Development and Validation of the Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT)

Alternative TRIPOD-compliant Title: Development and Validation of the Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT): A Population-Based Diagnostic Algorithm

Rafidul Islam, MSc[1,2]

Tracey Bushnik, MBA[3]

Manish M. Sood, MD, MSc[1,2,4]

Monica Taljaard, PhD[1,2]

Finlay A. McAlister, MD, MSc[5]

Juan Li, PhD[2]

Douglas G. Manuel, MD, MSc[1,2,3]

1. School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada
2. Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada
3. Health Analysis and Modelling Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Canada
4. Division of Nephrology, The Ottawa Hospital, Ottawa, Canada
5. Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

Short Title: The Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT)

Corresponding author: Douglas G. Manuel, MD MSc, Ottawa Hospital - Civic Campus, 1053 Carling Ave Box 693, 2-012 Admin Services Building, Ottawa, ON K1Y 4E9. Phone: 613-798-5555 x19108. Email: dmanuel@ohri.ca

Word Count: 5,700

Abstract

Background: Effective hypertension prevention requires diagnostic tools applicable to broad populations, yet current models often rely on specialized laboratory testing. We aimed to develop and validate the Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT) - a diagnostic model derived with only readily available data, suitable for individual screening and population health planning.

Methods: We analyzed data from the Canadian Health Measures Survey (cycles 1–6, 2007–2019). The study included community-dwelling respondents aged 20–79 years. The primary outcome was hypertension, defined as measured systolic/diastolic blood pressure of 140/90 mm Hg or current antihypertensive medication use. Sex-specific logistic regression models were developed using 16 predictors, including 4 sociodemographic, 3 psychosocial, 2 health status, 5 health behavioural, and 2 chronic condition variables. The model was fully prespecified, including the stepdown procedure to derive parsimonious models**.**

Results: Of 19,643 participants, 5,152 (26.2%) had hypertension. The final models included age, body mass index, diabetes status, and family history of hypertension. Optimism-corrected c-statistics were 0.86 (95% CI 0.85–0.87) for men and 0.88 (0.87–0.88) for women. Calibration showed relative differences between observed and predicted risk of 1.02% (men) and 1.41% (women), and consistent performance across 179 of 181 policy-relevant subgroups.

Conclusions: HTNPoRT is a well-performing diagnostic tool that relies only on minimal non-invasive, self-reported data. It is suitable for both individual risk screening and population-level surveillance to inform hypertension prevention strategies.

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

BMI – Body mass index

C-statistic – Concordance statistic

CHMS – Canadian Health Measures Survey

CI – Confidence interval

DBP – Diastolic blood pressure

HTNPoRT – Hypertension Population Risk Tool

MEC – Mobile examination centre

mm Hg – Millimeters of mercury

SBP – Systolic blood pressure

SHAP – SHapley Additive exPlanation

Introduction

Hypertension affects about 1 in 4 Canadians and is the world's leading risk factor for preventable cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality.[1,2] However, reducing this burden is challenged by the asymptomatic nature of the condition; many individuals remain undiagnosed or unaware of their status.[3] Diagnostic models can bridge this gap by first identifying high-risk individuals who may have undiagnosed hypertension, thereby reinforcing the need for confirmed clinical blood pressure measurement. Beyond this immediate screening function, accurate risk classification can guide prevention strategies by facilitating individual decision-making and supporting the identification of high-risk subpopulations to inform the evaluation and design of preventive interventions tailored to population needs.[4]

Despite these potential benefits, there is a lack of accessible tools that can provide this baseline risk assessment. To be widely usable to support screening or surveillance, a model must rely on predictors that are non-invasive, self-reportable, and derived from representative populations. However, most existing prediction models are not aligned with these requirements. They often use predictors that are inaccessible for individual self-assessment and cumbersome for population-level planning, such as genetic markers,[5–9] biomarkers,[10–13] and clinically obtained measures.[7–15] Furthermore, they are typically developed using ethnically homogenous cohorts , limiting their generalizability to diverse populations needed for effective health planning.[9,16–18]

Our objective was to develop and validate a diagnostic algorithm—the Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT)—that the public and health planners can use to classify the risk of hypertension. We specifically set out to develop the algorithm using multiethnic, population-based survey data and readily available, self-reported measures to facilitate screening reinforcement and inform prevention strategies.

