

# Measurement of Respiratory Rate using Wearable Devices and Applications to COVID-19 Detection

Aravind Natarajan,\* Hao-Wei Su, Conor Heneghan,  
Leanna Blunt, Corey O'Connor, and Logan Niehaus

*Fitbit Research, 199 Fremont St, Fl #14, San Francisco, CA 94105*

(Dated: May 13, 2021)

## Abstract

We show that heart rate enabled wearable devices can be used to measure respiratory rate. Respiration modulates the heart rate creating excess power in the heart rate variability at a frequency equal to the respiratory rate, a phenomenon known as respiratory sinus arrhythmia. We isolate this component from the power spectral density of the heart beat interval time series, and show that the respiratory rate thus estimated is in good agreement with a validation dataset acquired from sleep studies (root mean squared error =  $0.648 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , mean absolute percentage error = 3%). Using the same respiratory rate algorithm, we investigate population level characteristics by computing the respiratory rate from 10,000 individuals over a 14 day period, with equal number of males and females ranging in age from 20 - 69 years. 90% of respiratory rate values for healthy adults fall within the range  $11.8 \text{ min}^{-1}$ – $19.2 \text{ min}^{-1}$  with a mean value of  $15.4 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . Respiratory rate is shown to increase with nocturnal heart rate. It also varies with BMI, reaching a minimum at  $25 \text{ kg/m}^2$ , and increasing for lower and higher BMI. The respiratory rate decreases slightly with age and is higher in females compared to males for age  $< 50$  years, with no difference between females and males thereafter. The 90% range for the coefficient of variation in a 14 day period for females (males) varies from 2.3%–9.2% (2.3%–9.5%) for ages 20–24 yr, to 2.5%–16.8% (2.7%–21.7%) for ages 65–69 yr. We show that respiratory rate is often elevated in subjects diagnosed with COVID-19. In a 7 day window centered on the date when symptoms present (or the test date for asymptomatic cases), we find that 33% (18%) of symptomatic (asymptomatic) individuals had at least one measurement of respiratory rate  $3 \text{ min}^{-1}$  higher than the regular rate.

### 1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 It is well known that heart rate varies with respiration, increasing during inhalation, and  
3 decreasing during exhalation. This modulation of the heart rate in response to respiration  
4 is known as Respiratory Sinus Arrhythmia (RSA), and is associated with the efficiency  
5 of pulmonary gas exchange [1-3]. RSA thus manifests as excess power at the respiration  
6 frequency, making it possible to infer the respiratory rate from heart beat interval data.

7 Unlike other vital signs such as pulse rate and blood pressure, the respiratory rate can be  
8 consciously altered by a patient who is aware of the measurement being made, potentially

---

\* [anatarajan@google.com](mailto:anatarajan@google.com)

9 resulting in flawed recordings. The respiratory rate is a valuable metric in determining  
10 clinical deterioration [4, 5] and an increase of  $3 \text{ min}^{-1}$  to  $5 \text{ min}^{-1}$  can indicate deterioration  
11 [4]. The heart rate to respiratory rate ratio and respiratory rate to oxygen saturation ratio  
12 have been shown to be useful indicators in predicting the duration of hospitalization [6].  
13 In a study of patients admitted to the hospital with pneumonia from 2010 - 2012, it was  
14 shown that those with a respiratory rate in excess of  $27 \text{ min}^{-1}$  had an odds ratio of 1.72  
15 for in-hospital death [7]. The respiratory rate factors into the CURB-65 score for predicting  
16 mortality in community-acquired pneumonia [8], as well as during epidemics [9]. Elevated  
17 respiratory rate values ( $> 27 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ) have been shown to be predictive of cardiopulmonary  
18 arrest [10]. Increased respiratory rate factors into early warning scores meant to assess the  
19 likelihood of a patient needing critical care [11-13]. The respiratory rate has also been  
20 shown to be a useful biomarker for COVID-19 detection [14, 15]. Despite these findings, the  
21 respiratory rate is not always recorded while monitoring patients, and may be considered a  
22 neglected vital sign [6, 16, 17].

23 The clinical value in measuring respiratory rate, and the growing interest in wearable  
24 devices provides a valuable opportunity in the field of digital health. Wearable devices  
25 can compute the respiratory rate during sleep, thus obtaining measurements that are made  
26 without the conscious knowledge of the user. Commercial wearable devices accomplish this  
27 through photoplethysmography (PPG) [18-20], usually at a single point of contact, either  
28 on the wrist (smartwatches, trackers, straps) or the finger (rings). Respiration modifies the  
29 PPG time series signal in a number of ways [21-23]. In this work, we focus on the RSA  
30 feature, i.e. the frequency modulation of the PPG.

31 Karlen et al. [22] computed the respiratory rate from PPG in a study involving both  
32 children and adults, and found agreement with capnometry measurements up to respiratory  
33 rates of  $\sim 45 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . In a study involving 32 participants, it was shown that the respiratory  
34 rate computed by WHOOP devices compared well with polysomnography (PSG) measurements  
35 [24], with low bias (1.8%) and precision error (6.7%). The respiratory rate may also be  
36 inferred from the PPG time series through deep learning techniques [25]. In the present  
37 work, we briefly describe how the respiratory rate may be inferred from the RSA feature  
38 in the power spectral density of heart beat interval time series data. We compute the  
39 respiratory rate over the course of a night, and show that it agrees well with validation data  
40 obtained from ground truth measurements. We examine how the respiratory rate varies with

41 age and sex, and how much it varies relative to the mean value over the course of 14 days.  
42 We also investigate its dependence on BMI and heart rate. Finally, we build upon earlier  
43 work [15] and show that the respiratory rate can be a valuable biometric in the detection  
44 and monitoring of COVID-19.

## 45 II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 46 A. Data

#### 47 1. Respiratory rate data

48 The dataset used to explore correlations between respiratory rate and age, sex, BMI,  
49 and heart rate consisted of 10,000 users of Fitbit devices who reside in the United States or  
50 Canada, and who wore their devices to sleep in the date range Nov 1 – 14, 2020. We collected  
51 sleep and heart rate variability data from these Fitbit users during this 14 day period. The  
52 data were collected and anonymized consistent with Fitbit’s terms and conditions. The  
53 dataset consisted of male and female individuals in the age range 20-69 with 500 subjects  
54 of each sex and each of 10 equally spaced age bins (5 year age bin size), yielding a total of  
55 135,947 usable measurements. The mean Body Mass Index (BMI) of the participants was  
56  $27.8 \pm 5.2$  for males and  $27.5 \pm 6.4$  for females, where the quoted error bar is 1 standard  
57 deviation. The main Fitbit devices used to collect these data include Charge 3 (22.5%), Versa  
58 2 (20.0%), Inspire HR (11.3%), Versa (10.0%), Charge 2 (9.62%), and Charge 4 (7.68%),  
59 with a number of other devices contributing less than 5% each.

