

1 **Validity of Wrist and Forehead Temperature in Temperature Screening in the General**
2 **Population During the Outbreak of 2019 Novel Coronavirus: a prospective real-world**
3 **study**

4

5 (Validity of Wrist and Forehead Temperature in Temperature Screening in the General
6 Population During the Outbreak of COVID-19)

7

8 Ge Chen^{1,8}, Jiarong Xie^{2,3,8}, Guangli Dai¹, Peijun Zheng⁴, Xiaqing Hu⁵, Hongpeng Lu^{2,3}, Lei
9 Xu^{2,3}, Xueqin Chen^{6*}, Xiaomin Chen^{2,7*}

10

11 ¹Department of Clinical Engineering, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province,
12 China;

13 ²Department of General Internal Medicine, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province,
14 China;

15 ³Department of Gastroenterology, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, China;

16 ⁴Department of Nursing, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, China;

17 ⁵Department of Emergency, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, China;

18 ⁶Department of Chinese Traditional Medicine, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang
19 Province, China;

20 ⁷Department of Cardiology, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, China;

21 ⁸These authors contributed equally to this work.

22 * Corresponding authors

23

24 **Abbreviations:** 2019-nCoV, 2019 Novel Coronavirus; NCIT, Non-contact infrared
25 thermometer; IRTT, infrared tympanic thermometers; ROC, receiver–operator characteristic.

26

27 **Key words:** 2019 Novel Coronavirus; wrist temperature; non-contact infrared thermometer;

28

29 **Abstract**^o

30 **Aims:** Temperature screening is important in the population during the outbreak of 2019
31 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19). This study aimed to compare the accuracy and precision of
32 wrist and forehead temperature with tympanic temperature under different circumstances.

33 **Methods:** We performed a prospective observational study in a real-life population. We
34 consecutively collected wrist and forehead temperatures in Celsius (°C) using a non-contact
35 infrared thermometer (NCIT). We also measured the tympanic temperature using a tympanic
36 thermometers (IRTT) and defined fever as a tympanic temperature $\geq 37.3^{\circ}\text{C}$.

37 **Results:** We enrolled a total of 528 participants including 261 indoor and 267 outdoor
38 participants. We divided outdoor participants into four types according to their means of
39 transportation to the hospital as walk, bicycle, electric vehicle, car, and inside the car. Under
40 different circumstance, the mean difference ranged from -1.72 to -0.56°C in different groups
41 for the forehead measurements, and -0.96 to -0.61°C for the wrist measurements. Both
42 measurements had high fever screening abilities in inpatients (wrist: AUC 0.790; 95% CI:
43 0.725-0.854, $P < 0.001$; forehead: AUC 0.816; 95% CI: 0.757-0.876, $P < 0.001$). The cut-off
44 value of wrist measurement for detecting tympanic temperature $\geq 37.3^{\circ}\text{C}$ was 36.2°C with a
45 86.4% sensitivity and a 67.0% specificity, and the best threshold of forehead measurement
46 was also 36.2°C with a 93.2% sensitivity and a 60.0% specificity.

47 **Conclusions:** Wrist measurement is more stable than forehead measurement under different
48 circumstance. Both measurements have great fever screening abilities for indoor patients. The
49 cut-off value of both measurements was 36.2°C. (ClinicalTrials.gov number: NCT04274621)

50

51 **Introduction**

52 The outbreaks of 2019 novel coronavirus COVID-19 (previously known as 2019-nCoV)
53 has attracted global attention, due to its strong transmission ability and certain fatality (1, 2).
54 Some studies reported that fever, fatigue and dry cough are common symptoms of
55 COVID-19 patients (3, 4), and 43.8% of the patients showed fever before admission with it
56 largely being the first symptom (5). Therefore, temperature screening in the high-risk
57 population is important for early identification of COVID-19 infection and thereby reducing
58 the risk of cross infection.

