Identifying atypical-HUS in the presence of hypertensive emergency

A guide to differential diagnosis of thrombotic microangiopathy (TMA) in the presence of hypertensive emergency

Hypertensive emergency is characterized by severely elevated blood pressure (>180/120 mmHg) associated with evidence of new or worsening end-organ damage

- **Malignant hypertension (mHTN)**, a type of hypertensive emergency associated with poor prognosis, is a potential trigger for atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome (atypical-HUS)¹⁻⁴
- As TMA is a known clinical feature of atypical-HUS, **detecting TMA among hypertensive** emergency patients should prompt urgent differential diagnosis, while treating the hypertensive emergency⁵⁻⁷
- TMA and atypical-HUS may be present and often overlooked in patients with mHTN. In a retrospective study of hospitalized patients with mHTN (N=199)^{8*}:





EARLY DIAGNOSIS OF ATYPICAL-HUS CAN MINIMIZE THE RISK OF NEGATIVE OUTCOMES, INCLUDING KIDNEY TRANSPLANTS^{3,9}

*Retrospective cohort analysis of hospitalized patients diagnosed with mHTN (N=199) from 2000-2020 in 8 nephrology departments in Spain.⁸





The information in this brochure is intended as educational information for healthcare professionals. It does not replace a healthcare professional's judgment or clinical diagnosis.



Recognize the critical role of hypertensive emergency as a trigger for atypical-HUS^{2,3}

Hypertensive emergency may lead to TMA and unmask atypical-HUS^{2,6,7,10}

Hypertensive emergency is severe hypertension with end-organ involvement¹



 Overactivation of the complement system was found in 59% (n=17/29) of patients with hypertensive emergency and TMA^{11*}



 Patients may present with key markers of TMA^{8,9}

TMA is a medical emergency requiring immediate screening for an underlying cause^{3,12}

TMA is characterized by^{3,9}:



>25%

 Thrombocytopenia: Low platelet count (<150 x 10⁹/L or a >25% decrease in platelet count from baseline)

Microangiopathic hemolytic

hemoglobin, elevated lactate

dehydrogenase, decreased

anemia: Signs include decreased

haptoglobin levels, and evidence

of schistocytes in blood smears



 One or more signs and symptoms of organ damage

Atypical-HUS is associated with continuous risk of complement-mediated TMA and life-threatening consequences^{3,5,12}

Atypical-HUS is a result of either or both of these factors^{3,12}:



 A patient's genetic predisposition to complement dysregulation



 Exposure to factors or conditions that trigger complement activation such as hypertensive emergency

In patients with mHTN, could TMA and atypical-HUS be more common than you realize?

In a retrospective analysis of 199 patients with mHTN^{8†}



of the patients presented with TMA (n=40/199)



of the patients with TMA had atypical-HUS (n=24/40)

*Based on a 2021 cohort study of patients with TMA with severe kidney involvement (N=65) from the Limburg Renal Registry in the Netherlands and the Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc in Belgium.¹¹ †Retrospective cohort analysis of hospitalized patients diagnosed with mHTN (N=199) from 2000-2020 in 8 nephrology departments in Spain.⁸ IgA=immunoglobulin A.

While treating patients for hypertensive emergency, the presence of TMA should increase suspicion of atypical-HUS⁸

Other causes of TMA in patients with hypertensive emergency included drug-related mHTN, some systemic diseases, and IgA nephropathy.^{8,10}

Early diagnosis and management for atypical-HUS in the presence of hypertensive emergency is critical^{3,9,12}

Studies of patients with atypical-HUS have found that...



In a study of 9 patients with hypertensive emergency who had atypical-HUS, hematological signs of TMA were uncommon, potentially reflecting smoldering cases of TMA. These cases of TMA can present as a persistent, progressive, and gradual disease course^{7,145}

*Retrospective analysis of patients with MHT and aHUS (N=1097) enrolled in the Clobal aHUS Registry and followed for ≥90 days from atypical-HUS diagnosis from 2012 to 2020.9

[†]Based on a French retrospective cohort analysis of patients with atypical-HUS, with or without concomitant hypertensive emergency (N=137), screened between 2000 and 2016.¹³

[‡]Retrospective cohort analysis of hospitalized patients diagnosed with mHTN (N=199) from 2000-2020 in 8 nephrology departments in Spain.⁸ [§]A retrospective analysis of patients with severe hypertension with biopsy-proven renal TMA (N=9) from January 2005 onward at a medical center in the Netherlands.⁷

HE=hypertensive emergency; MHT=malignant hypertension.