Methods

Study design

We developed and validated sex-specific HTNPoRT algorithms using our registered protocol (OSF.io, 10.17605/OSF.IO/V27MW).[19] Our reporting adhered to the TRIPOD-AI (Transparent Reporting of a Multivariable Prediction Model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis) guide.[20] The statistical approach to developing the model followed recommendations by both Steyerberg and Harrell.[21,22] The Ottawa Health Science Network Research Ethics Board granted approval for the research. There were minor deviations from the protocol to improve the model's final performance and usability. Specifically, the categories for the alcohol consumption level predictor were updated to align with Canada's current Low-Risk Drinking Guidelines.[23] We also applied a stricter statistical threshold for multicollinearity to ensure that the model predictors were sufficiently independent of one another. Finally, the model selection process balanced predictive accuracy with parsimony to ensure the final tool is practical for end-users. A detailed list and justification for each deviation is provided in Appendix 1.

Data source

Data for the study included the first six cycles of the Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS), covering data collected from March 2007 to December 2019. The CHMS is a recurring, cross-sectional survey conducted by Statistics Canada designed to produce national-level health data. It uses a stratified, multi-stage sampling design to select a representative sample of community-dwelling individuals aged 3 to 79 living in the 10 provinces. The survey excludes full-time members of the Canadian Forces and people living in the three territories, on reserves, in institutions, and in certain remote regions.

Data collection for the CHMS is a two-step process: an in-person household interview followed by a visit to a Mobile Examination Centre (MEC). The household interview gathers sociodemographic, health, and lifestyle information. At the MEC, a series of direct physical measurements are performed, including standardized blood pressure readings according to a published protocol. Information on prescription medication use, including antihypertensive drugs, is collected via inventory during both the household interview and the MEC visit.[24] Further details on accessing the CHMS data are available in Appendix 2. The study population consisted of community-dwelling Canadians aged 20 to 79 in the CHMS. CHMS respondents were excluded if they were pregnant or had missing values for the hypertension outcome.

Outcome

The study outcome was hypertension status, determined by direct blood pressure measurements and a medication inventory. At the MEC, a trained health professional took six blood pressure readings from seated respondents using an automated BpTRU™ BPM-300 device. Following the CHMS protocol, the first reading was discarded, and the average of the final five readings was used. These mean values were then adjusted using a standard formula to approximate manual auscultatory readings.[1,25] Respondents were classified as hypertensive if they met any of the following criteria:

1. A mean adjusted systolic blood pressure (SBP) of ≥ 140 mm Hg or a mean adjusted diastolic blood pressure (DBP) of ≥ 90 mm Hg. For respondents with diabetes or chronic kidney disease, a lower threshold of SBP ≥ 130 mm Hg or DBP ≥ 80 mm Hg was used.
2. Reported taking antihypertensive medication in the past month for the purpose of lowering blood pressure.

Predictors

Seventeen candidate predictors were selected for the initial model based on review of established hypertension risk factors and consultation with knowledge users in clinical hypertension and public health (Table 1). These predictors were grouped into five domains: sociodemographic measures, psychosocial measures, health statuses, health behaviours, and chronic conditions.

All predictor variables were cleaned, derived, and harmonized across the six CHMS cycles using functions from the chmsflow R package, a newly developed package to support open and reproducible harmonization across CHMS cycles.[26] All variables with missing data were imputed once to create one imputed dataset, using a model derived from the multiple imputation using chained equations (MICE) method.[27] Detailed variable definitions and derivations are provided in Appendix 3 and analytical code on GitHub (see Major Resources Table). Predictor data were drawn from three sources: the household questionnaire, direct physical measurements, and laboratory tests collected at the MEC. Direct physical measurements included height, weight, and waist circumference, which were all used to calculate body mass index (BMI) and waist-to-height ratio. Laboratory test measures included blood glucose and serum creatinine, which were used to derive the presence of diabetes and chronic kidney disease, respectively.[1,28]

Statistical analysis

Sex-specific logistic regression models were developed. All analyses incorporated CHMS survey weights for population-level inference. Continuous predictors were modelled with restricted cubic splines when there were known non-linear relationships; otherwise, they were modelled as linear terms. Knots for restricted cubic splines were placed at fixed quantiles of the distribution

as described by Harrell.[22] The models incorporated two-way interactions between age and clinically relevant variables identified in the literature.

Model development and specification

An initial sex-specific "full model" was fitted using all pre-specified predictors and interactions (Table 1). To create a more practical model for end-users, a parsimonious "reduced model" was derived from each full model using a stepdown approach. This process sequentially removed predictors with the least contribution until the model's R^2 was 95% of the full model's R^2.[22,29]

Assessment of model performance

To compare the full and reduced models for each sex, we used an internal bootstrap approach. The models were refitted and evaluated on 1,000 bootstrap samples, each randomly drawn with replacement from the original sample from which they were derived. The models were also validated within their original derivation sample. Sensitivity analyses were performed to assess if model performance was affected by either dropping missing data, deriving models from four other imputed datasets generated with the same imputation model, leaving skewness, re-including possible collinear predictors, using linear interactions, deriving hypertension with unadjusted blood pressures, or excluding people with controlled hypertension.

