ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Aliskiren vs. other antihypertensive drugs in the treatment of hypertension: a meta-analysis

Yongfei Chen^{1,2}, Long Meng¹, Hua Shao² and Feng Yu¹

To investigate the antihypertensive effects and tolerability of aliskiren in comparison with other antihypertensive drugs and placebo in patients with hypertension, a meta-analysis was performed of studies published between 1950 and 2012. A systematic literature search of MEDLINE and the Cochrane Library was conducted for randomized controlled trials. Weighted mean differences and relative risk with 95% confidence intervals were calculated for continuous and dichotomous data, respectively. In all, 14 studies with 6741 participants were included in the present meta-analysis. Nine studies included trial arms with placebo, four included angiotensin (Ang) AT1 receptor blockers (ARBs), three included Ang-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs), two included calcium channel blockers (CCBs), one included a β-blocker, and one included hydrochlorothiazide (HCTZ). We found that aliskiren, which lowered blood pressure (BP) effectively in patients with mild-to-moderate hypertension, was similar to HCTZ but inferior to CCBs in BP reduction, response rates and control rates. Furthermore, aliskiren was superior to ACEIs in lowering diastolic BP (DBP), while it had similar effects to ACEIs on systolic BP (SBP) reduction, response rates and control rates. Additionally, the present meta-analysis showed the superiority of atenolol over aliskiren in DBP reduction and BP response but showed that atenolol was inferior in SBP reduction and BP control. No difference was found in the rates of therapeutic response between aliskiren and ARBs, while more patients achieved BP control with aliskiren. Further studies will be needed to determine the antihypertensive effects and tolerability of aliskiren in comparison with other antihypertensive drugs.

Hypertension Research (2013) 36, 252-261; doi:10.1038/hr.2012.185; published online 15 November 2012

Keywords: aliskiren; efficacy; hypertension; meta-analysis; safety

INTRODUCTION

Hypertension is an important public health problem worldwide. The estimated total number of adults with hypertension in 2000 was 972 million (957–987 million): 333 million (329–336 million) in economically developed countries and 639 million (625–654 million) in economically developing countries.¹ The number of adults with hypertension in 2025 is predicted to increase by ~60%, to a total of 1.56 billion (1.54–1.58 billion).¹ In addition to its high frequency, hypertension has been identified as the leading risk factor for cardiovascular and kidney diseases^{2,3} and for mortality.⁴

The renin–angiotensin (Ang)–aldosterone system (RAAS) has a crucial role in volume regulation and the maintenance of blood pressure (BP), acting primarily through Ang II. Ang-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs) and Ang AT1 receptor blockers (ARBs) reduce the effects of Ang II, either by reducing its production or by directly blocking its interaction with the Ang-1 receptor, respectively.⁵ Although ACEIs and ARBs have been proven effective, suppression of RAAS remains incomplete with these agents because of their

disruption of the negative feedback effects of Ang II on renin release, with a consequent increase in plasma renin activity and the reactive activation of the RAAS.⁶ As renin catalyzes the conversion of angiotensinogen into Ang I, the initial and rate-limiting step of the RAAS, it has been suggested that renin inhibitors offer the potential to optimize suppression of the RAAS by interrupting the system at its first regulated step.^{7,8}

Aliskiren is the first orally effective direct renin inhibitor,⁹ and it has recently been approved by the US Food and Drug Administration and the European Medicines Agency for the treatment of hypertension. It inhibits the activity of renin, controlling the renin system at the rate-limiting step. Some clinical trials have studied its efficacy in hypertension;^{10,11} however, there have been no metaanalyses that have examined the effects of aliskiren and other antihypertensive agents on BP.

Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis to investigate the antihypertensive effects and tolerability of aliskiren, in comparison with other antihypertensive drugs and placebo, in patients with hypertension.

¹Department of Clinical Pharmacy, China Pharmaceutical University, Nanjing, China and ²Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Zhongda Hospital, Southeast University, Nanjing, China

Correspondence: Dr H Shao, Department of Clinical Pharmacology, Zhongda Hospital, Southeast University, Nanjing 210009, China. E-mail: gycsh@yahoo.cn.

or Professor F Yu, Department of Clinical Pharmacy, China Pharmaceutical University, 24 Tongjiaxiang, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210009, China.

E-mail: yufengcpu@163.com

Received 5 June 2012; revised 23 August 2012; accepted 24 August 2012; published online 15 November 2012

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search strategy

We developed a protocol for the review and followed standard QUOROM reporting guidelines.¹² We searched online databases, including MEDLINE (1950–2012) and the Cochrane Library (Issue 5, 2012), using the following terms: aliskiren, renin inhibitor, hypertension and BP, without restrictions on language. We also searched the Clinical Trials (http://clinicaltrials.gov/) Web site and the Novartis Clinical Trials Results Database (http:// www.novctrd.com/ctrdWebApp/clinicaltrialrepository/public/main.jsp) for unpublished data and reviewed the reference lists of the included randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and review articles to identify other unrecognized or unpublished reports of RCTs.^{13,14}

Inclusion criteria

Studies were eligible for inclusion if they met the following criteria: (1) doubleblind, prospective, randomized, controlled trials of antihypertensive treatment with aliskiren; (2) enrolled patients \geq 18 years of age with mild-to-moderate hypertension (systolic BP (SBP) 140–179 mm Hg and/or diastolic BP (DBP) 90–109 mm Hg, as defined in current international guidelines);^{15,16} (3) study treatments had to have been taken for at least 4 weeks with aliskiren at 300 mg per day and other active comparators at the maximum commonly used dose; (4) only monotherapy treatment arms were included in the meta-analysis; and (5) assessment of the effectiveness of aliskiren *vs.* placebo or other classes of drugs for hypertension.

Exclusion criteria

The exclusion criteria pertained to studies that recruited participants with secondary hypertension, severe hypertension (DBP \geq 110 mm Hg and/or SBP \geq 180 mm Hg), poorly controlled diabetes mellitus, a history of severe cardiovascular or cerebrovascular disease, severe chronic kidney disease (stage 4–5), other severe life-threatening medical conditions, unavailable data or no quantitative data and that had cohorts of <25 patients. Studies that only enrolled patients in a specific subgroup (for example, based on ethnicity or diabetes mellitus) and that used aliskiren for indications other than hypertension were also excluded.

Data extraction

The quality of each included study was assessed on the Jadad quality scale,¹⁷ with a score of 0–2 reflecting low quality, a score of 3–4 indicating moderate quality and a score of 5 representing a high-quality study. All of the data were extracted by two independent authors. The following information was abstracted from each trial: number, age and sex of participants; intervention strategies; baseline SBP and DBP values; duration; and measures of end points (that is, changes from baseline in SBP and DBP, rates of therapeutic response and of SBP and DBP control; proportion of adverse events; and the number of drop-outs). Disagreements were resolved by discussion between the authors.

Statistical analysis

The meta-analysis was performed using the Cochrane RevMan software, version 5.02 (Cochrane Library, UK). For continuous data, the results were expressed as weighted mean differences (WMDs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). For dichotomous data, pooling data were described as relative risks (RRs) with 95% CIs. Subgroup analysis was conducted between different comparators. We assessed heterogeneity with a standard χ^2 -test, with significance set at P < 0.10, and with the I^2 statistic, with significance set at $I^2 > 50\%$.¹⁸ The fixed-effects model was employed in the absence of between study heterogeneity; otherwise, the random-effects model was used.

RESULTS

Study characteristics

After screening the titles and abstracts of all of the studies identified by the search strategy, 491 potentially relevant articles were selected and reviewed for more detailed information. We excluded 30 duplicate articles, 35 non-related articles and 46 preclinical studies. Of the 380 reports selected for detailed evaluation, 359 studies were excluded, predominantly for study type (open-label, cross-over), study duration and article type (reviews, letters, comments, and interviews). Of the 21 full-text articles selected for assessing for eligibility, seven studies were not RCTs. Therefore, a total of 14 studies, $^{10,11,19-30}$ enrolling 6741 participants, fulfilled all of the inclusion criteria. All 14 articles were available as full reports (all in English). Table 1 describes the baseline characteristics of all of the eligible studies. The 14 studies included in this meta-analysis were short-term (4–16 weeks), randomized, double-blind clinical trials with similar designs and comparable primary end points and secondary efficacy measures. The patient demographics and baseline characteristics were also similar in all of the included studies, except that two studies that included patients aged older than 65 years old, 27,29 and one study included patients aged between 21 and 70 years old.²⁶

Aliskiren was compared with ARBs (losartan, irbesartan and valsartan) in four trials,^{21,23,24,26} ACEIs (ramipril, lisinopril) in two trials,^{10,27} calcium channel blocker (CCB) (amlodipine) in two trials,^{19,30} a β -blocker (atenolol) in one trial,²⁰ a thiazide diuretic (hydrochlorothiazide, HCTZ)²⁸ in one trial, and placebo in nine trials.^{11,21–25,28–30} Two reports of unpublished data were checked with the Novartis Clinical Trials Results Database and the Clinical Trials Web site, and they were designated CSPP100A2405²⁹ and CSPA100A2305.³⁰ According to the Jadad quality scale, our quality assessment scores ranged from 3 to 5 for all of the studies included. These studies were considered to be of good quality, with six of them having excellent quality.

