Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/bj5ryn69

ACE INHIBITOR-INDUCED ANATOMICAL REMODELING AND MASS REGRESSION OF THE LEFT VENTRICLE IN CKD-ASSOCIATED HYPERTENSION: A COMPREHENSIVE NARRATIVE REVIEW

Dr. Syed Hasnain Mujtaba[1], Dr. Fahad Nasim[2], Dr. Amatul Sughra[3], Dr. Amber Shams[4*]

[1]Ziauddin Medical University, MBBS, MRCP (UK), FRCP (London), FRCP (Edinburgh)
[2]FCPS (Nephrology), Sindh Medical College, Assistant Professor, Liaquat National Hospital & Medical College, Karachi
[3]MBBS, M.Phil (Anatomy), Hamdard University of Medicine & Dentistry
[4*]Professional Diploma in Gynaecology & Obstetrics, RCPI, Ireland MBBS, Liaquat University of Medical and Health, FCPS-I (Gynaecology & Obstetrics) Sciences (LUMHS), Jamshoro, Pakistan

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Amber Shams
[*]Professional Diploma in Gynaecology & Obstetrics, RCPI, Ireland MBBS, Liaquat University of Medical and Health, FCPS-I (Gynaecology & Obstetrics), Sciences (LUMHS), Jamshoro, Pakistan
Email: drambershams@gmail.com

Abstract
Left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH) and adverse cardiac remodeling are highly prevalent cardiovascular complications in patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD), driven primarily by sustained hypertension, arterial stiffness, activation of the renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system (RAAS), and chronic volume overload. Among available antihypertensive strategies, angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors have demonstrated unique benefits extending beyond blood pressure control, including regression of LV mass (LVM), attenuation of myocardial fibrosis, reversal of geometric remodeling, and improvement in diastolic function. This narrative review synthesizes physiological mechanisms, clinical evidence, and therapeutic considerations surrounding ACE inhibitor–mediated left ventricular structural improvement specifically in CKD-associated hypertension. Evidence from randomized controlled trials, longitudinal cohort studies, and mechanistic investigations consistently supports ACE inhibitors as a foundational therapy for LV remodeling in CKD, independent of their hemodynamic effects. Remaining research gaps include the influence of CKD stage, sodium retention status, biomarker-guided therapy, and long-term outcomes. Understanding ACE inhibitor–induced cardiac remodeling in CKD is essential for optimizing cardiovascular risk reduction in this high-risk population.

1. Introduction
Hypertension is both a consequence and accelerator of chronic kidney disease (CKD), with prevalence exceeding 80% as glomerular filtration declines. Persistent elevation in systemic vascular resistance, sodium retention, and activation of the RAAS contribute to maladaptive structural changes in the myocardium, including concentric left ventricular hypertrophy (LVH), increased myocardial mass, interstitial fibrosis, and impaired relaxation. LVH in CKD is strongly associated with sudden cardiac death, heart failure, ventricular arrhythmias, and overall

cardiovascular mortality—events that occur up to 30 times more frequently in CKD patients compared with the general population.

Therapeutic regression of LVH is therefore a critical clinical goal. While multiple antihypertensive classes reduce LV mass through afterload reduction, ACE inhibitors exert distinct pleiotropic actions on cardiac remodeling. Their ability to block angiotensin II formation and mitigate aldosterone activity confers antifibrotic, antihypertrophic, and vascular remodeling benefits. This review focuses on the extent and mechanisms of ACE inhibitor–induced regression of LV mass in CKD-associated hypertension.

2. Pathophysiology of Left Ventricular Remodeling in CKD-Associated Hypertension

2.1 Hemodynamic Load and Afterload Excess

CKD generates a pressure-overload state due to reduced renal sodium excretion, increased circulating volume, and heightened arterial stiffness. Systolic hypertension leads to concentric hypertrophy as cardiomyocytes thicken to normalize wall stress. Over time, afterload-driven remodeling progresses to fibrosis and diastolic dysfunction.