Assessment of overall model performance across the derivation and the bootstrap samples was detailed, focusing on measures of predictive accuracy, discrimination, and calibration. Predictive accuracy was gauged by Nagelkerke's R^2 and the Brier score.[30] Discrimination, or the model's ability to distinguish between those who have the outcome and those who do not, was appraised via the concordance statistic (c-statistic) whose optimism was quantified using the 1,000 bootstrap samples of internal validation.[22,30] Calibration, or the agreement between predicted and

observed risk, was assessed by comparing observed and predicted hypertension probabilities, calibration slopes, and visual inspection of calibration plots fitted with Local Estimated Scatterplot Smoothing.[31] Calibration was also assessed across different subgroups important to clinicians and policymakers, including most of the model's predictor variables (Table 1), as well as additional variables and alternate derivations of predictor variables. The clinically relevant standard of calibration was defined as a difference of less than 20% between observed and predicted estimates within subgroups with a hypertension prevalence of at least 5%. Centering variables around their means will facilitate recalibration in new populations.

Model presentation and implementation

Following model validation and performance assessment, all sex-specific logistic models were presented using beta coefficients. SHapley Additive exPlanation (SHAP) plots were used to show the ranked importance of risk factors in increasing or decreasing the predicted probability for a given individual, using one of the models. SHAP values provided an understanding of variable importance, accounting for non-linear effects and interactions.[32] The current hypertension probability and the SHAP plot comprised the hypertension risk profile. To enhance accessibility to HTNPoRT models, we will render them executable via a web application and an Excel-based calculator (see Major Resources Table), offering user-friendly experiences.

Results

Participants

The final study population comprised 19,643 respondents, including 9,633 men and 10,010 women. Of this sample, 5,152 individuals (2,681 men and 2,471 women) were classified as having hypertension, corresponding to a weighted prevalence of 25% in men and 22% in women. This estimate can be interpreted as the prevalence of hypertension among Canadian adults from 2007 to 2019.

The median age was 46 years (IQR: 33-58) for men and 47 years (IQR: 34-59) for women. Detailed weighted characteristics of the study population are provided in Table 2. Most predictors had less than 2% missing data. Missing data were most prevalent for hypertension family history and sleep duration (30-38% missing), as these variables were not collected in all CHMS cycles. A detailed breakdown of missingness for each predictor without weighting is shown in Appendix 4.

Model performance

The performance of two sets of sex-specific models was evaluated: a full model with 16 predictors and seven interactions (56 degrees of freedom), and a more parsimonious reduced model with four predictors and two interactions (17 degrees of freedom). Waist-to-height ratio was excluded because it was collinear with body mass index (variance inflation factor > 2.5). Model specifications and beta coefficients are available in Table 1 and Appendix 5, respectively.

Full models

Table 3 shows that the full models for both men and women were well able to discriminate those who have hypertension from those who do not (male c-statistic: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.86-0.87; female

c-statistic: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.87-0.89 across bootstrap samples), with c-statistics remaining unchanged upon optimism correction. Predicted probabilities of hypertension closely approximated observed proportions of hypertension within the overall population (observed v. predicted relative difference across bootstrap samples, men: 2.09%; women: 1.15%). Calibration slopes were near the ideal value of 1 (0.95 in men and 0.97 in women across bootstrap samples).

Model reduction

In the reduced models, overall discriminative performance was similar in men (c-statistic: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.85-0.87) and women (c-statistic: 0.88, 95% CI: 0.87-0.88) across bootstrap samples, and the c-statistics remained unchanged after optimism correction. As seen commonly with model reduction, discrimination across predicted probability percentiles mildly degraded in men and women, but calibration slopes improved (0.98 in men and 0.99 in women across bootstrap samples). Calibration plots for the reduced models are shown in Figure 1, and additional performance metrics are presented in Table 3.

Performance in policy-relevant subgroups and sensitivity analyses

The full model was well calibrated across all 181 predefined policy-relevant subgroups (stratified by sociodemographics, health status, etc.) where hypertension prevalence was at least 5% (Appendix 6). The reduced model also performed well, showing poor calibration in only two subgroups: men with chronic kidney disease and men who are heavy drinkers (Appendix 7). Full and reduced model c-statistics, calibration slopes, calibration plots, and even predicted risk in specific cases remained similar and within expectations during the sensitivity analyses outlined earlier (Appendix 8).