Outcome characteristics

Sitting clinic BP was used for all of the trials. The primary outcome of most of the trials was the change from baseline in mean sitting DBP, except for the studies by Verdecchia $(2007)^{27}$ and by Stanton (2003),²⁶ the primary outcomes of which were the change from baseline in mean 24 h ambulatory SBP, and for the study by Brown $(2011)^{19}$ and for CSPP100A2405,²⁹ the primary outcomes of which were the change from baseline in mean sitting SBP (msSBP). Secondary variables included the following: the change from baseline in msSBP, diastolic responder rates (defined as mean sitting DBP <90 mm Hg or equal to 10 mm Hg reduction in mean sitting DBP) or systolic responder rates (defined as mean sitting DBP) or systolic responder rates (defined as a BP <140/90 mm Hg); number of patients with adverse events and withdrawals due to adverse effects.

Efficacy

Aliskiren vs. placebo. Nine trials^{11,21–25,28–30} involving 3541 patients compared the effects of treatments with aliskiren and placebo in terms of reduction in BP. Aliskiren was significantly superior to placebo in lowering DBP and SBP (WMD –4.75, 95% CI –5.59 to –3.92, P <0.00001; WMD –8.12, 95% CI –9.61 to –6.63, P <0.00001, respectively); Figures 1 and 2. Seven trials^{11,23–25,28–30} (n = 2915) reported statistically significant improvements in responder rates (RR 1.65, 95% CI 1.52–1.80, P <0.00001); Figure 3. Six trials^{21,23–25,28,30} (n = 2577) reported that aliskiren led to significantly greater control rates than placebo (RR 1.96, 95% CI 1.73–2.23, P <0.00001); Figure 4.

Aliskiren vs. ARBs. Four trials^{21,23,24,26} involving 1467 patients compared the effects of treatments with aliskiren and ARBs in terms of reduction in BP. No significant differences were found in the reduction of DBP and SBP of the two groups (WMD -0.83, 95% CI -2.79 to -1.13, P=0.40; WMD -0.57, 95% CI -2.40 to

npg	2
254	ŀ

he meta-analysis
the
⊒.
included
studies
all eligible
all
J.
characteristics (
baseline
The
Table 1

StudyDesign and treatment durationSample sizeStanton 2003 ²⁶ r, db, ac, pg, 4 weeks226Gradman 2005 ²¹ r, mc, db, pg, pc, ac, 8 weeks652	nt duration 3				Age						
		Sample size	Dosage (mg d ⁻¹)	Male/n(%)	(mean±s.d.)	DBP	SBP	DBP	SBP	Inclusion criteria	Jadad score
	weeks	226	Aliskiren 300	23/40(57.5)	51.8 ± 10.5	94.1 ± 11.1	157.6 ± 16.8	-5.7 ± 11.0	-11.8 ± 14.9	DASBP:≽140	e
				23/36(63.9)	55.9 ± 8.9	95.0 ± 8.1	159.0 ± 15.5	-5.5 ± 10.7	-11.4 ± 19.2		
	c, 8 weeks	652	Aliskiren 300	55/130(42.3)	56.0±10.2	98.8±3.4	152.1 ± 10.2	-11.77 ± 8.56	-15.76 ± 14.02	DBP:95-110	Ð
		<u> </u>	Placebo Irbesartan 150	64/131(48.9)	57.1±12.0 56	98.9±3.3	152.3±12.1	-6.34±8.56	-5.29 ± 14.02		
OF 200722 , dh	of loons of	04.9		66/134(49.3) 106/160/60 7)	1±11.8 54.52	99.4±4.0	152.8±11.2	-8.88±8.53 -8.86±8.53	-12.50 ± 13.96		ç
UN ZUU/ I, MC, AD, PG, PC, & Weeks	Ø WEEKS	7/0	AllSkiren 300 Discobo	100/109(02.7)	50 40	47.1 AA.4	0.101 1.501	-11.110.32	-14./ I 13.20 2 8 + 12 10	U11-02-110	n
Onaril 2007 ²³ r mc dh na nc 8 weeks	8 weeks	1 797	Aliskiren 300	255/437(58%)	519+104	1002+39	1539+117	-4.9±0.22 -9.0+8.71	-3.61 13.04 -13.04 13.89	DRP-95-110	LC.
			Placebo	281/459 (61%)	52.6 ± 10.4	100.4 ± 4.2	154.1 ± 12.8	-4.1 ± 8.75	-4.6 ± 13.86)
			Valsartan 320	281/455 (62%)	52.4 ± 10.4	100.3 ± 3.8	154.2 ± 12.7	-9.7 ± 8.73	-12.8 ± 13.83		
Dietz 2008 ²⁰ r, mc, db, 12 weeks	veeks	694	Aliskiren 300	134/	55.8 ± 11.9	99.7±3.8	157.6 ± 12.3	-11.26 ± 9.08	-14.34 ± 16.14	DBP:95-110	4
			Atenolol 100	231(58.0%)	54.7 ± 11.5	99.4 ± 3.8	155.9 ± 12.9	-13.66 ± 9.07	-14.26 ± 16.14		
				113/							
				231(48.9%)							
Kushiro 2006 ¹¹ r, mc, db, pc, pg, 8 weeks	8 weeks	455	Aliskiren 300	80/113(70.8%)	51.6 ± 9.9	99.6±4.4	155.0 ± 11.7	-10.72 ± 7.97	-14.09 ± 12.54	DBP:95-110	2
			Placebo	90/115(78.3%)	52.7 ± 9.5	99.4±3.9	155.4 ± 10.7	-3.26 ± 8.04	-2.85 ± 12.55		
Puig 2009 r, mc, db, pc, pg, 8 weeks	8 weeks	642	Aliskiren 300	91/158(57.6)	52.1 ± 11.01	100.3 ± 3.96	152.9 ± 12.73	-8.43 ± 7.99	-9.90 ± 13.74	DBP:95-110	Ð
			Placebo	93/160(58.1)	51.9 ± 11.06	100.1 ± 4.23	153.6 ± 13.03	-3.95 ± 7.94	-5.25 ± 13.77		
Andersen 2008 ²⁵ r, mc, db, ac, 26 weeks	i weeks	842	Aliskiren 300	224/420/53.3%)	53.4 ± 10.8	98.8 ± 3.4	151.3 ± 11.7	-11.3 ± 8.14	-14.0 ± 12.2	DBP:95-110	ო
			Ramipril 10	256/422/60.7%)	53.1 ± 11.2	98.9 ± 3.5	151.5 ± 11.7	-9.7 ± 8.18	-11.3 ± 12.3		
Villamil 2007 ¹⁰ r, mc, db, pc, pg, 8 weeks	8 weeks	2776	Aliskiren 300	99/183(54.1%)	54.2	99.3	154.4	-10.3 ± 8.05	-15.7 ± 12.75	DBP:95-110	ო
			Placebo	109/	54.4	99.3	152.7	-6.9 ± 8.04	-7.5 ± 12.75		
			HCTZ 25	195(55.9%)	55.1	99.1	154.5	-9.4 ± 8.02	-14.3 ± 12.76		
				92/176(52.3%)							
Pool 2007 ²⁴ r, mc, db, pc, pg, ac, 8 weeks	c, 8 weeks	1123	Aliskiren 300	100/	56.7 ± 11.9	99.1 ± 3.41	152.9 ± 12.20	-12.3 ± 8.20	-15.0 ± 12.70	DBP:95-110	4
			Placebo	175(57.1%)	55.2 ± 12.2	98.7 ± 3.03	152.6 ± 11.80	-8.6 ± 8.23	-10.0 ± 12.74		
			Valsartan 320	97/177(54.8%)	56.8 ± 10.7	98.9±3.49	153.4 ± 9.73	-11.3 ± 8.13	-16.5 ± 12.55		
				31/60(51.7%)							
Verdecchia 2007 ²⁷ r, mc, db, pg, ac, 8 weeks	8 weeks	355	Aliskiren 300	35/94(37.2%)	73.0 ± 5.6	90.1 ± 8.2	160.7 ± 8.9	-6.4 ± 7.85	-14.5 ± 14.06	SBP:140-180	£
			Lisinopril 10	29/86(33.7%)	74.2 ± 6.1	88.1 ± 8.6	161.4 ± 9.2	-5.4 ± 8.02	-14.9 ± 14.29		
Brown 2011 ¹⁹ r, mc, db, pg, ac, 32 weeks	32 weeks	1254	Aliskiren 300	164/318(51.6)	58.4 ± 10.8	92.1 ± 10.5	161.0 ± 8.0	NR	NR	SBP:150-180	Ð
			Amlodipine 10	156/316(49.4)	58.1 ± 10.9	93.0 ± 9.1	161.2 ± 8.2				
CSPP100A2405 r, mc, db, pc, pg, 8 weeks	8 weeks	755	Aliskiren 300	84/186(45.2)	72.1 ± 5.47	NR	NR	-6.66 ± 7.90	-14.14 ± 14.22	SBP:150-180 DBP:<110	
			Placebo	89/187(47.6)	72.3 ± 5.25			-3.50 ± 7.85	-7.97 ± 14.15		
CSPA100A2305 r, mc, db, ac, pg, pc, 8 weeks	c, 8 weeks	1688	Aliskiren 300	95/203(46.8)	54.0 ± 9.99	NR	NR	-10.19 ± 8.98	-15.37 ± 14.04	DBP:95-110	
			Placebo	90/198(45.5)	53.7 ± 10.32			-5.35 ± 8.72	-6.79 ± 14.07		
			Amlodipine 10	87/181(48.1)	55.0 ± 10.34			-13.82 ± 8.83	-21.04 ± 14.05		

