

Characterizing Dual Combination Therapy Use in Treatment Escalation of Hypertension: Real-World Evidence from Multinational Cohorts

Yuan Lu, ScD¹; Jing Li, MS²; Xialin Wang, MS²; Jaehyeong Cho, BS^{3*}; Sreemanees Raaj Dorajoo, PhD^{4*}; Mengling Feng, PhD^{5*}; Min-Huei Hsu, MD, PhD^{6*}; Jason C. Hsu, PhD^{7*}; Jiyoung Hwang, MD^{8*}; Usman Iqbal, PharmD, MBA, PhD^{6*}; Chen Zhengfeng Jason, MBBS, MMed, MRCP^{9*}; Jitendra Jonnagaddala, PhD^{10*}; Yu-Chuan Li, MD, PhD^{6*}; Siaw-Teng Liaw, MBBS, PhD^{10*}; Hong-Seok Lim, MD, PhD^{11*}; Kee Yuan Ngiam, MBBS, MRCS, Mmed^{12*}; Phung-Anh Nguyen, PhD^{13*}; Rae Woong Park, MD, PhD^{14*}; Nicole Pratt, PhD^{15*}; Christian Reich, MD, PhD^{16*}; Sang Youl Rhee, MD^{17*}; Selva Muthu Kumaran Sathappan, MSc^{18*}; Seo Jeong Shin, MS^{3*}; Hui Xing Tan, Mtech^{19*}; Seng Chan You, MD, PhD^{20*}; Xin Zhang, MS^{21*}; Harlan Krumholz, MD, MS¹; Marc Suchard, MD, PhD²²; Yun Liu, PhD²¹; Mui Van Zandt, BS²; Hua Xu, PhD²³

* Listed alphabetically

1. Center for Outcomes Research & Evaluation (CORE), Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA
2. Real World Solutions, IQVIA, Durham, NC, USA
3. Department of Biomedical Sciences, Ajou University Graduate School of Medicine, Suwon, Republic of Korea
4. Health Sciences Authority, Singapore and Khoo Teck Puat Hospital, Singapore
5. Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University Health System and National University of Singapore and Institute of Data Science, National University of Singapore, Singapore
6. Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan
7. International PhD Program in Biotech and Healthcare Management, College of Management, Taipei Medical University, Taipei, Taiwan
8. Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, Republic of Korea
9. National University Heart Center and Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, Singapore
10. WHO Collaborating Center on eHealth, School of Population Health, UNSW Sydney, Australia
11. Department of Cardiology, Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, Republic of Korea
12. Group Chief Technology Office, National University Health System, Singapore
13. International Center for Health Information Technology, Taipei Medical University and Taiwan Department of Healthcare Information and Management, School of Health Technology, Ming Chuan University, Taipei, Taiwan.

14. Department of Biomedical Informatics, Ajou University School of Medicine, Suwon, Republic of Korea; Department of Biomedical Sciences, Ajou University Graduate School of Medicine, Suwon, Republic of Korea
15. Quality Use of Medicines and Pharmacy Research Center, Clinical and Health Sciences, University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia
16. Real World Solutions, IQVIA, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
17. Kyung Hee University Medical Center, Seoul, Republic of Korea
18. Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University Health System and National University of Singapore, Singapore
19. Health Sciences Authority, Singapore
20. Department of Preventive Medicine, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Republic of Korea
21. Department of Medical Informatics, School of Biomedical Engineering and Informatics, Nanjing Medical University, Jiangsu, China
22. Department of Biostatistics, UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA
23. The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston, Texas, USA

ABSTRACT

Background: Over one billion adults have hypertension globally, of whom approximately 70% cannot achieve blood pressure control goal with monotherapy alone. Data are lacking on patterns of dual combination therapies prescribed to patients who escalate from monotherapy in routine practice.

Methods: Using eleven electronic health record databases that cover 118 million patients across eight countries/regions, we characterized the initiation of antihypertensive dual combination therapies for patients with hypertension. In each database, we first constructed twelve exposure cohorts of patients who newly initiate dual combination therapy with one of the four most commonly used antihypertensive drug classes (angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor [ACEi] or angiotensin receptor blocker [ARB]; calcium channel blocker [CCB]; beta-blocker; and thiazide or thiazide-like diuretic) after escalating from monotherapy with one of the three alternative classes. Using these cohorts, we then described dual combination therapy utilization, stratified by age, gender, history of cardiovascular diseases (CVD), and country.

Results: Across data sources, we identified 980,648 patients with hypertension initiating dual combination therapy with antihypertensive agents after escalating from monotherapy: 12,541 from Australia, 6,980 from South Korea, 2,096 from Singapore, 7,008 from China, 16,663 from Taiwan, 103,994 from France, 76,082 from Italy, and 754,137 from the United States (US). Significant variations in treatment utilization existed across countries and patient subgroups. In Australia and Singapore, starting an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a CCB was most common while in South Korea, China and Taiwan, starting a CCB monotherapy followed by an ACEi/ARB was most common. In Italy, France, and the US, sequential use of an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a diuretic was most common. Younger patients were more likely to be

prescribed ACEi/ARB followed by either a CCB or a diuretic compared with older patients.

Women were more likely to be prescribed diuretics than an ACEi/ARB or a CCB compared with men. Among patients with history of CVD, ACEi/ARB followed by beta-blocker, and beta-blocker followed by ACEi/ARB were more commonly prescribed.

