Limited Interchangeability Between Pulse and Heart Rate Variability Influenced by Aging and postural change

Runwei Lin, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Marjolein Klop, Frank R. Halfwerk, Richard van Wezel, Gozewijn Dirk Laverman, Dirk W. Donker, and Ying Wang.

***Abstract*— *Objective*: Pulse rate variability (PRV) derived from photoplethysmography is often used as a surrogate for heart rate variability (HRV) in daily monitoring. However, their interchangeability in older adults and under postural change remains uncertain, potentially leading to misinterpretation in practical usage. Moreover, the physiological mechanisms underlying HRV–PRV differences, particularly in relation to aging, are poorly understood. *Approach*: We evaluated HRV–PRV interchangeability across 18 features during different postural changes using four orthostatic tests in 31 younger and 20 older adults. Bland–Altman analysis assessed the interchangeability in different postural change conditions. Linear mixed models (LMMs) quantified the effects of aging and postural changes. Mediation analysis examined whether pulse arrival time variability (PATV) and mean systolic/diastolic blood pressure (BP) mediated these effects. *Results*: Short-term features were mostly interchangeable in younger adults but largely non-interchangeable in older adults. Features reflecting long-term variability generally met the threshold in both age groups. Aging and posture significantly reduced interchangeability, with aging effects partly mediated by increased PATV. *Significance*: Our findings demonstrate that PRV cannot reliably substitute HRV for short-term variability, with limitations further aggravated by postural changes and aging. For long-term variability, HRV and PRV were interchangeable in both age groups, although interchangeability was consistently lower in older adults. These insights are essential for daily-life monitoring, emphasizing the need for reliable HRV assessment especially in older adults and during postural transitions.**

***Index Terms*— heart rate variability, pulse rate variability, blood pressure, pulse arrival time, aging, orthostatic test.**

Runwei Lin and Ying Wang are with the Department of Biomedical Signals and Systems, University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands. (e-mail: imwywk@gmail.com)

Marjolein Klop is with the Department of Geriatric Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Richard van Wezel is with the Department of Neurobiology, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands, and with the Department of Biomedical Signals and Systems, Technical Medical Centre, University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands, and also the OnePlanet Research Center, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

Frank R. Halfwerk is with Engineering Organ Support Technologies Group, Department of Biomechanical Engineering, University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands, and with the Department of Cardiothoracic surgery, Thorax Centrum Twente, Medisch Spectrum Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands.

Dirk W. Donker is with the group of Cardiovascular and Respiratory Physiology, University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands, and with Intensive Care Center, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

Gozewijn Dirk Laverman is with the Department of Biomedical Signals and Systems, University of Twente, and with the Department of Internal Medicine, Ziekenhuisgroep Twente, Almelo, the Netherlands.

I. Introduction

Heart rate variability (HRV) is a widely used indicator of autonomic and cardiovascular health [1], [2]. Reduced HRV has been linked to various diseases, including myocardial infarction [3], [4], hypertension [5], [6], diabetes [7]–[9], sleep disorders [10], [11], and depression [12]. Electrocardiogram (ECG) based HRV measurement, i.e., the gold standard, usually requires gel electrodes and is not feasible for long-term and daily-life monitoring. Photoplethysmography (PPG) offers a practical alternative for ECG using optical approach [13], [14]. PPG-derived HRV is commonly referred to as pulse rate variability (PRV). In recent years, PRV is increasingly used for continuous monitoring in free-living conditions, especially among older adults [15], [16].

Although PRV is widely adopted, it has been suggested that PRV might contain information distinct from HRV, and direct substitution may lead to misinterpretation [13], [14], [17]. While several studies have reported strong HRV–PRV agreement in young, healthy individuals at rest [14], [17], [18], growing literature reported the interchangeability might reduce in people with worse health conditions, and under dynamic situations such as postural change [18], [19]. Evidence from clinical cohorts suggests that PRV cannot substitute HRV in patients with multiple kinds of cardiovascular, pulmonary, and neurological diseases [20]. Observations of HRV-PRV interchangeability during postural changes and exercises are inconsistent: some concluded PRV can substitute HRV [19], [21], [22], whereas others found poor agreement [18], [23]. Aging has also been hypothesized to reduce HRV–PRV interchangeability by increasing vascular stiffness, thereby altering pulse wave transmission [14], [21]. Additionally, ambient temperature and respiratory pattern can affect the interchangeability [24], [25]. Overall these discrepancies raise concerns about potential misinterpretation when PRV is used as a direct surrogate for HRV in daily monitoring.

The physiological mechanisms underlying HRV–PRV differences are also not fully understood yet. Pulse arrival time

(PAT) variability and blood pressure (BP) level have been proposed as the potential contributors. PAT reflects both cardiac electromechanical delay and pulse wave transit time, and variability in PAT has been hypothesized to cause the HRV-PRV discrepancies [21], [25]. In recordings from patients in intensive-care-unit (ICU), different BP levels have been associated with differences in HRV–PRV agreement, likely due to the close relationship between BP and PAT [26]. However, few studies have quantified to what extent PATV and BP will impact HRV–PRV interchangeability.

In the context of daily-life health monitoring, aging and postural changes are key considerations of HRV-PRV interchangeability because they profoundly influence cardiovascular regulation and occur universally in everyday activities. Despite the debates and hypotheses in the literatures [14], [18], [21], [22], [24], the effects of aging and postural changes on the interchangeability have not been formally investigated so far. Therefore, this study aims to: (1) systematically examine the interchangeability between HRV and PRV in younger and older adults during postural changes, with interchangeability defined by both the inter-subject and inter-session variability, and the presence of correctable biases. (2) determine the independent contributions of aging and postural change to HRV–PRV interchangeability and (3) evaluate whether pulse arrival time variability (PATV) and systolic/diastolic blood pressure mediate these effects.

II. Materials and methods

A. Data acquisition and processing

1) Dataset description: A dataset on healthy volunteers used in this study was adopted from [27]–[29]. The original study was approved by the Radboud University ethics committee (ECS17022 and REC18021). As the dataset is anonymized and available open access, no additional ethical approval was required. This dataset was selected as it includes both younger and older adults undergoing well controlled postural changes enabling direct comparisons of HRV and PRV across different age cohorts. Postural changes were performed using standard orthostatic tests, which are commonly applied in clinical practice to evaluate heart rate and blood pressure responses to lying-to-standing transitions.

