medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Post-viral parenchymal lung disease of COVID-19 and viral pneumonitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis.

Laura Fabbri[1,2,3], Samuel Moss[1,2], Fasihul Khan[1,2], Wenjie Chi[4], Jun Xia[5], Karen Robinson[6], Alan Smyth[2,7], Gisli Jenkins[1,2,3], Iain Stewart[1,2,3]

1. Division of Respiratory Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.
2. Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre, National Institute for Health Research, UK
3. National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, London, UK.
4. Systematic Review Solutions Ltd, Ingenuity Centre, Nottingham, UK
5. Institute of Mental Health, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
6. Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, US
7. Division of Child Health, Obstetrics & Gynaecology, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

Correspondence to:

Dr Iain Stewart, iain.stewart@imperial.ac.uk

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42020183139

Date of registration: 30th April 2020

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Approximately half of patients discharged following COVID-19 related hospitalisation are reported to suffer from persisting respiratory symptoms. We assess the prevalence of long term radiological and functional pulmonary sequelae in survivors from COVID-19 and other viral pneumonia in published literature.

Methods: We performed systematic review and meta-analysis of all original studies in adults admitted to hospital with SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV, or Influenza pneumonia and followed within 12 months from discharge. Searches were run on MEDLINE and Embase, with the last update on 1st March 2021. Primary outcomes were presence of 1) radiologic sequelae at CT scans; 2) restrictive impairment; 3) reduced diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO). This review is registered on PROSPERO, CRD42020183139.

Results: Sixty studies were included for qualitative synthesis, of which 41 were suitable for meta-analysis. On follow up CT scans, the overall estimated proportion was 0·56 (95%CI 0·44 to 0·66, I^2= 94·44%) for inflammatory changes, and 0·40 (95%CI 0·29 to 0·52, I^2=95·19%) for fibrotic findings. In SARS-CoV-2 specifically, proportions were estimated at 0·43 (95%CI 0·32 to 0·56, I^2=94.60%) and 0·30 (95%CI 0·19 to 0·43, I^2=94.89%) for inflammatory and fibrotic findings, respectively. Overall proportion for restrictive impairment was 0·19 (95%CI 0·12 to 0·27, I^2=94·46%), DLCO reduction was estimated at 0·45 (95%CI 0·38 to 0·52, I^2=90·10). Elevated radiological and functional estimates persisted across follow-up times. Confidence in the estimates was deemed very low as studies were largely observational without control groups, heterogeneity in estimates was high but was not clearly attributable to between-study differences of severity or design.

Conclusion: Although estimates of prevalence are likely limited by differences in case mix and initial severity, a substantial proportion of radiological and functional sequelae are observed following viral pneumonitis, including COVID-19. This highlights the importance of vigilant radiological and functional follow up.

Funding: National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

COVID-19, the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, was declared a global pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on 11th March 2020,[1] since then over 118 million individuals have been infected with approximately 2.6 million deaths (March 2021).[2] Whilst there has been substantial mortality, the vast majority of people have survived the acute infection with many people experiencing long term symptoms, so-called Long COVID.[3,4] Emerging data suggest that approximately half of COVID-19 survivors experience ongoing breathlessness in the months following infection.[3,5,6] Chronic breathlessness can suggest the development of pulmonary fibrosis, a potentially life limiting disease with substantial morbidity. Fibrotic lung disease has been reported follow previous coronavirus infections such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, caused by SARS-CoV in 2002, and the Middle East respiratory syndrome, caused by MERS-CoV in 2012.[7-9] Similarly, Influenza viruses, including those leading to epidemics such as H1N1 in 1918 and 2009, H2N2 in 1957, H3N2 in 1968, H5N1 in 2005, and H7N9 in 2013, have also been proposed to promote the development of pulmonary fibrosis although systematic evidence is lacking.[10,11]

Pulmonary fibrosis is characterised by the development of fibrotic tissue in the alveolar parenchyma and can occur after lung injury. In some cases, such as Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS), the insult may be clear and resulting fibrosis does not progress after the acute phase, whilst in other cases the trigger is less apparent but the fibrosis is progressive. Although viral agents are considered important insults with scientific rationale to implicate their role in disease pathogenesis, empirical evidence that suggests they can promote progressive pulmonary fibrosis is limited.[12 13]

Given the exceptional rate of COVID-19 spread and the longer-term impact on survivors' quality of life, particularly breathlessness, we undertook a systematic review and meta-analysis to assess the prevalence and characteristics of radiological and functional sequelae following viral pneumonia. We focus on respiratory viruses that have been associated with severe viral pneumonitis during previous epidemics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Search strategy and selection criteria

The systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted in accordance with a protocol registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) on 30th April 2020 (registration number CRD42020183139). The review has been reported following PRISMA guidelines[14].

All original studies and research letters reporting outcomes in hospitalized adult patients (aged >18) with presumed or confirmed viral infection by SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV or Influenza viruses were considered eligible for inclusion. No language criteria were applied. Pre-prints, commentaries, expert opinions, editorials, conference abstracts, and non-original studies were excluded.

The pre-specified primary outcomes within 12 months of hospitalisation were: 1) presence of radiologic sequelae at follow-up CT scans; 2) presence of restrictive lung function impairment; 3) presence of reduced diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO). Radiological sequelae were defined as inflammatory (ground-glass opacification, consolidation) or fibrotic (reticulation, lung architectural distortion, interlobular septal thickening, traction bronchiectasis, honeycombing). Restrictive lung impairment was defined as a total lung capacity (TLC) <80% predicted value or forced vital capacity (FVC) < 80% predicted value with normal-to-high FEV1/FVC ratio. Reduced DLCO was defined as percent predicted DLCO < 80%.