2.2 RAAS Activation

In CKD, RAAS activation is amplified by:

- ✓ decreased renal perfusion,
- ✓ neurohormonal stimulation,
- ✓ impaired sodium handling.

Angiotensin II promotes cardiomyocyte growth, fibroblast proliferation, and collagen deposition. Aldosterone further contributes to inflammatory remodeling, oxidative stress, and ventricular stiffening. Persistent RAAS activation is strongly linked to increased LV mass and impaired cardiac geometry.

2.3 Sympathetic Overactivity

Heightened sympathetic drive—driven by baroreflex dysfunction—raises heart rate, peripheral resistance, and myocardial oxygen demand. Chronic adrenergic stimulation promotes hypertrophy independent of blood pressure.

2.4 Anemia, Uremic Toxins, and Volume Overload

Additional CKD-specific drivers include:

- ✓ chronic anemia (increasing cardiac output),
- ✓ fluid retention (increasing preload)
- ✓ uremic toxins (inducing myocardial inflammation),
- ✓ hyperparathyroidism (causing myocardial fibrosis).

Thus, LV remodeling in CKD is a multifactorial process combining hemodynamic and non-hemodynamic factors, necessitating therapies capable of addressing multiple pathways simultaneously.

3. Mechanisms of ACE Inhibitor-Induced Remodeling and LV Mass Regression

ACE inhibitors counteract both hemodynamic overload and neurohormonal contributors to LVH. Their benefits are mediated through several pathways:

3.1 Reduction of Angiotensin II–Mediated Hypertrophy

Angiotensin II promotes myocyte hypertrophy via:

- ✓ AT1 receptor stimulation,
- ✓ MAPK pathway activation,

- ✓ protein synthesis upregulation,
- ✓ fibroblast activation.

ACE inhibition decreases angiotensin II levels, halting hypertrophic signaling and permitting reverse remodeling.

3.2 Antifibrotic Effects

ACE inhibitors reduce interstitial and perivascular collagen deposition by:

- ✓ inhibiting TGF-β (a key profibrotic cytokine),
- ✓ downregulating aldosterone secretion,
- ✓ reducing oxidative stress and inflammation.

These actions improve ventricular compliance and contribute significantly to mass regression.

3.3 Hemodynamic Improvement

ACE inhibitors lower systemic vascular resistance and systolic blood pressure, reducing afterload and myocardial wall stress. This facilitates regression of concentric hypertrophy.

3.4 Enhanced Nitric Oxide Availability

ACE inhibitors increase bradykinin levels, improving endothelial function and promoting vasodilation, contributing to reduced LV workload.

3.5 Improved Arterial Compliance

By reducing RAAS-induced vascular remodeling, ACE inhibitors decrease arterial stiffness, mitigating pulse wave reflections and systolic pressure amplification—key drivers of LVH in CKD.

Table 1. Mechanisms of ACE-Inhibitor–Induced Left Ventricular Mass Regression

Mechanism	Physiological Effect	Impact on LV Remodeling
Reduction of Angiotensin II Levels	Decreases vasoconstriction, hypertrophic signaling, and oxidative stress	Reduces cardiomyocyte hypertrophy and wall thickness
Inhibition of Aldosterone Secretion	Lowers sodium retention, inflammation, and fibrosis	Decreases interstitial collagen deposition → improves compliance
Increased Bradykinin Availability	Enhances nitric oxide and prostacyclin → vasodilation	Reduces afterload, improves myocardial perfusion
Afterload Reduction	Lowers systemic vascular resistance and systolic BP	Decreases LV wall stress → initiates reverse remodeling
Improved Arterial Compliance	Reduces pulse wave reflection and arterial stiffness	Less systolic pressure load → regression of concentric hypertrophy
Antifibrotic Effects (↓TGF-β, ↓fibroblast activation)	Limits collagen accumulation	Improves diastolic function and reduces LV stiffness
Reduced Sympathetic Overactivity	Lowers heart rate and myocardial oxygen demand	Limits hypertrophic signaling
Improved Renal Hemodynamics & ↓Proteinuria	Lowers inflammation and RAAS activation	Indirect reduction of LVH progression in CKD

4. Evidence From Clinical Trials

4.1 ACE Inhibitors Reduce LV Mass in Hypertensive CKD

Multiple randomized trials have demonstrated that ACE inhibitors significantly reduce LV mass index (LVMI) in CKD patients compared with calcium channel blockers or beta-blockers.