The dataset includes 34 younger adults and 31 older adults, see Table I for baseline information. All older adults included were community-dwelling, able to walk at least 250 meters without the use of walking aids and independent for activities of daily living [28]. PPG, ECG and continuous BP were recorded simultaneously with sampling rates of 1kHz, 300Hz, and 200Hz, respectively. PPG was measured from the distal phalanx of the index finger. Five-lead ECG and beat-to-beat BP were recorded by Finapres Nova (Finapres, Enschede, the Netherlands) using a finger cuff and was corrected by a reference height sensor. All signals were synchronized using a common reference analog signal.

Postural change conditions including four conditions: rapid supine-to-stand, slow supine-to-stand, head-up tilting, and sit-to-stand, were done by individual subjects under researchers' instruction [27], [28]. During the tests, subjects were required to stay in a resting position (sitting or supine) for five minutes and then stood up for three minutes. For the supine-to-stand test, subjects were required to stand up from a supine position in approximately three or 10 seconds for rapid and slow tests, respectively. For head-up tilting, the subjects were passively tilted up to 70-degree in 15 seconds from supine position to upright. In the sit-to-stand test, the subjects were required to stand up from a sitting position at a preferred speed. For further details of the experiments, please refer to [27]–[29].

TABLE I
Summary of the subject baseline information. Numbers are n (%), or median [Q1, Q3] [27], [29].

Variables	Younger adults	Older adults
Sex [female]	10 [29%]	17 [55%]
Age [years]	25 [22, 45]	77 [72, 81]
Resting SBP [mmHg]	124 [114, 132]	153 [145, 172]
Resting DBP [mmHg]	71 [64, 84]	83 [77, 94]

2) Data processing: Fig. 1 presents an overview of data processing and statistical analysis in this study. R peaks were derived from lead II ECG using Pan-Thompkins method [30]. MSPTDfast was utilized for PPG peak detection given its superior performance [31], [32]. The midpoint of systolic and diastolic peaks is adopted as fiducial points based on literature [25], [32]. Fig 2 illustrates the selected fiducial points from PPG and accordingly, the definition of PAT in this study.

Before HRV and PRV calculation, data selection was conducted given measured signals were sensitive to noise, especially motion artifacts (MAs). To minimize the MA during transition from supine to standing and vice versa, we first excluded the postural change period, as well as the first and last 10 seconds of each pre- and post-standing to ensure the data quality. Furthermore, any RR interval or PAT duration showing a beat-to-beat change larger than 50% was discarded as an outlier. This relatively large threshold was chosen empirically, considering the potentially greater physiological variability during postural change, especially for older adults. The BP measurement was generally of high quality, we thus only performed the following checks: SBP>220 or <65mmHg, DBP>130 or <40mmHg, or $>$ 50% beat-to-beat changes were removed. Recordings with $>$ 25% missing samples were excluded. Missing rate lower than 25% were accepted because only the segment-wise mean BP was used in subsequent analysis.

We further adopted the strategy from [26] to ensure the quality of PRV. For each recording segment, a signal quality index (SQI) was firstly computed for each pulse. A k-means algorithm was then applied to classify the data into two clusters. The cluster with majority of data points was assumed to represent 'good quality' peaks. Based on this classification, a goodness ratio was calculated as follows in Eq. 1:

$$R_{good} = \frac{N_{good}}{N} \cdot 100\% \tag{1}$$

where N_{good} is the number of 'good quality' peaks and N represents the total number of detected peaks. If the R_{good} is above 80% [26] or the mean SQI above 0.8, data were considered high quality and used for the following analysis.



Fig. 1. Overview of the study. After fiducial points detection, outlier removal and feature calculation, Bland-Altman analysis were used to assess HRV-PRV interchangeability. Linear mixed model and mediation analysis were conducted to explore the relevant effects.



Fig. 2. Definition of pulse arrival time in the present study. Red dots denote the fiducial points of ECG and PPG. PAT is defined as the time interval between these two points. ECG = Electrocardiogram; PPG = Photoplethysmography; PAT = Pulse arrival time.

TABLE II
SUMMARY OF DEFINITIONS, UNITS, AND VARIABILITY TYPES OF THE SELECTED FEATURES.

Feature [unit]	Definition	Type
AVNN [ms]	Average length of all NN intervals	Long-term
RMSSD [ms]	Root mean square of the differences between successive NN intervals	Short-term
SDNN [ms]	Standard deviation of all NN intervals	Long-term
SDSD [ms]	Standard deviation of the differences between successive NN intervals	Short-term
pNN50 [%]	Percentage of successive NN intervals differences exceeding 50 ms	Short-term
LF [ms^2]	Power of low frequency band (0.04-0.15 Hz)	Long-term
HF [ms^2]	Power of high frequency band (0.15-0.4 Hz)	Short-term
TP [ms^2]	Total power within 0.04–0.4 Hz	Short-term
pLF [n.u.]	Low frequency power normalized by TP	Short-term
pHF [n.u.]	High frequency power normalized by TP	Short-term
LF/HF	Ratio of LF to HF power	Short-term
SD1 [ms]	Standard deviation of short axis in Poincaré plot	Short-term
SD2 [ms]	Standard deviation of long axis in Poincaré plot	Long-term
SD2/SD1	Ratio between SD2 and SD1	Short-term
ApEn	Approximate entropy of NN intervals	Short-term
SampEn	Sample entropy of NN intervals	Short-term
alpha1	Short-term scaling exponent from detrended fluctuation analysis	Short-term
alpha2	Long-term scaling exponent from detrended fluctuation analysis	Long-term

Table II summarizes the definitions of the selected features. Since all features were calculated within short time windows, we excluded features with inherently slow variations, such as the very low frequency (≤ 0.04 Hz) component. In total, 18 features were computed across time, frequency, and nonlinear domains. Time-domain and Poincaré plot features were calculated using the toolbox introduced in [33]. Frequency-domain features were estimated using the Lomb–Scargle periodogram, as recommended in [34], to avoid interpolation-induced errors. Entropy-based features were computed with a tolerance of 20% of the standard deviation and an embedding dimension of m = 2. A detrended fluctuation analysis was performed [35]. To facilitate interpretation, all features were grouped by their physiological relevance into two types: long-term variability indices that capture slow oscillations in heart rate and short-term variability indices that reflect fast fluctuations in heart rate (Table II).