#### 60 2. Validation data

61 We conducted 2 experiments to validate the respiratory rate algorithm. Experiment A  
62 was conducted at Sleep Med in Columbia, SC, from Oct 17, 2019 to Nov 6, 2019, and used  
63 a polysomnography device (Alice 5). Experiment B was conducted remotely, by shipping  
64 equipment to the homes of participants, from March 9, 2020 to May 29, 2020, and used a  
65 Home Sleep Test (Resmed Apnealink). Both experiments were approved by an Institutional  
66 Review Board (Solutions IRB). Participants provided informed consent for their data to  
67 be collected and used for research purposes. Participants in Experiment A wore Fitbit

68 devices on both wrists, while participants in Experiment B wore a Fitbit device on one wrist  
69 only. We excluded participants with severe sleep apnea (Apnea-Hypopnea Index  $\geq 30$ ). 52  
70 measurements were obtained from 28 individuals (15 female, 13 male) between the ages of 32  
71 and 71 (mean age was 48.9 yr with a standard deviation of 9.5 yr). More details regarding  
72 the data collection may be found in Table S1 in the Supplementary Text.

### 73 3. *COVID-19 data*

74 The Fitbit COVID-19 survey is an ongoing survey of Fitbit users residing in the United  
75 States or Canada. Participants provided information on whether they were diagnosed with  
76 COVID-19, and whether they experienced symptoms. The data for the COVID-19 survey  
77 were collected with Institutional Review Board approval (Advarra IRB), and participants  
78 provided written consent for their data to be used for research purposes. The data used in the  
79 present study comprises a subset, consisting of 3,236 individuals with COVID-19 PCR pos-  
80 itive test dates (self reported) ranging from Feb 28 - Nov 13, 2020, with 2,939 symptomatic  
81 and 297 asymptomatic individuals. 77.6% of participants identified as female. The mean  
82 age was  $42.25 \pm 12.35$  yr, and the mean BMI was  $30.29 \pm 7.25$ , where the stated errors are  
83 1 standard deviation. More details regarding the Fitbit COVID-19 survey may be found in  
84 Ref. [15].

### 85 4. *Software*

86 All statistical analyses were performed using standard Python packages such as NUMPY  
87 and SCIPY. The respiratory rate code software was written in Scala and uses the BREEZE  
88 library.

## 89 **B. Computation of respiratory rate from heart rate variability**

90 Interbeat interval values are computed from the heart beat interval time series data and  
91 assembled into non-overlapping 5 minute blocks. The data are cleaned to remove noise due to  
92 motion artifacts, electronic artifacts, missed heart beats, etc. For details on the cleaning and  
93 pre-processing steps, we refer the reader to Ref. [26]. Each 5 minute block of data is resampled

94 to obtain 512 equally spaced samples allowing us to resolve all frequency components up to  
 95  $0.5 \times (512/300) = 0.85$  Hz. The resolution in frequency space is  $1/300$  Hz. The mean of  
 96 the data in the time window is subtracted, and the data smoothed with a Hann window. A  
 97 Fast Fourier Transform is applied, and properly normalized to give us the Power Spectral  
 98 Density (PSD), which is the power contained per unit frequency. Integrating the PSD over  
 99 the range 0.04 Hz - 0.15 Hz gives us the low frequency (LF) power, while integrating the  
 100 PSD over the range 0.15 Hz - 0.4 Hz gives us the high frequency (HF) power. The PSD for  
 101 different 5 minute segments are aggregated.

102 The PSD of HRV fluctuations is shown in Fig. [1](#) for a single individual and for one night:  
 103 The plot contains 2 main components: *background* and *RSA*. To isolate the RSA component,  
 104 we need to model the background and subtract it from the power spectrum.

### 105 1. Modeling the background

106 We set a maximum frequency  $f_{\max} = 0.5$  Hz (corresponding to a respiratory rate of 30  
 107  $\text{min}^{-1}$ ), and discard data at higher frequencies. We also set a minimum frequency  $f_{\min}$   
 108  $= 0.1367$  Hz (corresponding to a respiratory rate of  $8.2 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ). The power spectrum at  
 109 frequencies from  $f_0 = 1/300$  Hz to  $f_{\min}$  is used to determine the noise level. The RSA feature  
 110 is contained between two frequencies  $f_1 (> f_{\min})$  and  $f_2 (< f_{\max})$  which we will determine  
 111 iteratively.

112 1. Low frequency background: The PSD from frequencies  $f_0$  to  $f_1$  is modeled by a func-  
 113 tion of the form  $\log_{10}[\text{PSD}] = c_1 + c_2 f$ .

114 2. High frequency background: The PSD from frequencies  $f_2$  to  $f_{\max}$  is modeled by a  
 115 similar function:  $\log_{10}[\text{PSD}] = c_3 + c_4 f$ .

116 3. The PSD from  $f_1$  to  $f_2$  is modeled by a *patching function*:  $\log_{10}[\text{PSD}] = p_1 + p_2 f +$   
 117  $p_3 f^2 + p_4 f^3$ .  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  are fixed to match the end points of the low frequency and high  
 118 frequency background regions, while  $p_3$  and  $p_4$  are set to match the derivatives at the  
 119 end points, thus enabling a smooth transition.

120 2. *Isolating the signal*

121 To begin, we assign reasonable values to  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , which will be refined in subsequent  
 122 iterations. We initialize  $f_1 = f_{\min}$  and  $f_2 = 0.333$  Hz (corresponding to a respiratory rate  
 123 of  $20 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ). In practice, the choice of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are determined by the expected range of  
 124 respiratory rates in the population under study. Signal estimation is performed using the  
 125 following steps:

- 126 1. The power spectrum is modeled as described earlier, and parameterized by the vari-  
 127 ables  $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)$ .
- 128 2. The background function is subtracted from the data to obtain the residuals. The  
 129 residuals are low pass filtered (we use a median filter of size 3) to reduce noise, and  
 130 interpolated (we use a cubic spline) to maintain the original frequency resolution.
- 131 3. The peak of the residuals is identified as  $A_{\text{RSA}}$ , and the frequency corresponding to  
 132 the maximum value =  $f_{\text{RSA}}$ . Assuming a gaussian distribution for the RSA feature,  
 133 we identify a frequency  $f_- < f_{\text{RSA}}$  such that  $A(f_-) = 0.6065A_{\text{RSA}}$ , as well as a  
 134 frequency  $f_+ > f_{\text{RSA}}$  such that  $A(f_+) = 0.6065A_{\text{RSA}}$ . The mean of these two values  
 135  $f_{\text{resp}} = 0.5 \times (f_+ + f_-)$  is identified as the mean respiratory frequency. The standard  
 136 deviation is  $\sigma_{\text{resp}} = 0.5 \times (f_+ - f_-)$ . The mean  $\mu_{\text{noise}}$  and standard deviation  $\sigma_{\text{noise}}$  of  
 137 the residuals from  $f_0$  to  $f_{\min}$  are calculated. The signal-to-noise ratio  $SNR$  is defined  
 138 as  $SNR = (A_{\text{RSA}} - \mu_{\text{noise}}) / \sigma_{\text{noise}}$ .
- 139 4.  $f_1$  is redefined as  $f_{\text{resp}} - 3\sigma_{\text{resp}}$ , and  $f_2$  is set to  $f_{\text{resp}} + 3\sigma_{\text{resp}}$ .