Conclusion: This is the largest and most comprehensive study characterizing the real-world utilization of dual combination therapies in treating hypertension. Large variation in the transition between monotherapy and dual combination therapy for hypertension was observed across countries. These results highlight the need for future research to identify which second-line dual combination therapy is most effective in practice.

INTRODUCTION

Hypertension is the leading global risk factor for cardiovascular diseases (CVD) and chronic kidney disease, contributing world-wide to over 7 million deaths and 57 million disability-adjusted life-years annually.^{1, 2} In 2015, approximately 1.13 billion adults had hypertension, yet fewer than 30% have achieved blood pressure (BP) control goal.^{3, 4} Notably, the burden of hypertension is particularly salient in the Asian Pacific region as it has 60% of the world's population and is experiencing a rapid increase in prevalence of hypertension in the past decades.^{3, 5}

Approximately 70% of patients with hypertension cannot achieve BP control goal with monotherapy.^{6, 7} Despite the wide use of combination antihypertensive therapy, considerable uncertainty remains regarding the optimal choice for a second agent with which to escalate from monotherapy. Clinical trials lack head-to-head comparisons of second antihypertensive agents added to monotherapy⁸ and only two trials (ACOMPOLISH and COPE) directly compared different combination regimens in hypertensive patients who require two drugs.⁹⁻¹¹ These trials, however, provided comparisons between only a few agents, not drug classes, included primarily patients from Western countries, and did not systematically assess heterogeneity in different patient subgroups. The absence of high-quality evidence has limited the ability of clinical guidelines to provide evidence-based recommendations about the preferred choice of the second medication for treatment escalation.^{12, 13} A better understanding of the prescription patterns of dual combination therapy in treatment escalation of hypertension, with attention to relevant subgroups of patients defined by demographic and clinical factors, can lay a foundation for future studies of the comparative effectiveness of different dual antihypertensive combinations.

Accordingly, we conducted a large-scale observational study within the Observational Health Data Science and Informatics (OHDSI) collaborative community to characterize real-world utilization of dual antihypertensive combination therapies for treatment escalation among people with hypertension, using data from eleven electronic health record (EHR) databases across eight countries/regions. We employed a systematic, open science, evidence generation approach for high-quality observational research based on the Large-Scale Evidence Generation and Evaluation across a Network of Databases for Hypertension (LEGEND-HTN) study.¹⁴⁻¹⁶

METHODS

Data Source

We examined patient records from eleven EHR databases mapped to the Observational Medical Outcome Partnership (OMOP) Common Data Model (CDM) version 5.3 from participating research partners across the OHDSI community. These data sources included: IQVIA Longitudinal Patient Database (LPD) Australia (3,101,500 subjects) and Electronic Practice based Research Network 2019 Linked Dataset from South Western Sydney Local Health District (ePBRN SWSLHD, 139,346 subjects) from Australia, Ajou University School of Medicine (AUSOM, 3,109,677 subjects) and Kyung Hee University Hospital (KHMC, 2,010,456 subjects) from South Korea, Khoo Teck Puat Hospital (KTPH, 290,074 subjects) and National University Hospital (NUH, 750,270 subjects) from Singapore, Jiangsu Province Hospital (6,230,000 subjects) from China, Taipei Medical University Clinical Research Database (TMUCRD) (3,659,572 subjects) from Taiwan, IQVIA LPD France (18,118,000 subjects) from France, IQVIA LPD Italy (2,209,600 subjects) from Italy, and IQVIA US Ambulatory EMR

(78,526,000 subjects) from the United States (US, **Appendix Table 1**). These data partners altogether monitor over 118 million patients from eight countries and regions across the world.

We executed this study through the federated network model of OHDSI, where access to data and statistical analyses were executed inside each data partner's institution using the OHDSI common toolstack.^{14, 15, 17-19} We prespecified the entire analytical process before execution and collected aggregated results from data partners for interpretation. Each data partner obtained the necessary Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or exemption. Previous studies have demonstrated that this process could be successfully applied to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of first-line antihypertensive monotherapies.^{16, 20, 21}

Study Population

The study population consisted of adult patients (≥ 18 years) with prior antihypertensive monotherapy who newly initiate escalated treatment with one of the 56 drug ingredients (**Appendix Table 2**) that comprise four major drug classes from 2000 to 2019. For these patients, we constructed 12 non-overlapping, exposure cohorts. Each cohort contains new-users of one of the four dual combination drug classes after escalating from monotherapy with one of the three alternative classes (**Appendix Table 3**).

New-user cohort design is advocated as the primary design choice for comparative effectiveness research.²²⁻²⁴ By identifying patients who start a new drug for treatment escalation and using initiation of the second drug as the start of follow-up, the new-user design models a randomized controlled trial (RCT) where the randomized intervention commences upon treatment escalation at the patient's index visit.

Specifically, cohort entry (index date) for each patient was their date of prescription initiating the second drug containing the RxNorm ingredient concept codes of the four major drug classes from 2000 to 2019. Inclusion criteria for patients based on the index date included: 1) at least one hypertension diagnosis any time in the patient’s record before the index date; 2) at least one year of observation time before the index date (washout period to improve new-user sensitivity); 3) at least one prescription of an antihypertensive agent and no prescriptions for any other agent any time before the index date; 4) at least 30 days between the initiation of first drug class and the initiation of second drug class on the index date (**Appendix Figure 1**). We purposefully did not exclude patients with a history of cardiovascular events (CVD), enabling us to report drug utilizations for individuals with and without history of CVD. History of CVD was defined by at least one diagnosis code for arteriosclerotic vascular disease, cerebrovascular disease, ischemic heart disease, or peripheral vascular disease any time on or prior to the index date. Continuous drug exposures were constructed by allowing fewer than 30-day gaps between prescriptions.