Example of a hypertension risk profile

Figure 2 demonstrates a risk profile for a hypothetical 74-year-old man using HTNPoRT. His predicted probability of currently having hypertension is 75.3%, substantially higher than the population average of 27.6% for men. The profile, generated using SHAP values, shows how individual factors contribute to his overall probability. His age is the most influential factor, associated with a 28.0% increase in probability relative to the average. His diabetes diagnosis and BMI of 35.3 kg/m² are associated with further increases of 20.2% and 6.9%, respectively. Conversely, his lack of a family history of hypertension is associated with a 5.6% decrease in probability. This profile illustrates that the individual's high probability is strongly associated with his older age, diabetes, and higher BMI.

Discussion

The Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT) is a classification algorithm that is both discriminating and well-calibrated, having been developed and validated in a nationally representative, multiethnic Canadian population. A key feature of the model is its development using easily collected population-based survey data. For individuals, the algorithm can enhance personal risk awareness and facilitate conversations with healthcare providers about hypertension screening and prevention. For health planners, it can help identify populations with a high burden of potential or those with undiagnosed hypertension who may benefit from targeted outreach and prevention programs.[4]

Strengths and methodological considerations

The favourable performance of HTNPoRT can be attributed to study strengths. First, the use of the CHMS provided a large, representative sample, which afforded the statistical power to develop a highly specified model with flexible non-linear terms and interactions. While increased model complexity can risk overfitting, this was mitigated by the pre-specification of all predictors. Including a medication inventory in the hypertension definition is a strength, as it ensures the model captures individuals with both controlled and uncontrolled hypertension, reflecting the true population burden.

A third strength is the model's ability to describe the relative importance of key hypertension predictors, in the presence of interactions and non-linear terms. As expected, age was the most powerful predictor of hypertension status. Among modifiable factors, measures of adiposity were among the most important contributors to risk. While there is debate about the clinical limitations of body mass index (BMI), our analysis confirmed that it is a simple, practical, and

highly predictive component for this tool. Our analysis showed a sex-specific nuance: while waist-to-height ratio showed a slightly stronger association with hypertension in men, it was collinear with BMI (see note 3 of Table 1). It did not improve the overall model discrimination or calibration when substituted, possibly reflecting known sex differences in fat distribution.[33,34] Consequently, BMI was retained as the sole adiposity measure in accordance with our prespecified protocol. This decision prioritizes utility without sacrificing accuracy; height and weight are more frequently known and self-reported by the public than waist circumference, minimizing barriers to tool use.

Study in context

A recent review of 75 hypertension prediction models provides context for HTNPoRT's performance.[35] The review reported a pooled c-statistic of 0.75 (95% CI: 0.73-0.77), with a trade-off: complex data, such as genetics or biomarkers, achieved high discrimination (c-statistic > 0.80), while the only comparable model using readily available data performed modestly (c-statistic: 0.74).[36]

HTNPoRT bridges this gap, achieving discriminative ability (c-statistic: 0.86-0.88) comparable to models that rely on complex clinical data, yet using only readily available data. This favourable performance is likely attributable to its highly specified modelling approach, which flexibly accounted for key non-linear relationships and interactions.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the predictors were restricted to those available in the CHMS, and other unmeasured factors may also contribute to hypertension risk. Second, while the CHMS is nationally representative, it excludes certain populations, such as on-reserve

Indigenous peoples, which may limit the model's generalizability to these specific groups. Finally, reliance on self-reported predictors introduces a risk of measurement error; however, the model performed well despite this potential source of error.

The issue of measurement error is particularly relevant for the diet predictor. A notable finding was the low predictive influence of diet in our model, which contrasts with the strong causal evidence from intervention trials of the DASH diet.[37] This discrepancy likely highlights two key issues: the difficulty of capturing complex dietary patterns with survey questions, and the high degree of collinearity between diet and other predictors, such as adiposity. Therefore, while HTNPoRT is an effective risk stratification tool, it is not designed to estimate the potential benefits of specific dietary interventions, and any associations between risk factors and hypertension should not be causally interpreted.

A key consideration is the model's generalizability to other countries. The model's performance across different healthcare systems and in countries with varying demographic profiles and baseline hypertension risks is unknown. The transportability of the model's effects may also vary by predictor. For instance, the strong influence of a universal biological factor, such as adiposity, is likely to be robust across settings, and studies such as INTERHEART and INTERSTROKE have supported this.[38,39] In contrast, the effect size for age may be more context-dependent, acting as a proxy for cumulative exposures that differ between populations. Fortunately, this challenge can be readily addressed, as the age term is particularly amenable to recalibration using local, age-stratified hypertension prevalence data from a new target population. HTNPoRT was developed to support transportability across populations by centring all predictors and interactions, as well as reporting predictor correlations and other data (see analytical code).