140 Steps 1-4 are repeated until either successive estimates of  $f_{\text{resp}}$  agree to within 1%, or 5  
 141 iterations are completed. We restrict our range of respiratory rates to between  $10 \text{ min}^{-1}$  to  
 142  $26 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . Frequencies much higher than  $26 \text{ min}^{-1}$  are hard to resolve due to the rapid fall-off  
 143 of the power spectral density with frequency, while resonances at frequencies lower than  $10$   
 144  $\text{min}^{-1}$  may be confused with Mayer wave oscillations [27]. The values of  $(f_{\text{resp}}, \sigma_{\text{resp}}, SNR)$   
 145 are stored for each individual, for each day, provided  $SNR \geq 2.5$ . Fig. 1(b) shows the  
 146 residuals and estimation of the RSA feature. Also shown is a gaussian with mean  $f_{\text{resp}}$  and  
 147 standard deviation  $\sigma_{\text{resp}}$ .

148 When aggregating respiratory rate measurements over multiple days, we adopt a numer-  
 149 ical approach: The respiratory rate measurement for any given day for each individual is  
 150 treated as a random variable drawn from a gaussian distribution with mean  $f_{\text{resp}}$  and stan-  
 151 dard deviation  $\sigma_{\text{resp}}$ . We randomly choose 100 samples from this distribution for each day.  
 152 The mean and standard deviation over all samples is then computed. We follow the same  
 153 process for averages involving multiple subjects.

### 154 C. Validation of estimated respiratory rate data with ground truth measurements

155 We obtained 52 measurements of air flow data, from 28 individuals through polysomnog-  
 156 raphy (PSG), or a home sleep test (HST). Data were collected from 1 to 3 nights for each  
 157 participant, with devices on either one or both wrists (data from the two experiments were  
 158 combined, see Table S1 in the Supplementary Text for details). Data from the air flow  
 159 sensor were band pass filtered with a fourth order Butterworth filter to retain frequencies  
 160 between  $10 \text{ min}^{-1}$  -  $30 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . The data were then analyzed with the help of a spectral peak  
 161 detection algorithm with a window size of 51.2 s and a step size of 6.4 s. The median of all  
 162 respiratory rate measurements over the night is computed, and serves as the true respiratory  
 163 rate.

164 Fig. 2 shows the comparison between the true respiratory rate and the rate estimated from  
 165 the peak of the heart beat interval power spectral density. Plot (a) shows 52 measurements  
 166 in the range ( $10 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $26 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ) with  $\text{SNR} \geq 2.5$ , obtained from 28 individuals with apnea-  
 167 hypopnea index  $< 30$ . The Pearson correlation coefficient  $r = 0.9515$ . Plot (b) shows the  
 168 Bland-Altman plot of the difference in measurements (predicted value - true value) plotted  
 169 against the average of the two. The bias (mean of the difference between predicted and true  
 170 values) is  $-0.244 \text{ min}^{-1}$  ( $-1.67\%$ ), and the root mean squared error is  $0.648 \text{ min}^{-1}$  ( $4.2\%$ ).  
 171 The mean absolute error is found to be  $0.460 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , and the mean absolute percentage error  
 172  $= 3.0\%$ .

## 173 III. RESULTS

174 Sleep consists of 3 main stages: Light sleep (stages  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ ), deep sleep (stage  $N_3$ ), and  
 175 REM sleep. Fitbit has developed a validated algorithm which estimates a person's different



176 sleep stages over a night. Fitbit heart rate and sleep measurements have been studied by  
 177 an external group who found that Fitbit Charge HR devices showed a 97% sensitivity and  
 178 a 91% accuracy in detecting sleep [28]. It is known that different stages of sleep are likely  
 179 to have varying magnitudes of respiratory sinus arrhythmia [29]. The sinus arrhythmia  
 180 component is contained within the HF band for respiratory rate values  $> 9 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . Thus  
 181 the HF power can serve as a proxy for the magnitude of sinus arrhythmia. Let us define the  
 182 dimensionless metric  $\text{HF}_\nu = \text{HF} / (\text{HF} + \text{LF})$ . The value of  $\text{HF}_\nu$  averaged over all individuals  
 183 in deep sleep is found to be  $\text{HF}_{\nu,\text{deep}} = 0.40 \pm 0.17$  (stated values are mean and standard  
 184 deviation). In Light sleep, the equivalent  $\text{HF}_{\nu,\text{light}} = 0.27 \pm 0.13$ , while in REM sleep, we  
 185 find  $\text{HF}_{\nu,\text{REM}} = 0.19 \pm 0.11$ . We thus find with our data that HF power is largest in deep  
 186 sleep, and least during REM sleep. For the following results, we ignore REM sleep, and  
 187 estimate the respiratory rate primarily during deep sleep if  $\text{SNR}_{\text{deep}} \geq 2.5$  is obtained and  
 188 during light sleep (provided  $\text{SNR}_{\text{light}} \geq 2.5$ ) if  $\text{SNR}_{\text{deep}} < 2.5$ . We note that in the validation  
 189 test described in the Materials and Methods section, we computed respiratory rate during  
 190 all sleep stages since we did not have sleep stage information for the data collected with the  
 191 PSG and HST. A large difference in respiratory rate between sleep stages is not expected  
 192 according to Ref. [30-32]. However, Ref. [33] found a statistically significant increase from  
 193  $16.1 \pm 2.0 \text{ min}^{-1}$  in non-REM sleep to  $17.9 \pm 2.7 \text{ min}^{-1}$  in REM sleep ( $p < 0.05$ ). Ref.  
 194 [34] also found a statistically significant difference in respiratory rate among sleep stages  
 195 ( $p < 0.001$ ), with REM sleep having the highest rate ( $p < 0.01$ ).

196 We estimated the probability of the algorithm taking 0,1,2,3,4, and 5 iterations to estimate  
 197 the respiratory rate, using a subset of 1,000 randomly selected individuals on one night of  
 198 data (0 iterations means there was either no data, or the signal-to-noise ratio was found to  
 199 be too low for a reliable estimate. 14.6% of measurements had 0 iterations, i.e. no result  
 200 with deep sleep data, 6.1% of measurements had no result with light sleep data, and 2.6%  
 201 of measurements had no result with either deep or light sleep data). For measurements  
 202 in deep sleep, the fraction of estimates taking 1,2,3,4,5 iterations were respectively, 50.8%,  
 203 22.6%, 4.2%, 1.3%, and 6.5%. For measurements in light sleep, the fractions were found to  
 204 be 50.7%, 28.6%, 5.7%, 1.2%, and 7.7%. These results assume a convergence threshold of  
 205 1% between successive iterations. Note that respiratory rate estimates that take 5 iterations  
 206 may not have attained the required level of convergence (if the convergence threshold is  
 207 relaxed to 5%, only 1% of measurements in deep sleep and 0.9% in light sleep required 5

208 iterations).