Cohort Development and Validation

We developed all exposure cohorts above using OHDSI’s open source ATLAS²⁵ platform that enables researchers to define cohorts based on drug exposures, diagnoses, procedures and patient characteristics through a user-friendly interface. We based drug exposure on occurrences of RxNorm codes in the appropriate OMOP CDM tables and built diagnosis concept sets, such as “hypertension diagnosis,” as SNOMED term collections in the appropriate OMOP CDM tables. ATLAS enforced complete transparency in cohort definitions by

automatically generating human- and computer-readable representations. We used previously validated concept definitions for hypertension diagnosis and antihypertensive agents.¹⁶

We further validated exposure cohorts and aggregated drug utilization using comprehensive cohort characterization tools against data sources through the OHDSI's CohortDiagnostic package.²⁶ For each cohort and data source, this package systematically generated incidence new-user rates (stratified by age, gender, and calendar year), cohort characteristics (all comorbidities, drug use, health utilization) and the actual codes found in the patient records triggering the various rules in the cohort definitions. This approach allowed us to better understand the heterogeneity of source coding for exposures and health outcomes as well as the impact of various inclusion criteria on overall cohort counts.

Statistical Analysis

For each database, we described the overall utilization in dual combination therapies and evaluated treatment variation in patient groups by age (18-44 / 45-64 / ≥ 65 years), gender, history of CVD, and country. Specifically, we calculated the proportion of users of each dual combination regiment. We compared the distribution of treatment utilization between patient subgroup defined by age, gender, and history of CVD using Chi-squared tests or t-tests. A pre-specified 2-sided p-value of < 0.05 will be used to indicate statistical significance. Finally, we characterized treatment pathways for hypertension (i.e., the ordered sequence of medications that a patient is prescribed) in diverse populations using the Sunburst plots. The sequences included changes in medication and additions of medication.

RESULTS

Utilization of dual combination therapies in treatment escalation

Among 118 million patients identified across eleven data sources, we found 980,648 patients with hypertension being newly initiating dual combinations of antihypertensive agents after escalating from monotherapy: 12,541 from Australia, 6,980 from South Korea, 2,096 from Singapore, 7,008 from China, 16,663 from Taiwan, 103,994 from France, 76,082 from Italy, and 754,137 from the US (**Figure 1**). Patient ages varied across data sources, but most patients clustered around the ages of 45 to 64 years old. The proportion of women was similar as that of men.

We observed significant variation in treatment utilization across countries. Starting an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a CCB was the most commonly prescribed combination in Australia (proportion of users ranged from 45.2-45.9% across databases) and Singapore (12.9-23.2%), while starting a CCB monotherapy followed by an ACEi/ARB was most common in South Korea (19.7-23.3%) and China (38.3%). Sequential use of an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a diuretic was most common in Italy (28.5%), France (27.4%), and the US (25.2%). ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a beta-blocker, or beta-blocker monotherapy followed by an ACEi/ARB were more commonly prescribed in the US and Italy than in other countries. CCB monotherapy followed by a beta-blocker, or beta-blocker monotherapy followed by a CCB were more commonly prescribed in the South Korea. Certain drug combinations, including CCB or beta-blocker monotherapy followed by a diuretic, or diuretic monotherapy followed by a CCB or a beta-blocker were among the least frequently prescribed combinations across all countries (proportion of users ranged from 0.6% to 1.2%).

Figure 2 shows the proportion of users of each dual combination regimen by age and sex. Most (33-57%) of the patients who were starting an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a CCB or starting an ACEi/ARB followed by a diuretic were between 45 and 64 years of age, whereas most (28-73%) of those who were starting an CCB followed by a diuretic, starting a CCB followed by a beta-blocker, or starting an ACEi/ARB followed by a beta-Blocker were in age of 65 years or older. Compared with men, women were more likely to be prescribed a diuretic monotherapy followed by an ACEi/ARB (38-74%) or a beta-blocker followed by a diuretic (19-73%). Men were more likely to be prescribed an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a beta-blocker (47-63%), or a beta-blocker followed by an ACEi/ARB (39-58%). **Figure 3** reports the proportion of users of each dual combination regimen by history of CVD. Over 80% of the hypertensive patients included in our analysis did not have history of CVD. Among patients with history of CVD, starting an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a beta-blocker, or starting a beta-blocker followed by an ACEi/ARB were the most commonly prescribed dual combinations.

Treatment pathway for hypertension

Tracking medication changes for these 980,648 patients over time revealed a diverse array of treatment trajectories across countries. **Figure 4** illustrates the treatment pathways for hypertensive agents across the largest nine data sources. The most common first-line therapy of patients in Australia and Singapore was an ACEi/ARB, whereas the most common first-line therapy of patients in South Korea was a CCB. The proportion of patients who were prescribed with dual therapy differed between countries. There were more patients in Australia who were initiated with dual therapy than patients in South Korea. Most patients (84.1%) in China initiated with a CCB or an ACEi/ARB. The commonly prescribed agents in the US, Italy and France were an ACEi/ARB and a diuretic.