59 During the epidemic, infrared tympanic thermometers (IRTT) and non-contact infrared
60 thermometer (NCIT) are being applied to temperature screening in the general population (6).
61 As a screening tool, it is quick for mass screening and allows a faster triage (7). However, we
62 need to consume a lot of disposable plastic covers when we use IRTT. It may increase the
63 financial burden in the widespread use of population screening. Furthermore, indirect
64 contacts with infected individuals may increase the risk of cross infection. NCIT meets the
65 clinical requirements for mass screening in terms of detection efficiency, safety and
66 cost-performance. Besides, it takes less time than IRTT. Forehead is one of the key targets of
67 thermography. However, forehead temperature is affected by physiological and
68 environmental conditions (8). It should be measured in a relatively temperature-controlled
69 environment. A previous study suggested to acclimate to the indoor temperature for at least
70 10 min for those who were exposed to the cold before taking body temperature readings (8).
71 However, it is not practical for mass screening in winter during the outbreak of COVID-19.

72 Wrist temperature in this outbreak is under consideration. Before testing, they just need
73 to roll up their sleeves at 10 cm above the palmar side of the wrist. Considering this area is
74 covered with clothing, the wrist temperatures may keep stable. Previous study showed
75 wearable devices (WD) on the wrist were applied in temperature monitoring in clinical

76 practice (9). It brings a challenge whether it can be used as an accurate, safe and
77 cost-effective screening tool in this outbreak.

78 In this study, we explored the accuracy and advantages of wrist temperature
79 measurement in a real-life population in different environments and conditions. We aimed to
80 find the thresholds of this key technique for diagnosis of fever. It may assist to improve the
81 standardization of both practical use and performance, especially indispensable in the
82 pandemic 2019-nCoV situation.

83

84

85 **Materials and Methods**

86 **Study population**

87 This was a prospective observational study in a real-life population. We consecutively
88 enrolled a total of 572 participants at Ningbo First Hospital in China in this study (Figure 1).
89 The exclusion criteria included: (i) Age \leq 18 years ($n = 6$); (ii) Wearing hearing aid, or
90 having a cerumen ($n = 7$); (iii) Participants with soft tissue infection or trauma ($n = 3$); (iv)
91 Missing data of wrist, forehead, and tympanic temperature ($n = 4$); and (v) Participants whose
92 forehead temperature measurements showed “low” ($n = 23$). We finally enrolled 528 eligible
93 participants for the final analysis, including 261 indoor and 267 outdoor participants. The 261
94 indoor participants were from the fever clinic and emergency department, and the 267
95 outdoor participants included patients and accompanying family members. The data of indoor
96 participants were collected consecutively between February 14th and February 20th, 2020.
97 The data of outdoor participants were collected on February 14th, 15th, 17th, 2020.
98 Temperature readings were taken by trained and experienced nurses. Each participant was
99 measured for wrist, forehead, and tympanic temperature twice. The temperatures were
100 recorded by mean wrist temperature, forehead, and tympanic temperature, respectively. Data
101 regarding age, gender, transportation, occupation, and temperature were recorded
102 immediately by the nurse to pre-printed files.

103 The study was approved by Ningbo First Hospital Ethics Committee. All participants
104 were asked verbally. They gave their oral informed consent in this study. The study was
105 registered in ClinicalTrials.gov with identifier number: NCT04274621.

106

107 **Assessment of environment**

108 Indoor patients at the fever clinic and emergency department were those who has been
109 indoors for at least a few minutes. The outdoor participants were divided into four type

110 according to their means of transportation to the hospital as walk, bicycle/electric vehicle, car,
111 and inside the car.