209 Fig. 3 shows the distribution of respiratory rate values, with a bin size of  $1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . 90%  
210 of values fall in the range  $11.8 \text{ min}^{-1} - 19.2 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . The 95% range is  $11.2 \text{ min}^{-1} - 20.0$   
211  $\text{min}^{-1}$ . The mean of the distribution is  $15.4 \text{ min}^{-1}$  and the standard deviation is  $2.35 \text{ min}^{-1}$ .

212 Fig. 4(a) shows the variation of respiratory rate with age and sex. The black points show  
213 the measurements for female participants, while the green dots represent males. The age  
214 bin size is 5 years, and the error bars are one standard deviation. The respiratory rate for  
215 females is higher than for males for age  $< 50 \text{ yr}$  ( $p$ -value  $< 0.001$ ). There is no statistically  
216 significant difference between males and females for age  $> 50 \text{ yr}$ . The mean respiratory rate  
217 for females (males) decreases from  $16.7$  ( $15.5$ )  $\text{min}^{-1}$  in the age group  $20 \text{ yr} - 24 \text{ yr}$ , to  $14.8$   
218 ( $14.8$ )  $\text{min}^{-1}$  in the age group  $65 \text{ yr} - 69 \text{ yr}$ , a difference of  $1.9$  ( $0.7$ )  $\text{min}^{-1}$  for females (males)  
219 over a span of 50 yr. For age below 50 yr, the Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficient comparing  
220 the dependence of mean respiratory rate with age for females (males) is  $-0.145$ ( $-0.104$ ).  
221 For ages  $> 50 \text{ yr}$ , we find  $r = -0.031$ ( $-0.043$ ) for females (males).

222 Plot (b) shows the coefficient of variance (CoV) (ratio of standard deviation to the mean)  
223 measured over a 14 day period, and only considering subjects with 10 or more nights of data.  
224 The CoV increases with age, with a Pearson  $r$ - correlation coefficient of  $0.132$  ( $0.172$ ) for  
225 females (males). The CoV varies from  $4.65\%$  ( $4.98\%$ ) in the age range  $20 \text{ yr} - 25 \text{ yr}$  to  $6.14\%$   
226 ( $7.41\%$ ) in the age range  $65 \text{ yr} - 69 \text{ yr}$  for females (males). The difference between male and  
227 female participants is most significant above age  $60 \text{ yr}$  ( $p$ -value  $< 0.001$ ).

228 The dependence of respiratory rate with BMI (measured in  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ) is shown in Fig. 5(a).  
229 The bin size in BMI = 1 and the error bars represent the standard error of the mean. The  
230 respiratory rate reaches a minimum at BMI  $\approx 25$ . For BMI  $< 25$ , the respiratory rate  
231 decreases with increase in BMI, with a Pearson  $r$ -correlation coefficient of  $-0.0425$ . For  
232 values of BMI  $\geq 25$ , we see an increase with BMI, with  $r = 0.196$ . Expanding in a Taylor  
233 series about the minimum, we find that the mean respiratory rate  $R$  measured in  $\text{min}^{-1}$  may  
234 be expressed as:

$$R = \alpha_{\text{BMI}} + \gamma_{\text{BMI}} \xi_{\text{BMI}}^2, \quad (1)$$

235 where  $\alpha_{\text{BMI}} = 15.24$ ,  $\gamma_{\text{BMI}} = 2.95$ .  $\xi_{\text{BMI}} = \frac{\text{BMI} - 25}{25}$ . Eq. 1 is a useful model over the range of  
236 BMI 18–45.

237 The variation of respiratory rate with nocturnal heart rate is shown in Fig. 5(b). The  
238 heart rate in beats per minute (bpm) is measured in non-REM sleep. The red curve is for all

239 individuals, while the black and green curves are plotted for female and male participants  
 240 respectively. The mean respiratory rate (for all participants) increases with increase in heart  
 241 rate, with a Pearson  $r$ -correlation of 0.154. It is possible to model the mean respiratory  
 242 rate  $R$  (measured in  $\text{min}^{-1}$ ) dependence on heart rate as:

$$R = \alpha_{\text{HR}} + \beta_{\text{HR}}\xi_{\text{HR}} + \gamma_{\text{HR}}\xi_{\text{HR}}^2, \quad (2)$$

243 where  $\alpha_{\text{HR}} = 15.14, \beta_{\text{HR}} = 1.88, \gamma_{\text{HR}} = 4.17$ .  $\xi_{\text{HR}} = \frac{\text{HR}-60}{60}$ . Eq. 2 was fitted for all  
 244 participants (male and female), and is useful over the range 45–85 bpm.

### 245 A. Effect of COVID-19 on the respiratory rate

246 In this section, we present results from a subset of the Fitbit COVID-19 data survey.  
 247 Let  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  be the mean and standard deviation of the respiratory rate for a specific user,  
 248 estimated several days prior to the onset of illness. The  $Z$ -score on a given day  $D_n$  may be  
 249 defined as

$$Z(D_n) = \frac{R(D_n) - \mu}{\sigma}, \quad (3)$$

250 where  $R(D_n)$  is the respiratory rate for a specific user on day  $D_n$ . For symptomatic indi-  
 251 viduals, let  $D_0$  be the date when symptoms present. For asymptomatic users, we set  $D_0$  to  
 252 the test date. Mean and standard deviation of the respiratory rate are computed using data  
 253 from  $D_{-90} - D_{-30}$ , only considering users with at least 30 days of data in this date range.  
 254 There were 1,247 symptomatic individuals (from a total of 2,939) and 133 asymptomatic  
 255 individuals (from a total of 297) satisfying this requirement. Fig. 6(a) shows the average  
 256  $Z$ -score measured for symptomatic individuals. The  $Z$ -score  $\approx 0$  for days  $< D_{-14}$ , but  
 257 increases thereafter, reaching a peak on  $D_{+2}$ , i.e. two days following the day when symptoms  
 258 first present. Interestingly  $Z$  does not fall off to zero, but instead approaches a constant  
 259 between  $D_{+14} - D_{+28}$ .

