medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Characterising long term Covid-19: a living systematic review

Authors: Melina Michelen[1,2], Vincent Cheng[3*], Lakshmi Manoharan[2*], Natalie Elkheir[2,4*], Drew Dagens[2*], Claire Hastie[5], Margaret O'Hara[5], Jake C. Suett[6], Dania T. Dahmash[2], Polina Bugaeva[7], Ishmeala Rigby[2], Daniel Munblit[8,9,10], Eli Harriss[12], Amanda Burls[1], Carol Foote[11], Janet T. Scott[13], Gail Carson[2], Piero Olliaro[2], Louise Sigfrid[2**] and Charitini Stavropoulou[1**]

1. School of Health Sciences, City, University of London, London, UK
2. ISARIC Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
3. Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
4. Department of Clinical Research, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK
5. Long Covid Support
6. Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Kings Lynn, UK
7. Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany
8. Department of Paediatrics and Paediatric Infectious Diseases, Institute of Child's Health, Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University), Moscow, Russia
9. Inflammation, Repair and Development Section, National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
10. Research and Clinical Center for Neuropsychiatry, Moscow, Russia
11. Freelance, Soquel, California, USA
12. Bodleian Health Care Libraries, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
13. MRC-University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research, Glasgow, UK

*Joint second authors

**Joint senior authors

Correspondence to C.Stavropoulou@city.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Section 1: What is already known?

- A significant number of people continue to describe ongoing symptoms long after the acute phase of Covid-19, often referred to as Long Covid.
- Long Covid is a heterogeneous condition with an uncertain prevalence, for which there is currently no precise case definition.

Section 2: What are the new findings?

- This 'living' systematic review provides a comprehensive summary of peer-reviewed published evidence on persistent symptoms of Covid-19 and will be regularly updated as new evidence emerges.
- The breadth of reported symptoms suggests a complex, heterogeneous condition affecting both those who were hospitalised and those managed in the community.
- Our review identifies weakness (41%; 95% CI 25% to 59%), general malaise (33%; 95% confidence interval 15% to 57%), fatigue (31%; 95% CI 24% to 39%), concentration impairment (26%; 95% CI 21% to 32%) and breathlessness (25%; 95% CI 18% to 34%) as the most common symptoms.

Section 3: What do the new findings imply?

- The current evidence base of the clinical spectrum of Long Covid is limited, based on heterogenous data, and vulnerable to biases, hence caution should be used when interpreting or generalising the results.
- Our review identifies areas where further Long Covid research is critically needed to help characterise Long Covid in different populations and define its aetiology, risk factors, and biomarkers, as well as the impact on variants of concern and vaccination on long term outcomes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background

While it is now apparent clinical sequelae (often called Long Covid) may persist after acute Covid-19, their nature, frequency, and aetiology are poorly characterised. This study aims to regularly synthesise evidence on Long Covid characteristics, to inform clinical management, rehabilitation, and interventional studies to improve long term outcomes.

Methods

A living systematic review. Medline, CINAHL (EBSCO), Global Health (Ovid), WHO Global Research Database on Covid-19, LitCOVID, and Google Scholar were searched up to 17th March 2021. Published studies including at least 100 people with confirmed or clinically suspected Covid-19 at 12 weeks or more post-onset were included. Results were analysed using descriptive statistics and meta-analyses to estimate prevalence with 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

Results Thirty-nine studies were included: 32 cohort, six cross-sectional, and one case-control. Most showed high or moderate risk of bias. None were set in low-income countries, limited studies included children. Studies reported on 10,951 people (48% female) in 12 countries. Most followed-up post hospital discharge (78%, 8520/10951). The longest mean follow-up was 221.7 (SD: 10.9) days post Covid-19 onset. An extensive range of symptoms with wide prevalence was reported, most commonly weakness (41%; 95% CI 25% to 59%), malaise (33%; 95% CI 15% to 57%), fatigue (31%; 95% CI 24% to 39%), concentration impairment (26%; 95% CI 21% to 32%), and breathlessness (25%; 95% CI 18% to 34%). Other frequent symptoms included musculoskeletal, neurological, and psychological. 37% (95% CI 18% to 60%) of people reported reduced quality of life.

Conclusion: Long Covid is a complex condition with heterogeneous symptoms. The nature of the studies precludes a precise case definition or evaluation of risk factors. There is an urgent need for prospective, robust, standardised controlled studies into aetiology, risk factors, and biomarkers to characterise Long Covid in different at-risk populations and settings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Systematic review registration The protocol was prospectively registered on the PROSPERO database (CRD42020211131).

Keywords: Covid-19, Long Covid, Covid sequelae, post-acute Covid-19, living systematic review

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) first emerged in December 2019 causing a widespread pandemic. Most people experience asymptomatic or mild to moderate acute coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) symptoms, whilst around 15% of people are estimated to progress to more severe disease requiring hospitalisation and approximately 5% become critically ill.[1]

While the acute phase of the disease was characterised early, there is still limited data on long term outcomes. Symptoms of long-lasting Covid-19 sequelae and complications, termed Long Covid by patients [2], have been reported worldwide. Yet the underlying aetiology behind prolonged or fluctuating symptomatology is limited and there is no widely-accepted uniformed case definition.[3] Instead, Long Covid has been defined pragmatically as "not recovering [for] several weeks or months following the start of symptoms."[3] Others have distinguished between post-acute Covid-19, referring to symptoms beyond three weeks and chronic Covid-19 beyond 12 weeks [4], while the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) distinguishes between ongoing symptomatic Covid-19 lasting from four to 12 weeks and post-covid-19 syndrome continuing for over 12 weeks.[5]

The number of people living with Long Covid is unknown. Attempts to quantify the prevalence of Long Covid use different methods, including national surveys and patient-led studies, making it difficult to compare across studies. The UK's Office for National Statistics (ONS) has estimated that on average one in five people have symptoms beyond five weeks, while one in ten have symptoms persisting over 12 weeks.[6] A patient-led survey found that in survival analysis, the chance of full recovery by day 50 was smaller than 20% [7] and a Covid symptom app study found 13.3% had symptoms lasting 28 days or more, 4.5% eight or more weeks and 2.3% had symptoms lasting over 12 weeks.[8]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The symptoms of Long Covid are equally ill-defined, with some people describing it as a fluctuating illness of disparate symptoms. [7,9] Indeed, the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) has suggested that post-acute Covid-19 may consist of several distinct clinical syndromes including: a post-intensive care syndrome, chronic fatigue syndrome, long-term Covid-19 syndrome and disease from SARS-CoV-2 inflicted organ damage.[10] Additionally, even with an expanding knowledge of risk factors in the acute phase, little is currently known on predictive factors for developing Long Covid.[8] Despite suggested classifications, there is yet no clear consensus.

Our early understanding of Long Covid has been accumulated from case reports and cross-sectional online survey studies as the pandemic global research focus has largely been on studies of hospitalised patients during the acute phase. As the pandemic progresses, emerging studies have followed up people to present the fluctuating multiorgan sequelae of acute Covid-19, yet evidence is still scarce. There continues to be a call to further understand and acknowledge this condition while involving patient knowledge and experiences.[11,12]

Given the enormous number of people worldwide who have suffered from Covid-19, it is essential to establish a precise categorisation of Long Covid. Such categorisation will not only help people better understand their symptoms, but also direct research into prevention, treatment, and support, ultimately allowing us to understand and prepare to respond to the long-term consequences inflicted by the Covid-19 pandemic. Our review seeks to synthesise and continually update the evidence on the character and prevalence of Long Covid.