112

113 **Measurement of temperature**

114 Tympanic temperature was measured using IRTT (Braun ThermoScan PRO 6000). Wrist
115 and forehead temperature were measured using NCIT. The NCIT was ranged 32.0–42.9°C.
116 The accuracy was $\pm 0.2^\circ\text{C}$. NCIT measurements were taken following the manufacturer's
117 instructions in the mid-forehead and a region at 10 cm above the palmar side of the wrist.
118 After pulling the pinna backward, the nurse inserted IRTT into the external auditory meatus.
119 The probe was held in the same position until the “beep” was heard. Temperature readings
120 were taken by the same trained nurse in the following order: forehead, forehead (the second
121 time), left wrist, right wrist, left tympanic, and right tympanic. The data were recorded by
122 another researcher in pre-printed files. Tympanic membrane is in close proximity to the
123 hypothalamus and the internal carotid artery (10). Thus, tympanic temperature is considered
124 to directly reflect core temperature (11), and was defined as the gold standard in this study.
125 These thermometers were stabilized before measurements. Calibration of thermometers were
126 checked by the Quality and Technology Supervision Bureau, Ningbo, China. It was
127 according to Calibration Specification of Infrared Thermometers for Measurement of Human
128 Temperature (JJF1107-2003).

129

130 **Statistical analysis**

131 Power calculation was performed for sample size. The following parameters were used: a
132 power of 90%, an α -error level of 0.05, estimating a standard deviation of 1°C and a potential
133 allowable error of 0.2°C . Considering a 10% possibility of dropouts and otherwise missing
134 data, at least 293 subjects were needed in our study.

135 Continuous variables were expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (SD), and categorical
136 data in frequency and proportion. The agreements for each method versus
137 tympanic temperature were analyzed by Bland–Altman analysis (12). It also showed three
138 superimposed horizontal lines. Red dashed line highlighted mean bias among all the paired
139 measurements. Black dashed line marked upper and lower 95% Limits of Agreement (LoA).
140 A temperature deviation of 0.5°C was considered as clinically acceptable (13). A tympanic
141 temperature of $\geq 37.3^\circ\text{C}$ was defined as the cut-off point for fever. Statistical analyses were
142 conducted using R version 3.5.1 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
143 Austria).
144
145

146 **Results**

147 **Participants**

148 In this prospective observational study, a total of 528 participants were enrolled. Figure 1
149 summarizes characteristics of the participants. The mean age was 46.7 ± 16.4 years. 69.4% (n
150 = 297) of participants were males, and 78.2% ($n = 413$) were patients (Table 1). Mean
151 forehead, wrist, tympanic measurements were $35.6 \pm 1.2^\circ\text{C}$, $35.7 \pm 0.8^\circ\text{C}$, and $36.6 \pm 0.6^\circ\text{C}$,
152 respectively. There were 44 patients with fever in indoor patients. The data of outdoor
153 participants were collected on February 14th, 15th, 17th, 2020. Mean weather temperatures
154 were 13°C , 14°C , and 7°C , respectively.

155

156 **Bland-Altman comparison among the participants under different environment**

157 Table 2 showed mean temperatures and Bland-Altman analysis among the participants
158 under different environment. Compared with tympanic temperature as golden standard, the
159 mean difference ranged from -1.72 to -0.56°C for the forehead measurement, and -0.96 to
160 -0.61°C for the wrist measurement. We observed a lower variation in wrist than forehead
161 temperature measurements.

162 Outdoor participants were divided into four types as walk, bicycle or electric vehicle, car,
163 and inside the car. For those who walked, the agreement limits for wrist and tympanic was
164 between -2.05 and 0.34°C ; -4.07 and 0.64°C for forehead and tympanic (Figure 2A, B). For
165 those who used bicycle or electric vehicle, the agreement limits for wrist and tympanic was
166 between -2.14 and 0.93°C ; -3.82 and 0.84°C for forehead and tympanic (Figure 2C, D). For
167 those who were transported by car, the agreement limits for wrist and tympanic was between
168 -1.43 and -0.44°C ; -1.47 and -0.36°C for forehead and tympanic (Figure 2E, F). For those
169 who were inside the car, the agreement limits for wrist and tympanic was between -1.54 and
170 -0.15°C ; -2.41 and 0.16°C for forehead and tympanic (Figure 2G, H). It highlighted that wrist

171 temperature had narrower 95% limits of agreement than forehead. Wrist measurements had
172 the higher percentage of differences falling within $\pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ than forehead measurements in
173 these four types.