260 Next, we investigate the likelihood that a randomly selected symptomatic individual will  
 261 receive an anomalously high respiratory rate value on a specific day. Let us consider a 7 day  
 262 window, and compute the probability that a subject will receive  $N \geq N_*$  respiratory rate  
 263 values satisfying  $Z \geq 2.326$  (this threshold corresponds to a  $p$ -value of 0.01 for a 1-tailed  
 264 test. We are only concerned with values above the mean). Plot (b) shows the results for  
 265 7-day windows centered from  $D_{-28}$  to  $D_{+28}$ , only considering subjects with all 7 days of

266 valid data in the window. Shown are probabilities for  $N_* = 1, 3,$  and  $5$ . Plot (c) shows the  
 267 effect of fever which is known to increase the respiratory rate [35]. The red data points show  
 268 the probability for  $N_* = 1$  for symptomatic individuals who presented with a fever, while  
 269 the black data points show the same probability for individuals who did not list fever as a  
 270 symptom. Plot (d) considers the respiratory rate measured for asymptomatic individuals.  
 271 The plot shows the probability for  $N_* = 1$ , as a function of window center. In all cases,  
 272 the error bars represent the standard error of the mean. For plots (b), (c), and (d), we  
 273 approximated the standard error of a count as the square root of the count.

#### 274 IV. DISCUSSION

275 In this article, we showed how to compute the respiratory rate by locating the peak of  
 276 the RSA feature. We computed the power spectral density from the heart rate interbeat  
 277 interval time series every 5 minutes. These individual spectra were then aggregated over a  
 278 night, and the respiratory rate was estimated from the averaged power spectral density. We  
 279 validated our technique with the help of nasal cannula data consisting of 52 measurements  
 280 obtained from 28 participants with apnea-hypopnea index  $< 30$ . The bias (mean of the  
 281 predicted rate - true rate) was found to be  $-0.244 \text{ min}^{-1}$  ( $-1.67\%$ ) while the RMS error  
 282 was  $0.648 \text{ min}^{-1}$  ( $4.18\%$ ). The mean absolute error was  $0.460 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , and the mean absolute  
 283 percentage error was  $3\%$ . The absolute value of bias is larger for low values of respiratory  
 284 rate. For rates lower than  $16 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , the bias is  $-0.41 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , while for rate  $\geq 16 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , the  
 285 bias is 0.

286 We then collected respiratory rate data for 10,000 participants, ranging in age from 20–69  
 287 years, for both male and female participants. Respiratory rates measured in deep sleep (or  
 288 light sleep when deep sleep data was unavailable) for adults commonly ranges from  $11.8$   
 289  $\text{min}^{-1}$  -  $19.2 \text{ min}^{-1}$  (90% range). For both males and females, respiratory rate values are  
 290 inversely correlated with age. From ages 20 yr - 50 yr, the Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficient  
 291 for female (male) participants was found to be  $-0.145(-0.104)$ , while for ages  $> 50$  yr, the  
 292 corresponding values for females (males) was  $-0.031(-0.043)$ . The coefficient of variation on  
 293 the other hand, increases with age (Fig. 4(b)). The coefficient of variation is higher in males  
 294 compared to females, for ages greater than 60, with no difference for age  $< 60$  yr. From age  
 295 20-24 yr, the coefficient of variation measured over a 14 day period range for female (male)

296 participants ranges from 2.3%–9.2%(2.3%–9.5%) (90% range). For subjects in the age range  
 297 65 – 69 yr, the 90% ranges for female (male) participants are 2.5% – 16.8%(2.7% – 21.7%).  
 298 Respiratory rate varies with BMI, reaching a minimum at a BMI of 25 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. It also varies  
 299 with heart rate, increasing with increase in heart rate measured during non-REM sleep. We  
 300 note however that BMI and heart rate are not independent of each other [36].

301 We see an interesting behavior in the way the respiratory rate varies with age for female  
 302 and male participants (see Fig. 4(a)). Female subjects have a higher respiratory rate than  
 303 males for age < 50 yr, while for age > 50 yr, there is no difference between males and  
 304 females. Female participants on average, have a higher heart rate than males [37], and we  
 305 have shown that the respiratory rate is elevated in individuals with a higher heart rate.  
 306 To determine whether the increased heart rate in females could contribute to the increased  
 307 respiratory rate, we use Eq. 5 to obtain

$$\Delta R = \Delta H_{60} [\beta + 2\gamma (H_{60} - 1)], \quad (4)$$

308 where HR is the heart rate,  $H_{60} = \text{HR} / (60 \text{ bpm})$ , and  $R$  is the mean respiratory rate for  
 309 individuals with a heart rate HR. For the age group 20–24 yr, we find that male participants  
 310 have  $\langle H_{60} \rangle = 1.0031$ . For female participants in the same age group, we find  $\langle H_{60} \rangle = 1.1123$ ,  
 311 giving us  $\langle \Delta H_{60} \rangle = 0.1092$ . The correlation between heart rate and respiratory rate implies  
 312 that the increased heart rate can account for at most an excess of  $\Delta R \approx 0.208 \text{ min}^{-1}$ .  
 313 The true difference in respiratory rates between females and males in this age group is 1.2  
 314  $\text{min}^{-1}$  (Fig. 4(a)). The increased heart rate in females can thus account for only 17.3%  
 315 of the difference between the respiratory rates of females and males. As a further test, we  
 316 considered heart rate bins of 5 bpm, and selected male and female individuals within the  
 317 same age bin, and the same heart rate bin. With 280 female, and 357 male participants in  
 318 the heart rate bin 57.5–62.5 bpm, and the age bin 20–24 yr, we find a mean respiratory  
 319 rate of 16.5  $\text{min}^{-1}$  for females, and 15.6  $\text{min}^{-1}$  for males, with an effect size of 0.38, and a  
 320  $p$ -value of  $1.54 \times 10^{-6}$ . Similar computations can be made for other heart rate bins and  
 321 age groups. While the effect size is slightly decreased compared to the case where the heart  
 322 rate is unrestricted, the increased nocturnal heart rate in females cannot solely explain  
 323 the increase in respiratory rate. A striking feature seen in Fig. 4(a) is the rapid decrease  
 324 in the mean respiratory rate in female participants around the age  $\approx 50$  yr. This leads  
 325 us to hypothesize that sex hormones are responsible for the difference in respiratory rates

326 between men and women. It is well known that some sex hormones such as progesterone act  
 327 as respiratory stimulants [38-40]. Since progesterone secretion decreases after menopause  
 328 [38, 40], it is likely that the change in mean respiratory rate seen in females at age  $\approx 50$  yr  
 329 is associated with menopause.