METHODS

Systematic reviews conducted early during the Covid-19 pandemic soon became redundant due to the rapidity with which new research was released. In recognition of this, many reviewers have moved towards the concept of a 'living systematic review' (LSR), which has in-built mechanisms for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

regular update and renewal.[13,14] We conducted a 'living' systematic review to provide frequently updated evidence on the symptoms and complications of Long Covid. This review was developed in collaboration with infectious disease clinicians, public health professionals, information specialists, review methodologists with experience in clinical epidemic research, and members of the global Long Covid Support Group, that includes people living with Long Covid. This living systematic review will be updated approximately every 6 months as new evidence emerges.

Protocol registration

This report was structured according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement guidelines.[15] The protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42020211131) and published in a peer-reviewed journal.[16]

Search strategy

The following databases were searched: Medline and CINAHL (EBSCO), Global Health (Ovid), WHO Global Research Database on Covid-19, and LitCOVID from 1st January 2020 to 17th March 2021. Additionally, we searched Google Scholar on 17th March 2021, screening the first 500 titles. A 'backwards' snowball search was conducted of the references of systematic reviews. Full search terms are included in supplement 1. The search terms and inclusion criteria have, for this first version, been designed to cast a wide net, and will be modified in line with new evidence, research priorities, and clinical and policy needs.

Eligibility criteria

Peer-reviewed studies were considered eligible if they included at least 100 people with suspected, laboratory confirmed, and/or clinically diagnosed Covid-19. Without a clear or internationally agreed case definition, we included studies that reported symptoms or outcomes assessed at 12 or more weeks post Covid-19 onset.[5] There were no language restrictions. Reviews and opinion pieces

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

were excluded. Studies were excluded if they included fewer than 100 participants or the follow-up was unclear or less than 12 weeks post-onset.

Screening

Screening was performed independently by two reviewers. Any disagreements were resolved via consensus or a third reviewer. Non-English articles were translated using Google Translate or reviewed by a reviewer with good knowledge of the language. The data were managed using the review software Rayyan.[17]

Data extraction

Data extraction was performed using Microsoft Excel. A data extraction template informed by a previous review [18] was reviewed, updated, and piloted before being finalised. Data extracted included study design, population characteristics, outcomes, prevalence, duration of symptoms, and risk factors. Data extraction was performed by one reviewer and checked by a second reviewer. Disagreements were resolved through consensus. To avoid duplication of data in future updates and ensure robustness, data extraction was not performed for non-peer-reviewed preprints.

Risk of bias assessment

The included studies were assessed for risk of bias using a modified version of the tool produced by Hoy *et al*. [19] (Supplement 2). This assessment checklist is a validated tool for assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies. The checklist has ten domains for assessing risk of bias, used to calculate a cumulative overall risk of bias for the whole study.

Data analysis

We undertook individual descriptive analysis for each study. We presented symptom proportions by different settings, as presented in the individual studies: hospitalised, non-hospitalised, or a mix of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

both populations if no subset data was available. Symptoms were broadly grouped into physiological clusters through discussion with clinicians. Proportion of symptoms and its 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were estimated using the exact method.[20] If there were two or more studies in each symptom, a meta-analysis was performed using a random intercept logistic regression model with Hartung-Knapp modification due to the heterogeneity and skewed sample sizes.[21,22] Heterogeneity between estimates was assessed using the I^2 statistic.[23] Additional subgroup analysis was conducted to explore the modification of the following factors on proportion of symptoms: hospitalisation, settings, continents, and follow-up timing. We also conducted meta-regression analysis on the percentage of females and ICU patients where there were more than 10 studies in the symptom. Sensitivity analyses were conducted to examine the impact of high risk of bias studies and statistical methods, Freeman-Tukey Double arcsine transformation using inverse variance meta-analysis, on the estimates. Funnel plots were plotted using proportion of the symptom against the precision and sample sizes [22] where there were more than 10 studies in the symptom to explore risk of publication bias. All analysis and data presentation were performed using *metaprop* and *ggplot2* in R (version 4.0.5) via RStudio (version 1.3.1093). The data is presented using a combination of infographics, prepared by a design company, Design Science, and scientific tables to facilitate interpretation by different stakeholders, including non-specialists.

Patient and public involvement

The study team includes members who have been affected by long term Covid-19 sequalae (CH, MO, and JCS). CH, MO, and JCS are members of Long Covid Support, a patient support group with global reach, with approximately 40,000 members.

They actively contributed to the development of the study protocol, to inform the research questions and interpretation and presentation of the findings, to communicate the results to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

different audiences. The results of this LSR will be disseminated to Long Covid patient forums for discussion and feedback to inform research priorities and updates.

RESULTS

We identified 6,459 studies, of which 39 met the inclusion criteria (Supplement 3). Of these, 32 were included in the meta-analysis. The remaining studies included single symptoms or imaging and diagnostics and are presented narratively.

Characteristics of included studies

Most studies were set in Europe (62%, 24/39), followed by Asia (23%, 9/39), North America (8%, 3/39), and the Middle East 8% (3/39). There was no study set in a low-middle income (LMIC) country (Figure 1).[24] Most were cohort studies (82%, 32/39), followed by cross sectional studies (15%, 6/39), and a case control study (3%, 1/39).



[Insert Figure 1 here]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

These studies present data on 10,951 (range: 100-1,733) people in 12 countries, aged from 9 months to 93 years old, 48% (5206/10931) were female. Most studies included adults, while 10% (4/39) also included children.[25–28] Only 15% (6/39) of studies reported ethnicity of the participants [29–34], but without stratification. Table 1 presents the included study characteristics.

Most studies (67%, 26/39) were cohorts of hospitalised patients post-discharge, 10% (4/39) were set in the community (non-hospitalised population) whilst 23% (9/39) included both, with 78% (8520/10951) of individuals hospitalised during acute Covid-19. Twenty-two studies included people requiring ICU admission during the acute phase.[25,27–29,31,32,34–49]

The longest follow-up period in any study was a mean of 221.7 (SD: 10.9) days post-onset. Only 56% (22/39) of studies specified Covid-19 severity [25,27–29,31,32,34–49], 31% (12/39) treatment received during the acute phase [30,34,35,39,40,44,47,50–54], and 62% (24/39) described ventilation support requirements.[30–36,39,40,42–45,47,48,50,51,54–60] Pre-existing comorbidities were reported in the majority of studies (85%, 33/39), with hypertension and diabetes most commonly documented.[27,29–51,53–57,59,61–63]

[Insert Table 1 here: Table 1. Study characteristics **]**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