Aliskiren and hypertension Y Chen et al

	Δli	skiren		C	ontrol			Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean			Mean		Total	Weight		Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 Aliskiren vs. Pl		00	Total	Mean	00	Total	Weight	14, Italiaolii, 3070 0	Tear	
Gradman2005	-11.77	8 56	130	-6.34	8 56	131	9.1%	-5.43 [-7.51, -3.35]	2005	
Kushiro2006	-10.72		113	-3.26		115	9.1%	-7.46 [-9.54, -5.38]		
Oparil2007		8.71	437		8.75	459	15.0%	-4.90 [-6.04, -3.76]		
Oh 2007	-11.1		169		8.22	165	10.7%	-6.20 [-7.97, -4.43]		
Villamil2007	-10.3		183		8.04	195	11.6%	-3.40 [-5.02, -1.78]		
Pool2007	-12.3	8.2	175		8.23	177	11.0%	-3.70 [-5.42, -1.98]		
CSPA100A2305	-10.19		203	-5.35		198	10.9%	-4.84 [-6.57, -3.11]		
CSPP100A2405	-6.66	7.9	186		7.85	187	11.8%	-3.16 [-4.76, -1.56]		
Puig2009	-8.43		158	-3.95		160	10.8%	-4.48 [-6.23, -2.73]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	0110		1754	0.00			100.0%	-4.75 [-5.59, -3.92]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.86: Ch	i² = 17	.53. df =	= 8 (P =	0.02):	$ ^2 = 54^{\circ}$	%			
Test for overall effect:					,,					
1.1.2 Aliskiren vs. AF	RBs									
Stanton2003	-5.7	11	40	-5.5	10.7	36	11.5%	-0.20 [-5.08, 4.68]	2003	
Gradman2005	-11.77	8.56	130	-8.88	8.53	134	27.9%	-2.89 [-4.95, -0.83]		
Pool2007	-12.3	8.2	175	-11.3		60	25.2%	-1.00 [-3.39, 1.39]		
Oparil2007	-9	8.71	437	-9.7	8.73	455	35.4%	0.70 [-0.44, 1.84]	2007	+=-
Subtotal (95% CI)			782			685	100.0%	-0.83 [-2.79, 1.13]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2.48; Ch	i² = 9.3	82, df =	3 (P = 0	.03); ľ	² = 68%	,			
Test for overall effect:										
1.1.3 Aliskiren vs. A0	CEIs									
Verdecchia2007		7.85	94	-54	8.02	86	18.4%	-1.00 [-3.32, 1.32]	2007	
Andersen2008	-11.3		420		8.18	422	81.6%	-1.60 [-2.70, -0.50]		
Subtotal (95% CI)	11.0	0.14	514	0.7	0.10	508		-1.49 [-2.49, -0.49]	2000	\bullet
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00: Ch	$i^2 = 0.2$		1(P = 0)	.65): 1					
Test for overall effect:				. (,	0,0				
1.1.4 Aliskiren vs. Ar	nlodinin									
CSPA100A2305	-10.19		202	-13.82	0 02	101	100.0%	2 62 [1 95 5 41]	2000	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-10.19	0.90	203	-13.02	0.03		100.0%	3.63 [1.85, 5.41] 3.63 [1.85, 5.41]	2009	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	nlicable		200			101	100.070	0.00 [1.00, 0.41]		•
Test for overall effect:		(P < 0	0001)							
		(, , , ,								
1.1.5 Aliskiren vs. Ho	CTZ									_
Villamil2007	-10.3	8.05	183	-9.4	8.02		100.0%	-0.90 [-2.56, 0.76]	2007	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			183			176	100.0%	-0.90 [-2.56, 0.76]		-
Heterogeneity: Not ap										
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.06	(P = 0	.29)							
1.1.6 Aliskiren vs. At	enolol									_
Dietz2008 Subtotal (95% CI)	-11.26	9.08	231 231	-13.66	9.07		100.0% 100.0%	2.40 [0.74, 4.06] 2.40 [0.74, 4.06]	2008	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable		_0.							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.84	(P = 0	.004)							
									F	i
									-10	0 -5 0 5 10
									F	avours aliskiren Favours control

Figure 1 Change (mm Hg) from baseline in mean sitting diastolic BP at end point following treatment with aliskiren or other antihypertensive drugs and placebo during monotherapy. ACEIs, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; ARBs, angiotensin receptor blockers; CI, confidence interval; HCTZ, hydrochlorothiazide; IV, inverse variance. Control, antihypertensive drug used as comparator drug in that study. 'Total' indicates the total number of individuals.

-1.25, P=0.54, respectively); Figures 1 and 2. Two trials^{23,24} (n=1118) compared BP responder rates between aliskiren and ARBs, with no significant difference between the two groups (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.89–1.10, P=0.84); see Figure 3. Three trials^{21,23,24} (n=1381) reported that more patients achieved BP control with aliskiren than with ARBs (RR 1.16, 95% CI 1.01–1.34, P=0.03); Figure 4. Additionally, Stanton (2003)²⁶ showed that the reductions in

daytime and nighttime ambulatory SBP and DBPs were of a similar magnitude with aliskiren and losartan.

Aliskiren vs. ACEIs. Two trials^{10,27} involving 1022 patients compared the effects of treatments with aliskiren and ACEIs in terms of reduction in BP. Aliskiren significantly reduced DBP compared with ACEIs (WMD -1.49, 95% CI -2.49 to -0.49, P = 0.003), while no