330 Finally, we studied how respiratory rate is affected by COVID-19. We computed res-  
 331 piratory rates for 3,236 uses of Fitbit devices with test dates ranging from Feb 28 - Nov  
 332 13, 2020, consisting of 2,939 symptomatic and 297 asymptomatic individuals. Let  $D_0$  be  
 333 the data when symptoms first present, for symptomatic individuals, and the date when  
 334 the COVID-19 test was taken, for asymptomatic individuals. We estimated the mean and  
 335 standard deviation of the respiratory rate from  $D_{-90}$  to  $D_{-30}$ , only considering individuals  
 336 with 30 or more days of data within this date range. We obtained the mean and standard  
 337 deviation for 1,247 symptomatic individuals (677 who presented with a fever, and 570 who  
 338 did not) and 133 asymptomatic individuals. The  $Z$ -scores for each day from  $D_{-28}$  to  $D_{+28}$   
 339 are shown in Fig. 6(a) averaged over participants. For days up to  $D_{-14}$ , the  $Z$ -scores  
 340 are consistent with zero, but increase thereafter, reaching a maximum around  $\sim D_{+2}$ . The  
 341  $Z$ -scores decrease for larger  $D_n$ , but interestingly, they do not fall to zero. 33% (18%)  
 342 of symptomatic (asymptomatic) individuals recorded a respiratory rate  $3 \text{ min}^{-1}$  (or more)  
 343 higher than their regular rate on at least one day in the 7 day window between  $D_{-3}$  and  $D_{+3}$ ,  
 344 while only 4.6% (0.0%, limited by sample size) of symptomatic (asymptomatic) individuals  
 345 showed the same increase in the 7 day period between  $D_{-28}$  and  $D_{-22}$ .

346 In Fig. 6(b), we computed the probability of obtaining  $N \geq N_*$  measurements satisfying  
 347  $Z \geq 2.326$ . Let us estimate the noise floor by averaging the probability in the 14 day period  
 348  $D_{-28} \leq d < D_{-14}$ . For  $N_* = 1, 3, \text{ and } 5$ , we find noise floor values equal to 13.4%, 0.88%,  
 349 and 0.092%, while the peak values are respectively, 59.3%, 23.9%, and 11.1%, yielding  
 350 peak-to-noise ratios of 4.42, 27.1, and 120.4 respectively. Setting the noise floor as the false  
 351 positive rate, and assuming a disease prevalence of 1 per 1000 individuals per day, we obtain  
 352 positive predictive values for  $N_* = 1, 3, 5$  to be 0.440%, 2.641%, and 10.76% respectively. For  
 353 symptomatic individuals presenting with a fever (Fig. 6(c)), the  $P(N \geq 1)$  plot peaks at  
 354 71.5%, while for symptomatic individuals who do not present with a fever, the plot peaks  
 355 at 47.3%. For asymptomatic individuals (Fig. 6(d)), the plot for  $N_* = 1$  peaks at 33.3%.  
 356 This is smaller than for symptomatic individuals (59.3%) and for individuals who present  
 357 with a fever (71.5%).

359 There are several limitations to the present work. The dataset of 10,000 participants  
360 consisted of individuals who were randomly selected. We did not attempt to exclude subjects  
361 with significant sleep apnea (for whom “average” respiration rate may be hard to define).  
362 Age, sex, and BMI were provided by the user, and we are unable to verify these demographic  
363 data. We have assumed that participants were healthy during the 2 week period of study,  
364 but we do not have evidence of this. This limitation is even more important for the COVID-  
365 19 study. Although we have assumed that individuals are healthy several days prior to being  
366 diagnosed with COVID-19, we do not have any way to confirm this. The date of COVID-19  
367 diagnosis was provided by the participants themselves, and errors in this date can affect our  
368 results. Nevertheless, the results presented in this work establish that the respiratory rate  
369 is a valuable health metric which can be reliably computed using wearable devices.

## 370 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

371 We thank the Fitbit users who volunteered their data for inclusion in this study. We  
372 thank the members of the Fitbit Research team for helpful discussions.

373 *Conflict of interest statement:* All authors are affiliated with Fitbit and acknowledge  
374 funding from Fitbit.

375 *Data availability:* Fitbit’s privacy policy does not permit us to make the raw data avail-  
376 able to third parties including researchers, outside of our web API OAuth 2.0 consent process.  
377 For specific questions, contact Fitbit at <https://healthsolutions.fitbit.com/contact/>.

378 *Author contributions:* A.N. was responsible for software development, scientific analy-  
379 sis, and for writing the initial draft. H.W.-S. contributed to the validation of the results  
380 with observational data, and for scientific analysis. C.H. led the Fitbit COVID-19 study,  
381 contributed to project design, scientific analysis, and provided valuable insights regarding  
382 the interpretation of the data. L.B., C.O-C., and L.H. were responsible for acquiring ob-  
383 servational data regarding respiratory rate, and for the design and execution of the data

- 385 [1] J. A. Hirsch and B. Bishop, Respiratory sinus arrhythmia in humans: how breathing pattern  
386 modulates heart rate, *Am J Physiol* **241**, H620 (1981).
- 387 [2] J. Hayano, F. Yasuma, A. Okada, S. Mukai, and T. Fujinami, Respiratory sinus arrhythmia.  
388 A phenomenon improving pulmonary gas exchange and circulatory efficiency, *Circulation* **94**,  
389 842 (1996).
- 390 [3] N. D. Giardino, R. W. Glenny, S. Borson, and L. Chan, Respiratory sinus arrhythmia is  
391 associated with efficiency of pulmonary gas exchange in healthy humans, *Am J Physiol Heart*  
392 *Circ Physiol* **284**, H1585 (2003).
- 393 [4] R. R. Molgaard, P. Larsen, and S. J. Hakonsen, Effectiveness of respiratory rates in determin-  
394 ing clinical deterioration: a systematic review protocol, *JBI Database System Rev Implement*  
395 *Rep* **14**, 19 (2016).
- 396 [5] K. Mochizuki, R. Shintani, K. Mori, T. Sato, O. Sakaguchi, K. Takeshige, K. Nitta, and  
397 H. Imamura, Importance of respiratory rate for the prediction of clinical deterioration after  
398 emergency department discharge: a single-center, case-control study, *Acute Med Surg* **4**, 172  
399 (2017).
- 400 [6] E. Siniorakis, S. Arvanitakis, C. Tsitsimpikou, K. Tsarouhas, P. Tzevelekos, S. Panta,  
401 F. Aivalioti, C. Zampelis, F. Triposkiadis, and S. Limberi, Acute Heart Failure in the Emer-  
402 gency Department: Respiratory Rate as a Risk Predictor, *In Vivo* **32**, 921 (2018).
- 403 [7] R. Strauß, S. Ewig, K. Richter, T. König, G. Heller, and T. T. Bauer, The prognostic signif-  
404 icance of respiratory rate in patients with pneumonia: a retrospective analysis of data from  
405 705,928 hospitalized patients in Germany from 2010-2012, *Dtsch Arztebl Int* **111**, 503 (2014).
- 406 [8] W. S. Lim, M. M. van der Eerden, R. Laing, W. G. Boersma, N. Karalus, G. I. Town, S. A.  
407 Lewis, and J. T. Macfarlane, Defining community acquired pneumonia severity on presentation  
408 to hospital: an international derivation and validation study, *Thorax* **58**, 377 (2003).
- 409 [9] D. Talmor, A. E. Jones, L. Rubinson, M. D. Howell, and N. I. Shapiro, Simple triage scoring  
410 system predicting death and the need for critical care resources for use during epidemics, *Crit*  
411 *Care Med* **35**, 1251 (2007).
- 412 [10] J. F. Fieselmann, M. S. Hendryx, C. M. Helms, and D. S. Wakefield, Respiratory rate predicts