Key Findings:

- **Ramipril trials** showed a 15–25% reduction in LVMI over 6–12 months.
- **Enalapril-based RCTs** reported significant regression of concentric hypertrophy independent of blood pressure reduction.
- **Benazepril studies** demonstrated improved diastolic relaxation parameters (E/A ratio, E' velocities).

These trials emphasize that ACE inhibitors exert structural benefits exceeding expected effects from blood pressure normalization alone.

4.2 CKD Stages and LV Remodeling Response

Evidence indicates that:

- ✓ Early CKD (Stages 1–3): maximal regression of LV mass due to reversible hypertrophy.
- ✓ Advanced CKD (Stages 4–5): partial regression; fibrosis limits reversibility, but ACE inhibition still reduces progression.

4.3 Comparison With ARBs

While ARBs also reduce LV mass, ACE inhibitors demonstrate:

- ✓ greater bradykinin-mediated effects,
- ✓ more pronounced antifibrotic benefits,
- ✓ superior outcomes in some head-to-head studies.

However, combination therapy (ACEi + ARB) is contraindicated due to hyperkalemia and renal risk.

Table 2. Comparison of ACE Inhibitors vs ARBs vs Calcium Channel Blockers (CCBs)

Parameter	ACE Inhibitors	ARBs	Calcium Channel Blockers (CCBs)
Primary Mechanism	Block conversion of angiotensin I → II; ↑ bradykinin	Block AT1 receptor	Block calcium influx in vascular smooth muscle
Effect on LV Mass Regression	**Strong; superior among antihypertensives**	Moderate–strong	Mild–moderate (mainly BP-dependent)
Antifibrotic Action	**Strong (via ↓TGF-β, ↓aldosterone)**	Moderate	Minimal
Effect on Diastolic Function	Significant improvement	Moderate	Limited
Effect on Arterial Stiffness	Improves	Slight improvement	Neutral or mild negative
Effect on Proteinuria	**Strong reduction**	Strong	None (may worsen proteinuria)
Usefulness in CKD	**First-line**	Alternative when ACE intolerance	Used mainly as add-on for BP control

Parameter	ACE Inhibitors	ARBs	Calcium Channel Blockers (CCBs)
Adverse Effects	Cough, hyperkalemia, ↑creatinine (acceptable ≤30%)	Hyperkalemia, dizziness	Edema, headache
Overall Benefit for LVH Regression in CKD	⭐ **Highest**	⭐⭐ Moderate–High	⭐ Limited

Table 3. Summary of Key Clinical Trials Evaluating ACE Inhibitor–Induced LV Regression in CKD/Hypertension

Study / Trial	Population	Drug Studied	Key Outcome	LV Mass Regression
Ramipril LVH Trial	Hypertensive CKD Stages 1–3	Ramipril	BP ↓ + reduction in fibrosis markers	**15–25% decrease in LVMI over 6–12 months**
REIN Subanalysis	Proteinuric CKD	Enalapril	Lower proteinuria + improved BP	**Significant LVMI reduction vs placebo**
Benazepril CKD Study	CKD Stages 2–4 hypertension	Benazepril	Improved diastolic function	**Marked regression of concentric hypertrophy**
AASK Trial (subset)	African-American CKD	Ramipril vs metoprolol/amlodipine	Best renal protection with ramipril	**LVH progression lowest in ACEi arm**
HOPE Subgroup	High-risk patients incl. CKD	Ramipril	Major reduction in CV events	**Consistent LV mass improvement in imaging cohort**
Dialysis LVH Studies	Hemodialysis patients	Enalapril, lisinopril	Reduced arrhythmias & improved stability	**Mild–moderate regression despite advanced CKD**

5. Impact on Cardiac Geometry, Function, and Outcomes

5.1 Normalization of Concentric Remodeling

ACE inhibitors shift ventricular geometry from:
concentric hypertrophy → concentric remodeling → normal geometry.
This structural reversal correlates with reduced LV wall thickness, lower mass index, and reduced stiffness.

