www.jmscr.igmpublication.org
Impact Factor (SJIF): 6.379
Index Copernicus Value: 79.54
ISSN (e)-2347-176x ISSN (p) 2455-0450
crossrefDOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18535/jmscr/v6i12.186

IGM Publication
Journal Of Medical Science And Clinical Research
An Official Publication Of IGM Publication

Characteristics of Resistant Hypertension in Odisha Populations

Authors
Deepak Kumar Parhi, Kumar Gaurav Behera*
Department of Cardiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha O Anusandhan University,
K 8, Kalinga Nagar, Bhubaneswar-751003, Odisha, India
*Corresponding Author
Dr Gaurav Behera
Assistant Professor, Department of Cardiology, IMS and SUM Hospital, Bhubaneswar751003, Odisha, India
Email: *kumargauravbehera@soa.ac.in*

Abstracts
Objective: *To assess the commonness of and describe safe hypertension in a vast delegate populace with fruitful hypertension the board and dependable wellbeing data.*
Patient and Methods: *We played out a cross-sectional examination utilizing clinical experience, research center, and regulatory data from the Kaiser Permanente Southern California wellbeing framework between January 1, 2006, and December 31, 2007. From people more seasoned than 17 years with hypertension, safe hypertension was recognized and commonness was resolved. Multivariable strategic relapse was utilized to ascertain chances proportions (ORs), with modifications for statistic qualities, clinical factors, and medicine use.*
Results: *Of 470,386 hypertensive people, 60,327 (12.8%) were recognized as having safe illness, speaking to 15.3% of those taking meds. By and large, 37,061 patients (7.9%) had uncontrolled hypertension while taking at least 3 meds. The ORs (95% CIs) for safe hypertension were more prominent for dark race (1.68 [1.62-1.75]), more seasoned age (1.11 [1.10-1.11] for each 5-year increment), male sex (1.06 [1.03-1.10]), and weight (1.46 [1.42-1.51]). Drug adherence rates were higher in those with safe hypertension (93% versus 89.8%; P<.001). Unending kidney illness (OR, 1.84; 95% CI, 1.78-1.90), diabetes mellitus (OR, 1.58; 95% CI, 1.53-1.63), and cardiovascular infection (OR, 1.34; 95% CI, 1.30-1.39) were likewise connected with higher danger of safe hypertension.*
Conclusion: *In a progressively institutionalized hypertension treatment condition, we watched a rate of safe hypertension practically identical with that of past examinations utilizing increasingly divided information sources. Past observations have been constrained because of nonrepresentative populaces, unwavering quality of the information, heterogeneity of the treatment situations, and not exactly perfect control rates. This partner, which was set up utilizing an electronic medicinal record based approach, can possibly give a superior comprehension of safe hypertension and results.*

Introductions

As the general mindfulness and subsequent control of hypertension enhances in the United States, a rising sub-populace with treatment safe illness is ending up progressively clear. It has been recommended that the safe hypertension populace is at excessively higher hazard for target-organ harm and cardiovascular occasions

contrasted and the general hypertension population.[1-6] To this end, the acknowledgment and recognizable proof of those with safe hypertension is of specific significance as these people may require further demonstrative assessments and advantage from explicit mediations. In addition, they may enable us to more readily comprehend reaction to current hyperstrain treatment rehearses, which can make ready for prior, progressively effective, and novel oversee ment systems.

The depicted rates of safe hypertension are ending up increasingly steady. Chronicledly, revealed assessments of safe hypertension have extended from as meager as 5% in unselected hypertension populaces to as high as half in subspecialty hypertension clinics.[7,8] Resistant hypertension has been operationally characterized as inability to accomplish circulatory strain (BP) control with utilization of at least 3 meds or utilization of at least 4 meds paying little mind to BP.[2,9] Our present comprehension and appraisals of safe hypertension are gotten from cross-sectional populace samplings,[1,10,11] review partner evaluations,12,13 and subanalyses of huge clinical trials.[14-18] Populations, for example, the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) and different associates have evaluated the predominance of safe hypertension to be 10% to 15% in those with hypertension.[1,10,11,19,20]

Regardless of these endeavors, estimation of the prevalence of safe hypertension is testing. Pseudo-hoisted BPs, heterogeneous practice examples, and trouble in evaluating adherence to the drug routine influence the precise distinguishing proof of safe hypertension.[21-23] Previous perceptions have their own individual confinements inferable from the sort of populaces considered, the dependability of the data, and not exactly perfect BP control. Along these lines, the current estimates have been gotten from divided information on specific populaces with low hypertension control rates.

