Effect of Telmisartan on Renal Outcomes
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Background: Angiotensin-receptor blockers (ARBs) blunt progression of advanced diabetic nephropathy, but their long-term renal effects in other patients are not clear.

Objective: To examine the long-term renal effects of telmisartan versus placebo in adults at high vascular risk.

Design: Randomized trial. Patients were randomly assigned by a central automated system between November 2001 and May 2004 and were followed until March 2008. Participants and investigators were blinded to intervention status.

Setting: Multicenter, multinational study.

Patients: 5927 adults with known cardiovascular disease or diabetes with end-organ damage but without macroalbuminuria or heart failure who cannot tolerate angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors.

Intervention: Telmisartan, 80 mg/d (n = 2954), or matching placebo (n = 2972) plus standard treatment for a mean of 56 months.

Measurements: Composite renal outcome of dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine, changes in estimated glomerular filtration rate (GFR), and changes in albuminuria.

Results: No important difference was found in the composite renal outcome with telmisartan (58 patients [1.96%]) versus placebo (46 patients [1.55%]) (hazard ratio, 1.29 [95% CI, 0.87 to 1.89]; P = 0.20). Among the telmisartan and placebo groups, 7 and 10 patients had dialysis and 56 and 36 patients had doubling of serum creatinine, respectively (hazard ratio, 1.59 [CI, 1.04 to 2.41]; P = 0.031). Albuminuria increased less with telmisartan than with placebo (32% [CI, 23% to 41%] vs. 63% [CI, 52% to 76%]; P < 0.001). Decreases in estimated GFR were greater with telmisartan than with placebo (mean change in estimated GFR, –3.2 mL/min per 1.73 m² [SD, 18.3] vs. –0.26 mL/min per 1.73 m² [SD, 18.0]; P < 0.001).

Limitation: Only 17 participants had dialysis.

Conclusion: In adults with vascular disease but without macroalbuminuria, the effects of telmisartan on major renal outcomes were similar to those of placebo.
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T he TRANSCEND (Telmisartan Randomised Assessment Study in ACE Intolerant Subjects with Cardiovascular Disease) study examined cardiovascular outcomes with telmisartan, an angiotensin-receptor blocker (ARB), compared with placebo in people at high vascular risk who were intolerant of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors. Telmisartan had no statistically significant effect on the primary cardiovascular outcome, but it reduced the risk for the secondary composite outcome of cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, and stroke to a moderate extent and had no effect on cardiovascular or total mortality (1). Renal outcomes were prespecified, important secondary outcomes of the TRANSCEND study, because a growing number of patients with atherosclerotic vascular disease are starting renal replacement therapy (2). For example, in a German registry, the proportion of individuals with vascular causes of nephropathy leading to long-term dialysis increased from 12% in 1995 to 23% in 2005 (3). Drugs used to reduce vascular events may also affect the kidney, so the effects of such drugs on renal outcomes in people with vascular disease are relevant.

Angiotensin-receptor blockers reduce elevated blood pressure (4) and urinary protein excretion (5), which are both considered to be surrogate variables of renal benefit. Large trials in patients with overt diabetic nephropathy have demonstrated that ARBs reduce the rate of dialysis and doubling of serum creatinine (6, 7). The impact of ARBs on renal outcomes in other patients is not reliably known.

This prespecified analysis of the TRANSCEND study (1) examined the effects of telmisartan on renal function in a large sample that was intolerant of ACE inhibitors and had vascular disease but not macroalbuminuria. The composite renal outcome was dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine.
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Context
Few trials have evaluated whether angiotensin-receptor blockers (ARBs) prevent renal disease in people without proteinuria.

Contribution
In this trial, patients with cardiovascular disease or diabetes, but without macroalbuminuria or heart failure, were randomly assigned to receive telmisartan or placebo. During 4 to 5 years of follow-up, telmisartan recipients had albuminuria less often but had doubling of serum creatinine and slight decreases in estimated glomerular filtration rate more often than placebo recipients. Few patients in either group required dialysis.

Implication
The effects of ARBs on renal variables are complicated, but no strong evidence indicates that they prevent clinically important renal disease in patients without proteinuria.