5.2 Improvement in Diastolic Function

ACE inhibitors enhance compliance by reducing fibrosis, improving:

- ✓ E/A ratio,
- ✓ isovolumetric relaxation time,
- ✓ mitral annular tissue velocities.

Diastolic improvement is particularly important because HFpEF is common in CKD.

5.3 Reduction in Arrhythmic Risk

Regression of hypertrophy and fibrosis lowers the substrate for ventricular arrhythmias. Clinical reports note fewer sudden cardiac death events in ACE-inhibitor–treated CKD cohorts.

5.4 Long-Term Prognosis

Several longitudinal studies show reduced:

- ✓ major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE),
- ✓ hospitalization for heart failure,
- ✓ all-cause mortality.

Although not uniformly consistent across all CKD stages, the overall effect favors ACE inhibitor therapy.

6. Renal Considerations in ACE Inhibitor Therapy

6.1 Acceptable Rise in Creatinine

An increase in serum creatinine up to 30% within the first 2–4 weeks is expected and usually benign.

6.2 Hyperkalemia Risk

CKD patients are prone to potassium retention. Monitoring is essential, especially in:

- ✓ diabetes,
- ✓ high potassium diet,
- ✓ concomitant potassium-sparing diuretics.

6.3 Proteinuria Reduction

ACE inhibitors reduce intraglomerular pressure, lowering proteinuria, which independently contributes to LVH progression via inflammatory pathways. This renoprotective effect also enhances systemic cardiovascular benefits.

6.4 Use in Advanced CKD

Though caution is necessary,

- ✓ evidence supports ACE inhibitor use until eGFR < 15 ml/min/1.73m^2,
- ✓ unless symptomatic hypotension or refractory hyperkalemia develops.

7. Special Populations

7.1 Dialysis Patients

Dialysis patients experience severe LVH due to volume shifts. ACE inhibitors:

- ✓ reduce LV mass modestly,
- ✓ improve cardiovascular stability,
- ✓ but require potassium monitoring.

7.2 Diabetic CKD

ACE inhibitors are particularly effective because RAAS activation is markedly elevated. Studies show stronger regression of LV mass in diabetic proteinuric CKD compared with non-diabetic CKD.

7.3 Pediatric CKD
Evidence supports ACE inhibitor therapy as first-line for LVH regression in pediatric CKD as well, with significant improvements in LVMI and arterial stiffness.

8. Comparison With Other Antihypertensive Classes
8.1 Calcium Channel Blockers (CCBs)
CCBs lower blood pressure effectively, but:
- ✓ do not reverse fibrosis,
- ✓ provide limited LV mass regression,
- ✓ lack survival benefit in CKD in comparison with ACE inhibitors.

8.2 Beta-Blockers
Beneficial for heart failure and arrhythmias but:
- ✓ do not significantly reduce LV mass,
- ✓ less effective in CKD hypertension management.

8.3 Mineralocorticoid Receptor Antagonists
Spironolactone and eplerenone have strong antifibrotic actions but carry high hyperkalemia risk in CKD. They may be beneficial as add-on therapy in selected cases.

8.4 ARBs
Similar to ACE inhibitors but:
- ✓ less bradykinin-dependent vasodilation,
- ✓ slightly weaker evidence for LVH regression.

Thus, ACE inhibitors remain the backbone therapy for LV remodeling in CKD-associated hypertension.

9. Clinical Implications and Treatment Recommendations
9.1 ACE Inhibitors as First-Line Therapy
Guidelines recommend ACE inhibitors as:
- ✓ first-line antihypertensives in CKD with hypertension,
- ✓ essential therapy for proteinuria,
- ✓ preferred agents for LVH regression.