DISCUSSION

This is the first study to describe the real-world utilization of antihypertensive dual combination therapies for treatment escalation across eight countries, including five Asia Pacific countries and regions. We observed heterogeneity in the use of dual combination therapies as recorded in EHR and administrative claim data sources, identifying a total of 980,648 patients with hypertension and dual combination therapy in Australia, South Korea, Singapore, China, Taiwan, France, Italy and the United States. These findings provide insight into the current prescription patterns of antihypertensive agents and are critical to guide the real-world application of treatment decision pathways for patients with hypertension.

Our study extends the prior literature substantially as it is the largest multisite analysis of real-world evidence to address dual combination therapies used in treatment escalation of hypertension. Through the OHDSI network (particularly the OHDSI APAC network), we take advantage of disparate health databases drawn from different sources and across a range of countries and practice settings. These large-scale and unfiltered populations better represent real-world practice than the restricted study populations from RCTs and population-based cohort studies. This first descriptive analysis of the OHDSI APAC collaborative demonstrates that coordinated efforts can overcome many of the logistic and methodological challenges associated with observational study designs. The profiles of treatment pathways are based on more than 118 million patient records. We successfully addressed patient privacy and diverse research regulatory constraints, adopted a consistent data model, and distributed queries across a broad population.

There are several possible explanations to our findings. The observed prescription pattern of antihypertensive agents is, in part, a reflection of hypertension guidelines issued in the past few decades. An ACEi/ARB is the most commonly prescribed drug class across all data sources as it is recommended as a first-line treatment option by most guidelines.^{12, 27-31} The finding of CCBs being the predominant prescribed drug class in the Chinese data source is consistent with a previous national study in China,³² which may reflect the endorsement of the clinical guideline in China and the lower cost of CCBs compared with other antihypertensive drugs.³¹ Despite beta-blockers being less effective,^{33, 34} their high use in South Korea and US is consistent with nationwide studies in those countries that revealed the use of beta-blocker monotherapy for hypertensive patients remains prevalent.^{16, 29, 35} Among patients with a history of CVD, the common use of an ACEi/ARB or a beta-blocker stands consistent with guidelines for secondary prevention of CVD.³⁶⁻³⁸ Finally, our study corroborates the previous work by OHDSI researchers, which revealed significant heterogeneity in treatment pathways for several chronic diseases across data sources.^{16, 20, 39}

Our findings also have important public health implications. The heterogeneity of treatment pathways of hypertension across countries and sites reflects the failure of the field to converge on effective consistent treatment escalation algorithm for hypertension. Current guidelines do not provide recommendations about the preferred choice of the second agent added to monotherapy due to the lack of evidence from RCT,^{12, 27-31} and the large variation observed in clinical practice may reflect a trial-and-error approach to intensify treatment for hypertension. This finding highlights the need to generate robust real-world evidence on the efficacy and safety of different combinations of antihypertensive agents. While RCTs remain a key tool for high-quality clinical efficacy estimates in controlled settings, real-world observational studies can help

to fill evidence gaps where large-scale RCTs are not feasible, such as in the study of second- and third-line hypertension treatments.

Several limitations need to be considered when interpreting the results of this study. First, our study was based on routinely collected real-world data, where misclassification of diseases and therapies may be present. We only included patients who had a clinical diagnosis of hypertension; therefore, patients without a coded diagnosis would have been excluded even if they had elevated blood pressure that met the criteria of hypertension. Second, treatment misclassification is possible given that participating data sources varied in their capture of drugs, from hospital billing records, prescription orders, or dispensing data. Third, the lack of information on medication is another limitation as this is important information that may add value to the understanding of prescribing trends. Fourth, this study only describes prescription pattern of antihypertensive medications and we do not have information about medication compliance among patients with hypertension. Finally, our study is limited to eight countries and regions, of which the findings may not be generalizable to other countries of the world.

In conclusion, this is the largest and most diverse study characterizing the real-world utilizations of dual combination therapies in treatment escalation of hypertension. Large variation in drug utilization was observed in routine practice, highlighting the need for future research on the safety and efficacy of the more commonly used treatments.

Acknowledgement:

The authors appreciate Patrick Ryan and George Hripcsak for their inputs into this paper.

Disclosure:

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: JL, XW, CR MVZ are employees of IQVIA. YL reports grants from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (K12HL138037) and the Yale Center for Implementation Science. She was a recipient of a research agreement, through Yale University, from the Shenzhen Center for Health Information for work to advance intelligent disease prevention and health promotion. HMK received expenses and/or personal fees from UnitedHealth, IBM Watson Health, Element Science, Aetna, Facebook, the Siegfried and Jensen Law Firm, Arnold and Porter Law Firm, Martin/Baughman Law Firm, F-Prime, and the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases in Beijing. He was a co-founder of Refactor Health and HugoHealth and had grants and/or contracts from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Medtronic, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Johnson & Johnson, and the Shenzhen Center for Health Information. MAS reports grants from US National Science Foundation, grants from US National Institutes of Health, grants from IQVIA, personal fees from Janssen Research and Development. SCY reports grants from Korean Ministry of Health & Welfare, grants from Korean Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy. RWP reports grants from Korean Ministry of Health & Welfare, grants from Korean Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy. The other co-authors report no potential competing interests.

Ethical approval:

All the data partners received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or exemption.

