

Fever as an adverse event following immunization: case definition and guidelines of data collection, analysis, and presentation

S. Michael Marcy^a, Katrin S. Kohl^{b,*}, Ron Dagan^c, David Nalin^d, Michael Blum^e,
Marcy Connell Jones^f, John Hansen^g, Jerry Labadie^h, Lucia Leeⁱ, Bryan L. Martin^j,
Katherine O'Brien^k, Edward Rothstein^l, Patricia Vermeer^m,
The Brighton Collaboration Fever Working Group^{n, o, l}

^a Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, USA and Kaiser-Permanente Health Care Program, CA, USA

^b Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Immunization Program, 1600 Clifton Rd.,
Mailstop E-61, Atlanta, GA 30333, USA

^c Soroka Medical Center, Beer Sheva, Israel

^d Merck & Co., West Point, PA, USA

^e Wyeth Research, Collegeville, PA, USA

^f California DHS Immunization Branch, Berkeley, CA, USA

^g Kaiser Permanente Health Care Program, Oakland, CA, USA

^h Netherlands Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb, s-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands

ⁱ Food and Drug Administration, Rockville, MD, USA

^j Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, DC, USA

^k The Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA

^l Pennridge Pediatrics Associates, Sellersville, PA, USA

^m National Institute of Public Health and Environment, Bilthoven, The Netherlands

ⁿ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA

^o University Children's Hospital, Basel, Switzerland

Keywords: Fever; Adverse events following immunization; Case definition; Guidelines

1. Preamble

To improve comparability of vaccine safety data, the Brighton Collaboration *Fever* Working Group has developed a case definition and guidelines for fever following immunization, applicable in study settings with different availability of resources, in health care settings that differ by availability of and access to health care, and in different geographic regions.

The definition and guidelines were developed through group consensus. They are grounded on both expert opinion and a review of more than four hundred articles related to the assessment of fever as an adverse event following immunization and to the diagnosis of fever in humans.

1.1. Background on fever and rationale for decisions about case definition

Fever is defined as an elevation of body temperature above the normal. It is usually caused by infection, but it can also be associated with a number of immunologic, neoplastic, hereditary, metabolic, and toxic conditions. Fever is endogenously generated and is distinguished from hyperthermia [1], which is a warming of the body caused by external environmental factors. Since temperature regulation occurs at the hypothalamic level, the temperature of blood bathing the thermoregulatory centers in the hypothalamus probably best reflects true core body temperature [2,3]. Temperatures recorded within the pulmonary artery and upper oesophagus have been considered acceptable surrogates [3–6]. While these sites are generally regarded the “physiologic gold standards” for measurement of human body temperature, they are accessible only under surgical or experimental conditions and are impractical for detecting fever in a clinical setting.

A universally acceptable clinical definition of fever (a “clinical gold standard”) is, however, more elusive [7]. This

* Corresponding author: Tel: +1-404-639-8073.

E-mail address: secretariat@brightoncollaboration.org (K.S. Kohl).

¹ <http://brightoncollaboration.org>

is largely because normal body temperature, the yardstick against which fever is defined, is not a single value, but rather a range of values that fluctuate from time to time and place to place in different individuals. These values also vary by anatomic site, with different norms for rectal, oral, axillary, temporal artery, tympanic membrane, umbilical, inguinal, or skin-mattress temperatures. While general trends are observed when temperatures at these sites are compared (e.g., oral temperatures tend to be lower than rectal and higher than axillary temperatures) the relationship between temperatures taken at these various sites has been found to be inconsistent. It is fundamental to an understanding of the recommendations given below that there are no reliable mathematical formulae that permit temperature recorded at one anatomic site to directly predict temperature at another site. Further, no anatomic site for measuring fever in a clinical setting has been shown to be consistently superior to another [5,8–37].