Studies were identified by searching MEDLINE (1946 to latest), Embase (1974 to latest), and Google Scholar. In addition, hand searches were conducted of the reference lists of eligible primary studies, and relevant review articles. Searches were last updated on 1st of March 2021. Searches were carried out using patient-related, treatment-related, and outcomes-related terms (Supplementary Figure 1). Two reviewers (LF, FK) screened the records by titles and abstracts, followed by full-text review. Disagreements between reviewers were resolved by consensus, with unsolved conflicts determined by a third reviewer (IS). Non-English language records were screened by appropriate native speakers (WC).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data analysis

Data from the selected articles were extracted using a pre-defined proforma independently by reviewers and mutually confirmed (LF, SM, WC). Case reports and case series with fewer than ten cases were excluded from quantitative synthesis owing to the inherent risk of selection bias. Extracted data included study design, viral agent and methods of diagnosis, participant demographics (age, gender, smoking status), ventilatory requirements and CT and lung function findings at both baseline and follow-up. Baseline investigations were defined as those performed during hospitalization, and follow-up as obtained after discharge; baseline data were only extracted where studies reported follow-up. If more than one follow-up visit was reported, the latest examination within 12 months from discharge was extracted. For quantitative synthesis, follow up visits performed within 4 weeks of discharge were categorised as 1 month, subsequent timepoints within three months were categorised as 3 months, similarly for 6 and 12 months.

All selected studies were included in the narrative or qualitative synthesis, with summary tables for study characteristics. Where available, CT findings and pulmonary function tests (PFTs) were extracted or calculated for quantitative synthesis. Where data were not reported in the text, we contacted corresponding authors and estimated values from figures (Plot Digitizer; Free Software Foundation). Absolute values of the number of people meeting outcome criteria and number of people with exam results available were extracted as numerator and denominator, respectively. Meta-analyses of proportions were performed where sufficient studies reported data, studies were excluded where descriptive proportions could not be extracted. Analyses were performed exclusively on observational, descriptive data, and no separation according to prospective study design was applied. Separate analyses were performed according to the type of radiological (inflammatory, fibrotic) or physiological (restrictive impairment, reduced DLCO) change and subsequently by viral agent (SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV, Influenza), with summary estimates also provided by follow up time (1 month, 3 months, 6 months, 12 months). Quantitative synthesis and random effect meta-analysis were performed in Stata SE16 (TX: StataCorp LLC) using the metaprop command, which computes 95% confidence intervals based on binomial distribution and applies the Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation to support inclusion of observations of 0% and 100%.[15] Heterogeneity was assessed

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

with I^2, we report all estimates regardless of statistical heterogeneity. Where study numbers were low in subgroups of three or less, summary estimates and heterogeneity could not be computed. Significant heterogeneity between subgroup estimates was defined as a p-value ≤0.05.

The risk of bias in individual studies was assessed by two authors independently using appropriate assessment tools available from the CLARITY Group at McMaster University,[16] through criteria specific for study design. As none of the included studies had an unexposed control group, tools were adapted. For cohort studies we assessed exposure, the outcomes of interest, prognostic factors, interventions, adequacy of follow-up, and co-interventions. Randomised controlled trials were included if they reported our pre-specified outcomes and were evaluated for adequacy of follow up, selective reporting, and other possible causes of risks of bias. Any disagreements were resolved by consensus, or by decision of a third reviewer if necessary. All studies were included, regardless of their risk of bias score.

The quality of the evidence was evaluated using the GRADE guidance.[17] Retrospective observational studies were considered weak but could be upgraded, whilst randomised controlled trials were deemed to be strong and could be downgraded. Analytical and publication risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, and imprecision were assessed. An overall judgement of 'high', 'moderate', 'low', or 'very low' was provided for the quality of the cumulative evidence for review outcomes.

Role of the funding source

The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

A total of 5549 records were identified from databases and bibliography searches. After title and abstract screening, 88 unique full-text manuscripts were assessed for eligibility, and 60 were included for qualitative synthesis (54 in English, 6 in Chinese). A total of 41 studies were included in the quantitative synthesis (Figure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1). Among the manuscripts included, 25 reported infections by SARS-CoV-2;[5,18-41] 18 by SARS-CoV;[8,9,42-57] 1 by MERS-CoV;[58] 16 by Influenza (11 subtype H1N1, 1 subtype H5N1, 1 subtype H3N2, 2 subtype H7N9 and 1 study both H1N1 and H7N9).[59-74] All studies were observational in design and included case reports and case series, with the exception of a single randomised control trial.[55] Individual studies' characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Risk of bias assessment identified a number of limitations and possible causes of biases. Albeit the majority of the studies listed the diagnostic tests used to assess the viral infections, 15 did not specify whether any serological or molecular testing was performed, referring to national guidelines at the time the study was conducted.[8,21,23,34,35,38,42-45,50,54,55,60,65] Inclusion and exclusion criteria differed among studies, indicating that the severity of patients enrolled and possible interventions administered were inconsistent, which represent a possible selection bias. Few studies reported the presence of previous respiratory diseases or mechanical ventilation as exclusion criteria;[21,36] others were restricted to include only symptomatic patients or perform follow-up CT where there was a clinical indication, such as abnormalities on the chest X-Ray (CXR) or if the DLCO was reduced.[9,22,31,47] In each study, we can be confident in the assessment of the proportion of people with the outcomes of interest (Supplementary Tables 1-2, Supplementary Figure 2).

A total of 43 studies described thoracic CT finding, and 28 were included in meta-analysis of radiological outcome. Causes of exclusion are listed in Figure 1. The median follow-up time was 3 months (range 1-12). Within 12 months from discharge, the overall estimated proportion of chest CT inflammatory findings was 0·56 (95% CI 0·45 to 0·66. I^2= 94·44%) on a total of 1727 CT scans, whilst fibrotic findings had an estimated prevalence of 0·40 (95% CI 0·29 to 0·52. I^2=95·08%) assessed on 1625 exams. Severe heterogeneity was observed overall, within summary estimates by viral agent, and between viral agents (Figure 2). When stratified by viral agent, the proportion of patients with inflammatory sequelae was 0·43 (95% CI 0·32 to 0·56. I^2=94·60%), 0·81 (95% CI 0·58 to 0·97. I^2=91·84%), and 0·61 (95% CI 0·27 to 0·90. I^2=93·29%) following SARS-CoV2, SARS-CoV and Influenza infections, respectively. Estimates of fibrotic sequelae were 0·30 (95% CI 0·19 to 0·43. I^2=94·89%), 0·66 (95% CI 0·43 to 0·86. I^2=92·83%), and 0·27 (95% CI 0·15 to 0·40. I^2= 57·06%, p=0·07) following SARS-CoV2, SARS-CoV and Influenza infections, respectively (Figure 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A further subgroup analysis according to reported follow up time was performed for SARS-CoV-2 specifically (Figure 3). Inflammatory changes were observed in 0·93 of patients at baseline (95% CI 0·87 to 0·97. I2=90·92%), falling to 0·54 (95% CI 0·45 to 0·63. I2=51·68% p=0·10) within one month of discharge, 0·35 (95% CI 0·15 to 0·58) and 0·49 (95% CI 0·28 to 0.70) at three months and six months, respectively. Significant heterogeneity was observed between subgroup estimates of follow up time (p<0·0001). In contrast, fibrotic estimates were 0·27 (95% CI 0·07 to 0·53. I^2=98·17%) at baseline, with similar proportions observed at one, three and six months of follow up and no significant heterogeneity between subgroup estimates (p=0·536). In follow up time subgroup analysis of other viral agents, a similar temporal evolution according to radiological subtype was observed in a limited number of Influenza studies, whilst high proportions of both inflammatory and fibrotic sequelae were reported across follow up times in the majority of SARS-CoV studies (Supplementary Figure 3).