Data Source	IRB Approval
IQVIA LPD Australia	Use of de-identified IQVIA data sources was deemed not human subject research by the IQVIA internal review committee and approved for OHDSI network studies.
ePBRN SWSLHD 2019 Linked Dataset	Use of Australia ePBRN SWSLHD data source was approved by the UNSW Sydney and South Western Sydney Local Health District Human Research Ethics Committees (Project number: 2019/PID05368).
Korea Ajou University School of Medicine (AUSOM) CDM	The Korean Bioethics Act does not require an IRB review for retrospective observational studies using common data model in distributed research networks.
Korea CDM of Kyung Hee University Hospital	The Korean Bioethics Act does not require an IRB review for retrospective observational studies using common data model in distributed research networks.
Khoo Teck Puat Hospital (KTPH)	Use of KTPH data source was reviewed by National Health Group Domain Specific Review Board and approved the request for waiver of informed consent (Project number: 2017/00995).
National University Hospital (NUH)	Use of NUH data source was reviewed by National Health Group Domain Specific Review Board and was determined that it qualifies for exemption because the analysis involved a dataset without identifiers (Project number: 2021/00125).
China Jiangsu Province Hospital	Use of Jiangsu Province Hospital data source was reviewed and approved by the Nanjing Medical University Institutional Review Board.

Taiwan Taipei Medical University Clinical Research Database (TMUCRD)	Use of TMUCRD data has been approved by the TMU-Joint Institutional Review Board (Project number: TMU-JIRB N202011003).
IQVIA Ambulatory EMR	Use of de-identified IQVIA data sources was deemed not human subject research by the IQVIA internal review committee and approved for OHDSI network studies.
IQVIA LPD France	Use of de-identified IQVIA data sources was deemed not human subject research by the IQVIA internal review committee and approved for OHDSI network studies.
IQVIA LPD Italy	Use of de-identified IQVIA data sources was deemed not human subject research by the IQVIA internal review committee and approved for OHDSI network studies.

Funding sources:

This study was supported by the National Research Foundation Singapore under its AI Singapore Programme (Award Number: AISG-GC-2019-002), National Medical Research Council (NMRC) under the Open Fund - Large Collaborative Grant (OF-LCG) - NMRC/OFLCG/001/2017 and Center Grant (CG) schemes - NMRC/CG/C016/2017, the Bio Industrial Strategic Technology Development Program (20003883, 20005021), the Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy (MOTIE, Korea), a grant from the Korea Health Technology R&D Project through the Korea Health Industry Development Institute (KHIDI), the Ministry of Health & Welfare, Republic of Korea (grant number: HR16C0001), the Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC Grant Number: APP1192469).

Data Availability:

All aggregated data and executable source code are available through GitHub at: github.com/ohdsi-studies.

Figure 1. Patient counts of 12 exposure cohorts from 11 committed data sources*

Cohort #	Dual combination	Data Sources										
		Australia		Korea		Singapore		China	Taiwan	France	Italy	United States
		Australia LPD	ePBRN SWSLHD	Ajou University	KHMC	SG_KTPH	SG_NUH	Jiangsu	TMUCRD	France LPD	Italy LPD	US AmbEMR
1	ACEi/ARB + B-blocker	1,184	268	392	49	105	144	46	1,464	11,236	11,844	110,579
2	ACEi/ARB + CCB	4,254	698	1,216	147	216	439	3,127	2,812	22,523	14,628	95,284
3	ACEi/ARB + Diuretic	2,066	508	474	12	16	31	111	8	22,399	16,988	123,940
4	B-blocker + ACEi/ARB	717	210	386	98	68	128	26	2,357	11,116	8,264	106,380
5	B-blocker + CCB	159	54	614	199	97	243	19	2,484	5,972	2,755	41,388
6	B-blocker + Diuretic	27	17	51	10	5	7	1	1	4,316	2,967	36,303
7	CCB + ACEi/ARB	1,339	246	1,487	191	191	133	3,312	5,015	15,749	5,841	54,297
8	CCB + B-blocker	190	41	814	217	120	101	34	2,518	3,866	2,475	30,593
9	CCB + Diuretic	74	28	259	15	11	6	78	4	1,660	1,103	21,108
10	Diuretic + ACEi/ARB	251	94	154	2	8	7	114	-	3,281	5,749	84,275
11	Diuretic + B-blocker	27	14	43	5	1	8	-	-	779	1,929	27,422
12	Diuretic + CCB	50	25	139	6	4	7	140	-	1,097	1,539	22,568


* ACEi/ARB + B-Blocker denotes starting an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a beta-blocker.







ACEi = angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB = angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor; B-blocker = beta- blocker; CCB = calcium channel blocker.

Figure 2. Proportion of users of each dual combination of antihypertensive agents by (A) age and (B) gender*





* ACEi/ARB + B-Blocker denotes starting an ACEi/ARB monotherapy followed by a beta-blocker.

(A) By Age





(B) By Sex












Figure 3. Proportion of users of each dual combination of antihypertensive agents by history of cardiovascular diseases











Figure 4. Treatment pathway of hypertension


(A) IQVIA LPD Australia

Target Cohort

[APAC HTN] APAC overall population

- Target cohort count: 78,840
- Persons with pathways count: 69,213
- Persons with pathways portion: 87.8%

- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis




(B) Australia ePBRN SWSLHD

Target Cohort

[APAC HTN] APAC overall population (1)

- Target cohort count: 10,964
- Persons with pathways count: 9,057
- Persons with pathways portion: 82.6%

- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis




(C) Korea Ajou University

Target Cohort

[APAC HTN] APAC overall population

- Target cohort count: 68,431
- Persons with pathways count: 52,250
- Persons with pathways portion: 76.4%

- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis




(D) Korea KHMC

Target Cohort

[APAC HTN] APAC overall population

- Target cohort count: 34,248
- Persons with pathways count: 13,146
- Persons with pathways portion: 38.4%


- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis



(E) Singapore NUH

Target Cohort
 [APAC HTN] APAC overall population
 Target cohort count: 16,774
 Persons with pathways count: 14,707
 Persons with pathways portion: 87.7%


- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis



(F) Singapore KTPH

Target Cohort
 [APAC HTN] APAC overall population
 • Target cohort count: 10,582
 • Persons with pathways count: 8,874
 • Persons with pathways portion: 83.9%


- Event Cohorts**
- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
 - [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
 - [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
 - [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis



(G) China Jiangsu Province Hospital

Target Cohort
 [APAC HTN] APAC overall population
 • Target cohort count: 123,083
 • Persons with pathways count: 64,188
 • Persons with pathways portion: 52.2%


- Event Cohorts**
- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
 - [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
 - [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
 - [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis



(H) IQVIA LPD France

Target Cohort
 [APAC HTN] APAC overall population
 • Target cohort count: 898,482
 • Persons with pathways count: 771,390
 • Persons with pathways portion: 85.9%

- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis




(I) IQVIA US AmbEMR

Target Cohort

[APAC HTN] APAC overall population

- Target cohort count: 6,000,244
- Persons with pathways count: 5,166,727
- Persons with pathways portion: 86.1%

- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis



(J) IQVIA Italy LPD


Target Cohort

[APAC HTN] APAC overall population

- Target cohort count: 535,157
- Persons with pathways count: 283,301
- Persons with pathways portion: 52.9%

Event Cohorts

- [APAC HTN] Beta-blocker use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] CCB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] ACEI/ARB use after hypertension diagnosis
- [APAC HTN] Diuretic use after hypertension diagnosis



Reference:

1. Global Burden of Metabolic Risk Factors for Chronic Diseases C. Cardiovascular disease, chronic kidney disease, and diabetes mortality burden of cardiometabolic risk factors from 1980 to 2010: a comparative risk assessment. *The lancet Diabetes & endocrinology*. 2014;2:634-47.
2. Forouzanfar MH, Liu P, Roth GA, Ng M, Biryukov S, Marczak L, Alexander L, Estep K, Hassen Abate K, Akinyemiju TF, Ali R, Alvis-Guzman N, Azzopardi P, Banerjee A, Barnighausen T, Basu A, Bekele T, Bennett DA, Biadgilign S, Catala-Lopez F, Feigin VL, Fernandes JC, Fischer F, Gebru AA, Gona P, Gupta R, Hankey GJ, Jonas JB, Judd SE, Khang YH, Khosravi A, Kim YJ, Kimokoti RW, Kokubo Y, Kolte D, Lopez A, Lotufo PA, Malekzadeh R, Melaku YA, Mensah GA, Misganaw A, Mokdad AH, Moran AE, Nawaz H, Neal B, Ngalesoni FN, Ohkubo T, Pourmalek F, Rafay A, Rai RK, Rojas-Rueda D, Sampson UK, Santos IS, Sawhney M, Schutte AE, Sepanlou SG, Shifa GT, Shiue I, Tedla BA, Thrift AG, Tonelli M, Truelsen T, Tsilimiparis N, Ukwaja KN, Uthman OA, Vasankari T, Venketasubramanian N, Vlassov VV, Vos T, Westerman R, Yan LL, Yano Y, Yonemoto N, Zaki ME and Murray CJ. Global Burden of Hypertension and Systolic Blood Pressure of at Least 110 to 115 mm Hg, 1990-2015. *Jama*. 2017;317:165-182.
3. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration. Worldwide trends in blood pressure from 1975 to 2015: a pooled analysis of 1479 population-based measurement studies with 19.1 million participants. *Lancet*. 2017;389:37-55.
4. Mills KT, Bundy JD, Kelly TN, Reed JE, Kearney PM, Reynolds K, Chen J and He J. Global Disparities of Hypertension Prevalence and Control: A Systematic Analysis of Population-Based Studies From 90 Countries. *Circulation*. 2016;134:441-50.
5. Martiniuk AL, Lee CM, Lawes CM, Ueshima H, Suh I, Lam TH, Gu D, Feigin V, Jamrozik K and Ohkubo T. Hypertension: its prevalence and population-attributable fraction for mortality from cardiovascular disease in the Asia-Pacific region. *Journal of hypertension*. 2007;25:73-79.
6. Wald DS, Law M, Morris JK, Bestwick JP and Wald NJ. Combination therapy versus monotherapy in reducing blood pressure: meta-analysis on 11,000 participants from 42 trials. *Am J Med*. 2009;122:290-300.
7. Salam A, Kanukula R, Atkins E, Wang X, Islam S, Kishore SP, Jaffe MG, Patel A and Rodgers A. Efficacy and safety of dual combination therapy of blood pressure-lowering drugs as initial treatment for hypertension: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of hypertension*. 2019;37:1768-1774.
8. Reboussin DM, Allen NB, Griswold ME, Guallar E, Hong Y, Lackland DT, Miller EPR, 3rd, Polonsky T, Thompson-Paul AM and Vupputuri S. Systematic Review for the 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2018;138:e595-e616.