Both normal body temperature and fever are usually recognized clinically through symptoms or signs (e.g., skin warmth) and confirmed through thermometry. Establishing the significance or severity of the signs or symptoms of a presumed febrile illness is highly subjective and open to wide interpretation, particularly in young children, as is tactile determination of skin temperature [38]. Several studies have attempted to define the ability of caregivers to diagnose fever by palpation [39–46]. The results of their observations indicate that there are significant inaccuracies in attempting to define the presence or absence of fever by touch—errors of both over- and under-diagnosis.

Deciding whether thermometry accurately indicates the presence of fever requires consideration of numerous influences that are difficult or impossible to control. For example, body temperature in healthy infants, children, and adults is affected by level of activity [47,48], meals [27,48–50], time of day [9,47,48,51], and environmental conditions [52–54]. Among young infants, gestational age [55] and postnatal age [22,51,52,56] also affect temperature. Mouth-breathing during oral thermometry; failure to properly position a rectal, axillary, or aural thermometer; hurried measurements; and failure to properly standardize and maintain instruments have all been shown to adversely affect the accuracy and reproducibility of readings. Any complete description of elevated temperature in an individual must include, in addition to the anatomic site, where the temperature was measured, placement within that site [1,51,55,57–59], and the duration of measurement [17,60]. The device used to assess temperature should be specified: mercury-in-glass, electronic, infrared, or thermophototropic liquid crystal. Only measurements obtained with validated devices should be considered acceptable.

1.2. Temporal versus causal association with immunization

It is recognized by the *Fever Working Group* and should be emphasized to parents, patients, health care providers,

and all others concerned with immunization safety, that fever (or any other adverse event) that follows administration of an inactivated component or live vaccine may be temporally *associated with*, but is not necessarily *the result of*, administration of a vaccine. Because of known high background rates particularly of fever [61,62], any occurrence of fever should be compared to a control group (ideally by placebo-controlled double-blinded and randomized comparisons) or against a background rate.

Because the definition itself defines a clinical entity without inference of a causal relation to a given exposure, the time interval between immunization and onset of the event cannot be part of the definition itself, but should be assessed as described in the guidelines.

1.3. Use of guidelines for data collection, analysis, and presentation

Recognizing the many variables and uncertainties affecting both the definition and the determination of normal and elevated body temperature, the Brighton Collaboration *Fever Working Group* has attempted to establish useful and practical guidelines for standardizing the collection, analysis, and presentation of data on temperature measurement in the setting of prelicensure and postlicensure clinical trials, surveillance, and retrospective epidemiologic studies of vaccine safety. The guidelines are not intended to establish criteria for management of ill infants, children, or adults. As they represent a minimum standard, additional data may be collected, analyzed, and presented as deemed necessary by the investigators. This is particularly relevant for surveillance of fever as an adverse event for new vaccines against chronic diseases (e.g., diabetes mellitus and rheumatoid arthritis) and therapeutic vaccines (e.g., tumor vaccines), as well as genetically engineered vaccines, mucosal vaccines, or vaccines with slow-release delivery systems.

1.4. Periodic review

It is the recommendation of the Brighton Collaboration *Fever Working Group*, that prelicensure and postlicensure studies be specifically designed to investigate fever as an adverse event following immunization as described in this document. Review and, when indicated, revision of the definition and guidelines is planned on a regular (i.e., every 3–5 years) or “as needed” basis.

2. Case definition of fever as an adverse event following immunization

• Level 1 of diagnostic certainty

Fever is defined as the endogenous elevation of at least one measured body temperature of $\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$.^{2,3}

- **Level 2 of diagnostic certainty**
Not applicable.
- **Level 3 of diagnostic certainty**
Not applicable.

3. Guidelines for data collection, analysis, and presentation of fever as an adverse event following immunization

It was the consensus of the Brighton Collaboration *Fever Working Group* to recommend the following guidelines to enable meaningful and standardized collection, analysis, and presentation of information about fever following immunization. However, implementation of all guidelines may not be possible in all settings. The availability of information may vary depending upon resources, geographic region, and whether the source of information is a prospectively designed clinical trial, a post-marketing surveillance or epidemiologic study, or an individual report of elevated temperature.