Study	Design	Country	Population size	Age (years)	Sex (% female)	COVID-19 confirmation method	Follow-up time (days)	Follow-up timepoint	Follow-up mode
Non-hospitalised									
Hopkins et al. [52]	Cross Sectional	UK	434	Median (range): 40 (19-77)	75	PCR or serological assays (26.3%)	6 months	1st survey	Electronic survey
Klein et al. [41]	Cohort (P)	Israel	103	Mean (SD): 35 (12)	38	PCR (RT-PCR)	6 months	Onset	Phone interview
Petersen et al. [26]	Cohort (P)	Faroe Islands	180	Mean (SD; range): 39.9 (19.4; 0-93)	54	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD) 125 (17)	Onset	Phone interview
Stavem et al. [62]	Cross Sectional	Norway	451	Mean (SD): 49.8 (15.2)	56	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (range): 117 (41-193)	Onset	Outpatient visit and survey
Non-hospitalised & hospitalised									
Parente-Arias et al. [49]	Cohort (P)	Spain	151	Mean (range): 55.2 (18–88)	65	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 100.5 (3.3)	Admission	Phone interview
Venturelli et al. [54]	Cohort (P)	Italy	767	Mean (SD): 63 (13.6)	33	PCR (RT-PCR) (94%); Serology (5%) Clinician diagnosis (1.2%)	Median (IQR): 105 (84–127)	Onset	Outpatient visit
Anastasio et al.[35]	Cohort (P)	Italy	379	Median (IQR; range): 56 (49-63; 20-80)	54	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR): 135 (102–175)	Onset	Outpatient visit
Einvik et al. [61]	Cross Sectional	Norway	538	Mean (SD) 57.7 (14.2) (hospital) 49.6 (15.3)	42 (hospital) 56	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 112 (30) (hospital) 118 (27)	Onset	Outpatient visit and survey
Jacobson et al.[34]	Cohort (P)	USA	118	Mean (SD): 43.3 (14.4)	47	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 119.3 (33)	Diagnosis	Outpatient visit
Logue et al.[29]	Cohort (P)	USA	177 21 (C)	Mean (SD): 48(15.2)	57	Lab confirmed	Median (range): 169 (31-300)	Onset	Electronic survey
Mazza et al. [64]	Cohort (P)	Italy	226	Mean (SD; range): 58 (12.8; 26-87)	34	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 90 (13.4)	Discharge	Phone interview
Rass et al. [44]	Cohort (P)	Austria	135	Median (IQR; range) 56 (48-68; 19-87)	39	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR): 102 (91-110)	Onset	Outpatient visit
Sonnweber et al. [42]	Cohort (P)	Austria	145	Mean (SD): 57 (14)	43	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 103 (21)	Diagnosis	Outpatient visit
Hospitalised									
Alharthy et al. [48]	Cohort (P)	Saudi Arabia	127	Mean (SD): 47 (11.38)	21	PCR (RT-PCR)	4 months	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Arnold et al. [31]	Cohort (P)	UK	110	Median (IQR): 60 (46-73)	38	PCR or radiological diagnosis	Median (IQR): 90 (80–97)	Onset	Outpatient visit
Baricich et al. [57]	Cross Sectional	Italy	204	Mean (SD): 57.9 (12.8)	40	NR	Mean (SD): 124.7 (17.5)	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Bellan et al. [36]	Cohort (P)	Italy	238	Median (IQR): 61 (50-71)	40	PCR (RT-PCR) (97.5%); Bronchoalveolar lavage (0.4%); Serology/radiological (2.1%)	3-4 months	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Blanco et al. [32]	Cohort (P)	Spain	100	Mean (SD) DLCO <80: 54.98 (10.72) DLCO >80: 54.75 (9.83)	36	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR): 104 (89.25-126.75)	Onset	Outpatient visit

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

Study	Design	Country	Population size	Age (years)	Sex (% female)	COVID-19 confirmation method	Follow-up time (days)	Follow-up timepoint	Follow-up mode
Doyle et al. [60]	Cohort (P)	UK	129	Mean: 62 (Cambridge) 56 (London)	31 (Cambridge) 27 (London)	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (range): 113 (96–138)	Discharge	NR
Garrigues et al. [59]	Cohort (P)	France	120	Mean (SD): 63.2 (15.7)	38	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 110.9 (11.1)	Admission	Phone interview
Gherlone et al. [51]	Cohort (P&R)	Italy	122	Median (IQR): 62.5 (53.9-74.1)	25	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR): 104 (95-132)	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Han et al. [40]	Cohort (P)	China	114	Mean (SD; range): 54 (12; 24-82)	30	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 175 (20)	Onset	Outpatient visit
Huang et al. [50]	Cohort (P&R)	China	1733	Median (IQR): 57 (47–65)	48	Lab confirmed	Median (IQR): 186 (175–199)	Onset	Outpatient visit
Zhang, J et al. [25]	Cohort (R/S)	China	527	Median (IQR; range): 42.5 (32–54; 0-91)	44	NR	6 months	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Lerum et al. [55]	Cohort (P)	Norway	103	Median (25th-75th percentile): 59 (49, 72)	48	Nasopharyngeal swab	3 months	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Méndez et al. [43]	Cohort (R/S)	Spain	215	Median (IQR): 55 (47-66)	40	Lab confirmed	Median (IQR): 87 (62-109)	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Nguyen et al.[27]	Cohort (P)	France	125	Median (IQR; range): 36 (27-48; 16- 85)	55	PCR (RT-PCR)	Mean (SD): 221.7 (10.9)	Onset	Phone interview
Nugent et al. [30]	Cohort (R/S)	USA	182 1430 (C)	Median (IQR): 67.4 (58.3-80.1)	47	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR): 92.9 (52.5-127.7)	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Qin et al. [47]	Cohort (P)	China	647	Mean (SD): 58 (15) years	56	PCR (RT-PCR)	90	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Qu et al. [28]	Cohort (P)	China	540	Median (IQR): 47.50 (37-57)	50	PCR (RT-PCR)	3 months	Discharge	Electronic survey
Sibila et al. [45]	Cohort (P)	Spain	172	Mean (SD): 56.1 (19.8)	43	NR	Mean (SD): 101.5 (19.9)	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Simani et al. [53]	Cohort (P)	Iran	120	Mean (SD): 54.62 (16.94)	33	PCR or radiological diagnosis	6 months	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Suárez-Robles et al. [58]	Cross Sectional	Spain	134	Mean (SD): 58.53 (18.53)	54	PCR (RT-PCR)	90	Discharge	Phone survey
Sykes et al. [33]	Cohort (P)	UK	134	Median (range): 58 (25–89)	34	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (range): 113 (46–167)	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Taboada et al. [56]	Cross Sectional	Spain	183	Mean (SD): 65.9 (14.1)	40	PCR (RT-PCR)	6 months	Discharge	Unstructured interview
Weng et al. [39]	Cohort (P)	China	117	45.3% ≥60years	44	Viral nucleic acid test	90	Discharge	Phone interview
Xiong et. Al [38]	Cohort (P)	China	538 184 (C)	Median (IQR; range): 52 (41-62; 22-79)	55	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR; range): 97.0 (95.0-102.0; 91 - 116)	Discharge	Phone interview
Xu et al.[37]	Case control	China	103 27 (C)	Median (IQR) M/M: 56 (45-63) S/C: 61 (55-68)	M/M: 58.8 S/C: 53.6	NR	3 months	Discharge	Outpatient visit
Zhang et al. [46]	Cohort (P)	China	310	Median (IQR): 51 (31.8-61)	50	PCR (RT-PCR)	Median (IQR): 92.0 (90-100)	Discharge	Outpatient visit

C: Control group; IQR; interquartile range; P: Prospective; R: Retrospective; M/M: mild/moderate; NR: Not reported; S/C: severe/critical; SD: Standard deviation;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Risk of bias

Twelve studies were assessed as high risk of bias, 22 moderate, and five low risk of bias. Most studies had a high risk of bias with regards to the generalisability of their results to the wider population with Covid-19. High risk-of-bias ratings were most common for external validity, with item 1 (representation of target population) and item 3 (random selection) having the most high risk of bias ratings (Supplement 2). Further, the recruitment process and response rates were often not well-described, and several studies applied different data collection methods. Although many studies applied validated measurement methods to assess participants, most were not designed to detect symptoms arising from Covid-19. Only four studies included a comparative control group.[29,30,37,38]

Symptoms & signs

People suffering from Long Covid report a wide range of new or persistent symptoms, in both the hospitalised and non-hospitalised populations. Symptoms were broadly organised into physiological 'clusters' for the purpose of presentation and interpretation of this review (Figure 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



[Insert Figure 2 here]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The focus of each study included in our analysis varied. Some authors focused solely on a specialty, such as dentistry, or a specific symptom, such as cognition, making comparative analysis difficult. Even amongst those studies which took a broad approach, the prevalence of symptoms was diverse. Similarly, the prevalence of the more commonly reported symptoms varied markedly.