256

Audu or Cuberrout		iskiren	Total		ontrol	Tatal	Woinht	Mean Difference	Veer	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup .2.1 Aliskiren vs. pla	Mean	SD	Iotal	Mean	SD	lotal	weight	IV, Random, 95% C	rear	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Gradman2005	-15.76	14.02	130	F 20	14.02	131	0.20/	-10.47 [-13.87, -7.07]	2005	←
Kushiro2006	-14.09		113		12.55	115		-11.24 [-14.50, -7.98]		
/illamil2007	-15.7		183		12.75	195	11.8%	-8.20 [-10.77, -5.63]		
Dh 2007	-14.7		169	-3.8	13.1	165		-10.90 [-13.73, -8.07]	2007	
Dparil2007		13.89	437		13.86	459	14.3%	-8.40 [-10.22, -6.58]		
Pool2007	-15	12.7	175		12.74	177	11.5%	-5.00 [-7.66, -2.34]		
SPA100A2305	-15.37		203		14.07	198	11.2%	-8.58 [-11.33, -5.83]		
SPP100A2405	-14.14		186		14.15	187	10.8%	-6.17 [-9.05, -3.29]		
uig2009	-9.9	13.74	158	-5.25	13.77	160	10.4%	-4.65 [-7.67, -1.63]	2009	
Subtotal (95% CI)			1754			1787	100.0%	-8.12 [-9.61, -6.63]		-
leterogeneity: Tau ² = est for overall effect: 2					.006); l²	² = 63%				
.2.2 Aliskiren vs. AR	Bs									
Stanton2003	-11.8	14.9	40	-11.4	19.2	36	5.2%	-0.40 [-8.19, 7.39]	2003	
Gradman2005	-15.76	14.02	130	-12.5	13.95	134	22.9%	-3.26 [-6.63, 0.11]		
ool2007	-15	12.7	175		12.55	60	19.9%	1.50 [-2.19, 5.19]		
Dparil2007		13.89	437		13.83	455	52.0%	-0.20 [-2.02, 1.62]		
ubtotal (95% CI)			782			685	100.0%	-0.57 [-2.40, 1.25]		
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 est for overall effect: 2				(P = 0.2	28); I² =	21%				
.2.3 Aliskiren vs. AC	Els									
/erdecchia2007	-14.5	14.06	94	-14.9	14.29	86	30.4%	0.40 [-3.75, 4.55]	2007	
ndersen2008	-14	12.2	420	-11.3	12.3	422	69.6%	-2.70 [-4.35, -1.05]	2008	
ubtotal (95% CI)			514			508	100.0%	-1.76 [-4.55, 1.04]		
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 2 est for overall effect: 2				(P = 0.1	17); l² =	46%				
.2.4 Aliskiren vs. Am	lodipine									
SPA100A2305	-15.37	14.04	203	-21.04	14.05	181	100.0%	5.67 [2.86, 8.48]	2009	
ubtotal (95% CI)			203				100.0%	5.67 [2.86, 8.48]		
leterogeneity: Not app	olicable									
est for overall effect: 2		(P < 0.0	001)							
.2.5 Aliskiren vs. HC	TZ									
		12.75	183	-14.3	12.76	176	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24]	2007	- +
/illamil2007		12.75	183 183	-14.3	12.76		100.0% 1 00.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24] -1.40 [-4.04, 1.24]	2007	
'illamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI)	-15.7	12.75		-14.3	12.76				2007	
'illamil2007 subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app	-15.7 olicable		183	-14.3	12.76				2007	
/illamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app fest for overall effect: 2	-15.7 blicable Z = 1.04		183	-14.3	12.76				2007	
/illamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app est for overall effect: 2 .2.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate	-15.7 olicable Z = 1.04 enolol	(P = 0.3	183 0)			176	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24]		
fillamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app est for overall effect: 2 .2.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate bietz2008	-15.7 blicable Z = 1.04	(P = 0.3	183 0) 231	-14.3		176 231	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24] -0.08 [-3.02, 2.86]		
/illamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app est for overall effect: 2 .2.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate Dietz2008 Subtotal (95% CI)	-15.7 blicable Z = 1.04 enolol -14.34	(P = 0.3	183 0)			176 231	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24]		
fillamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app est for overall effect: 2 .2.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate Dietz2008 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app	-15.7 blicable Z = 1.04 enolol -14.34 blicable	(P = 0.3 16.14	183 0) 231 231			176 231	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24] -0.08 [-3.02, 2.86]		
.2.5 Aliskiren vs. HC (illamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app 'est for overall effect: 2 .2.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate Dietz2008 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app 'est for overall effect: 2	-15.7 blicable Z = 1.04 enolol -14.34 blicable	(P = 0.3 16.14	183 0) 231 231			176 231	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24] -0.08 [-3.02, 2.86]		
/illamil2007 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app est for overall effect: 2 .2.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate Dietz2008 Subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Not app	-15.7 blicable Z = 1.04 enolol -14.34 blicable	(P = 0.3 16.14	183 0) 231 231			176 231	100.0%	-1.40 [-4.04, 1.24] -0.08 [-3.02, 2.86]	2008	

Figure 2 Change (mm Hg) from baseline in mean sitting systolic BP at end point following treatment with aliskiren or other antihypertensive drugs and placebo during monotherapy. ACEIs, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; ARBs, angiotensin receptor blockers; CI, confidence interval; HCTZ, hydrochlorothiazide; IV, inverse variance. Control, antihypertensive drug used as comparator drug in that study. 'Total' indicates the total number of individuals.

difference was found in the reduction of SBP of the two groups (WMD -1.76, 95% CI -4.55 to -1.04, P = 0.22); Figures 1 and 2. Only one trial¹⁰ (n = 832) compared BP responder rates between aliskiren and ACEIs, with no significant difference between the two groups (RR 1.10, 95% CI 0.99–1.24, P = 0.09); Figure 3. There was no significant difference in BP control rates between the two groups (RR 1.12, 95% CI 0.96–1.30, P = 0.15); Figure 4. In addition, Verdecchia²⁷

found that both aliskiren and lisinopril groups produced significant decreases in mean 24 h ambulatory SBP and ambulatory DBP from baseline to end point.

Aliskiren vs. amlodipine. Only one study³⁰ involving 384 patients reported the effects of treatments with aliskiren and amlodipine in terms of reduction in BP. Aliskiren was inferior to amlodipine