3.1. Data collection

These guidelines represent a minimum standard for the collection of data on fever to allow for comparability of data. Additional information may be collected depending on the study question and setting.

- (1) Documentation of the *pre-immunization health status*, including temperature measurement, of a vaccine recipient should be available to document the presence or absence of elevated body temperature.
- (2) *Tactile determinations* of fever are not acceptable forms of measurement unless confirmed by thermometry.
- (3) *Temperature measurement* in clinical trials should be performed whenever fever is suspected, but no less than once a day even in the absence of suspected fever. If fever is detected, temperature should be measured at least twice a day (in the morning and evening) or as clinically appropriate until two consecutive measurements are $< 38^{\circ}\text{C}$.
- (4) Any *device validated* to provide accurate and reproducible results is acceptable for measuring body temperature. Appropriate anatomic site(s), duration of measurement, and maintenance/standardization schedules should be specified for each such device and recorded on the diary card.

² The value of $\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$ is accepted as reflecting an abnormal elevation of temperature, irrespective of device, anatomic site, age, or environmental conditions.

³ While it is recognized that this value is to some extent *arbitrary*, it is based upon a conservative interpretation of definitions proposed and used by clinicians, investigators, and the public at large.

- (5) The *duration of surveillance* for fever, when collected as a prespecified adverse event in prelicensure and postlicensure clinical trials on a diary card, is to some extent arbitrary and depends on
 - biologic characteristics of the vaccine (e.g., live attenuated versus inactivated component vaccines);
 - biologic characteristics of the vaccine-targeted disease; and
 - biologic characteristics of fever including patterns identified in previous trials (e.g., early-phase trials).
 Monitoring of fever still present on the last day of follow-up should be extended to resolution.
- (6) For all cases and/or all study participants, as appropriate, the *following information should be recorded*.
 - Temperature.
 - The method of temperature measurement, i.e., route and device.
 - Date of birth, sex, ethnicity.
 - Date and time of immunization.
 - Description of vaccine(s) (i.e., name of vaccine, manufacturer, lot number, dose, and dose number).
 - Method and route of administration (e.g., intramuscular, intradermal, subcutaneous, oral, intranasal, and needle-free or other injection devices).
 - Needle length and gauge.
 - Anatomical site (including left or right side) of immunization (e.g., vaccine A in proximal left lateral thigh, vaccine B in left deltoid).
 - Detailed clinical description of the pattern of elevated temperature.
 - Concurrent signs, symptoms, and diseases.
 - Concurrently administered biologics and prescription and non-prescription medication, particularly antipyretics.
 - Laboratory examination and/or pathological findings and diagnoses.
 - Person reporting and/or measuring the temperature (e.g., medical provider, parent/patient, and other third party reporter), including contact information.
 - Date/time of diagnosis⁴ and end of episode.⁵
 - Immunization history (i.e., previous immunizations and any adverse events following immunization).
- (7) *Additional* desirable but not essential information to be collected includes:
 - placement of measuring device within or upon the anatomic site;
 - level of prior activity, relationship to a meal;
 - time of day, environmental conditions;
 - the duration of measurement;
 - gestational age and birth weight of infants (< 37 weeks gestation);

⁴ The *date and time of diagnosis* of an episode is the time the event met the case definition.

⁵ The *end of an episode* is defined as the time the event failed to meet the case definition (i.e., temperature measurement reached $< 38^{\circ}\text{C}$).

- time interval between birth and immunization for neonatal immunizations; and
 - presence or absence of concurrent local disease outbreaks.
- (8) The device, route, method, duration of measurement, and time of day should be *consistent within and between study groups*, if applicable.
- (9) *Follow-up of cases* should attempt to verify and complete the information collected as outlined in guidelines 1–7.

3.2. Data analysis

These guidelines represent a minimum standard for the analysis of data on fever to allow for comparability of data. Additional information may be analyzed depending on the study question and setting.

