

#### Newly Reported Hypertension after Military Combat Deployment in a Large Population-based Study

Granado, N.S., Smith, T.C., Swanson, M., Harris, R.B., Shahar, E., Smith, B., Boyko, E.J., Wells, T.S., & Ryan, M.A.K. (2009). Newly reported hypertension after military combat deployment in a large population-based study. *Hypertension, 54*, 966-973. doi: 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.109.132555



36,061 U.S. Service members from all branches of the military were included in a study examining the relationship between combat deployment-induced stress and hypertension. 6% of the deployers with multiple combat exposures reported new hypertension compared to 7% in the general population. Deployers with multiple combat exposures were at significantly higher risk of newly reported hypertension compared to noncombat deployers.

# Key Findings:

- Over the approximate 3 year period of the study, newly reported hypertension was observed in 6% of deployers with multiple combat exposures and 7% in the overall population; newly reported hypertension was found to be higher among nondeployers than deployers.
- Compared with noncombat deployers, with multiple combat deployers were at significantly higher risk of newly reported hypertension.
- Non-Hispanic Blacks had an 84% higher risk for newly reported hypertension than non-Hispanic Whites; among deployers, non-Hispanic Blacks had a 97% higher chance than non-Hispanic Whites.
- Obese military personnel had a 3 times higher likelihood of reporting hypertension than normal or underweight Service members.
- Individuals who strength-trained and were physically active were at a decreased risk of hypertension, but only if nondeployers were included in the model
- In the total sample, smoking was not associated with increased risk of hypertension, and in deployers only current smoking was inversely related to newly reported hypertension.

## Implications for Programs:

- Programs could target young Service members at highest risk (non-Hispanic Blacks, deployers with multiple combat tours, obese Service members) for new hypertension cases for outreach and prevention efforts.
- Programs might consider including information about hypertension prevention behaviors and risk factors during active duty, post-deployment briefings and re-integration activities.

## Implications for Policies:

- Policies could track Service members with multiple risk factors for new hypertension or place them in a special prevention program.
- Policies could be enacted through health insurance plans to incentivize preventative behaviors such as being physically active
  or quitting smoking.

## Avenues for Future Research:

- Future studies could use non-self-report measures, such as medical records or blood pressure measurements, to verify hypertension diagnoses.
- Additional follow-up of this cohort could allow for better understanding of relations between deployment and hypertension.
- Research on this issue with a more recent sample of Service members would allow for understanding about the generalizability of these findings.

Prepared by the Military REACH Team.

For additional information, please visit reachmilitaryfamilies.umn.edu

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & LIFE SCIENCES Notron School of Family and Consumer Sciences Cooperative Extension



# **Background Information**

#### Methodology:

- Data from the Millennium Cohort respondents, a random sample of U.S. Military members who were serving as of 10/1/2000, who completed baseline (07/2001-06/2003) and a follow-up measure (06/2004-02/2006) were used.
- Deployment, demographic, and occupational data was obtained from the Defense Manpower Data Center, and hypertension, general health, alcohol consumption, physical activity, and cigarette smoking were assessed via survey.
- Multivariable logistic regression was used to predict relations between newly reported hypertension and combat deployment.

#### Participants:

- 36,061 U.S. Service members participated.
- Nondeployed characteristics (N=27,232): 75% male, 42% born 1960-69, 37% high school diploma, 67% married, 73% Non-Hispanic White, 53% active duty, 48% Army, 27% Air Force, 20% Navy/Coast Guard.
- Deployed without combat characteristics (N=4,385): 84% male, 45% born 1960-69, 32% high school diploma, 67% married, 75% Non-Hispanic White, 60% active duty, 26% Army, 52% Air Force, 19% Navy/Coast Guard.
- Deployed with single combat tour characteristics (N=586): 81% male, 44% born 1960-69, 38% high school diploma, 62% married, 71% Non-Hispanic White, 60% active duty, 44% Army, 38% Air Force, 15% Navy/Coast Guard.
- Deployed with multiple combat tours characteristics (N=3858): 86% male, 39% born 1960-69, 46% high school diploma, 63% married, 69% Non-Hispanic White, 62% active duty, 68% Army, 18% Air Force, 6% Navy/Coast Guard.

#### Limitations:

- Loss of participants at the time of the second assessment and the use of self-report measures may have biased this data.
- Some risk factors such as family history and high dietary salt were not measured.
- Selection bias may have occurred as those who were currently deployed were excluded.
- Misclassification bias may have occurred for some who did not have adequate time to be examined and diagnosed with hypertension post-deployment.

# Assessing Research that Works

Research Design and Sample				Quality Rating:	$\star \star \star$
	Excellent (★★★)	Appropriate (★★☆)	Limited (★★★)	Questionable (★★★)	
The design of the study (e.g., research plan, sample, recruitment) used to address the research question was	$\boxtimes$				
Research Methods				Quality Rating:	$\star \star \star \star$
	Excellent (★★★)	Appropriate (★★★)	Limited (★★★)	Questionable (★★★)	
The research methods (e.g., measurement, analysis) used to answer the research question were		$\boxtimes$			
Limitations				Quality Rating:	$\star \star \star \star$
	Excellent Minor Limitations (★★★)	Appropriate Few Limitations (★★☆)	Limited Several Limitations (★	Questionable Many/Severe Limitations ()	
The limitations of this study are		$\boxtimes$			
Implications				Quality Rating:	N/A
	Excellent (★★★)	Appropriate (★★☆)	Limited (★★★)	Questionable (★★★)	
The implications of this research to programs, policies and					
the field, stated by the authors, are	$oxedsymbol{\boxtimes}$ Not applicable because authors do not discuss implications				
Overall Quality Rating					$\star$