**Supplemental Methods**

**Blood pressure device comparison sub-study**

This sub-study was approved by the Syracuse University Institutional Review Board and complied with ethical standards for human subjects research (IRB # 20-013). Briefly, participants were asked to lie supine for 10 min on a padded exam table in a quiet room prior to blood pressure measurement. The oscillometric blood pressure devices (Panasonic EW3109 vs Omron BP786N) were used in a counter-balanced order on the same arm to avoid inter-arm blood pressure differences. A minimum of 2 measurements were obtained separated by 2 min; additional measurements were performed until 2 blood pressure readings for that given device agreed within 5 mmHg. The average blood pressure of the 2 readings was used for all analyses. In total, 32 participants between the ages of 20-68 yrs completed this study (sample mean age of 30 ± 13 yrs; n = 17 women). Mean arterial pressure was calculated as described previously in the main manuscript. The data were inspected for outliers and normal distributions quantitatively (Shapiro-Wilk test) and qualitatively (histograms and Q-Q plots). Device agreement was compared using mean differences between devices (Panasonic value – Omron value), Pearson and intraclass correlation coefficients, and Bland-Altman plots.

**Supplemental Results**

**Blood pressure device comparison**

On average, the Panasonic device determined systolic, diastolic, and mean arterial pressure to be 3 mmHg greater than the Omron device (Figure S1). The data displayed in the Bland-Altman plots show the average difference between oscillometric devices (solid line) ± 1.96 × SD (standard deviation of the mean difference; dashed line). The scatterplots display the trendline (solid line) with 95% confidence interval about the mean (dashed lines). Pearson correlation coefficients indicate the values were highly correlated between devices, with r ≥ 0.82, p < 0.001 for all correlations. Intraclass correlation coefficients were calculated with absolute agreement as 0.92, 0.88, and 0.93 for systolic, diastolic, and mean arterial pressure, respectively. Together, the data show that the devices present acceptable agreement in blood pressure readings, with the Panasonic device reading slightly higher (3 mmHg) than the Omron device on average.

Figure S1: Bland-Altman and univariate association between Omron and Panasonic blood pressure devices. Univariate associations displayed with linear trend line and 95% confidence interval.