- (10) Reported events should be *classified* in one of the following two categories. Events that meet the case definition should be classified as Level 1 of diagnostic certainty as specified in the case definition; Level 2 and Level 3 are not applicable for fever. Events that do not meet the case definition should be classified in the additional category for analysis.

Event classification in two categories

Event meets case definition

- (1) Level 1: as specified in the case definition for fever

Event does not meet case definition

Additional category for analysis

- (2) Reported event of fever with insufficient evidence to meet the case definition

This applies if the evidence available for an event is insufficient because information is missing (e.g., only tactile temperature information, no actual measured temperature $\geq 38^\circ\text{C}$ with validated device provided).

- (11) Temperature measurement in clinical trials, and whenever possible in surveillance systems, should be analyzed in *defined time increments*. These may vary according to the biological activity of the vaccine under consideration. The *time interval between immunization and fever* should be determined by using the date of immunization and the date of diagnosis.

For example:

Number (<i>n/N</i> (%)) of subjects with fever
0 (time of immunization) to 24:00 h (Day 1)
00:01–24:00 h (Day 2)
Days 3–7
Days 8–14
Days 15–21
Days 22–28, etc.

- (12) The *duration of fever* should be analyzed as the *number of days* with one or more temperature readings of $\geq 38^\circ\text{C}$.
- (13) Temperature measurement should be analyzed in 0.5°C increments, and as the percentage of subjects whose *highest temperature* fell within that increment during a specified time span.

Temperature increments		Subjects (<i>n/N</i> (%)) within those increments
$^\circ\text{C}$	$^\circ\text{F}$	
<38.0	<100.4	<i>n/N</i>
38.0–38.4	100.4–101.1	<i>n/N</i>
38.5–38.9	101.3–102.0	<i>n/N</i>
39.0–39.4	102.2–102.9	<i>n/N</i>
39.5–39.9	103.1–103.8	<i>n/N</i>
40.0–40.4	104.0–104.7	<i>n/N</i>
40.5–40.9	104.9–105.6	<i>n/N</i>
>41.0	>105.8	<i>n/N</i>

If detailed analysis in increments is not possible, at a minimum the overall number of subjects with a temperature of $\geq 38.0^\circ\text{C}$ should be used as a basis for analysis of incidence and prevalence.

- (14) In clinical trials, measured temperature should be analyzed by *study arm and dose*.
- (15) Results obtained in subjects receiving a vaccine under study ideally should be *compared* with those obtained from one or more control groups.

3.3. Data presentation

These guidelines represent a minimum standard for the presentation and publication of data on fever to allow for comparability of data. Additional information collected and analyzed may be presented depending on the study question and setting. The guidelines are NOT guidelines for primary reporting of fever to a surveillance system or study monitor. It is recommended also to refer to existing guidelines (e.g., CONSORT and MOOSE) for presentation and publication of vaccine safety studies [63].

- (16) All reported events of fever should be presented according to the *categories* listed in guideline 12.
- (17) Data on fever should be presented in accordance with *data collection guidelines 1–7* and *data analysis guidelines 10–15*.
- (18) *Terms* to describe fever (e.g., “low-grade,” “mild,” “moderate,” “high,” “severe,” or “significant”) are highly subjective and prone to wide interpretation, and therefore should be avoided.
- (19) Data should be presented with *numerator and denominator (*n/N*)* and not only in percentages.

Since in surveillance systems denominators are usually not readily available, attempts should be made to identify approximate denominators. The source of

denominator data should be reported and calculations of estimates described (e.g., obtained from manufacturer, Ministry of Health and coverage/population based data).