Methods
Design Overview
We enrolled and randomly assigned participants age 55 years or older with documented cardiovascular disease or diabetes with end-organ damage who could not tolerate ACE inhibitors between November 2001 and May 2004 to receive telmisartan, 80 mg/d, or matching placebo along with standard treatment. Follow-up was completed by March 2008. The main trial primary outcome, reported elsewhere (1), was the composite of myocardial infarction, stroke, cardiovascular death, and hospitalization for heart failure. We report the prespecified renal outcomes in this article. The ethics committees at all participating institutions and the regulatory authorities in each country approved the study protocol, and each participant provided written informed consent.

Setting and Participants
In 630 centers in 40 countries, we enrolled 5926 patients age 55 years or older who were intolerant of ACE inhibitors if they had coronary, peripheral, or cerebrovascular disease or diabetes with end-organ damage (1, 8). We defined ACE inhibitor intolerance as discontinuation of an ACE inhibitor for a documented reason—most commonly cough (88.2%), symptomatic hypotension (4.1%), angioedema (1.3%), and renal dysfunction (1%) (1, 8). We excluded patients who, according to the clinical investigators, needed an ARB; were known to be hypersensitive or intolerant to ARBs; or had heart failure, significant valvular or cardiac outflow tract obstruction, constrictive pericarditis, complex congenital heart disease, unexplained syncope, planned cardiac surgery, cardiac revascularization in the previous 3 months, systolic blood pressure of 160 mm Hg or greater, heart transplantation, subarachnoid hemorrhage, known significant renal artery stenosis (formal exclusion not required), serum creatinine levels greater than 265 μmol/L (3.0 mg/dL), or hepatic dysfunction. The Appendix Table (available at www.annals.org) lists all exclusion criteria. Macroalbuminuria (urinary albumin–creatinine ratio [UACR] >33.9 mg/mmol) was an exclusion criterion, but it was detected at baseline in 78 participants (1.4%) when the urine was analyzed centrally. Before entering the study, 1773 participants (29.9%) were receiving or had received ARBs.

The study was coordinated by the Population Health Research Institute at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. The steering committee designed and oversaw the trial and implemented an operations committee, an independent data safety and monitoring board, and an end point adjudication committee. Clinical sites in 40 countries, selected by the national coordinators, used a wide variety of recruitment strategies, including chart review, referral from other physicians, and mass mailing.

Randomization and Interventions
After a 3- to 4-week run-in phase, participants were randomly assigned to telmisartan, 80 mg/d, or placebo. During the run-in phase, all participants received single-blind placebo for 1 week followed by telmisartan, 80 mg/d, for 2 to 3 weeks. Of 6666 participants entering the run-in phase, 11 (0.2%) withdrew because of elevated serum creatinine levels and 26 (0.4%) withdrew because of elevated serum potassium levels. Figure 1 shows the study flow diagram and reasons for exclusion; baseline characteristics of the participants are published elsewhere (1). Participants were randomly assigned by telephone through a central automated system. Randomization was stratified by hospital or clinic. All participants and trial investigators were blinded to randomized treatment. Tablets identical in color, shape, and taste were provided in blister packs. Unblinded data were made available exclusively to the independent data safety and monitoring board by a statistician who was independent of the trial.

Outcomes and Measurements
In August 2007, before completion of the TRANDEND study, we developed a statistical analysis plan for the renal outcomes. As in other large renal trials, the primary composite outcome was defined as the first occurrence of dialysis, renal transplantation, doubling of serum creatinine, or death (6, 7, 9). No cases of renal transplantation were reported in this trial. The secondary renal outcome was the composite of dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine. After completion of the analysis, death—a nonspecific outcome—outnumbered the other components of the primary outcome by 4-fold. Therefore, we determined the secondary outcome as the composite outcome measure of this

creatinine. We also report changes in estimated glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and albuminuria.
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Further outcomes were components of the composite outcome, changes in estimated GFR and UACR, and progression of proteinuria (defined as development of new micro- or macroalbuminuria), as well as the original primary composite outcome and the composite of dialysis; doubling of serum creatinine; or development of new microalbuminuria, macroalbuminuria, or both. Dialysis was categorized as short-term (≤2 months) or long-term (>2 months). Such information was missing in 1 patient. Urinary albumin and creatinine were measured centrally (10), and serum creatinine was measured locally at study sites. The estimated GFR was calculated from serum creatinine by using the 4-variable Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study formula (11). Serum creatinine values below 35 μmol/L (<0.4 mg/dL) were considered implausible, and we excluded participants with such values from the analysis (10 patients at baseline and 15 patients at follow-up). Information about dialysis was recorded at each visit.