Given the severity of atypical-HUS and hypertensive emergency, it's critical to diagnose patients quickly to minimize the risk of poor outcomes^{3,9,12}

In patients with

atypical-HUS and mHTN (n=26),‡

Kidney survival **3** at 5 years was



Without appropriate atypical-HUS management⁺

The renal survival rates of patients with hypertensive emergency and atypical-HUS were

36%¹³ At 1 year

23%¹³ At 5 years

Recognize the patient with hypertensive emergency at risk for atypical-HUS and respond promptly

Studies show that characteristics of patients with atypical-HUS and hypertensive emergency may include:



Usually in their mid 40s or younger^{8,13*†}



Some have genetic complement abnormalities^{8,13‡}



Often have renal involvement and potentially severe kidney injury^{8,13*†}



May have extrarenal manifestations—including neurological^{8,13*†}



- ► Taking >2 antihypertensives to normalize blood pressure—while renal function continues to decline
- Requiring dialysis at presentation
- Having a family or medical history of TMA and/or kidney failure

*Based on a French retrospective cohort analysis of patients with atypical-HUS, with or without concomitant hypertensive emergency (N=137), screened between 2000 and 2016.¹³

¹Retrospective cohort analysis of hospitalized patients diagnosed with mHTN (N=199) from 2000-2020 in 8 nephrology departments in Spain.⁸ ¹In 30%-40% of atypical-HUS patients, the cause is ill-defined, and the role of additional genetic or environmental factors remains debatable.^{13,15}

Can you think of a patient with hypertensive emergency who wasn't responding to therapy the way you expected?

Actor portraval

Rapid recognition of TMA is critical

TMAs present with similar signs and symptoms but can have distinct underlying causes

step] Recognize	ТМА	= Plate	Thrombocytopeni elet count <150 x 10 decrease from bas	°/Lor +				
TMA early ³ STEP2 Rapidly determine the cause of TMA ^{12,16}	 Neurolog symptom 		nonary 🕨 Visua		f the following Cardiovascular symptoms	 Renal impairment 	 Gastrointestinal symptoms 	
	immediate ≤10%* ADAMTS13 activity	Shiga toxin/EHEC positive	>10%* ADAMTS13 activity	Rapidly A nor Labs, c PLASM validat A scc	y rule out DIC in p mal coagulation p	atients with TMA profile (PT, aPTT, INF e, can help predic Key predict ► A patient v of ≥1.5 g/g	R, D-dimers) indicates TMA t a diagnosis ^{3,17,18} ive labs with TMA presenting a PU/CI is less likely to have TTP ¹⁸	
	ТТР	STEC-HUS	Strongly consider atypical-HUS	of atypical-HUS ¹⁷		>1.7 to 2.3 a diagnos	 A platelet count >30 x 10⁹/L and/or sCr >1.7 to 2.3 mg/dL almost eliminates a diagnosis of severe ADAMTS13 deficiency (TTP)² 	
IF APPROPRIATE, a renal biopsy can reveal TMA ^{19,20}		Glomerular arteriolar thrombi	1	Basemen membrar splitting	人大 》 医端间接	Basement me formation and cellular interp	Lusco MA, et al. Am J Kidney Dis.	
Although renal biopsy is not	required for di	agnosis of aty	pical-HUS, it may	reveal smol	dering cases of TN	MA ^{14,20}		

*Range for ADAMTS13 deficiency found in published literature is <5%-10%.¹⁶

ADAMTS13=a disintegrin and metalloproteinase with a thrombospondin type 1 motif member 13; aPTT=activated partial thromboplastin time; CU=creatininuria; DIC=disseminated intravascular coagulation; EHEC=enterohemorrhagic *E coli*; HUS=hemolytic uremic syndrome; INR=international normalized ratio; LDH=lactate dehydrogenase; PT=prothrombin time; PU=proteinuria; sCr=serum creatinine; STEC=Shiga toxin–producing *E coli*; TTP=thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura.

Case study: hypertensive emergency and atypical-HUS

Angela

Overview: Presented to the ER with hypertensive emergency, headache, dyspnea, and sudden onset of blurred vision.

Baseline

- ▶ Age: 34 years old
- Height: 155 cm (5 ft 1 in)
- Weight: 62 kg (137 lb)
- BMI: 25.9
- Not pregnant

Hypothetical patient case.