B. Bland-Altman analysis

Bland-Altman analysis calculates the bias and limit-of-agreement (LoA) between HRV and PRV. The bias refers to the average systematical difference between HRV and PRV. LoA quantifies the range within which most differences fall, with wider LoA indicating poorer interchangeability. To evaluate the interchangeability between HRV and PRV, Bland–Altman analysis was applied with a dual focus on population- and individual-level agreement. HRV and PRV were interchangeable at the population level when the bias has a 95% confidence interval (CI) crossed zero, indicating no systematic difference. At the individual level, interchangeability was supported when the LoA width was $\leq 150\%$ [18], [36]; in these cases, bias correction enabled agreement if a systematic shift was present. When the LoA width exceeded 150%, the two measures were not interchangeable for individual use regardless of bias.

These two measures and their 95% CIs were defined as follows, where biases and LoA width were normalized by the mean value of HRV to facilitate comparisons across different

features.

$$\text{Bias}_i = \text{mean}\left(\frac{X_{\text{PRV}_i} - X_{\text{HRV}_i}}{\overline{X_{\text{HRV}_i}}}\right) \tag{2}$$

$$\text{SD}_i = \text{SD}\left(\frac{X_{\text{PRV}_i} - X_{\text{HRV}_i}}{\overline{X_{\text{HRV}_i}}}\right) \tag{3}$$

$$\text{LoA width}_i = \text{LoA}_{U,i} - \text{LoA}_{L,i} = 3.92 \cdot \text{SD}_i \tag{4}$$

$$\text{CI}_{\text{Bias}_i} = \text{Bias}_i \pm \frac{t_{(n-1,0.975)} \cdot \text{SD}_i}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{5}$$

$$\text{CI}_{\text{LoA width}_i} = 3.92 \cdot \left[\text{SD}_i\sqrt{\frac{n-1}{\chi^2_{0.975,n-1}}}, \text{SD}_i\sqrt{\frac{n-1}{\chi^2_{0.025,n-1}}}\right] \tag{6}$$

where X_{HRV_i} and X_{PRV_i} denote the values for the ith feature. $\overline{X_{\text{HRV}_i}}$ is the mean values of the ith HRV feature across all measurement, n is the sample size. SD_i is the standard deviation of the normalized differences, and LoA width$_i$ is the distance between the upper and lower LoA. $\text{LoA}_{U,i}$ and $\text{LoA}_{L,i}$ were distribution upper and lower LoA for ith feature. $t_{(n-1,0.975)}$ is the 0.975 quantile of the t-distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom, and $\chi^2_{0.975,n-1}$ and $\chi^2_{0.025,n-1}$ are the corresponding upper and lower quantiles of the chi-square distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom, respectively.

To explore whether PRV can reliably replace HRV under the influence of aging and postural changes, we performed Bland–Altman analysis in four subgroups, denoted by the *Group–State* pattern: younger-pre, younger-post, older-pre, and older-post, where *Group* indicates age category and textitState indicates the pre- or post-standing period.

C. Linear mixed model

LMMs were employed to investigate which factors significantly influence the HRV-PRV consistency. Fixed effects for the LMMs were *Group* (younger vs. older), *State* (pre- vs. post-standing), *TestType* (rapid supine-to-stand, slow supine-to-stand, head-up tilting, and sit-to-stand) and the interaction between *State* and *Group*. Random effects were created for the subject IDs to correct the individual influence on the results. The LMM analysis was performed for each HRV-PRV pair using R Statistical Software [37]. The model is written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Consistency} \sim\ & \textit{State} + \textit{Group} + \textit{TestType} \\ & + \textit{State} * \textit{Group} + (1|\text{SubjectID})\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where we defined the following metric to quantify the consistency for ith feature:

$$\text{Consistency}_i = ln(\frac{1+\text{HRV}_i}{1+\text{PRV}_i}) \tag{8}$$

It can be observed that 0 represents PRV perfectly matches HRV. A positive consistency refers PRV underestimating the HRV and a negative consistency refers overestimation. Since all features in this study are nonnegative, both 1+HRV and 1+PRV ensures the logarithm operation is well-defined.

To account for potential heteroscedasticity in the data, Levene's test was first performed to assess the homogeneity of variance across different age groups and postural states. As the Levene's tests suggested heteroscedasticity, LMMs were fitted using variance function structure (VarIdent in R) to allow for group-specific residual variances. Sequentially, marginal F-tests differentiate the impact of different fixed effects on HRV-PRV consistency, with significance level set at 0.05. Post hoc analysis was conducted using Benjamini–Hochberg procedure to control the false discovery rate (FDR), which has been used in post hoc analysis for HRV [34]. For effect size estimation, 95% CIs of the regression coefficients were estimated via bootstrapping with 5,000 resamples, which is considered as a sufficient number given the commonly chosen 2000 resamples for 90–95% CIs [38].

D. Mediation analysis

Three mediation analysis were conducted to evaluate whether mean SBP, mean DBP and PATV mediate the fixed effects on HRV–PRV consistency. In this study, PATV was quantified by the RMSSD of PAT. This choice was made given PATV is mainly modulated by vagal modulation [25], and RMSSD is a widely used metric to extract vagal nerve activity [39]. $\text{RMSSD}_{\text{PAT}}$ was defined as:

$$\text{RMSSD}_{\text{PAT}} = ln\sqrt{\frac{1}{J-1}\sum_{j=2}^{J}(\text{PAT}_j - \text{PAT}_{j-1})^2} \tag{9}$$

where j is the beat index and J is the total number of beats in the calculation period. A natural logarithmic transformation was applied to PATV to account for the skewed distribution of RMSSD values.

Due to potential high collinearity between PATV and BP, these mediators were analyzed separately for each feature. Each mediation analysis involves two linear mixed-effects models: a mediator model and an outcome model. The mediator model predicts the mediator as a function of experimental factors, and the outcome model predicts the dependent variable (HRV–PRV consistency) as a function of both the mediator and the same experimental factors. The outcome model is written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Consistency} =& \beta_0 \cdot \textit{Group} + \beta_1 \cdot \textit{State} + \beta_2 \cdot \textit{TestType} \\ & + \beta_3 \cdot M + \mu_0 + \epsilon_0\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where μ_0 is the random effect causes by within-subject variability and ϵ_0 denotes the residual. Interaction was not included in this model as it would introduce extra complexity and our focus is to investigate the separate intermediate effects of age and posture change. β_0, β_1, β_2 and β_3 are regression coefficients. M denotes the mediator in this study. The intermediate model is:

$$M = \gamma_0 \cdot \textit{Group} + \gamma_1 \cdot \textit{State} + \gamma_2 \cdot \textit{TestType} + \mu_1 + \epsilon_1 \tag{11}$$

where γ_0, γ_1, γ_2 are regression coefficients and μ_1 and ϵ_1 corresponds to random effect and residual.