9. Jamerson K, Weber MA, Bakris GL, Dahlof B, Pitt B, Shi V, Hester A, Gupte J, Gatlin M, Velazquez EJ and Investigators AT. Benazepril plus amlodipine or hydrochlorothiazide for hypertension in high-risk patients. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2008;359:2417-28.
10. Bakris G, Briasoulis A, Dahlof B, Jamerson K, Weber MA, Kelly RY, Hester A, Hua T, Zappe D, Pitt B and Investigators A. Comparison of benazepril plus amlodipine or hydrochlorothiazide in high-risk patients with hypertension and coronary artery disease. *The American journal of cardiology*. 2013;112:255-9.
11. Ogihara T, Matsuzaki M, Umemoto S, Rakugi H, Matsuoka H, Shimada K, Higaki J, Ito S, Kamiya A and Suzuki H. Combination therapy for hypertension in the elderly: a sub-analysis of the Combination Therapy of Hypertension to Prevent Cardiovascular Events (COPE) Trial. *Hypertension Research*. 2012;35:441-448.
12. Whelton PK, Carey RM, Aronow WS, Casey DE, Jr., Collins KJ, Dennison Himmelfarb C, DePalma SM, Gidding S, Jamerson KA, Jones DW, MacLaughlin EJ, Muntner P, Ovbiagele B, Smith SC, Jr., Spencer CC, Stafford RS, Taler SJ, Thomas RJ, Williams KA, Sr., Williamson JD and Wright JT, Jr. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2018;138:e426-e483.
13. Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, Clement DL, Coca A, de Simone G, Dominiczak A, Kahan T, Mahfoud F, Redon J, Ruilope L, Zanchetti A, Kerins M, Kjeldsen SE, Kreutz R, Laurent S, Lip GYH, McManus R, Narkiewicz K, Ruschitzka F, Schmieder RE, Shlyakhto E, Tsioufis C, Aboyans V, Desormais I and Group ESCSD. 2018 ESC/ESH Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension. *European heart journal*. 2018;39:3021-3104.
14. Schuemie MJ, Ryan PB, Pratt N, Chen R, You SC, Krumholz HM, Madigan D, Hripcsak G and Suchard MA. Principles of Large-scale Evidence Generation and Evaluation across a Network of Databases (LEGEND). *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2020;27:1331-1337.
15. Schuemie MJ, Ryan PB, Pratt N, Chen R, You SC, Krumholz HM, Madigan D, Hripcsak G and Suchard MA. Large-scale evidence generation and evaluation across a network of databases (LEGEND): assessing validity using hypertension as a case study. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2020;27:1268-1277.
16. Suchard MA, Schuemie MJ, Krumholz HM, You SC, Chen R, Pratt N, Reich CG, Duke J, Madigan D, Hripcsak G and Ryan PB. Comprehensive comparative effectiveness and safety of first-line antihypertensive drug classes: a systematic, multinational, large-scale analysis. *Lancet*. 2019;394:1816-1826.
17. Hripcsak G, Duke JD, Shah NH, Reich CG, Huser V, Schuemie MJ, Suchard MA, Park RW, Wong IC, Rijnbeek PR, van der Lei J, Pratt N, Norén GN, Li YC, Stang PE, Madigan D and Ryan PB. Observational Health Data Sciences and Informatics (OHDSI): Opportunities for Observational Researchers. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2015;216:574-8.
18. Suchard MA, Simpson SE, Zorych I, Ryan P and Madigan D. Massive parallelization of serial inference algorithms for a complex generalized linear model. *ACM Trans Model Comput Simul*. 2013;23.

19. Schuemie MJ, Ryan PB, Hripcsak G, Madigan D and Suchard MA. Improving reproducibility by using high-throughput observational studies with empirical calibration. *Philos Trans A Math Phys Eng Sci.* 2018;376.
20. You SC, Jung S, Swerdel JN, Ryan PB, Schuemie MJ, Suchard MA, Lee S, Cho J, Hripcsak G, Park RW and Park S. Comparison of First-Line Dual Combination Treatments in Hypertension: Real-World Evidence from Multinational Heterogeneous Cohorts. *Korean Circ J.* 2020;50:52-68.
21. Chen R, Suchard MA, Krumholz HM, Schuemie MJ, Shea S, Duke J, Pratt N, Reich CG, Chan You S, Ryan P and Hripcsak G. Comparative first-line effectiveness and safety of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers for hypertension: a multinational cohort study. *Hypertension.* 2021;In press.
22. Schneeweiss S. A basic study design for expedited safety signal evaluation based on electronic healthcare data. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf.* 2010;19:858-68.
23. Gagne JJ, Fireman B, Ryan PB, Maclure M, Gerhard T, Toh S, Rassen JA, Nelson JC and Schneeweiss S. Design considerations in an active medical product safety monitoring system. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf.* 2012;21 Suppl 1:32-40.
24. Johnson ES, Bartman BA, Briesacher BA, Fleming NS, Gerhard T, Kornegay CJ, Nourjah P, Sauer B, Schumock GT, Sedrakyan A, Sturmer T, West SL and Schneeweiss S. The incident user design in comparative effectiveness research. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf.* 2013;22:1-6.
25. Observational Health Data Sciences and Informatics. ATLAS. Accessed August 19, 2020. <https://www.ohdsi.org/web/atlas>.
26. Rao G, Schuemie M, Ryan P and Weaver J. CohortDiagnostics. Available from: <https://ohdsi.github.io/CohortDiagnostics/>. 2020.
27. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, Cushman WC, Green LA, Izzo Jr JL, Jones DW, Materson BJ, Oparil S and Wright Jr JT. The seventh report of the joint national committee on prevention, detection, evaluation, and treatment of high blood pressure: the JNC 7 report. *Jama.* 2003;289:2560-2571.
28. James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, Cushman WC, Dennison-Himmelfarb C, Handler J, Lackland DT, LeFevre ML, MacKenzie TD, Ogedegbe O, Smith SC, Jr., Svetkey LP, Taler SJ, Townsend RR, Wright JT, Jr., Narva AS and Ortiz E. 2014 evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the Eighth Joint National Committee (JNC 8). *Jama.* 2014;311:507-20.
29. Larson S, Cho MC, Tsioufis K and Yang E. 2018 Korean Society of Hypertension Guideline for the Management of Hypertension: A Comparison of American, European, and Korean Blood Pressure Guidelines. *European heart journal.* 2020;41:1384-1386.
30. Williams B, Mancia G, Spiering W, Agabiti Rosei E, Azizi M, Burnier M, Clement D, Coca A, De Simone G, Dominiczak A, Kahan T, Mahfoud F, Redon J, Ruilope L, Zanchetti A, Kerins M, Kjeldsen S, Kreutz R, Laurent S, Lip GYH, McManus R, Narkiewicz K, Ruschitzka F, Schmieder R, Shlyakhto E, Tsioufis K, Aboyans V, Desormais I and List of authors/Task Force m. 2018 Practice Guidelines for the management of arterial hypertension of the European