Follow-up Procedures and Monitoring

We followed participants after 6 weeks, 6 months, and every 6 months thereafter for a mean of 56 months. At each visit, we collected information about adverse events.

Figure 1. Study flow diagram.

All participants received randomized therapy and were followed, except for 18 (0.3%) who were followed until the end of the study or until a primary event occurred. The number of patients considered for the trial who did not enter the run-in phase is unknown. A figure showing trial follow-up and cardiovascular outcomes is published elsewhere (1). Progression of proteinuria was defined as new microalbuminuria, macroalbuminuria, or both. eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; UACR = urinary albumin–creatinine ratio.
including dialysis; adherence to trial medication; and outcomes. We began data management as soon as data had been submitted, usually within 1 week of the patient visit. The data were sent through the datafax system and examined for ranges, plausibility, and missing data. Queries were sent to the investigator until responses were obtained. We measured serum creatinine before the run-in phase, 6 weeks after randomization, after 2 years, and at the end of the study, and we measured UACR before the run-in phase, at 2 years, and at the penultimate visit in a first morning urine sample. A UACR between 3.4 and 33.9 mg/mmol was defined as microalbuminuria and a value greater than 33.9 mg/mmol (approximately 300 mg/g creatinine) as macroalbuminuria. A blinded central committee, using standardized criteria, adjudicated all deaths and primary outcomes. After trial conclusion, a questionnaire was sent to all sites that reported dialysis to obtain information about duration of dialysis.

## Statistical Analysis

The original sample size estimates for the trial were based on a composite cardiovascular outcome (1) and not on renal outcomes. Our primary analysis used a time-to-event approach and included all randomly assigned participants. Treatment comparisons with regard to time-to-event–related data (based on Cox regression of time to occurrence of first event) are displayed as hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% CIs. We performed analyses of prespecified subgroups by using the Cox regression model with factors for treatment, subgroup, and interactions. Adjustment for a center effect did not materially alter the analysis. Continuous data are presented as means (SDs) and categorical data as actual frequencies and percentages. All \( P \) values are 2-sided. We compared study groups for categorical data by using the chi-square test. For continuous variables, we compared study groups by using \( t \) tests. Urinary albumin levels and UACR were not normally distributed.

### Table 1. Baseline Patient Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Telmisartan Group (n = 2954)</th>
<th>Placebo Group (n = 2972)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (SD), y</td>
<td>66.9 (7.3)</td>
<td>66.9 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean blood pressure (SD), mm Hg</td>
<td>140.7/81.8 (16.8/10.1)</td>
<td>141.3/82.0 (16.4/10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean heart rate (SD), beats/min</td>
<td>68.8 (11.5)</td>
<td>68.8 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean body mass index (SD), kg/m²</td>
<td>28.2 (4.6)</td>
<td>28.1 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean glucose level (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mmol/L</td>
<td>6.51 (2.43)</td>
<td>6.49 (2.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg/dL</td>
<td>117 (44)</td>
<td>117 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean creatinine level (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µmol/L</td>
<td>91.9 (23.1)</td>
<td>91.9 (22.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg/dL</td>
<td>1.0 (0.3)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean potassium level (SD), mmol/L</td>
<td>4.38 (0.44)</td>
<td>4.37 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, n (%)</td>
<td>1280 (43.3)</td>
<td>1267 (42.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>637 (21.6)</td>
<td>624 (21.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>37 (1.3)</td>
<td>40 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>51 (1.7)</td>
<td>55 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>1801 (61.0)</td>
<td>1820 (61.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native or Aboriginal</td>
<td>390 (13.2)</td>
<td>393 (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38 (1.3)</td>
<td>40 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary artery disease</td>
<td>2211 (74.8)</td>
<td>2207 (74.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke or transient ischemic attack</td>
<td>648 (21.9)</td>
<td>654 (22.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral artery disease</td>
<td>349 (11.8)</td>
<td>323 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>2259 (76.5)</td>
<td>2269 (76.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>1059 (35.8)</td>
<td>1059 (35.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left ventricular hypertrophy*</td>
<td>376 (12.7)</td>
<td>401 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microalbuminuria†</td>
<td>283 (10.6)</td>
<td>273 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking status, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>293 (9.9)</td>
<td>289 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>1273 (43.1)</td>
<td>1283 (43.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medications, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statin</td>
<td>1645 (55.7)</td>
<td>1627 (54.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-Blocker</td>
<td>1753 (59.3)</td>
<td>1700 (57.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>2215 (75.0)</td>
<td>2210 (74.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clopidogrel or ticlopidine</td>
<td>319 (10.8)</td>
<td>314 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiplatelet agent</td>
<td>2356 (79.8)</td>
<td>2349 (79.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretic</td>
<td>980 (33.2)</td>
<td>974 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium-channel blocker</td>
<td>1179 (39.9)</td>
<td>1202 (40.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on the local investigators’ electrocardiographic interpretations.
† Central measurements.
RESULTS
Baseline Characteristics