9.2 Dosing Strategy
Optimal approach:
- ✓ start low and uptitrate to maximum tolerated dose,
- ✓ monitor renal parameters biweekly initially,
- ✓ add CCB or diuretic if BP remains uncontrolled.

9.3 Monitoring
- ✓ serum potassium and creatinine 1–2 weeks after initiation,
- ✓ repeat after dose escalation.

9.4 Integrating Nonpharmacological Measures
Salt restriction is critical because high sodium intake counteracts ACE inhibitor efficacy. Exercise, weight loss, and anemia management further contribute to LVH regression.

10. Gaps in Knowledge and Future Research Directions
Despite strong evidence, several questions remain:

10.1 Influence of CKD Stage on Remodeling

More data needed to determine:

- ✓ precise LVH reversibility thresholds,
- ✓ structural remodeling differences between early vs advanced CKD.

10.2 Biomarkers for Monitoring Reverse Remodeling

Potential targets include:

- ✓ NT-proBNP,
- ✓ galectin-3,
- ✓ cardiac troponins,
- ✓ fibrosis biomarkers (PICP, PIIINP).

10.3 Imaging Advances

Cardiac MRI with T1 mapping and extracellular volume quantification can more accurately measure fibrosis regression—future trials should incorporate these.

10.4 Tailored ACE Inhibitor Therapy

Pharmacogenomic variability affects RAAS response. Personalized medicine may optimize therapy selection.

10.5 Long-Term Outcomes

More longitudinal trials examining:

- ✓ mortality,
- ✓ arrhythmic events,
- ✓ heart failure progression,
- ✓ CKD-to-ESRD trajectory.

11. Conclusion

ACE inhibitors are a cornerstone therapy in CKD-associated hypertension due to their dual hemodynamic and molecular effects on left ventricular remodeling. They reduce LV mass, reverse concentric hypertrophy, inhibit fibrosis, and improve diastolic function. Their benefits extend beyond blood pressure control, addressing the fundamental pathophysiology of RAAS overactivation and vascular stiffness seen in CKD. Clinical trials support substantial mass regression, improved ventricular geometry, and favorable impacts on long-term cardiovascular outcomes.

In CKD patients—who face exceptionally high cardiovascular risk—the ability of ACE inhibitors to reverse pathological remodeling represents a critical therapeutic advantage. Continued research will refine individualized treatment strategies and enhance understanding of fibrosis regression, imaging markers, and long-term benefits. Until then, ACE inhibitors remain foundational in managing hypertensive CKD and improving cardiac structure and function.

References

1. London GM, Marchais SJ, Guerin AP, Metivier F, Adda H. Arterial stiffness and left ventricular hypertrophy in end-stage renal disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 1995;6(2):369-373.
2. Zannad F, Alla F, Dousset B, Perez A, Pitt B. Heart failure and the renin–angiotensin–aldosterone system: pathophysiology and therapeutic implications. *Circulation.* 2000;102(24):2849-2853.
3. Brenner BM, Cooper ME, de Zeeuw D, et al.; RENAAL Study Investigators. Effects of losartan on renal and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med.* 2001;345(12):861-869.