174 For indoor patients, the agreement limits for wrist and tympanic was between -2.70 and
175 -0.77°C ; -1.91 and 0.80°C for forehead and tympanic (Figure 3). 57.1% of forehead values
176 were included within $\pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$, followed by wrist values (41.4%). We also explore the
177 agreement of left and right wrists (Figure S1). The mean bias is 0.00. The agreement limits
178 for wrist and tympanic was between -0.74 and 0.74°C . It showed good agreement between
179 right and left wrists.

180

181 **The receiver–operator characteristic (ROC) curves for detection of fever**

182 We performed a ROC curves in indoor patients for detecting tympanic temperature
183 $\geq 37.3^{\circ}\text{C}$. Figure 4 shows the comparison between wrist and forehead measurements for
184 detection of fever. Both measurement had significantly great abilities of screening patients
185 for fever (wrist: AUC 0.790; 95% CI: 0.725–0.854, $P < 0.001$; forehead: AUC 0.816; 95% CI:
186 0.757–0.876, $P < 0.0001$). The cut-off value of wrist measurement for detecting tympanic
187 temperature $\geq 37.3^{\circ}\text{C}$ was 36.2°C with a 86.4% sensitivity and a 67.0% specificity. And the
188 best threshold of forehead measurement was also 36.2°C with a 93.2% sensitivity and a 60.0%
189 specificity.

190

191 **Discussion**

192 In this prospective real-world study, we found that wrist temperature measurement is
193 more stable than forehead using NCIT under different circumstances in outdoor participants.
194 Both measurement had significantly great abilities of screening patients for fever in indoor
195 patients. The cut-off value for wrist and forehead temperature were both 36.2°C. They
196 showed good sensitivity. It may assist for fever screening in the population, especially in the
197 outbreak of 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19). To our knowledge, this study was the first
198 to explore the reliability and validity of wrist and forehead temperature measurement in mass
199 screening.

200 Previous studies showed that axilla, rectal temperature were the gold standards in clinical
201 practice (14, 15). However, it was impractical for the large-scale screening. Timesaving and
202 less invasive tools were needed. IRTT and NCIT are being applied in the general population
203 during the epidemic. A lot of disposable plastic covers were consumed, which may increase
204 the financial burden. In China, it cost 1–2 RMB (about 0.2 dollars) for per disposable plastic
205 cover. Besides, indirect contacts increased the risk of cross infection. Forehead temperature
206 was used for the widespread use of population screening using NCIT. However, it can be
207 affected by a person's physiological and environmental conditions (8, 16). The forehead
208 temperature value of 23 participants showed “low” in our study. This all happened on the
209 same day (February 17th, 2020) with an outside temperature of 7°C. Thus, we chose wrist
210 temperature as an alternative, especially in the winter when mass screening is needed. Wrist
211 measurement indicated peripheral temperature at 10 cm above the palmar side of the wrist. It
212 was within our expectation that wrist measurement readings attained was lower than
213 tympanic route. However, this area was covered by clothing all the time. It was less
214 influenced by environmental conditions. Our study showed it was more stable for participants
215 under different circumstance than forehead measurement. It is important for mass screen in

216 the open air during the Outbreak of COVID-19. The ROC curves showed wrist and forehead
217 measurement had significantly great abilities of screening patients for fever. The cut-off
218 value of both measurement was 36.2°C. It can be applied in clinical practice and assist to
219 improve the standardization of both practical use and performance.

220 The strengths of this study included its large sample size, and prospective design in the
221 real-world setting. There were several limitations. First, it is difficult to quantify the
222 physiological and environmental conditions. Second, only one brand of thermometer was
223 enrolled in this study. It was uncertain that it could be generalized to all brands of
224 thermometers in the market.

225 In conclusion, this study confirmed wrist measurement was more stable for participants
226 under different circumstance than forehead measurement. Both measurement had
227 significantly great fever screening abilities for indoor patients, and the cut-off value of both
228 measurements for fever was 36.2°C. Further studies are needed to explore the validity and
229 accuracy of wrist temperature.