Baseline patient characteristics were similar between the 2 groups, as reported elsewhere (1, 8). Table 1 gives an overview of those characteristics. Mean estimated GFR was 71.7 mL/min per 1.73 m² (SD, 19.9); estimated GFR was less than 60 mL/min per 1.73 m² in 1629 participants (27.6%) and 60 mL/min per 1.73 m² or greater in 4282 participants (72.4%). Few participants (49 [0.8%]) had an estimated GFR less than 30 mL/min per 1.73 m². Microalbuminuria (UACR ≥3.4 to <33.9 mg/mmol) was present in 559 patients (10.3%) and macroalbuminuria in 78 patients (1.44%). Mean blood pressure at randomization was 141/82 mm Hg, which was significantly lower by about 3/1.5 to 5/2.5 mm Hg with telmisartan than with placebo throughout the study despite more intensive antihypertensive medication in the placebo group (details published elsewhere [1]). Among the telmisartan and placebo groups, 1.8% and 2.9% of patients at 1 year and 5.8% and 7.6% at the end of the study, respectively, were receiving an open-label ARB.

During the study, fewer participants in the telmisartan group (21.6%) than the placebo group (23.7%) (P = 0.055) permanently discontinued trial medication (1). Hypotensive symptoms leading to permanent discontinuation of trial medication were more frequent with telmisartan (0.98% vs. 0.54%). Hyperkalemia with potassium val-
ues greater than 5.5 mmol/L was also more frequent with telmisartan (3.8% vs. 1.4%), as were renal abnormalities reported on local clinical reports (10.4% vs. 8.1%) that rarely, however, led to trial medication discontinuation (0.81% vs. 0.44%) (1).

Main Outcomes

The incidence of the composite outcome of dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine was similar with telmisartan and placebo (58 patients [1.96%] vs. 46 patients [1.55%]; HR, 1.29 [95% CI, 0.87 to 1.89]; P = 0.20 (Figure 2 and Table 2). Of 17 patients requiring dialysis, 6 cases were short-term, 10 were long-term, and 1 was unknown. In 4 of the 17 patients, dialysis occurred within the first year of participating in the trial. Dialysis cases did not significantly differ between groups (Table 2).

Doubling of serum creatinine was more frequent with telmisartan than with placebo (56 vs. 36 patients) (Table 2) and occurred mainly in patients with baseline serum creatinine levels less than 89 μmol/L (<1.0 mg/dL) (72 of 92 patients). Among the telmisartan and placebo groups, it occurred within 6 weeks in 15 of 56 patients and 6 of 36 patients, respectively, and was reversible in 14 of 56 patients and 9 of 36 patients, respectively. The composite outcome of dialysis, doubling of serum creatinine, or death did not significantly differ between the telmisartan and placebo groups (412 patients [14.0%] vs. 381 patients [12.8%]; HR, 1.10 [CI, 0.95 to 1.26]; P = 0.193 (Table 2). The timing of and reasons for death are published elsewhere (1). We categorized death as cardiovascular, due to cancer, or other, but we did not know the number of deaths due to renal disease.
Changes in Albuminuria