Within these limitations, we performed a meta-analysis of the most commonly reported symptoms and signs of Long Covid. The most commonly described symptoms (with prevalence of 25% or greater) were weakness (41%, 95% CI 25.43 to 59.01), general malaise (33%, 95% CI 14.91 to 57.36), fatigue (31%, 95% CI 23.91 to 39.03), concentration impairment (26%, 95% CI 20.96 to 31.73) and breathlessness (25%, 95% CI 17.86 to 33.97). Across studies, 37% (95% CI 18.43 to 59.93) of people reported reduced quality of life. Although high I^2 values (>80%) were observed, they resulted from narrow dispersions in the estimates and well-separated estimates and confidence intervals between studies (Supplement 4). The differences between these symptoms, and the heterogeneity within them is likely to be, to some extent, due to other factors (e.g., study settings, populations, and different measurement tools used).

A diverse array of less prevalent symptoms, including systemic, musculoskeletal, neurological, and psychological symptoms such as sweating, chest pain, sore throat, anxiety, and headaches, amongst others, were also reported. The prevalence of these symptoms was lower, usually less than 20%. Figure 3 presents the range of symptoms.

[Insert Figure 3]

Figure 4 displays this data by population. We also performed subgroup analysis based upon setting (hospitalised vs never hospitalised) and follow-up time. In several symptoms and signs, the heterogeneity of the results was found to be associated with level of hospitalisation, hospital settings, location of the studies, and follow-up timing using subgroup analysis (Supplement 5-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

8). Using meta-regression, the proportion of females in the studies was positively associated with headache and smell and taste disturbance (Supplement 9), while the proportion of ICU patients in the studies was positively associated with muscle pain (Supplement 10). No major difference was found in the sensitivity analyses (Supplement 11-12). Asymmetries found in the funnel plots suggest reporting biases and limited methodological quality in the included studies (Supplement 13).

[Insert Figure 4]

Imaging & diagnostics

Multiple studies assessed lung sequelae and respiratory performance through outpatient visits follow-up (49%, 19/39).[25,31–37,40,42,43,45–48,50,54,55,60] Imaging results were reported in 33% (13/39) [25,31–33,37,40,42,46–48,50,55,60] of the cohort studies, with one including controls,[37] and one including children.[25] Authors used heterogenous measurement techniques, including artificial intelligence and point-of-care ultrasound.[37,48] Studies found abnormal CT results, including consolidation, reticulation, residual ground glass opacity, interstitial thickening, and fibrotic changes. Some of these studies presented comparisons between initial CT findings and those at follow-up, showing improvements overtime in pulmonary clinical measures and radiologic resolutions at serial visits. [31,33,40,42,48]

Pulmonary function tests were reported in 26% (10/39) of studies [31,32,35–37,42,43,45,47,50,55], including spirometry, diffusion capacity, lung volume, and exercise tests. These studies found evidence of altered pulmonary function, most frequently significant reduction of diffusing lung capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO). Across these, the study with the longest follow up, at an average of 186 (175–199) days post-hospital discharge, following up adults (median age 57 (IQR 47–65) years; 52% men) found impaired 6-min walk test in 24–56%, with higher impairment correlating with increased acute phase severity. Using high resolution CT and ultrasonography they detected corresponding lung diffusion impairment in 22% (severity scale 3), 29% (severity scale 4), and 56%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

(scale 5–6). Median CT scores were 3 (IQR 2–5) for severity scale 3, 4 (3–5) for scale 4, and 5 (4–6) for scale 5-6.[65]

Whereas one study assessing thrombotic complications in Covid-19 with a minimum of 90 days follow-up from critical care admission did not detect any post-discharge venous thromboembolism using CT or doppler, in a cohort of 129 patients.[60]

Another study assessed kidney function in people with Covid-19 –associated acute kidney injury (AKI) compared with people with non-Covid-19 associated AKI, and found that Covid-19–related AKI was associated with decreased kidney recovery during outpatient follow-up (median (IQR): 92.9 (52.5-127.7) days).[30]

Risk factors

Exploring the literature, we sought to produce a meta-analysis of risk factors for Long Covid. We found a considerable diversity of reported risk factors, including age, sex, comorbidities, ethnicity, and severity of the acute phase.

Several cohorts (64%, 25/39) assessed whether there was an association between the severity of initial Covid-19, including symptom load, level of hospital care, and need for mechanical ventilation, and the risk of persisting sequelae. An association between female gender and risk of prolonged recovery and post-acute SARS-CoV2 sequelae has been identified in longitudinal studies (20.5%, 8/39), as has the association between presence of pre-existing comorbidity,[34,49,51,57,62,66] age,[26,28,44,49,56,57] and minority ethnicity (e.g. Latinx and unspecified)[34,61].

The heterogeneity in study design and evidence base, limited number of studies including non-hospital cohorts, and lack of control groups limits the statistical conclusions or identification of a case definition at this time. We have summarised the reported significant associations to date (Supplement 14) and suggest that these associations be explored in prospective controlled trials to forward the evidence into long term Covid-19 outcomes in different at-risk populations.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

Our work represents the most comprehensive review of evidence regarding Long Covid yet produced. Accurate to 17 March 2021, this living systematic review captures the breadth of persistent symptoms reported in 39 studies, including over 10,000 people. These data suggest post-acute Covid-19, or Long Covid, is a multifaceted syndrome affecting several organs, across the acute disease severity spectrum. It is predominantly characterised by marked fatigue, weakness, general malaise, breathlessness, cognitive or concentration impairment, and neuromuscular and psychological sequelae. In a proportion of people, it adversely impacts quality of life. Besides the most commonly reported symptoms, there is a diverse array of additional symptoms.

The findings in this review show symptoms and prevalence aligned to current knowledge on long term Covid-19 outcomes. These findings are in line with the ONS statistical estimates of Long Covid in the UK, reporting 13.7% experienced persistent symptoms for 12 or more weeks, with fatigue most commonly reported. ONS also estimated that prevalence rates of self-reported Long Covid were greatest in females and adults (aged 35 to 69 years old). In addition, prevalence rates were greater for those living in the most deprived areas, working in health or social care, and those with a pre-existing health conditions.[6]

Our data indicates that for some people symptoms of long-term sequelae may be attributed to reduced pulmonary diffusion capacities. This is consistent with recent studies reporting reduced lung perfusion using xenon MRI (XeMRI) three to nine months post Covid-19 hospital discharge [67] and using lung function and high-resolution chest CT 12 months post-onset.

Yet, there is no definite evidence into aetiology or underlying risk factors for post-acute Covid-19 syndromes. Endothelial dysfunction, inflammation, and/or autoimmune events triggering chronic inflammation have been suggested.[68] One recent study identified immunological differences in children with PASC (post-acute Covid-19 syndrome), compared to controls that had recovered fully.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Another study identified a high increase in autoantibody reactivities in Covid-19 patients compared to uninfected controls, with a high prevalence of autoantibodies against immunomodulatory proteins including cytokines, chemokines, complement components, and cell surface proteins.[69] Our findings highlight an urgent need for comprehensive assessments including biochemical, immunological, functional and imaging tests (e.g., MRI and SPECT), in a step-by-step approach guided by initial assessments and symptomatology.

