml/min/1.73 m ²	daytime ambulatory SBP after 2 months	(ultrasound)	
TARGET BP OFF-MED 2022 ²⁹	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, off med	50/56	18-80 y, office SBP 140-180 and DBP ≥90 mmHg on 0-2 med.	eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73 m ² , severe HF, unsuitable renal anatomy	Change in 24-h SBP after 2 months	Peregrine (alcohol)	NCT03503773
REQUIRE 2022 ³¹	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med	72/71	20-75 y, resistant hypertension with 3 med., BP >150/>90 mmHg	eGFR <40 ml/min/1.73 m ² , secondary hypertension, chronic diseases, unsuitable renal artery anatomy	Change in 24-h SBP after 3 months	Paradise (ultrasound)	NCT02918305
RADIANCE II	Randomized	150/74	18-75 y, 24-h	eGFR <40	Change in	Paradise	NCT03614260

Study and publication year	Study design	Sample size (RDN/Sham)	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Primary efficacy endpoint	Catheter (Modality)	Link to the public trial registry
2023 ²⁸	2:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, off med		BP ≥135/85 and <170/105 mmHg	ml/min/1.73 m ² , unsuitable renal artery anatomy	daytime ambulatory SBP after 2 months	(ultrasound)	
SPYRAL HTN-ON MED (Pilot and Expansion phase) 2023 ³⁰	Randomized 1:1 for 106 patients and 2:1 for 231 subsequent patients, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med	206/131	20-80 y, 24-h SBP >140/90 mmHg on 1-3 drugs	Angina pectoris, MI within last 3 months, unsuitable renal artery anatomy, eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73 m ²	Change in 24-h SBP after 6 months	Spyral (radiofrequency)	NCT02439775
Iberis-HTN 2023 ²³	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med	107/110	18-65 y, office SBP 150-180 mmHg and DBP ≥90 mmHg on 3 med	eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73m ² , secondary hypertension, unsuitable renal artery anatomy	Change in 24-h SBP Iberis after 6 (radiofrequency) months		NCT02901704
Netrod RDN 2023 ²²	Randomized 2:1, RDN vs. sham	139/66	18-65 y, office BP ≥ 150/90 and <180/110	eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73m ² , secondary	Change in 24-h SBP at 6 months	Netrod (radiofrequency)	NCT03261375

Study and publication year	Study design	Sample size (RDN/Sham)	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Primary efficacy endpoint	Catheter (Modality)	Link to the public trial registry
	procedure, off med		mmHg on ≥2 drugs	hypertension			
TARGET BP I 2024 ²⁴	Randomized 1:1, RDN vs. sham procedure, on med	148/153	18-80 y, office SBP ≥ 150 and <180 mmHg on ≥2 drugs	eGFR <45 ml/min/1.73m ² , secondary hypertension	Change in 24-h SBP at 3 months	Peregrine (alcohol)	NCT02910414

Abbreviations: CV, cardiovascular; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; FMD, fibromuscular dysplasia; HF, heart failure; RDN, renal denervation; med, medications; MI, myocardial infarction; SBP, systolic blood pressure; y, years.

Table 2. Safety	^r endpoints	across RDN	and	sham	group
-----------------	------------------------	------------	-----	------	-------

Frader - tre 4	Number of studies	Number of studies	RDN	Sham	Effect Estimate
Endpoint	with documented endpoint	that specifically reported endpoint	N (%)	N (%)	(OR with 95% CI)
Vascular complication	7	13	8 / 1,598 (0.5%)	2 / 1,197 (0.17%)	1.69, 0.57-5.0, p=0.34
Renal artery stenosis >70%	1	12	1 / 1,424 (0.07%)	0 / 1,029 (0%)	1.50, 0.06-36.97, p=0.80
Renal artery re-intervention	0	10	0 / 1,377 (0%)	0 / 1,040 (0%)	N.A.
Hypertensive crisis / emergency	5	9	14 / 1,248 (1.12%)	13/915 (1.42%)	0.65, 0.30-1.38, p=0.26
Stroke	4	8	4 / 1,160 (0.34%)	5 / 823 (0.60%)	0.54, 0.15-1.91, p=0.34
Hospitalization for HF	1	6	9 / 847	3 / 582	1.47, 0.39-5.50, p=0.57

		(1.06%)	(0.51%)	
3	11	4 / 1,476	1 / 1,070	1 76 0 34-9 20 p=0 50
		(0.27%)	(0.08%)	1.70, 0.34-9.20, p=0.50
1	9	1 / 1,270	0 / 930	
		(0.07%)	(0%)	1.45, 0.06-36.12, p=0.82
0	8	0 / 1,316	0 / 914	
		(0%)	(0%)	N.A.
	3	3 11 1 9 0 8	3 11 4 / 1,476 3 11 4 / 1,476 (0.27%) (0.27%) 1 9 1 / 1,270 0 8 0 / 1,316 (0%) (0%)	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

* - 1 death in RADIANCE HTN TRIO was sudden cardiac death unrelated to the RDN procedure, 1 death (unrelated to the study procedure, device or drug) in TARGET BP I and 2 death cases (details not stated) in SYMPLICITY HTN Trial occurred within 6 months after the procedure,

Data are frequencies (%) and odds ratios (95% confidence intervals).

