!comprehensive_cardiorenal-report

Andrew Bland

July 24, 2025

Comprehensive Management of Cardiorenal Disease: An Evidence-Based Synthesis of Modern Guideline-Directed Medical Therapy

Executive Summary

Cardiorenal disease represents a complex bidirectional relationship between heart and kidney dysfunction, affecting approximately 40-60% of patients with either condition and substantially worsening prognosis[31,32]. This comprehensive synthesis integrates current evidence regarding the diagnosis, classification, and management of cardiorenal disease, with particular emphasis on the modern four-pillar therapeutic approach, critical sick day management protocols, and phenotype-specific treatment strategies.

The evolution of human physiology in a sodium and sugar-scarce environment has created a fundamental mismatch with modern dietary patterns, driving the epidemic of hypertension, heart failure, diabetes, and chronic kidney disease[33,34]. Contemporary guideline-directed medical therapy (GDMT) effectively counters this mismatch by pharmacologically recreating our ancestral metabolic environment through four foundational pillars: renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS) inhibition (encompassing ACE inhibitors, ARBs, ARNIs, and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists), sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 (SGLT2) inhibitors, and beta-blockers[35,36]. While MRAs are technically RAAS inhibitors blocking the final effector hormone aldosterone, they are discussed separately in clinical practice due to their distinct mechanisms, safety profiles, and phenotype-specific benefits.

Key findings demonstrate that modern GDMT incorporating these four pillars can reduce mortality by 40-50% when used in combination[10,35], with implementation of integrated cardiorenal care potentially saving approximately 253 lives annually per 100,000 population while generating substantial healthcare cost savings of $39.4 million[37]. The evidence reveals a clear hierarchy of effectiveness among RAAS inhibitors, with angiotensin receptor-neprilysin inhibitors (ARNIs) demonstrating superiority over ACE inhibitors, which in turn outperform angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs)[4,5,8]. Similarly, important distinctions exist between steroidal and non-steroidal MRAs, with emerging evidence suggesting phenotype-specific benefits[15]. The concept of natriuretic peptide resistance emerges as a critical consid-

eration for treatment timing, with evidence supporting early intervention before significant resistance develops[17,18].

Section 1: Introduction and Epidemiological Context

1.1 The Cardiorenal Syndrome Paradigm

Cardiorenal syndrome encompasses the complex bidirectional relationship between heart and kidney dysfunction, where impairment of one organ accelerates deterioration in the other, creating a vicious cycle of mutual organ dysfunction[31]. This integrated perspective fundamentally changes treatment approaches from managing single organs to treating the interconnected cardiorenal system.

The classification system recognizes five types of cardiorenal syndrome[1,31]:

- Type 1: Acute cardiorenal (acute heart failure leading to acute kidney injury)
- Type 2: Chronic cardiorenal (chronic heart failure leading to progressive CKD)
- Type 3: Acute renocardiac (acute kidney injury leading to acute cardiac dysfunction)
- Type 4: Chronic renocardiac (CKD leading to cardiac disease)
- Type 5: Secondary cardiorenal syndrome from systemic conditions

This comprehensive analysis focuses primarily on chronic cardiorenal disease (Types 2 and 4), where established therapies can modify disease trajectory.

1.2 Epidemiology and Prognosis

The epidemiological burden of cardiorenal disease is substantial:

- Approximately 40-60% of heart failure patients have chronic kidney disease (eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73m^2)[31,32]
- About 30-45% of CKD patients develop heart failure[31]
- Heart failure affects approximately 64.3 million individuals worldwide, with prevalence continuing to increase[1,38]
- Mortality risk increases multiplicatively when both conditions coexist, with 2-year mortality approaching 50%[31]
- Each 10 mL/min/1.73m^2 decrease in eGFR increases heart failure hospitalization risk by 7%[39]
- Each doubling of NT-proBNP increases CKD progression risk by 20%[40]

Despite advances in treatment, 5-year survival rates remain suboptimal at 69.8% for heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) and similar rates for heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF)[1].

1.3 Evolutionary Physiology and Modern Disease

Human physiology evolved over millions of years in an environment characterized by scarcity of sodium and simple sugars[33,34,41]. Our ancestors faced a world where salt was rare and concentrated sugars were limited to occasional encounters with ripe fruit or honey. This

environmental pressure shaped our physiological systems to aggressively conserve sodium and maximize glucose utilization whenever these resources became available[42,43].

The renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS) and sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 (SGLT2) mechanisms represent evolutionary adaptations that ensured survival in this resource-scarce environment[41,43]. The RAAS evolved to maintain blood pressure and preserve sodium during periods of salt deprivation, while the SGLT2 system prevents the loss of valuable glucose by reabsorbing nearly all filtered glucose back into the bloodstream.

The dramatic shift in human dietary patterns over the past century has created a profound mismatch between our evolutionary programming and our current environment[33,34]. Today's typical diet contains 50-100 times more sodium than our ancestors consumed, and sugar intake has increased exponentially[33]. This abundance overwhelms physiological systems designed for scarcity, leading to the epidemic of cardiometabolic diseases. Hypertension, heart failure, diabetes, and chronic kidney disease can be understood as diseases of physiological systems operating in an environment for which they were not designed[34,41].

Section 2: Pathophysiological Mechanisms and Disease Interrelationships

2.1 Shared Pathophysiology

Common mechanisms driving cardiorenal disease include[2,31]:

- RAAS activation and aldosterone excess
- Sympathetic nervous system overactivity
- Inflammation and oxidative stress
- Endothelial dysfunction
- Volume overload and venous congestion
- Metabolic derangements
- Fibrotic pathways

Understanding these shared pathways enables targeted therapeutic approaches that benefit both organ systems.

The Comprehensive RAAS Inhibition Paradigm The renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system represents a critical cascade in cardiorenal pathophysiology, and its inhibition can be achieved at multiple points: renin inhibition (direct renin inhibitors), angiotensin II formation blockade (ACE inhibitors), angiotensin II receptor antagonism (ARBs), combined neprilysin and angiotensin receptor inhibition (ARNIs), and aldosterone receptor blockade (MRAs). While all these agents technically constitute RAAS inhibitors, clinical practice and guidelines typically discuss them in distinct categories due to their different mechanisms of action, safety profiles, and evidence bases. This document follows conventional clinical terminology by discussing proximal RAAS inhibitors (ACE-I, ARBs, ARNIs) separately from MRAs, while acknowledging that comprehensive RAAS blockade includes all these agents working at different points in the cascade.

2.2 Heart Failure as a Renal Disorder: A Paradigm Shift

A growing body of evidence suggests that heart failure, particularly HFpEF, may be more accurately conceptualized as a renal disorder[44]. This paradigm shift has profound implications for both understanding and treatment.

Temporal Relationships and Reversibility Abnormalities in the kidney's ability to maintain sodium and fluid balance appear to precede the development of HFpEF. Prospective registry data indicate that subtle abnormalities in renal function presage the development of HFpEF, but not HFrEF[44]. This temporal relationship provides compelling evidence that renal dysfunction may be the primary driver.

The systolic and diastolic abnormalities in heart failure can be reversed with kidney transplantation despite the nearly ubiquitous presence of hypertension after transplant[45]. This reversibility strongly suggests that cardiac manifestations of HFpEF may be secondary to renal dysfunction rather than primary cardiac pathology.

Beyond Glomerular Filtration Rate Assessment of kidney function using glomerular filtration rate may not adequately gauge the kidney's ability to maintain fluid balance[46]. Biomarkers of renal tubular dysfunction, including N-acetylglucosaminidase, neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin, and kidney injury molecule-1, can be abnormal despite similar degrees of chronic kidney disease as assessed by GFR. These tubular changes were predictive of outcomes, suggesting that tubular dysfunction directly affecting sodium handling may be more relevant to heart failure pathophysiology than glomerular filtration[46].

Mineralocorticoid Receptor Activation Patterns Urine studies have shown that the urine sodium to potassium ratio is much lower in patients with HFpEF compared to those with HFrEF, indicating higher mineralocorticoid receptor activation in the kidney[47]. This higher activation might be related to obesity and hyperglycemia, suggesting distinct pathophysiological mechanisms between HFpEF and HFrEF that require different therapeutic approaches.

2.3 Inflammation and Endothelial Dysfunction

Chronic kidney disease is associated with systemic endothelial dysfunction and inflammation. A meta-analysis involving over 1 million patients with heart failure found that CKD was associated with an odds ratio of 3.22 for all-cause mortality in patients with an ejection fraction greater than 40%[2]. This association reflects the systemic nature of cardiorenal disease, where inflammatory mediators and endothelial dysfunction create a hostile environment for both organs[2].

2.4 Diabetic Kidney Disease as an Accelerator

Diabetic kidney disease represents a particularly aggressive form of cardiorenal pathology. Hyperglycemia directly damages both renal and cardiac tissues through advanced glycation

end products, oxidative stress, and pro-inflammatory pathways[48]. DKD progresses to end-stage kidney disease faster than general CKD, with annual progression rates of 5% compared to 3% in non-diabetic CKD[48]. This accelerated progression creates a narrower window for intervention and emphasizes the importance of early, aggressive management.