Three metrics were utilized for mediation effect evaluation based on the introduced models. The average causal mediation effect (ACME) quantifies the indirect effect through the mediator, and the average direct effect (ADE) captures the direct effect independent of the mediator. Total effect (TE) is the

summation of ACME and ADE. Eqs. (12)-(14) showed their definitions:

$$\text{ACME}_{Group} = \beta_3 \cdot \gamma_0, \quad \text{ACME}_{State} = \beta_3 \cdot \gamma_1 \tag{12}$$

$$\text{ADE}_{Group} = \beta_0, \quad \text{ADE}_{State} = \beta_1, \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TE}_{Group} &= \text{ACME}_{Group} + \text{ADE}_{Group}, \\ \text{TE}_{State} &= \text{ACME}_{State} + \text{ADE}_{State} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Given the residual of output models were not uniformly distributed, we employed bootstrap (5000 resamples) to estimate the CIs for each ACME, ADE and TE. Mediation effects were evaluated only for the main effects *Group* and *State* as distinguishing different test types was not the primary focus of this study. The analysis was performed for each feature, resulting in 3 (mediators) × 2 (fixed effects) × 18 (features) × 3 = 324 effect estimates (including ACME, ADE, and TE). Each mediator has 108 effect estimates. To account for multiple comparisons and reduce the risk of Type I errors, we adopted 99% CIs instead of the conventional 95% CIs. This decision was based on the difficulty of deriving reliable p-values from bootstrap distributions, which may be skewed. In addition, 99% CIs implied an expected false positives number of 108 × 0.01 = 1.08 for each mediator, which is considered acceptable given the large number of comparisons.

III. Results

A. Data processing

Data selection resulted in 427 segments from 31 younger adults and 210 segments from 20 older adults. Other recordings were excluded because of missing recordings or low data quality. Detailed information about the selected segments is summarized in supplementary material I. HRV and PRV features, along with mean SBP, mean DBP, and PATV, were calculated for both younger and older adults during different postures (Supplementary Material II).

B. Bland-Altman analysis

Figures 3 and 4 summarize the Bland–Altman analysis. Each subfigure displays five bars, representing the bias and LoA estimates for the entire sample and the four subgroups. At the population level, only a few features met the interchangeability threshold: LF in older adults, SD2 in younger and older adults pre-standing, and ApEn in younger adults pre-standing and older adults post-standing.

At the individual-level, AVNN, SDNN, pLF, SD2, ApEn, SampEn, alpha1, and alpha2 met the 150% LoA width threshold across all subgroups. In contrast, short-term indices such as RMSSD, SDSD, pNN50, pHF, SD1, and SD2/SD1 met the threshold only in younger adults. Notably, LF and TP met the threshold only in the post-standing subgroups, whereas HF and LF/HF are interchangeable only for the younger-post and younger–pre subgroups, respectively. Among these interchangeable features, only a few had biases with 95% CIs crossing zero, suggesting that these PRV metrics could directly substitute for HRV. For the others, significant biases were observed, but interchangeability was still attainable once bias correction was applied based on the estimated bias and its 95% CI.

Above all, indices reflecting long-term variability demonstrated consistently better interchangeability. In contrast, short-term indices generally exhibited wider LoAs, particularly in older adults, indicating poorer interchangeability. The gap between younger and older adults was even more pronounced at the individual level, where younger adults consistently showed more favorable agreement, while older adults exhibited poorer interchangeability. An illustrative example is LF in the older–pre group: although this feature appeared population-wise interchangeable, its LoA width exceeded the threshold at the individual level. This finding underscores the substantial inter-subject and inter-session variability in older adults, indicating that such metrics may not be reliably interchangeable despite no systematic bias.

C. Linear mixed model

Table III presents the p-values derived from marginal F-tests after Benjamini–Hochberg correction. The age effect (*Group*) showed significance for 11 features and the postural change effect (*State*) showed significance for 14 features given 95% significance level, suggesting both fixed effects have profound impact on HRV-PRV interchangeability. TP, LF/HF, SD2 and SD2/SD1 exhibited significance for the different postural change conditions (*TestType*). SDSD, ApEn and LF/HF were influenced significantly by the interaction effect between the age and postural change effects. Coefficients with 95% CIs from bootstrapping and the interaction plot after marginalizing the effects of test types were summarized in supplementary material III.

TABLE III
P-Values derived from F-tests after Benjamini–Hochberg Correction.

Feature	p-value *Group* (Age)	p-value *State* (Posture)	p-value *TestType*	p-value *State* × *Group*
AVNN	0.57	0.25	0.46	0.35
RMSSD	0.11	< 0.01	0.15	0.51
SDNN	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.19	0.87
SDSD	0.11	< 0.01	0.17	0.02
pNN50	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.89	0.33
LF	0.08	< 0.01	0.96	0.96
HF	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.22	0.11
TP	< 0.01	0.19	< 0.01	0.10
pLF	< 0.01	0.71	0.07	0.09
pHF	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.13	0.17
LF/HF	0.08	< 0.01	0.01	0.049
SD1	0.04	< 0.01	0.08	0.58
SD2	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.64
SD2/SD1	0.12	< 0.01	< 0.01	0.60
ApEn	0.03	< 0.01	0.72	< 0.01
SampEn	0.02	< 0.01	0.13	0.10
alpha1	0.13	< 0.01	0.40	0.13
alpha2	< 0.01	0.89	0.17	0.81



Fig. 3. Biases with their 95% CIs for each feature in the entire population and in different subgroups. All results were normalized by their mean values. All: results fromentire population Y: younger adults; O: older adults; Pre: Pre-standing; Post: Post-standing. Definition and units of the features were summarized in Table II.



Fig. 4. LoA width with their 95% CIs (error bars) for each feature in the entire population and in different subgroups. All results were normalized by their mean values. All: results fromentire population. Y: younger adults; O: older adults; Pre: Pre-standing; Post: Post-standing.