Society of Hypertension and the European Society of Cardiology: ESH/ESC Task Force for the Management of Arterial Hypertension. *Journal of hypertension*. 2018;36:2284-2309.

31. Joint Committee for Guideline R. 2018 Chinese Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension-A report of the Revision Committee of Chinese Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Hypertension. *J Geriatr Cardiol*. 2019;16:182-241.

32. Su M, Zhang Q, Bai X, Wu C, Li Y, Mossialos E, Mensah GA, Masoudi FA, Lu J, Li X, Salas-Vega S, Zhang A, Lu Y, Nasir K, Krumholz HM and Jiang L. Availability, cost, and prescription patterns of antihypertensive medications in primary health care in China: a nationwide cross-sectional survey. *Lancet*. 2017;390:2559-2568.

33. Wiysonge CS, Bradley HA, Volmink J, Mayosi BM and Opie LH. Beta-blockers for hypertension. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;1:CD002003.

34. Chan You S, Krumholz HM, Suchard MA, Schuemie MJ, Hripcsak G, Chen R, Shea S, Duke J, Pratt N, Reich CG, Madigan D, Ryan PB, Woong Park R and Park S. Comprehensive Comparative Effectiveness and Safety of First-Line beta-Blocker Monotherapy in Hypertensive Patients: A Large-Scale Multicenter Observational Study. *Hypertension*. 2021;77:1528-1538.

35. Derington CG, King JB, Herrick JS, Shimbo D, Kronish IM, Saseen JJ, Muntner P, Moran AE and Bress AP. Trends in Antihypertensive Medication Monotherapy and Combination Use Among US Adults, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2005-2016. *Hypertension*. 2020;75:973-981.

36. Smith SC, Jr., Benjamin EJ, Bonow RO, Braun LT, Creager MA, Franklin BA, Gibbons RJ, Grundy SM, Hiratzka LF, Jones DW, Lloyd-Jones DM, Minissian M, Mosca L, Peterson ED, Sacco RL, Spertus J, Stein JH, Taubert KA, World Heart F and the Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses A. AHA/ACCF Secondary Prevention and Risk Reduction Therapy for Patients with Coronary and other Atherosclerotic Vascular Disease: 2011 update: a guideline from the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology Foundation. *Circulation*. 2011;124:2458-73.

37. Levine GN, Bates ER, Bittl JA, Brindis RG, Fihn SD, Fleisher LA, Granger CB, Lange RA, Mack MJ, Mauri L, Mehran R, Mukherjee D, Newby LK, O'Gara PT, Sabatine MS, Smith PK and Smith SC, Jr. 2016 ACC/AHA Guideline Focused Update on Duration of Dual Antiplatelet Therapy in Patients With Coronary Artery Disease: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines: An Update of the 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI Guideline for Percutaneous Coronary Intervention, 2011 ACCF/AHA Guideline for Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery, 2012 ACC/AHA/ACP/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Patients With Stable Ischemic Heart Disease, 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for the Management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction, 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline for the Management of Patients With Non-ST-Elevation Acute Coronary Syndromes, and 2014 ACC/AHA Guideline on Perioperative Cardiovascular Evaluation and Management of Patients Undergoing Noncardiac Surgery. *Circulation*. 2016;134:e123-55.

38. Ibanez B, James S, Agewall S, Antunes MJ, Bucciarelli-Ducci C, Bueno H, Caforio ALP, Crea F, Goudevenos JA, Halvorsen S, Hindricks G, Kastrati A, Lenzen MJ, Prescott E, Roffi M, Valgimigli M, Varenhorst C, Vranckx P, Widimsky P and Group ESCSD. 2017 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment

elevation: The Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *European heart journal*. 2018;39:119-177.

39. Hripesak G, Ryan PB, Duke JD, Shah NH, Park RW, Huser V, Suchard MA, Schuemie MJ, DeFalco FJ, Perotte A, Banda JM, Reich CG, Schilling LM, Matheny ME, Meeker D, Pratt N and Madigan D. Characterizing treatment pathways at scale using the OHDSI network. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2016;113:7329-36.