2.5 Fibrotic Pathways

Markers of fibrosis, such as galectin-3, have been shown to precede the development of both CKD and incident HFpEF[49]. This shared fibrotic pathway represents a common mechanism driving dysfunction in both organs. The profibrotic environment created by chronic inflammation, oxidative stress, and metabolic dysfunction leads to progressive organ damage that becomes increasingly difficult to reverse as fibrosis advances.

Section 3: Comparative Efficacy of RAAS Inhibitors in Cardiorenal Disease

This section examines the comparative effectiveness of proximal RAAS inhibitors (ACE inhibitors, ARBs, and ARNIs) in cardiorenal disease. While mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists also inhibit the RAAS by blocking aldosterone receptors, they are discussed separately in Section 4 due to their distinct clinical considerations, safety profiles, and phenotype-specific benefits. The term "RAAS inhibitors" in this section refers specifically to agents acting on the proximal cascade unless otherwise noted.

3.1 ACE Inhibitors versus ARBs: Critical Distinctions

Despite similar mechanisms targeting the RAAS, ACE inhibitors and ARBs demonstrate important differences in clinical outcomes for heart failure patients.

A meta-analysis by van Vark et al. demonstrated that ACE inhibitors reduce all-cause mortality with a hazard ratio of 0.90 (p=0.004) compared to placebo, while ARBs showed no significant mortality benefit (HR 0.99, p=0.68)[4]. This translates to dramatically different numbers needed to treat: approximately 70 patients with ACE inhibitors versus 446 with ARBs to prevent one death[5].

The differential benefit appears attributable to the additional mechanisms of ACE inhibitors beyond simple angiotensin II blockade. ACE inhibitors decrease bradykinin degradation, leading to increased release of nitric oxide and prostaglandins with resulting additional vasodilation and cardioprotective effects[6]. This bradykinin-potentiating effect may explain the superior coronary protection seen with ACE inhibitors (NNT=54) compared to ARBs (NNT=3,580)[5].

Table 1. Comparative Efficacy of ACE Inhibitors vs ARBs in Heart Failure

Parameter	ACE Inhibitors	ARBs	Difference
All-cause mortality reduction (relative)	11%	No significant reduction	Significant
Absolute risk reduction (all-cause mortality)	~1.4%	~0.2%	1.2%
Number needed to treat (all-cause mortality)	70	446	376 fewer patients
Cardiovascular mortality reduction (relative)	14%	No significant reduction	Significant
Absolute risk reduction (CV mortality)	~0.8%	~0.1%	0.7%
Number needed to treat (CV mortality)	124	750	626 fewer patients
Absolute risk reduction (HF hospitalization)	~1.9%	~1.5%	0.4%
Coronary event protection (NNT)	54	3,580	3,526 fewer patients
Absolute risk reduction (coronary events)	~1.9%	~0.03%	1.87%
Cerebrovascular protection (NNT)	1,415	173	ARBs superior
Absolute risk reduction (stroke)	~0.07%	~0.58%	0.51% in favor of ARBs

3.2 The Cardiorenal Effectiveness Paradox

A fascinating paradox emerges when examining the comparative effectiveness of ACE inhibitors versus ARBs across cardiovascular and renal outcomes, revealing important clinical nuances for managing cardiorenal disease.

Heart Failure Mortality Outcomes The evidence for heart failure mortality demonstrates clear superiority of ACE inhibitors over ARBs, as detailed above. This dramatic difference in mortality reduction extends beyond simple statistical significance to represent a fundamental distinction in cardiovascular protection between these drug classes.

CKD Progression and Albuminuria Outcomes In contrast to their heart failure mortality differences, the CKD protection profile shows more nuanced distinctions between these

drug classes:

End-Stage Renal Disease Prevention: A meta-analysis of diabetic patients with albuminuria revealed that ARBs significantly reduced the risk of ESRD by 23% (odds ratio 0.77, 95% CI 0.65-0.92), while ACE inhibitors were not associated with a decreased risk of ESRD (0.69, 0.43-1.10)[77]. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously as the confidence interval for ACE inhibitors was wide, suggesting insufficient power rather than true ineffectiveness.

Doubling of Serum Creatinine: Both drug classes demonstrated effectiveness in preventing doubling of serum creatinine - ACE inhibitors showed an odds ratio of 0.60 (95% CI 0.39-0.91) and ARBs showed 0.75 (95% CI 0.64-0.88)[77], with overlapping confidence intervals suggesting similar efficacy.

Albuminuria Reduction: Multiple studies indicate comparable effectiveness for albuminuria reduction[78]. A meta-analysis of 17 randomized controlled trials including 17,951 patients found that ACEIs and ARBs were similarly effective in terms of reducing urinary protein excretion. The mechanistic basis for this similarity relates to both drug classes ultimately reducing intraglomerular pressure, though through different pathways.

Advanced CKD Populations: Recent evidence supports continued benefit even in advanced CKD. In patients with advanced CKD (eGFR 15-29 mL/min/1.73m^2), ACE inhibitor or ARB initiation resulted in a 34% lower risk for progression to kidney failure replacement therapy (hazard ratio 0.66, 95% CI 0.55-0.79), with no differentiation made between the two drug classes[79].

Clinical Implications of the Paradox This paradoxical pattern - where ACE inhibitors dominate in cardiovascular mortality reduction while showing similar or potentially inferior renal outcomes compared to ARBs - has several important clinical implications:

1. **Disease Context Matters:** The relative importance of mortality reduction versus renal progression prevention varies by clinical scenario. In patients with established heart failure and CKD, the mortality benefit of ACE inhibitors may outweigh any potential renal advantages of ARBs.

2. **Mechanism-Based Understanding:** The differential effects likely relate to drug-specific mechanisms. ACE inhibitors' bradykinin potentiation provides cardiovascular benefits beyond simple angiotensin II blockade, while ARBs may provide more complete and selective AT1 receptor blockade, potentially explaining their consistent renal benefits.

3. **Practical Selection Strategy:** The recommendation hierarchy appropriately reflects this evidence: For HFrEF with CKD (eGFR >30), ARNIs are first choice followed by ACE inhibitors, while for CKD with high heart failure risk, ACE inhibitors are preferred with potential to switch to ARNI if ejection fraction decreases.

4. **Future Research Needs:** The paucity of direct head-to-head trials comparing ACE inhibitors to ARBs in CKD populations represents a critical knowledge gap. Most

evidence comes from indirect comparisons or network meta-analyses, limiting definitive conclusions about relative renal protection.

3.3 The Evolving Role within Modern GDMT

The comparative effectiveness of ACE inhibitors versus ARBs undergoes a fundamental transformation when evaluated within the context of comprehensive guideline-directed medical therapy rather than as isolated interventions. This shift reflects the evolution from monotherapy-focused treatment paradigms to integrated multi-pillar approaches that fundamentally alter the relative contribution and importance of individual drug classes.

The Diminishing Magnitude of Differential Impact When ACE inhibitors and ARBs were the primary pharmacological interventions for cardiorenal disease, the mortality difference between them represented a critical clinical decision point. However, within modern four-pillar GDMT, this differential impact becomes proportionally less significant. Analysis from the Get With The Guidelines-Heart Failure registry demonstrated that using all four pillars of modern heart failure therapy reduces all-cause mortality by approximately 24.8% compared to no GDMT, translating to only four patients needing treatment with quadruple therapy to prevent one death[10].

In this context, the absolute mortality difference between ACE inhibitors and ARBs becomes a smaller component of the overall treatment effect. The addition of SGLT2 inhibitors, which provide 25-30% reduction in heart failure hospitalization across both HFrEF and HFpEF, and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists, which offer 30-37% mortality reduction, creates a therapeutic environment where the ACE inhibitor versus ARB choice represents only one of several critical decisions.

Complementary Mechanisms and Synergistic Protection The integration of multiple GDMT pillars creates complementary mechanisms that may compensate for the relative weaknesses of either ACE inhibitors or ARBs. SGLT2 inhibitors provide robust renal protection through mechanisms entirely independent of the renin-angiotensin system, including reduced intraglomerular pressure, decreased tubular workload, and metabolic reprogramming. This parallel pathway of renal protection may diminish the clinical significance of any differential renal effects between ACE inhibitors and ARBs.

Similarly, the cardiovascular benefits of beta-blockers and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists may partially offset the mortality advantage of ACE inhibitors over ARBs. When patients receive comprehensive GDMT, the cumulative cardiovascular protection from multiple mechanisms creates a situation where the specific RAAS inhibitor choice becomes less determinative of overall outcomes.

The ARNI Paradigm Shift The development of angiotensin receptor-neprilysin inhibitors represents a fundamental shift that transcends the ACE inhibitor versus ARB debate. ARNIs demonstrated a 20% reduction in the primary composite endpoint of cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization compared to enalapril, with a 16%

reduction in all-cause mortality[8]. This superiority over ACE inhibitors effectively reframes the clinical question from "ACE inhibitor or ARB?" to "Can this patient tolerate an ARNI?"

