

Patient-reported respiratory outcome measures in the recovery of adults hospitalised with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Sophie Middleton^{1,2}, Christos Chalitsios³, Tricia. M. McKeever^{1,3}, Alex R. Jenkins¹, Charlotte. E. Bolton^{1,2}

1. NIHR Nottingham BRC Respiratory Theme, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
2. Dept. of Respiratory Medicine, City Hospital, Nottingham University Hospital NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK.
3. Division of Epidemiology and Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

ABSTRACT

Background

Acute COVID-19 clinical symptoms have been clearly documented, but long-term functional and symptomatic recovery from COVID -19 is less well described.

Methods

A systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted to describe patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) in adults at least 8 weeks post hospital discharge for COVID-19. Comprehensive database searches in accordance with the PRISMA statement were carried out up till 31/05/2021. Data were narratively synthesized, and a series of meta-analyses were performed using the random-effects inverse variance method.

Results

From 49 studies, across 14 countries with between 2-12 months follow up, the most common persisting symptom reported was fatigue with meta-analysis finding 36.6% (95 % CI 27.6 to 46.6, n=14) reporting it at 2-4 months, decreasing slightly to 32.5% still reporting it at >4 months (95% CI 22.6 to 44.2, n=15). This was followed by dyspnoea. Modified MRC score (mMRC) ≥ 1 was reported in 48% (95% CI 30 to 37, n=5) at 2-4months reducing to 32% (95% CI 22 to 43, n=7) at 4 months. Quality of life (QOL) as assessed by the EQ-5D-5L VAS remained reduced at >4 months (73.6 95% CI 68.1 to 79.1, n=6). Hospitalisation with COVID-19 also resulted in persisting sick leave, change in scope of work, and continued use of primary and secondary healthcare.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Conclusion

The symptomatic and functional impact of COVID-19 continues to be felt by patients months after discharge from hospital. This widespread morbidity points towards a multi-disciplinary approach to aid functional recovery.

INTRODUCTION

Since emerging in December 2019, COVID-19 has impacted people, society and healthcare worldwide. As of 15th March 2022 there has been over 450 million reported confirmed cases and 6 million deaths. [1] Although there is a significant acute mortality the majority of patients with COVID-19 infection will survive. [2] Attention then shifts to consideration of long-term morbidity and its effects on society, the economy and healthcare. Previous coronavirus outbreak survivors have shown continued fatigue, persistent shortness of breath and reduced quality of life up to 12 months post illness. [3] Hospitalised pneumonia patients experience fatigue, cough, and dyspnoea during recovery with adverse impacts on functioning and healthcare utilisation. [4] Studies of early recovery have shown similar ongoing morbidity [5, 6] with continuing abnormal respiratory function in COVID-19 survivors. [7]

Often there is a mismatch between patients and clinicians on when recovery has been reached. A negative COVID-PCR test, discharge from hospital and resolution of pneumonia on thoracic imaging can all occur with a person experiencing ongoing symptoms and reduced functioning. [8] Patient reported outcomes (PROMs) are measurement tools that are a useful way for patients to provide relevant information on their health, including quality of life, symptoms, and day-to-day functioning to help provide information on their recovery. [9] This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to investigate the respiratory symptomatic and functional recovery of patients hospitalised with COVID-19 more than 8 weeks after hospitalisation using PROMs.

METHODS

This systematic review was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42021242134) [10] and followed PRISMA guidelines for reporting systematic reviews. [11]

Search strategy

The following databases were searched on 31/05/2021 for relevant studies: Embase, PubMed/MEDLINE, Cochrane COVID-19 Study register and CINAHL. The top 500 most relevant results on Google scholar were also searched as well as references within relevant articles and

reviews. The search strategy included synonyms for COVID-19, respiratory outcomes and relevant terms related to quality of life and functioning and was not subject to language restrictions (Supplementary table 1).

Eligibility and data extraction

Following collation of search results and removal of duplicate citations, title and abstract screening was undertaken by one reviewer to eliminate obviously irrelevant papers. Full papers were reviewed in duplicate for selection by four reviewers (SM, CC, TM, AJ). Papers were included if they contained participants over 18 years old, had a sample size of at least 30 patients who had been hospitalised in the acute phase, incorporated patients that had a clinical or PCR diagnosis of COVID-19 and had a minimum follow up time of 8 weeks post hospital discharge. A cut off sample size of 30 patients was used to avoid the inclusion of low powered studies and case reports. Studies were excluded if their primary outcome measures were focussed solely on non- respiratory or functional outcomes such as olfactory, gustatory, or neurological outcomes of COVID-19. Studies that included both hospitalised and non-hospitalised patients were included if they reported the hospitalised cohort separately. Studies that recorded follow-up from symptom onset were included if follow-up occurred at least 10 weeks following symptom onset as average time to admission to hospital is 5-6 days and average length of hospital stay is 5-15 days depending on age. [12]