Study or Subgroup Events Total Weight M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl Year M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl 1.3.1 Aliskiren vs. placebo 1.3.1 Aliskiren vs. placebo 72 113 32 115 6.3% 2.29 [1.65, 3.17] 2006 Pool2007 119 175 85 176 16.9% 1.41 [1.7, 1.69] 2007 Oparli2007 230 430 136 455 26.3% 1.79 [1.52, 2.11] 2007 Oparli2007 230 430 136 455 26.3% 1.79 [1.52, 2.16] 2009 CSPP100A2405 88 186 6.3 184 10.6% 1.64 [1.25, 2.16] 2009 Puig2009 88 156 46 154 9.2% 1.89 [1.43, 2.50] 2009 Subtotal (95% Cl) 1444 1474 100.0% 1.65 [1.52, 1.80] 2007 Total events 821 508 513 10.0.7% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: ChP = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); P = 0%		Aliskirer	n Co	ontrol		Risk Ratio	F	Risk Ratio
Kushiro2006 72 113 32 115 6.3% 2.29 [1.65, 3.17] 2006 Pool2007 119 175 85 176 16.9% 1.41 [1.17, 1.69] 2007 Oparli2007 230 430 136 455 26.3% 1.79 [1.52, 2.11] 2007 Villamil2007 115 180 88 192 17.0% 1.39 [1.15, 1.68] 2007 CSPA100A2405 88 186 53 184 10.6% 1.68 [1.25, 1.99] 2009 Puig2009 88 156 46 154 9.2% 1.89 [1.43, 2.50] 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) 1441 1474 100.0% 1.65 [1.52, 1.80] 1.07 1.32 Aliskiren vs. ARBs Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); P = 0% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Total events 255 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 614 <td< td=""><td>Study or Subgroup</td><td>Events T</td><td>Total Eve</td><td>nts Total</td><td>Weight</td><td>M-H, Fixed, 95% C</td><td>Year M-H,</td><td>Fixed, 95% Cl</td></td<>	Study or Subgroup	Events T	Total Eve	nts Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	Year M-H,	Fixed, 95% Cl
Pool2007 119 175 85 176 16.9% 1.41 [1.17, 1.69] 2007 Openil2007 230 430 136 455 26.3% 1.79 [1.52, 2.11] 2007 (Vilamil207 115 180 88 192 17.0% 1.39 [1.15, 1.68] 2007 CSPP100A2405 88 186 53 184 10.6% 1.64 [1.25, 2.16] 2009 CSPA100A2305 109 201 68 198 13.7% 1.58 [1.25, 1.99] 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) 1441 1474 100.0% 1.65 [1.52, 1.80] Total events 821 508 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 11.84, df = 6 (P = 0.47); P = 49% Test for overall effect: Z = 11.90 (P < 0.00001) 1.3.2 Aliskiren vs. ARBS Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Output (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 1.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.42) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIS Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.00 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 0.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.33] 2011 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Vilami2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 155 13 492 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 155 13 00 22 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007	1.3.1 Aliskiren vs. plac	cebo						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Kushiro2006	72	113	32 115	6.3%	2.29 [1.65, 3.17]	2006	
Vilamil20071151808819217.0%1.391.15, 1.682007CSPP100A2405881865318410.6%1.64[1.25, 2.16]2009CSPA100A23051092016819813.7%1.56[1.52, 1.99]2009Puig200988156461549.2%1.89[1.43, 2.50]2009Puig200988156461549.2%1.89[1.43, 2.50]2009Puig20098814411474100.0%1.65[1.52, 1.80]Total events821508Heterogeneity: Chi² = 11.84, df = 6 (P = 0.07); P = 49%Test for overall effect: Z = 11.90 (P < 0.00001)	Pool2007	119	175	85 176	16.9%	1.41 [1.17, 1.69]	2007	-
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Oparil2007	230	430 1	36 455	26.3%	1.79 [1.52, 2.11]	2007	-
CSPA100A2305 109 201 68 198 13.7% 1.58 [1.25, 1.90] 2009 Puig2009 88 156 46 154 9.2% 1.89 [1.43, 2.50] 2009 Total events 821 508 Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 11.84$, $df = 6$ (P = 0.07); $l^2 = 49\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 11.90$ (P < 0.00001) 1.3.2 Aliskiren vs. ARBS Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.65$, $df = 1$ (P = 0.42); $l^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.42); $l^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.42); $l^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.42); $l^2 = 0\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.94) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 233 418 100.0% 1.01 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 100.77 [0.69, 0.86] 100.77 [0.69, 0.86] 100.0% Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.00001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villami2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 180 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007	Villamil2007	115	180	88 192	17.0%	1.39 [1.15, 1.68]	2007	
Puig2009 88 156 46 154 9.2% $1.89 [1.43, 2.50] 2009$ Subtotal (95% CI) 1441 1474 100.0% $1.65 [1.52, 1.80]$ Total events 821 508 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 11.84, df = 6 (P = 0.07); I ² = 49% Test for overall effect: Z = 11.90 (P < 0.00001) 1.3.2 Aliskiren vs. ARBS Opari2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.42); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.42); I ² = 0% Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.71 (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Andolipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.0001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007	CSPP100A2405	88	186	53 184	10.6%	1.64 [1.25, 2.16]	2009	
Subtotal (95% Cl) 1441 1474 100.0% 1.65 $[1.52, 1.80]$ Total events 821 508 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 11.84, df = 6 (P = 0.07); l ² = 49% Test for overall effect: Z = 11.90 (P < 0.00001)	CSPA100A2305	109	201	68 198	13.7%	1.58 [1.25, 1.99]	2009	
Total events 821 508 Heterogeneity: $Chi^{2} = 11.84$, df = 6 (P = 0.07); l^{2} = 49% Test for overall effect: Z = 11.90 (P < 0.00001)	Puig2009	88	156	46 154	9.2%	1.89 [1.43, 2.50]	2009	
Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 11.84, df = 6 (P = 0.07); l ² = 49% Test for overall effect: Z = 11.90 (P < 0.00001) 1.3.2 Aliskiren vs. ARBs Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.71 (P = 0.99) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. AmIodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007	Subtotal (95% CI)	1	441	1474	100.0%	1.65 [1.52, 1.80]		•
Test for overall effect: $Z = 11.90$ (P < 0.00001) 1.3.2 Aliskiren vs. ARBs Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% Cl) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.99) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.00001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007								
1.3.2 Aliskiren vs. ARBs Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% Cl) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 1414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 19 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1.84, df = 6	6 (P = 0.07)	; I² = 49%				
Oparil2007 230 430 250 453 81.1% 0.97 [0.86, 1.09] 2007 Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.71 (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.86] 101 101.00% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 101 101.00% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 115 <t< td=""><td>Test for overall effect: Z</td><td>Z = 11.90 (F</td><td>P < 0.00001</td><td>)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Test for overall effect: Z	Z = 11.90 (F	P < 0.00001)				
Pool2007 119 175 38 60 18.9% 1.07 [0.86, 1.33] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 [0.89, 1.10] Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Total events 255 233 1.10 10.99, 1.24] 2008 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.71 (P = 0.09) 1.33 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Total events 258 319 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td>								_
Subtotal (95% CI) 605 513 100.0% 0.99 $[0.89, 1.10]$ Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.84) 1.10 $[0.99, 1.24]$ 2008 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 $[0.99, 1.24]$ 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 $[0.99, 1.24]$ 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 $[0.99, 1.24]$ 2008 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.71 (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine 0.73 $[0.63, 0.85]$ 2009 CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 $[0.69, 0.93]$ 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 $[0.69, 0.86]$ 2011 100.0% 0.77 $[0.69, 0.86]$ 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 $[0.92, 1.28]$ 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 180 173 100	•							
Total events 349 288 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.21 (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.71 (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 CSPA100A2305 109 9 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001)						· · ·	2007	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.65, df = 1 (P = 0.42); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.0001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% Cl) 180 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28]	· ,				100.0%	0.99 [0.89, 1.10]		Ţ
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.21$ (P = 0.84) 1.3.3 Aliskiren vs. ACEIs Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Total events 255 233 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86]								
Andersen2008 255 414 233 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Subtotal (95% CI) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Total events 255 233 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] 2008 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.34 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 14eterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% 0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 1.35 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 180 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007	• •		. ,.	l² = 0%				
Subtotal (95% Cl) 414 418 100.0% 1.10 [0.99, 1.24] Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.00001)		Els						
Total events 255 233 Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.00001) 1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007		255	414 2	33 418	100.0%		2008	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] • Total events 258 319 • • • Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% • • • Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.00001)	Subtotal (95% CI)		414	418	100.0%	1.10 [0.99, 1.24]		
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.71$ (P = 0.09) 1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] • Total events 258 319 • • • Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% • • • Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.73$ (P < 0.00001)	Total events	255	2	33				
1.3.4 Aliskiren vs. Amlodipine CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 Total events 258 319 14erogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 10.69, 0.86] 0.77	• • •							
CSPA100A2305 109 201 133 179 43.1% 0.73 [0.63, 0.85] 2009 Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319	Test for overall effect: Z	Z = 1.71 (P	= 0.09)					
Brown2011 149 312 186 313 56.9% 0.80 [0.69, 0.93] 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001)		lodipine						_
Subtotal (95% CI) 513 492 100.0% 0.77 [0.69, 0.86] Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% 7 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001)								
Total events 258 319 Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001)							2011	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); l ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001)					100.0%	0.77 [0.69, 0.86]		•
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.73 (P < 0.00001)								
1.3.5 Aliskiren vs. HCTZ Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 180 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] Image: the second se								
Villamil2007 115 180 102 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) 180 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28] •	Test for overall effect: 2	2 = 4.73 (P	< 0.00001)					
Subtotal (95% CI) 180 173 100.0% 1.08 [0.92, 1.28]			100	00 170	100.001		0007	
		115					2007	
		445			100.0%	1.00 [0.92, 1.28]		
	Total events	115 liaabla	1	02				
Heterogeneity: Not applicable	• • •		- 0.24					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.95 (P = 0.34)	i est for overall effect: 2	_ = 0.95 (P	- 0.34)					
1.3.6 Aliskiren vs. Atenolol			000	70 000	400.00/	0.04 10.74 0.055	0000	
Dietz2008 145 230 172 230 100.0% 0.84 [0.74, 0.95] 2008							2008	
Subtotal (95% CI) 230 230 100.0% 0.84 [0.74, 0.95]					100.0%	0.84 [0.74, 0.95]		•
Total events 145 172			1	12				
Heterogeneity: Not applicable			- 0.007)					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.69 (P = 0.007)	l est for overall effect: Z	L = 2.69 (P	= 0.007)					
							⊢ + → +	
0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5							0.1 0.2 0.5	5 1 2 5 10
Favours control Favours aliski								

Figure 3 BP response rates of patients to aliskiren compared with other antihypertensive drugs and placebo. A successful response to treatment was defined as a mean sitting diastolic BP <90 mm Hg or a $10 \ge \text{mm}$ Hg reduction from baseline or a mean sitting systolic BP (msSBP) <140 mm Hg or a $20 \ge \text{mm}$ Hg reduction from baseline. 'Events' indicate number of patients with a successful response. 'Total' indicates the total number of individuals. ACEIs, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; ARBs, angiotensin receptor blockers; BP, blood pressure; CI, confidence interval; HCTZ, hydrochlorothiazide; RR, relative risk; M-H, Mantek-Haenzel.