Within comprehensive GDMT frameworks, the pathway often involves initiating an ACE inhibitor or ARB as a bridge to ARNI therapy once clinical stability is achieved. This sequential approach acknowledges that the initial RAAS inhibitor choice may be less critical than ensuring patients ultimately receive the most effective therapy their clinical status permits.

Risk Mitigation Through Multi-Modal Therapy The comprehensive GDMT approach also mitigates some traditional risks associated with RAAS inhibitor selection. Hyperkalemia risk, historically a major consideration in choosing between ACE inhibitors and ARBs, becomes more manageable when newer potassium binders are available and when non-steroidal MRAs like finerenone offer lower hyperkalemia risk. The multi-pillar approach provides alternative pathways for dose optimization when individual drug tolerability becomes limiting.

Practical Implications for Clinical Decision-Making The transformation of ACE inhibitor versus ARB selection within modern GDMT has several practical implications:

1. **Urgency of Initiation:** The urgency of initiating any RAAS inhibitor supersedes deliberation over the specific agent, particularly given that implementing integrated cardiorenal care could save approximately 253 lives annually per 100,000 population[37]. The focus shifts from optimizing individual drug selection to ensuring rapid implementation of comprehensive therapy.
2. **Transitional Approach:** The initial RAAS inhibitor choice increasingly serves as a temporary decision point rather than a definitive treatment selection. The modern treatment pathway anticipates transitions - from ACE inhibitor or ARB to ARNI in appropriate candidates, with adjustments based on tolerability, renal function evolution, and emerging evidence.
3. **Patient-Specific Factors:** Within a multi-pillar GDMT framework, considerations such as cough tolerance, angioedema risk, cost, and formulary availability may reasonably drive ACE inhibitor versus ARB selection, knowing that other pillars provide substantial risk reduction regardless of this choice.

The Residual Importance of Thoughtful Selection Despite the diminished relative impact within comprehensive GDMT, thoughtful RAAS inhibitor selection remains clinically relevant. For patients unable to tolerate other GDMT pillars, those with contraindications to newer agents, or those with limited medication access, the mortality difference between ACE inhibitors and ARBs regains significance. Additionally, in specific populations such as those with preserved ejection fraction heart failure where ARNI benefits are less established, the traditional ACE inhibitor advantages may remain more relevant.

3.4 Angiotensin Receptor-Neprilysin Inhibitors: The New Standard

ARNIs represent a significant advancement in RAAS modulation for heart failure. The combination of sacubitril (a neprilysin inhibitor) and valsartan (an ARB) enhances levels of beneficial natriuretic peptides while simultaneously blocking angiotensin II effects.

Pharmacokinetic Considerations in CKD: The ACE Inhibitor Washout Challenge
An important but often overlooked consideration when transitioning from ACE inhibitors to ARNIs involves the altered pharmacokinetics of ACE inhibitors in chronic kidney disease. The fundamental pharmacokinetic principle states that five half-lives are required to eliminate approximately 97% of a drug from the body, a concept that becomes critically important when considering drug transitions that require washout periods[80]. Many commonly used ACE inhibitors undergo significant renal elimination, and their half-lives extend substantially in patients with reduced kidney function. This prolongation has critical implications for the mandatory washout period required before ARNI initiation to minimize the risk of angioedema.

For example, lisinopril demonstrates a dramatic extension in elimination kinetics with kidney disease. While the plasma half-life in normal kidney function is approximately 12 hours, this extends to over 30 hours in patients with severe CKD, with some reports suggesting even longer elimination phases[81]. Similarly, enalapril and its active metabolite enalaprilat have half-lives that extend from approximately 11 hours in normal kidney function to over 35 hours in severe CKD[82]. This pharmacokinetic alteration means that achieving adequate drug clearance (five half-lives) could require 5-7 days or longer in patients with significant renal impairment, rather than the standard 36-hour washout period that would be sufficient for patients with normal kidney function.

The clinical consequence is that patients with cardiorenal disease, who might benefit most from rapid optimization to ARNI therapy, face the longest transition periods due to delayed ACE inhibitor clearance. This creates a therapeutic dilemma where the standard 36-hour washout may leave residual ACE inhibitor activity in CKD patients, potentially increasing angioedema risk, while extending the washout period prolongs the time without optimal RAAS inhibition.

This consideration adds another dimension to the ACE inhibitor versus ARB selection debate in CKD patients. ARBs do not require a washout period before ARNI initiation, allowing for immediate transition. Therefore, in patients with CKD who are likely candidates for future ARNI therapy, initial selection of an ARB rather than an ACE inhibitor may facilitate more rapid therapeutic optimization, despite the potential mortality advantages of ACE inhibitors discussed previously.

The landmark PARADIGM-HF trial established the superiority of sacubitril/valsartan over enalapril in patients with HFrEF. The study demonstrated a 20% reduction in the primary composite endpoint of cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization (HR 0.80, 95% CI 0.73-0.87, $p<0.001$) and a 16% reduction in all-cause mortality (HR 0.84, 95% CI 0.76-0.93, $p<0.001$)[8].

Table 2. Comparative Efficacy of ARNI vs ACE-I in HFrEF (PARADIGM-HF Trial)

Outcome	ARNI	ACE-I	Absolute Risk Reduction	NNT	Hazard Ratio
Primary composite endpoint	21.8%	26.5%	4.7%	21	0.80 (0.73-0.87)
All-cause mortality	17.0%	19.8%	2.8%	36	0.84 (0.76-0.93)
Cardiovascular mortality	13.3%	16.5%	3.2%	31	0.80 (0.71-0.89)
Heart failure hospitalization	12.8%	15.6%	2.8%	36	0.79 (0.71-0.89)
Sudden cardiac death	6.0%	7.5%	1.5%	67	0.80 (0.68-0.94)

3.5 Practical RAAS Inhibitor Selection in Cardiorenal Disease

Table 3. RAAS Inhibitor Selection Strategy

Clinical Scenario	First Choice	Alternative	Rationale
HFrEF + CKD (eGFR >30)	ARNI	ACE inhibitor	Superior CV outcomes, preserved kidney benefits
HFrEF + CKD (eGFR <30)	ACE inhibitor	ARB	ARNI contraindicated, ACE-I mortality signal
HFpEF + CKD	ACE inhibitor	ARB	Limited ARNI benefit, proven CKD protection
CKD + likely future ARNI candidate	ARB	ACE inhibitor	Avoid prolonged washout in CKD
CKD + high HF risk	ACE inhibitor	ARNI if LVEF ↓	Potential mortality benefit, monitor cardiac function

Clinical Scenario	First Choice	Alternative	Rationale
Hyperkalemia prone	ARB or ARNI	Lower dose ACE-I	Similar K risk, optimize other factors

Section 4: Mineralocorticoid Receptor Antagonists: Evolution and Phenotype-Specific Benefits

Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists represent the terminal blockade point of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system, inhibiting the effects of aldosterone, the final effector hormone of this cascade. While MRAs are fundamentally RAAS inhibitors, they merit distinct consideration from proximal RAAS inhibitors (ACE-I, ARBs, ARNIs) due to several unique characteristics: their action at the tissue level rather than circulating hormone blockade, their distinct safety profile particularly regarding hyperkalemia and endocrine effects, their differential tissue distribution between steroidal and non-steroidal agents, and emerging evidence for phenotype-specific benefits. This section examines the evolution from steroidal to non-steroidal MRAs and their optimal deployment in cardiorenal disease.

4.1 Steroidal MRAs: Established Benefits and Limitations

Steroidal MRAs (spironolactone and eplerenone) have well-established benefits in heart failure based on landmark trials. In the RALES trial, spironolactone reduced all-cause mortality by 30% in patients with severe HFrEF (NYHA class III-IV) with an NNT of only 10[12]. The EMPHASIS-HF trial subsequently demonstrated that eplerenone reduced cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization by 37% in patients with mild HFrEF (NYHA class II) with an NNT of 13[13].

Despite proven benefits, steroidal MRAs have important limitations:

- High rates of hyperkalemia, particularly in patients with reduced kidney function (absolute increase of 5-10% over placebo)
- Significant endocrine side effects, especially with spironolactone (gynecomastia in 10% of men)
- Predominantly kidney-focused tissue distribution that may limit cardiac effects
- Underutilization in clinical practice due to safety concerns

4.2 Non-Steroidal MRAs: Emerging Evidence

Non-steroidal MRAs like finerenone offer several potential advantages:

- Balanced heart-kidney tissue distribution
- Superior selectivity for the mineralocorticoid receptor
- Minimal off-target effects on androgen and progesterone receptors
- Reduced risk of hyperkalemia compared to steroidal agents

The FINEARTS-HF trial evaluated finerenone in patients with HFpEF, demonstrating a significant 29% reduction in the composite of total heart failure events and cardiovascular death compared to placebo (HR 0.71, 95% CI 0.60-0.85, p<0.001)[15]. This represents one of the few positive trials in the challenging HFpEF population.

