TOOLS FOR PRACTICE #415 | June 8, 2026

TOOLS FOR PRACTICE

PEER PATIENTS EXPERIENCE EVIDENCE RESEARCH

Blood Pressure Measurement Technique: Meaningful mistakes or minor details?

CLINICAL QUESTION

Does following recommended blood pressure measurement techniques impact the accuracy of readings?

BOTTOM LINE

Cuff size, arm position, bladder distention, and leg crossing meaningfully affect systolic and diastolic blood pressure measurement accuracy from ~1 mmHg lower to 20 higher. Measuring over thin clothing does not impact readings. Consider a five-minute rest before measurement as rest may give more accurate readings if blood pressure ≥140mmHg systolic. Following Hypertension Canada's measurement technique recommendations is reasonable to obtain accurate readings.

EVIDENCE

- Results statistically significant unless otherwise stated.
- One systematic review.[1] Reporting larger, higher quality randomized crossover trials due to methodological limitations.
- Cuff size (195 patients). Compared to appropriate cuff size:[2]
    - Using too-large cuff:

        - Small arm using regular-sized cuff: -3.6mmHg systolic blood pressure (SBP), -1.3mmHg diastolic blood pressure (DBP).
    - Using too-small cuff:
        - Large arm using regular-sized cuff: +4.8mmHg (SBP), +1.8mmHg (DBP).
        - Extra-large arm using regular-sized cuff: +19.5mmHg (SBP), +7.4mmHg (DBP).
- Arm position: Arm supported at heart level, hand on lap, or arm hanging at side (133 patients).[3]
    - Lap versus supported: +3.9mmHg (SBP), +4.0mmHg (DBP).
    - Side versus supported: +6.5mmHg (SBP), +4.4mmHg (DBP).
- Leg position (111 patients):[4]
    - Crossed legs at knee versus feet on ground: +3 to 8mmHg (SBP), +2mmHg (DBP).
    - Crossed legs at ankles: No difference.
- Rest period (113 patients):[5]
    - No rest versus 5-minute rest:
        - Patients with SBP <140mmHg: No meaningful difference.
        - SBP ≥140mmHg: Inconsistent; ranged from no effect to ≥ 4mmHg.
- Clothing (201 participants):[6] No difference between thin-sleeved (< 2mm) and bare-arm measurements.
- Bladder (172 women; ultrasound-confirmed full bladder; not randomized):[7]
    - Full bladder versus empty: +4.2mmHg (SBP), +2.8mmHg (DBP).
- Talking: May raise SBP between 4-19mmHg, but suboptimal randomization processes used.[8-11]
- Environment: No difference between quiet private and noisy public environments.[12]

CONTEXT

- 5mmHg reduction in SBP reduces major cardiovascular events by ~10%, suggesting small measurement errors may be clinically meaningful.[13]
- Hypertension Canada's recommended measurement techniques[14] align with protocols used in landmark hypertension trials.
- Automated office and home measurements using standardized techniques correlate more closely with awake ambulatory measurement than manual office readings.[15]
- Guidelines recommend validated, automated devices for measurement.[14]

REFERENCES

1. Kallioinen N, Hill A, Horswill MS, *et al.* Journal of Hypertension. 2017;35(3): 421–41.
2. Ishigami J, Charleston J, Miller ER, *et al.* JAMA Intern Med. 2023;183(10): 1061.
3. Liu H, Zhao D, Sabit A, *et al.* JAMA Intern Med. 2024;184(12): 1436.
4. Adiyaman A, Tosun N, Elving LD, *et al.* Blood Pressure Monitoring. 2007;12(3): 189–93.
5. Brady TM, Charleston J, Ishigami J, *et al.* Hypertension. 2021;78(5): 1511-19.

AUTHORS

Tony Nickonchuk, BSc Pharm
Adrienne J Lindblad, BSP ACPR PharmD
Scott Garrison, MD CCFP
Danielle Perry, RN MSc

Authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

6. Liebl M, Holzgreve H, Schulz M, *et al.* Blood Pressure. 2004;13(5): 279–82.
7. Choi EJ, Jeong DW, Lee JG, *et al.* Korean J Fam Med. 2011;32(5): 306.
8. Zheng D, Giovanni R, Murray A. J Hum Hypertens. 2012;26: 458-62.
9. Le Pailleur C, Montgermont P, Feder JM, *et al.* Behav Med. 2001;26: 149-57.
10. Le Pailleur C, Vacheron A, Landais P, *et al.* Behav Med. 1996;22: 114-22.
11. Liehr P. Arch Psychiatr Nurs. 1992;6: 306-11.
12. Ishigami J, Liu H, Zhao D, *et al.* Ann Intern Med. 2025;178(2): 149–56.
13. Rahimi K, Bidel Z, Nazarzadeh M, *et al.* The Lancet. 2021;397(10285): 1625–36.
14. Goupil R, Tsuyuki RT, Santesso N, *et al.* CMAJ. 2025;197(20): E549–64.
15. Roerecke M, Kaczorowski J, Myers MG. JAMA Intern Med. 2019;179(3): 351.

TOOLS FOR PRACTICE PROVIDED BY

PEER Patients Experience Evidence Research

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

The College of Family Physicians of Canada / Le Collège des médecins de famille du Canada

Ontario College of Family Physicians

Alberta College of Family Physicians

The Saskatchewan College of Family Physicians / Le Collège des médecins de famille de la Saskatchewan
A chapter of the College of Family Physicians of Canada
Une section du Collège des médecins de famille du Canada

Tools for Practice are peer reviewed and summarize practice-changing medical evidence for primary care. Coordinated by **Dr. Adrienne Lindblad,** the articles are developed by the Patients, Experience, Evidence, Research (PEER) team, and supported by the College of Family Physicians of Canada, and the Alberta, Ontario, and Saskatchewan Colleges of Family Physicians. Feedback is welcome and can be sent to toolsforpractice@cfpc.ca. Archived articles can be found at www.toolsforpractice.ca

This communication reflects the opinion of the authors and does not necessarily mirror the perspective and policy of the College of Family Physicians of Canada.

This TFP was written by humans. AI may have helped with editing or formatting, but that's about it.