Medical history

- History of hypertension since age 25
- Unremarkable first pregnancy
- Preeclampsia in 3rd trimester of second pregnancy (G2P2)
- Managed with diuretic

Family history

 Father: history of renal failure and ESRD at age 59 of unknown causes

Vital signs

- ▶ Blood pressure: 235/125 mmHg
- ► Heart rate: 100 bpm
- Oxygen saturation: 100%
- ► **Temperature:** 37.0°C (98.6°F)



Lab values							
		Prior labs (8 months ago)	Lab values at presentation	Reference values ²¹⁻²³			
Complete Blood Count	White blood cell count (x 10 ⁹ /L)	5.3	11	4.5-11			
	Hemoglobin (g/dL)	12.5	8.9	12-16			
	Haptoglobin (mg/dL)		20	30-200			
	Platelet count (x 10 ⁹ /L)	250	130	150-350			
	LDH (U/L)		500	60-160			
	Reticulocytes (%)		2.5	0.5-1.5			
Peripheral Smear	Schistocytes present	No	2+	Absent			
Comprehensive Metabolic Panel	BUN (mg/dL)	14	30	8-20			
	eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m ²)*	108	33	≥90			
	Serum creatinine (mg/dL)	0.7	1.9	0.5-1.0			
	Bilirubin (mg/dL)	0.4	3.4	0.0-0.3			
Other Tests	Blood pressure (mmHg)	141/85 (Stage 2 Hypertension [†])	235/125	<120/<80			
	Pregnancy test		Negative				
	Urine toxicology		Negative				

*Calculated using https://reference.medscape.com/calculator/251/egfr-using-ckd-epi-2021-update.

[†]As per the AHA/ACC 2017 Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults.¹

bpm=beats per minute; BMI=body mass index; BUN=blood urea nitrogen; eGFR=estimated glomerular filtration rate; ER=emergency room; ESRD=end-stage renal disease; G2P2=gravida 2 para 2.

Case study: hypertensive emergency and atypical-HUS

Treatment initiation: Angela was treated with IV vasodilators and eventually put on an IV calcium channel blocker. Blood pressure came down slowly (by about 25% each day). However, on **Day 3**, repeat lab measurements did not improve. On **Day 4**, nephrology and hematology consults were requested given a lack of improvement of hematologic and renal parameters.

Lab values at Day 5: Angela's blood pressure had improved with initial treatment, but her labs deteriorated

		Prior labs (8 months ago)	Lab values at presentation	Day 5 values	Reference values ²¹⁻²³	
Complete Blood Count	White blood cell count (x 10 ⁹ /L)	5.3	11	10	4.5-11	
	Hemoglobin (g/dL)	12.5	8.9	7.5	12-16	
	Haptoglobin (mg/dL)		20	15	30-200	
	Platelet count (x 10 ⁹ /L)	250	130	78	150-350	
	LDH (U/L)		500	700	60-160	
	Reticulocytes (%)		2.5	3	0.5-1.5	
Peripheral Smear	Schistocytes present	No	2+	3+	Absent	
Comprehensive Metabolic Panel	BUN (mg/dL)	14	30	42	8-20	
	eGFR (mL/min/1.73 m ²)*	108	33	23	≥90	
	Serum creatinine (mg/dL)	0.7	1.9	2.5	0.5-1.0	
	Bilirubin (mg/dL)	0.4	3.4	0.2	0.0-0.3	
	Indirect bilirubin (mg/dL)		3.4	3.5 (elevated)	0.3-1.2	
Other Tests	Blood pressure (mmHg)	141/85 (Stage 2 hypertension [†])	235/125	125/82	<120/<80	
	ADAMTS13			Pending		
	Shiga-toxin			Negative		
	Vitamin B levels (pg/mL)			305	200-800	



86% of patients with hypertensive emergency and atypical-HUS did not recover normal renal function despite receiving antihypertensive treatment^{24\ddagger}

Angela's worsening creatinine, hemolysis, and renal failure led the treatment team to suspect TMA

▶ Her differential diagnosis included DIC, TTP, infectious diseases including STEC-HUS, and CM-TMA due to other triggers

48% ADAMTS13 activity level: consider a diagnosis of atypical-HUS³

*Calculated using https://reference.medscape.com/calculator/251/egfr-using-ckd-epi-2021-update.