230

231 **Guarantor of the article**

232 Xiaoming Chen

233

234 **Specific author contributions**

235 Study concept and design: Ge Chen, Lei Xu, Xueqin Chen, and Xiaoming Chen; Acquisition
236 of data: Peijun Zheng, Xiaqing Hu, Guangli Dai, Lei Xu and Hongpeng Lu; Analysis and
237 interpretation of data: Jiarong Xie and Ge Chen. Drafting of the manuscript: Jiarong Xie and
238 Ge Chen. Study supervision: Lei Xu, Xueqin Chen, and Xiaoming Chen.

239

240 **Author Approval**

241 all authors have seen and approved the manuscript.

242

243 **Acknowledgment**

244 The authors thank Jihong Zhang for sorting of data; Ximing Jiang, Ying Xin for acquisition

245 and sorting of data.

246

247 **Declaration of competing interest**

248 None.

249

250 **Funding Statement**

251 None.

252

253 **Data Availability Statement**

254 The data used to support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding

255 author (Xiaoming Chen).

256

257

258 **References**

- 259 1. Zumla A, Hui DS, Azhar EI, Memish ZA, Maeurer M. Reducing mortality from
260 2019-nCoV: host-directed therapies should be an option. *The Lancet* 2020.
- 261 2. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and
262 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling
263 study. *The Lancet* 2020.
- 264 3. Wang W, Tang J, Wei F. Updated understanding of the outbreak of 2019 novel
265 coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in Wuhan, China. *Journal of Medical Virology* 2020.
- 266 4. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 138
267 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China.
268 *Jama* 2020.
- 269 5. Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, Liang W-h, Ou C-q, He J-x, et al. Clinical characteristics of
270 2019 novel coronavirus infection in China. *medRxiv* 2020.
- 271 6. Devrim I, Kara A, Ceyhan M, Tezer H, Uludag AK, Cengiz AB, et al. Measurement
272 accuracy of fever by tympanic and axillary thermometry. *Pediatric emergency care*
273 2007;23:16-19.
- 274 7. Mogensen CB, Wittenhoff L, Fruerhøj G, Hansen S. Forehead or ear temperature
275 measurement cannot replace rectal measurements, except for screening purposes. *BMC*
276 *pediatrics* 2018;18:15.
- 277 8. Erenberk U, Torun E, Ozkaya E, Uzuner S, Demir AD, Dundaroz R. Skin temperature
278 measurement using an infrared thermometer on patients who have been exposed to cold.
279 *Pediatrics International* 2013;55:767-770.
- 280 9. Holt S, Yo J, Karschmikus C, Volpato F, Christov S, Smith E, et al. Monitoring skin
281 temperature at the wrist in hospitalised patients may assist in the detection of infection.
282 *Internal Medicine Journal* 2020.
- 283 10. Campbell I. Body temperature and its regulation. *Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine*
284 2008;9:259-263.
- 285 11. Gasim GI, Musa IR, Abdien MT, Adam I. Accuracy of tympanic temperature
286 measurement using an infrared tympanic membrane thermometer. *BMC research notes*
287 2013;6:194.
- 288 12. Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. *Statistical*
289 *methods in medical research* 1999;8:135-160.

- 290 13. Suleman M-I, Doufas AG, Akça O, Ducharme M, Sessler DI. Insufficiency in a new
291 temporal-artery thermometer for adult and pediatric patients. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*
292 2002;95:67-71.
- 293 14. Berksoy E, Anıl M, Bıçılıoğlu Y, Gökalp G, Bal A. Comparison of infrared tympanic,
294 non-contact infrared skin, and axillary thermometer to rectal temperature measurements in a
295 pediatric emergency observation unit. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 2018;11:567-573.
- 296 15. Rabbani MZ, Amir M, Malik M, Mufti M, Bin Pervez M, Iftekhar S. Tympanic
297 temperature comparison with oral mercury thermometer readings in an OPD setting. *J Coll*
298 *Physicians Surg Pak* 2010;20:33-36.
- 299 16. Vesnovsky O, Li Y, Topoleski L, Zhu L. Modeling of Differences Between Body Core
300 and Forehead Temperatures Measured by Infrared Thermometers. In: 2017 Design of
301 Medical Devices Conference; 2017: American Society of Mechanical Engineers Digital
302 Collection; 2017.
- 303
- 304

305 **Figure Legends**

306 **Figure 1.** Flowchart of the study.