Incident albuminuria increased less with telmisartan than with placebo (Table 3). The risk for new microalbuminuria, macroalbuminuria, or both during the trial was lower with telmisartan than with placebo (336 patients [11.4%] vs. 441 patients [14.8%]; relative risk [RR], 0.77 [CI, 0.67 to 0.88]; \( P = 0.001 \)). Among patients with microalbuminuria at baseline (559 total [286 telmisartan recipients and 273 placebo recipients]), 28 patients (9.8%) in the telmisartan group and 49 (17.9%) in the placebo group progressed to macroalbuminuria (RR, 0.58 [CI, 0.36 to 0.92]; \( P = 0.018 \)). The composite outcome of dialysis; doubling of serum creatinine; and new microalbuminuria, macroalbuminuria, or both occurred in 383 patients (13.0%) in the telmisartan group and 474 (16.0%) in the placebo group (HR, 0.81 [CI, 0.72 to 0.92]; \( P = 0.001 \)).

We further analyzed the association of changes in estimated GFR with the increase in UACR from baseline to 2 years (Table 3). A greater decline in estimated GFR from baseline to 6 weeks (linear regression \( P = 0.003 \); 4255 patients) and from baseline to 2 years (linear regression \( P = 0.005 \); 4257 patients) was associated with less increase in UACR from baseline to 2 years. For these 2 correlations, there was a treatment interaction; the correlations were significant only in the telmisartan group. In that group, UACR increased 17.6% less for each 1–mL/min per 1.73 m² decrease in estimated GFR at 6 weeks (\( P = 0.008 \); 2134 patients) and increased 19.1% less for each 1–mL/min per 1.73 m² decrease in estimated GFR at 2 years (\( P = 0.001 \); 2138 patients).

Changes in Estimated GFR

During follow-up, estimated GFR decreased more with telmisartan than with placebo (Table 4 and Appendix Figure 1, available at www.annals.org). The decrease in estimated GFR was mainly observed during the initial 6 weeks of the trial. After 6 weeks, a further, significant but very slight decline in estimated GFR occurred in the telmisartan group (Table 4). Of participants in the placebo and telmisartan groups with a baseline estimated GFR of 30 mL/min per 1.73 m², 44 of 2897 (1.52%) and 74 of 2903 (2.55%), respectively, reached an estimated GFR less than 30 mL/min per 1.73 m² (RR, 1.71 [CI, 1.18 to 2.48]; \( P = 0.005 \)). Of participants with a baseline estimated GFR of 60 mL/min per 1.73 m² or greater, 555 of 2128 (26.1%) and 729 of 2109 (34.6%), respectively, reached an estimated GFR less than 60 mL/min per 1.73 m² (RR, 1.40 [CI, 1.125 to 1.56]; \( P < 0.001 \)).

The modest initial changes in estimated GFR were related to the change in systolic blood pressure during the same interval (Figure 3); a greater decrease in blood pressure was associated with a greater decrease in estimated GFR. Figure 3 shows the relationship for all participants;

### Table 2. Incidence of the Main Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Telmisartan Group, n (%)</th>
<th>Placebo Group, n (%)</th>
<th>Hazard Ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>( P ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine</td>
<td>58 (19.6)</td>
<td>46 (15.5)</td>
<td>1.29 (0.87–1.89)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis†</td>
<td>7 (0.24)</td>
<td>10 (0.34)</td>
<td>0.71 (0.27–1.86)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>2 (0.07)</td>
<td>4 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.51 (0.09–2.76)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>4 (0.14)</td>
<td>6 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.19–2.38)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling of serum creatinine</td>
<td>56 (1.90)</td>
<td>36 (1.21)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.04–2.41)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>364 (12.3)</td>
<td>349 (11.7)</td>
<td>1.05 (0.91–1.22)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis, doubling of serum creatinine, or death</td>
<td>412 (14.0)</td>
<td>381 (12.8)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.95–1.26)</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Differences between groups were analyzed by time-to-event analysis. The number of participants with doubling of serum creatinine varies slightly from a previous report (1) because we excluded some implausible serum creatinine levels <35 \( \mu \)mol/L (<0.4 mg/dL) (see Methods section).
† Patients who had ≥1 dialysis treatment were considered to be having dialysis; long-term dialysis was >2 months, and short-term dialysis was ≤2 months. No information on duration of dialysis was available for 1 patient.

### Table 3. Changes in Log-Transformed UACR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Geometric Mean UACR (95% CI), mg/mmol</th>
<th>Patients, n</th>
<th>Geometric Mean UACR (95% CI), mg/mmol</th>
<th>Patients, n</th>
<th>( P ) Value (Telmisartan vs. Placebo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline UACR</td>
<td>0.68 (0.63–0.72)</td>
<td>2691</td>
<td>0.66 (0.63–0.70)</td>
<td>2721</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of 2-year vs. baseline UACR</td>
<td>1.17 (1.11–1.24)</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>1.45 (1.37–1.53)</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of final vs. baseline UACR</td>
<td>1.32 (1.23–1.41)</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>1.63 (1.52–1.76)</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UACR = urinary albumin–creatinine ratio.
* All UACRs were log-transformed before analyses; geometric mean values are back-transformed. Differences were calculated by using an analysis of variance model adjusted for baseline values. Only participants with baseline and follow-up values could be included in the analysis. Mean follow-up time for the final UACR was 50 months. Absolute values of UACR at 2 years and final values also significantly differed between groups, as did absolute values of changes from baseline between groups (\( P < 0.001 \) for all comparisons; data not shown).
the association was evident for both groups with no treatment interaction. Linear regression analysis indicated that a 10–mm Hg decrease in systolic blood pressure was associated with a decrease in estimated GFR of 2.05 mL/min per 1.73 m² from the run-in phase to 6 weeks. The change in estimated GFR from baseline to week 6, analyzed as a continuous variable by Cox regression for all participants and for the 2 groups separately, was not associated with subsequent death or the composite outcome of myocardial infarction, stroke, and cardiovascular death, adjusted for baseline estimated GFR, age, sex, and baseline systolic blood pressure. Similarly, we found no evidence that those cardiovascular outcomes differed by tertiles of change in estimated GFR from baseline to week 6.

Main Outcomes in Subgroups

For the composite renal outcome of dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine, the effects of telmisartan varied by the baseline UACR ($P = 0.006$ for interaction) and estimated GFR ($P = 0.022$) (Figure 3). Telmisartan increased the incidence of the composite renal outcome in patients with no microalbuminuria or an estimated GFR greater than 60 mL/min per 1.73 m². In contrast, telmisartan tended to reduce this outcome in those with microalbuminuria or an estimated GFR below 60 mL/min per 1.73 m² (Appendix Figure 2, available at www.annals.org).

**DISCUSSION**

The TRANSCEND study was a large trial in adults intolerant of ACE inhibitors who had atherosclerotic vascular disease but not macroalbuminuria; it evaluated an ARB, telmisartan, versus placebo and measured 2 common markers of renal dysfunction—serum creatinine and urinary albumin—over 56 months. Telmisartan had no important effect on the composite outcome of dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine, decreased UACR, and decreased estimated GFR. Telmisartan increased 1 component of the composite renal outcome: doubling of serum creatinine. The prognostic implication of doubling of serum creatinine in this population is unclear. Because doubling of serum creatinine indicates an approximate halving of GFR (12), the difference may suggest a potential disadvantage of telmisartan. However, the excess of 20 of these events must be balanced by the reduction in 56 major vascular events, including cardiovascular death, stroke, and myocardial infarction (1). The former outcome is a laboratory measure and is clinically less severe than the latter clinical outcome and may reverse after stopping treatment. Doubling of serum creatinine occurred mainly in participants with normal estimated GFR at baseline and was not associated with dialysis during the 5 years of the trial; only studies with a much longer follow-up can determine the clinical significance of doubling of serum creatinine from normal values.