[†]As per the AHA/ACC 2017 Guideline for the Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Management of High Blood Pressure in Adults.¹

[‡]A retrospective analysis of patients from 2003 to 2006 in China with severe or malignant hypertension accompanied by biopsy-proven renal TMA lesions (N=21).²⁴

CM-TMA=complement-mediated TMA; IV=intravenous

The information in this presentation is intended as educational information for healthcare professionals. It does not replace a healthcare professional's judgment or clinical diagnosis. Tests listed may not be available at all institutions.

Suspect TMA in patients with hypertensive emergency and conduct rapid differential diagnosis for atypical-HUS

Given that hypertensive emergency is a known trigger of atypical-HUS, early diagnosis and management are critical^{2,3,9}

TMA and atypical-HUS may be present and often overlooked in patients with mHTN. In a retrospective study of hospitalized patients with mHTN (N=199)⁸*:



of patients with mHTN had TMA





Controlled hypertension without resolution of associated renal failure may indicate atypical-HUS^{6,7,25}



While treating patients for hypertensive emergency, the presence of TMA should increase suspicion of atypical-HUS⁸

If TMA is suspected, it is important to include a multidisciplinary team of specialists in the diagnostic process²⁶

PROMPT DIAGNOSIS AND INTERVENTION IN ATYPICAL-HUS CAN LEAD TO IMPROVED OUTCOMES^{3,9,12}

*Retrospective cohort analysis of hospitalized patients diagnosed with mHTN (N=199) from 2000-2020 in 8 nephrology departments in Spain.⁸

References: 1. Whelton P, et al. Hypertension. 2018;71:e13-e115. 2. Boulestreau R, et al. J Am Heart Assoc. 2022;11:e023397. doi:10.1161/JAHA.121.023397 3. Laurence J, et al. Clin Adv Hematol Oncol. 2016;14(11)(suppl 11):2-15. 4. Amraoui F, et al. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich). 2014;16(2):122-126. 5. Schaefer F, et al. Kidney Int. 2018;94(2):408-418. 6. Asif A, et al. J Nephrol. 2017;30(3):347-362. 7. Timmermans SAMEG, et al. Kidney Int. 2017;91(6):1420-1425. 8. Cavero T, et al. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2023;38:1217-1226. 9. Halimi JM, et al. J Nephrol. 2023;36:817-828. 10. Halimi JM, et al. BMC Nephrol. 2022;23:39:1-10. 11. Timmermans SAMEG, et al. Kidney Int Rep. 2021;6(4):1099-1109. 12. Azoulay E, et al. Chest. 2017;152(2):424-434. 13. El Karoui K, et al. Haematologica. 2019;104(12):2501-2511. 14. Kim YJ. Kidney Res Clin Pract. 2022;41(5):524-532. 15. Fakhouri F, et al. [published correction appears in Lancet. 2017;390(10095):648]. Lancet. 2017;390(10095):681-696. 16. Vincent JL, et al. Crit Care. 2018;22(1):158. 17. Wynick C, et al. Thromb Res. 2020;196:335-339. 18. Burguet L, et al. J Clin Med. 2022;11(3):648. 19. Lusco MA, et al. Am J Kidney Dis. 2016;68(6):e33-e34. 20. Campistol JM, et al. Nefrologia. 2015;35:421-447. 21. Padilla O, Abadie J. Blood tests: normal values. Merck Manuals Professional Version. Updated September 2022. Accessed May 3, 2023. https://www.merckmanuals.com/professional/resources/normal-laboratory-values/blood-tests-normal-values 22. Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR). 2022. National Kidney Foundation. Accessed May 3, 2023. https://www.kidney.org/atoz/content/gfr 23. The seventh report of the Joint National Committee on prevention, detection, evaluation and treatment of high blood pressure. US Department of Health and Human Services. Published August 2004. https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/ files/docs/guidelines/jnc7full.pdf 24. Zhang B, et al. Hypertens Res. 2008;31(3):471-483. 25. Langman C. Haematologica. 2012;97(suppl 1):195-196. 26. Uriol Rivera MG, et al. PLoS ONE. 13(11):e0206558. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0206558



ALEXION and the Alexion logo are registered trademarks of Alexion Pharmaceuticals, Inc. © 2023, Alexion Pharmaceuticals, Inc. All rights reserved. US/UNB-a/0045 V4 09/2023

Advance your knowledge of the atypical-HUS diagnosis at aHUSSource.com/physician



bit.lv/30D8NX1