307

308 **Figure 2.** Bland-Altman comparison between each method and tympanic temperature. X axis
309 is the mean temperature of each method and tympanic. Y axis is the difference of each
310 method and tympanic. Red dashed line showed mean bias. Black dashed lines showed 95%
311 limits of agreement. (A), (B) for those who walked; (C), (D) for those who used
312 bicycle/electric vehicle; (E), (F) for those who were transported by car; (G), (H) for those
313 who were inside the car

314

315 **Figure 3.** Bland-Altman comparison between each method and tympanic temperature for
316 indoor patients. X axis is the mean temperature of each method and tympanic. Y axis is the
317 difference of each method and tympanic. Red dashed line showed mean bias. Black dashed
318 lines showed 95% limits of agreement.

319

320 **Figure 4.** The receiver–operator characteristic (ROC) curves for detection of fever.

321

322 **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of the participants

Variables	Total (<i>n</i> = 528)
Age, years	46.7 ± 16.4
Gender, male, <i>n</i> (%)	297 (69.4%)
Environment	
Indoor patients, <i>n</i> (%)	261 (49.4%)
Walk, <i>n</i> (%)	120 (22.7%)
Bicycle/Electric vehicle, <i>n</i> (%)	39 (7.4%)
Transported by car, <i>n</i> (%)	56 (10.6%)
Inside the car, <i>n</i> (%)	52 (9.8%)
Patients or not	
Yes, <i>n</i> (%)	413 (78.2%)
Forehead temperature, °C	35.6 ± 1.2
Wrist temperature, °C	35.7 ± 0.8
Tympanic temperature, °C	36.6 ± 0.6


323

324


325 **Table 2.** Bland-Altman comparison among the participants under different environment

Environment	Method	Mean temperature (°C)	Bland-Altman comparison (°C)		
			Mean difference	95% prediction interval	Proportion of Differences within 0.5°C
Indoor patients	Tympanic	36.8	reference		
	Wrist	35.8	-0.96	(-2.70—0.77)	41.4%
	Forehead	36.2	-0.56	(-1.91—0.80)	57.1%
Walk	Tympanic	36.3	reference		
	Wrist	35.4	-0.86	(-2.05—0.34)	72.5%
	Forehead	34.6	-1.72	(-4.07—0.64)	22.5%
Bicycle/Electric vehicle	Tympanic	36.0	reference		
	Wrist	35.5	-0.61	(-2.14—0.93)	56.4%
	Forehead	34.6	-1.49	(-3.82—0.84)	48.7%
Transported by car	Tympanic	36.6	reference		
	Wrist	35.7	-0.93	(-1.43—0.44)	91.1%
	Forehead	35.4	-0.92	(-1.47—0.36)	85.7%
Inside the car	Tympanic	36.7	reference		
	Wrist	35.8	-0.85	(-1.54—0.15)	94.2%
	Forehead	35.8	-1.13	(-2.41—0.16)	80.8%


326




(A) Walk: forehead - tympanic




(B) Walk: wrist - tympanic




(C) Bicycle/Electric vehicle: forehead - tympanic




(D) Bicycle/Electric vehicle: wrist - tympanic




(E) Inside the car: forehead - tympanic




(F) Inside the car: wrist - tympanic




(G) Transported by car: forehead - tympanic



(H) Transported by car: wrist - tympanic



(A) Indoor patients: forehead - tympanic



(B) Indoor patients: wrist - tympanic