We looked to distinguish and portray resistant hypertension in an incorporated wellbeing framework with a generally institutionalized model of hypertension care and large amounts of control. We speculate that safe hypertension pervasiveness rates will be bring down in this huge, ethnically assorted populace in a progressively perfect treatment condition with dependable top ture of medicine use.

Materials and Methods

Study Population

A cross-sectional investigation was performed of members of the Kaiser Permanente Southern California (KPSC) wellbeing framework between January 1, 2006, and December 31, 2007. The KPSC human services framework is a paid ahead of time incorporated wellbeing plan giving exhaustive consideration to 3.4 million people all through Southern California, from Bakersfield to San Diego, at 14 restorative focuses and in excess of 100 satellite centers. Amid the examination time frame, there were 2.4 million grown-up individuals. The patient population is ethnically and financially di-refrain, mirroring the overall public of the rehearsing territory and the province of California.[24] Of the individuals in the KPSC electronic restorative record database, 42.7% are white, 35.2% Hisfreeze, 8.8% dark, and 10.2% Asian. All KPSC individuals have comparable advantages and access to human services administrations, center visits, methodology, and copays for meds. Complete human services experiences are followed utilizing a typical electronic restorative record. All research center information, crucial sign appraisals (counting BP measurements), and indicative and methodology codes are gathered in the electronic wellbeing records as a feature of routine clinical consideration experiences. The investigation convention was affirmed by the KPSC Institutional Review Board and was absolved from educated assent.

The examination populace included people 18 years and more seasoned with at least 4 months of

persistent participation in the wellbeing plan. This time prerequisite was utilized to dependably top ture hypertension determinations and comorbidities. We included people who had reported hypertension and a BP estimation. Hypertension was distinguished by inpatient and outpatient International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) codes explicit to hypertension (codes 401.xx, 402.xx, 403.xx, 404.xx, and 405.xx). To be incorporated into this investigation, all individuals were required to have somewhere around 2 visits with ICD-9 codes to decide common hyper-pressure amid the examination time frame. The exactness of ICD-9 coding for the conclusion of hypertension has been already validated.[25] The date of the outpatient BP estimation nearest to the second ICD-9 hypertension code was utilized as the file date. In experiences with various BP estimations, the most minimal esteem was utilized for investigation to limit the impacts of white coat hypertension. Blood weights were viewed as uncontrolled if systolic BP was 140 mm Hg or higher or diastolic BP was 90 mm Hg or higher. People who did not have a BP estimation or who were analyzed as having auxiliary hypertension were rejected. In particular, individuals with ICD-9 codes for renovascular illness, adrenal issue, Cushing disorder, aortic coarctation, and auxiliary hypertension not indicated were rejected from the examination partner. Rest apnea was not rejected in light of the fact that it regularly coincides with hypertension and isn't really a causative factor.

Comorbidities

Comorbidities, including diabetes mellitus, coronary supply route illness, congestive heart disappointment, and cerebrovascular malady, were resolved based on inpatient and outpatient ICD-9 finding codes. Ceaseless kidney ailment (CKD) was recognized and characterized as an expected glomerular filtration rate of under 60 mL/min per 1.73 m2 assessed from serum creatinine levels (when accessible) and the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration equation.[26]

Appraisal of Medication Use Antihypertensive medicine use was recovered from the inward drug store administering records. Medicine orders, drug store fills, and refills are followed for wellbeing plan individuals with pharmacy benefits. People were resolved to take an antihypertensive medicine on the off chance that it was endorsed and filled inside 60 days of the list date. They were viewed as taking accompanying antihypertensive meds if there was a more noteworthy than 7-day cover in medications. Meds that were recommended and filled for under 7 days were not considered.

Every antihypertensive prescription was categorized into a particular medication class. Prescription medication classes included thiazide type diuretics, circle diuretics, angiotensin-changing over en-zyme inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, b-blockers, dihydropyridine and nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers, potassium-saving diuretics, aldosterone receptor blockers, a-blockers, midway acting an agonists, and direct renin inhibitors. Single-pill mixes were relegated based on their individual components. The entirety of individual BP meds characterized the quantity of antihypertensive medications taken by every individual and may have included diverse meds from a similar medication class.

Kaiser Permanente Hypertension Treatment Since 2005, KPSC has inside pushed and made accessible a streamlined hypertension treat-ment calculation with suggestions to direct treatment for all doctors treating and overseeing hypertension (Supplemental Figure 1, accessible online at http://www.mayoclinicproceedings. organization). This calculation has since been changed (in 2009), with the most vital distinction being the expansion of a mineral ocorticoid re-ceptor opponent as a second-line specialist alongside b-blockers. Amid the investigation time of January 1, 2006, to December 31, 2007, hyper-strain control rates in the KPSC populace were assessed to be 65% to 70% (Supplemental Figure 2, accessible online at http://www.mayo clinicproceedings.org).

Statistical Analyses

Contrasts in age and research center qualities between those with and without safe hyper-pressure were tried utilizing the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test. For correlations of sex and race, c2 tests were utilized. Multivariable logistic relapse examinations were utilized to gauge the chances proportions (ORs) and 95% CIs for resistant hypertension, with change for age, sex, race, weight list (determined as load in kilograms partitioned by tallness in meters squared) of no less than 30, and the nearness of comorbidities, including diabetes mellitus, CKD, ischemic coronary illness, congestive heart disappointment, and cerebrovascular ailment. All the factual investigations were produced utilizing SAS form 9.2 programming (SAS Institute, Inc).

Results

Table 1 Characteristic of Participants With Nonresistant and Resistant Hypertension

			Participants			
			With nonresistant		With resistant	
	All		hypertension		hypertension	
Characteristic	(N¼470,386)		(n¼410,059)		(n¼60,327)	
Age (y), mean SD	65 11		65 11		69 11	
Female sex (%)	256,581	(55)	224,941	(55)	31,640	(52)
Race (%)						
White	201,076	(43)	173,879	(42)	27,197	(45)
Black	59,588	(13)	48,288	(12)	11,300	(19)
Hispanic	98,251	(21)	87,238	(21)	11,013	(18)
Asian/Pacific	36,713	(8)	32,768	(8)	3945	(6)
Other	74,758	(16)	67,886	(17)	6872	(11)
BMI (%)						
<30	262,788	(56)	232,911	(57)	29,877	(50)
30	200,820	(43)	171,268	(42)	29,552	(49)
Missing	6778	(1)	5880	(1)	898	(1)
Blood pressure (mm Hg),						
mean SD						
Systolic	133 18		132 17		143 20	
Diastolic	75 11		75 11		74 13	
Diabetes mellitus (%)	156,932	(33)	127,442	(31)	29,490	(49)
Ischemic heart disease (%)	119,906	(25)	94,802	(23)	25,104	(42)
Congestive heart failure (%)	46,218	(10)	32,621	(8)	13,597	(23)
Cerebrovascular disease (%)	49,081	(10)	38,773	(9)	10,308	(17)
Chronic kidney disease (%)	45,871	(34)	30,825	(30)	15,046	(52)

Table 2 Participants (%)

Antihypertensive medication class	All	With nonresistant hypertension	number
Diuretics/natriuretics	56	50	97
Distal diuretic	43	39	70
Loop diuretic	6	4	24
Calcium channel blocker	18	12	56
Suppressors	39	32	82
b-Blocker	37	32	78
Other renin suppressors	3	1	14
Blockers	52	47	90
ACEI	45	40	72
ARB	9	7	22
Other medications	9	6	31

Hypertension Cohort

A sum of 498,891 people in KPSC were recognized as having hypertension amid the examination time frame. This spoke to 21% of all grown-ups in the wellbeing plan. Optional hypertension was recognized in 642 patients, bringing about 498,249 people with nonsecondary hypertension. Another 27,863 patients had BPs people and 15.3% (60,327 out of 395,482 patients with meds) in those taking medications. Utilizing a stricter criteria, 7.9% of the hypertension populace (n¼37,061) had un-controlled BP while taking at least 3 drugs. Hypertensive people who were male, of dark race, corpulent, and more seasoned were bound to have safe hypertension. The comorbidities of diabetes mellitus, ischemic coronary illness, congestive heart disappointment, and CKD were likewise associated with safe hypertension. The safe hypertension populace had marginally better adherence to their endorsed antihypertensive meds.

The safe hypertension populace is rising as a focal point of concern, and there are numerous unanswered inquiries in regards to this sub-gathering of hypertensive people. The portrayed rates of safe hypertension are consistently expanding and have paralleled the expanding distinguishing proof and treatment of hyperten-sion.[11,19] The safe subgroup itself might be a particular populace in danger for exacerbated out-comes and, along these lines, may warrant distinctive treat-ment methodologies. Likewise, the way that they have protection from current treatment techniques may feature the need to rethink the present hypertension rules at any rate for certain sub-populaces. At last, the improvement of a superior comprehension of safe hypertension may give bits of knowledge into enhancing control and results over every single hypertensive person.

The present discoveries were drawn from an examination situation that we accepted had a superior capacity to recognize safe hypertension attributable to higher BP control rates and had progressively dependable patient data. This is contrasted and past perceptions that involved progressively divided data and less steady treatment envi-ronments.[2,7,10-13,27-30] what's more, the present examination populace was racially and ethnically various and, consequently, intelligent of a delegate treatment population.[24] The clinical information in the present investigation was gotten from a genuine clinical work on setting, contrasted and past perceptions from various information sources. Hypertensive people were seen under genuine circumstances and clinical consideration situations. Then again, clinical preliminaries examine explicit target populaces utilizing age-and comorbidity-based consideration criteria. Regularly, explicit conventions for medication determination, portion titration, and adherence are intently checked. These fake circumstances make their individual predominance gauges hard to sum up to the general population.[14,16,17,31,32] Our clinical practice condition incorporated a substantial, delegate, and ethnically assorted populace. The decent variety in the populace was practically identical with that in the NHANES pop-ulation.24 However, the present investigation had increasingly dependable catch of medicine use and comorbidities attributable to the extensive electronic therapeutic records. The high BP control rates in the treatment condition enabled us to more readily distinguish resistant hypertension yet constrained a portion of the generalizability of the discoveries. Hypertension control rates were around 67% (316,331), com-pared with half in the NHANES amid the equivalent period.19 Our clinical practice environment had high rates of BP mindfulness, treatment, and control. The higher control rates are incompletely owing to an institutionalized way to deal with hypertension the executives. Kaiser Permanente wellbeing framework utilizes an inward hypertension treatment rule that is Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure based,[9,33] which is trailed by an extensive extent of the specialists. Likewise, social insurance experts get comparative preparing

in BP estimation procedures, which contributes to increasingly dependable and reproducible BP information. Institutionalizing hypertension care additionally limits hypertension control varieties caused by heterogeneity practically speaking examples. In this manner, we trust that we could more accurately recognize safe hypertension in this clinical care condition. Utilizing comparative criteria, 37,061 (7.9%) of the hypertension populace had uncontrolled BP while taking at least 3 medications contrasted and 13.4% in the latest assessment of the NHANES population.10 We trust that our lower rates are owing to less restorative latency as prove by the way that 395,482 (84%) of KPSC hypertensive people were treated with prescriptions contrasted and just 48% in the NHANES. The correlation with the NHANES information under-scores the way that our hypertension control rates contrast from those saw in whatever is left of the nation. Accordingly, the relevance of these discoveries may not be as including to whatever is left of the hypertension world. Nonetheless, the Kaiser Permanente treatment condition can possibly feature or embody what can be cultivated in reality setting that exploits choice help and more institutionalization of training.

Truly, the investigation of safe hyper-pressure has been a test wing to various elements that perplex the correct ID of this populace. Prescription adherence has been a note worthy confounder in light of the fact that the specific meaning of safe hypertension depends on the supposition that people are completely disciple to their drug routine of at least 3 meds. Albeit defective, we utilized an operational meaning of safe hypertension that is like the one utilized by the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure and the American Heart Associ-ation.[2,9] Although the present investigation did not have data taking drugs use practices essentially on every hypertensive individual, we used the information in the drug store prescription records specifying meds endorsed to and filled by people. With this data, we evaluated adherence utilizing extent of days secured. Subsequently, some proportion of adherence was accessible on the in excess of 60,000 people in the safe hypertension associate. In spite of the fact that it doesn't totally answer the topic of adherence, we found that over 90% (56,106) of the safe hypertension population had more prominent than 80% of days secured in regards to their antihypertensive prescriptions. Extent of days secured has been an all around acknowledged surrogate for adherence, and its qualities have corresponded with clinical outcomes.[34-36]

The cross-sectional plan was a potential impediment of this investigation in that it couldn't assess perseverance of drug use in essence as a more extended nitty gritty follow-up examination would give. A longitudinal examination is un-der approach to assess perseverance of medicine use by assessing refill rates over longer durations. To this end, drug adherence and doctor practice designs should be better contemplated and used to all the more precisely recognize safe hypertension. Extra potential constraints of this investigation and discoveries incorporate the utilization of single BP estimations, the absence of data taking drugs doses, and the general heterogeneity in treatment by individual specialists not withstanding having an inside hypertension treatment rule.

Conclusion

In a substantial agent hypertension population, we recognized and portrayed a safe hypertension companion that represented a substantial extent (12.8%) of the hypertension populace. The safe hypertension population was more established, was bound to be dark, would be advised to adherence, and had more comorbidities. This partner, built up by an electronic medical recorde based approach, can possibly enhance our comprehension of safe hyper-pressure by tending to a significant number of the present learning holes, including longitudinal out-comes. Concentrate this accomplice may give more

prominent bits of knowledge that lead to progressively proficient and compelling methodologies to oversee hypertension.

References

1. Kumbhani DJ, Steg PG, Cannon CP, et al. Resistant hypertension: a frequent and ominous finding among hypertensive patients with atherothrombosis. Eur Heart J. 2013;34(16): 1204-1214.
2. Calhoun DA, Jones D, Textor S, et al. Resistant hypertension: diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Professional Education Committee of the Council for High Blood Pressure Research. Circulation. 2008;117(25):e510-e526.
3. Calhoun DA, Zaman MA, Nishizaka MK. Resistant hyperten-sion. Curr Hypertens Rep. 2002;4(3):221-228.
4. Cuspidi C, Macca G, Sampieri L, et al. High prevalence of car-diac and extracardiac target organ damage in refractory hyper-tension. J Hypertens. 2001;19(11):2063-2070.
5. Pierdomenico SD, Lapenna D, Bucci A, et al. Cardiovascular outcome in treated hypertensive patients with responder, masked, false resistant, and true resistant hypertension. Am J Hypertens. 2005;18(11):1422-1428.
6. Daugherty SL, Powers JD, Magid DJ, et al. Incidence and prog-nosis of resistant hypertension in hypertensive patients. Circula-tion. 2012;125(13):1635-1642.
7. Kaplan NM. Resistant hypertension. J Hypertens. 2005;23(8): 1441-1444.
8. Yakovlevitch M, Black HR. Resistant hypertension in a tertiary care clinic. Arch Intern Med. 1991;151(9):1786-1792.
9. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al. 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(19):2560-2572.
10. Egan BM, Zhao Y, Axon RN, Brzezinski WA, Ferdinand KC. Un- controlled and apparent treatment resistant hypertension in the United States, 1988 to 2008. Circulation. 2011;124(9): 1046-1058.
11. Persell SD. Prevalence of resistant hypertension in the United States, 2003-2008. Hypertension. 2011;57(6): 1076-1080.
12. Garg JP, Elliott WJ, Folker A, Izhar M, Black HR. Resistant hyper-tension revisited: a comparison of two university-based cohorts. Am J Hypertens. 2005;18(5, pt 1):619-626.
13. McAdam-Marx C, Ye X, Sung JC, Brixner DI, Kahler KH. Results of a retrospective, observational pilot study using electronic medical records to assess the prevalence and characteristics of patients with resistant hypertension in an ambulatory care setting. Clin Ther. 2009;31(5):1116-1123.
14. Dahlof B, Devereux RB, Kjeldsen SE, et al. Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in the Losartan Intervention For Endpoint reduction in hypertension study (LIFE): a ran-domised trial against atenolol. Lancet. 2002;359(9311): 995-1003.
15. Pepine CJ, Handberg EM, Cooper-DeHoff RM, et al. A calcium antagonist vs a non-calcium antagonist hypertension treatment strategy for patients with coronary artery disease: the Interna-tional Verapamil-Trandolapril Study (INVEST): a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2003;290(21):2805-2816.
16. Jamerson K, Weber MA, Bakris GL, et al. Benazepril plus amlo-dipine or hydrochlorothiazide for hypertension in high-risk pa-tients. N Engl J Med. 2008;359(23):2417-2428.
17. ALLHAT Officers and Coordinators for the ALLHAT Collabora-tive Research

Group. Major outcomes in moderately hypercho-lesterolemic, hypertensive patients randomized to pravastatin vs usual care: The Antihypertensive and Lipid-Lowering Treatment to Prevent Heart Attack Trial (ALLHAT-LLT). JAMA. 2002; 288(23):2998-3007.

18. Dahlof B, Zanchetti A, Diez J, et al. Effects of losartan and aten-olol on left ventricular mass and neurohormonal profile in patients with essential hypertension and left ventricular hyper-trophy. J Hypertens. 2002;20(9):1855-1864.
19. Egan BM, Zhao Y, Axon RN. US trends in prevalence, aware-ness, treatment, and control of hypertension, 1988-2008. JAMA. 2010;303(20):2043-2050.
20. Sarafidis PA. Epidemiology of resistant hypertension. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich). 2011;13(7):523-528.
21. Berlowitz DR, Ash AS, Hickey EC, et al. Inadequate manage-ment of blood pressure in a hypertensive population. N Engl J Med. 1998;339(27):1957-1963.
22. Okonofua EC, Simpson KN, Jesri A, Rehman SU, Durkalski VL, Egan BM. Therapeutic inertia is an impediment to achieving the Healthy People 2010 blood pressure control goals. Hyperten-sion. 2006;47(3):345-351.
23. Phillips LS, Branch WT, Cook CB, et al. Clinical inertia. Ann Intern Med. 2001;135(9):825-834.
24. Koebnick C, Langer-Gould AM, Gould MK, et al. Sociodemo-graphic characteristics of members of a large, integrated health care system: comparison with US Census Bureau data. Perm J. 2012;16(3):37-41.
25. Bhandari SK, Pashayan S, Liu IL, et al. 25-Hydroxyvitamin D levels and hypertension rates. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich). 2011;13(3):170-177.
26. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, et al. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. Ann Intern Med. 2009; 150(9):604-612.
27. de la Sierra A, Segura J, Banegas JR, et al. Clinical features of 8295 patients with resistant hypertension classified on the basis of ambulatory blood pressure monitoring. Hypertension. 2011; 57(5):898-902.
28. Ishikawa J, Haimoto H, Hoshide S, Eguchi K, Shimada K, Kario K. An increased visceral-subcutaneous adipose tissue ratio is asso-ciated with difficult-to-treat hypertension in men. J Hypertens. 2010;28(6):1340-1346.
29. Moser M, Setaro JF. Clinical practice: resistant or difficult-to-control hypertension. N Engl J Med. 2006;355(4):385-392.
30. Park J, Campese V. Clinical characteristics of resistant hyperten-sion: the importance of compliance and the role of diagnostic evaluation in delineating pathogenesis. J Clin Hypertens (Green-wich). 2007;9(1, suppl 1):7-12.
31. Black HR, Elliott WJ, Grandits G, et al. Principal results of the Controlled Onset Verapamil Investigation of Cardiovascular End Points (CONVINCE) trial. JAMA. 2003;289(16):2073-2082.
32. Cooper-DeHoff RM, Gong Y, Handberg EM, et al. Tight blood pressure control and cardiovascular outcomes among hyper-tensive patients with diabetes and coronary artery disease. JAMA. 2010;304(1):61-68.
33. National High Blood Pressure Education Program Working Group report on primary prevention of hypertension. Arch Intern Med. 1993;153(2):186-208.
34. Karve S, Cleves MA, Helm M, Hudson TJ, West DS, Martin BC. An empirical basis for standardizing adherence measures derived from administrative

claims data among diabetic pa-tients. Med Care. 2008;46(11):1125-1133.

35. Mazzaglia G, Ambrosioni E, Alacqua M, et al. Adherence to antihypertensive medications and cardiovascular morbidity among newly diagnosed hypertensive patients. Circulation. 2009;120(16):1598-1605.
36. Ho PM, Magid DJ, Shetterly SM, et al. Medication nonadherence is associated with a broad range of adverse outcomes in patients with coronary artery disease. Am Heart J. 2008;155(4):772-779.