Comparing hypertension guidelines

Guidelines are based on evidence from trials, not normal practice

EDITOR,—T P Fahey and T J Peters illustrate well the difficulties that general practitioners face in deciding whether to treat hypertension, given the variation in published guidelines.¹ One factor that they do not consider, however, is that the treatment levels set in guidelines are based on evidence from trials rather than measurement in normal practice.

We examined blood pressure readings in West Sussex. We expected to find lower systolic and diastolic blood pressures than the national average, given the recently confirmed evidence that blood pressures in areas of low cardiovascular mortality are lower than the national average.² Instead, where we could analyse individual readings we found that, although recorded systolic pressures in both sexes were lower ($P < 0.0001$) than national values,³ recorded diastolic pressures in both sexes were higher ($P < 0.0001$). Figure 1 shows the results by age group for women ($n = 1316$); the results for men ($n = 846$) showed a similar trend.

Given that in general practice blood pressures are taken by a variety of team members, this consistency was remarkable. Interviews with team members confirmed the use of the phase IV Korotkoff sound as opposed to phase V, which is generally used in trials and national surveys.³ It is therefore likely that many people diagnosed as being hypertensive in practice would not be so diagnosed in a clinical trial and that published

No of subjects:							
England:							
—Systolic	123	124	126	134	148	158	166
--Diastolic	66	70	74	76	82	81	83
West Sussex:							
—Systolic	114	116	121	131	141	150	161
--Diastolic	71	73	80	82	85	88	90

Fig 1—Mean blood pressure by age group in women in West Sussex ($n = 1316$) and in England ($n = 1423$)

recommended levels for starting treatment are in practice artificially high.

Consistency is undoubtedly needed in guidelines, but guidelines also need to reflect the practice of medicine in vivo as opposed to the rarefied atmosphere of clinical trials and national surveys.

T J SCANLON

Senior registrar in public health medicine

East Sussex, Brighton and Hove Health Authority,
Brighton BN1 4ST

R LUBEN

Medical statistician

Institute of Public Health,
University of Cambridge CB2 2SR

P LYLE

General practitioner

Silverdale Road Surgery,
Burgess Hill RH15 0EF

- 1 Fahey TP, Peters TJ. What constitutes controlled hypertension? Patient based comparisons of hypertension guidelines. *BMJ* 1996;313:93-6. (13 July.)
- 2 Whincup PH, Cook DG, Adshad F, Taylor S, Papacosta O, Walker M, et al. Cardiovascular risk factors in British children from towns with widely differing adult cardiovascular mortality. *BMJ* 1996;313:79-84.
- 3 Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, Social Survey Division. *Health survey for England 1993*. London: HMSO, 1995. (Series HS No 3.)

Audit in Mid-Glamorgan also shows major problems with management of hypertension

EDITOR,—T P Fahey and T J Peters's paper highlights the fact that blood pressure guidelines vary considerably in the way they determine control of hypertension.¹ Colleagues and I are currently carrying out an audit of hypertensive patients, and I report here some preliminary data on our findings from this audit in Upper Rhondda Fawr, Mid-Glamorgan.

The audit involves five local practices and 10 community pharmacists, who regularly assess control of blood pressure and other, related variables in patients being treated for hypertension. Fahey and Peters studied 876 treated hypertensive patients in Oxford, to whom a range of different hypertension management guidelines were applied. When the guideline criteria of the British Hypertension Society,² regarded as a

British standard, were applied 417 (48%) of the Oxford patients were found to have well controlled blood pressure.

Our audit findings to date suggest a similar, high level of failure of treatment. Preliminary results for 181 treated antihypertensive patients show that as few as 65 (36%) were well controlled according to the British Hypertension Society's guidelines, which set a target blood pressure of $<160/90$ mm Hg.²

The audit also focused on possible reasons for failure of treatment. In all, 119 of the 181 patients were receiving single drug treatment and the remainder various drug combinations. Only 16 of the 181 were free of side effects of their antihypertensive treatment, while 123 had more than two side effects. Of the 116 patients with uncontrolled blood pressure, 112 had side effects of their antihypertensive treatment. Altogether 114 of the 181 patients had problems that affected the quality of their life. This high incidence of side effects of antihypertensive treatment is consistent with a study by the Stroke Association, which reported a similar incidence and also linked this to the discontinuation of treatment.³

In conclusion, on the basis of the British Hypertension Society's guidelines, the findings of both the Oxford study and the audit in Rhondda (to date) clearly imply major problems with the management of hypertension. This suggests that currently available guidelines may not adequately facilitate good clinical practice in hypertension. In our audit a range of measures, such as education, counselling, and review of the prescription, are being used to improve blood pressure control where appropriate. Any benefits to patients should be apparent in the outcome data for the audit, which will be reported later.