Abbreviations: ESRD, end-stage renal disease; HF, heart failure; NA, not applicable; RDN, renal denervation.

		RDN		5	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-6.7	15.1	329	-4.7	17.2	162	10.1%	-2.00 [-5.11, 1.11]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-7	8.6	74	-3.1	9.7	72	10.4%	-3.90 [-6.88, -0.92]	2018	
SPYRAL HTN-OFF	-4.7	11.4	140	-0.6	9.7	134	11.5%	-4.10 [-6.60, -1.60]	2020	
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-8.7	13.9	69	-5.2	16.9	63	6.2%	-3.50 [-8.81, 1.81]	2021	
TARGET BP OFF	-2.9	7.4	48	-1.4	8.6	51	10.0%	-1.50 [-4.65, 1.65]	2022	
lberis–HTN	-13	12.1	107	-3	13	110	9.6%	-10.00 [-13.34, -6.66]	2023	
Netrod RDN	-12.4	12.3	137	-3.7	12.5	66	9.0%	-8.70 [-12.35, -5.05]	2023	
RADIANCE II	-7.7	10.7	144	-1.7	9.3	72	10.9%	-6.00 [-8.77, -3.23]	2023	- _
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-6.5	10.7	206	-4.5	10.3	131	12.0%	-2.00 [-4.29, 0.29]	2023	
TARGET BP I	-10	14.2	148	-6.8	12.1	153	10.4%	-3.20 [-6.18, -0.22]	2024	
Total (95% CI)			1402			1014	100.0%	-4.41 [-6.12, -2.70]		◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 4.99$; Test for overall effect: $7 = 5$	$Chi^2 = 2$	27.86,	df = 9	(P = 0.0)	001); I	$^{2} = 68\%$	6			-10 -5 0 5 10
Test for overall effect. $z = 5$.	.00 (1 <	0.000	(01)							Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]

Ambulatory diastolic blood pressure change

		RDN		5	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-4.1	9.2	329	-3.1	10.1	162	11.2%	-1.00 [-2.85, 0.85]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-4.4	5.8	74	-3	6.1	72	10.8%	-1.40 [-3.33, 0.53]	2018	+
SPYRAL HTN-OFF	-3.7	7.1	140	-0.8	5.8	134	12.6%	-2.90 [-4.43, -1.37]	2020	_
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-5.2	8.7	69	-4	11.1	63	6.0%	-1.20 [-4.62, 2.22]	2021	
TARGET BP OFF	-2	5.1	48	-1.1	6.6	51	9.3%	-0.90 [-3.22, 1.42]	2022	
lberis–HTN	-7.7	8.6	107	-2.8	10.1	110	8.6%	-4.90 [-7.39, -2.41]	2023	
Netrod RDN	-6.4	7.7	137	-1.3	7.3	66	9.8%	-5.10 [-7.28, -2.92]	2023	
RADIANCE II	-5.3	6.4	144	-1.2	5.4	72	12.2%	-4.10 [-5.73, -2.47]	2023	.
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-4.4	7.3	206	-3.4	7.6	131	12.1%	-1.00 [-2.64, 0.64]	2023	
TARGET BP I	-9.9	13.7	148	-6.9	11.7	153	7.4%	-3.00 [-5.88, -0.12]	2024	
Total (95% CI)			1402			1014	100.0%	-2.55 [-3.58, -1.52]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.59;	$Chi^2 = 2$	22.48,	df = 9	(P = 0.0)	007); I	$^{2} = 60\%$	6			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$.	.84 (P <	0.000	01)							Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]

Figure 1. Comparison of effects of renal denervation vs sham procedure on ambulatory systolic (top forest plot) and diastolic (bottom forest plot) blood pressure