Aliskiren and hypertension Y Chen et al

<u>Study or Subgroup</u> 1.4.1 Aliskiren vs. plac Gradman2005	Events	Lotal				MALL PL L ABOV -		
	aha	Total	Events	lotal	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	Year	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
(Prodmon2005								
	65	130	27	130	10.2%	2.41 [1.65, 3.51]		
Villamil2007	84	180	54	192	19.8%	1.66 [1.26, 2.18]		
Oparil2007	161	430	75	455	27.6%	2.27 [1.79, 2.89]		
Pool2007	74	175	49	176	18.5%	1.52 [1.13, 2.04]		
CSPA100A2305	73	201	38	198	14.5%	1.89 [1.35, 2.66]		
Puig2009	56	156	25	154	9.5%	2.21 [1.46, 3.35]	2009	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1272		1305	100.0%	1.96 [1.73, 2.23]		•
Total events	513		268					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 7	.27, df = {	5 (P = 0	.20); I ² =	31%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 10.55	(P < 0.0	00001)					
1.4.2 Aliskiren vs. ARE	Bs							
Gradman2005	65	130	45	133	19.3%	1.48 [1.10, 1.98]	2005	
Oparil2007	161	430	153	453	64.6%	1.11 [0.93, 1.32]		H
Pool2007	74	175	25	60	16.1%	1.01 [0.72, 1.43]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		735		646	100.0%	1.16 [1.01, 1.34]		◆
Total events	300		223					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3		2(P = 0)	.18): ² =	42%				
Test for overall effect: Z		· ·	,.					
1.4.3 Aliskiren vs. ACE	Els							
Andersen2008	197	414	178	418	100.0%	1.12 [0.96, 1.30]	2008	
Subtotal (95% CI)		414			100.0%	1.12 [0.96, 1.30]		•
Total events	197		178					
Heterogeneity: Not appl	icable							
Test for overall effect: Z		⊃ = 0.1 8	5)					
1.4.4 Aliskiren vs. Am	lodipine							
CSPA100A2305	73	201	90	179	100.0%	0.72 [0.57, 0.91]	2009	
Subtotal (95% CI)		201			100.0%	0.72 [0.57, 0.91]		\bullet
Total events	73		90					
Heterogeneity: Not appl								
Test for overall effect: Z		⊃ = 0.00	06)					
1.4.5 Aliskiren vs. HCl	7							
Villamil2007	84	180	65	173	100.0%	1.24 [0.97, 1.59]	2007	
Subtotal (95% CI)	04	180	00		100.0%	1.24 [0.97, 1.59]	2007	►
Total events	84		65					
Heterogeneity: Not appl			00					
Test for overall effect: Z		⊃ = 0.0§	9)					
1.4.6 Aliskiren vs. Ate	nolol							
Dietz2008	83	230	97	230	100.0%	0.86 [0.68, 1.08]	2008	
Subtotal (95% CI)	00	230	0.	230	100.0%	0.86 [0.68, 1.08]		
Total events	83		97			,		
Heterogeneity: Not appl			0.					
Test for overall effect: Z		⊃ = 0.18	3)					
							⊢	
							0.1	0.2 0.5 1 2 5

Figure 4 BP control rates of patients to aliskiren or other antihypertensive drugs and placebo. Control rate was defined as mean sitting diastolic BP < 90 mm Hg and mean sitting systolic BP < 140 mm Hg. 'Events' indicate number of patients with a successful control. 'Total' indicates the total number of individuals. ACEIs. angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; ARBs, angiotensin receptor blockers; BP, blood pressure; CI, confidence interval; HCTZ, hydrochlorothiazide; RR, relative risk; M-H, Mantek-Haenzel.

258

in lowering DBP and SBP (WMD 3.63, 95% CI 1.85–5.41, P < 0.0001; WMD 5.67, 95% CI 2.86–8.48, P < 0.0001, respectively); Figures 1 and 2. Two trials^{19,30} (n = 1005) reported the response rates. Response rates were significantly higher with amlodipine than with aliskiren (RR 0.77, 95% CI 0.69–0.86, P < 0.00001); Figure 3. Only one trial³⁰ (n = 380) reported the control rates. The control rates were significantly higher with amlodipine than with aliskiren (RR 0.72, 95% CI 0.57–0.91, P = 0.006); Figure 4.

Aliskiren vs. HCTZ. Only one study²⁸ involving 359 patients reported the effects of treatments with aliskiren and HCTZ in terms of reduction in BP. No difference was found in the reduction of DBP and SBP of the two groups (WMD -0.90, 95% CI -2.56-0.76, P=0.29; WMD -1.40, 95% CI -4.04-1.24, P=0.30, respectively); Figures 1 and 2. The trial²⁸ (n=353) compared BP responder rates between aliskiren and HCTZ, with no significant difference between the two groups (RR 1.08, 95% CI 0.92–1.28, P=0.34); Figure 3. There was no significant difference in BP control rates between the two groups (RR 1.24, 95% CI 0.97–1.59, P=0.09); Figure 4.

Aliskiren vs. atenolol. Only one study²⁰ involving 462 patients reported the effects of treatments with aliskiren and atenolol in terms of reduction in BP. DBP changes were larger with atenolol than with aliskiren (WMD 2.40, 95% CI 0.74–4.06, P = 0.004), while there was no significant difference between the msSBP reductions of the two groups (WMD -0.08, 95% CI -3.02-2.86, P = 0.96); Figures 1 and 2. Only one trial²⁰ (n = 460) reported response rates. Response rates were significantly higher with atenolol than aliskiren (RR 0.84, 95% CI 0.74–0.95, P = 0.007); Figure 3. There was no significant difference in BP control rates between the two groups (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.68–1.08, P = 0.18) of the trial;²⁰ Figure 4.

Safety and tolerability

The safety population comprised all of the patients randomized in the 14 trials included in this analysis (n = 7879). The most common adverse events included headache, dizziness, diarrhea, nasopharyngitis, fatigue and nausea. There were no significant differences in number of adverse events between aliskiren and placebo or other active comparators (Table 2). Similarly, there were no significant

Table 2 Safety and tolerability of aliskiren vs. other antihypertensive drugs

	Adverse events (any reason) RR			Withdrawals due to adverse effects RR		
Interventions	(95% CI)	1 ²	Ρ	(95% CI)	1 ²	Ρ
Aliskiren <i>vs.</i> placebo	0.96 (0.88,1.05)	0%	0.34	0.83 (0.54,1.27)	0%	0.39
Aliskiren <i>vs.</i> ARBs	0.93 (0.81,1.08)	0%	0.33	0.91 (0.50,1.67)	0%	0.76
Aliskiren <i>vs.</i> ACEIs	1.00 (0.89,1.11)	0%	0.93	0.62 (0.11,3.70)	65%	0.60
Aliskiren <i>vs.</i> Amlodipine	0.99 (0.89,1.11)	37%	0.92	0.42 (0.08,2.30)	65%	0.32
Aliskiren <i>vs.</i> HCTZ	0.95 (0.74,1.22)	NA	0.68	1.92 (0.59,6.27)	NA	0.28
Aliskiren <i>vs.</i> Atenolol	0.88 (0.72,1.08)	NA	0.23	0.60 (0.22,1.62)	NA	0.31

Abbreviations: ACEIs: Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors; ARBs, angiotensin receptor blockers; CI, confidence interval; HCTZ: hydrochlorothiazide; NA, not applicable; RR, relative risk. differences in withdrawals due to adverse events between aliskiren and placebo or other active comparators (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

The present study evaluated the antihypertensive efficacy, safety, and tolerability of the novel, orally effective direct renin inhibitor aliskiren in comparison with other antihypertensive agents, in a total of 6741 patients with mild-to-moderate hypertension.

The results of our study suggest that aliskiren, which lowered BP effectively in patients with mild-to-moderate hypertension, was similar to HCTZ but inferior to CCBs in BP reduction, response rates and control rates. Furthermore, aliskiren was superior to ACEIs in lowering DBP, while it had similar effects to ACEIs on SBP reduction, response rates and control rates. Additionally, the present meta-analysis showed the superiority of atenolol over aliskiren in DBP reduction and BP response and atenolol's inferiority in SBP reduction and BP control. No difference was found in rates of therapeutic response between aliskiren and ARBs; these findings are consistent with the results from two previous studies,^{31,32} which demonstrated that aliskiren and ARBs have comparable efficacy, while we found that more patients achieved BP control with aliskiren. The most obvious difference between the two studies^{31,32} and ours is that they only assessed the antihypertensive efficacy and safety of aliskiren in comparison with ARBs in mild-to-moderate hypertensive patients, while our study included other antihypertensive drugs, apart from ARBs, for analysis. The two other meta-analyses^{31,32} included study treatments with aliskiren at doses of 150 and 300 mg, drug combinations, and specific groups, such as obese patients. Zheng et al.³¹ found that aliskiren monotherapy at 150 mg per day provided comparable antihypertensive efficacy to ARBs at half of the recommended maximum dose; moreover, aliskiren and ARB combination therapy provided more effective BP reduction than each respective monotherapy, without increasing adverse events, and this combination might have organ-protective effects.