ANDREW J BURR

Pharmaceutical adviser (clinical)

Hensol Hospital,
Mid-Glamorgan CF72 8YS

- 1 Fahey TP, Peters TJ. What constitutes controlled hypertension? Patient based comparison of hypertension guidelines. *BMJ* 1996;313:93-6. (13 July.)
- 2 Sever P, Beevers G, Bulpitt C, Lever A, Ramsay L, Reid J, et al. Management guidelines in essential hypertension: report of the second working party of the British Hypertension Society. *BMJ* 1993;306:983-7.
- 3 Stroke Association. *Preventing strokes and saving lives: a survey of general practitioners and patients on falling out of treatment for hypertension*. London: SA, 1995.

Cost effectiveness analyses have been carried out in Sweden

EDITOR,—T P Fahey and T J Peters applied five different sets of guidelines for the treatment of hypertension to patients from several general practices; only about one third of hypertensive patients met all the guideline criteria.¹ In an editorial Rodney T Jackson and David L Sackett suggest (i) that the guidelines overemphasise clinically inappropriate relative measures of the benefit of treating raised blood pressure and (ii) that more interest should be focused on the absolute benefits of antihypertensive treatment.² They also suggest (iii) "that clinicians practising evidence based medicine should explicitly consider the resource implications of their decisions (the cost effectiveness)."

A report published by the Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care (an independent Swedish civil service agency) addressed the problems of moderately raised

Advice to authors

We receive more letters than we can publish: we can currently accept only about one third. We prefer short letters that relate to articles published within the past four weeks. Letters received after this deadline stand less chance of acceptance. We also publish some "out of the blue" letters, which usually relate to matters of public policy.

When deciding which letters to publish we favour originality, assertions supported by data or by citation, and a clear prose style. Wit, passion, and personal experience also have their place.

Letters should have fewer than 400 words (please give a word count) and no more than five references (including one to the *BMJ* article to which they relate); references should be in the Vancouver style. We welcome pictures.

Letters should be typed and signed by each author, and each author's current appointment and address should be stated. We encourage you to declare any conflict of interest.

Please enclose a stamped addressed envelope if you would like to know whether your letter has been accepted or rejected.

Letters will be edited and may be shortened.

Table 1—Cost per life year gained with diuretic and β blocker treatment (thousands of Swedish crowns at 1992 prices; 10 Swedish crowns = £1). *With permission³

Diastolic blood pressure (mm Hg)	Age (years)					
	<45		45-69		≥70	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
90-94	681	1805	26	122	13	8
95-99	551	1328	CS	56	3	CS
100-104	438	931	CS	CS	CS	CS
≥105	283	422	CS	CS	CS	CS

CS = Cost saving.

*Assuming a discount interest rate of 5% for costs and life years, an annual pharmaceutical cost of 900 Swedish crowns (annual treatment cost 2300 Swedish crowns), a treatment period of one year, and a reduction in risk of coronary heart disease of 16% and of stroke of 38%.

blood pressure in Sweden.³ The report contains a critical review of the literature focusing on the absolute treatment effects attained and a series of cost effectiveness analyses of treating high blood pressure in Swedish men and women with and without other risk factors.

The total annual cost of treating hypertension in Sweden in 1992 was about 1.6 billion Swedish crowns (£160m). Cost effectiveness analyses calculating the cost per life year gained showed that this cost decreased with increasing age in both sexes, as table 1 shows for treatment with diuretics and β blockers. The cost was also lower at a higher initial blood pressure. It is reasonable to assume that even more expensive drugs are cost effective for their special indications, provided they have an effect on morbidity and mortality, which remains to be proved, and no major side effects.³

We agree with Jackson and Sackett that it is time to put more emphasis on absolute treatment effects than on relative ones. An alternative (which may be easier to explain to patients) to the numbers needed to treat to prevent an unwanted event is to give the chances over, say, five years of remaining free of an unwanted event (for example, a stroke) in those actively treated and those not treated or treated with placebo. This has been done in the report by the Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care, with a set of tables from most of the major studies on the risks and benefits of antihypertensive treatment.³

The report may be requested (free) from the Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care, PO Box 161 58, S-103 24 Stockholm, Sweden (fax +46 8 611 79 73).

LARS H LINDHOLM
Chairman of project committee

LARS WERKÖ
Chairman of board of Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care

Department of Community Health Sciences,
Lund University,
S-223 54 Lund,
Sweden

1 Fahey TP, Peters TJ. What constitutes controlled hypertension? Patient based comparison of hypertension guidelines. *BMJ* 1996;313:93-6. (13 July.)

2 Jackson RT, Sackett DL. Guidelines for managing raised blood pressure. *BMJ* 1996;313:64-5. (13 July.)

3 Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care. Moderately elevated blood pressure. *J Intern Med* 1996;238(suppl 737):1-225.

Technical difficulties may have affected study's results

EDITOR,—We agree with the main conclusion of T P Fahey and T J Peters—namely, that hypertension guidelines vary considerably and that guidelines should explicitly target those people with higher absolute levels of cardiovascular risk.¹ Yet we are not convinced by many of the detailed arguments in the authors' paper.

Why did the authors choose to study patients who had already been labelled in their notes as hypertensive and were currently taking anti-hypertensive treatment? This group is not defined by any of the guidelines. It will include some who have never had hypertension by any guideline and will exclude some whom all the guidelines would have included. It is not a group to generate generalisable conclusions.