Lung function sequelae were described in a total of 45 papers, with 25 reaching criteria for inclusion in quantitative synthesis, and a total sample of 2202 for restrictive impairment and 2185 for DLCO reduction. Follow-up lung function tests were performed at a median of 3 months after discharge (range 1-12). The overall estimated proportion of individuals with restrictive impairment during follow-up was 0·19 (95% CI 0·12 to 0·27. I^2=94·46%), which was similar across viral agent subgroup with estimated proportion for SARS-CoV-2 at 0·21 (95% CI 0·12 to 0·33. I^2=95·59%), 0·15 (95% CI 0·07 to 0·24. I^2=88·5%) for SARS-CoV, and 0·15 (95% CI 0·04 to 0·42) for Influenza (Figure 4). Heterogeneity between viral agent subgroup was not significant (p=0·206). The overall proportion of individuals with a reduction in DLCO during follow-up was estimated at 0·45 (95% CI 0·38 to 0·52. I^2=90·10) with the SARS-CoV-2 estimate at 0·45 (95% CI 0·34 to 0·56. I^2=92·45%), similar for SARS-CoV at 0·41 (95% CI 0·30 to 0·52. I^2=86·8%) and higher in influenza (0·58, 95% CI 0·26 to 0·87), although the heterogeneity between viral agent subgroups was not significant (p=0·403). One study reported lung function data in MERS-CoV follow-up, which showed similar proportions to other viral agents. Heterogeneity in the overall estimate and within subgroup summary estimates was high for both restrictive impairment and reduced DLCO.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In subgroup analysis by follow up time, the majority of restrictive impairment observed within one and three months had resolved by 12 months (0·07 95% CI 0·04 to 0·11) with significant heterogeneity observed between subgroup estimates of follow up time (p=0.008). Similarly, the proportion of patients with a reduced DLCO appeared to reduce over follow up time with significant heterogeneity between subgroups (p=0.017), but still remained elevated at twelve months (0·39 95% CI 0·24 to 0·55. I^2=89·88%) (Figure 5).

As subgroup estimates of viral agent and timing of follow up showed high levels of heterogeneity we additionally explored whether patient severity or study design features (where reported) were significant sources (Supplementary Figures 4-11). In overall analysis of all viral agents, we observed no significant between-group heterogeneity according to prospective study design for any outcome tested. Inclusion of ventilated patients at study-level suggested larger estimates in more severe cohorts but significant heterogeneity was only observed for estimates of restrictive impairment (p=0.006), with similar findings where people with ARDS were included but heterogeneity between groups did not reach significance. In SARS-CoV-2 studies, estimates were frequently larger in prospective study designs compared to retrospective, with significant heterogeneity between groups for estimates of reduced DLCO (p=0.003). Estimates of outcomes were frequently larger in SARS-CoV-2 studies reporting on ventilated patients or people with ARDS, with significant between group heterogeneity observed for fibrotic findings (p=0.034 and p<0.001, respectively). Similarly, estimates of proportion in SARS-CoV-2 were frequently larger in cohorts with a median age of 50 or over, or over 50% male. Limited study numbers precluded further stratification beyond viral agent and follow up time.

Based on the GRADE framework, we report the confidence in estimates as very low for all outcomes. All studies included in the quantitative synthesis had an observational design and moderate risk of bias as possible confounding factors were not extensively assessed and could not be modelled in estimates of proportion. Inconsistency between studies was considered high due to the considerable statistical heterogeneity (I^2>90%) and wide confidence intervals of the summary estimates. No causes of indirectness were detected since all study subjects had confirmed viral pneumonia, although severity and eligibility criteria were inconsistent. We judged the risk of imprecision as moderate, due to the possible influence of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

sample size on proportion. Risk of publication bias was evaluated based on timing of publication from the epidemic outbreak, and was deemed moderate as most papers were published within 12 months from their outbreak, which may influence research integrity and reproducibility, while 13 manuscripts were published after 12 months or more (Supplementary Table 3).

Discussion

To our knowledge this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the prevalence of radiological and functional consequences post-hospitalisation for viral pneumonitis, particularly for that caused by SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV, and Influenza. Heterogeneity in summary estimates was frequently considerable and therefore results should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, this study demonstrates that a considerable proportion of patients discharged following viral pneumonitis, who received a follow up CT scan or underwent lung function tests, had evidence consistent with lung parenchymal abnormalities in all viral agent subgroups. Furthermore, radiological and functional characteristics of pulmonary fibrosis remained elevated over increasing follow-up time. We demonstrate that parenchymal lung damage by viral insult may be common and has the potential to explain a substantial proportion of Long COVID related breathlessness.