Aliskiren provides highly effective BP reduction independent of age or sex in patients with hypertension. In a pooled analysis by Weir,³³ aliskiren demonstrated comparable efficacy in patients aged ≥ 65 years old or < 65 years old, in men and women, and it lowered BP effectively in all racial subgroups, consistent with previous studies.^{34,35}

In addition to its antihypertensive effects, some recent publications have published findings regarding aliskiren's protective profile on the organs. Aliskiren has been shown to induce reductions in plasma levels of B-type natriuretic peptide in heart failure³⁶ and in left ventricular mass in hypertensive patients with left ventricular hypertrophy.³⁷ In addition, the AVOID trial showed that aliskiren has renoprotective effects that are independent of its BP lowering effects in hypertensive type 2 diabetic patients with nephropathy who are receiving the recommended maximal renoprotective treatment.³⁸

Our meta-analysis indicates that aliskiren is associated with a similar incidence of adverse events and discontinuation due to adverse events to placebo and that it has similar tolerability with other antihypertensive drug classes. A pooled analysis of $>12\,000$ patients confirmed our results, which demonstrate that aliskiren at doses of 150 mg or 300 mg exhibits an excellent safety profile in patients with hypertension.³⁹ These findings suggest that aliskiren could be widely used for the treatment of hypertension because tolerability is an important factor in patient non-compliance and quality of life.⁴⁰

We analyzed the short-term antihypertensive effects and tolerability of aliskiren in patients with mild-to-moderate hypertension. The longest-duration randomized, controlled trial, Brown (2011),¹⁹ was 32 weeks, while the most common trial length was eight weeks. Nevertheless, White's Pooled Analysis found that more than 750 patient-years of aliskiren exposure confirmed the tolerability of aliskiren in long-term studies.³⁹ A pooled analysis reported that rates of discontinuation due to adverse events were low (1.7%–2.6%); the most frequently reported adverse events with aliskiren were headache (5.7%), nasopharyngitis (4.4%), diarrhea (2.6%), dizziness (1.8%) and fatigue (1.6%).³³

A meta-analysis of the result of serious adverse events was not conducted because of the lack of effective data in Villamil²⁸ and in Pool.²⁴ However, the incidence of serious adverse events was very low: three trials^{10,23,26} reported one case of death in each in the losartan,²⁶ aliskiren,²³ and valsartan²³ and ramipril group.¹⁰ Although aliskiren has shown a good safety and tolerability profile, we should note that the Food and Drug Administration has recently issued a warning about combining aliskiren with ACEIs and ARBs in patients diagnosed with diabetes or renal impairment. The ALTITUDE study, which was recently terminated, found an increased risk of adverse events in patients considered high-risk and who were taking direct renin inhibitors as an add-on to other antihypertensive medications, such as ARBs and ACEIs. The Food and Drug Administration said in a safety announcement that diabetic patients who combine the drugs are at risk of renal impairment, hypotension and hyperkalemia, although the combination showed similar safety and tolerability in patients with uncomplicated hypertension.

Change from baseline in mean sitting DB was the primary outcome in most of the trials included in our analysis, while two trials^{27,29} with population aged older than 65 years used change from baseline in SBP as the primary outcome. Usually, diastolic hypertension predominates before age 50, and systolic hypertension represents the most common form of hypertension in patients older than 50 years of age;⁴¹ therefore, SBP is the main efficacy variable for the diagnosis and treatment of hypertension in the elderly.⁴²

To the best of our knowledge, this is the only systematic review summarizing the antihypertensive effects and tolerability of aliskiren in comparison with other antihypertensive drugs. There are still some limitations to our meta-analysis. First, each result of our meta-analysis was based only on limited trials with limited sizes; in particular, there was only one single study comparing aliskiren with atenolol and one comparing HCTZ and amlodipine. The results should be interpreted cautiously, and more RCTs are necessary to support our findings. Actually, there are some ongoing trials with large-scale populations that will provide further data on the efficacy and tolerability of aliskiren.^{43–45} Second, the duration of the trials in our analysis was relatively short. Third, we dealt with surrogate end points, instead of direct clinical outcomes, such as the incidence of cardiovascular disease or morbidity and mortality.

CONCLUSION

Our meta-analysis indicates that the direct renin inhibitor aliskiren, at doses of 300 mg, provided good antihypertensive efficacy that was at least as effective as that provided by ACEIs, ARBs and HCTZ at the recommended daily doses. However, aliskiren might not be as effective as CCBs and β -blockers, although it has similar safety and tolerability in patients with hypertension. Additional large-scale, well-controlled trials, preferably with clinical end points, are warranted.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all of the participants in this study.

- Kearney PM, Whelton M, Reynolds K, Muntner P, Whelton PK, He J. Global burden of hypertension: analysis of worldwide data. *Lancet* 2005; 365: 217–223.
- Poulter N. Global risk of cardiovascular disease. *Heart* 2003; **89**(Suppl 2): ii2–ii5; discussion ii35–37.
- 3 Lea JP, Nicholas SB. Diabetes mellitus and hypertension: key risk factors for kidney disease. J Natl Med Assoc 2002; 94: 75–155.
- 4 Ezzati M, Lopez AD, Rodgers A, Vander Hoorn S, Murray CJ. The Comparative Risk Assessment Collaborating Group. Selected major risk factors and global and regional burden of disease. *Lancet* 2002; **360**: 1347–1360.
- 5 Watanabe T, Barker TA, Berk BC. Angiotensin II and the endothelium: diverse signals and effects. *Hypertension* 2005; 45: 163–169.
- 6 Weber MA, Giles TD. Inhibiting the renin-angiotensin system to prevent cardiovascular diseases: do we need a more comprehensive strategy? *Rev Cardiovasc Med* 2006; 7: 45–54.
- 7 Skeggs Jr LT, Kahn JR, Lentz K, Shumway NP. The preparation, purification, and amino acid sequence of a polypeptide renin substrate. J Exp Med 1957; 106: 439–453.
- 8 Duprez DA. Role of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system in vascular remodeling and inflammation: a clinical review. J Hypertens 2006; 24: 983–991.
- 9 Wood JM, Maibaum J, Rahuel J, Grütter MG, Cohen NC, Rasetti V, Rüger H, Göschke R, Stutz S, Fuhrer W, Schilling W, Rigollier P, Yamaguchi Y, Cumin F, Baum HP, Schnell CR, Herold P, Mah R, Jensen C, O'Brien E, Stanton A, Bedigian MP. Structure-based design of aliskiren, a novel orally effective renin inhibitor. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2003; **308**: 698–705.
- 10 Andersen K, Weinberger MH, Egan B, Constance CM, Ali MA, Jin J, Keefe DL. Comparative efficacy and safety of aliskiren, an oral direct renin inhibitor, and ramipril in hypertension: a 6-month, randomized, double-blind trial. J Hypertens 2008; 26: 589–599.
- 11 Kushiro T, Itakura H, Abo Y, Gotou H, Terao S, Keefe DL. Aliskiren a novel oral renin inhibitor, provides dose-dependent efficacy and placebo-like tolerability in Japanese patients with hypertension. *Hypertens Res* 2006; 29: 997–1005.
- 12 Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses. *Lancet* 1999; **354**: 1896–1900.
- 13 Hopewell S, McDonald S, Clarke M, Egger M. Grey literature in meta-analyses of randomized trials of health care interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007; 2: MR000010.
- 14 McAuley L, Pham B, Tugwell P, Moher D. Does the inclusion of grey literature influence estimates of intervention effectiveness reported in meta-analyses? *Lancet* 2000; **356**: 1228–1231.
- 15 Mancia G, De Backer G, Dominiczak A, Cifkova R, Fagard R, Germano G, Grassi G, Heagerty AM, Kjeldsen SE, Laurent S, Narkiewicz K, Ruilope L, Rynkiewicz A, Schmieder RE, Boudier HA, Zanchetti A, Vahanian A, Camm J, De Caterina R, Dean V, Dickstein K, Filippatos G, Funck-Brentano C, Hellemans I, Kristensen SD, McGregor K, Sechtem U, Silber S, Tendera M, Widimsky P, Zamorano JL, Erdine S, Kiowski W, Agabiti-Rosei E, Ambrosioni E, Lindholm LH, Viigimaa M, Adamopoulos S, Agabiti-Rosei E, Ambrosioni E, Bertomeu V, Clement D, Erdine S, Farsang C, Gaita D, Lip G, Mallion JM, Manolis AJ, Nilsson PM, O'Brien E, Ponikowski P, Redon J, Ruschitzka F, Tamargo J, van Zwieten P, Waeber B, Williams B. Management of arterial hypertension of the European Society of Hypertension (ESH) and of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). J Hypertens 2007; 25: 1105–1187.
- 16 World Health Organization. International Society of Hypertension Writing Group. 2003 World Health Organization (WHO)/International Society of Hypertension (ISH) statement on management of hypertension. J Hypertens 2003; 21: 1983–1992.
- 17 Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJM, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials* 1996; **17**: 1–12.
- 18 Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in metaanalyses. BMJ 2003; 327: 557–560.
- 19 Brown MJ, McInnes GT, Papst CC, Zhang J, MacDonald TM. Aliskiren and the calcium channel blocker amlodipine combination as an initial treatment strategy for hypertension control (ACCELERATE): a randomised, parallel-group trial. *Lancet* 2011; **377**: 312–320.
- 20 Dietz R, Dechend R, Yu CM, Bheda M, Ford J, Prescott MF, Keefe DL. Effects of the direct renin inhibitor aliskiren and atenolol alone or in combination in patients with hypertension. J Renin Angiotensin Aldosterone Syst 2008; 9: 163–175.
- 21 Gradman AH, Schmieder RE, Lins RL, Nussberger J, Chiang Y, Bedigian MP. Aliskiren, a novel orally effective renin inhibitor, provides dose-dependent antihypertensive efficacy and placebo-like tolerability in hypertensive patients. *Circulation* 2005; 111: 1012–1018.