4.3 Differential Effects by Heart Failure Phenotype

A landmark individual patient-level meta-analysis published in The Lancet in 2024 revealed important differences in treatment effects by heart failure phenotype[15]:

- Steroidal MRAs demonstrated significant reduction in cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization in patients with HFrEF
- Non-steroidal MRAs showed significant reduction in cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization in HFmrEF/HFpEF

This pattern suggests that the optimal MRA class may differ based on ejection fraction phenotype - a paradigm-shifting concept that challenges the traditional approach of treating all MRAs as essentially interchangeable agents.

Table 4. Comparative Efficacy of MRAs by Heart Failure Phenotype

NYHA Class	Steroidal MRAs	Non-Steroidal MRAs	Key Differences
Class II	Eplerenone: 37% ↓ CV death/HF hospARR: 7.6% (NNT=15)	Emerging data suggests effectivenessLower hyperkalemia risk	Steroidal MRAs have more extensive evidence in HFrEF
Class III	Spironolactone: 30% ↓ mortalityARR: 11.0% (NNT=10)	Limited specific dataARR: 4-5% for composite endpoints	Spironolactone has strongest evidence
HFpEF	TOPCAT: Mixed resultsAmericas ARR: 3.4% (NNT=29)	FINEARTS-HF: 29% ↓ CV death/HF eventsARR: 5.9% (NNT=17)	nsMRAs showing more consistent benefit

Section 5: SGLT2 Inhibitors: Unifying Cardiorenal Protection

SGLT2 inhibitors have emerged as transformative therapy for cardiorenal syndrome, with benefits extending across the spectrum of heart failure and chronic kidney disease[50,51]. These agents occupy a unique position as the only drug class with:

- Consistent benefits across HFrEF, HFpEF, and CKD
- Reduction in both incident and worsening events
- Protection against acute kidney injury despite initial eGFR dip
- Benefits independent of diabetes status
- Rapid onset of protection (within weeks)

5.1 Mechanisms of Cardiorenal Protection

The mechanisms of benefit extend well beyond glycemic control[52,53]:

Cardiac mechanisms: - Reduced preload and afterload through natriuresis and diuresis - Improved myocardial energetics through ketone utilization - Reduced inflammation and fibrosis - Enhanced erythropoiesis

Renal mechanisms: - Reduced intraglomerular pressure - Decreased tubular workload by inhibiting sodium-glucose cotransport - Metabolic reprogramming creating a fasting-like state - Reduced inflammation

Integrated effects: - Improved volume homeostasis without neurohormonal activation - Reduced sympathetic activation - Enhanced natriuresis efficiency - Metabolic benefits

5.2 Clinical Evidence Across the Cardiorenal Spectrum

Table 5. SGLT2 Inhibitor Evidence in Cardiorenal Disease

Trial	Population	Heart Failure Outcomes	Kidney Outcomes	Key Findings
DAPA-HF	HFrEF (42% with CKD)	26% ↓ CV death/HF hosp	29% ↓ composite kidney	Benefits consistent across eGFR
EMPEROR-Reduced	HFrEF (48% with CKD)	25% ↓ CV death/HF hosp	50% ↓ composite kidney	Greater benefit if CKD present
EMPEROR-Preserved	HFpEF (50% with CKD)	21% ↓ CV death/HF hosp	95% ↓ composite kidney	First positive HFpEF trial
DAPA-CKD	CKD ± diabetes (38% with HF)	29% ↓ HF hosp/CV death	39% ↓ kidney progression	Reduced new HF
EMPA-KIDNEY	CKD broad (33% with HF)	39% ↓ HF hosp	28% ↓ kidney progression	Benefits in normoalbuminuric

Clinical evidence demonstrates[50,51]:

- 25-30% reduction in heart failure hospitalization across both HFrEF and HFpEF
- 37% reduction in kidney disease progression regardless of diabetes status
- Benefits that emerge within weeks of initiation
- Efficacy maintained down to eGFR 20 mL/min/1.73m^2

Section 6: Beta-Blockers: Foundation Therapy with Phenotype Specificity

6.1 Evidence in Heart Failure with Reduced Ejection Fraction

Beta-blockers remain a cornerstone of therapy for HFrEF, with robust evidence for mortality reduction. A meta-analysis of major beta-blocker trials demonstrated a 31% reduction in mortality compared to placebo after a median of 12 months (OR 0.69, 95% CI 0.56-0.80)[54]. The mortality benefit translates to an NNT of approximately 26 patients to prevent one death[54,55].

Three beta-blockers have proven mortality benefits in HFrEF[54]: - Carvedilol: Non-selective with alpha-blocking properties - Metoprolol succinate: Beta-1 selective - Bisoprolol: Beta-1 selective

6.2 Differential Effects by Ejection Fraction

Recent evidence suggests important differences in beta-blocker effects based on ejection fraction[56,57]:

- **HFrEF (EF <40%)**: Clear mortality benefit with 31% reduction in death
- **HFmrEF (EF 40-49%)**: Similar mortality benefit to HFrEF (4.7% absolute reduction in CV mortality, NNT=21)
- **HFpEF (EF 50%)**: No mortality benefit; potential for increased HF hospitalization, particularly when EF >60%

6.3 Special Populations

Advanced CKD In patients with HFrEF and advanced CKD (eGFR <30 mL/min/1.73m^2), beta-blockers remain beneficial with similar mortality reductions to those with moderate CKD[58]. However, these benefits were not observed in HFmrEF or HFpEF with advanced CKD.

Section 7: Natriuretic Peptide System and Treatment Timing Considerations

7.1 Natriuretic Peptide Resistance: A Critical Concept

Natriuretic peptides serve as counter-regulatory hormones that promote natriuresis, vasodilation, and inhibit the RAAS and sympathetic nervous systems. However, their effectiveness diminishes as heart failure progresses - a phenomenon known as natriuretic peptide resistance[17,18].

Natriuretic peptide resistance develops through several mechanisms[17,18]:

- Receptor downregulation after chronic exposure to high levels
- Post-receptor signaling defects
- Enhanced degradation by neprilysin and other proteases

- Production of biologically inactive fragments

7.2 Clinical Thresholds and Biomarker Indicators

The development of resistance follows a continuum with certain clinical thresholds:

Clinical stages: - Early resistance begins in NYHA class II or CKD stage 3a (often subclinical) - Clinically significant resistance manifests in NYHA class III or CKD stage 3b-4 - Advanced resistance with minimal effect seen in NYHA class IV or CKD stage 5

Biomarker thresholds: - NT-proBNP >1,000 pg/ml: Onset of measurable receptor downregulation - NT-proBNP >3,000-4,000 pg/ml: More significant resistance typically develops[8] - cGMP/BNP ratio <0.15 pmol/pg: Strongly associated with established resistance[19] - Spot urine sodium <50-70 mmol/L after diuretic: Correlates with resistance[20]

7.3 Implications for ARNI Therapy Timing

The concept of natriuretic peptide resistance has important implications for ARNI therapy timing. While theoretically neprilysin inhibition may offer greatest benefit before significant resistance develops, clinical trial evidence shows nuanced outcomes:

- PARADIGM-HF showed consistent relative risk reduction across NYHA classes and NT-proBNP quartiles, though with a trend toward attenuated benefit in the highest NT-proBNP quartile (>2,995 pg/ml)[8]
- PIONEER-HF demonstrated greater NT-proBNP reduction in de novo heart failure compared to acute-on-chronic decompensation (61% vs. 46% reduction)[21]

This evidence supports early ARNI initiation while acknowledging clinically meaningful benefits across the spectrum of heart failure severity.

7.4 Shifting Neurohormonal Balance with Disease Progression

An important conceptual framework recognizes that BNP functions as a homeostatic hormone that loses effectiveness in advanced disease, while other neurohormones like aldosterone and vasopressin maintain or increase their biological importance[22]. This shifting balance helps explain why therapies targeting the RAAS and aldosterone maintain effectiveness even in advanced heart failure, while strategies solely enhancing natriuretic peptides may show diminishing returns.

Section 8: The Critical Vulnerability: Sick Day Management Protocols

8.1 Understanding the Physiological Challenge

The pharmacological recreation of an ancestral metabolic environment through GDMT creates a critical vulnerability when patients face acute physiological stress[59,60]. During episodes of sepsis, gastroenteritis with vomiting and diarrhea, or other causes of volume depletion, the body requires its adaptive mechanisms to maintain homeostasis. Patients

on comprehensive GDMT have these protective systems pharmacologically blocked, leaving them unable to mount appropriate compensatory responses.

This situation creates risk for[59,60]:

- Severe acute kidney injury, as the kidneys cannot appropriately retain sodium and maintain perfusion pressure
- Life-threatening hyperkalemia as RAAS blockade prevents potassium excretion during stress
- Hemodynamic collapse when normal blood pressure maintenance mechanisms are disabled

8.2 Comprehensive Sick Day Management Protocol

Effective sick day management requires proactive planning and patient education[59,60,61]:

Immediate Medication Adjustments: During any illness causing decreased oral intake, fever, vomiting, or diarrhea, patients should temporarily discontinue:

- SGLT2 inhibitors
- ACE inhibitors/ARBs/ARNIs
- Diuretics

These medications can be resumed once the patient has recovered and is maintaining adequate oral intake.