A high proportion of inflammatory findings such as ground glass opacities and consolidation were observed at baseline in COVID-19 and Influenza, consistent with the radiological signs commonly described in literature for viral pneumonitis,[75,76] however these inflammatory consequences of viral infections tended to reduce over the course of follow-up. Although features of pulmonary fibrosis were present less frequently, observed in approximately 20% of tested individuals with COVID-19 or influenza, fibrotic sequelae were still observed in a similar proportion of people across follow up times, suggesting that the pulmonary fibrosis associated with viral pneumonitis does not resolve substantially in the first year following infection. Moreover, radiological and functional sequelae have also been described up to five years after Influenza infections,[10,71,77] and up to fifteen years after SARS-CoV.[8,78,79]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The proportion of functional tests performed indicated approximately one quarter of participants had restrictive impairment in the acute phase of recovery, however considerably more had impaired DLCO regardless of viral aetiology. Subsequent time points demonstrated improved restrictive impairment, although the proportion of tests reporting a reduced DLCO remained high, affecting approximately 40% of patients 12 months following infection. In individuals with SARS-CoV-2, it has been shown that TLC and DLCO impairment are significantly different between categories of infection severity,[21,23,24,34,80] with similar findings reported in SARS-CoV.[46,52]

There are a number of limitations associated with this review. As our search strategy focused on follow-up, the number of included articles that reported baseline findings was limited, particularly regarding SARS-CoV infection, whilst contemporary SARS-CoV-2 papers had limited follow-up length. Furthermore, estimates of proportion are based on the number of tests performed, and not patients infected, which could be affected by selection bias. Similarly, estimates represent people hospitalised with infection, which may not reflect prevalence in non-hospitalised cases. Caution is required in interpreting overall and summary estimates as heterogeneity in estimated proportions was frequently considerable, which was not completely attributable to the study-level features evaluated. It is likely that variability in case mix and severity within studies contributes to the heterogeneity between them, which may be addressed by individual patient data approaches. We defined radiological sequelae extracted from studies regarded to be attributable to inflammatory and fibrotic responses, however these were not always reported specifically or exclusively, and there are limitations of our predefined radiological outcomes. Ground-glass opacities do not necessarily reflect inflammation and could also reflect retractile fibrosis during follow up. Unfortunately, it is not possible to discriminate between the two without histopathology. Internationally standardised approaches to reporting of post-COVID radiological change would support patient management and epidemiological study.

We have demonstrated the presence of substantial radiological and functional sequelae following viral pneumonias in the published literature, comprising over 1600 CT scans and over 2000 lung function tests. These parenchymal sequelae of viral infection are likely to have a considerable clinical impact given the large numbers of people discharged from hospital with COVID-19. Whilst the certainty of the presented estimates

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

is very low, they justify vigilant radiological and functional follow up of individuals hospitalised with viral pneumonia.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Bibliography

1. WHO. General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 2020.
2. WHO. Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). https://covid19.who.int/.
3. Carfi A, Bernabei R, Landi F, Gemelli Against C-P-ACSG. Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *Jama* 2020; **324**(6): 603-5.
4. Stavem K, Ghanima W, Olsen MK, Gilboe HM, Einvik G. Persistent symptoms 1.5-6 months after COVID-19 in non-hospitalised subjects: a population-based cohort study. *Thorax* 2020: thoraxjnl-2020-216377.
5. 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* 2020: thoraxjnl-2020-216086.
6. Mandal S, Barnett J, Brill SE, et al. 'Long-COVID': a cross-sectional study of persisting symptoms, biomarker and imaging abnormalities following hospitalisation for COVID-19. *Thorax* 2020: thoraxjnl-2020-215818.
7. Das KM, Lee EY, Singh R, et al. Follow-up chest radiographic findings in patients with MERS-CoV after recovery. *Indian J Radiol Imaging* 2017; **27**(3): 342-9.
8. Wu X, Dong D, Ma D. Thin-Section Computed Tomography Manifestations During Convalescence and Long-Term Follow-Up of Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). *Med Sci Monit* 2016; **22**: 2793-9.
9. Xie L, Liu Y, Fan B, et al. Dynamic changes of serum SARS-coronavirus IgG, pulmonary function and radiography in patients recovering from SARS after hospital discharge. *Respir Res* 2005; **6**: 5.
10. Xing ZH, Sun X, Xu L, et al. Thin-section computed tomography detects long-term pulmonary sequelae 3 years after novel influenza A virus-associated pneumonia. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2015; **128**(7): 902-8.
11. Qiao J, Zhang M, Bi J, et al. Pulmonary fibrosis induced by H5N1 viral infection in mice. *Respir Res* 2009; **10**(1): 107.
12. Jenkins G. Demystifying pulmonary fibrosis. *Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol* 2020; **319**(3): L554-L9.
13. Jolly L, Stavrou A, Vanderstoken G, et al. Influenza promotes collagen deposition via alphavbeta6 integrin-mediated transforming growth factor beta activation. *J Biol Chem* 2014; **289**(51): 35246-63.
14. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *Bmj* 2009; **339**: b2700.
15. Nyaga VN, Arbyn M, Aerts M. Metaprop: a Stata command to perform meta-analysis of binomial data. *Archives of Public Health* 2014; **72**(1): 39.
16. CLARITY Group. https://www.evidencepartners.com/resources/methodological-resources/.
17. Granholm A, Alhazzani W, Møller MH. Use of the GRADE approach in systematic reviews and guidelines. *Br J Anaesth* 2019; **123**(5): 554-9.
18. 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**(1): e2036142.
19. Daher A, Balfanz P, Cornelissen C, et al. Follow up of patients with severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Pulmonary and extrapulmonary disease sequelae. *Respir Med* 2020; **174**: 106197.
20. de Graaf MA, Antoni ML, Ter Kuile MM, et al. Short-term outpatient follow-up of COVID-19 patients: A multidisciplinary approach. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **32**: 100731.
21. Guler SA, Ebner L, Beigelman C, et al. Pulmonary function and radiological features four months after COVID-19: first results from the national prospective observational Swiss COVID-19 lung study. *Eur Respir J* 2021: 2003690.
22. Han X, Fan Y, Alwalid O, et al. Six-Month Follow-up Chest CT findings after Severe COVID-19 Pneumonia. *Radiology* 2021: 203153.
23. Huang C, Huang L, Wang Y, et al. 6-month consequences of COVID-19 in patients discharged from hospital: a cohort study. *Lancet* 2021; **397**(10270): 220-32.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