A deeper understanding of Long Covid is currently prevented by the limitations of the published literature. The studies included in our review were highly heterogeneous due to differences in their study designs, settings, populations, follow-up time, and symptom ascertainment methods. In addition, studies used inconsistent terminology describing symptoms and limited details and stratification on pre-existing comorbidities, the severity of Covid-19, and treatment methods. This inconsistency and limited reporting partly explain the high degree of variability observed. The lack of case-control studies prevents a direct attribution of symptoms solely to Covid-19; larger prospective studies with matched control groups are needed. We note that there are large, robust prospective cohort studies of hospitalised patients [70] and non-hospitalised people.[71] Simultaneously, qualitative studies are ongoing to better explore the Long Covid patient experience. [72]

The findings have identified several research gaps and priorities. The majority of Long Covid cohorts were conducted in Western Europe on patients recently discharged from hospital. There is a paucity of evidence on the long-term effects of Covid-19 in low to middle income countries and in people who were not hospitalised. Similarly, there were no studies identified focusing on children, despite evidence showing that children and young people are also affected by Long Covid.[73] Additionally, no study stratified by ethnicity or socioeconomic factors, important risk factors for the acute phase. There is an urgent need to identify appropriate comparative control groups and enhance inclusion of children and people from diverse demographics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Our review also highlights a need for standardised and validated Covid-19 research tools to harmonise data collection, improve quality and reduce reporting variability. For instance, fatigue is one of the most commonly reported symptoms of Long Covid. However, the symptom alone is not clearly defined and open to different interpretation and requires validated tool such as the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) graded fatigue scale for robust, objective, and comparative analysis. The International Severe Acute Respiratory and emerging Infection Consortium (ISARIC) has developed open access research tools available to sites globally to facilitate standardisation of data collection, analysis and interpretation for adults and children of an age.[74] We support the broader use of this tool as well as initiatives to standardise outcome measures for Long Covid.

Similarly, our study highlights the need for further research to refine the many circulating interim case definitions and precisely characterise Long Covid, including the potential impacts of variants of concern and vaccination on Long Covid.

As this is a living systematic review, emerging themes from this first version will inform future updates. The LSR will be updated periodically, as new research is published internationally, in order to provide relevant up to date information for clinicians, patients, researchers, policymakers, and health-service commissioners. Version changes will be identified, and previous reports will be archived.

CONCLUSION

This living systematic review summarises published evidence on the spectrum of long term Covid-19 associated symptoms and sequelae (as of 17 March 2021). It is clear that Long Covid affects different populations, with a wide range of symptomatology. Our findings suggest this multi-organ syndrome is characterised by fatigue, weakness, malaise, breathlessness, and concentration impairment, amongst other less frequent symptoms. Currently the strength of the available evidence is limited and prone to bias. The long-term effects of Covid-19, in both hospitalised and non-hospitalised

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

individuals, including children and at-risk populations, should be a priority for future research using standardised and controlled study designs. Robust research is needed to characterise and define Long Covid, identify risk factors and underlying aetiology, in order to inform prevention, rehabilitation, clinical, and public health management to improve recovery and long-term Covid-19 outcomes. This living systematic review will be updated approximately every six months as new evidence emerges for up to two years.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

List of Abbreviations

ADL – Activities of daily living

AKI - Acute kidney injury

COVID-19 – Coronavirus Disease

DCLO – Diffusion capacity for carbon monoxide

ICU – Intensive care unit

IQR – Interquartile Range

ISARIC – International Severe Acute Respiratory and emerging Infection Consortium

LMIC – Low-middle income country

LSR – Living' systematic review

NICE - National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

NIHR – National Institute for Health Research

PTSD – post traumatic stress disorder

RoB – Risk of bias

SARS-CoV-2 – Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2

SD – Standard deviation

VAS- Visual Analogue Scale

DECLARATIONS

Ethics approval and consent to participate.

Not applicable

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Competing interest statement

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years. JCS declares he is an individual living with long-term symptoms of probably Covid-19. All other authors declare no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Funding statement:

This work was supported by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office and Wellcome [215091/Z/18/Z] and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [OPP1209135]. The results presented have been obtained with the financial support of the EU FP7 project PREPARE (602525).

Authors contributions:

MM and CS led on the drafting of the manuscript with contributions from AD, VC, NE, CS, LM, LS, DD CH, MOH, JS, GC, PO, EH. MM, NE, LM, VC, CS critically appraised the studies. VC led on the presentation of the results. CS, MM, VC, LS conceptualised the study, all authors contributed to the final protocol, the interpretation and analysis of the results and reviewed and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgments:

We would like to thank the members of the Long Covid support group, and the ISARIC Global Support Centre.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

List of references

1 WHO. Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection (SARI) when COVID-19 disease is suspected: interim guidance, 13 March 2020. World Health Organization 2020.

2 Callard F, Perego E. How and why patients made Long Covid. *Soc Sci Med* 2021;**268**:113426. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113426

3 Nabavi N. Long covid: How to define it and how to manage it. *BMJ* 2020;**370**. doi:10.1136/bmj.m3489

4 Greenhalgh T, Knight M, A'Court C, *et al.* Management of post-acute covid-19 in primary care. *BMJ* 2020;**370**. doi:10.1136/bmj.m3026

5 NICE. Overview | COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing the long-term effects of COVID-19 | Guidance | NICE. 2020.https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng188 (accessed 5 May 2021).

6 ONS. Prevalence of ongoing symptoms following coronavirus (COVID-19) infection in the UK - Office for National Statistics. 2021.https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/prevalenceofongoingsymptomsfollowingcoronaviruscovid19infectionintheuk/1april2021 (accessed 3 May 2021).

7 Patient Led Research. Report: What Does COVID-19 Recovery Actually Look Like? Patient Led Res. https://patientresearchcovid19.com/research/report-1/ (accessed 29 Oct 2020).

8 Sudre CH, Murray B, Varsavsky T, *et al.* Attributes and predictors of long COVID. *Nat Med* 2021;**27**:626–31. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01292-y

9 Long Covid Support Group. Facebook Groups. https://www.facebook.com/groups/longcovid/ (accessed 29 Oct 2020).

10 NIHR Evidence - Living with Covid19 - Informative and accessible health and care research. https://evidence.nihr.ac.uk/themedreview/living-with-covid19/ (accessed 29 Oct 2020).

11 Callard F, Perego E. How and why patients made Long Covid. *Soc Sci Med* 2020;:113426. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113426

12 Gorna R, MacDermott N, Rayner C, *et al.* Long COVID guidelines need to reflect lived experience. *The Lancet* 2021;**397**:455–7. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32705-7

13 REH-COVER - Rapid living Systematic Reviews. /covid-19/reh-cover-rapid-living-systematic-reviews (accessed 9 Nov 2020).

14 Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, *et al.* Living systematic review: 1. Introduction-the why, what, when, and how. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;**91**:23–30. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.08.010

15 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;**372**:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

16 Michelen M, Sigfrid L, Manoharan L, *et al.* What are the long-term symptoms and complications of COVID-19: a protocol for a living systematic review. *F1000Research* 2020;**9**:1455. doi:10.12688/f1000research.27284.1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

17 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al.* Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;**5**. doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4

18 Michelen M, Jones N, Stavropoulou C. In patients of COVID-19, what are the symptoms and clinical features of mild and moderate cases? CEBM. https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/in-patients-of-covid-19-what-are-the-symptoms-and-clinical-features-of-mild-and-moderate-case/ (accessed 29 Oct 2020).

19 Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, *et al.* Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012;**65**:934–9.

20 Clopper CJ, Pearson ES. The Use of Confidence or Fiducial Limits Illustrated in the Case of the Binomial. *Biometrika* 1934;**26**:404–13. doi:10.2307/2331986

21 Jackson D, Law M, Rücker G, *et al.* The Hartung-Knapp modification for random-effects meta-analysis: A useful refinement but are there any residual concerns? *Stat Med* 2017;**36**:3923–34. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.7411

22 Schwarzer G, Chemaitelly H, Abu-Raddad LJ, *et al.* Seriously misleading results using inverse of Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation in meta-analysis of single proportions. *Res Synth Methods* 2019;**10**:476–83. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1348

23 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;**21**:1539–58. doi:10.1002/sim.1186

24 World Bank Country and Lending Groups – World Bank Data Help Desk. https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups (accessed 4 Dec 2020).