Despite these limitations, HTNPoRT was designed with several strengths that support its robustness and potential for broad application. It was developed in a diverse, multiethnic population, enhancing its relevance for varied community settings. The use of a transparent logistic regression framework and techniques like predictor centering - which is specifically intended to facilitate recalibration in new populations - provide a clear and adaptable foundation for future external validation studies.

Perspectives

This study demonstrates that a high-performing and interpretable predictive model for hypertension can be developed using only readily available data from population-based health surveys. The resulting algorithm, HTNPoRT, achieves discriminative performance comparable to that of models that rely on complex clinical data. There are several next steps to support HTNPoRT use or the use of other models that use the HTNPoRT approach. First, external validation in other countries is feasible, as the CHMS methodology is like many international health surveys. Second, future implementation science research can assess how this readily accessible risk assessment tool can best address existing needs in both clinical communication and public health planning.

Novelty and Relevance

What is New?

HTNPoRT is a diagnostic algorithm developed entirely from readily available survey data. It achieves discrimination comparable to complex clinical models and is well-calibrated across diverse, policy-relevant subgroups.

What is Relevant?

Many hypertension prediction models are too complex for public health use. HTNPoRT provides a practical, generalizable tool for population-level risk assessment that is discriminating and well-calibrated, filling a critical gap in preventative health tools.

Clinical/Pathophysiological Implications?

HTNPoRT can enhance public awareness of hypertension risk and facilitate patient-provider conversations about screening and evidence-based prevention strategies.

Article Information

Acknowledgments: RI conceived the original study and was responsible for devising the methodology, conducting all analyses, and interpreting results in consultation with the other authors. RI is the primary author who drafted the manuscript and accessed study data while all co-authors contributed substantially to its revision. All authors approved the final version for submission and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work. No patients or members of the public were involved in the design or dissemination of this study.

Funding: This study was supported by the grant BHI 23-111 from uOttawa Brain-Heart Interconnectome (BHI), a Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF) program.

Disclosures: None.

Supplemental Material: Appendices 1-8, Major Resources Table.

References

1. Leung AA, Bushnik T, Hennessy D, McAlister FA, Manuel DG. Risk Factors for Hypertension in Canada. *Health Reports*. 2019;30(82):3–13.
2. Murray CJL, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi-Kangevari M, Abd-Allah F, Abdelalim A, Abdollahi M, Abdollahpour I, Abegaz KH, Abolhassani H, Aboyans V, Abreu LG, Abrigo MRM, et al. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10258):1223–1249.
3. Inoue T. Unawareness and untreated hypertension: a public health problem needs to be solved. *Hypertension Research*. 2025;48(4):1639–1642.
4. Manuel DG, Rosella LC, Hennessy D, Sanmartin C, Wilson K. Predictive risk algorithms in a population setting: an overview. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 2012;66:859–865.
5. Choi Y-H, Chowdhury R, Swaminathan B. Prediction of hypertension based on the genetic analysis of longitudinal phenotypes: a comparison of different modeling approaches for the binary trait of hypertension. *BMC Proceedings*. 2014;8(1):S78.
6. Niiranen TJ, Havulinna AS, Langén VL, Salomaa V, Jula AM. Prediction of Blood Pressure and Blood Pressure Change With a Genetic Risk Score. *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*. 2016;18(3):181–186.
7. Lim N-K, Lee J-Y, Lee J-Y, Park H-Y, Cho M-C. The Role of Genetic Risk Score in Predicting the Risk of Hypertension in the Korean population: Korean Genome and Epidemiology Study. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(6):e0131603.
8. Lu X, Huang J, Wang L, Chen S, Yang X, Li J, Cao J, Chen J, Li Y, Zhao L, Li H, Liu F, Huang C, Shen C, Shen J, et al. Genetic Predisposition to Higher Blood Pressure Increases Risk of Incident Hypertension and Cardiovascular Diseases in Chinese. *Hypertension*. 2015;66(4):786–792.
9. Fava C, Sjögren M, Montagnana M, Danese E, Almgren P, Engström G, Nilsson P, Hedblad B, Guidi GC, Minuz P, Melander O. Prediction of Blood Pressure Changes Over Time and Incidence of Hypertension by a Genetic Risk Score in Swedes. *Hypertension*. 2013;61(2):319–326.
10. Asgari S, Khalili ,Davood, Mehrabi ,Yadollah, Kazempour-Ardebili ,Sara, Azizi ,Fereidoun, and Hadaegh F. Incidence and risk factors of isolated systolic and diastolic hypertension: a 10 year follow-up of the Tehran Lipids and Glucose Study. *Blood Pressure*. 2016;25(3):177–183.
11. Kanegae H, Oikawa T, Suzuki K, Okawara Y, Kario K. Developing and validating a new precise risk-prediction model for new-onset hypertension: The Jichi Genki hypertension prediction model (JG model). *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*. 2018;20(5):880–890.
12. Chen Y, Wang C, Liu Y, Yuan Z, Zhang W, Li X, Yang Y, Sun X, Xue F, Zhang C. Incident hypertension and its prediction model in a prospective northern urban Han Chinese cohort study. *Journal of Human Hypertension*. 2016;30(12):794–800.
13. Zhang W, Wang L, Chen Y, Tang F, Xue F, Zhang C. Identification of Hypertension Predictors and Application to Hypertension Prediction in an Urban Han Chinese Population: A Longitudinal Study, 2005-2010. *Preventing Chronic Disease*. 2015;12:E184.
14. Syllos DH, Calsavara VF, Bensenor IM, Lotufo PA. Validating the Framingham Hypertension Risk Score: A 4-year follow-up from the Brazilian Longitudinal Study of the Adult Health (ELSA-Brasil). *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*. 2020;22(5):850–856.