24. Huang Y, Tan C, Wu J, et al. Impact of coronavirus disease 2019 on pulmonary function in early convalescence phase. *Respir Res* 2020; **21**(1): 163.
25. Li R, Liu G, Huang X, et al. Dynamic changes in clinical and CT characteristics of COVID-19 cases with different exposure histories: a retrospective study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2020; **20**(1): 567.
26. Liang L, Yang B, Jiang N, et al. Three-month Follow-up Study of Survivors of Coronavirus Disease 2019 after Discharge. *J Korean Med Sci* 2020; **35**(47): e418.
27. Liu C, Ye L, Xia R, et al. Chest Computed Tomography and Clinical Follow-Up of Discharged Patients with COVID-19 in Wenzhou City, Zhejiang, China. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2020; **17**(10): 1231-7.
28. Liu D, Zhang W, Pan F, et al. The pulmonary sequalae in discharged patients with COVID-19: a short-term observational study. *Respir Res* 2020; **21**(1): 125.
29. Liu X, Zhou H, Zhou Y, et al. Temporal radiographic changes in COVID-19 patients: relationship to disease severity and viral clearance. *Sci Rep* 2020; **10**(1): 10263.
30. Lv D, Chen X, Wang X, et al. Pulmonary function of patients with 2019 novel coronavirus induced-pneumonia: a retrospective cohort study. *Ann Palliat Med* 2020; **9**(5): 3447-52.
31. Myall KJ, Mukherjee B, Castanheira AM, et al. Persistent Post-COVID-19 Inflammatory Interstitial Lung Disease: An Observational Study of Corticosteroid Treatment. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2021.
32. Ramani C, Davis EM, Kim JS, Provencio JJ, Enfield KB, Kadl A. Post-ICU COVID-19 Outcomes: A Case Series. *Chest* 2021; **159**(1): 215-8.
33. Shah AS, Wong AW, Hague CJ, et al. A prospective study of 12-week respiratory outcomes in COVID-19-related hospitalisations. *Thorax* 2020: thoraxjnl-2020-216308.
34. Smet J, Stylemans D, Hanon S, Ilsen B, Verbanck S, Vanderhelst E. Clinical status and lung function 10 weeks after severe SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Respir Med* 2021; **176**: 106276.
35. Tabatabaei SMH, Rajebi H, Moghaddas F, Ghasemiadl M, Talari H. Chest CT in COVID-19 pneumonia: what are the findings in mid-term follow-up? *Emerg Radiol* 2020; **27**(6): 711-9.
36. van der Sar-van der Brugge S, Talman S, Boonman-de Winter L, et al. Pulmonary function and health-related quality of life after COVID-19 pneumonia. *Respir Med* 2021; **176**: 106272.
37. van Gassel RJJ, Bels JLM, Raafs A, et al. High Prevalence of Pulmonary Sequelae at 3 Months after Hospital Discharge in Mechanically Ventilated Survivors of COVID-19. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2021; **203**(3): 371-4.
38. Wei J, Yang H, Lei P, et al. Analysis of thin-section CT in patients with coronavirus disease (COVID-19) after hospital discharge. *J Xray Sci Technol* 2020; **28**(3): 383-9.
39. Yu M, Liu Y, Xu D, Zhang R, Lan L, Xu H. Prediction of the Development of Pulmonary Fibrosis Using Serial Thin-Section CT and Clinical Features in Patients Discharged after Treatment for COVID-19 Pneumonia. *Korean J Radiol* 2020; **21**(6): 746-55.
40. Zhao YM, Shang YM, Song WB, et al. Follow-up study of the pulmonary function and related physiological characteristics of COVID-19 survivors three months after recovery. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020; **25**: 100463.
41. Zhong L, Zhang S, Wang J, et al. Analysis of Chest CT Results of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients at First Follow-Up. *Can Respir J* 2020; **2020**: 5328267.
42. Antonio GE, Wong KT, Hui DS, et al. Thin-section CT in patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome following hospital discharge: preliminary experience. *Radiology* 2003; **228**(3): 810-5.
43. Jin ZY, You H, Zhang WH, et al. [Thoracic high resolution CT findings of 100 SARS patients in convalescent period]. *Zhongguo Yi Xue Ke Xue Yuan Xue Bao* 2003; **25**(5): 512-5.
44. Liu T, Peng M, Cai BQ, et al. [Assessment of health-related quality of life in cured SARS patients]. *Zhongguo Yi Xue Ke Xue Yuan Xue Bao* 2003; **25**(5): 516-9.
45. Peng M, Cai BQ, Liu T, et al. [Assessment of pulmonary function in SARS patients during the convalescent period]. *Zhongguo Yi Xue Ke Xue Yuan Xue Bao* 2003; **25**(5): 529-32.
46. Chiang CH, Shih JF, Su WJ, Perng RP. Eight-month prospective study of 14 patients with hospital-acquired severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2004; **79**(11): 1372-9.
47. Hsu HH, Tzao C, Wu CP, et al. Correlation of high-resolution CT, symptoms, and pulmonary function in patients during recovery from severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Chest* 2004; **126**(1): 149-58.
48. Ng CK, Chan JW, Kwan TL, et al. Six month radiological and physiological outcomes in severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) survivors. *Thorax* 2004; **59**(10): 889-91.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

49. Wong KT, Antonio GE, Hui DS, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome: thin-section computed tomography features, temporal changes, and clinicoradiologic correlation during the convalescent period. *J Comput Assist Tomogr* 2004; **28**(6): 790-5.
50. Beijing Respiratory Experts Panel of the Medical Staff Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome P. [A follow-up study of the lung function and the chest CT changes in medical staff with severe acute respiratory syndrome in Beijing]. *Zhonghua Jie He He Hu Xi Za Zhi* 2005; **28**(1): 10-2.
51. Chang YC, Yu CJ, Chang SC, et al. Pulmonary sequelae in convalescent patients after severe acute respiratory syndrome: evaluation with thin-section CT. *Radiology* 2005; **236**(3): 1067-75.
52. Hui DS, Wong KT, Ko FW, et al. The 1-year impact of severe acute respiratory syndrome on pulmonary function, exercise capacity, and quality of life in a cohort of survivors. *Chest* 2005; **128**(4): 2247-61.
53. Ong KC, Ng AW, Lee LS, et al. 1-year pulmonary function and health status in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Chest* 2005; **128**(3): 1393-400.
54. Zheng ZG, Chen RC, Wu H, et al. [Changes in pulmonary function in severe acute respiratory syndrome patients during convalescent period]. *Zhongguo Wei Zhong Bing Ji Jiu Yi Xue* 2005; **17**(6): 329-31.
55. Chen X, Lin J, Yu H. Research of pulmonary function, health-related quality of life of cured patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome and the effect of Chinese traditional medicine treatment during recovery. [Chinese]. *Chinese Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 2006; **21**(2): 124-6.
56. Li TS, Gomersall CD, Joynt GM, Chan DP, Leung P, Hui DS. Long-term outcome of acute respiratory distress syndrome caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS): an observational study. *Crit Care Resusc* 2006; **8**(4): 302-8.
57. Tansey CM, Louie M, Loeb M, et al. One-year outcomes and health care utilization in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Arch Intern Med* 2007; **167**(12): 1312-20.
58. Park WB, Jun KI, Kim G, et al. Correlation between Pneumonia Severity and Pulmonary Complications in Middle East Respiratory Syndrome. *J Korean Med Sci* 2018; **33**(24): e169.
59. Bai L, Gu L, Cao B, et al. Clinical features of pneumonia caused by 2009 influenza A(H1N1) virus in Beijing, China. *Chest* 2011; **139**(5): 1156-64.
60. Chen J, Wu J, Hao S, et al. Long term outcomes in survivors of epidemic Influenza A (H7N9) virus infection. *Sci Rep* 2017; **7**(1): 17275.
61. Dai J, Zhou X, Dong D, et al. Human infection with a novel avian-origin influenza A (H7N9) virus: serial chest radiographic and CT findings. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2014; **127**(12): 2206-11.
62. Edgeworth D, Brohan J, O'Neill S, Maher M, Breen D, Murphy D. Pulmonary sequelae of severe H1N1 infection treated with high frequency oscillatory ventilation. *Ir Med J* 2013; **106**(8): 249-52.
63. Hsieh MJ, Lee WC, Cho HY, et al. Recovery of pulmonary functions, exercise capacity, and quality of life after pulmonary rehabilitation in survivors of ARDS due to severe influenza A (H1N1) pneumonitis. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2018; **12**(5): 643-8.
64. Li H, Weng H, Lan C, et al. Comparison of patients with avian influenza A (H7N9) and influenza A (H1N1) complicated by acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2018; **97**(12): e0194.
65. Liu W, Peng L, Liu H, Hua S. Pulmonary Function and Clinical Manifestations of Patients Infected with Mild Influenza A Virus Subtype H1N1: A One-Year Follow-Up. *PLoS ONE* 2015; **10**(7): e0133698.
66. Lu PX, Wang YX, Zhou BP, et al. Radiological features of lung changes caused by avian influenza subtype A H5N1 virus: report of two severe adult cases with regular follow-up. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2010; **123**(1): 100-4.
67. Luyt CE, Combes A, Becquemin MH, et al. Long-term outcomes of pandemic 2009 influenza A(H1N1)-associated severe ARDS. *Chest* 2012; **142**(3): 583-92.
68. Mineo G, Ciccarese F, Modolon C, Landini MP, Valentino M, Zompatori M. Post-ARDS pulmonary fibrosis in patients with H1N1 pneumonia: role of follow-up CT. *Radiol Med* 2012; **117**(2): 185-200.
69. Quispe-Laime AM, Fiore C, Gonzalez-Ros MN, et al. [Lung diffusion capacity and quality of life 6 months after discharge from the ICU among survivors of acute respiratory distress syndrome due to influenza A H1N1]. *Med Intensiva* 2012; **36**(1): 15-23.
70. Saha A, Vaidya PJ, Chavhan VB, Achlerkar A, Leuppi JD, Chhajed PN. Combined pirfenidone, azithromycin and prednisolone in post-H1N1 ARDS pulmonary fibrosis. *Sarcoidosis Vasc Diffuse Lung Dis* 2018; **35**(1): 85-90.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

71. Singh V, Sharma BB, Patel V. Pulmonary sequelae in a patient recovered from swine flu. *Lung India* 2012; **29**(3): 277-9.
72. Toufen C, Jr., Costa EL, Hirota AS, Li HY, Amato MB, Carvalho CR. Follow-up after acute respiratory distress syndrome caused by influenza a (H1N1) virus infection. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)* 2011; **66**(6): 933-7.
73. Winterbauer RH, Ludwig WR, Hammar SP. Clinical course, management, and long-term sequelae of respiratory failure due to influenza viral pneumonia. *Johns Hopkins Med J* 1977; **141**(3): 148-55.
74. Zarogoulidis P, Kouliatsis G, Papanas N, et al. Long-term respiratory follow-up of H1N1 infection. *Virol J* 2011; **8**: 319.
75. Franquet T. Imaging of pulmonary viral pneumonia. *Radiology* 2011; **260**(1): 18-39.
76. Koo HJ, Choi SH, Sung H, Choe J, Do KH. RadioGraphics Update: Radiographic and CT Features of Viral Pneumonia. *Radiographics* 2020; **40**(4): E8-E15.
77. Wang Q, Jiang H, Xie Y, et al. Long-term clinical prognosis of human infections with avian influenza A(H7N9) viruses in China after hospitalization. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020; **20**: 100282.
78. Guo L, Han Y, Li J, et al. Long-term outcomes in patients with severe acute respiratory syndrome treated with oseltamivir: A 12-year longitudinal study. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Medicine* 2019; **12**(10): 12464-71.
79. Zhang P, Li J, Han N, et al. Long-term consequences in lung and bone associated with hospital-acquired severe acute respiratory syndrome: a 15-year follow-up from a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet* 2018; **392 (Supplement 1)**: S11.
80. Mo X, Jian W, Su Z, et al. Abnormal pulmonary function in COVID-19 patients at time of hospital discharge. *Eur Respir J* 2020; **55**(6): 2001217.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.15.21253593; this version posted March 17, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Flow diagram illustrates systematic search and screening strategy, exclusion criteria and numbers meeting eligibility



Figure 2. Radiological findings at follow-up by viral agent

Estimates are reported as proportion of number of CT scans showing the outcome of interest (n) on the total number of exams performed (N) and 95% confidence interval



Figure 3. Radiological findings at baseline and follow-up in SARS-CoV-2 studies

Estimates are reported as proportion of number of CT scans showing the outcome of interest (n) on the total number of exams performed (N) and 95% confidence interval.

Follow-up visits performed within the first four weeks after discharge were categorised as 1 month, subsequent timepoints within three months were categorised as 3 month, similarly for 6 and 12 months.



Figure 4. Pulmonary function testing at follow-up by viral agent

Estimates are reported as proportion of number of tests showing the outcome of interest (n) on the total number of exams performed (N) and 95% confidence interval.



Figure 5. Pulmonary function testing at follow-up, by time

Estimates are reported as proportion of number of tests showing the outcome of interest (n) on the total number of exams performed (N) and 95% confidence interval.

Follow-up visits performed within the first four weeks after discharge were categorised as 1 month, subsequent timepoints within three months were categorised as 3 month, similarly for 6 and 12 months.

Table 1. Studies overview

Centre: S: single centre; M: multicenter

Study design: P: prospective; R: retrospective

Method of diagnostic: ¶: PCR; ||: serology; *: other (reference to National guidelines)

Outcomes reported: †: radiological; ‡: restrictive; § reduction of DLCO; NA: not available

FU: Follow-up in months

Quantitative synthesis: n: not included; r: radiological outcome; f: functional outcome; b: both outcomes

Author(s)	Year	Country of study	Centre	Study design	Study design 2	Sample size	Viral Agent	Method of diagnostic	Sex (males) N	Age Reporting	Age (years)	N ever smoker(s)	Outcomes			FU months	Quantitative synthesis
Winterbauer et al.[73]	1977	United States	S	P	Case series	11	H3N2	‖	5	mean+SD	62.09 (14.93)	NA	NA	‡	§	1	n
Antonio et al. [42]	2003	China	S	R	Cohort	24	SARS-CoV	*	10	mean+range	39 (23-70)	NA	†	NA	NA	2	r
Jin et al. [43]	2003	China	S	R	Cohort	100	SARS-CoV	*	43	mean+SD	36.7 (11.4)	NA	†	‡	§	2	r
Liu, T., et al.[44]	2003	China	M	R	Cohort	119	SARS-CoV	*	64	mean+SD	34.1 (11.4)	NA	NA	‡	§	1	n
Peng et al. [45]	2003	China	S	R	Cohort	89	SARS-CoV	*	40	mean+SD	35.7 (11.1)	23	†	‡	§	2	f
Chiang et al.[46]	2004	Taiwan	S	P	Cohort	14	SARS-CoV	¶	3	mean+SD	36.1 (13.9)	0	†	‡	§	8	r
Hsu et al. [47]	2004	Taiwan	S	R	Cohort	19	SARS-CoV	¶+ ‖	6	mean+SD	42.5 (12.4)	4	†	‡	§	1	b
Ng et al. [48]	2004	China	S	P	Cohort	57	SARS-CoV	¶+ ‖	22	mean+SD	38.1 (10.7)	3	†	‡	§	6	f
Wong et al. [49]	2004	China	S	R	Cohort	99	SARS-CoV	‖	41	mean+SD	39.4 (12.8)	NA	†	‡	§	6	r
Beijing Panel[50]	2005	China	M	R	Cohort	456	SARS-CoV	NA	90	mean+SD	33 (9)	NA	†	‡	§	6	f
Chang et al.[51]	2005	Taiwan	S	P	Cohort	40	SARS-CoV	‖	15	mean+SD	42.8 (12.3)	1	†	NA	NA	5	r
Hui et al.[52]	2005	China	S	P	Cohort	97	SARS-CoV	‖	39	mean+SD	36.9 (9.5)	3	NA	‡	§	12	f
Ong et al.[53]	2005	Singapore	S	P	Cohort	94	SARS-CoV	‖	24	mean+SD	37 (12)	7	NA	‡	§	12	f
Xie et al. [9]	2005	China	M	P	Cohort	383	SARS-CoV	‖	160	mean+SD	38.2 (13.6)	NA	†	‡	§	12	b
Zheng et al.[54]	2005	China	S	R	Cohort	26	SARS-CoV	*	10	mean+SD	36.2 (11.2)	NA	NA	‡	§	18	n

Chen et al.[55]	2006	China	S	P	RCT	85	SARS-CoV	*	45	mean+SD	37.2 (10.91)	NA	NA	‡	§	2	n
Li, T., et al.[56]	2006	China	S	R	Cohort	59	SARS-CoV	‖	34	mean+SD	47 (16)	3	NA	‡	§	12	n
Tansey et al.[57]	2007	Canada	S	P	Cohort	117	SARS-CoV	‖	39	median+IQR	42 (33-51)	20	NA	‡	§	12	n
Lu, et al.[66]	2010	China	S	R	Case series	2	H5N1	¶	1	mean+SD	31.5 (7.78)		†	NA	NA	12	n
Bai et al. [59]	2011	China	S	P	Cohort	65	H1N1	¶	39	median+IQR	41 (28-57)	19	†	‡	§	3	b
Toufen et al.[72]	2011	Brazil	S	P	Cohort	4	H1N1	¶	4	median+range	35.5 (25-54)	NA	†	‡	§	6	n
Zarogoulidis et al.[74]	2011	Greece	S	R	Cohort	44	H1N1	¶	28	mean+SD	36 (14.7)	11	NA	‡	§	6	n
Luyt et al.[67]	2012	France	M	P	Cohort	37	H1N1	¶	18	median+IQR	ECLA: 35.5 (30-39) - Non-ECLA: 42 (32.75-51.25)	17	†	‡	§	12	r
Mineo et al[68]	2012	Italy	S	R	Case series	20	H1N1	¶	11	mean+SD	43.5 (16.4)	NA	†	NA	NA	999	n
Quispe-Laime et al.[69]	2012	Argentina	S	P	Cohort	7	H1N1	¶	4	mean+SD	37.43 (10.51)	5	NA	‡	§	6	n
Singh et al.[71]	2012	India	S	R	Case report	1	H1N1	¶	0	specific value+NA	29.0	NA	†	‡	NA	12	n
Edgeworth et al.[62]	2013	Ireland	S	R	Case series	4	H7N9	¶	3	median+range	34.5 (31-56)	1	†	‡	§	19	n
Dai et al. [61]	2014	China	M	R	Cohort	10	H1N1	¶	6	mean+SD	53.6 (15.9)	NA	†	NA	NA	3	n
Liu, W., et al. [65]	2015	China	S	R	Cohort	48	H1N1	*	26	mean+SD	29.5 (27-39.5)	NA	NA	‡	§	12	f
Wu et al.[8]	2016	China	M	R	Case series	11	SARS-CoV	*	3	mean+range	38.6 (30-54)	0	†	NA	NA	84	r
Chen et al.[60]	2017	China	S	P	Cohort	56	H7N9	*	28	mean+SD	54.48 (13.94)	11	†	‡	§	24	b
Hsieh et al.[63]	2018	Taiwan	S	P	Cohort	9	H1N1	¶	9	mean+SD	45.11 (5.48)	NA	NA	‡	NA	6	n
Li, H., et al.[64]	2018	China	M	P	Cohort	44	H1N1-H7N9	¶	32	median+IQR	H7N9: 59 (48-73) - H7N1: 53 (40-62)	NA	†	NA	NA	6	r
Park, et al.[58]	2018	South Korea	M	P	Cohort	73	MERS-CoV	¶	43	median+range	51 (25-80)	14	†	‡	§	12	f
Saha, et al. [70]	2018	India	S	R	Case series	3	H1N1	¶ ; ‖	3	mean+SD	48 (9.85)	0	†	‡	NA	12	n
Arnold et al.[5]	2020	United Kingdom	S	P	Cohort	110	SARS-CoV-2	¶	91	median+IQR	60 (46-73)	NA	†	‡	NA	3	f
Daher et al.[19]	2020	Germany	S	P	Cohort	33	SARS-CoV-2	¶	22	mean+SD	64 (3)	NA	NA	‡	§	1.5	f

Huang, Y., et al.[24]	2020	China	S	P	Cross-Sectional	57	SARS-CoV-2	¶	26	mean+SD	46.72 (13.78)	9	†	‡	§	1	b
Li, R., et al.[25]	2020	China	S	R	Cohort	53	SARS-CoV-2	¶	22	mean+SD	50.2 (15.2)	NA	†	NA	NA	8	n
Liang et al.[26]	2020	China	S	P	Cohort	76	SARS-CoV-2	¶	21	mean+SR	41.3 (13.8)	0	†	‡	§	3	b
Liu C., et al.[27]	2020	China	S	R	Cohort	51	SARS-CoV-2	¶	21	mean+SR	46.6 (13.9)	3	†	NA	NA		r
Liu, D., et al.[28]	2020	China	S	P	Cohort	149	SARS-CoV-2	¶	82	mean+IQR	43 (36-56)	NA	†	NA	NA	1	r
Liu, X., et al.[29]	2020	China	S	R	Cohort	99	SARS-CoV-2	¶	55	means+SD	56.13 (20.7)	NA	†	NA	NA	2	r
Lv et al.[30]	2020	China	S	R	Cohort	137	SARS-CoV-2	¶	71	mean+SD	47 (13)	6	NA	‡	NA	0.5	f
Shah et al.[33]	2020	Canada	S	P	Cohort	60	SARS-CoV-2	¶	41	median+IQR	67 (54-74)	23	†	‡	§	3	b
Tabatabaei et al.[35]	2020	Iran	S	R	Cohort	52	SARS-CoV-2	*	32	mean+SD	50.17 (13.1)	8	†	NA	NA	3	r
Wei et al.[38]	2020	China	M	R	Cohort	59	SARS-CoV-2	*	31	mean+range	41 (25-70)	NA	†	NA	NA	0.5	r
Yu et al.[39]	2020	China	S	R	Cohort	32	SARS-CoV-2	¶	22	mean+SD	47.05 (17.85)	NA	†	NA	NA	0.3	r
Zhao et al.[40]	2020	China	M	R	Cohort	55	SARS-CoV-2	¶	32	mean+SD	47.74 (15.49)	4	†	‡	§	3	b
Zhong et al.[41]	2020	China	S	R	Cohort	52	SARS-CoV-2	¶	29	mean+SD	45.46 (13.74)	NA	†	NA	NA	1	r
Bellan et al.[18]	2021	Italy	S	P	Cohort	238	SARS-CoV-2	¶ ; ‖	142	median+IQR	61 (50-71)	99	NA	‡	§	4	f
de Graaf et al.[20]	2021	Netherlands	S	P	Cohort	81	SARS-CoV-2	¶	51	mean+SD	61 (13)	9	†	‡	§	1.5	n
Guler et al.[21]	2021	Switzerland	M	P	Cohort	113	SARS-CoV-2	NA	67	mean+SD	57.22 (12.11)	NA	†	‡	§	4	r
Han et al.[22]	2021	China	S	P	Cohort	114	SARS-CoV-2	¶	80	mean+SD	54 (12)	16	†	‡	§	6	b
Huang C., et al.[23]	2021	China	S	P	Cohort	1733	SARS-CoV-2	*	897	median+IQR	57 (47-65)	146	†	‡	§	6	b
Myall et al.[31]	2021	United Kingdom	S	P	Cohort	325	SARS-CoV-2	¶ ; *	25	mean+SD	60.5 (10.7)	21	†	‡	§	1.5	n
Ramani et al.[32]	2021	USA	S	P	Case series	28	SARS-CoV-2	¶	17	mean+SD	55.5 (11.9)	NA	NA	‡	§	1.5	f
Smet et al.[34]	2021	Belgium	S	P	Cohort	220	SARS-CoV-2	NA	135	mean+SD	53 (13)	52*	†	‡	§	1.5	b
van der Sar et al.[36]	2021	Netherlands	S	P	Cohort	101	SARS-CoV-2	¶	58	mean+SD	66.4(12.6)	56	NA	‡	§	1.5	f
van Gassel et al.[37]	2021	Netherlands	S	P	Cohort	48	SARS-CoV-2	¶	33	median+ IQR	63 (55-68)	23	†	‡	§	3	b