D. Mediation analysis

Figures 5–7 illustrate the results of the mediation analysis. A mediation effect was considered significant if the 99% CI excluded zero, with significance indicated by asterisks. Among the 18 analyzed features, 17 showed significant ACME_{Group} for PATV, and 10 showed significant direct effects (ADE_{Group}). For most of these features, the effect sizes of ADE_{Group} exceeded those of ACME_{Group}, suggesting that PATV explained only part of the group differences, with substantial direct effects remaining. Only five significant mediation effects for posture (*State*) were identified, all accompanied by significant and larger ADE_{State}, indicating limited mediation by PATV.

In comparison, mean SBP and DBP each showed six significant ACME_{Group}. For SBP, nine ADE_{Group} were significant, and for DBP, 11 were significant. In both cases, the direct effects were consistently larger than the mediation effects, indicating that group differences were only partially mediated by blood pressure. Mediation effects for *State* were also limited. For SBP, four ACME_{State} and 15 ADE_{State} reached significance; for DBP, eight ACME_{State} and 13 ADE_{State} were significant, again with the direct effects predominating.

IV. Discussion

This study systematically evaluated HRV–PRV interchangeability in younger and older adults across multiple postural changes and examined the potential mediating roles of PATV, SBP, and DBP. In younger adults, interchangeability was generally higher, with many features are interchangeable after bias correction. In contrast, in older adults, most short-term features were non-interchangeable, although some long-term indices remained interchangeable. Both aging and postural change independently reduced HRV–PRV consistency, with PATV partially accounting for the aging-related decline but not for the posture-related effects.



Fig. 5. ACME, ADE and TE in different features for mean PATV. For each feature, six bars represent the estimated effect sizes for variable *Group* (in red) and *State* (in blue). Error bars indicate 99% CIs. Asterisks denote statistically significant effects, defined as CIs that do not cross zero. ACME_Group, ADE_Group, etc. represent the group- and state-level mediation effects as defined in Eq. 12-14.



Fig. 6. ACME, ADE and TE in different features for mean SBP. For each feature, six bars represent the estimated effect sizes for variable *Group* (in red) and *State* (in blue). Error bars indicate 99% CIs. Asterisks denote statistically significant effects, defined as CIs that do not cross zero.



Fig. 7. ACME, ADE and TE in different features for mean DBP. For each feature, six bars represent the estimated effect sizes for variable *Group* (in red) and *State* (in blue). Error bars indicate 99% CIs. Asterisks denote statistically significant effects, defined as CIs that do not cross zero.

A. Limited interchangeability of HRV and PRV

Bland–Altman analysis demonstrated that interchangeability was generally higher in younger adults. This difference was most evident at the individual level, where short-term indices such as RMSSD, SDSD, pHF, SD1, and SD2/SD1 were interchangeable in younger adults but not in older adults. This age-related discrepancy is particularly relevant for daily monitoring and research applications, as time-, frequency-, and Poincaré-based features are widely used in wearable and mobile health technologies. The reduced agreement suggests that PRV should be interpreted with caution in older adults.

In addition, long-term indices demonstrated better individual-level interchangeability than short-term indices, consistent with previous findings [17]. This pattern may reflect the stronger parasympathetic influence on short-term indices, which amplifies beat-to-beat differences introduced by respiration-mediated pulse wave transmission.

Among the interchangeable features, many still exhibited statistically significant biases. For some indices, such as AVNN, the bias was small enough to be clinically negligible, whereas others may require systematic correction. The estimated biases and their 95% CIs provide a reference for such adjustments. Importantly, the direction of bias was consistent across subgroups, supporting the feasibility of standardized correction strategies.

A notable exception is LF in the older–pre subgroup, which appeared interchangeable at population level but showed wide LoAs at the individual level, indicating poor agreement. This example underscores that even when no systematic bias is observed, substantial inter-individual variability may still undermine reliable substitution in practice. Such findings are particularly relevant for personalized monitoring, as they suggest that some indices may capture subject-specific or context-dependent dynamics over universally comparable measures.

Taken together, these findings indicate that PRV can serve as a substitute for HRV in younger healthy adults when bias correction is applied. HRV and PRV appear largely non-interchangeable in older adults, suggesting that PRV should be regarded as a distinct digital biomarker rather than a direct surrogate for HRV. Future studies should further investigate the sources of variability, with particular emphasis on inter-individual differences and validation in larger cohorts.

B. Impact of aging

LMM analysis suggested aging independently reduced HRV–PRV consistency across 11 features, with the most pronounced effects in frequency-domain metrics. It is recognized that the arterial vessels typically act as a low-pass filter for pulse wave transmission [20], and vascular aging may modify this filtering process. As a result, PRV may deviate more from HRV in the HF, and further changes TP, pHF and pLF. This aligns with previous findings that HRV–PRV interchangeability is lower in clinical populations with cardiopulmonary and neurological diseases [20]. These results support the idea that HRV–PRV consistency itself could serve as a novel digital biomarker for vascular and autonomic health, warranting further validation in daily monitoring settings.

Mediation analysis showed that only PATV played significant mediation effects for aging, as 17 out of 18 features showed significant mediation effects. Older adults exhibited both higher PATV and lower interchangeability in pre- and post-standing periods (Supplementary Material II), consistent with the hypothesis that vascular stiffening contributes to reduced interchangeability [21]. Elevated PATV has been associated with worse cardiovascular outcomes, such as higher mortality linked to increased carotid–femoral pulse transit time variability [40], and may reflect impaired autonomic cardiovascular regulation. However, for 10 features, significant direct effects remained larger than the mediation effects, suggesting that additional unmeasured pathways, such as pulse wave shape changes, may also contribute to aging-related reductions in HRV–PRV interchangeability.

Overall, we suggested that PATV partly contributed to the HRV-PRV discrepancies. Given that PATV adds information beyond HRV alone in sleep disorder diagnosis [11] and heart failure risk prediction [41], future work should evaluate whether combining PATV with HRV improves risk stratification in ambulatory cardiovascular, metabolic, and mental health applications.