- (20) If the *distribution of data* is skewed and a median and range are more appropriate statistical descriptors than a mean, the mean and standard deviation also should be provided to facilitate meta-analysis. Modal values would provide a useful insight into the etiology of fever following immunization particularly for the analysis of fever with bimodal distribution.
- (21) Any publication of data on fever following immunization should include as detailed as possible a *description of the methods* used for data collection and analysis. It is essential to specify
- the study design of clinical trials;
 - the search strategy in surveillance databases;
 - the trial profile, indicating participant flow during a study including drop-outs and withdrawals to indicate the size and nature of the respective groups under investigation;
 - comparator group(s), if used for analysis; and
 - whether the day of immunization was considered “day 1” or “day 0” in the analysis.
- (22) The *incidence and prevalence* of cases in the study population should be presented and clearly identified as such in the text.
- (23) The use of the Brighton Collaboration case definition for fever should be *mentioned in the abstract or methods section* of a publication, and this document referenced.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the support and helpful comments by the Brighton Collaboration Steering Committee and Reference Group, medical editor Mary McCauley and the Steering group of the European Research Programme For Improved Vaccine Safety Surveillance (EUSAFEVAC) Project.

References⁶

- [1] Bouchama A, Knochel JP. Heat stroke. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:1978–88.
- [2] Benziger TH. Clinical temperature: new physiologic basis. *JAMA* 1969;209:1200–6.
- [3] Dinarello CA. Thermoregulation and the pathogenesis of fever. *Infect Dis Clin N Am* 1996;10:433–49.
- [4] Benziger M. Tympanic thermometry in surgery and anesthesia. *JAMA* 1969;209:1207–11.
- [5] Robinson JL, Seal RF, Spady DW, et al. Comparison of esophageal, rectal, axillary, bladder, tympanic, and pulmonary artery temperatures in children. *J Pediatr* 1998;133:553–6.
- [6] Romano MJ, Fortenberry JD, Autrey E, et al. Infrared tympanic thermometry in the pediatric intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 1993;21:1181–5.
- [7] Baraff LJ, Bass JW, Fleisher GR. Practice guideline for the management of infants and children 0 to 36 months of age with fever without source. *Pediatrics* 1993;92:1–12.
- [8] Agarwal N, Garg RK, Arora RC, Gandhi RK, Kapoor M. Oral versus axillary temperatures in human volunteers. *J Assoc Physicians India* 1990;38:541.
- [9] Anagnostakis D, Matsaniotis N, Grafakos S, Sarafidou E. Rectal-axillary temperature difference in febrile and afebrile infants and children. *Clin Pediatr* 1993;32:268–72.
- [10] Barrus DH. A comparison of rectal and axillary temperatures by electronic thermometer measurement in preschool children. *Pediatr Nurs* 1983;9:424–5.
- [11] Bliss-Holtz J. Comparison of rectal, axillary, and inguinal temperatures in full-term newborn infants. *Nurs Res* 1989;38:85–7.
- [12] Brown RD, Kearns G, Eichler VF, Wilson JT. A probability nomogram to predict rectal temperature in children. *Clin Pediatr* 1992;31:523–31.
- [13] Brown PJ, Christmas BG, Ford RP. Taking an infant’s temperature: axillary or rectal thermometer? *N Z Med J* 1992;105:309–11.
- [14] Buntain WL, Pregler M, O’Brien PC, Lynn HB. Axillary versus rectal temperature: a comparative study. *J Louisiana State M Soc* 1977;129:5–8.
- [15] Chamberlain JM, Grandner J, Rubinoff JL, Klein BL, Waisman Y, Huey M. Comparison of tympanic thermometer to rectal and oral thermometers in a pediatric emergency department. *Clin Pediatr* 1991;30(Suppl):24–9.
- [16] Craig JV, Lancaster GA, Taylor S, et al. Infrared ear thermometry compared with rectal thermometry in children: a systematic review. *Lancet* 2002;360:603–9.
- [17] Craig JV, Lancaster GA, Williamson PR, Smyth RL. Temperature measured at the axilla compared with rectum in children and young people: systematic review. *Brit Med J* 2000;320:1174–8.
- [18] Erickson RS. The continuing question of how best to measure body temperature. *Crit Care Med* 1999;27:2308–10.
- [19] Fraden J, Lackey RP. Estimation of body sites temperatures from tympanic measurements. *Clin Pediatr* 1991;30(Suppl):65–70.
- [20] Jaffe DM. What’s hot and what’s not: the gold standard for thermometry in emergency medicine. *Ann Emerg Med* 1995;25:57–9.
- [21] Leick-Rude MK. A comparison of temperature-taking methods in neonates. *Neonatal Netw* 1998;17:21–37.
- [22] Loveys AA, Dutko-Fioravanti I, Eberly SW, Powell KR. Comparison of ear to rectal temperature measurements in infants and toddlers. *Clin Pediatr* 1999;38:463–6.
- [23] Morley CJ, Hewson PH, Thornton AJ, Cole TJ. Axillary and rectal temperature measurements in infants. *Arch Dis Child* 1992;67:122–5.
- [24] Muma BK, Treloar DJ, Wurmlinger K, Peterson E, Vitae A. Comparison of rectal, axillary and tympanic membrane temperatures in infants and young children. *Ann Emerg Med* 1991;20:41–4.
- [25] Osinusi K. Comparison of body temperatures taken at different sites and the reliability of axillary temperature in screening for fever. *Afr J Med Med Sci* 1997;26:163–6.
- [26] Peterson-Smith A, Barber N, Coody DK, West MS, Yetman RJ. Comparison of aural infrared with traditional rectal temperatures in children from birth to age three years. *J Pediatr* 1994;125:83–5.
- [27] Rabinowitz RP, Cookson ST, Wasserman SS, Mackowiak PA. Effects of anatomic site, oral stimulation, and body position on estimates of body temperature. *Arch Intern Med* 1996;156:777–80.
- [28] Roll C, Wallot M, Hannsler L. Axillary versus rectal temperature measurement in premature and newborn infants. *Z Geburtshilfe Neonatol* 1998;202:207–11.

⁶ The complete literature search is available from the Brighton Collaboration Secretariat: secretariat@brightoncollaboration.org.

- [29] Romanovsky AA, Quint PA, Benikova Y, Kiesow LA. A difference of 5 °C between ear and rectal temperatures in a febrile patient. *Am J Emerg Med* 1997;15:383–5.
- [30] Sganga A, Wallace R, Kiehl E, Irving T, Witter L. A comparison of four methods of normal newborn temperature measurement. *Am J Maternal Child Nurs* 2000;25:76–9.
- [31] Shann F, Mackenzie A. Comparison of rectal, axillary and forehead temperatures. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 1996;150:74–8.
- [32] Talo H, Macknin ML, Medendorp SV. Tympanic membrane temperatures compared to rectal and oral temperatures. *Clin Pediatr* 1991;30(Suppl):30–3.
- [33] Treolar D, Muma B. Comparison of axillary, tympanic membrane, and rectal temperatures in young children. *Ann Emerg Med* 1988;17:435.
- [34] Weisse ME, Reagen MS, Boule L, France N. Axillary vs. rectal temperatures in ambulatory and hospitalized children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 1991;10:541–2.
- [35] Wilshaw R, Beckstrand R, Waid D, Schaalje GB. A comparison of the use of tympanic, axillary and rectal thermometers in infants. *J Pediatr Nurs* 1999;14:88–93.
- [36] Yetman RJ, Coody DK, West MS, Montgomery D, Brown M. Comparison of temperature measurements by an aural infrared thermometer with measurements by traditional rectal and axillary techniques. *J Pediatr* 1993;122:769–73.
- [37] Jean-Mary MB, Dicanzio J, Shaw J, Bernstein HH. Limited accuracy and reliability of infrared axillary and aural thermometers in a pediatric outpatient population. *J Pediatr* 2002;141:671–6.
- [38] Bonadio WA, Hegenbarth M, Zachariason M. Correlating reported fever in young infants with subsequent temperature patterns and rate of serious bacterial infections. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 1990;9:158–60.
- [39] Banco L, Veltri D. Ability of mothers to subjectively assess the presence of fever in their children. *Am J Dis Child* 1984;138:976–8.
- [40] Bergeson PS, Steinfeld HJ. How dependable is palpation as a screening method for fever. Can touch substitute for thermometer readings? *Clin Pediatr* 1974;13:350–1.
- [41] Einterz EM, Bates ME. Fever in Africa: do patients know when they are hot? *Lancet* 1997;350:781.
- [42] Ernst TN, Philip M. Temperature assessment by parental palpation. *Am J Dis Child* 1985;139:546.
- [43] Graneto JW, Soglin DF. Maternal screening of childhood fever by palpation. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 1996;12:183–4.
- [44] Hooker EA, Smith SW, Miles T, King L. Subjective assessment of fever by parents: comparison with measurement by noncontact tympanic thermometer and calibrated rectal glass mercury thermometer. *Ann Emerg Med* 1996;28:313–7.
- [45] Singhi S, Sood V. Reliability of subjective assessment of fever by mothers. *Indian J Pediatr* 1990;27:811–5.
- [46] Whybrew K, Murray M, Morley C. Diagnosing fever by touch: observational study. *Brit Med J* 1998;317:321–2.
- [47] Wailoo MP, Petersen SA, Whittaker H, Goodenough P. Sleeping body temperatures in 3–4 month old infants. *Arch Dis Child* 1989;64:596–9.
- [48] Anderson ES, Petersen SA, Wailoo MP. Factors influencing the body temperature of 3–4 month old infants at home during the day. *Arch Dis Child* 1990;65:1308–10.
- [49] Sugarek NJ. Temperature lowering after iced water: enhanced effects in the elderly. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1986;34:526–9.
- [50] Terndrup TE, Allegra JR, Kealy JA. A comparison of oral, rectal, and tympanic membrane-derived temperature changes after ingestion of liquids and smoking. *Am J Emerg Med* 1989;7:150–4.
- [51] Cone Jr TE. Diagnosis and treatment: children with fevers. *Pediatrics* 1989;43:290–3.
- [52] Herzog LW, Coyne LJ. What is fever? Normal temperature in infants less than 3 months old. *Clin Pediatr* 1993;32:1452–6.
- [53] Sequin J, Terry K. Neonatal infrared axillary thermometry. *Clin Pediatr* 1999;38:35–40.
- [54] Zehner JW, Terndrup TE. The impact of moderate ambient temperature variance on the relationship between oral, rectal, and tympanic membrane temperatures. *Clin Pediatr* 1991;30(Suppl):61–4.
- [55] Mayfield SR, Bhatia J, Nakamura KT, et al. Temperature measurement in term and preterm neonates. *J Pediatr* 1984;104:2712–6.
- [56] Watson EH. Growth and development of children. Chicago, IL: Year Book Medical Publishers Inc.; 1978.
- [57] Blainey CG. Site selection in taking body temperature. *Am J Nursing* 1974;74:1859–61.
- [58] Erickson RS, Woo TM. Accuracy of infrared thermometry and traditional temperature methods in young children. *Heart Lung* 1994;23:181–95.
- [59] Karlberg P. The significance of depth of insertion of the thermometer for recording the rectal temperature. *Acta Paediatr Scand* 1949;38:359–66.
- [60] Stephen SB, Sexton PR. Neonatal axillary temperature: increases in readings over time. *Neonatal Netw* 1987;5:25–8.
- [61] Virtanen M, Peltola H, Paunio M, et al. Day-to-day reactogenicity and the healthy vaccinee effect of measles-mumps-rubella vaccination. *Pediatrics* 2000;106:e62.
- [62] Peltola H, Heinonen OP. Frequency of true adverse reactions to measles-mumps-rubella vaccine: a double-blind placebo-controlled trial in twins. *Lancet* 1986;1:939–42.
- [63] The CONSORT statement and MOOSE, available at: <http://www.consort-statement.org/>.