		RDN		9	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-14.1	23.9	353	-11.7	25.9	171	9.7%	-2.40 [-7.01, 2.21]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-10.8	13.6	74	-3.9	17.4	72	9.3%	-6.90 [-11.97, -1.83]	2018	
SPYRAL HTN-OFF	-9.2	15.3	156	-2.5	13.6	150	11.0%	-6.70 [-9.94, -3.46]	2020	
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-8.5	19.1	69	-2	20.6	63	7.7%	-6.50 [-13.30, 0.30]	2021	
TARGET BP OFF	-4	12.6	50	0.6	13.2	54	9.4%	-4.60 [-9.56, 0.36]	2022	
lberis–HTN	-21.7	14.5	107	-15.4	15.8	110	10.3%	-6.30 [-10.33, -2.27]	2023	
Netrod RDN	-25.2	13.9	137	-6.2	12.5	66	10.5%	-19.00 [-22.81, -15.19]	2023	
RADIANCE II	-11	13.5	137	-5.5	12.9	71	10.5%	-5.50 [-9.26, -1.74]	2023	_ .
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-9.9	13.9	206	-5.1	13.2	131	11.2%	-4.80 [-7.75, -1.85]	2023	
TARGET BP I	-12.7	18.3	148	-9.7	17.3	153	10.3%	-3.00 [-7.03, 1.03]	2024	
Total (95% CI)			1437			1041	100.0%	-6.62 [-9.66, -3.57]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 19.17 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.	; Chi² = .26 (P <	-20 -10 0 10 20 Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]								

Office diastolic blood pressure change

		RDN		C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-6.6	11.9	353	-4.6	13.6	171	10.5%	-2.00 [-4.39, 0.39]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-5.5	8.4	74	-1.2	10	72	9.6%	-4.30 [-7.30, -1.30]	2018	
SPYRAL HTN-OFF	-5.1	8.4	156	-1	8.4	150	11.2%	-4.10 [-5.98, -2.22]	2020	_ -
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-4.8	13.7	69	-0.1	12.6	63	7.4%	-4.70 [-9.19, -0.21]	2021	
TARGET BP OFF	-3.5	7.6	50	-1.1	8.8	54	9.4%	-2.40 [-5.55, 0.75]	2022	
RADIANCE II	-5.9	9.4	137	-3.3	9.2	71	10.1%	-2.60 [-5.26, 0.06]	2023	
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-5.2	8.8	206	-3.3	8.2	131	11.2%	-1.90 [-3.75, -0.05]	2023	
Iberis–HTN	-12.9	10.9	107	-7.8	11.8	110	9.6%	-5.10 [-8.12, -2.08]	2023	
Netrod RDN	-12.6	8.9	137	-2.5	9.2	66	10.1%	-10.10 [-12.77, -7.43]	2023	
TARGET BP I	-6.8	9.4	148	-8.1	8.8	153	11.0%	1.30 [-0.76, 3.36]	2024	+
Total (95% CI)			1437			1041	100.0%	-3.49 [-5.40, -1.59]		◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 7.51;$	$Chi^2 = 5$	0.51,	df = 9	(P < 0.0)	00001); I ² = 8	32%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	59 (P =	0.000	3)							Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]

Figure 2. Comparison of effects of renal denervation vs sham procedure on office systolic (top forest plot) and diastolic (bottom forest plot) blood pressure

		RDN		9	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-7.2	16.4	334	-6.2	19.2	163	12.6%	-1.00 [-4.43, 2.43]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-8.5	9.3	74	-2.2	10	72	13.1%	-6.30 [-9.43, -3.17]	2018	.
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-9	14.5	69	-5.1	16.4	63	9.3%	-3.90 [-9.20, 1.40]	2021	
RADIANCE II	-7.9	11.6	145	-1.8	9.5	73	13.6%	-6.10 [-8.98, -3.22]	2023	_ -
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-6.5	12.6	192	-5	11.8	117	13.8%	-1.50 [-4.28, 1.28]	2023	
Iberis–HTN	-12.9	13.6	107	-2.6	13.6	110	12.2%	-10.30 [-13.92, -6.68]	2023	_
Netrod RDN	-13.5	12.4	137	-3.8	13	66	11.9%	-9.70 [-13.46, -5.94]	2023	
TARGET BP I	-10.1	13.6	148	-7.1	11.7	153	13.6%	-3.00 [-5.87, -0.13]	2024	
Total (95% CI)			1206			817	100.0%	-5.17 [-7.57, -2.77]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 8.88; Test for overall effect: Z = 4.	Chi² = 2 22 (P <	-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]								