Data extraction was undertaken using a proforma by four reviewers (SM, CC, TM, AR) and data agreed for each paper by two reviewers. Where disagreement remained, a third reviewer was included (CEB or TM). The proforma included patient selection, sample size, demographics, and study design. Main outcomes collected were patient reported symptoms, quality of life scores, breathlessness scales, functional testing, return to work and use of healthcare since discharge. The quality of the included studies was determined using the Newcastle-Ottawa score and Downs and Blacks checklist. [13, 14]

Statistical analysis

Narrative synthesis of evidence was conducted for all included studies. Extracted results were analysed for adequate numbers of each outcome reported to perform a meta-analysis. Studies were split into separate groups where participant subgroups had been reported separately and it was not possible to combine the data. Meta-analysis using random effects models was performed to allow for apparent heterogeneity among studies given the different population characteristics. When looking at the chronology of follow up there were 2 peaks around 3 and 6 months. To capture this the studies were grouped considering the time after discharge (2- 4 months and > 4 months) and

meta-analyses were performed for each group. The generic inverse variance method was used for pooling. Pooled estimates were calculated using proportions with 95% CI for symptoms, modified medical research council dyspnoea score (mMRC) and mean difference with 95% CI for 6 minute walk test (6MWT), Short physical performance battery (SPPB), and EQ5D-5L. The Dersimonian-Laird method was used to estimate the between-study variance T^2 . The percentage of variability in the effect sizes not caused by sampling error was tested by using the Higgins' I^2 test, with estimates of 25%, 50% and 75% indicating low, moderate, and high heterogeneity respectively. If a study reported follow-up at multiple time-points with the same cohort, only the first follow-up timepoint was used in the meta-analysis to avoid bias. All meta-analyses were conducted in R v4.0.3 using the "meta" and "metafor" packages and all statistical tests were two sided and used a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

The search strategy identified 7331 papers of which 49 studies were included in the study (Figure 1).
[15-62]




Figure 1: Paper selection process. Note some full text articles were excluded for multiple reasons.

Study Characteristics

All studies were observational studies with follow-up time ranging from 2 to 12 months and originating from countries worldwide including Italy (11), China (10), UK (5), France (4), Spain (3), Switzerland (3), Canada (2), Netherlands (2), Norway (2), Belgium (2), USA (1), Denmark (1), Russia (1), Brazil (1), Japan (1). Participant numbers ranged from 36 to 2649, overall, 56% of participants were male. (Supplementary Table 2). Eight studies included only participants that were admitted to ITU (Intensive therapy unit). Outcome areas of interest ranged widely between the studies and the outcome tools were not standardised. See supplementary table 3 for the full list of individual outcome measures. Thirty-one studies reported patient respiratory/general symptoms, 33 respiratory or functioning PROMs, 27 health-related quality of life, 10 return to work and 6 healthcare utilisations. Most studies were of moderate quality scoring an average of 5.8(SD 1.6) out of a maximum of 10. The majority of studies were single site with no control group or adjustment for confounders (Supplementary Table 4). One patient cohort was reported at different timepoints over 2 publications. [33, 34]

Patient-reported symptoms

Thirty-one papers reported on at least one respiratory or functional symptom and results from meta-analyses are reported in Table 1 (Forest plots Supplementary Figures 1 to 10). [15-17, 23, 24, 27-29, 32-34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 47-52, 57, 58, 61-63] The most prevalent reported symptom was fatigue (2 to 4 months; 36.6%; 95 % CI 27.6 to 46.6) which decreased slightly to 32.5% at >4 months (95% CI 22.6 to 44.2). This next most prevalent symptom at both times points was breathlessness.

Table 1: Meta-analysis of patient reported symptoms at 2-4 months and >4months after discharge.

Symptoms	2-4 months			>4 months		
	No of studies	Effect size (95% CI)	I^2 (%)	No of studies	Effect size (95% CI)	I^2 (%)
Breathlessness, %	15	28.8 (21.5 to 37.5)	94	11	22.0 (12.7 to 35.4)	98
Chest Pain , %	6	5.1 (1.9 to 13)	91	10	7.5 (4.9 to 11.3)	95
Cough, %	14	13.3 (9.4 to 18.6)	88	12	8.6 (5.4 to 13.7)	95
Fatigue, %	14	36.6 (27.6 to 46.6)	95	15	32.5 (22.6 to 44.2)	98
Myalgia, %	4	11.8 (5.4 to 24.1)	92	9	12.7 (6.4 to 24.4)	99