The authors found that the different guidelines produced large discrepancies in the number of patients whose blood pressure seemed to be controlled, and hence in the number who required treatment. There are at least two explanations for this observation. The first—and the only possibility considered by the authors—is that other risk factors need to be taken into account and that guidelines differ in their ability to do this. The second, and potentially major, explanation is that technical difficulties get in the way. Fahey and Peters's assessment of blood pressure control is flawed for at least three reasons.

Firstly, most guidelines demand numerous readings before treatment is started. In their study the authors used single readings, and never more than three in total. It is then an error to use a risk table from a guideline without first correcting for regression dilution bias, which is the weakening of the apparent relation between risk and blood pressures based on few readings.

Secondly, digit preference in recording² and perseverance in subsequent measurements³ make the interpretation of small threshold changes perilous.

Thirdly, the distribution of blood pressures determines the comparison of control based on a threshold method with control measured by absolute risk. The distribution of blood pressure in these patients will be peculiar to the behaviour of the patients and physicians in Oxfordshire and may be quite different elsewhere.

Altogether, 2.1% of subjects did not have their blood pressure recorded and were excluded. How many patients had no documentation about other risk factors, and how were the guidelines interpreted when additional risk factors were not recorded? The conclusion of the paper depends crucially on the coincidence of blood pressure and risk factors in the same patients: missing data can have a profound effect.

STUART BARTON

Senior lecturer in primary care therapeutics

MIKE CRANNEY

General practice research fellow

TOM WALLEY

Professor of clinical pharmacology

Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics,
University of Liverpool,
Liverpool L69 3BX

1 Fahey TP, Peters TJ. What constitutes controlled hypertension? Patient based comparison of hypertension guidelines. *BMJ* 1996;313:93-6. (13 July.)

2 Wen SW, Kramer MS, Hoey J, Hanley JA, Usher RH. Terminal digit preference, random error, and bias in routine clinical measurement of blood pressure. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1993;46:1187-93.

3 Hense HW, Kuulasmaa K, Zaborskis A, Kupsc W, Tuomilehto J. Quality assessment of blood-pressure measurements in epidemiologic surveys—the impact of last digit preference and the proportions of identical duplicate measurements. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique* 1990;38:463-8.

Authors' reply

EDITOR,—We agree with Lars H Lindholm and Lars Werkö that guidelines that focus on the absolute risks and cost effectiveness of treatment are likely to make management of hypertension more rational. Stuart Barton and colleagues suggest that misclassification may have occurred because of incompleteness in recording of blood pressure and risk factors. In our study four fifths of patients had three records of blood pressure and 98% had evidence of a blood pressure record in the previous five years. Validation of computer records in a sample of patients showed that 11% of patients had additional blood pressure records in their notes. The completeness of records of other risk factors varied greatly (body mass index 83%, cholesterol concentration 24%, smoking status 89%). If a factor was not recorded then it was deemed not to be present; thus misclassification was always in the direction of underestimating absolute risk, making such estimates conservative.

Our study was a pragmatic one. We accept that digit preference and more frequent recordings may alter threshold measurements and subsequent estimation of control in guidelines that rely primarily on blood pressure alone. In contrast, blood pressure is only a small determinant of overall absolute cardiovascular risk^{1, 2}; therefore measurement error and digit preference are far less important when determining control of hypertension according to an absolute risk standard. Indeed, we found that high blood pressure alone, in this group of patients, is a poor predictor of absolute risk.³

T P FAHEY
Lecturer in primary care

T J PETERS
Senior lecturer in medical statistics

University of Bristol,
Department of Social Science,
Bristol BS8 2PR

1 Anderson KM, Wilson PWF, Odell PW, Kannel WB. An updated coronary risk profile. A statement for health professionals. *Circulation* 1991;22:312-8.

2 Wolf PA, D'Agostino RB, Belanger AJ, Kannel WB. Probability of stroke: a risk profile from the Framingham study. *Stroke* 1991;22:312-8.

3 Fahey TP, Peters TJ. A general practice based study examining the absolute risk of cardiovascular disease in treated hypertensive patients. *Br J Gen Pract* (in press).

St John's wort for depression

EDITOR,—The meta-analysis about the use of St John's wort (*Hypericum perforatum*) for depression¹ and the accompanying editorial highlight² two important points. The first is the growing interest in phytotherapy in Britain and the large amount of scientific data that still needs to be collected to confirm the anecdotal evidence about the safe and effective use of such preparations (which are often used for self treatment). There is a serious shortage of funds available for the necessary work to be carried out at all levels, but there is also a need for more clinicians in Britain to be willing to participate in clinical trials of well authenticated herbal material.

The second important point is that plants to be used for phytotherapy need to be identified correctly. The illustration in the editorial is not of *Hypericum perforatum* but of another species of *Hypericum*.² *H perforatum* does not have the leaf shape or fruits shown in the figure. Correct identification of species is extremely important because use of the wrong plant may result in lack of effect or even toxicity. A large number of toxicological effects that are attributed to particular