25 Zhang J, Xu J, Zhou S, *et al.* The characteristics of 527 discharged COVID-19 patients undergoing long-term follow-up in China. *Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis* 2021;**104**:685–92. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.01.064

26 Petersen MS, Kristiansen MF, Hanusson KD, *et al.* Long COVID in the Faroe Islands: A Longitudinal Study Among Nonhospitalized Patients. *Clin Infect Dis* Published Online First: 30 November 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1792

27 Nguyen NN, Hoang VT, Lagier J-C, *et al.* Long-term persistence of olfactory and gustatory disorders in COVID-19 patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* Published Online First: 5 January 2021. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.12.021

28 Qu G, Zhen Q, Wang W, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of COVID-19 patients after discharge: A multicenter follow-up study. *J Clin Nurs*;**n/a**. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15733

29 Logue JK, Franko NM, McCulloch DJ, *et al.* Sequelae in Adults at 6 Months After COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;**4**:e210830. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.0830

30 Nugent J, Aklilu A, Yamamoto Y, *et al.* Assessment of Acute Kidney Injury and Longitudinal Kidney Function After Hospital Discharge Among Patients With and Without COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;**4**:e211095. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.1095

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

31 Arnold DT, Hamilton FW, Milne A, *et al.* Patient outcomes after hospitalisation with COVID-19 and implications for follow-up: results from a prospective UK cohort. *Thorax* 2021;**76**:399–401. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-216086

32 Blanco J-R, Cobos-Ceballos M-J, Navarro F, *et al.* Pulmonary long-term consequences of COVID-19 infections after hospital discharge. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2021;**0**. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.02.019

33 Sykes DL, Holdsworth L, Jawad N, *et al.* Post-COVID-19 Symptom Burden: What is Long-COVID and How Should We Manage It? *Lung* 2021;**199**:113–9. doi:10.1007/s00408-021-00423-z

34 Jacobson KB, Rao M, Bonilla H, *et al.* Patients with uncomplicated COVID-19 have long-term persistent symptoms and functional impairment similar to patients with severe COVID-19: a cautionary tale during a global pandemic. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* Published Online First: 7 February 2021. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab103

35 Anastasio F, Barbuto S, Scarnecchia E, *et al.* Medium-term impact of COVID-19 on pulmonary function, functional capacity and quality of life. *Eur Respir J* Published Online First: 11 February 2021. doi:10.1183/13993003.04015-2020

36 Bellan M, Soddu D, Balbo PE, *et al.* Respiratory and Psychophysical Sequelae Among Patients With COVID-19 Four Months After Hospital Discharge. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;**4**:e2036142. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.36142

37 Xu J, Zhou M, Luo P, *et al.* Plasma metabolomic profiling of patients recovered from COVID-19 with pulmonary sequelae 3 months after discharge. *Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am* Published Online First: 17 February 2021. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab147

38 Xiong Q, Xu M, Li J, *et al.* Clinical sequelae of COVID-19 survivors in Wuhan, China: a single-centre longitudinal study. *Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2021;**27**:89–95. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.09.023

39 Weng J, Li Y, Li J, *et al.* Gastrointestinal sequelae 90 days after discharge for COVID-19. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2021;**6**:344–6. doi:10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00076-5

40 Han X, Fan Y, Alwalid O, *et al.* Six-month Follow-up Chest CT Findings after Severe COVID-19 Pneumonia. *Radiology* 2021;**299**:E177–86. doi:10.1148/radiol.2021203153

41 Klein H, Asseo K, Karni N, *et al.* Onset, duration and unresolved symptoms, including smell and taste changes, in mild COVID-19 infection: a cohort study in Israeli patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2021;**27**:769–74. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2021.02.008

42 Sonnweber T, Sahanic S, Pizzini A, *et al.* Cardiopulmonary recovery after COVID-19 – an observational prospective multi-center trial. *Eur Respir J* Published Online First: 1 January 2020. doi:10.1183/13993003.03481-2020

43 Méndez R, Latorre A, González-Jiménez P, *et al.* Reduced Diffusion Capacity in COVID-19 Survivors. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* Published Online First: 20 January 2021. doi:10.1513/AnnalsATS.202011-1452RL

44 Rass V, Beer R, Josef Schiefecker A, *et al.* Neurological outcome and quality of life three months after COVID-19: a prospective observational cohort study. *Eur J Neurol* Published Online First: 7 March 2021. doi:10.1111/ene.14803

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

45 Sibila O, Albacar N, Perea L, *et al.* Lung Function sequelae in COVID-19 Patients 3 Months After Hospital Discharge. *Arch Bronconeumol* 2021;**57**:59–61. doi:10.1016/j.arbres.2021.01.036

46 Zhang D, Zhang C, Li X, *et al.* Thin-section computed tomography findings and longitudinal variations of the residual pulmonary sequelae after discharge in patients with COVID-19: a short-term follow-up study. *Eur Radiol* Published Online First: 11 March 2021. doi:10.1007/s00330-021-07799-9

47 Qin W, Chen S, Zhang Y, *et al.* Diffusion Capacity Abnormalities for Carbon Monoxide in Patients with COVID-19 At Three-Month Follow-up. *Eur Respir J* Published Online First: 11 February 2021. doi:10.1183/13993003.03677-2020

48 Alharthy A, Abuhamdah M, Balhamar A, *et al.* Residual Lung Injury in Patients Recovering From COVID-19 Critical Illness: A Prospective Longitudinal Point-of-Care Lung Ultrasound Study. *J Ultrasound Med*;**n/a**. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/jum.15563

49 Parente-Arias P, Barreira-Fernandez P, Quintana-Sanjuas A, *et al.* Recovery rate and factors associated with smell and taste disruption in patients with coronavirus disease 2019. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2021;**42**:102648. doi:10.1016/j.amjoto.2020.102648

50 L Huang TZ P Zhao, D Tang. Cardiac involvement in patients recovered from COVID-2019 identified using magnetic resonance imaging. *JACC …* Published Online First: 2020.https://imaging.onlinejacc.org/content/early/2020/07/30/j.jcmg.2020.05.004?versioned=true

51 Gherlone EF, Polizzi E, Tetè G, *et al.* Frequent and Persistent Salivary Gland Ectasia and Oral Disease After COVID-19. *J Dent Res* 2021;**100**:464–71. doi:10.1177/0022034521997112

52 Hopkins C, Surda P, Vaira LA, *et al.* Six month follow-up of self-reported loss of smell during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Rhinology* 2021;**59**:26–31. doi:10.4193/Rhin20.544

53 Simani L, Ramezani M, Darazam IA, *et al.* Prevalence and correlates of chronic fatigue syndrome and post-traumatic stress disorder after the outbreak of the COVID-19. *J Neurovirol* 2021;**27**:154–9. doi:10.1007/s13365-021-00949-1

54 Venturelli S, Benatti SV, Casati M, *et al.* Surviving COVID-19 in Bergamo province: a post-acute outpatient re-evaluation. *Epidemiol Infect* 2021;**149**:e32. doi:10.1017/S0950268821000145

55 Lerum TV, Aaløkken TM, Brønstad E, *et al.* Dyspnoea, lung function and CT findings three months after hospital admission for COVID-19. *Eur Respir J* Published Online First: 1 January 2020. doi:10.1183/13993003.03448-2020

56 Taboada M, Cariñena A, Moreno E, *et al.* Post-COVID-19 functional status six-months after hospitalization. *J Infect* 2021;**82**:e31–3. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.12.022

57 Baricich A, Borg MB, Cuneo D, *et al.* Midterm functional sequelae and implications in rehabilitation after COVID19. A cross-sectional study. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2021.