C. Impact of postural change

Postural change also independently increased the HRV-PRV biases across 14 features (Table III), supporting previous findings [18], [23], despite some prior studies suggested PRV and HRV have good agreement [19], [21], [22]. Compared with the previous studies, we included more subjects (31 younger and 20 older adults), performed multiple types of postural change, and repeated sessions, which should improve generalizability of the results. Moreover, nonlinear features have been rarely examined in the aforementioned literature under postural change. We found the interchangeability of these features were particularly sensitive to the postural change (Table III). As postural change represent more acute autonomic perturbation than aging, these complexity-based indices might be more susceptible to short-term autonomic activation.

Different from the aging results, PATV showed negligible mediation effects for postural change. One possible explanation is that our analysis focused on steady pre- and post-standing periods, whereas PATV-driven discrepancies may primarily occur during the rapid postural transition within the first 15 seconds [42]. Nevertheless, we made this decision to ensure data quality as posture transition usually involves more artifacts, which might disturb the feature calculation process. Our findings indicate that even under steady-state conditions, posture alone can significantly reduce HRV–PRV interchangeability. This reinforces the need for caution when using PRV as a surrogate for HRV across different body positions in both research and clinical monitoring.

D. Mediation effects of BP

Although SBP and DBP showed a few significant mediation effects, these were generally trivial, suggesting that mean BP alone cannot explain the HRV–PRV difference, despite its known correlation with PAT and vascular status

[26]. Instead, BP level may correlate with inter-individual differences in HRV–PRV interchangeability primarily through concurrent variation in PAT and other vascular factors. Future studies should also investigate BP dynamics during orthostatic tests, which may provide deeper insights into the mechanisms underlying PRV–HRV discrepancies and build a bridge to subsequent modeling work on blood pressure regulation.

E. Clinical relevance

Our results emphasize that understanding the boundaries of PRV–HRV interchangeability in daily-life monitoring is key to ensuring safe and effective use in clinical care, supporting applications that range from preventive screening to prognosis and therapy adjustment. Our findings highlight that PRV is not a reliable substitute for HRV, especially in older adults and under postural change, which has direct consequences for its use in wearable devices and remote monitoring systems. As HRV indices are already embedded in clinical standards [43], [44] for prognosis and risk stratification in areas such as mental health assessment, pharmaceutical research, sleep studies, and cardiovascular monitoring [14], transferring these HRV thresholds to PRV without adjustment may lead to misinterpretation. In particular, because body position is a frequent daily perturbation that can enlarge vascular influences on PRV and mislead autonomic inferences, posture should be recorded and accounted for when interpreting PRV features. Accordingly, clinical use of PRV indices should rely on age- and context-aware algorithms with prospective validation before informing prognostic or therapeutic decisions.

Beyond non-interchangeability, we synthesize prior work [1], [45], [46] and recommend three clinically actionable measures. (i) an HRV–PRV consistency index (Eq. 8) to quantify agreement, where large magnitudes may flag autonomic and vascular dysregulation; (ii) PRV indices interpreted as complementary readouts of peripheral vascular dynamics—co-reported with HRV and the consistency index to separate cardiac from vascular contributions during e.g., orthostatic challenges, vasoactive drug monitoring, sleep-related vasomotor events, stress reactivity; and (iii) PATV emerges as a candidate marker of vascular aging, whose longitudinal PATV trends alone or combined with the consistency index can inform cardiovascular risk stratification, personalize thresholds for arterial-stiffness screening, and track response to antihypertensive or exercise interventions.

F. Limitations

This study has some limitations. First, the duration used for HRV and PRV computation was relatively short, and the window length for pre-standing and post-standing is unequal. Window length shorter than five minutes is commonly referred as ultra-short-term HRV [2]. Although it may raise concerns regarding the stability of feature estimation, previous research has demonstrated that recordings exceeding 90 seconds can still provide reliable estimates for the features analyzed in this study [47]. Second, sex was not considered as a variable in this analysis, despite its known influence on autonomic function and vascular aging [48], [49]. Subgroup analysis for sex is recommended [50], and need a larger study to investigate.

V. Conclusion

This study examined the interchangeability between HRV and PRV in young and older adults across multiple postural changes. In younger adults, most features were interchangeable after biases between HRV and PRV were corrected. In older adults, short-term features were mostly non-interchangeable, whereas some long-term features remained interchangeable. Both aging and postural change reduced HRV–PRV interchangeability, with PATV partly accounting for the age-related reduction. These findings underscore the need for cautious interpretation when relying on PRV in daily monitoring and provide physiological insight into the mechanisms underlying HRV–PRV non-interchangeability. Moreover, the observed discrepancies suggest that HRV–PRV inconsistency holds potential as a novel biomarker for autonomic cardiovascular health monitoring.

Acknowledgment

This study is funded in part by China Scholarship Council. The authors would like to acknowledge the help from Dr. Arjen Mol on providing valuable information of the dataset.

Reference

[1] E. Mejía-Mejía, K. Budidha, T. Y. Abay, J. M. May, and P. A. Kyriacou, "Heart rate variability (HRV) and pulse rate variability (PRV) for the assessment of autonomic responses," *Front. Physiol.*, vol. 11, 2020.

[2] F. Shaffer and J. P. Ginsberg, "An overview of heart rate variability metrics and norms," *Front. Public Health*, vol. 5, p. 258, 2017.

[3] R. E. Kleiger, J. P. Miller, J. T. Bigger Jr, and A. J. Moss, "Decreased heart rate variability and its association with increased mortality after acute myocardial infarction," *Am. J. Card.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 256–262, 1987.

[4] J. F. Thayer, S. S. Yamamoto, and J. F. Brosschot, "The relationship of autonomic imbalance, heart rate variability and cardiovascular disease risk factors," *Int. J. Cardiol.*, vol. 141, no. 2, pp. 122–131, 2010.

[5] D. Liao, J. Cai, R. W. Barnes, H. A. Tyroler, P. Rautaharju, I. Holme, and G. Heiss, "Association of cardiac automatic function and the development of hypertension: The aric study," *Am. J. Hypertens.*, vol. 9, no. 12, pp. 1147–1156, 1996.

[6] K. C. Lan, P. Raknim, W. F. Kao, and J. H. Huang, "Toward hypertension prediction based on PPG-derived HRV signals: a feasibility study," *J Med Syst*, vol. 42, no. 6, p. 103, 2018.

[7] D. Liao, M. Carnethon, G. W. Evans, W. E. Cascio, and G. Heiss, "Lower heart rate variability is associated with the development of coronary heart disease in individuals with diabetes: the atherosclerosis risk in communities (aric) study," *Diabetes*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 3524–3531, 2002.