Respiratory and Functional outcomes

Thirty-three studies reported respiratory and functional outcomes across 18 different outcome measures. [15, 16, 20-25, 27, 28, 30-38, 40-43, 45, 47, 51-53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 63] The most common outcome measure reported was the mMRC breathlessness score (2 to 4 months; 48%; 95% CI 30 TO 67) reducing to 32% (95% CI 22 to 43) at >4 months (Table 2) (Forrest plots Online supplement Figure 11 to 21). The six-minute walk test(6MWT) was around 500 metres for both patients in 2 to 4 months and >4 months after discharge. [20, 30-35, 41, 45, 55, 60, 63]

Three studies measured breathlessness according to the Borg scale at 9 weeks (51%) [20], 6 months (40%) [40] and 6 months (11%) [59] The full summary of outcomes not included in the meta-analysis can be seen in Supplementary Table 5 to 7.

Table 2: Meta-analysis of functional outcomes and health related quality of life at 2-4 months and >4months after discharge.

Functional test	2- 4 months			>4 months		
	No of studies	Effect size (95% CI)	I^2 (%)	No of studies	Effect size (95% CI)	I^2 (%)
6MWT, m	6	501 (441.3 to 560.8)	98	6	494.7 (457 to 532.4)	98
SPPB	-	-	-	2	9.5 (8.4 to 10.6)	92
mMRC 0, %	5	45 (31 to 60)	89	7	67 (54 to 77)	98
mMRC \geq 1, %	5	48 (30 to 67)	93	7	32 (22 to 43)	98
EQ5D-Index	2	0.67 (0.60 to 0.74)	72	5	0.74 (0.68 to 0.81)	97
EQ5D-VAS	1	-	-	6	73.6 (68.1 to 79.1)	98

Abbreviations: Six minute walk test (6MWT), Short physical performance battery (SPPB), modified medical research council (mMRC) dyspnoea score.

Health related Quality of life

Twenty-seven papers looked at patient quality of life using seven different outcome measures. The most common outcome measure used was the EQ-5D. [15, 18, 21, 27, 28, 32, 35, 38, 40, 42, 47, 51-54, 56, 57] The EQ-5D VAS score ranges from 0 to 100 with 100 being the best quality of life. The meta-analysis showed a EQ-5D-5L VAS score of 73.6(95% CI 68.1 to 79.1) at 4 months (Table 2).

Five studies [33, 34, 41, 43, 55] used the SF-36 score to assess quality of life at follow up. Similarly, marked out of 100, with 100 representing the best quality of life, participants reported being

particularly limited in their role in society by their physical health problems (Range 23.7 to 68). [34, 55] (Supplementary Table 8). Gianella et al found Health-related quality of life to be below population average at 81 days follow up with an average score of 31 ± 1.6 (50 ± 10 expected average). [30] Using the 15-D HRQOL score, Gamberini et al found impairment in a participant's breathing, usual activities, vitality, and sexual activity at 90 days. [26]

Return to work

Ten studies reported on work resumption. [15, 19, 25, 27, 29, 33, 38, 40, 54, 62] Eight papers reported return to pre-illness job without work adjustments. [15, 19, 25, 27, 29, 33, 40, 62] This ranged from 20.5% back at work after 61 days [40] to 100% back at work after 3 months [62] At 61 days Monti et al [40] reported 48.7% of workers remaining on sick leave, whereas Latronico et al [33] reported 32% at 3 months and Evans et al [15] reported 17.6% at 5 months. Vaes et al found that on average participants missed 81.5% of work time at 3 month follow up decreasing to 60% at 6 months. [54] Of those at work 67.8% and 59.7% felt their work was impaired at 3 and 6 month follow up. [54] The proportion of participants who had a change in their scope of work or part time work ranged from 2.5% to 32%. [33, 38, 40, 62]

Healthcare utilisation

Six studies reported on reattendance to healthcare providers following discharge. [25, 29, 38, 49, 50, 53] Rehospitalisation rate ranged from 8% to 28% at the time of follow-up across the 6 studies. Two studies found that 61.7% and 66.4% of participants had visited a GP between discharge and follow-up [38, 50] and 20.3% of participants had attended an emergency department by 3 months follow-up. [53]

DISCUSSION

This comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the respiratory and functional recovery of hospitalised adult patients with COVID-19 demonstrates over a third of participants continued to experience fatigue and 32% had an abnormal dyspnoea score over 4 months following hospital discharge. After 4 months the quality of life was below population average. [64].

Hospitalisation with COVID-19 resulted in persisting sick leave, change in scope of work and impairment at work up to 6 months post discharge and continued use of primary and secondary healthcare.