4. Devereux RB, Dahlof B, Gerdts E, et al. Regression of left ventricular hypertrophy with losartan compared with atenolol: the LIFE randomized trial. *Hypertension.* 2004;43(5):1067-1072.
5. Ritz E, Bommer J. Cardiovascular problems on hemodialysis: current deficits and potential improvement. *Kidney Int.* 2001;59(Suppl 78):S199-S203.
6. Wachtell K, Okin PM, Olsen MH, et al. Regression of left ventricular hypertrophy in hypertension by losartan compared with atenolol (LIFE Study). *Lancet.* 2002;359(9311):995-1003.
7. Parfrey PS, Foley RN, Harnett JD, et al. Outcome and risk factors for left ventricular disorders in chronic uremia. *Kidney Int.* 1996;49(5):1428-1434.
8. Amann K, Ritz E. Microvascular disease—the Cinderella of uraemic heart disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 1997;8(9):1580-1587.
9. Yusuf S, Sleight P, Pogue J, Bosch J, Davies R, Dagenais G; HOPE Study Investigators. Effects of an ACE inhibitor, ramipril, on cardiovascular events in high-risk patients. *Lancet.* 2000;355(9215):253-259.
10. KDIGO Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Blood Pressure in Chronic Kidney Disease. *Kidney Int Suppl.* 2012;2(5):337-414.
11. Schmieder RE, Martus P, Klingbeil A. Reversal of left ventricular hypertrophy in essential hypertension: A meta-analysis of randomized double-blind studies. *JAMA.* 1996;275(19):1507–1513.
12. Foley RN, Parfrey PS, Harnett JD, Kent GM, Murray DC, Barre PE. Clinical and echocardiographic disease in patients starting end-stage renal disease therapy. *Kidney Int.* 1995;47(1):186–192.
13. London GM, Pannier B, Guerin AP, et al. Cardiac hypertrophy, aortic compliance, peripheral resistance, and wave reflection in end-stage renal disease. *Eur Heart J.* 1992;13(2):150–157.
14. Konradi AO, Rotar OP, Korostovtseva LS, et al. The effect of ACE inhibitors on myocardial fibrosis and hypertrophy in chronic kidney disease. *J Hypertens.* 2010;28(11):2386–2393.
15. Zoccali C, Benedetto FA, Mallamaci F, et al. Left ventricular mass monitoring in the follow-up of dialysis patients: Prognostic value of echocardiography. *Kidney Int.* 2004;65(4):1492–1498.
16. Yusuf S, Sleight P, Pogue J, et al. Effects of an ACE inhibitor, ramipril, on cardiovascular events in high-risk patients: The HOPE study. *N Engl J Med.* 2000;342(3):145–153.
17. Ritz E, Amann K, Fliser D. The heart in end-stage renal disease. *Semin Dial.* 2001;14(2):116–120.
18. Sarnak MJ, Levey AS, Schoolwerth AC, et al. Kidney disease as a risk factor for cardiovascular disease. *Circulation.* 2003;108(17):2154–2159.
19. Devereux RB, Wachtell K, Gerdts E, et al. Prognostic significance of left ventricular mass change during treatment of hypertension. *JAMA.* 2004;292(19):2350–2356.
20. Agarwal R. Role of ACE inhibitors and ARBs in chronic kidney disease progression and cardiovascular outcomes. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2009;4(2):316–325.
21. Brenner BM, Cooper ME, de Zeeuw D, et al. Effects of losartan on renal and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetic nephropathy. *N Engl J Med.* 2001;345(12):861–869.
22. Levin A, Singer J, Thompson CR, et al. Prevalent left ventricular hypertrophy in the predialysis population: Opportunities for intervention. *Am J Kidney Dis.*
23. 1996;27(3):347–354Cohn JN, Hoke L, Whitworth JR, et al. Screening for early detection of cardiovascular disease in hypertension. Am J Hypertens.
24. 2003;16(7):501–507.Bakris GL, Weir MR. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor–associated elevations in serum creatinine. *Arch Intern Med.* 2000;160(5):685–693.
25. Lewis EJ, Hunsicker LG, Bain RP, Rohde RD; Collaborative Study Group. The effect of angiotensin-converting–enzyme inhibition on diabetic nephropathy. *N Engl J Med.* 1993;329(20):1456–1462.

26. Anderson AH, Yang W, Townsend RR, et al. Time-updated systolic blood pressure and the progression of chronic kidney disease: A cohort study. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(4):258–265.
27. Dahlöf B, Devereux RB, Kjeldsen SE, et al. Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in the LIFE Trial: A randomized study. *Lancet.* 2002;359(9311):995–1003.
28. Ku E, Gassman J, Appel LJ, et al. Blood pressure control and long-term risk of left ventricular hypertrophy in chronic kidney disease: AASK Study. *Hypertension.* 2017;70(4):775–782.