Hyperkalemia Prevention:

- Understand symptoms of hyperkalemia (muscle weakness, palpitations, nausea)
- Access to non-sodium polystyrene sulfonate potassium binders if history of hyperkalemia
- Dietary potassium restriction during illness
- Early laboratory monitoring

Volume Status Management:

- Daily weight monitoring during illness
- Liberal salt and fluid intake temporarily (reversal of usual restrictions)
- Recognition that fluid losses need replacement

Early Medical Contact:

- Contact healthcare provider early in illness course
- Laboratory monitoring of renal function and electrolytes
- Clear thresholds for seeking care (persistent vomiting, inability to maintain oral intake, symptomatic hypotension)

8.3 Creating a Culture of Proactive Management

Successfully implementing sick day management requires a fundamental shift in chronic disease management approach. Healthcare systems should develop[59,60]:

- Standardized sick day action plans provided at GDMT initiation
- Regular review and updates as regimens change
- Family/caregiver education and involvement
- Electronic health record integration with automated reminders
- Quality metrics including sick day plan provision assessment

Section 9: Implementation Strategies and Clinical Outcomes

9.1 The Modern Cardiorenal Protection Framework

The four-pillar approach to cardiorenal protection represents a practical clinical framework that acknowledges the comprehensive nature of neurohormonal blockade. While RAAS inhibition technically encompasses multiple drug classes acting at different points in the cascade (ACE inhibitors, ARBs, ARNIs, and MRAs), clinical implementation typically considers proximal RAAS inhibitors (ACE-I/ARB/ARNI) and MRAs as distinct therapeutic decisions due to their different safety profiles, monitoring requirements, and phenotype-specific benefits. This separation reflects practical considerations rather than physiological distinctions, as all these agents ultimately work to counteract the deleterious effects of RAAS activation.

Table 6. Prioritized Implementation Strategy

Priority	Intervention	Timing	Expected Benefits
1. Foundation	SGLT2 inhibitor + Proximal RAAS inhibitor (ACE-I/ARB/ARNI)	Immediate	30-40% ↓ both HF and CKD events
2. Optimization	Add/switch to ARNI (if HFrEF)	Weeks 2-4	Additional 10% ↓ CV death
3. Refinement	Add MRA (complete RAAS blockade)	Weeks 4-12	15-20% ↓ residual events
4. Beta-blockade	Beta-blockers (HFrEF)	Concurrent	Mortality reduction, rate control

9.2 Clinical Outcomes with Optimal Therapy

Table 7. Expected Outcomes with Multi-Pillar Therapy

Outcome	Monotherapy	Dual Therapy	Triple Therapy	Quadruple Therapy
HF hospitalization reduction	20-25%	35-45%	50-60%	60-70%
CKD progression reduction	20-30%	40-50%	55-65%	65-75%

Outcome	Monotherapy	Dual Therapy	Triple Therapy	Quadruple Therapy
CV mortality reduction	10-15%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%
All-cause mortality reduction	10-15%	20-25%	30-35%	35-45%

Analysis from the Get With The Guidelines-Heart Failure (GWTG-HF) registry demonstrated that using all four pillars of modern heart failure therapy reduces all-cause mortality by approximately 24.8% compared to no GDMT[10]. This translates to only four patients needing treatment with quadruple therapy to prevent one death[10,37].

9.3 Life-Saving Potential and Economic Impact

In a population of approximately 100,000, implementing integrated cardiorenal disease management could[37]:

- Save or extend 253 lives annually (197 through prevention of ESKD progression, 56 through reduced CV mortality)
- Generate 738 quality-adjusted life years annually
- Reduce heart failure hospitalizations by 30%
- Prevent progression to dialysis in 246 patients annually

Economic outcomes demonstrate compelling value[37]:

- Total annual healthcare cost savings: $39.4 million per 100,000 population
- Dialysis cost avoidance: $22.1 million
- Reduced hospitalizations: $2.5 million
- Implementation costs: $8.2 million
- Return on investment ratio: 4.8:1

9.4 The Central Role of Nephrologists

Nephrologists play an essential, often underrecognized role in directing GDMT for cardiorenal syndrome[62]:

- Direct implementation of medications benefiting both organs
- Expertise in volume management critical for cardiorenal patients
- Care coordination between specialties
- Managing complex drug interactions and renal dosing
- Establishing monitoring protocols

Section 10: Monitoring Strategies and Special Populations

10.1 Biomarker Monitoring in Clinical Practice

Several landmark trials have evaluated serial natriuretic peptide monitoring:

- TIME-CHF showed no overall benefit but suggested advantages in patients <75 years[23]
- GUIDE-IT was stopped early for futility with no improvement in outcomes[24]
- Meta-analysis of 2,431 patients showed 18% reduction in mortality with biomarker guidance, most pronounced in younger patients with HFrEF[25]

The 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guidelines give a Class 2a recommendation for measuring natriuretic peptides during hospitalization but only Class 2b for biomarker-guided therapy[11].

Special considerations with ARNI therapy:

- BNP levels increase with neprilysin inhibition
- NT-proBNP preferred for monitoring
- Daily inpatient measurements have limited utility due to lag time and variability

10.2 Management in Special Populations

Table 8. Approach to Specific Cardiorenal Scenarios

Scenario	Challenge	Recommended Approach
Advanced CKD (eGFR <30)	Limited drug options	Continue SGLT2-I to eGFR 20; ACE-I with close monitoring; Avoid ARNI
Recurrent hyperkalemia	Limits RAAS/MRA use	Newer K binders; Switch to finerenone; Optimize diuretics
Elderly (>75 years)	Frailty, polypharmacy	Start one drug at a time; Lower initial doses; Focus on quality of life
Diabetes + Cardiorenal	Multiple targets	SGLT2-I priority; Consider GLP-1 RA; Monitor closely

10.3 Integrated Monitoring Protocol

Table 9. Comprehensive Monitoring Schedule

Parameter	Baseline	2-4 Weeks	3 Months	6 Months	Ongoing
Kidney function	eGFR, UACR	eGFR, K	eGFR, UACR, K	Full panel	Q3-6 months
Cardiac markers	NT-proBNP, Echo	Clinical assessment	NT-proBNP	Consider echo	Annual echo
Safety labs	K , Mg^2 , CBC	K after changes	Full panel	Full panel	Q3-6 months

10.4 Managing Diuretic Resistance: Hypertonic Saline and Natriuretic Response Prediction

10.4.1 Hypertonic Saline for Diuretic Resistance Diuretic resistance represents a major challenge in cardiorenal syndrome management, occurring in up to 40% of patients with acute decompensated heart failure[66]. Hypertonic saline solution (HSS) combined with high-dose loop diuretics has emerged as a potential strategy to overcome diuretic resistance through several mechanisms[67,68]:

Mechanistic Rationale: - **Chloride repletion**: Hypochloremia is associated with diuretic resistance through RAAS activation and upregulation of distal tubule sodium channels[69] - **Osmotic fluid mobilization**: HSS draws fluid from the interstitial compartment into the vascular space, improving effective arterial blood volume[68,70] - **RAAS suppression**: Unlike loop diuretics alone, HSS can suppress rather than activate renin production[71] - **Enhanced renal blood flow**: Volume expansion improves renal perfusion and diuretic delivery[70]

Clinical Evidence: Multiple studies have evaluated HSS in hospitalized patients with diuretic-resistant heart failure: - A meta-analysis of randomized trials (n=2,064) demonstrated that HSS plus furosemide reduced all-cause mortality (RR 0.56, 95% CI 0.41-0.76) and heart failure readmissions (RR 0.50, 95% CI 0.33-0.76) compared to furosemide alone[66] - Real-world data from a U.S. academic center showed improved diuretic efficiency, weight loss, and renal function with HSS in diuretic-resistant patients[67,70] - The SMAC-HF study demonstrated shorter hospitalization (3.5 vs 5.5 days), improved NYHA class, and reduced readmissions with HSS therapy[71]

However, the recent SALT-HF trial in ambulatory patients with worsening heart failure found no difference in 3-hour diuresis or congestion parameters between HSS plus furosemide versus furosemide alone, suggesting the benefit may be limited to more severe, hospitalized cases[72].

Practical Protocol: - Typical regimen: 150 mL of 3% NaCl (or 1.4-4.6% adjusted for serum sodium) over 30 minutes - Administered with high-dose IV loop diuretic (typically 2.5x oral dose) - Requires intensive/progressive care unit monitoring - Contraindications: Hypernatremia (>145 mEq/L), severe respiratory distress - Monitor for sodium overcorrection (>10 mEq/L in 24 hours)

10.4.2 Natriuretic Response Prediction Using 2-Hour Post-Diuretic Urine Sodium and the Yale Diuretic Pathway The Natriuretic Response Prediction Equation (NRPE) represents a transformative advance in personalizing diuretic therapy by allowing rapid assessment and titration based on actual sodium excretion rather than crude surrogates like urine output or weight loss[73,74]. The Yale Diuretic Pathway (YDP) represents the first systematic implementation of NRPE-guided therapy through a nurse-driven automated protocol that fundamentally reimagines diuretic management in acute decompensated heart failure.