15. Lee BJ, Kim JY. A Comparison of the Predictive Power of Anthropometric Indices for Hypertension and Hypotension Risk. *PLOS ONE*. 2014;9(1):e84897.
16. Parikh NI, Pencina MJ, Wang TJ, Benjamin EJ, Lanier KJ, Levy D, D'Agostino RB, Kannel WB, Vasan RS. A risk score for predicting near-term incidence of hypertension: the Framingham Heart Study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2008;148(2):102–110.
17. Paynter NP, Cook NR, Everett BM, Sesso HD, Buring JE, Ridker PM. Prediction of Incident Hypertension Risk in Women with Currently Normal Blood Pressure. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2009;122(5):464–471.
18. Kivimäki M, Tabak AG, Batty GD, Ferrie JE, Nabi H, Marmot MG, Witte DR, Singh-Manoux A, Shipley MJ. Incremental predictive value of adding past blood pressure measurements to the Framingham hypertension risk equation: the Whitehall II Study. *Hypertension (Dallas, Tex.: 1979)*. 2010;55(4):1058–1062.
19. Islam R, Bushnik T, Sood M, Taljaard M, McAlister F, Manuel DG. A Protocol for Development and Validation of a Diagnostic Model – The Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT) – to Predict Hypertension and Describe Risk Profiles: A Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study of Canadians. 2024.
20. Collins GS, Moons KGM, Dhiman P, Riley RD, Beam AL, Calster BV, Ghassemi M, Liu X, Reitsma JB, Smeden M van, Boulesteix A-L, Camaradou JC, Celi LA, Denaxas S, Denniston AK, et al. TRIPOD+AI statement: updated guidance for reporting clinical prediction models that use regression or machine learning methods. *BMJ*. 2024;385:e078378.
21. Steyerberg EW. *Clinical Prediction Models: A Practical Approach to Development, Validation, and Updating*. New York, NY: Springer New York; 2009.
22. Harrell Jr FE. *Regression modeling strategies: With Applications, to Linear Models, Logistic and Ordinal Regression, and Survival Analysis*. Springer; 2016.
23. Government of Canada HC. Low-risk alcohol drinking guidelines. 2021.
24. Government of Canada SC. Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS). 2018.
25. Myers MG, McInnis NH, Fodor GJ, Leenen FHH. Comparison between an automated and manual sphygmomanometer in a population survey. *American Journal of Hypertension*. 2008;21(3):280–283.
26. Islam R, Manuel DG, Chan T. chmsflow: Transforming and Harmonizing CHMS Variables.
27. Buuren S van, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011;45(3):1–67.
28. Charles K, Lewis MJ, Montgomery E, Reid M. The 2021 Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration Race-Free Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate Equations in Kidney Disease: Leading the Way in Ending Disparities. *Health Equity*. 2024;8(1):39–45.
29. Ambler G, Brady AR, Royston P. Simplifying a prognostic model: a simulation study based on clinical data. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2002;21(24):3803–3822.
30. Steyerberg EW, Vickers AJ, Cook NR, Gerds T, Gonen M, Obuchowski N, Pencina MJ, Kattan MW. Assessing the performance of prediction models: a framework for traditional and novel measures. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*. 2010;21(1):128–138.
31. Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJC, Habbema JDF. Substantial effective sample sizes were required for external validation studies of predictive logistic regression models. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2005;58(5):475–483.
32. Ariza-Garzón MJ, Arroyo J, Caparrini A, Segovia-Vargas M-J. Explainability of a Machine Learning Granting Scoring Model in Peer-to-Peer Lending. *IEEE Access*. 2020;8:64873–64890.