Daytime diastolic blood pressure change

	I	RDN		9	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-4.4	9.7	334	-3.9	11.2	163	15.2%	-0.50 [-2.51, 1.51]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-5.1	5.9	74	-2.6	6.5	72	15.2%	-2.50 [-4.52, -0.48]	2018	
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-5.3	9.2	69	-4.1	10.8	63	10.4%	-1.20 [-4.64, 2.24]	2021	
Iberis–HTN	-7.7	9.3	107	-2.5	10.4	110	13.0%	-5.20 [-7.82, -2.58]	2023	- _
Netrod RDN	-7	7.9	137	-1.1	8	66	14.0%	-5.90 [-8.24, -3.56]	2023	_
RADIANCE II	-5.4	6.5	145	-1.3	5.7	73	16.4%	-4.10 [-5.78, -2.42]	2023	_ -
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-4.6	7.7	192	-3.7	8.2	117	15.8%	-0.90 [-2.74, 0.94]	2023	
Total (95% CI)			1058			664	100.0%	-2.90 [-4.48, -1.31]		◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 3.26$;	$Chi^2 = 2$	22.28	3, df = 0	6 (P = 0	.001);	$I^2 = 73$	3%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	58 (P =	0.00	03)							Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]

Figure 3. Comparison of effects of renal denervation vs sham procedure on daytime systolic (top forest plot) and diastolic (bottom forest plot) blood pressure

		RDN		S	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI		
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-5.6	19.4	337	-2.4	18.5	166	14.0%	-3.20 [-6.69, 0.29]	2014			
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-4.8	11.7	74	-3.1	11.5	72	12.7%	-1.70 [-5.46, 2.06]	2018			
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-8.1	15.7	69	-4.8	20.1	63	5.8%	-3.30 [-9.49, 2.89]	2021			
RADIANCE II	-6.6	12.8	144	-1.3	11.3	72	14.8%	-5.30 [-8.64, -1.96]	2023	_		
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-6.7	12.7	194	-3	12.6	118	17.6%	-3.70 [-6.59, -0.81]	2023	_ _		
Iberis–HTN	-13.1	13.9	107	-3.7	16.7	110	11.3%	-9.40 [-13.48, -5.32]	2023			
Netrod RDN	-8.2	16.9	137	-1.3	16.2	66	8.8%	-6.90 [-11.73, -2.07]	2023			
TARGET BP I	-9.3	14.8	148	-6	14.4	153	15.0%	-3.30 [-6.60, 0.00]	2024	-		
Total (95% CI)			1210			820	100.0%	-4.46 [-6.07, -2.84]		•		
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 1.71$; ($Chi^2 = 1$	0.27,	df = 7	(P = 0.1)	17); I ²	= 32%						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 5$.	39 (P <	0.000	01)							Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]		

Nighttime diastolic blood pressure change

		RDN		9	Sham			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
SYMPLICITY HTN-3	-3.3	11.6	337	-1.5	11.2	166	18.2%	-1.80 [-3.91, 0.31]	2014	
RADIANCE-HTN SOLO	-3.3	8.5	74	-2.7	7.3	72	14.0%	-0.60 [-3.17, 1.97]	2018	
RADIANCE-HTN TRIO	-5.1	10	69	-3	13.3	63	6.8%	-2.10 [-6.14, 1.94]	2021	
lberis–HTN	-7.3	10.2	107	-2.9	12.6	110	10.8%	-4.40 [-7.45, -1.35]	2023	
Netrod RDN	-4.2	10.8	137	-0.3	8.6	66	12.6%	-3.90 [-6.65, -1.15]	2023	
RADIANCE II	-4.7	8.2	144	-0.5	6.7	72	18.9%	-4.20 [-6.25, -2.15]	2023	
SPYRAL HTN-ON Extension	-4.3	8.5	194	-2.8	9.3	118	18.7%	-1.50 [-3.56, 0.56]	2023	
Total (95% CI)			1062			667	100.0%	-2.60 [-3.73, -1.46]		◆
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.70;$	$Chi^2 = 8$	3.58, c	f = 6 (P = 0.2	0); I ² =	= 30%				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4$.	.47 (P <	0.000	01)							Favours [RDN] Favours [Sham]

Figure 4. Comparison of effects of renal denervation vs sham procedure on nighttime systolic (top forest plot) and diastolic (bottom forest plot) blood pressure

Efficacy and safety of catheter-based RDN vs sham in hypertension



Ultrasound RDN: RADIANCE TRIO ^a (*Paradise*) RADIANCE SOLO ^c (*Paradise*) RADIANCE II ^c (*Paradise*)

Alcohol RDN: TARGET BP OFF ^c (Peregrine) TARGET BP I ^b (Peregrine)

- a) Resistant hypertension
- b) Hypertension on medication
- c) Hypertension off medication

Efficacy outcomes



Safety outcomes