Scientific Foundation and Development

The NRPE emerged from recognition that traditional metrics of diuretic response poorly correlate with actual sodium excretion. The equation uses a spot urine sample collected 2 hours after loop diuretic administration to predict 6-hour cumulative sodium output. This approach acknowledges three critical physiological principles[74]. First, sodium rather than water drives extracellular volume expansion and congestion in heart failure. Second, the sodium content of diuretic-induced urine varies dramatically between patients, with some producing high-volume but low-sodium urine. Third, positive sodium balance, even with apparent net fluid loss, associates with increased mortality.

Validation and Performance Metrics

The validation of the NRPE proceeded through two distinct cohorts. The Diagnosing and Targeting Mechanisms of Diuretic Resistance (MDR) cohort provided prospective validation across 638 loop diuretic administrations. The equation demonstrated exceptional performance with area under the curve values of 0.92 for predicting poor response (<50 mmol), 0.90 for suboptimal response (<100 mmol), and 0.90 for excellent response (>150 mmol)[73]. Importantly, the NRPE significantly outperformed traditional clinical parameters including net fluid balance and weight loss at all response thresholds ($p<0.05$ for all cutpoints).

The Yale Diuretic Pathway: Implementation and Outcomes

The Yale Diuretic Pathway represents the translation of the NRPE from research tool to clinical practice through a nurse-driven automated protocol. This protocol fundamentally departed from traditional once-daily diuretic adjustment by recognizing that natriuresis from intravenous loop diuretics is nearly complete within 6 hours of administration. The YDP therefore enabled diuretic titration every 6 hours rather than waiting for the next day's physician rounds.

The implementation cohort included 161 patients with acute decompensated heart failure requiring intravenous diuretic therapy. The protocol empowered bedside nurses to independently adjust diuretic dosing based on NRPE results without requiring physician orders for each adjustment. This nurse-driven approach proved critical to achieving rapid optimization, as it eliminated delays associated with traditional physician-dependent titration.

The clinical outcomes from YDP implementation demonstrated dramatic improvements across all measured parameters[73]. Mean daily urine output increased from 1.8 ± 0.9 liters to 3.0 ± 0.8 liters ($p<0.001$), representing a 67% improvement. Net fluid output improved from negative 1.1 ± 0.9 liters to negative 2.1 ± 0.9 liters daily ($p<0.001$), effectively doubling the rate of decongestion. Most strikingly, average daily weight loss increased from 0.3 ± 0.3 kilograms to 2.5 ± 0.3 kilograms ($p<0.001$), an eight-fold improvement that translated to meaningful clinical decongestion.

Detailed Protocol Structure

The Yale Diuretic Pathway protocol incorporated several innovative elements that enabled its success. The automated nature of the protocol meant that once initiated, nurses could proceed with titration based on predetermined thresholds without awaiting physician input for each dose adjustment. This automation proved essential given the every-6-hour titration schedule, which would have been impractical with traditional physician-dependent ordering.

The protocol categorized natriuretic response into three actionable tiers based on predicted 6-hour sodium excretion. Poor responders with less than 50 mmol predicted excretion triggered immediate intervention, as this level of natriuresis would result in positive sodium balance even with twice-daily dosing. The protocol mandated either doubling the loop diuretic dose or adding sequential nephron blockade with oral metolazone or intravenous chlorothiazide. Suboptimal responders with 50-100 mmol predicted excretion received a 50% dose increase, allowing for more gradual titration in patients showing some response. Excellent responders with greater than 150 mmol continued their current regimen, though the protocol included provisions for dose reduction if natriuresis exceeded 200 mmol to prevent intravascular volume depletion.

Critical Success Factors

Several elements proved essential to the Yale Diuretic Pathway's success. The nurse empowerment aspect cannot be overstated - traditional physician-dependent diuretic adjustment simply cannot achieve the titration frequency required for optimal decongestion. The automated protocol eliminated variability in clinical decision-making while ensuring consistent application of evidence-based thresholds. The integration with existing nursing workflows minimized disruption while maximizing compliance. Laboratory infrastructure capable of rapid turnaround for urine electrolytes proved essential, with the Yale system achieving results within 60 minutes of sample collection.

The education and training component also proved critical. Nursing staff required thorough education on the physiological basis for the protocol, proper timing of urine collection, and interpretation of results. This education transformed nurses from passive implementers of physician orders to active participants in optimizing diuretic therapy. The psychological shift from "following orders" to "following protocol" empowered more assertive management of diuretic resistance.

Overcoming Implementation Barriers

The Yale experience identified several barriers to implementation and developed solutions that inform broader adoption. Initial physician skepticism about nurse-driven titration required extensive education about the protocol's evidence base and built-in safety parameters. Concerns about rapid titration causing acute kidney injury were addressed through data showing that effective decongestion actually improves renal outcomes. Laboratory workflow modifications proved necessary to ensure rapid turnaround, including prioritization of NRPE samples and dedicated technician training. Electronic health record integration streamlined ordering and result interpretation while reducing transcription errors.

Comparison to Traditional Approaches

The superiority of the Yale Diuretic Pathway over traditional management becomes apparent when considering typical diuretic adjustment patterns. Traditional once-daily physician-dependent titration often results in persistent underdosing, with many patients receiving the same diuretic dose throughout their hospitalization despite inadequate response. The YDP's every-6-hour adjustment capability means that a patient could receive four dose escalations in the time traditional management might achieve one. This rapid optimization explains the

dramatic improvements in decongestion metrics observed in the implementation cohort.

Integration with Comprehensive Heart Failure Management

While the Yale Diuretic Pathway focuses on optimizing diuretic response, its integration with comprehensive heart failure management amplifies its impact. Effective decongestion creates the hemodynamic stability necessary for initiating and titrating guideline-directed medical therapy. The protocol's success in achieving euvolemia facilitates earlier discharge and reduces readmission risk. The objective nature of NRPE-guided management also provides clear endpoints for decongestion, reducing the ambiguity that often prolongs hospitalization.

Contemporary Context and Evolution

The recent PUSH-HF trial provided additional validation of natriuresis-guided therapy principles while highlighting areas for refinement[76]. This multicenter pragmatic trial demonstrated that natriuresis-guided therapy led to treatment intensification in the majority of patients and improved 24-hour natriuresis, though without significant impact on 180-day mortality or heart failure rehospitalization. These findings suggest that while natriuresis-guided therapy excels at achieving short-term decongestion, integration with comprehensive post-discharge management remains essential for long-term benefit.

The evolution from the Yale Diuretic Pathway to contemporary practice has incorporated several refinements. Recognition that some patients require combination diuretic therapy from the outset has led to earlier implementation of sequential nephron blockade. The integration of SGLT2 inhibitors as adjunctive agents for diuretic resistance adds another tool to the armamentarium. Advanced protocols now incorporate assessments of plasma refill rate to identify patients at risk for intravascular volume depletion despite persistent congestion.

Future Directions and Optimal Implementation

The success of the Yale Diuretic Pathway establishes a new standard for diuretic management in acute heart failure. Future implementations should consider several enhancements based on accumulated experience. Integration with continuous monitoring systems could enable real-time titration based on hemodynamic parameters. Machine learning algorithms might predict individual patient response patterns, allowing for preemptive adjustment strategies. Expansion to outpatient settings through home health integration could prevent readmissions by identifying early diuretic resistance.

For healthcare systems considering implementation, the Yale experience provides a clear roadmap. Success requires institutional commitment to nurse empowerment, laboratory infrastructure investment, and cultural change in approaching diuretic management. The return on investment through reduced length of stay, decreased readmissions, and improved patient outcomes justifies the initial implementation costs. Most importantly, the dramatic improvements in decongestion metrics translate directly to reduced patient suffering and improved quality of life.

The Yale Diuretic Pathway demonstrates that transforming theoretical advances into clini-

cal practice requires more than just new knowledge - it demands systematic reimagining of care delivery. By empowering nurses, automating decision-making, and accelerating titration frequency, the YDP achieved what decades of physician-dependent management could not: reliable, rapid, and safe decongestion for patients with acute heart failure. This success provides both a model for implementation and inspiration for continued innovation in cardiorenal care delivery.

Section 11: Future Directions and Emerging Therapies

11.1 GLP-1 Receptor Agonists: Expanding Cardiorenal Indications

GLP-1 receptor agonists have shown promising cardiorenal benefits[63,64]:

- FLOW trial: 24% reduction in kidney events[16,65]
- Consistent cardiovascular benefits across CKD stages
- Weight loss particularly beneficial in cardiorenal disease
- Potential to become a fifth pillar of therapy

11.2 Novel Therapeutic Approaches Under Investigation

- Endothelin receptor antagonists (sparsentan, atrasentan)
- Novel MRAs (ocedurenone, esaxerenone)
- Soluble guanylate cyclase stimulators (vericiguat)
- Anti-inflammatory agents targeting specific pathways
- Precision medicine approaches using genetic and proteomic profiling

11.3 Healthcare Delivery Innovation

- Development of integrated cardiorenal clinics
- Remote monitoring technologies
- AI-assisted clinical decision support
- Value-based care models specific to cardiorenal disease

Conclusions and Key Recommendations

The management of cardiorenal disease has evolved from reactive, single-organ approaches to proactive, integrated strategies targeting complex bidirectional pathophysiology. Key principles for optimal management include:

1. Recognition of heart failure (particularly HFpEF) as potentially a renal disorder requiring kidney-focused interventions
2. Early implementation of comprehensive four-pillar GDMT to maximize benefits before irreversible changes occur
3. Understanding the hierarchy of RAAS inhibitor effectiveness: ARNIs > ACE inhibitors > ARBs for mortality reduction, while recognizing the complex paradox of potentially superior renal outcomes with ARBs

4. Appreciation that within modern multi-pillar GDMT, the differential impact between ACE inhibitors and ARBs becomes proportionally less significant as complementary mechanisms provide synergistic protection
5. Phenotype-specific MRA selection: Steroidal MRAs for HFrEF, non-steroidal MRAs for HFpEF/CKD
6. Integration of sick day management protocols as essential components of chronic disease management
7. Acceptance of expected hemodynamic changes such as modest creatinine increases when initiating therapy
8. Recognition of natriuretic peptide resistance as a factor in treatment timing and response
9. Systematic monitoring with predetermined intervention thresholds to ensure safety while maximizing benefits

The implementation gap between evidence and practice represents the greatest opportunity for improving outcomes. With optimal implementation of currently available therapies and appropriate management protocols, the majority of adverse cardiorenal outcomes could be prevented or delayed. This translates to hundreds of lives saved and millions in healthcare cost savings for every 100,000 population served.

Success requires transforming chronic disease management through systematic, evidence-based approaches that recognize both the power and vulnerabilities of modern medical therapy. Healthcare systems must develop infrastructure supporting integrated cardiorenal care, including multidisciplinary clinics, standardized protocols, and quality improvement initiatives focused on GDMT optimization.

References

1. Bozkurt B, Coats AJS, Tsutsui H, et al. Universal Definition and Classification of Heart Failure. J Card Fail. 2021;27(4):387-413.
2. Hartupee J, Mann DL. Neurohormonal activation in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2017;14(1):30-38.
3. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, et al. 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2022;79(17):e263-e421.
4. van Vark LC, Bertrand M, Akkerhuis KM, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors reduce mortality in hypertension: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system inhibitors involving 158,998 patients. Eur Heart J. 2012;33(16):2088-97.
5. Mourad JJ, Brugts J, Bertrand M. Number needed to treat and reduction of outcomes with RAAS inhibitors. European Heart Journal. 2013;34(suppl_1):5963.
6. Ferrario CM, Strawn WB. Role of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system and proinflammatory mediators in cardiovascular disease. Am J Cardiol. 2006;98(1):121-8.
7. Li EC, Heran BS, Wright JM. Angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors versus angiotensin receptor blockers for primary hypertension. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2014;2014(8):CD009096.
8. McMurray JJ, Packer M, Desai AS, et al. Angiotensin-neprilysin inhibition versus

enalapril in heart failure. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(11):993-1004.
9. Velazquez EJ, Morrow DA, DeVore AD, et al. Angiotensin-Neprilysin Inhibition in Acute Decompensated Heart Failure. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(6):539-548.
10. Greene SJ, Butler J, Albert NM, et al. Medical Therapy for Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction: The CHAMP-HF Registry. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2018;72(4):351-366.
11. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, et al. 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2022;79(17):e263-e421.
12. Pitt B, Zannad F, Remme WJ, et al. The effect of spironolactone on morbidity and mortality in patients with severe heart failure. Randomized Aldactone Evaluation Study Investigators. N Engl J Med. 1999;341(10):709-17.
13. Zannad F, McMurray JJ, Krum H, et al. Eplerenone in patients with systolic heart failure and mild symptoms. N Engl J Med. 2011;364(1):11-21.
14. Filippatos G, Anker SD, Böhm M, et al. A randomized controlled study of finerenone vs. eplerenone in patients with worsening chronic heart failure and diabetes mellitus and/or chronic kidney disease. Eur Heart J. 2016;37(27):2105-14.
15. Jhund PS, Talebi A, Henderson AD, et al. Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists in heart failure: an individual patient level meta-analysis. Lancet. 2024;404(10458):1119-1131.
16. Bakris GL, Agarwal R, Anker SD, et al. Effect of Finerenone on Chronic Kidney Disease Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(23):2219-2229.
17. Nalivaeva NN, Zhuravin IA, Turner AJ. Neprilysin expression and functions in development, maturation and diseases of the central nervous system. CNS Neurol Disord Drug Targets. 2012;11(5):722-40.
18. Maisel AS, Krishnaswamy P, Nowak RM, et al. Rapid measurement of B-type natriuretic peptide in the emergency diagnosis of heart failure. N Engl J Med. 2002;347(3):161-7.
19. Vodovar N, Mebazaa A, Januzzi JL Jr, et al. Evolution of natriuretic peptide biomarkers in heart failure: Implications for clinical care and future drug development. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2020;76(11):1351-5.
20. Verbrugge FH, Dupont M, Steels P, et al. The kidney in heart failure: an update. Heart Fail Rev. 2015;20(1):475-89.
21. Morrow DA, Velazquez EJ, DeVore AD, et al. Clinical Outcomes in Patients With Acute Decompensated Heart Failure Randomly Assigned to Sacubitril/Valsartan or Enalapril in the PIONEER-HF Trial. Circulation. 2019;139(19):2285-2288.
22. Bayliss J, Norell M, Canepa-Anson R, et al. Untreated heart failure: clinical and neuroendocrine effects of introducing diuretics. Br Heart J. 1987;57(1):17-22.
23. Pfisterer M, Buser P, Rickli H, et al. BNP-guided vs symptom-guided heart failure therapy: the Trial of Intensified vs Standard Medical Therapy in Elderly Patients With Congestive Heart Failure (TIME-CHF) randomized trial. JAMA. 2009;301(4):383-92.
24. Felker GM, Anstrom KJ, Adams KF, et al. Effect of Natriuretic Peptide-Guided Therapy on Hospitalization or Cardiovascular Mortality in High-Risk Patients With Heart Failure and Reduced Ejection Fraction: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2017;318(8):713-720.
25. Troughton RW, Frampton CM, Brunner-La Rocca HP, et al. Effect of B-type natri-

uretic peptide-guided treatment of chronic heart failure on total mortality and hospitalization: an individual patient meta-analysis. Eur Heart J. 2014;35(23):1559-67.
26. Packer M, McMurray JJV, Desai AS, et al. Angiotensin receptor neprilysin inhibition compared with enalapril on the risk of clinical progression in surviving patients with heart failure. Circulation. 2015;131(1):54-61.
27. Morrow DA, Januzzi JL Jr. Natriuretic Peptides in Heart Failure: Established Applications and Emerging Roles. JACC Heart Fail. 2021;9(11):782-795.
28. Cowie MR, Struthers AD, Wood DA, et al. Value of natriuretic peptides in assessment of patients with possible new heart failure in primary care. Lancet. 1997;350(9088):1349-53.
29. Wang L, Zhou Y, Chen Y, et al. Network Meta-Analysis Comparing Angiotensin Receptor-Neprilysin Inhibitors, Angiotensin Receptor Blockers, and Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors in Heart Failure With Reduced Ejection Fraction. The American Journal of Cardiology. 2023;187:66-75.
30. Armstrong PW, Pieske B, Anstrom KJ, et al. Vericiguat in Patients with Heart Failure and Reduced Ejection Fraction. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(20):1883-1893.
31. Ronco C, Bellasi A, Di Lullo L. Cardiorenal Syndrome: An Overview. Adv Chronic Kidney Dis. 2018;25(5):382-390.
32. Rangaswami J, Bhalla V, Blair JEA, et al. Cardiorenal Syndrome: Classification, Pathophysiology, Diagnosis, and Treatment Strategies: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2019;139(16):e840-e878.
33. Morris RC Jr, Schmidlin O, Frassetto LA, Sebastian A. Relationship and interaction between sodium and potassium. J Am Coll Nutr. 2006;25(3 Suppl):262S-270S.
34. Eaton SB, Konner M. Paleolithic nutrition. A consideration of its nature and current implications. N Engl J Med. 1985;312(5):283-9.
35. Basile J, Bloch MJ. Analysis of Recent Papers in Hypertension: The STRONG-HF Trial; Economic Modeling Analysis of an Intensive GDMT Optimization Program. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich). 2024;26(1):82-85.
36. Vaduganathan M, Claggett BL, Jhund PS, et al. Estimating lifetime benefits of comprehensive disease-modifying pharmacological therapies in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a comparative analysis of three randomised controlled trials. Lancet. 2020;396(10244):121-128.
37. Parizo JT, Goldhaber-Fiebert JD, Salomon JA, et al. Economic Modeling Analysis of an Intensive GDMT Optimization Program in Hospitalized Heart Failure Patients. Circ Heart Fail. 2024;17(1):e010218.
38. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, et al. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. Lancet. 2020;396(10258):1204-1222.
39. Smith DH, Thorp ML, Gurwitz JH, et al. Chronic kidney disease and outcomes in heart failure with preserved versus reduced ejection fraction: the cardiovascular research network PRESERVE study. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2013;6(3):333-42.
40. deFilippi CR, Seliger SL, Maynard S, Christenson RH. Impact of renal disease on natriuretic peptide testing for diagnosing decompensated heart failure and predicting mortality. Clin Chem. 2007;53(8):1511-9.
41. Johnson RJ, Herrera-Acosta J, Schreiner GF, Rodriguez-Iturbe B. Subtle ac-

quired renal injury as a mechanism of salt-sensitive hypertension. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(12):913-23.
42. Geerling JC, Loewy AD. Central regulation of sodium appetite. Exp Physiol. 2008;93(2):177-209.
43. Leshem M. The Human Penchant for Deranged Salt Balance. In: De Luca Jr LA, Menani JV, Johnson AK, editors. Neurobiology of Body Fluid Homeostasis: Transduction and Integration. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press/Taylor & Francis; 2014. Chapter 4.
44. Shah SJ, Katz DH, Deo RC. Phenotypic spectrum of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. Heart Fail Clin. 2014;10(3):407-18.
45. Drazner MH. The progression of hypertensive heart disease. Circulation. 2011;123(3):327-34.
46. Damman K, Valente MA, Voors AA, O'Connor CM, van Veldhuisen DJ, Hillege HL. Renal impairment, worsening renal function, and outcome in patients with heart failure: an updated meta-analysis. Eur Heart J. 2014;35(7):455-69.
47. Packer M. Uric acid is a biomarker of oxidative stress in the failing heart: lessons learned from trials with allopurinol and SGLT2 inhibitors. J Card Fail. 2020;26(11):977-984.
48. Thomas MC, Brownlee M, Susztak K, et al. Diabetic kidney disease. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2015;1:15018.
49. de Boer RA, Nayor M, deFilippi CR, et al. Association of Cardiovascular Biomarkers With Incident Heart Failure With Preserved and Reduced Ejection Fraction. JAMA Cardiol. 2018;3(3):215-224.
50. Zannad F, Ferreira JP, Pocock SJ, et al. SGLT2 inhibitors in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a meta-analysis of the EMPEROR-Reduced and DAPA-HF trials. Lancet. 2020;396(10254):819-829.
51. Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, et al. Cardiovascular and Renal Outcomes with Empagliflozin in Heart Failure. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(15):1413-1424.
52. Verma S, McMurray JJV. SGLT2 inhibitors and mechanisms of cardiovascular benefit: a state-of-the-art review. Diabetologia. 2018;61(10):2108-2117.
53. Lopaschuk GD, Verma S. Mechanisms of Cardiovascular Benefits of Sodium Glucose Co-Transporter 2 (SGLT2) Inhibitors: A State-of-the-Art Review. JACC Basic Transl Sci. 2020;5(6):632-644.
54. Chatterjee S, Biondi-Zoccai G, Abbate A, et al. Benefits of blockers in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction: network meta-analysis. BMJ. 2013;346:f55.
55. Cleland JGF, Bunting KV, Flather MD, et al. Beta-blockers for heart failure with reduced, mid-range, and preserved ejection fraction: an individual patient-level analysis of double-blind randomized trials. Eur Heart J. 2018;39(1):26-35.
56. Silverman DN, Plante TB, Infeld M, et al. Association of -Blocker Use With Heart Failure Hospitalizations and Cardiovascular Disease Mortality Among Patients With Heart Failure With a Preserved Ejection Fraction: A Secondary Analysis of the TOPCAT Trial. JAMA Netw Open. 2019;2(12):e1916598.
57. Patel RB, Fonarow GC, Greene SJ, et al. Beta-Blocker Use and Heart Failure Outcomes in Mildly Reduced and Preserved Ejection Fraction. JACC Heart Fail. 2023;11(7):893-906.

58. Fu EL, Uijl A, Dekker FW, et al. Association Between -Blocker Use and Mortality/Morbidity in Patients With Heart Failure With Reduced, Midrange, and Preserved Ejection Fraction and Advanced Chronic Kidney Disease. Circ Heart Fail. 2020;13(11):e007180.
59. Watson KE, Dhaliwal K, McMurtry E, et al. Consensus Recommendations for Sick Day Medication Guidance for People With Diabetes, Kidney, or Cardiovascular Disease: A Modified Delphi Process. Am J Kidney Dis. 2023;81(5):564-574.
60. Morrison J, Toumpakaris E, Gungabissoon U, et al. Sick Day Guidance in Patients at Risk of Acute Kidney Injury: A Qualitative Study of Health Care Professional Perspectives. BMJ Open Qual. 2022;11(4):e001954.
61. Whiting P, Morden A, Tomlinson LA, et al. What are the risks and benefits of temporarily discontinuing medications to prevent acute kidney injury? A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open. 2017;7(4):e012674.
62. House AA, Wanner C, Sarnak MJ, et al. Heart failure in chronic kidney disease: conclusions from a Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) Controversies Conference. Kidney Int. 2019;95(6):1304-1317.
63. Sattar N, Lee MMY, Kristensen SL, et al. Cardiovascular, mortality, and kidney outcomes with GLP-1 receptor agonists in patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2021;9(10):653-662.
64. Pfeffer MA, Claggett B, Diaz R, et al. Lixisenatide in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes and Acute Coronary Syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(23):2247-57.
65. Mann JFE, Ørsted DD, Brown-Frandsen K, et al. Liraglutide and Renal Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(9):839-848.
66. Gandhi S, Mosleh W, Myers RB. Hypertonic saline with furosemide for the treatment of acute congestive heart failure: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Cardiol. 2014;173(2):139-45.
67. Griffin M, Soufer A, Goljo E, et al. Real World Use of Hypertonic Saline in Refractory Acute Decompensated Heart Failure: A U.S. Center's Experience. JACC Heart Fail. 2020;8(3):199-208.
68. De Vecchis R, Esposito C, Ariano C, Cantatrione S. Hypertonic saline plus i.v. furosemide improve renal safety profile and clinical outcomes in acute decompensated heart failure: A meta-analysis of the literature. Herz. 2015;40(3):423-35.
69. Hanberg JS, Rao V, Ter Maaten JM, et al. Hypochloremia and Diuretic Resistance in Heart Failure: Mechanistic Insights. Circ Heart Fail. 2016;9(8):e003180.
70. Covic A, Copur S, Tapoi L, et al. Efficiency of Hypertonic Saline in the Management of Decompensated Heart Failure: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Clinical Studies. Am J Cardiovasc Drugs. 2021;21(3):331-347.
71. Paterna S, Di Pasquale P, Parrinello G, et al. Effects of high-dose furosemide and small-volume hypertonic saline solution infusion in comparison with a high dose of furosemide as bolus in refractory congestive heart failure: long-term effects. Am Heart J. 2003;145(3):459-66.
72. Cobo Marcos M, de la Espriella R, Comín-Colet J, et al. Efficacy and safety of hypertonic saline therapy in ambulatory patients with heart failure: The SALT-HF trial. Eur J Heart Fail. 2024;26(8):1844-1853.

73. Rao VS, Ivey-Miranda JB, Cox ZL, et al. Natriuretic Equation to Predict Loop Diuretic Response in Patients With Heart Failure. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2021;77(6):695-708.
74. Testani JM, Brisco MA, Turner JM, et al. Rapid and Highly Accurate Prediction of Poor Loop Diuretic Natriuretic Response in Patients With Heart Failure. Circ Heart Fail. 2016;9(1):e002370.
75. Cox ZL, Hung R, Lenihan DJ, Testani JM. Diuretic Strategies for Loop Diuretic Resistance in Acute Heart Failure: The 3T Trial. JACC Heart Fail. 2020;8(3):157-168.
76. Ter Maaten JM, Beldhuis IE, van der Meer P, et al. Natriuresis-guided diuretic therapy in acute heart failure: a pragmatic randomized trial. Nat Med. 2023;29(10):2625-2632.
77. Wang K, Hu J, Luo T, et al. Effects of Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors and Angiotensin II Receptor Blockers on All-Cause Mortality and Renal Outcomes in Patients with Diabetes and Albuminuria: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Kidney Blood Press Res. 2018;43(3):768-779.
78. Li Y, Li XH, Huang ZJ, et al. Effects of ACEIs Versus ARBs on Proteinuria or Albuminuria in Primary Hypertension: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials. Medicine (Baltimore). 2015;94(39):e1560.
79. Ku E, Bakris G, Johansen KL, et al. Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors or Angiotensin-Receptor Blockers for Advanced Chronic Kidney Disease: A Systematic Review and Retrospective Individual Participant-Level Meta-analysis of Clinical Trials. Ann Intern Med. 2024;177(7):953-963.
80. Anaestheasier.com. Clearance and Elimination: Pharmacokinetics Principles. February 2025. Available at: https://www.anaestheasier.com/clearance-and-volume-of-distribution/. Accessed June 27, 2025.
81. Davis R, Coukell A, McTavish D. Lisinopril: A review of its pharmacology and clinical efficacy in elderly patients. Drugs Aging. 1993;3(4):278-302.
82. Sica DA. Kinetics of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors in renal failure. J Cardiovasc Pharmacol. 1992;20(suppl 10):S13-S20.