33. Salim AA, Kawasoe S, Kubozono T, Ojima S, Kawabata T, Ikeda Y, Miyahara H, Tokushige K, Ohishi M. Assessment of Future Hypertension Risk by Sex Using Combined Body Mass Index and Waist-to-Height Ratio. *Circulation Reports*. 4(1):9–16.
34. Chang E, Varghese M, Singer K. Gender and Sex Differences in Adipose Tissue. *Current diabetes reports*. 2018;18(9):69.
35. Chowdhury MZI, Naeem I, Quan H, Leung AA, Sikdar KC, O'Beirne M, Turin TC. Prediction of hypertension using traditional regression and machine learning models: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*. 2022;17(4):e0266334.
36. Wang A, An N, Chen G, Li L, Alterovitz G. Predicting hypertension without measurement: A non-invasive, questionnaire-based approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*. 2015;42(21):7601–7609.
37. Mills KT, Stefanescu A, He J. The global epidemiology of hypertension. *Nature Reviews Nephrology*. 2020;16(4):223–237.
38. Yusuf S, Hawken S, Ôunpuu S, Dans T, Avezum A, Lanas F, McQueen M, Budaj A, Pais P, Varigos J, Lisheng L. Effect of potentially modifiable risk factors associated with myocardial infarction in 52 countries (the INTERHEART study): case-control study. *The Lancet*. 2004;364(9438):937–952.
39. O'Donnell MJ, Chin SL, Rangarajan S, Xavier D, Liu L, Zhang H, Rao-Melacini P, Zhang X, Pais P, Agapay S, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Damasceno A, Langhorne P, McQueen MJ, Rosengren A, et al. Global and regional effects of potentially modifiable risk factors associated with acute stroke in 32 countries (INTERSTROKE): a case-control study. *The Lancet*. 2016;388(10046):761–775.

Tables

Table 1. Predictor variables for the Hypertension Population Risk Tool (HTNPoRT)

Variable	Scale	Variable form, full model[1]	Variable form, reduced model[2]
Sociodemographic measures			
Sex	Categorical	Stratified: – Male – Female	N/A
Age	Continuous	4-knot restricted cubic spline: – 20-79 years	Unchanged
Marital status	Categorical	3 categories: – Married or common-law – Widowed, separated, or divorced – Single and never married	Excluded
Highest education level	Categorical	3 categories: – Less than secondary school graduation – Secondary school graduation – Post-secondary school graduation	Excluded
Working status	Categorical	2 categories: – Has a job – Does not have a job	Excluded
Psychosocial measures			
Self-rated mental health	Categorical	2 categories: – Poor or fair – Good, very good, or excellent	Excluded
Self-perceived stress	Categorical	2 categories: – Not at all to a bit – Quite a bit or extremely	Excluded
Sense of belonging[§]	Categorical	2 categories: – Strong – Weak	Excluded
Health status measures			
Hypertension family history	Categorical	2 categories: – Yes – No	Unchanged
Body mass index[§]	Continuous	3-knot restricted cubic spline: – 13.83-49.00 kg/m^2	Unchanged
Waist-to-height ratio[§]	Continuous	Excluded (collinear)	N/A[3]
Health behaviours			
Alcohol consumption	Categorical	4 categories: – Never drank – Low-risk drinker – Moderate drinker	Excluded

		– Heavy drinker	
Smoking status[§]	Categorical	3 categories: – Current smoker – Former smoker – Never smoker	Excluded
Physical activity minutes[§]	Continuous	3-knot restricted cubic spline: – 0-792 minutes per week	Excluded
Daily fruit and vegetable consumption	Continuous	Linear: – 0-10 times per day	Excluded
Sleep duration[§]	Continuous	Linear: – 0-18 hours per night	Excluded
Chronic conditions			
Diabetes[§]	Categorical	2 categories: – Yes – No	Unchanged
Chronic kidney disease[§]	Categorical	2 categories: – Yes – No	Excluded

[1] 56 degrees of freedom

[2] 17 degrees of freedom

[3] When not excluded due to collinearity, waist-to-height ratio and its age interaction replace body mass index and its age interaction in only the male reduced model after stepdown

[§] Age interaction included

Table 2. Weighted characteristics of the study populations for HTNPoRT

	Male[1]	Female[1]
Overall		
Total	9,633	10,010
Hypertensive	2,681 (25%)	2,471 (22%)
– Uncontrolled	1,300 (12%)	1,238 (11%)
– Controlled	1,381 (13%)	1,233 (11%)
Sociodemographic measures		
Age (years)	46 (33, 58)	47 (34, 59)
Marital status		
– Married or common-law	6,904 (67%)	6,069 (64%)
– Widowed, separated, or divorced	1,083 (8.6%)	2,211 (15%)
– Single and never married	1,646 (25%)	1,730 (21%)
Highest education level		
– Less than secondary school graduation	1,138 (13%)	1,155 (10%)
– Secondary school graduation	1,713 (22%)	1,805 (19%)
– Post-secondary school graduation	6,782 (66%)	7,050 (71%)
Working status		
– Has a job	6,836 (74%)	5,907 (65%)
– Does not have a job	2,797 (26%)	4,103 (35%)
Psychological measures		
Self-rated mental health		
– Poor or fair	570 (6.7%)	794 (8.9%)
– Good, very good, or excellent	9,063 (93%)	9,216 (91%)
Self-perceived stress		
– Not at all to a bit	7,617 (77%)	7,593 (74%)
– Quite a bit or extremely	2,016 (23%)	2,417 (26%)
Sense of belonging		
– Strong	6,395 (65%)	6,940 (66%)
– Weak	3,238 (35%)	3,070 (34%)
Health status measures		
Hypertension family history		
– Yes	4,795 (52%)	5,485 (57%)
– No	4,838 (48%)	4,525 (43%)
Body mass index (kg/m^2)	27.0 (24.2, 30.3)	25.8 (22.5, 30.2)
Health behaviours		
Alcohol consumption		
– Never drank	918 (10%)	1,777 (18%)
– Low-risk drinker	7,638 (78%)	7,557 (75%)
– Moderate drinker	431 (4.6%)	408 (3.9%)
– Heavy drinker	646 (7.2%)	268 (3.2%)
Smoking status		
– Current smoker	1,949 (23%)	1,662 (17%)
– Former smoker	3,326 (31%)	2,881 (27%)
– Never smoker	4,358 (46%)	5,467 (56%)

Physical activity minutes (minutes/week)	106 (41, 216)	86 (28, 182)
Daily fruit and vegetable consumption (times consumed/day)	3.00 (2.09, 4.14)	3.52 (2.51, 4.64)
Sleep duration (hours/night)	7.00 (6.00, 8.00)	7.00 (6.00, 8.00)
Chronic conditions		
Diabetes		
– Yes	1,099 (10%)	831 (7.3%)
– No	8,534 (90%)	9,179 (93%)
Chronic kidney disease		
– Yes	525 (4.5%)	723 (5.8%)
– No	9,108 (96%)	9,287 (94%)

[1] Median (Q1, Q3); n (unweighted counts) (weighted %)

Table 3. Goodness of fit summary statistics for HTNPoRT in full and reduced models across the derivation and bootstrap samples

	Derivation sample		Bootstrap samples	
	Full model	**Reduced model**	**Full model**	**Reduced model**
Male model				
Discrimination				
c-statistic (95% CI)[1]	0.87 (0.86-0.87)	0.86 (0.85-0.87)	0.87 (0.86-0.87)	0.86 (0.85-0.87)
90:10 predicted probability ratio[2]	68.9	45.2	94.2	52.7
95:5 predicted probability ratio[2]	221.3	121.7	445.8	180.8
Calibration				
Observed v. predicted	1.94%	0.90%	2.09%	1.02%
Calibration slope	0.91	0.98	0.95	0.98
Overall performance				
Brier score	0.129	0.131	0.129	0.131
Nagelkerke's R^2	0.458	0.449	0.474	0.452
Female model				
Discrimination				
c-statistic (95% CI) [1]	0.88 (0.87-0.89)	0.88 (0.87-0.88)	0.88 (0.87-0.89)	0.88 (0.87-0.88)
90:10 predicted probability ratio[2]	95.7	81.7	154.3	97.6
95:5 predicted probability ratio[2]	256.8	208.3	714.5	310.6
Calibration				
Observed v. predicted	1.20%	1.52%	1.15%	1.41%
Calibration slope	0.93	0.95	0.97	0.99
Overall performance				
Brier score	0.114	0.116	0.114	0.116
Nagelkerke's R^2	0.485	0.474	0.500	0.480

[1] c-statistics unchanged upon optimism correction

[2] The 90:10 and 95:5 predicted probability ratios show the spread of the predicted risk, with higher ratios indicating a more discriminating model. A 95:5 predicted probability ratio of 20 indicates that the predicted probability is 20 times higher for a person in the 95th percentile of risk than for a person in the 5th percentile of risk.

Figures





Figure 1. Calibration plots for reduced models; predicted hypertension probability versus observed hypertension proportion in men (top) and women (bottom)



Figure 2. Hypertension risk profile of a 74-year-old male with a predicted hypertension probability of 75.3%