Given the potential of inhibitors of the renin–angiotensin system, including ARBs, to induce acute renal failure (13), the results of the TRANSCEND study are informative. In this large sample of people with vascular disease and a follow-up of almost 5 years, only 6 cases of dialysis-dependent acute renal failure were documented: 4 with placebo and 2 with telmisartan. When telmisartan was combined with an ACE inhibitor in ONTARGET (Ongoing Telmisartan Alone and in Combination with Ramipril Global Endpoint Trial), the incidence of acute renal failure was substantially higher (9, 14).

Estimated GFR was fairly stable in the study and changed less than the annual decrease in estimated GFR of about 1 mL/min that is expected (12) in people with vascular disease. Estimated GFR decreased slightly more with telmisartan than with placebo. An initial short-term decrease in estimated GFR after initiation of ARB therapy is expected as a consequence of decreasing intraglomerular hydraulic pressure. Decreasing the intraglomerular pressure has been shown to contribute to blunt progressive renal damage (12). The initial decrease in estimated GFR may even be associated with a long-term benefit on estimated GFR (15). Our findings do not support or refute the latter expectation, because estimated GFR remained stable with placebo. The latter is unexpected and is a new finding in people with vascular disease given intensive treatment with proven drugs. Longer-term follow-up would be necessary to evaluate substantial effects of telmisartan on estimated GFR.
GFR in a patient sample at low renal risk or during a washout period at study end. Other studies have shown that GFR may considerably increase during a washout period of ARB (15, 16).

We also demonstrate that an initial decrease in estimated GFR is closely related to an initial decrease in blood pressure that was greater with telmisartan than with placebo. The relative contribution of angiotensin-receptor blockade and blood pressure to estimated GFR can be examined only with more rigorous measurement of blood pressure. Changes in blood pressure occurred within the renal autoregulatory range, but autoregulation may be variably impaired in this study population. Furthermore, the difference in estimated GFR between the telmisartan and placebo groups is not necessarily a disadvantage, because the change in estimated GFR was not related to death or other cardiovascular outcomes.

Compared with placebo, telmisartan reduced urinary albumin excretion and the progression of micro- to macroalbuminuria. This reduction was associated with an initial decrease in estimated GFR and blood pressure. The decrease in UACR is generally considered to be beneficial for the kidney, but we observed directionally opposite long-term effects on estimated GFR with telmisartan. The lack of association of less albuminuria with decreased long-term renal outcomes in patients with vascular disease and similar data from ONTARGET (10) suggest that reduction in urinary albumin excretion in people with a baseline level below the threshold of macroalbuminuria may not be a surrogate of other measures of renal function, at least over 5 years. In fact, a decrease in UACR was associated with a decrease in estimated GFR and may be nothing more than a consequence of the latter. Previous studies in patients with renal diseases and low levels of proteinuria reported varied results for the relationship of the early changes of UACR and long-term renal outcomes (17, 18).

Exploratory analyses of subgroups found a significant interaction of telmisartan’s effect on the secondary renal outcome with baseline albuminuria and baseline estimated GFR. Telmisartan increased the incidence of the secondary renal outcome in subgroups without specific renal risk—namely, patients with normal albumin excretion and an estimated GFR greater than 60 mL/min per 1.73 m²—but tended to be beneficial on the secondary renal outcome in subgroups at higher renal risk—namely, patients with elevated albuminuria and those with low estimated GFR. Even in such a large trial as TRANSCEND, subgroup results must be interpreted with great caution and should only be considered as hypothesis-generating. In proteinuric nephropathies above 1 g/g creatinine, inhibition of
the renin–angiotensin system is unequivocally beneficial (6, 7). In people with proteinuria below the macroalbuminuria threshold, several other studies reported no major detrimental or beneficial effects of ACE inhibitors or ARBs on GFR (19–22).