- 22 Oh BH, Mitchell J, Herron JR, Chung J, Khan M, Keefe DL. Aliskiren an oral renin inhibitor, provides dose-dependent efficacy and sustained 24-hour blood pressure control in patients with hypertension. J Am Coll Cardiol 2007; 49: 1157–1163.
- 23 Oparil S, Yarows SA, Patel S, Fang H, Zhang J, Satlin A. Efficacy and safety of combined use of aliskiren and valsartan in patients with hypertension: a randomised, double-blind trial. *Lancet* 2007; **370**: 221–229.
- 24 Pool JL, Schmieder RE, Azizi M, Aldigier JC, Januszewicz A, Zidek W, Chiang Y, Satlin A. Aliskiren, an orally effective renin inhibitor, provides antihypertensive efficacy alone and in combination with valsartan. *Am J Hypertens* 2007; **20**: 11–20.
- 25 Puig JG, Schunkert H, Taylor AA, Boye S, Jin J, Keefe DL. Evaluation of the dose-response relationship of aliskiren, a direct renin inhibitor, in an 8-week, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, placebo-controlled study in adult patients with stage 1 or 2 essential hypertension. *Clin Ther* 2009; **31**: 2839–2850.
- 26 Stanton A, Jensen C, Nussberger J, O'Brien E. Blood pressure lowering in essential hypertension with an oral renin inhibitor, aliskiren. *Hypertension* 2003; 42: 1137–1143.
- 27 Verdecchia P, Calvo C, Möckel V, Keeling L, Satlin A. Safety and efficacy of the oral direct renin inhibitor aliskiren in elderly patients with hypertension. *Blood Press* 2007; 16: 381–391.
- 28 Villamil A, Chrysant SG, Calhoun D, Schober B, Hsu H, Matrisciano-Dimichino L, Zhang J. Renin inhibition with aliskiren provides additive antihypertensive efficacy when used in combination with hydrochlorothiazide. J Hypertens 2007; 25: 217.
- 29 An eight-week double-blind, multi-center, randomized, placebo-controlled, parallelgroup study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of aliskiren 75 mg, 150 mg and 300 mg in elderly patients with essential hypertension when given with a light meal. http:// www.novctrd.com/ctrdWebApp/clinicaltrialrepository/displayFile.do?trialResult=2933.
- 30 An 8-week double-blind, multicenter, randomized, multifactorial, placebo-controlled, parallelgroup study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of aliskiren administered alone and in combination with amlodipine in patients with essential hypertension. http://www.novctrd.com/ctrdWebApp/clinicaltrialrepository/displayFile.do?trialResult=3000.
- 31 Zheng Z, Shi H, Jia J, Li D, Lin S. A systematic review and meta-analysis of aliskiren and angiotension receptor blockers in the management of essential hypertension. *J Renin Angiotensin Aldosterone Syst* 2011; **12**: 102–112.
- 32 Gao D, Ning N, Niu X, Wei J, Sun P, Hao G. Aliskiren vs. angiotensin receptor blockers in hypertension: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Hypertens* 2011; 24: 613–621.
- 33 Weir MR, Bush C, Anderson DR, Zhang J, Keefe D, Satlin A. Antihypertensive efficacy, safety, and tolerability of the oral direct renin inhibitor aliskiren in patients with hypertension: a pooled analysis. J Am Soc Hypertens 2007; 1: 264–277.
- 34 Gradman AH, Weir MR, Wright M, Bush CA, Keefe DL. Efficacy, safety and tolerability of aliskiren, a direct renin inhibitor, in women with hypertension: a pooled analysis of eight studies. J Hum Hypertens 2010; 24: 721–729.

- 35 Dahlöf B, Anderson D, Arora V, Bush C, Keefe D. Aliskiren a direct renin inhibitor, provides antihypertensive efficacy and excellent tolerability independent of age or gender in patients with hypertension. J Clin Hypertens 2007; 9: A157.
- 36 McMurray JJV, Pitt B, Latini R, Maggioni AP, Solomon SD, Keefe DL, Ford J, Verma A, Lewsey J; Aliskiren Observation of Heart Failure Treatment (ALOFT) Investigators. Effects of the oral direct renin inhibitor aliskiren in patients with symptomatic heart failure. *Circ Heart Fail* 2008; **1**: 17–24.
- 37 Solomon SD, Appelbaum E, Manning WJ, Verma A, Berglund T, Lukashevich V, Papst CC, Smith BA, Dahlöf B. Effect of the direct renin inhibitor aliskiren, the angiotensin receptor blocker losartan, or both on left ventricular mass in patients with hypertension and left ventricular hypertrophy. *Circulation* 2009; **119**: 530–537.
- 38 Parving HH, Persson F, Lewis JB, Lewis EJ, Hollenberg NK. AVOID Study Investigators. Aliskiren combined with losartan in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. N Engl J Med 2008; **358**: 2433–2446.
- 39 White WB, Bresalier R, Kaplan AP, Palmer BF, Riddell RH, Lesogor A, Chang W, Keefe DL. Safety and tolerability of the direct renin inhibitor aliskiren: a pooled analysis of clinical experience in more than 12,000 patients with hypertension. *J Clin Hypertens* 2010; **12**: 765–775.
- 40 Düsing R, Weisser B, Mengden T, Vetter H. Changes in antihypertensive therapy-the role of adverse effects and compliance. *Blood Press* 1998; 7: 313–315.
- 41 Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, Cushman WC, Green LA, Izzo Jr JL, Jones DW, Materson BJ, Oparil S, Wright Jr JT, Roccella EJ. Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; National High Blood Pressure Education Program Coordinating Committee. Seventh report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure. *Hypertension* 2003; **42**: 1206–1252.
- 42 Dickerson LM, Gibson MV. Management of hypertension in older persons. Am Fam Physician 2005; 71: 469-476.
- 43 Gheorghiade M, Albaghdadi M, Zannad F, Fonarow GC, Böhm M, Gimpelewicz C, Botha J, Moores S, Lewis EF, Rattunde H, Maggioni A; on behalf of the ASTRONAUT investigators and study coordinators. Rationale and design of the multicentre, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled Aliskiren Trial on Acute Heart Failure Outcomes (ASTRONAUT). *Eur J Heart Fail* 2011; **13**: 100–106.
- 44 Parving HH, Brenner BM, McMurray JJ, de Zeeuw D, Haffner SM, Solomon SD, Chaturvedi N, Ghadanfar M, Weissbach N, Xiang Z, Armbrecht J, Pfeffer MA. Aliskiren trial in type 2 diabetes using cardio-renal endpoints (ALTITUDE): rationale and study design. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2009; 24: 1663–1671.
- 45 Krum H, Massie B, Abraham WT, Dickstein K, Kober L, McMurray JJ, Desai A, Gimpelewicz C, Kandra A, Reimund B, Rattunde H, Armbrecht J. Direct renin inhibition in addition to or as an alternative to angiotensin converting enzyme inhibition in patients with chronic systolic heart failure: rationale and design of the Aliskiren Trial to Minimize OutcomeS in Patients with HEart failuRE (ATMOSPHERE) study. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2011; **13**: 107–114.