- cardiopulmonary arrest for internal medicine inpatients, *J Gen Intern Med* **8**, 354 (1993).
- [11] D. R. Goldhill, A. F. McNarry, G. Mandersloot, and A. McGinley, A physiologically-based early warning score for ward patients: the association between score and outcome, *Anaesthesia* **60**, 547 (2005).
- [12] C. P. Subbe, R. G. Davies, E. Williams, P. Rutherford, and L. Gemmell, Effect of introducing the Modified Early Warning score on clinical outcomes, cardio-pulmonary arrests and intensive care utilisation in acute medical admissions, *Anaesthesia* **58**, 797 (2003).
- [13] M. D. Howell, M. W. Donnino, D. Talmor, P. Clardy, L. Ngo, and N. I. Shapiro, Performance of severity of illness scoring systems in emergency department patients with infection, *Acad Emerg Med* **14**, 709 (2007).
- [14] D. J. Miller, J. V. Capodilupo, M. Lastella, C. Sargent, G. D. Roach, V. H. Lee, and E. R. Capodilupo, Analyzing changes in respiratory rate to predict the risk of COVID-19 infection, *PLoS One* **15**, e0243693 (2020).
- [15] A. Natarajan, H. W. Su, and C. Heneghan, Assessment of physiological signs associated with COVID-19 measured using wearable devices, *NPJ Digit Med* **3**, 156 (2020).
- [16] M. A. Cretikos, R. Bellomo, K. Hillman, J. Chen, S. Finfer, and A. Flabouris, Respiratory rate: the neglected vital sign, *Med J Aust* **188**, 657 (2008).
- [17] J. D. Yonge, P. K. Bohan, J. J. Watson, C. R. Connelly, L. Eastes, and M. A. Schreiber, The Respiratory Rate: A Neglected Triage Tool for Pre-hospital Identification of Trauma Patients, *World J Surg* **42**, 1321 (2018).
- [18] J. Allen, Photoplethysmography and its application in clinical physiological measurement, *Physiol Meas* **28**, 1 (2007).
- [19] M. Elgendi, On the analysis of fingertip photoplethysmogram signals, *Curr Cardiol Rev* **8**, 14 (2012).
- [20] A. A. Alian and K. H. Shelley, Photoplethysmography, *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* **28**, 395 (2014).
- [21] P. H. Charlton, D. A. Birrenkott, T. Bonnici, M. A. F. Pimentel, A. E. W. Johnson, J. Alastruey, L. Tarassenko, P. J. Watkinson, R. Beale, and D. A. Clifton, Breathing Rate Estimation From the Electrocardiogram and Photoplethysmogram: A Review, *IEEE Rev Biomed Eng* **11**, 2 (2018).
- [22] W. Karlen, S. Raman, J. M. Ansermino, and G. A. Dumont, Multiparameter respiratory rate

- 444 estimation from the photoplethysmogram, *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* **60**, 1946 (2013).
- 445 [23] A. Schafer and K. W. Kratky, Estimation of breathing rate from respiratory sinus arrhythmia:  
446 comparison of various methods, *Ann Biomed Eng* **36**, 476 (2008).
- 447 [24] S. Berryhill, C. J. Morton, A. Dean, A. Berryhill, N. Provencio-Dean, S. I. Patel, L. Estep,  
448 D. Combs, S. Mashaqi, L. B. Gerald, J. A. Krishnan, and S. Parthasarathy, Effect of wearables  
449 on sleep in healthy individuals: a randomized crossover trial and validation study, *J Clin Sleep*  
450 *Med* **16**, 775 (2020).
- 451 [25] D. Bian, P. Mehta, and N. Selvaraj, Respiratory Rate Estimation using PPG: A Deep Learning  
452 Approach, *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* **2020**, 5948 (2020).
- 453 [26] A. Natarajan, A. Pantelopoulos, H. Emir-Farinas, and P. Natarajan, Heart rate variability  
454 with photoplethysmography in 8 million individuals: a cross-sectional study, *Lancet Digit*  
455 *Health* **2**, e650 (2020).
- 456 [27] C. Julien, The enigma of Mayer waves: Facts and models, *Cardiovasc Res* **70**, 12 (2006).
- 457 [28] M. de Zambotti, F. C. Baker, A. R. Willoughby, J. G. Godino, D. Wing, K. Patrick, and  
458 I. M. Colrain, Measures of sleep and cardiac functioning during sleep using a multi-sensory  
459 commercially-available wristband in adolescents, *Physiol Behav* **158**, 143 (2016).
- 460 [29] W. C. Bond, C. Bohs, J. Ebey, and S. Wolf, Rhythmic heart rate variability (sinus arrhythmia)  
461 related to stages of sleep, *Cond Reflex* **8**, 98 (1973).
- 462 [30] J. R. Stradling, G. A. Chadwick, and A. J. Frew, Changes in ventilation and its components  
463 in normal subjects during sleep, *Thorax* **40**, 364 (1985).
- 464 [31] D. P. White, J. V. Weil, and C. W. Zwillich, Metabolic rate and breathing during sleep, *J*  
465 *Appl Physiol* (1985) **59**, 384 (1985).
- 466 [32] M. Pradella, Breathing frequency in sleep related respiratory disturbances, *Arq Neuropsiquiatr*  
467 **51**, 227 (1993).
- 468 [33] S. Rostig, J. W. Kantelhardt, T. Penzel, W. Cassel, J. H. Peter, C. Vogelmeier, H. F. Becker,  
469 and A. Jerrentrup, Nonrandom variability of respiration during sleep in healthy humans, *Sleep*  
470 **28**, 411 (2005).
- 471 [34] J. Krieger, N. Maglasiu, E. Sforza, and D. Kurtz, Breathing during sleep in normal middle-  
472 aged subjects, *Sleep* **13**, 143 (1990).
- 473 [35] J. Karjalainen and M. Viitasalo, Fever and cardiac rhythm, *Arch Intern Med* **146**, 1169 (1986).
- 474 [36] G. Quer, P. Gouda, M. Galarnyk, E. J. Topol, and S. R. Steinhubl, Inter- and intraindividual

- 475 variability in daily resting heart rate and its associations with age, sex, sleep, BMI, and time  
476 of year: Retrospective, longitudinal cohort study of 92,457 adults, PLoS One **15**, e0227709  
477 (2020).
- 478 [37] K. Prabhavathi, K. T. Selvi, K. N. Poornima, and A. Sarvanan, Role of biological sex in  
479 normal cardiac function and in its disease outcome - a review, J Clin Diagn Res **8**, 01 (2014).
- 480 [38] A. LoMauro and A. Aliverti, Sex differences in respiratory function, Breathe (Sheff) **14**, 131  
481 (2018).
- 482 [39] A. LoMauro and A. Aliverti, Respiratory physiology of pregnancy: Physiology masterclass,  
483 Breathe (Sheff) **11**, 297 (2015).
- 484 [40] M. Behan and J. M. Wenninger, Sex steroidal hormones and respiratory control, Respir Physiol  
485 Neurobiol **164**, 213 (2008).