58 Suárez-Robles M, Iguaran-Bermúdez MDR, García-Klepizg JL, *et al.* Ninety days post-hospitalization evaluation of residual COVID-19 symptoms through a phone call check list. *Pan Afr Med J* 2020;**37**:289. doi:10.11604/pamj.2020.37.289.27110

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

59 Garrigues E, Janvier P, Kherabi Y, *et al.* Post-discharge persistent symptoms and health-related quality of life after hospitalization for COVID-19. *J Infect* 2020;**81**:e4–6. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.08.029

60 Doyle AJ, Thomas W, Retter A, *et al.* Updated hospital associated venous thromboembolism outcomes with 90-days follow-up after hospitalisation for severe COVID-19 in two UK critical care units. *Thromb Res* 2020;**196**:454–6. doi:10.1016/j.thromres.2020.10.007

61 Einvik G, Dammen T, Ghanima W, *et al.* Prevalence and Risk Factors for Post-Traumatic Stress in Hospitalized and Non-Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**. doi:10.3390/ijerph18042079

62 Stavem K, Ghanima W, Olsen MK, *et al.* Persistent symptoms 1.5–6 months after COVID-19 in non-hospitalised subjects: a population-based cohort study. *Thorax* 2021;**76**:405–7. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-216377

63 Peters JL. Comparison of Two Methods to Detect Publication Bias in Meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2006;**295**:676. doi:10.1001/jama.295.6.676

64 Garrigues E, Janvier P, Kherabi Y, *et al.* Post-discharge persistent symptoms and health-related quality of life after hospitalization for COVID-19. *J Infect* 2020.

65 Huang C, Huang L, Wang Y, *et al.* 6-month consequences of COVID-19 in patients discharged from hospital: a cohort study. *The Lancet* 2021;**397**:220–32. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32656-8

66 Mazza MG, Palladini M, De Lorenzo R, *et al.* Persistent psychopathology and neurocognitive impairment in COVID-19 survivors: Effect of inflammatory biomarkers at three-month follow-up. *Brain Behav Immun* 2021;**94**:138–47. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2021.02.021

67 Grist JT, Chen M, Collier GJ, *et al.* Hyperpolarized 129Xe MRI Abnormalities in Dyspneic Participants 3 Months after COVID-19 Pneumonia: Preliminary Results. *Radiology* 2021;:210033. doi:10.1148/radiol.2021210033

68 Nalbandian A, Sehgal K, Gupta A, *et al.* Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome. *Nat Med* 2021;**27**:601–15. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z

69 Wang EY, Mao T, Klein J, *et al.* Diverse Functional Autoantibodies in Patients with COVID-19. *Nature* Published Online First: 19 May 2021. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03631-y

70 PHOSP. http://phosp.org (accessed 9 Nov 2020).

71 de Lusignan S, Lopez Bernal J, Zambon M, *et al.* Emergence of a Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19): Protocol for Extending Surveillance Used by the Royal College of General Practitioners Research and Surveillance Centre and Public Health England. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* 2020;**6**. doi:10.2196/18606

72 Ladds E, Rushforth A, Wieringa S, *et al.* Persistent symptoms after Covid-19: qualitative study of 114 “long Covid” patients and draft quality criteria for services. *medRxiv* 2020;:2020.10.13.20211854. doi:10.1101/2020.10.13.20211854

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

73 Counting long covid in children. The BMJ. 2020.https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2020/10/16/counting-long-covid-in-children/ (accessed 29 Oct 2020).

74 COVID-19 Long term protocol & survey. ISARIC. https://isaric.org/research/covid-19-clinical-research-resources/covid-19-long-term-follow-up-study/ (accessed 24 Nov 2020).

	N of study	n/N	Proportion (95% CI)	I^2 (%)	RoB (%)
Systemic					
Fatigue	n = 17	2207/6039	30.97 (23.91 to 39.03)	97.99	
Weakness	n = 2	186/ 513	41.20 (25.43 to 59.01)	96.02	
Fever	n = 7	47/3624	1.08 (0.24 to 4.66)	91.35	
Sweat or night sweats	n = 2	162/ 683	23.72 (20.68 to 27.05)	0	
Enlarged lymph nodes/ Lymphadenopathy	n = 1	4/ 451	0.89 (0.24 to 2.26)	NA	
General malaise	n = 2	292/ 672	32.68 (14.91 to 57.36)	97.34	
Dizziness	n = 5	162/3141	4.50 (2.53 to 7.86)	77.3	
Cardiopulmonary					
Breathlessness/ Exertional dyspnoea	n = 20	1297/5523	25.06 (17.86 to 33.97)	96.1	
Chest pain	n = 11	308/4878	6.36 (3.15 to 12.42)	93.21	
Cough	n = 16	414/5031	8.17 (4.85 to 13.44)	93.68	
Excessive sputum/ Expectoration	n = 6	113/1949	5.46 (3.19 to 9.19)	83.32	
Palpitations	n = 8	476/4778	9.67 (5.95 to 15.34)	93.89	
Flushing	n = 1	26/ 538	4.83 (3.18 to 7.00)	NA	
Newly diagnosed hypertension	n = 1	7/ 538	1.30 (0.52 to 2.66)	NA	
Other cardiovascular symptoms	n = 3	79/1952	1.38 (0.01 to 67.44)	96.8	
Upper Respiratory					
Sore throat	n = 5	127/2896	4.70 (2.42 to 8.91)	82.11	
Nasal congestion	n = 3	50/1003	4.99 (2.73 to 8.92)	0	
Voice change	n = 1	11/ 134	8.21 (4.17 to 14.21)	NA	
Other respiratory symptoms	n = 3	253/1111	15.58 (0.68 to 83.17)	98.21	
Gastrointestinal					
Nausea or Vomiting	n = 4	49/ 821	6.69 (1.64 to 23.59)	91.22	
Diarrhoea	n = 10	190/3925	4.00 (2.07 to 7.57)	81.37	
Loss of appetite	n = 3	202/1906	17.49 (4.13 to 51.04)	96.73	
Stomach/ Abdominal pain	n = 4	30/1427	2.33 (0.54 to 9.42)	83.22	
Other stomach/ Abdominal discomfort	n = 1	21/ 117	17.95 (11.47 to 26.12)	NA	
Weight loss	n = 2	97/ 568	20.99 (8.09 to 44.51)	97.79	
Bloody stools / Haematochezia	n = 1	2/ 117	1.71 (0.21 to 6.04)	NA	
Musculoskeletal					
Muscle pain/ Myalgia	n = 12	378/4782	11.29 (6.17 to 19.75)	97.1	
Joint pain/ Arthralgia	n = 9	437/3960	9.39 (5.72 to 15.03)	94.24	
Impaired mobility	n = 6	323/2866	14.42 (4.67 to 36.73)	98.17	
Neurological and neuromuscular					
Headache	n = 11	227/4535	4.88 (2.30 to 10.06)	94.88	
Tremors	n = 3	42/1124	3.53 (0.30 to 30.63)	89.14	
Seizures/ Cramps	n = 1	6/ 451	1.33 (0.49 to 2.87)	NA	
Slowness of movement/ Bradykinesia	n = 1	7/ 135	5.19 (2.11 to 10.39)	NA	
Lack of coordination/ Dysmetria	n = 1	2/ 135	1.48 (0.18 to 5.25)	NA	
Muscle atrophy	n = 1	9/ 135	6.67 (3.09 to 12.28)	NA	
Abnormal muscle tone	n = 1	6/ 135	4.44 (1.65 to 9.42)	NA	
Walking/ Gait abnormality	n = 3	34/ 809	4.20 (2.02 to 8.53)	0	
Taste disturbance	n = 17	687/5423	13.52 (8.96 to 19.89)	96.75	
Smell disturbance	n = 19	842/5668	15.17 (10.75 to 20.97)	96.2	
Ear/ Hearing conditions	n = 1	5/ 451	1.11 (0.36 to 2.57)	NA	
Visual disturbance	n = 2	28/ 586	4.78 (3.32 to 6.83)	26.01	
Speech difficulty/ Dysarthria	n = 1	3/ 135	2.22 (0.46 to 6.36)	NA	
Decreased sensation or sensibility	n = 2	30/ 269	10.90 (6.71 to 17.22)	71.76	
Tingling/ Parasthesia	n = 2	33/ 257	9.12 (2.21 to 30.87)	93.07	
Trigeminal neuralgia	n = 1	4/ 122	3.28 (0.90 to 8.18)	NA	
Abnormal reflex status	n = 1	31/ 135	22.96 (16.17 to 30.98)	NA	
Other neurological diseases	n = 1	20/ 135	14.81 (9.29 to 21.95)	NA	
Psychological and social					
Anxiety	n = 7	650/3551	18.73 (8.89 to 35.25)	97.2	
Depression	n = 6	485/3662	8.06 (4.14 to 15.10)	97.45	
Sleep disorder	n = 9	742/3442	18.15 (9.61 to 31.63)	93.87	
PTSD	n = 6	329/2057	9.14 (3.66 to 21.04)	96.44	
Low mood/ Dysphoria	n = 3	62/ 898	1.79 (0.00 to 98.74)	97.83	
Reduced quality of life	n = 3	340/ 807	36.76 (18.43 to 59.93)	91.07	
Care dependency	n = 3	160/2555	5.89 (0.46 to 45.96)	98.37	
Neurocognitive					
Memory impairment	n = 5	151/ 886	17.94 (5.26 to 46.25)	95.08	
Concentration impairment	n = 2	66/ 254	25.98 (20.96 to 31.73)	0	
Confusion	n = 2	33/1218	2.71 (1.93 to 3.79)	0	
Frontal release signs	n = 1	20/ 135	14.81 (9.29 to 21.95)	NA	
Other cognitive impairment	n = 3	122/ 441	17.77 (0.08 to 98.23)	98.68	
Other					
Skin rash	n = 4	67/2374	2.83 (0.95 to 8.16)	80.76	
Hair loss	n = 5	563/2810	14.34 (5.33 to 33.23)	94.64	
Conjunctivitis	n = 1	8/ 451	1.77 (0.77 to 3.47)	NA	





medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

	Population	N of study	n/N	Proportion (95% CI)	I^2 (%)	p−value
Systemic						
Fatigue	Non−hospitalised	n = 4	200/ 813	24.60 (20.11 to 29.72)	0	0.012
	Hospitalised	n = 11	1762/4147	37.10 (26.54 to 49.06)	98.23	
Fever	Non−hospitalised	n = 3	25/ 981	1.41 (0.06 to 24.82)	84.73	0.702
	Hospitalised	n = 4	17/1876	0.85 (0.02 to 24.20)	92.05	
Dizziness	Hospitalised	n = 2	115/2193	4.21 (0.08 to 71.53)	89.39	0.189
	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	29/ 434	6.68 (4.68 to 9.45)	NA	
Cardiopulmonary						
Breathlessness/ Exertional dyspnoea	Non−hospitalised	n = 4	151/1084	13.72 (8.51 to 21.37)	72.13	0.003
	Hospitalised	n = 14	765/3148	28.68 (18.48 to 41.64)	96.19	
Chest pain	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	14/ 96	14.58 (8.83 to 23.13)	NA	0.043
	Hospitalised	n = 9	225/3636	5.92 (2.45 to 13.63)	92.86	
Cough	Non−hospitalised	n = 3	61/ 981	5.95 (1.53 to 20.50)	56.24	0.15
	Hospitalised	n = 11	299/2769	10.52 (5.93 to 17.98)	93.05	
Excessive sputum/ Expectoration	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	16/ 451	3.55 (2.18 to 5.71)	NA	0.112
	Hospitalised	n = 5	97/1498	6.02 (3.20 to 11.03)	82.16	
Palpitations	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	7/ 96	7.29 (3.52 to 14.51)	NA	0.181
	Hospitalised	n = 6	416/3536	12.43 (7.78 to 19.29)	91.7	
Upper Respiratory						
Sore throat	Non−hospitalised	n = 2	24/ 547	4.39 (0.32 to 39.44)	0	0.815
	Hospitalised	n = 4	103/2349	4.81 (1.60 to 13.60)	85.83	
Nasal congestion	Hospitalised	n = 1	1/ 22	4.55 (0.64 to 26.15)	NA	0.924
	Non−hospitalised	n = 3	49/ 981	4.99 (2.72 to 8.99)	0	
Other respiratory symptoms	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	13/ 451	2.88 (1.68 to 4.90)	NA	<0.001
	Hospitalised	n = 2	240/ 660	32.43 (2.22 to 91.02)	88.57	
Gastrointestinal						
Nausea or Vomiting	Non−hospitalised	n = 2	16/ 547	3.66 (0.00 to 98.24)	89.91	0.771
	Hospitalised	n = 2	21/ 139	5.84 (0.00 to 100.00)	0	
Diarrhoea	Non−hospitalised	n = 3	40/ 981	4.16 (0.72 to 20.65)	84.27	0.573
	Hospitalised	n = 7	138/2809	2.93 (0.90 to 9.12)	81.91	
Stomach/ Abdominal pain	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	15/ 451	3.33 (2.01 to 5.44)	NA	0.475
	Hospitalised	n = 2	10/ 209	4.63 (0.03 to 89.20)	54.79	
Weight loss	Hospitalised	n = 1	50/ 134	37.31 (29.55 to 45.79)	NA	<0.001
	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	47/ 434	10.83 (8.23 to 14.12)	NA	
Musculoskeletal						
Muscle pain/ Myalgia	Non−hospitalised	n = 2	51/ 547	10.76 (0.24 to 85.64)	85.87	0.768
	Hospitalised	n = 7	199/2819	12.46 (4.30 to 31.09)	98.05	
Joint pain/ Arthralgia	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	42/ 451	9.31 (6.95 to 12.36)	NA	0.987
	Hospitalised	n = 8	395/3509	9.36 (5.25 to 16.14)	94.81	
Neurological and neuromuscular						
Headache	Non−hospitalised	n = 4	116/1161	8.82 (4.41 to 16.85)	86.25	0.106
	Hospitalised	n = 5	71/2093	2.98 (0.47 to 16.53)	96.56	
Tremors	Hospitalised	n = 1	25/ 538	4.65 (3.16 to 6.79)	NA	0.002
	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	4/ 451	0.89 (0.33 to 2.34)	NA	
Taste disturbance	Non−hospitalised	n = 5	258/1264	16.83 (7.91 to 32.26)	95.66	0.199
	Hospitalised	n = 8	232/2550	11.07 (6.90 to 17.28)	89.1	
Smell disturbance	Non−hospitalised	n = 5	324/1264	22.19 (11.69 to 38.04)	96.3	0.035
	Hospitalised	n = 9	308/2660	12.16 (7.98 to 18.10)	85.48	
Psychological and social						
PTSD	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	32/ 455	7.03 (5.02 to 9.78)	NA	0.216
	Hospitalised	n = 3	59/ 474	10.52 (3.06 to 30.44)	80.04	
Neurocognitive						
Memory impairment	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	15/ 96	15.62 (9.64 to 24.32)	NA	0.001
	Hospitalised	n = 3	96/ 276	34.78 (23.64 to 47.88)	0	
Other						
Skin rash	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	7/ 451	1.55 (0.74 to 3.22)	NA	0.112
	Hospitalised	n = 3	60/1923	3.53 (0.75 to 15.11)	82.97	
Hair loss	Non−hospitalised	n = 1	10/ 96	10.42 (5.70 to 18.29)	NA	0.006
	Hospitalised	n = 4	541/2335	23.54 (17.68 to 30.61)	74.84	



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.08.20246025 ; this version posted May 31, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .