Long Covid in adults discharged from UK hospitals after Covid-19: A prospective, multicentre cohort study using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol.

Louise Sigfrid*, Thomas M Drake*, Ellen Pauley, Edwin C Jesudason, Piero Olliaro, Wei Shen Lim, Annelise Gillesen, Colin Berry, David J Lowe, Joanne McPeake, Nazir Lone, Daniel Munblit, Anna Casey, Peter Bannister, Clark D Russell, Lynsey Goodwin, Antonia Ho, Lance Turtle, Margret O'Hara, Claire Hastie, Chloe Donohue, Rebecca Spencer, Cara Donegan, Alison Gummery, Janet Harrison, Hayley Hardwick, Claire E Hastie, Gail Carson, Laura Merson, J Kenneth Baillie, Peter JM Openshaw, Ewen M Harrison, Annemarie B Docherty, Malcom G Semple, Janet T Scott, ISARIC global follow-up working group[^] and ISARIC4C investigators[†]

*Joint first authors

† Listed in authorship supplement

Correspondence to:

Dr Janet T Scott

MRC-University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research

Garscube Estate,

Glasgow,

G61 1QH

Email: janet.scott@glasgow.ac.uk

Phone: +44 (0)141 339 8251

Author Affiliations:

Louise Sigfrid, MD PhD, Clinical Research Fellow, Public Health Specialist, ISARIC Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2764-1177

Thomas M Drake, MBChB BMedSci**,** Clinical Research Fellow, Centre for Medical Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9334-6494

Ellen Pauley, BMedSci, Medical Student, University of Edinburgh Medical School, Edinburgh, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6994-9722

Edwin C Jesudason, MBBChir MD, Consultant in Rehabilitation Medicine, NHS Lothian, Edinburgh, UK, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7855-2030

Piero Olliaro, MD PhD, Professor of Poverty Related Infectious Diseases, ISARIC Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Wei Shen Lim, MBMBS DM FRCP Prof, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7694-3051

Annelise Gillesen, RGN, Senior Clinical Trial Nurse, ISARIC Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Professor Colin Berry, MBMCh, Professor of Cardiology and Imaging, Institute of Cardiovascular and Medical Sciences, University of Glasgow, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4547-8636

David Lowe, Consultant in Emergency Medicine, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Emergency Department, Glasgow, UK

Joanne McPeake, PhD, Nurse Consultant in Clinical Research, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, University of Glasgow, UK https//orchi.org/0000-0001-82006-6801

Nazir Lone, MBChB MSc PhD, Senior Clinical Lecturer in Critical Care, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2707-2779

Daniel Munblit, MD PhD, 1. Department of Paediatrics and Paediatric Infectious Diseases, Institute of Child's Health, Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov

University), Moscow, Russia. 2. Inflammation, Repair and Development Section, National Heart and Lung Institute, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9652-6856

Anna Casey, Medical Student, Brighton and Sussex Medical School, UK

Peter Bannister, MSc, Medical Student, Brighton & Sussex Medical School, Brighton, UK, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6279-2651

Clark D. Russell, MBChB**,** Clinical lecturer in Infectious Diseases, Centre for Inflammation Research, University of Edinburgh, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9873-8243

Lynsey Goodwin, MBChB, Liverpool, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Studies, Univeristy of Liverpool, West Derby Street, L69 3BX. Tropical and Infectious Diseases Unit, North Manchester General Hospital, Delaunays Rd, Manchester, UK.

Antonia Ho, MBChB, PhD, Clinical Senior Lecturer/Consultant in Infectious Diseases, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1465-3785

Lance Turtle, MBBS PhD, 1. NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in emerging and zoonotic infections, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. 2. Tropical and Infectious Disease Unit, Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0778-1693

Margaret O'Hara, Long COVID Research, Birmingham, UK

Claire Hastie, Long COVID Research, Birmingham, UK

Chloe Donohue, BSc, Liverpool Clinical Trials Centre, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

Rebecca Spencer, LLM, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences (IVES), University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4944-9007.

Cara Donegan, LLM, LLB. Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences (IVES), University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

Alison Gummery, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences (IVES), University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

Janet Harrison, BA, 1. National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Liverpool, UK. 2. Institute of Infection and

Global Health, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

Hayley Hardwick, 1. National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Liverpool, UK. 2. Institute of Infection and Global Health, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3421-6435

Claire E Hastie, PhD, Lecturer in Public Health, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4604-3319

Gail Carson, MBChB, ISARIC Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.**Laura Merson**, BSc, Head of Data, ISARIC Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4168-1960

J Kenneth Baillie, MBChB PhD, Roslin Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5258-793

Peter Openshaw, **Prof. of Experimental Medicine,** National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College, London UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7220-2555

Professor Ewen M Harrison, MBChB MSc PhD FRCS, Director Centre for Medical Informatics, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5018-3066

Annemarie Docherty, MBChB PhD, 1. Centre for Medical Informatics, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK. 2. Intensive Care Unit, Royal Infirmary Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8277-420X

Malcolm G. Semple. BMBCh PhD, Prof. Health Protection Research Unit In Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, UK 2. Respiratory Medicine, Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Eaton Road, Liverpool, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9700-0418

Janet T Scott, BMBCh PhD, Clinical Lecturer in Infectious Disease, MRC-University of Glasgow Centre for Virus Research, Glasgow, UK. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8030-5223

Protocol registration number: osf.io/c5rw3/

EuroQol ID: 37035

Key words: Covid-19, post-acute Covid-19, long-Covid, post-Covid, sequelae, long-term outcomes, quality of life

Word count: 4296

Abstract word count: 442

Section 1: What is already known on this topic

- Long-term symptoms after hospitalisation for Covid-19 have been reported, but it is not clear what impact this has on quality of life.
- It is not known which patient groups are most likely to have long-term persistent symptoms following hospitalisation for Covid-19, or if this differs by disease severity.

Section 2: What this study adds

- More than half of patients reported not being fully recovered 7 months after onset of Covid-19 symptoms.
- Previously healthy participants and those under the age of 50 had higher odds of worse long-term outcomes compared to older participants and those with comorbidities.
- Younger women and those with more severe acute disease in-hospital had the worst long-term outcomes.
- Policy makers need to ensure there is long-term support for people experiencing long-Covid and should plan for lasting long-term population morbidity. Funding for research to understand mechanisms underlying long-Covid and identify potential interventions for testing in randomised trials is urgently required.

Structured Abstract

Objectives: The long-term consequences of severe Covid-19 requiring hospital admission are not well characterised. The objective of this study was to establish the long-term effects of Covid-19 following hospitalisation and the impact these may have on patient reported outcome measures.

Design: A multicentre, prospective cohort study with at least 3 months follow-up of participants admitted to hospital between 5th February 2020 and 5th October 2020.

Setting: 31 hospitals in the United Kingdom.

Participants: 327 hospitalised participants discharged alive from hospital with confirmed/high likelihood SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Main outcome measures and comparisons: The primary outcome was self-reported recovery at least ninety days after initial Covid-19 symptom onset. Secondary outcomes included new symptoms, new or increased disability (Washington group short scale), breathlessness (MRC Dyspnoea scale) and quality of life (EQ5D-5L). We compared these outcome measures across age, comorbidity status and in-hospital Covid-19 severity to identify groups at highest risk of developing long-term difficulties. Multilevel logistic and linear regression models were built to adjust for the effects of patient and centre level risk factors on these outcomes.

Results: In total 53.7% (443/824) contacted participants responded, yielding 73.8% (327/443) responses with follow-up of 90 days or more from symptom onset. The median time between symptom onset of initial illness and completing the participant questionnaire was 222 days (Interquartile range (IQR) 189 to 269 days). In total, 54.7% (179/327) of participants reported they did not feel fully recovered. Persistent symptoms were reported by 93.3% (305/325) of participants, with fatigue the most common (82.8%, 255/308), followed by breathlessness (53.5%, 175/327). 46.8% (153/327) reported an increase in MRC dyspnoea scale of at least one grade. New or worse disability was reported by 24.2% (79/327) of participants. Overall (EQ5D-5L) summary index was significantly worse at the time of follow-up (median difference 0.1 points on a scale of 0 to 1, IQR: -0.2 to 0.0). Females under the age of 50 years were five

times less likely to report feeling recovered (adjusted OR 5.09, 95% CI 1.64 to 15.74), were more likely to have greater disability (adjusted OR 4.22, 95% CI 1.12 to 15.94), twice as likely to report worse fatigue (adjusted OR 2.06, 95% CI 0.81 to 3.31) and seven times more likely to become more breathless (adjusted OR 7.15, 95% CI 2.24 to 22.83) than men of the same age.

Conclusions: Survivors of Covid-19 experienced long-term symptoms, new disability, increased breathlessness, and reduced quality of life. These findings were present even in young, previously healthy working age adults, and were most common in younger females. Policymakers should fund further research to identify effective treatments for long-Covid and ensure healthcare, social care and welfare support is available for individuals with long-Covid.

Introduction

Our understanding of long-term outcomes after acute Covid-19 disease remains limited. It is becoming increasingly evident that some patients who have had acute Covid-19 go on to experience persistent symptoms, known as long-Covid or post-covid syndrome[1]. Several studies in hospitalised and community settings have identified that those with Covid-19 frequently develop long-term symptoms and a range of sequelae affecting the kidneys, lungs and heart [2–4]. These symptoms appear to overlap with other post-viral syndromes and with the challenges faced by patients recovering from other critical illness with post-intensive care syndrome (PICS), such as muscle weakness, fatigue, and sleep disturbance [5–9]. Yet, understanding the impact Covid-19 has on patient reported outcome measures, including quality of life, has not yet been fully characterised [10].

Many clinical trials or studies that aim to characterise the immediate course of Covid-19 have used mortality as a primary outcome[11,12]. This has demonstrated that patients in older age groups and those who have pre-existing comorbidities are at higher risk of dying from the disease[13–16] . Nonetheless, most people with Covid-19 will survive the initial acute infection and data on what happens to these individuals in the long-term are lacking. The large number of people affected by Covid-19 and the growing evidence of long-term sequelae highlights the importance for policy makers, society and healthcare systems to understand the difficulties faced by those suffering from long-Covid[17–20] . Understanding the burden of disease, and who is at greatest risk of developing long-term complications, may help to target preventative strategies and provide effective support for affected individuals to improve Covid-19 outcomes and reduce risk of widening health inequalities by inadequate rehabilitation and recovery support. Identifying which patient groups are most likely to be affected could provide data to guide policy and aid future research to identify disease mechanisms, formulate and test new interventions.

The objective of this study is to characterise long-term patient reported outcomes in individuals who survived hospitalisation for Covid-19, in those who engaged with follow-up, using the International Severe Acute Respiratory and emerging Infections Consortium (ISARIC) WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol (CCP-UK) and follow-up protocol [21].

Methods

Study design and setting

The ISARIC WHO CCP protocol was first developed by international consensus in 2012 to respond to any emerging or re-emerging pathogen of public health interest[22]. It was activated in the UK in response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic on 17th January 2020. Study information including the CCP-UK and follow-up protocol, standardised case report forms, study information and consent forms, are available on the ISARIC4C.net website. Hospitals providing acute care throughout the United Kingdom are eligible to enrol participants into the study. This analysis is reported in line with the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines[23].

Participants

Patients aged 18 years and over, admitted to hospital between 17th January to 5th October 2020 with confirmed or highly suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection at 31 centres, who consented to be contacted for follow-up and were discharged at least 90 days ago were eligible for inclusion. Confirmation of SARS-CoV-2 was by reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). Individuals with highly suspected, Covid-19 were also eligible for inclusion, given that SARS-CoV-2 was an emergent pathogen in the earlier stages of the pandemic and laboratory confirmation was dependent on local availability of PCR testing.

Variables

Patient questionnaires for adults were developed by a multidisciplinary team of researchers, clinicians and psychologists through a series of meetings and e-mail iterations[22]. These

were piloted in three countries before being finalised. The UK version was piloted with patients at sites in Liverpool and Glasgow. Patient questionnaires were designed to allow self-assessment via post, or clinician led follow up via telephone, or in outpatient clinic, to support wide dissemination. All surviving patients who consented to be contacted following discharge and for which a valid address or phone number were provided were contacted. Questionnaires were posted from the Outbreak Laboratory coordinating centre at the University of Liverpool, UK, with a prepaid, self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire. A combination of postal and telephone follow-up was used to improve response rates. Those who did not respond by post and who had a valid phone number were followed up by telephone or in outpatient clinic by local study investigators. Participants completed one questionnaire as part of this study, so there were no repeat measures. Data from responses were entered onto a Research Electronic Capture (REDCap) Database system hosted at the University of Oxford and linked with data documented during the admission with acute Covid-19 for the analysis.

Explanatory variables at the time of hospital admission, including age, sex, pre-existing comorbidities, and treatment received during the hospital admission were recorded. Maximum severity of Covid-19 during the acute hospital admission with Covid-19 was classified using the WHO COVID-19 ordinal severity scale[24]. This scale comprised of 4 levels of severity which were relevant to our in-hospital cohort; level 3 - did not receive supplemental oxygen, level 4 - received supplemental oxygen, level 5 - received high flow oxygen or NIV non-invasive ventilation (HFNC, NIV), and levels 6 and 7 - received invasive mechanical ventilation or admission to critical care)[24]. We also used the WHO severity scale to account for in-hospital severity in our modelling approach[24,25].

Outcomes

The primary outcome was self-reported recovery at 3 to 12 months following initial Covid-19 symptoms. Secondary outcomes included persistent or new symptoms, new or worsened disability assessed using the Washington Disability Group (WG) Short Form[26],

breathlessness measured using the Medical Research Council (MRC) dyspnoea scale[27], fatigue measured on a 1 to 10 visual analogue scale (VAS) where zero is no fatigue and ten is worst possible fatigue, and quality of life using the EuroQol® EQ5D-5L instrument (supplementary appendix 2)[28]. The MRC dyspnoea scale was developed to grade the effect of breathlessness on daily activities[27]. This 5-point scale measures perceived respiratory disability, with 1 being no breathlessness and 5 being unable to undertake activities of daily living due to breathlessness[27]. The WG Short Set tool includes six questions on functioning (vision, hearing, mobility, cognition, self-care, communication)[29]. These questions reflect a bio-psychosocial model of disability by describing level of disability and probe aspects of disability which may limit an individual's participation in society. This tool has been shown to detect the majority of disabilities and is standardised for use globally[29]. The EuroQol®EQ5D-5L tool was used to measure psychosocial health and quality of life[28]. The tool covers five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression. The person indicates his/her health state for each of the five dimensions. To compare the change in EQ5D-5L at the time of follow-up to before Covid-19 onset, we asked patients the same questions contained in the EQ5D-5L with the tense altered to ask specifically about pre-Covid-19 state.

Statistical methods

Categorical data were summarised as frequencies and percentages, and continuous data as median, alongside the corresponding interquartile range (IQR) presented as the 25th and 75th centile values. To test for differences across comparison groups in categorical data, we used Fisher's exact test and for continuous data, used the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for two-sample testing and Kruskal-Wallis where there were more than 2 groups.

For disability, breathlessness, and EQ5D-5L index (health state), we calculated the change in value reported by participants before onset of their Covid-19 illness compared to the follow up assessment. For health state at the follow up assessment, we used the EQ5D-5L with the

English standardised valuation study protocol (EQ-VT) value set, developed by the EuroQol group on the composite time trade-off (cTTO) valuation[28]. Overall changes in summary health index, before and after Covid-19 onset, were summarised for the cohort using the Paretian Classification of Health Change (PCHC) method.[30,31] Summary EQ5D-5L indices and change in summary EQ5D-5L index were measured on a scale of 0 to 1, with 1 being perfect health and 0 being worst health imaginable. We calculated both the overall estimates and estimates for individual EQ5D-5L dimensions.

We created models to adjust for age, sex, presence of comorbidities and in-hospital severity of Covid-19, according to the maximum level of respiratory support that was required. Multilevel logistic regression was used for binary outcomes, and linear regression models were used for continuous outcomes. In both model types, we adjusted for the effects of explanatory variables using fixed-effects and centre by including a random-effects term. Final model selection was guided by minimisation of the Akaike information criterion (AIC). Variables were only included in the model if they were present during the first hospital admission for Covid-19. All models were checked for first order interactions and any meaningful interactions were retained and incorporated as dummy variables. Effect estimates are presented as odds ratios for binary outcomes or mean differences for continuous outcomes, alongside the corresponding 95% confidence interval (95% CI). Statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.6.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, AUT) with the tidyverse, finalfit, eq5d and Hmisc packages. Statistical significance was taken at the level of $P \leq 0.05$.

Public and patient involvement

This was an urgent public health research study in response to a public health emergency of international concern. Patients and the public were therefore not involved in the design, of the acute phase rapid response research. However, patients and people living with long covid were involved in the design, conduct and interpretation of the follow up study. The follow up

data collection survey and associated patient information was informed by the founding members of the Long Covid support group, who themselves are living with long Covid. The survey was also piloted in several settings in the UK with patients affected by Covid-19 from different demographics, and feedback incorporated into the final version. This included suggestions on the data on symptoms collected and the way questions were asked as well as on the patient information. The results and interpretation of the findings and final manuscript were informed by members of the Long Covid support group.

Results

Of the 2150 eligible people in the CCP-UK study who were discharged from their acute admission alive, 40.1% (862/2150) provided consent to be contacted for follow-up. Of these, 97.8% (843/862) were contacted. From these 843 people, 97.8% (824/843) were 18 or over and 53.7% (443/824) completed the follow-up questionnaire. Finally, of respondents 73.8% (327/443) responded 90 days or more after symptom onset. Included participants completed the follow-up questionnaire through self-assessment (71.6% 234/327), telephone (24.5% 80/327) or in outpatient clinic (4.0% 13/327, figure 1). The median follow-up time from symptom onset was 222 days (IQR: 189 to 269 days, range: 112 to 343 days, table 1).

Participant characteristics

Table 1 shows the characteristics of participants who responded. The majority of participants were male (58.7%, 192/327), with a median age of 59.7 (25th centile 51.7 to 75th centile 67.7) years and of white ethnicity (81.0%, 265/327, table 1). Asthma (19.9%, 65/327) and diabetes (19.0%, 62/327) were the most common comorbidities (table 1). Compared with the study population who were contacted and did not respond, respondents were significantly more likely to be of white ethnicity (81.0%, 265/327 participants versus 66.6%, 331/544 of non-respondents), were more likely to be ex-smokers (28.1%, 92/327 participants versus 24.7% 123/497 of non-respondents) and were more likely to have been admitted to critical care

(39.8% 130/327 in participants versus 26.8% 133/497 in non-respondents, supplementary table 1).

Outcomes and symptoms

Of 327 participants, 54.7% (179/327) did not feel they had fully recovered at the time of follow-up. At the univariable level, there were no associations between not feeling recovered and the risk factors of age, sex, ethnicity, and comorbidities (table 1) but we found patients with a higher severity of acute disease were significantly more likely not to feel recovered. Persistent or new symptoms were reported by 93.3% (305/327) participants (table 2). The most frequently reported symptoms were fatigue 82.8% (255/308), shortness of breath 53.5% (175/327), and problems sleeping 46.2% 151/327, figure 2A).

A heatmap and dendrogram of symptom co-occurrence identified two major clusters of symptoms (figure 2B); a fatigue, myalgia and sensorineural deficits cluster and an olfactory, appetite and urinary cluster (loss of smell, loss of taste, difficulty passing urine, weight loss and loss of appetite). Within the fatigue, myalgia and sensorineural deficits cluster, there was a distinct minor cluster affecting movement (muscle pain, joint pain, balance and limb weakness).

In addition to symptomatic breathlessness, 46.8% (153/327) of participants reported increased breathlessness compared to their pre-Covid-19 baseline. Overall, change in breathlessness was not affected by age or number of comorbidities (figure 3), but was significantly higher in females compared to males (41.7%, 80/192 in males versus 54.1% 73/135 in females). Of participants with a pre-Covid-19 MRC grade 1, 34.0% (73/215) reported an increase to grade 2, and 25.6% (55/213) reported an increase to grades 3-5 at time of follow-up (figure 4A to 4C). Proportionally, those who were admitted to critical care were more likely to have a higher MRC dyspnoea grade at the time of follow-up.

Overall, intensity of fatigue was unrelated to age or disease severity in hospital (figure 3, table 2), but females were found to have significantly increased levels of fatigue compared with males (median fatigue 0-10 VAS score, males 4.0, IQR 2.0 to 6; versus females 6.0, IQR 2.0 to 7.0, supplementary table 2, supplementary figure 1).

New or worsened disability in at least one Washington Group domain was experienced by 24.2% (79/327). This did not change by in-hospital Covid-19 severity (table 2) or comorbidities (figure 3). Females reported a greater number of new or worsened disabilities compared to males (20.3%, 39/192 in males compared with 29.6%, 40/135 in females, supplementary table 2). The most affected domain was walking and mobility (33.3% 109/327 new mild or worsened disability, 6.4% 21/327 new moderate or worsened disability and 0.3% 1/327 new severe or worsened disability, supplementary table 3), followed by memory and concentration (30.0% 90/327 new mild or worsened disability, 9.8% 32/327 new moderate or worsened disability). There were significant differences in domains affected by sex, with females reporting significantly higher levels of visual disabilities (12.0% 23/192 new mild or worsened disability for males versus 25.2% 34/135 new mild or worsened disability for females, supplementary table 3), higher levels of walking disability (28.6% 55/192 new mild or worsened disability for males versus 40.0% 54/135 new or worsened mild disability for females; 5.6% 11/192 new moderate or worsened disability for males versus 7.4% 10/327 new moderate or worsened disability for females) and memory disability (27.1% 52/192 new mild or worsened disability for males versus 34.1% 46/135 new mild or worsened disability for females; 7.3% 14/192 new moderate or worsened disability for males versus 13.3% 18/135 new moderate or worsened disability for females, supplementary table 4).

Overall summary EQ5D-5L index was 10% lower overall following Covid-19 (median difference -0.1 points, -0.2 25th centile to 0.0 75th centile, table 2). This change was independent of age or comorbidities (figure 3). The EQ5D-5L dimensions for which most participants reported worsening were usual activities (38.9%, 121/311), anxiety/depression

(37.6%, 117/311), and pain/discomfort (37.6%, 117/311) (supplementary table 5). Female sex was significantly associated with increased problems in the usual activity, pain or discomfort and anxiety and depression domains (supplementary table 6).

Predictors of long-term Covid-19 outcomes

Using multilevel regression models, we adjusted for the effects of age by sex (as this was identified as a significant interaction and retained in our models), the presence of comorbidity and initial in-hospital severity of Covid-19. This generated 6 groups; Males under 50 (34/327), males between 50 and 69 (114/327), males 70 and over (44/327), females under 50 (36/327), females between 50 and 69 (81/327), and females 70 and over (18/327). For the primary outcome of self-reported overall recovery, females under 50 were 5 times less likely to feel fully recovered (figure 4). Similarly, those who received invasive mechanical ventilation were 3.6 times less likely to feel fully recovered (figure 4). For the secondary outcomes, age did not appear to be associated with better or worse long-term outcomes (table 3). Females under 50 were more likely than men to experience persistent fatigue and seven times more likely to experience greater breathlessness, twice as likely to develop new disability and had a significantly poorer health state (EQ5D-5L), all of which persisted in adjusted analyses (table 3). Participants with one or more comorbidities were more likely to experience greater fatigue, disability, and a poorer health state (EQ5D-5L, table 3).

Discussion

We found high rates of long-term symptoms and poor long-term outcomes, which were present several months after hospitalisation for Covid-19. Women under 50, and those with severe acute disease requiring critical care had the worst long-term outcomes even after adjusting for severity of the initial illness. Interestingly, our findings were largely unaffected by existing patient comorbidities or disability.

Our findings add considerably to the current literature, as we identify the main risk factor for worse long-term outcomes are being female and under the age of 50. We also have been able to quantify the significant deterioration in disability and breathlessness-related disability in detail. Many of our findings are largely in agreement with other recent studies in Chinese and Russian populations, which also found high rates of breathlessness and fatigue[17,32]. In the community setting, a recent mobile application-based study, described very high rates of breathlessness (71%) and fatigue (98%) in those reporting symptoms persisting over 28 days [2]. Interestingly, in our population, the presence of symptoms many months after initial infection are higher than the 76% reported by Huang et al. and three times higher than that reported by Munblit et al. There are several reasons why we have found higher rates, which could be related to those who responded, or the severity of disease across the different study populations. The Huang et al. and Munblit et al. studies included very small numbers of patients requiring critical care or mechanical ventilation (1% in Huang et al. and under 2.6% in Munblit et al, in contrast to 28.1% 92/327 in our study), suggesting either these groups had a very high in-hospital mortality rate, substantially milder disease or the studies themselves did not capture patients with the most severe disease. Data from other studies suggests that up to a third of patients with Covid-19 who are admitted to hospital may require critical care and 10 to 13% of patients will require invasive mechanical ventilation based on data from the UK and Germany [33–35]. We have 26160 requiring intensive or high-dependency unit care out of 136337 patients with data in the latest ISARIC report (19%), and 15163/133557 (11.4%) requiring invasive mechanical ventilation [36]. Compared with these studies, our data contain far higher numbers of patients who required critical care and is likely to be more generalisable to these groups.

In our study, being young, female and having a high severity of acute disease were the strongest independent predictors of poor long-term outcomes. It is unclear why females had the worst outcomes. This could be to do with the effects of initial exposure, where females are more likely to be in industries where exposure to SARS-CoV-2 may be higher [37], however

recent data suggests teachers do not have greater exposure than other working-age populations and there is emerging evidence of divergent host responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection [38,39]. Another explanation is that females are more likely to survive severe acute disease than men, so could have worse long-term outcomes as a result. However, in our data, we could not find any differences by sex across several measures of disease severity. A further possibility is that men felt less able or inclined to disclose symptoms. From our findings it is clear more research is required into why females have worse long-term outcomes, particularly as sectors where females are likely to have greater exposure to SARS-CoV-2 are beginning to reopen (e.g. education, hospitality and healthcare).

There are several limitations to our study. First, we were not able to follow all the cases that were discharged from hospital, either because they did not give permission or because they did not respond to repeated requests for information. We attempted to reach non-responders to the survey via telephone follow-up to limit potential for selection bias, but not all could be reached. It is possible that those who did not respond might have been well and therefore uninterested in responding, but it could also be that some were too unwell to respond, had died or moved away. Our results may therefore not be fully representative of with the entire population of those hospitalised with Covid-19. Secondly, we did not include patients hospitalised with other non-Covid-19 illness or a contemporaneous control group, therefore it is unknown if the changes in our outcomes e.g. quality of life, are specific to recovery from Covid-19 or may be linked to other aspects of life during the pandemic. Thirdly, patients only completed the survey at one timepoint, limiting comparison across repeat measures. This also meant retrospective measures asking patients to rate outcomes before their Covid-19 illness were included, which are open to recall bias. Finally, as our study focussed on hospitalised patients primarily from the first wave of infection in the UK, our data cannot be generalised to those with disease managed in the community who comprise the majority of individuals affected by Covid-19.

Future research should focus on establishing the optimal care of this cohort, identifying interventions to test in randomised trials and to identify the mechanisms underlying adverse long-term outcomes. The PHOSP-Covid (Post-HOSPitalisation Covid-19) study is ongoing and will inform patient care by adding to our data on the long-term sequelae of Covid-19, looking at the impact on these of acute and post-discharge interventions, and exploring possible mechanisms [40].

Conclusion

In our study of 327 patients who were discharged alive from hospital, we found most participants reported symptoms months after acute Covid-19 infection. The most common symptoms were fatigue and breathlessness. Participants reported significant difficulties, including increased breathlessness, new or worsened disability and worse quality of life following Covid-19. These symptoms were largely independent of age and prior comorbidity, suggesting that the long-term effects of Covid-19 are determined by factors that differ from those that predict increased mortality. Moreover, the high frequency and severity of long-term symptoms emphasise the importance of long-Covid symptoms and the potential long-term impact on population health and wellbeing.

Acknowledgements

This work uses data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and support #DataSavesLives. We are extremely grateful to the 2,648 frontline NHS clinical and research staff and volunteer medical students, who collected this data in challenging circumstances; and the generosity of the participants and their families for their individual contributions in these difficult times. In particular, the ISARIC Global Covid-19 Follow up working group and the ISARIC global support centre. We would like to thank Sarah Moore, Romans Matulevics, and James Lee for administrative, data management and dissemination support. We also acknowledge the support of Jeremy J Farrar and NahokoShindo.

Declarations and statements

Contributors: JTS, LS, MGS developed the concept of the follow up study. JTS, LS, LWS, TMD, EJ, WLS, CB, DJL, JMcP, NL, DM, CR, AH, LT, PB, and the ISARIC Global Covid-19 follow up working group developed the follow up protocol and methodology. PB, CD, HH, RS, JH coordinated follow up survey distribution, data entry, AG, AC, LG conducted telephone follow up. LS, JTS, HH coordinated resources. LS, JTS, TMD, EP, AD, PO, EH, ABD were involved in data visualisation. TMD, EP, LS, JTS, PJMO, CH, ABD, MGS analysed and interpreted the data. LS, TMD, EP, JTS wrote the original draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed, and revised the manuscript prior to submission. JTS is the guarantor.

Competing interests

Ethical approval: Ethical approval was given by the South Central - Oxford C Research Ethics Committee in England (ref 13/SC/0149) and the Scotland A Research Ethics Committee (ref 20/SS/0028).

Data sharing: Data are available for reuse through a secure data sharing platform. Access is welcome through the ISARIC Independent Data and Material Access Committee (https://isaric4c.net).

Transparency: The lead author (the manuscript's guarantor) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Dissemination plans: Dissemination to participants and related patient and public communities: ISARIC4C has a public facing website [ISARIC4C.net] and twitter account (@CCPUKstudy). We are engaging with print and internet press, television, radio, news, and documentary programme makers.

Funding statement: This work is supported by grants from: the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) [award CO-CIN-01], the Medical Research Council [grant MC_PC_19059],

the Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (NIHR Imperial BRC, grant P45058), the Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Respiratory Infections at Imperial College London and NIHR HPRU in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections at University of Liverpool, both in partnership with Public Health England, [NIHR award 200907], Wellcome Trust and Department for International Development [215091/Z/18/Z], and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation [OPP1209135], and Liverpool Experimental Cancer Medicine Centre (Grant Reference: C18616/A25153), NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Imperial College London [IS-BRC-1215-20013], EU Platform for European Preparedness Against (Re-) emerging Epidemics [1] [FP7 project 602525] and NIHR Clinical Research Network for providing infrastructure support for this research. LT is a Wellcome Trust clinical career development fellow, supported by grant number 205228/Z/16/Z. This research was funded in part, by the Wellcome Trust. PJMO is supported by a NIHR Senior Investigator Award [award 201385]. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the DHSC, DID, NIHR, MRC, the Wellcome Trust or PHE.

Role of the funder: The study sponsors and funders had no role in the study design, collection, analysis, interpretation of data, writing of the report, or the decision to submit the article for publication. Investigators were independent from funders and the authors have full access to all of the data, including any statistical analysis and tables.

References

1 Carfì A, Bernabei R, Landi F, *et al.* Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *JAMA* 2020;**324**:603–5. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.12603

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

3 Sudre C, Murray B, Varsavsky T, *et al.* Attributes and predictors of Long-COVID: analysis of COVID cases and their symptoms collected by the Covid Symptoms Study App. *medRxiv Prepr Serv Heal Sci* doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.19.20214494

4 Salehi S, Reddy S, Gholamrezanezhad A. Long-term Pulmonary Consequences of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): What We Know and What to Expect. *J Thorac Imaging* 2020;**35**:W87-w89. doi:10.1097/rti.0000000000000534

5 Burki TK. Post-Ebola syndrome. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016;**16**:780–1. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(15)00259-5

6 Scott JT, Sesay FR, Massaquoi TA, *et al.* Post-Ebola Syndrome, Sierra Leone. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2016;**22**:641–6. doi:10.3201/eid2204.151302

7 Hung TM, Wills B, Clapham HE, *et al.* The Uncertainty Surrounding the Burden of Post-acute Consequences of Dengue Infection. *Trends Parasitol* 2019;**35**:673–6. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2019.06.004

8 Blettery M, Brunier L, Polomat K, *et al.* Brief Report: Management of Chronic Post-Chikungunya Rheumatic Disease: The Martinican Experience. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2016;**68**:2817–24. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/art.39775

9 Rawal G, Yadav S KR. Post-intensive care syndrome: An overview. *J Transl Intern Med* 2017;**5**:90–2. doi:10.1515/jtim-2016-0016

10 NICE. COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing the long-term effects of COVID-19. NICE Guidel. [NG188]. 2020.https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng188

11 Fei Zhou Ting Yu, MD, Ronghui Du et al. MD. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet* 2020;**395**:1054–62. doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3

12 Verity R Dorigatti I, et al. OLC. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;**20**:669–77. doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30243-7

13 C. CAJMW-G. Global, regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study. *Lancet Glob Heal* 2020;**8**:E1003-1017. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30264-3

14 National Institute for Demographic Studies. Demographics of COVID-19 deaths: data and metadata. Covid-19 INED. https://dc-covid.site.ined.fr/en/data/.

15 Global Health 50/50. COVID-19: data disaggregated by age and sex. https://globalhealth5050.org/covid19/age-and-sex-data/.

16 Knight SR, Ho A, Pius R, *et al.* Risk stratification of patients admitted to hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: development and validation of the 4C Mortality Score. *BMJ* 2020;**370**:m3339. doi:10.1136/bmj.m3339

17 Munblit D, Bobkova P, Spiridonova E, *et al.* Risk factors for long-term consequences of COVID-19 in hospitalised adults in Moscow using the ISARIC Global follow-up protocol: StopCOVID cohort study. *medRxiv* 2021 doi:10.1101/2021.02.17.21251895

18 Latronico N, Peli E, Rodella F, *et al.* Three-Month Outcome in Survivors of COVID-19 Associated Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Prepr with Lancet* 2021.

19 The Lancet. Facing up to long COVID. *Lancet* 2020;**396**:1861. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32662-3

20 The Lancet: Most patients hospitalised with COVID-19 have at least one symptom six months after falling ill, Wuhan follow-up study suggests. 2021.https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2021-01/tl-pss010721.php

21 ISARIC. ISARIC Clinical Characterisation Protocol (CCP): UK version. 2020.https://isaric4c.net/protocols/

22 ISARIC, WHO. Clinical Characterisation Protocol (CCP). 2012;.https://isaric.org/research/covid-19-clinical-research-resources/clinical-characterisation-protocol-ccp/

23 Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, *et al.* The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: Guidelines for Reporting Observational Studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;**61**:344–9. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008

24 Marshall JC, Murthy S, Diaz J, *et al.* A minimal common outcome measure set for COVID-19 clinical research. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;**20**:e192–7. doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30483-7

25 Gupta RK, Harrison EM, Ho A, *et al.* Development and validation of the ISARIC 4C Deterioration model for adults hospitalised with COVID-19: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021;**0**. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30559-2

26 Washington group.WG Short Set on Functioning (WG-SS). https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/question-sets/wg-short-set-on-functioning-wg-ss/

27 Medical Research Council. 1952 MRC Breathlessness Scale. https://mrc.ukri.org/research/facilities-and-resources-for-researchers/mrc-scales/mrc-dyspnoea-scale-mrc-breathlessness-scale/

28 EuroQol Research Foundation. EQ-5D-3L User Guide.2018.https://euroqol.org/publications/user-guides.

29 Washington Group on Disability Statistics. The Washington Group Short Set on Functioning (WG-SS). WG-SS. https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/question-sets/wg-short-set-on-functioning-wg-ss/

30 Devlin N, Parkin D, Browne J. Using the EQ-5D as a performance measurement tool in the NHS. *Health Econ* 2010;**19**:886–905.

31 Parkin D, Devlin N, Rice N. Statistical analysis of EQ-5D profiles: does the use of value sets bias inference? *Med Decis Making* 2010;**30**:556–65.

32 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**:220–32. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32656-8

33 Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, *et al.* Features of 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: prospective observational cohort study. *BMJ* 2020;**369**:m1985. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1985

34 Abate S, Ahmed AS, Mantfardo B, *et al.* Rate of Intensive Care Unit admission and outcomes among patients with coronavirus: A systematic review and Meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2020;**15**:e0235653. doi:doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0235653

35 Karagiannidis C, Mostert C, Hentschker C, *et al.* Case characteristics, resource use, and outcomes of 10 021 patients with COVID-19 admitted to 920 German hospitals: an observational study. *Lancet Respir Med* 2020;**8**:853–62. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30316-7

36 Escher M, Hall M, Baillie JK, *et al.* ISARIC Clinical Data Report 10 February 2021. *medRxiv* 2021;:2020.07.17.20155218. doi:10.1101/2020.07.17.20155218

37 Office for National Statistics. Which occupations have the highest potential exposure to the coronavirus (COVID-19)? 2020. https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/whichoccupationshavethehighestpotentialexposuretothecoronaviruscovid19/2020-05-11

38 Takahashi T, Ellingson MK, Wong P, *et al.* Sex differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease outcomes. *Nature* 2020;**588**:315–20. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2700-3

39 Office for National Statistics. COVID-19 Schools Infection Survey Round 2, England: December 2020. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/covid19schoolsinfectionsurveyround2england/december2020

40 Brightling C. Long-term follow up of adults hospitalised with COVID-19. Prospectively registered. 2020. *ISRCTN Regist* 2020.

Tables

Table 1 – Characteristics of participants who responded

		Recovered or unsure	Does not feel fully recovered	(Missing)	p-value
Total N (%)		144 (44.0)	179 (54.7)	4 (1.2)	
Age	Median (IQR)	60.5 (53.2 to 69.8)	59.4 (50.3 to 66.7)	54.2 (48.2 to 58.5)	0.089
	Under 50	26 (37.1)	43 (61.4)	1 (1.4)	
	50 to 69	83 (42.6)	109 (55.9)	3 (1.5)	
	Over 70	35 (56.5)	27 (43.5)	0 (0.0)	
Sex at Birth	Male	87 (45.3)	103 (53.6)	2 (1.0)	0.683
	Female	57 (42.2)	76 (56.3)	2 (1.5)	
Ethnicity	White	115 (43.4)	147 (55.5)	3 (1.1)	0.206
	South Asian	2 (25.0)	6 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	
	East Asian	3 (75.0)	1 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	
	Black	10 (66.7)	5 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	
	Other Ethnic Minority	10 (47.6)	10 (47.6)	1 (4.8)	
	(Missing)	4 (28.6)	10 (71.4)	0 (0.0)	
Smoking	Never Smoked	84 (47.7)	90 (51.1)	2 (1.1)	0.892
	Current Smoker	4 (57.1)	3 (42.9)	0 (0.0)	
	Former Smoker	43 (46.7)	47 (51.1)	2 (2.2)	
	(Missing)	13 (25.0)	39 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	
Diabetes	No	112 (44.1)	138 (54.3)	4 (1.6)	0.972
	Yes	27 (43.5)	35 (56.5)		
Obesity (as defined by clinical staff)	No	116 (45.7)	136 (53.5)	2 (0.8)	0.291
	Yes	20 (35.7)	34 (60.7)	2 (3.6)	
	(Missing)	8 (47.1)	9 (52.9)	0 (0.0)	
Chronic cardiac disease	No	119 (43.8)	149 (54.8)	4 (1.5)	1.000
	Yes	20 (45.5)	24 (54.5)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	5 (45.5)	6 (54.5)	0 (0.0)	
Chronic pulmonary disease (not asthma)	No	126 (43.4)	160 (55.2)	4 (1.4)	0.592
	Yes	12 (52.2)	11 (47.8)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	6 (42.9)	8 (57.1)	0 (0.0)	
Asthma (physician diagnosed)	No	114 (45.2)	135 (53.6)	3 (1.2)	0.410
	Yes	25 (38.5)	39 (60.0)	1 (1.5)	
	(Missing)	5 (50.0)	5 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	
Chronic kidney disease	No	131 (44.0)	163 (54.7)	4 (1.3)	1.000
	Yes	8 (44.4)	10 (55.6)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	5 (45.5)	6 (54.5)	0 (0.0)	
Malignant neoplasm	No	136 (44.4)	166 (54.2)	4 (1.3)	1.000
	Yes	4 (40.0)	6 (60.0)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	4 (36.4)	7 (63.6)	0 (0.0)	
Rheumatologic disorder	No	131 (45.2)	155 (53.4)	4 (1.4)	0.334
	Yes	8 (33.3)	16 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	5 (38.5)	8 (61.5)	0 (0.0)	

		Recovered or unsure	Does not feel fully recovered	(Missing)	p-value
ISARIC4C Mortality Score (predicted severity)	Median (IQR)	7.0 (5.0 to 9.0)	6.0 (4.0 to 9.0)	5.5 (5.0 to 6.0)	0.648
Severity	Scale 3 (did not receive supplemental oxygen)	34 (50.0)	33 (48.5)	1 (1.5)	0.001
	Scale 4 (received supplemental oxygen)	63 (53.4)	53 (44.9)	2 (1.7)	
	Scale 5 (received HFNC or NIV)	22 (44.9)	27 (55.1)	0 (0.0)	
	Scale 6 or 7 (received invasive mechanical ventilation or critical care)	25 (27.2)	66 (71.7)	1 (1.1)	
Critical care admission	Ward level care only	99 (50.3)	96 (48.7)	2 (1.0)	0.008
	Admitted to Critical Care	45 (34.6)	83 (63.8)	2 (1.5)	
Length of stay (days)	Median (IQR)	8.0 (5.0 to 13.0)	11.0 (6.2 to 25.0)	4.5 (3.0 to 7.8)	<0.001
Time from symptoms to completing survey (days)	Median (IQR)	221.0 (190.0 to 245.0)	224.0 (188.0 to 292.0)	210.0 (194.2 to 218.5)	0.419
Time from discharge to completing survey (days)	Median (IQR)	200.0 (177.0 to 230.0)	199.0 (161.0 to 268.0)	195.0 (178.0 to 208.2)	0.846

HFNC – High flow nasal cannulae, NIV – Noninvasive ventilation, IQR – Interquartile range, presented as 25th to 75th centiles. Numbers are presented as N (%), unless otherwise denoted as a continuous variable.

Table 2 – Long-term outcomes by severity of acute Covid-19

		Scale 3 (did not receive supplemental oxygen)	Scale 4 (received supplemental oxygen)	Scale 5 (received HFNC or NIV)	Scale 6 or 7 (received invasive mechanical ventilation or critical care)	p-value
Total N (%)		68 (20.8)	118 (36.1)	49 (15.0)	92 (28.1)	
Self-reported overall recovery	Feels fully recovered	21 (30.9)	34 (28.8)	11 (22.4)	17 (18.5)	0.006
	Does not feel fully recovered	33 (48.5)	53 (44.9)	27 (55.1)	66 (71.7)	
	Not sure	13 (19.1)	29 (24.6)	11 (22.4)	8 (8.7)	
	(Missing)	1 (1.5)	2 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.1)	
New or persistent symptoms	No new or persistent symptoms	3 (4.4)	9 (7.6)	6 (12.2)	4 (4.3)	0.268
	New or persistent symptoms	65 (95.6)	109 (92.4)	43 (87.8)	88 (95.7)	
Change in breathlessness after COVID-19 (MRC Dyspnoea)	No change	25 (36.8)	55 (46.6)	20 (40.8)	27 (29.3)	0.062
	Less breathless	2 (2.9)	5 (4.2)	2 (4.1)	2 (2.2)	
	More breathless	32 (47.1)	41 (34.7)	24 (49.0)	56 (60.9)	
	(Missing)	9 (13.2)	17 (14.4)	3 (6.1)	7 (7.6)	
Fatigue level (0 to 10 VAS)	Median (IQR)	5.5 (2.0 to 7.0)	4.0 (2.0 to 7.0)	5.0 (2.0 to 7.0)	5.0 (2.0 to 7.0)	0.469
EQ5D-5L change in overall summary index	Median (IQR)	-0.1 (-0.2 to 0.0)	-0.0 (-0.1 to 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.2 to 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.3 to -0.0)	0.004
Washington Group Short Set	No change in disability	52 (76.5)	88 (74.6)	35 (71.4)	66 (71.7)	0.892
	New or worse	15 (22.1)	27 (22.9)	13 (26.5)	24 (26.1)	
	(Missing)	1 (1.5)	3 (2.5)	1 (2.0)	2 (2.2)	

HFNC – High flow nasal cannulae, NIV – Noninvasive ventilation, MRC – Medical Research Council, IQR – Interquartile range, presented as 25th to 75th centiles. Numbers are presented as N (%), unless otherwise denoted as a continuous variable.

Table 3 – Multilevel regression models for secondary outcomes of new or persistent symptoms, change in MRC dyspnoea scale, fatigue, EQ5D-5L summary index change and Washington Short Set new or worse disability.

Explanatory variable		New or persistent symptoms: OR (95% Confidence Interval)	Change in MRC Dyspnoea: OR (95% Confidence Interval)	Fatigue level: Coefficient (95% Confidence Interval)	EQ5D-5L summary index change: Coefficient (95% Confidence Interval)	Washington Short Set new or worse disability: OR (95% Confidence Interval)
Sex at Birth by Age	Male | Under 50	-	-	-	-	-
	Male | 50 to 69	0.82 (0.21-3.30, p=0.783)	2.20 (0.89-5.45, p=0.088)	0.44 (-0.56 to 1.44, p=0.194)	-0.05 (-0.11 to 0.02, p=0.093)	1.66 (0.51-5.42, p=0.401)
	Male | Over 70	0.74 (0.14-3.83, p=0.720)	2.59 (0.84-7.95, p=0.096)	0.38 (-0.84 to 1.60, p=0.272)	-0.04 (-0.12 to 0.04, p=0.184)	2.08 (0.55-7.96, p=0.283)
	Female | Under 50	2.75 (0.26-28.92, p=0.400)	7.15 (2.24-22.83, p=0.001)	2.06 (0.81 to 3.31, p=0.001)	-0.19 (-0.27 to -0.11, p<0.001)	4.22 (1.12-15.94, p=0.034)
	Female | 50 to 69	2.10 (0.39-11.37, p=0.389)	6.18 (2.28-16.78, p<0.001)	1.20 (0.15 to 2.24, p=0.012)	-0.10 (-0.17 to -0.03, p=0.003)	2.70 (0.81-9.03, p=0.107)
	Female | Over 70	1.21 (0.11-13.89, p=0.876)	0.62 (0.12-3.11, p=0.562)	0.29 (-1.33 to 1.92, p=0.362)	-0.06 (-0.17 to 0.04, p=0.109)	1.88 (0.36-9.82, p=0.452)
Any comorbidity	No comorbidities	-	-	-	-	-
	One or more comorbidities	2.28 (0.92-5.65, p=0.076)	0.74 (0.42-1.31, p=0.304)	0.95 (0.35 to 1.55, p=0.001)	-0.02 (-0.06 to 0.02, p=0.139)	2.96 (1.57-5.57, p=0.001)
Severity	Scale 3 (did not receive supplemental oxygen)	-	-	-	-	-
	Scale 4 (received supplemental oxygen)	0.61 (0.15-2.43, p=0.483)	0.51 (0.24-1.07, p=0.076)	-0.26 (-1.06 to 0.55, p=0.266)	0.04 (-0.01 to 0.09, p=0.077)	1.11 (0.51-2.40, p=0.798)
	Scale 5 (received HFNC or NIV)	0.32 (0.07-1.46, p=0.142)	0.89 (0.36-2.21, p=0.794)	-0.20 (-1.22 to 0.83, p=0.354)	0.01 (-0.06 to 0.08, p=0.371)	1.32 (0.49-3.51, p=0.583)
	Scale 6 or 7 (received invasive mechanical ventilation or critical care)	1.18 (0.24-5.95, p=0.838)	1.82 (0.79-4.22, p=0.162)	-0.18 (-1.09 to 0.74, p=0.354)	-0.05 (-0.11 to 0.02, p=0.073)	1.48 (0.63-3.52, p=0.370)

HFNC – High flow nasal cannulae, NIV – Noninvasive ventilation, MRC – Medical Research Council. Model metrics: For persistent symptoms - Number in model = 327, Number of groups = 32, AIC = 172.4, C-statistic = 0.683; For change in MRC dyspnoea level - Number in model = 291, Number of groups = 32, AIC = 383.1, C-statistic = 0.767; For change in fatigue - Number in model = 308, Number of groups = 32, Log likelihood = -724.13, REML criterion = 1448.3; For change in health state (EQ5D-5L) - Number in model = 311, Number of groups = 32, Log likelihood = 80.55, REML criterion = -161.1; For change in Washington short set disability - Number in model = 320, Number of groups = 31, AIC = 355.1, C-statistic = 0.74.

Figures

Figure 1 – Patient inclusion flowchart



Figure 2 – Proportion of new or persistent symptoms occurring (figure 2A) and their co-occurrence with each other (figure 2B). For figure 2A, fatigue is coloured in green as this outcome was derived from the fatigue visual analogue outcome, where a fatigue rating of 2 or greater was considered as the presence of the fatigue symptom (see supplementary table 7 for raw values). Erectile dysfunction affected 23.4% (45/192) of males included, not shown as figure 2A presents data for any sex. For figure 2B, the Jaccard similarity index was calculated and presented as intensity of red colour, with 0 (white) being no co-occurrence and 1 (bright red) being always co-occurring.



Figure 3 – Outcomes stratified by age and presence of one or more comorbidities. Figure 3A – Proportion of participants not feeling fully recovered; Figure 3B – Proportion of participants with new or persistent symptoms; Figure 3C - Proportion of participants with increased breathlessness as measured by MRC dyspnoea scale; Figure 3D – Participant rated fatigue on 0 to 10 VAS; Figure 3E – Change in overall EQ5D-5L summary health index; Figure 3F – presence of new or worse disability in at least one Washington Group disability domain.



MRC – Medical Research Council, VAS – Visual Analogue Scale.

Figure 4 – MRC Dyspnoea scale prior to Covid-19 onset and at the time of follow-up. Figure 4A – MRC dyspnoea scale reported prior to onset of Covid-19 symptoms; Figure 4B – MRC dyspnoea scale at the time of follow-up; Figure 4C – Alluvial plot of proportion of the changes in proportion of men and women in each MRC scale grade before symptom onset and at time of follow-up, stratified in each sex group by admission to critical care. In figure 4C, for females, there are greater numbers of participants who begin at MRC 1 and transition to higher levels on the scale compared with males.



MRC – Medical Research Council

Figure 5 – Multilevel model for primary outcome of self-reported recovery (reference level is feeling fully recovered).



Number in model = 323, Number of groups = 32, AIC = 422.6, C-statistic = 0.773

Supplementary appendix 1
Supplementary table 1 – Comparison between respondents and those who did not respond

		No response	Responded	p-value
Total N (%)		497 (60.3)	327 (39.7)	
Age	Median (IQR)	57.7 (48.1 to 69.6)	59.7 (51.7 to 67.7)	0.173
	<50	138 (27.8)	70 (21.4)	
	50-69	240 (48.3)	195 (59.6)	
	70-79	69 (13.9)	40 (12.2)	
	80+	50 (10.1)	22 (6.7)	
Sex at Birth	Male	302 (60.8)	192 (58.7)	0.559
	Female	193 (38.8)	135 (41.3)	
	(Missing)	2 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	
Ethnicity	White	331 (66.6)	265 (81.0)	<0.001
	South Asian	37 (7.4)	8 (2.4)	
	East Asian	16 (3.2)	4 (1.2)	
	Black	40 (8.0)	15 (4.6)	
	Other Ethnic Minority	44 (8.9)	21 (6.4)	
	(Missing)	29 (5.8)	14 (4.3)	
Smoking	Never Smoked	274 (55.1)	176 (53.8)	0.018
	Current Smoker	31 (6.2)	7 (2.1)	
	Former Smoker	123 (24.7)	92 (28.1)	
	(Missing)	69 (13.9)	52 (15.9)	
Diabetes	No	388 (80.8)	254 (80.4)	0.947
	Yes	92 (19.2)	62 (19.6)	
Obesity (as defined by clinical staff)	No	407 (81.9)	254 (77.7)	0.069
	Yes	61 (12.3)	56 (17.1)	
	(Missing)	29 (5.8)	17 (5.2)	
Chronic cardiac disease	No	396 (79.7)	272 (83.2)	0.213
	Yes	84 (16.9)	44 (13.5)	
	(Missing)	17 (3.4)	11 (3.4)	
Chronic pulmonary disease (not asthma)	No	428 (86.1)	290 (88.7)	0.130
	Yes	52 (10.5)	23 (7.0)	
	(Missing)	17 (3.4)	14 (4.3)	
Asthma (physician diagnosed)	No	399 (80.3)	252 (77.1)	0.255
	Yes	82 (16.5)	65 (19.9)	
	(Missing)	16 (3.2)	10 (3.1)	
Chronic kidney disease	No	442 (88.9)	298 (91.1)	0.181
	Yes	41 (8.2)	18 (5.5)	
	(Missing)	14 (2.8)	11 (3.4)	
Malignant neoplasm	No	457 (92.0)	306 (93.6)	0.192
	Yes	26 (5.2)	10 (3.1)	
	(Missing)	14 (2.8)	11 (3.4)	
Rheumatologic disorder	No	445 (89.5)	290 (88.7)	0.719
	Yes	32 (6.4)	24 (7.3)	
	(Missing)	20 (4.0)	13 (4.0)	
Critical care admission	Ward level care only	363 (73.0)	197 (60.2)	<0.001
	Admitted to Critical Care	133 (26.8)	130 (39.8)	
	(Missing)	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	
Length of stay (days)	Median (IQR)	8.0 (5.0 to 20.0)	9.0 (5.0 to 20.0)	0.486

Supplementary table 2 – Long-term outcomes by sex

		Male	Female	p-value
Total N (%)		192 (58.7)	135 (41.3)	
Self-reported overall recovery	Feels fully recovered	56 (29.2)	27 (20.0)	0.117
	Does not feel fully recovered	103 (53.6)	76 (56.3)	
	Not sure	31 (16.1)	30 (22.2)	
	(Missing)	2 (1.0)	2 (1.5)	
New or persistent symptoms	No new or persistent symptoms	17 (8.9)	5 (3.7)	0.108
	New or persistent symptoms	175 (91.1)	130 (96.3)	
Change in breathlessness after COVID-19 (MRC Dyspnoea)	No change	88 (45.8)	39 (28.9)	0.015
	Less breathless	7 (3.6)	4 (3.0)	
	More breathless	80 (41.7)	73 (54.1)	
	(Missing)	17 (8.9)	19 (14.1)	
Fatigue level (0 to 10 VAS)	Median (IQR)	4.0 (2.0 to 6.0)	6.0 (2.0 to 7.0)	<0.001
EQ5D-5L change in overall summary index	Median (IQR)	-0.0 (-0.2 to 0.0)	-0.1 (-0.3 to 0.0)	<0.001
Washington Group Short Set	No change in disability	150 (78.1)	91 (67.4)	0.059
	New or worse disability in at least one domain	39 (20.3)	40 (29.6)	
	(Missing)	3 (1.6)	4 (3.0)	

HFNC – High flow nasal cannulae, NIV – Noninvasive ventilation, MRC – Medical Research Council, IQR – Interquartile range, presented as 25th to 75th centiles. Numbers are presented as N (%), unless otherwise denoted as a continuous variable.

Supplementary table 3 –Overall new or worse disability by Washington Group disability domains before onset of Covid-19 compared with disability at time of follow-up.

Washington Group Domain		Total participants (%)
Total N (%)		327 (100.0)
Vision	No change	256 (78.3)
	New mild disability	57 (17.4)
	New moderate disability	3 (0.9)
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)
	(Missing)	11 (3.4)
Hearing	No change	286 (87.5)
	New mild disability	28 (8.6)
	New moderate disability	4 (1.2)
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)
	(Missing)	9 (2.8)
Walking and mobility	No change	181 (55.4)
	New mild disability	109 (33.3)
	New moderate disability	21 (6.4)
	New severe disability	1 (0.3)
	(Missing)	15 (4.6)
Memory and concentration	No change	182 (55.7)
	New mild disability	98 (30.0)
	New moderate disability	32 (9.8)
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)
	(Missing)	15 (4.6)
Washing and self-care	No change	268 (82.0)
	New mild disability	45 (13.8)
	New moderate disability	4 (1.2)
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)
	(Missing)	10 (3.1)
Communicating	No change	265 (81.0)
	New mild disability	50 (15.3)
	New moderate disability	3 (0.9)
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)
	(Missing)	9 (2.8)

Numbers are N (%).

Supplementary table 4 – New or worse disability across Washington Group disability domains, before onset of Covid-19 compared with disability at time of follow-up stratified by sex.

Washington Group Domain		Male	Female	p-value
Total N (%)		192 (58.7)	135 (41.3)	
Vision	No change	160 (83.3)	96 (71.1)	0.009
	New mild disability	23 (12.0)	34 (25.2)	
	New moderate disability	2 (1.0)	1 (0.7)	
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	7 (3.6)	4 (3.0)	
Hearing	No change	168 (87.5)	118 (87.4)	0.246
	New mild disability	17 (8.9)	11 (8.1)	
	New moderate disability	4 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	3 (1.6)	6 (4.4)	
Walking and mobility	No change	120 (62.5)	61 (45.2)	0.040
	New mild disability	55 (28.6)	54 (40.0)	
	New moderate disability	11 (5.7)	10 (7.4)	
	New severe disability	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	5 (2.6)	10 (7.4)	
Memory and concentration	No change	119 (62.0)	63 (46.7)	0.023
	New mild disability	52 (27.1)	46 (34.1)	
	New moderate disability	14 (7.3)	18 (13.3)	
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	7 (3.6)	8 (5.9)	
Washing and self-care	No change	161 (83.9)	107 (79.3)	0.651
	New mild disability	24 (12.5)	21 (15.6)	
	New moderate disability	2 (1.0)	2 (1.5)	
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	5 (2.6)	5 (3.7)	
Communicating	No change	159 (82.8)	106 (78.5)	0.552
	New mild disability	26 (13.5)	24 (17.8)	
	New moderate disability	2 (1.0)	1 (0.7)	
	New severe disability	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
	(Missing)	5 (2.6)	4 (3.0)	

Numbers are N (%).

Supplementary table 5 – Overall changes by EQ5D-5L dimension before Covid-19 onset and at time of follow-up.

Dimension	Change in EQ5D-5L	Total number of participants (%)
Mobility	No change	199 (64.0)
	Improve	3 (1.0)
	Worsen	109 (35.0)
	Total	311 (100.0)
Self-care	No change	256 (82.3)
	Improve	1 (0.3)
	Worsen	54 (17.4)
	Total	311 (100.0)
Usual activities	No change	185 (59.5)
	Improve	5 (1.6)
	Worsen	121 (38.9)
	Total	311 (100.0)
Pain/discomfort	No change	184 (59.2)
	Improve	10 (3.2)
	Worsen	117 (37.6)
	Total	311 (100.0)
Anxiety/depression	No change	181 (58.2)
	Improve	13 (4.2)
	Worsen	117 (37.6)
	Total	311 (100.0)

Numbers are N (%).

Supplementary table 6 – Overall changes by EQ5D-5L dimension and sex before Covid-19 onset and at time of follow-up.

Dimension	Change in EQ5D-5L	Male (%)	Female (%)
Mobility	No change	126 (68.1)	73 (57.9)
	Improve	2 (1.1)	1 (0.8)
	Worsen	57 (30.8)	52 (41.3)
	Total	185 (100.0)	126 (100.0)
Self-care	No change	156 (84.3)	100 (79.4)
	Improve	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
	Worsen	28 (15.1)	26 (20.6)
	Total	185 (100.0)	126 (100.0)
Usual activities	No change	120 (64.9)	65 (51.6)
	Improve	3 (1.6)	2 (1.6)
	Worsen	62 (33.5)	59 (46.8)
	Total	185 (100.0)	126 (100.0)
Pain/discomfort	No change	121 (65.4)	63 (50.0)
	Improve	6 (3.2)	4 (3.2)
	Worsen	58 (31.4)	59 (46.8)
	Total	185 (100.0)	126 (100.0)
Anxiety/depression	No change	126 (68.1)	55 (43.7)
	Improve	8 (4.3)	5 (4.0)
	Worsen	51 (27.6)	66 (52.4)
	Total	185 (100.0)	126 (100.0)

Numbers are N (%).

Supplementary table 7 – Proportion of participants experiencing new or persistent symptoms at time of follow-up.

Symptom	Number of participants experiencing symptom (%)	Participant denominator
Fatigue	255 (82.8)	308
Shortness of breath	175 (53.5)	327
Problems sleeping	151 (46.2)	327
Headache	129 (39.4)	327
Limb weakness	123 (37.6)	327
Joint pain or swelling	121 (37.0)	327
Persistent muscle pain	121 (37.0)	327
Dizziness/light headedness	117 (35.8)	327
Problems with balance	99 (30.3)	327
Swollen ankle	80 (24.5)	327
Palpitations	76 (23.2)	327
Constipation	59 (18.0)	327
Problems seeing	59 (18.0)	327
Diarrhoea	58 (17.7)	327
Stomach pain	58 (17.7)	327
Chest pains	50 (15.3)	327
Persistent cough	50 (15.3)	327
Erectile dysfunction	45 (23.4)	192
Pain on breathing	43 (13.1)	327
Loss of smell	42 (12.8)	327
Other	42 (12.8)	327
Persistent fevers	36 (11.0)	327
Loss of taste	35 (10.7)	327
Nausea/vomiting	34 (10.4)	327
Loss of appetite	33 (10.1)	327
Problems swallowing	28 (8.6)	327
Skin rash	27 (8.3)	327
Weight loss	24 (7.3)	327
Problems passing urine	23 (7.0)	327
Hemiplegia/paraesthesiae	20 (6.1)	327
Toe lesions	13 (4.0)	327

Supplementary Figure 1 – Fatigue rating on Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) by sex.