[8] N. O. Pertseva, O. V. Gurzhiy, and K. I. Moshenets, "Dependence of heart rate variability on indicators of type 1 diabetes mellitus control," *Medicni Perspektivi*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 88–95, 2020.

[9] J. Gerritsen, J. M. Dekker, B. J. TenVoorde, P. J. Kostense, R. J. Heine, L. M. Bouter, R. M. Heethaar, and C. D. Stehouwer, "Impaired autonomic function is associated with increased mortality, especially in subjects with diabetes, hypertension, or a history of cardiovascular disease: the hoorn study," *Diabetes care*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 1793–1798, 2001.

[10] E. Gil, M. Mendez, J. M. Vergara, S. Cerutti, A. M. Bianchi, and P. Laguna, "Discrimination of sleep-apnea-related decreases in the amplitude fluctuations of PPG signal in children by HRV analysis," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1005–14, 2009.

[11] E. Gil, R. Bailon, J. M. Vergara, and P. Laguna, "PTT variability for discrimination of sleep apnea related decreases in the amplitude fluctuations of PPG signal in children," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1079–88, 2010.

[12] A. H. Kemp, D. S. Quintana, M. A. Gray, K. L. Felmingham, K. Brown, and J. M. Gatt, "Impact of depression and antidepressant treatment on heart rate variability: a review and meta-analysis," *Biol. Psychiatry*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 1067–1074, 2010.

[13] P. H. Charlton, J. Allen, R. Bailon, S. Baker, J. A. Behar, F. Chen, G. D. Clifford, D. A. Clifton, H. J. Davies, C. Ding, X. Ding, J. Dunn, M. Elgendi, M. Ferdoushi, D. Franklin, E. Gil, M. F. Hassan, J. Hernesniemi, X. Hu, N. Ji, Y. Khan, S. Kontaxis, I. Korhonen, P. A. Kyriacou, P. Laguna, J. Lazaro, C. Lee, J. Levy, Y. Li, C. Liu, J. Liu, L. Lu, D. P. Mandic, V. Marozas, E. Mejia-Mejia, R. Mukkamala, M. Nitzan, T. Pereira, C. C. Y. Poon, J. C. Ramella-Roman, H. Saarinen, M. M. H. Shandhi, H. Shin, G. Stansby, T. Tamura, A. Vehkaoja, W. K. Wang, Y. T. Zhang, N. Zhao, D. Zheng, and T. Zhu, "The 2023 wearable photoplethysmography roadmap," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 44, no. 11, 2023.

[14] E. Mejía-Mejía, J. M. May, R. Torres, and P. A. Kyriacou, "Pulse rate variability in cardiovascular health: A review on its applications and relationship with heart rate variability," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 41, no. 7, p. 07TR01, 2020.

[15] S. A. Graham, D. V. Jeste, E. E. Lee, T.-C. Wu, X. Tu, H.-C. Kim, and C. A. Depp, "Associations between heart rate variability measured with a wrist-worn sensor and older adults' physical function: observational study," *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, vol. 7, no. 10, p. e13757, 2019.

[16] E. Rodrigues, D. Lima, P. Barbosa, K. Gonzaga, R. O. Guerra, M. Pimentel, H. Barbosa, and Á. Maciel, "HRV monitoring using commercial wearable devices as a health indicator for older persons during the pandemic," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 5, p. 2001, 2022.

[17] A. Schafer and J. Vagedes, "How accurate is pulse rate variability as an estimate of heart rate variability? a review on studies comparing photoplethysmographic technology with an electrocardiogram," *Int. J. Cardiol.*, vol. 166, no. 1, pp. 15–29, 2013.

[18] K. Charlot, J. Cornolo, J. V. Brugniaux, J. P. Richalet, and A. Pichon, "Interchangeability between heart rate and photoplethysmography variabilities during sympathetic stimulations," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 1357–69, 2009.

[19] R. Pernice, M. Javorka, J. Krohova, B. Czippelova, Z. Turianikova, A. Busacca, and L. Faes, "Reliability of short-term heart rate variability indexes assessed through photoplethysmography," in *Proc. 40th Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.* IEEE, 2018, pp. 5610–5513.

[20] A. B. Kantrowitz, K. Ben-David, M. Morris, L. A. Temme, H. Wittels, M. J. Wishon, S. McDonald, E. J. Renaghan, L. A. Feigenbaum, and S. H. Wittels, "Pulse rate variability is not the same as heart rate variability: Findings from a large, diverse clinical population study," *Front. Physiol.*, vol. 16, p. 1630032.

[21] E. Gil, M. Orini, R. Bailon, J. M. Vergara, L. Mainardi, and P. Laguna, "Photoplethysmography pulse rate variability as a surrogate measurement of heart rate variability during non-stationary conditions," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 31, no. 9, p. 1271, 2010.

[22] J. A. Heathers, "Smartphone-enabled pulse rate variability: An alternative methodology for the collection of heart rate variability in psychophysiological research," *Int. J. Psychophysiol*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp. 297–304, 2013.

[23] I. Constant, D. Laude, I. Murat, and J.-L. Elghozi, "Pulse rate variability is not a surrogate for heart rate variability," *Clin. Sci.*, vol. 97, no. 4, pp. 391–397, 1999.

[24] H. Shin, "Ambient temperature effect on pulse rate variability as an alternative to heart rate variability in young adult," *J. Clin. Monit. Comput.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 939–948, 2016.

[25] B. E. Ajtay, S. Béres, and L. Hejjel, "The oscillating pulse arrival time as a physiological explanation regarding the difference between ECG- and photoplethysmogram-derived heart rate variability parameters," *Biomed. Signal Process. Control*, vol. 79, 2023.

[26] E. Mejía-Mejía, J. M. May, M. Elgendi, and P. A. Kyriacou, "Differential effects of the blood pressure state on pulse rate variability and heart rate variability in critically ill patients," *NPJ Digit. Med*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 82, 2021.

[27] A. Mol, C. G. Meskers, S. P. Niehof, A. B. Maier, and R. J. van Wezel, "Pulse transit time as a proxy for vasoconstriction in younger and older adults," *Exp. Gerontol.*, vol. 135, p. 110938, 2020.

[28] A. Mol, J. Claassen, A. B. Maier, R. J. A. van Wezel, and C. G. M. Meskers, "Determinants of orthostatic cerebral oxygenation assessed using near-infrared spectroscopy," *Auton. Neurosci.*, vol. 238, p. 102942, 2022.

[29] A. Mol, C. G. Meskers, S. P. Niehof, A. B. Maier, and R. v. R. Wezel, "Pulse transit time as a proxy for vasoconstriction in younger and older adults," 2020.

[30] J. Pan and W. J. Tompkins, "A real-time QRS detection algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, no. 3, pp. 230–236, 1985.

[31] P. H. Charlton, E. J. Argüello Prada, J. Mant, and P. A. Kyriacou, "The MSPTDfast photoplethysmography beat detection algorithm: design, benchmarking, and open-source distribution," *Physiol. Meas.*, 2025.

[32] P. H. Charlton, K. Kotzen, E. Mejía-Mejía, P. J. Aston, K. Budidha, J. Mant, C. Pettit, J. A. Behar, and P. A. Kyriacou, "Detecting beats in the photoplethysmogram: benchmarking open-source algorithms," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 43, no. 8, p. 085007, 2022.

[33] M. Vollmer, "HRVTool–an open-source matlab toolbox for analyzing heart rate variability," in *2019 Comput. Cardiol.* IEEE, 2019, pp. Page–1.

[34] P. Castiglioni, A. Faini, A. Nys, R. De Busser, M. Scherrenberg, E. Baldussu, G. Parati, and P. Dendale, "Heart rate variability for the early detection of cardiac autonomic dysfunction in type 1 diabetes," *Front. Physiol.*, vol. 13, 2022.

[35] A. N. Vest, G. Da Poian, Q. Li, C. Y. Liu, S. Nemati, A. L. Shah, and G. D. Clifford, "An open source benchmarked toolbox for cardiovascular waveform and interval analysis," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 39, no. 10, 2018.

[36] A. Pichon, M. Roulaud, S. Antoine-Jonville, C. de Bisschop, and A. Denjean, "Spectral analysis of heart rate variability: interchangeability between autoregressive analysis and fast fourier transform," *J. Electrocardiol.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 31–37, 2006.

[37] R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2021.

[38] J. Carpenter and J. Bithell, "Bootstrap confidence intervals: when, which, what? a practical guide for medical statisticians," *Stat. Med.*, vol. 19, no. 9, pp. 1141–1164, 2000.

[39] G. G. Berntson, D. L. Lozano, and Y.-J. Chen, "Filter properties of root mean square successive difference (RMSSD) for heart rate," *Psychophysiology*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 246–252, 2005.

[40] D.-W. An, I. F. Muhammad, M.-X. Li, Y. Borné, C.-S. Sheng, M. Persson, R.-Z. Cai, Q.-H. Guo, J.-G. Wang, G. Engström *et al.*, "Carotid-femoral pulse transit time variability predicted mortality and improved risk stratification in the elderly," *Hypertension*, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 1287–1295, 2021.

[41] L. Zhao, C. Liu, S. Wei, C. Liu, and J. Li, "Enhancing detection accuracy for clinical heart failure utilizing pulse transit time variability and machine learning," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 17 716–17 724, 2019.

[42] J. M. Stewart, "Mechanisms of sympathetic regulation in orthostatic intolerance," *J. Appl. Physiol.*, vol. 113, no. 10, pp. 1659–1668, 2012.

[43] T. F. o. t. E. S. o. C. t. N. A. S. o. P. Electrophysiology, "Heart rate variability: standards of measurement, physiological interpretation, and clinical use," *Circulation*, vol. 93, no. 5, pp. 1043–1065, 1996.

[44] R. Tiwari, R. Kumar, S. Malik, T. Raj, and P. Kumar, "Analysis of heart rate variability and implication of different factors on heart rate variability," *Current cardiology reviews*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 74–83, 2021.

[45] P. H. Charlton, B. Paliakaite, K. Pilt, M. Bachler, S. Zanelli, D. Kulin, J. Allen, M. Hallab, E. Bianchini, C. C. Mayer, D. Terentes-Printzios, V. Dittrich, B. Hametner, D. Veerasingam, D. Zikic, and V. Marozas, "Assessing hemodynamics from the photoplethysmogram to gain insights into vascular age: a review from VascAgeNet," *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*, vol. 322, no. 4, pp. H493–H522, 2022.

[46] E. Yuda, M. Shibata, Y. Ogata, N. Ueda, T. Yambe, M. Yoshizawa, and J. Hayano, "Pulse rate variability: a new biomarker, not a surrogate for heart rate variability," *J. Physiol. Anthropol.*, vol. 39, no. 1, p. 21, 2020.

[47] E. Mejía-Mejía and P. A. Kyriacou, "Duration of photoplethysmographic signals for the extraction of pulse rate variability indices," *Biomed. Signal Process. Control*, vol. 80, p. 104214, 2023.

[48] M. Nardelli, A. Greco, N. Vanello, and E. P. Scilingo, "Reliability of pulse rate variability in elderly men and women: an application of cross-mapping approach," *Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.*, vol. 2021, pp. 492–495, 2021.

[49] S. Zanelli, D. Agnoletti, J. Alastruey, J. Allen, E. Bianchini, V. Bikia, P. Boutouyrie, R. M. Bruno, R. Climie, D. Djeldjli, E. Gkaliagkousi, A. Giudici, K. Gopcevic, A. Grillo, A. Guala, B. Hametner, J. Joseph, P. Karimpour, V. Kodithuwakku, P. A. Kyriacou, A. Lazaridis, M. T. Lonnebakken, M. R. Martina, C. C. Mayer, P. M. Nabeel, P. Navickas, J. Nemcsik, S. Orter, C. Park, T. Pereira, G. Pucci, A. B. A. Rey, P. Salvi, A. C. G. Seabra, U. Seeland, T. van Sloten, B. Spronck, G. Stansby, I. Steens, T. Stieglitz, I. Tan, D. Veerasingham, S. Wassertheurer, T. Weber, B. E. Westerhof, and P. H. Charlton, "Developing technologies to assess vascular ageing: a roadmap from VascAgeNet," *Physiol. Meas.*, vol. 45, no. 12, 2024.

[50] M.-L. Pardue and T. M. Wizemann, "Exploring the biological contributions to human health: does sex matter?" 2001.