FIG. 1. (a) HRV power spectral density consisting of background and Respiratory Sinus Arrhythmia. (b) residuals after the background is subtracted.




FIG. 2. (a) Respiratory rate estimated from the heart beat interval time series data compared to ground truth measurements. (b) shows the Bland-Altman plot comparing the true and predicted values. The bias (mean of predicted value - true value) is  $-0.24 \text{ min}^{-1}$  ( $-1.67\%$ ). The RMS error =  $0.65 \text{ min}^{-1}$  and the mean absolute error =  $0.46 \text{ min}^{-1}$  ( $3.0\%$ ). The 95% region is shown in yellow.




FIG. 3. Distribution of respiratory rates. 90% of values are between 11.8 - 19.2 min<sup>-1</sup>.




FIG. 4. (a) shows the variation of respiratory rate with age and sex. Females have a higher respiratory rate on average for ages  $< 50$  yr, and no difference thereafter. (b) shows the coefficient of variation over a 14 day period. Error bars are 1 standard deviation.




FIG. 5. (a) respiratory rate dependence on BMI. The lowest value occurs at a BMI of  $\sim 25$ . (b) respiratory rate variation with nocturnal heart rate measured in non-REM sleep (black and green curves are for females and males, respectively, the red curve is for all participants). Error bars show the standard error of the mean.






FIG. 6. (a) shows the dimensionless  $Z$ -scored respiratory rate in symptomatic individuals, with day relative to the start of symptoms (Day 0 is the day when symptoms present). (b) measures the probability of receiving  $N \geq N_*$  anomalously high values in a 7 day window centered on day  $D$ , for  $N_* = 1, 3, 5$ . The effect of fever is seen in (c). The variation of respiratory rate for asymptomatic individuals is shown in (d). Error bars show the standard error of the mean.

## Supplementary Text

Table S1 shows the details of the 2 experiments conducted to validate the respiratory rate computatons. Experiment A was conducted at Sleep Med in Columbia, SC, from Oct 17, 2019 to Nov 6, 2019. Experiment B was conducted remotely, by shipping equipment to the homes of participants, from March 9, 2020 to May 29, 2020. Participants in Experiment A wore Fitbit devices on both wrists, while participants in Experiment B wore a Fitbit device on one wrist only. We excluded participants with severe sleep apnea (Apnea-Hypopnea Index  $\geq 30$ ). The columns are: (i) participant ID, (ii) age, (iii) sex, (iv) experiment (A or B), (v) night of measurement (1,2, or 3), (vi) apnea-hypopnea index, (vii) wrist (left, right, or unknown), (viii) predicted respiratory rate, and (ix) true respiratory rate.

### Validation of respiratory rate

ID	Age (yr)	Sex (M/F)	Expt (A/B)	Night (1/2/3)	AHI	Wrist (L/R/-)	Pred. Rate ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )	True Rate ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )	ID	Age (yr)	Sex (M/F)	Expt (A/B)	Night (1/2/3)	AHI	Wrist (L/R/-)	Pred. Rate ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )	True Rate ( $\text{min}^{-1}$ )
1	35-39	F	A	1	9.2	L	16	16.4	13	45-49	F	A	1	1.5	R	14.4	14.9
1	35-39	F	A	1	9.2	R	15.6	16.4	14	35-39	M	A	1	2.7	L	14.4	15.2
2	55-59	F	A	1	17.3	L	15.6	15.9	14	35-39	M	A	1	2.7	R	15	15.2
2	55-59	F	A	1	17.3	R	15.4	15.9	15	45-49	M	B	1	13	-	13.8	13.8
3	50-54	F	A	1	1.6	L	12.4	12.4	15	45-49	M	B	2	13.2	-	14.2	14.6
3	50-54	F	A	1	1.6	R	12.4	12.4	16	50-54	M	B	2	4.2	-	18.2	18.1
4	65-69	F	A	1	5.3	L	13	13.5	17	30-34	F	B	1	25	-	17.8	16.1
4	65-69	F	A	1	5.3	R	12.8	13.5	17	30-34	F	B	2	12.1	-	16.8	16.6
5	55-59	F	A	1	10	L	13.8	14.2	17	30-34	F	B	3	14.6	-	17	17.1
5	55-59	F	A	1	10	R	14	14.2	18	35-39	M	B	1	4.8	-	13.2	13.6
6	55-59	M	A	1	26	L	13.4	13.1	18	35-39	M	B	2	5.6	-	13.4	13.7
6	55-59	M	A	1	26	R	12.8	13.1	19	50-54	M	B	1	7.6	-	17.4	17.5
7	55-59	F	A	1	7.5	L	20.2	20.2	19	50-54	M	B	2	9.8	-	17.4	17.3
7	55-59	F	A	2	26.3	L	17.4	17.6	20	70-74	F	B	1	18.5	-	15.4	15.2
7	55-59	F	A	2	26.3	R	16.6	17.6	21	45-49	M	B	1	20.1	-	16.4	16.9
8	50-54	M	A	1	0.6	L	13	13.6	21	45-49	M	B	2	17.2	-	16.8	16.9
8	50-54	M	A	1	0.6	R	13	13.6	22	50-54	M	B	2	14.4	-	16.2	16.5
9	50-54	F	A	1	16.9	L	17.4	17.8	23	50-54	F	B	1	4.6	-	12.4	13.3
9	50-54	F	A	1	16.9	R	17.4	17.8	23	50-54	F	B	2	5.8	-	12.8	13.3
10	45-49	M	A	1	27.1	L	14.2	14.1	24	35-39	F	B	1	14.2	-	17.8	17.4
10	45-49	M	A	1	27.1	R	14	14.1	24	35-39	F	B	2	12.4	-	18.2	17.7
11	40-44	F	A	1	2.6	L	15.8	16.1	25	40-44	M	B	1	13.8	-	18.2	16.5
11	40-44	F	A	1	2.6	R	16	16.1	26	50-54	F	B	1	12.5	-	15	15
12	40-44	F	A	1	5	L	13.8	15.3	26	50-54	F	B	2	12.6	-	15.6	15.3
12	40-44	F	A	1	5	R	13.8	15.3	27	45-49	M	B	2	19.3	-	12.6	12.8
13	45-49	F	A	1	1.5	L	14.6	14.9	28	65-69	M	B	1	6.3	-	13.8	15.7

TABLE S1: Details of experiments A and B. The columns are: participant ID, age, sex, experiment number (A or B), night of observation (1,2, or 3), apnea hypopnea index, wrist (left, right, or unknown), predicted respiratory rate, and true respiratory rate.