

UVR induced systemic immunosuppression would effect a reduction in periodontal inflammation and thereby reduce periodontal disease severity. Skin lesions reported in C19 patients are autoimmune reactions caused by COVID-19 induced numerical deficiency or functional defect/s in regulatory T cells.

A more detailed summary of the above may be accessed online.⁹

P. V. Mc Crory, Stockport, Cheadle, UK

References

1. Cook T, Kursomovic E, Lennane S. Exclusive: deaths of NHS staff from covid-19 analysed. *HSJ* 22 April 2020. Available at: <https://www.hsj.co.uk/exclusive-deaths-of-nhs-staff-from-covid-19-analysed/7027471.article> (accessed 31 July 2020).
2. Pan D, Sze S, Minhas J S *et al*. The impact of ethnicity on clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020; **23**: 100404. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100404.
3. Nike S H, Nile A, Qiu J, Li Lin, Jia Zu, Kai G. COVID-19: Pathogenesis, cytokine storm and therapeutic potential of interferons. *Cytokine Growth Factor Rev* 2020; **53**: 66-70. doi: 10.1016/j.cytogfr.2020.05.002.
4. Fitzpatrick scale. From Wikipedia. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fitzpatrick_scale (accessed 31 July 2020).
5. Pearson correlation coefficient. From Wikipedia. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pearson_correlation_coefficient (accessed 31 July 2020).
6. Office for National Statistics. Data download. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/visualisations/dvc815/hazards/all-factors/datadownload.csv> (accessed 31 July 2020).
7. D'Orazio J, Jarrett S, Amaro-Ortiz A, Scott T. UV radiation and the skin. Table 1. *Int J Mod Sci* 2013; **14**: 12222-12248. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3709783/table/t1-ijms-14-12222/?report=objectonly> (accessed 31 July 2020).
8. Prietl B, Treiber G, Pieber T R, Amrein K. Vitamin D and immune function. *Nutrients* 2013; **5**: 2502-2521.
9. OSF Home. Ultraviolet Radiation Exposure and Hyper-cytokinaemia Associated With Covid 19 Infection Registration Doc 2020-07-01.docx (Version: 1). Available at: <https://osf.io/y2jc4/> (accessed 31 July 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-2003-y>

The resurgence of sedation

Sir, the impact of COVID-19 on patient access to hospital general anaesthesia (GA) for oral surgery is significant. With day case elective GA on hold over the pandemic, patients waiting for dental extractions under this modality (DGA) will be stacking up nationally. The 18-week pathway from referral will be more challenging to achieve now for adult dental extractions under GA than ever before. This is likely to have an impact on the previously reported culture of patient demand for this treatment.¹ Sedation will have a big role to play and there is likely to be a resurgence in its use.

We read with interest the recent positive anecdotal reports of patient satisfaction

and successful outcomes via the use of oral sedation with diazepam prior to attendance for urgent dental care.² For a number of years our OMFS department has also utilised oral diazepam prior to attendance for surgical removal of impacted wisdom teeth, with content and more relaxed patients in many cases. In addition, we are advocates for the technique of intranasal midazolam sedation using a MAD-device. We envisage this being an increasingly employed way of keeping needle phobic patients away from GA lists and within the more accessible sedation pathways.

Our own service pre-COVID was on the brink of introducing intravenous conscious sedation services to the department for our referred patients. Its current introduction at our site looks to be a well-timed, convenient development and some patients on waiting lists for GA are being successfully transferred to IV sedation. In 2017 a national survey of OMFS units containing questions about GA and sedation services demonstrated that a quarter of units were not routinely offering or able to offer sedation and that there was a need to review provision of sedation in the UK.¹ It highlighted a consensus of a lack of availability of sedation services and showed presence of a strong culture of patient demand-driven adult DGA in the UK.¹ Cultures needed addressing from patient demand back to clinical need and the authors asked 'what would it take to shift the cultural norm again?' It looks as though the answer to this question is coming to light – a pandemic, reduced access to DGA waiting lists, the resurgence of sedation and patients opting for the more accessible modality.

A. Orchard, F. Shah, S. Prabhu, Woking, UK

References

1. Hong B, Baker A. General anaesthetic service for adult dental extractions: an 'A La Carte Menu'? Survey results. *Br Dent J* 2017; **222**: 261-267
2. Atkinson G. Sedation during the pandemic. *Br Dent J* 2020; **229**: 4.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-2004-x>

Thermal screening

Sir, use of thermal screening has resurfaced recently in the light of the COVID-19 pandemic. It has been widely accepted worldwide for mass screening to restrict patients with high grade fever entering specific areas during high infectious periods. The concept of thermal imaging is not new and dates back to 1963 when Barnes

*et al.*¹ first demonstrated its usefulness in diagnosing physical illness. Sherman *et al.*² concluded that infrared thermography (IRT) is the simplest method of detecting body temperature in which thermal radiation emitted by a surface is captured by an infrared camera and converted to temperature.

Oral, axillary and inguinal temperatures are perhaps the most common sites apart from rectal and oesophageal. However, all these sites normally underestimate true core body temperature. They also require the measuring device to have direct contact with the subject which is undesirable in mass screening in a pandemic era for fear of spreading infection. The development of non-contact infrared thermal images of the head to determine body core temperature is clearly very promising. Recent data indicated that the temperature of the inner canthus of the eye is consistently the warmest area on the head and the most suitable site for use in fever detection, however this is complicated as it is also affected by climatic conditions. There will be always be incubation situations when infectious persons may not have an elevated body core temperature for several days and so will not be picked up by a screening system. Likewise there will be persons who have regained normal body temperature following a bout of fever yet who may still be infectious or who have suppressed their elevated body temperatures with pharmaceutical agents such as aspirin or paracetamol.

Despite this some authorities, for example the USA, maintain that fever screening may reduce spread statistics by up to 50%. The incorrect use and failure to follow guidelines for devices used are also causes for concern. Several administrative institutes and hospitals have recently used thermal infrared imaging techniques for mass screening but at high risk of bias, hence the need for large placebo-controlled clinical trials before any technique can be recommended.

U. Kumar, P. Parmar, C. K. Kaur, S. Yadav, A. Rajpu, Chandigarh, India

References

1. Barnes R B. Thermography of the human body. *Science* 1963; **140**: 870-877.
2. Sherman R A, Wideman A L, Karstetter K W. Comparative effectiveness of video-thermography, contact thermography, and infrared beamthermography for scanning relative skin temperature. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 1996; **33**: 377-386.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-2005-9>