Our study has limitations. Our inclusion criteria were based on individuals at risk for cardiovascular outcomes. Nevertheless, the 104 more specific renal outcomes add to knowledge from other similar trials (6, 7), and the effect of ARBs on the kidney in the study sample is relevant, because this constitutes a large population eligible to receive ARBs. Serum creatinine was measured locally, and the local methods were not calibrated to a standard. However, variations among laboratories create random errors and do not systematically bias the results. When serum creatinine doubled, we did not require a confirmatory measurement; however, such information was available in 61% of events. Doubling of serum creatinine mainly occurred in patients with normal estimated GFR or low serum creatinine at baseline; thus, few participants reached end-stage renal disease. Whether individuals with doubling of serum creatinine would develop end-stage renal disease during longer follow-up or would die at a faster rate than those with more stable GFR is unknown and should be explored in trials of longer duration. Our study did not include a washout period at the end, which may have been important to assess whether the small decrease in estimated GFR with telmisartan was due to continuing blockade of the renin–angiotensin system and was therefore reversible (15, 16) or reflected a true structural damage to the kidney.

Our results suggest that ARBs offer no renal benefit in ACE-intolerant people at high vascular risk but without macroalbuminuria and are not associated with an excess of dialysis-dependent renal failure. Therefore, the effect on cardiovascular outcomes should dominate clinical decision making on whether to use telmisartan. Although telmisartan reduced proteinuria, the implications of this reduction as a surrogate marker for progression of renal disease are uncertain in patients with relatively stable estimated GFR.
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Appendix Table. Exclusion Criteria

**Medication use***
- Inability to discontinue ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy
- Known hypersensitivity or intolerance to ARB or ACE inhibitors

**Cardiovascular disease***
- Symptomatic congestive heart failure
- Hemodynamically significant primary valvular or outflow tract obstruction (e.g., aortic or mitral valve stenosis, asymmetric septal hypertrophy, malfunctioning prosthetic valve)
- Constrictive pericarditis
- Complex congenital heart disease
- Syncope of unknown cause <3 months before informed consent
- Planned cardiac surgery or angioplasty within 3 months
- Uncontrolled hypertension with treatment (e.g., blood pressure >130/100 mm Hg)
- Heart transplant recipient
- Strokes due to subarachnoid hemorrhage

**Other condition***
- Significant renal disease, defined as:
  - Documented significant renal artery stenosis
  - Creatinine clearance <36 mL/min per 1.73 m² or serum creatinine level >265 μmol/L (>3.0 mg/dL)
- Hyperkalemia (potassium level >5.5 mmol/L)
- Proteinuria (for TRANSCEND only)
- Hepatic dysfunction, defined as:
  - ALT or AST level greater than 4 times the upper limit of normal
  - Total bilirubin level >20 μmol/L (>8.2 mg/dL)
- Biliary obstructive disorders
- Uncorrected volume depletion or sodium depletion
- Primary aldosteronism
- Hereditary fructose intolerance
- Any other major noncardiac illness expected to reduce life expectancy or interfere with study participation
- Simultaneous use of another experimental drug
- Significant or sufficient disability or other incapacity that precludes regular attendance at clinic for follow-up
- Inability or unwillingness to provide written informed consent

ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ALT = alanine aminotransferase; ARB = angiotensin-receptor blocker; AST = aspartate aminotransferase; TRANSCEND = Telmisartan Randomised Assessment Study in ACE Intolerant Subjects with Cardiovascular Disease.

* Patients with known intolerance to ACE inhibitors should be enrolled in the TRANSCEND study.

---

**Appendix Figure 1. Change in estimated GFR from baseline to 6 weeks after randomization, by quartile of change in systolic blood pressure from baseline to 6 weeks.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduction in Blood Pressure</th>
<th>Change in Estimated GFR From Baseline to Week 6, mL/min per 1.73 m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥16 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 mm Hg to &lt;16 mm Hg</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;4 mm Hg to Increase ≥7 mm Hg</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase &gt;7 mm Hg</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P for trend < 0.001

Regression analysis demonstrated that a change in systolic blood pressure of 10 mm Hg is associated with a change in estimated GFR of 2.05 mL/min per 1.73 m². GFR = glomerular filtration rate.

**Appendix Figure 2. Kaplan–Meier curves for the composite renal outcome (dialysis or doubling of serum creatinine), by baseline UACR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UACR ≥3.4 mg/mmol</th>
<th>Telmisartan</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UACR &lt;3.4 mg/mmol</td>
<td>Telmisartan</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The treatment–subgroup interaction term was significant (P = 0.006). See Appendix Figure 1. UACR = urinary albumin–creatinine ratio.