Other respiratory infections have shown similar ongoing respiratory and functional sequelae after discharge. [4, 65, 66] In a systematic review of community acquired pneumonia (CAP) at 6 weeks post infection, fatigue was seen in 42% (95% CI 10 to 74) and dyspnoea in 39% (95% CI 21 to 58).

This was comparatively slightly higher than in our study at 36.6% (CI 27.6 to 46.6) and 28.8% (CI 21.5 to 37.5) respectively at 2-4 months follow-up. [4] In SARS, survivors continued to have reduced exercise capacity at 6 months post discharge with mean 6MWT 461 m (95% CI 450–473m) compared to 494.7m (95% CI 457 to 532.4) in our study at >4months. This was coupled with long-term respiratory, psychological sequelae and reduced health related quality of life. [65] Additionally, COVID-19 survivors had a higher burden and broader array of systemic sequelae than hospitalised seasonal influenza survivors at a mean follow up time of 150 days. This was coupled with an increased risk of death (HR= 1.51; 95% CI 1.30–1.76) and increased risk of needing outpatient care (HR= 1.12; 95% CI 1.08–1.17). [66]

The majority of patients testing positive for COVID-19 will not require hospital admission [67] and indeed persisting symptoms may occur in this group too with 47% of women and 33% of men having ≥ 1 symptom an average of 117 days post COVID-19 infection. [68] In our study between 8% to 28% of patients were re-hospitalised [25, 29, 38, 49, 50, 53] and 61.7% and 66.4% had visited their GP at the time of follow up [38, 50]. Up to 6 months after testing positive for COVID-19, 73% of non-hospitalised patients had visited their GP, a hospital outpatient clinic or been admitted to hospital. Healthcare usage was increased compared to matched COVID-19 negative patients. [69] Allocation of resources should be considered for management of COVID-19 recovery at all severity levels regardless of hospitalisation status.

We have reported the long-term respiratory and functional sequelae of COVID-19. Other studies have described a larger breadth of sequelae effecting mental health, neurological, gastrointestinal, metabolic, and cardiac systems. [66] WHO has recognised the urgent need for further understanding of the complexity of prolonged recovery from COVID, its wider economic and social implications and the need for new management pathways centred round multi-disciplinary care. [70] Care should involve rehabilitation, psychological intervention as well speciality management of physical health symptoms. [71] These follow-up clinics can also facilitate future research to improve our understanding and care of patient during recovery from COVID-19.

Strengths and limitations.

To the best of our knowledge this is the first meta-analysis looking at PROMs during prolonged recovery from COVID-19 hospitalised patients more than 8 weeks post discharge. It was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines. Studies varied widely in their study population selection and their outcome measures used. This limited the number of outcomes that could be used in the meta-analysis and contributed to the heterogeneity of results. The criteria for severe COVID-19 were defined differently between different countries/studies, this inhibited subgroup analysis based on

this. There is a potential bias due to uncontrolled confounders and heterogeneity in observational studies. Due to insufficient data reporting in the original publications, we could not assess the effects of other factors, such as sex, age, and comorbidities in the proportion of symptoms. For future research, standardising PROMs used as well as classification of COVID-19 severity would aid translative research and collaborative work.

CONCLUSION

We have shown that beyond 2 months since discharge respiratory symptoms, functional deficits and reduced quality of life are experienced by survivors of COVID-19 hospital admission. These results along with other emerging data, support the need for a multi-system, multi-disciplinary approach to support and aid functional recovery in these patients.

Authors contribution:

S.M, C.E.B, and T.M.M designed the research and wrote the methodology. S.M performed the literature search. S.M, C.V.C, A.R.J and T.M.M were involved in the paper selection process. S.M, C.V.C, A.R.J and T.M.M extracted and checked data. C.V.C performed the meta-analyses. S.M drafted the paper. C.V.C, C.E.B, A.R.J and T.M.M critically reviewed and improved it.

Acknowledgements:

Thank you to Alison Ashmore, Senior Research Librarian at University of Nottingham libraries for help in devising a comprehensive literature search.

Declaration of interest:

No direct funding has been received. SM, first author, is a NIHR funded trainee. CEB and TMM are supported by the NIHR Nottingham Biomedical Research Centre. The views and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health and Social Care.

CEB has received research grant funding to conduct research into post Covid recovery from UKRI and NIHR, Nottingham University Hospitals R&I, NIHR Nottingham BRC and Nottingham Hospitals Charity.

REFERENCES

1 Geneva: World Health Organization. WHO COVID-19 Dashboard. ;2021.

- 2 Ioannidis JP. Infection fatality rate of COVID-19 inferred from seroprevalence data, *Bull World Health Organ* 2021;99:19.
- 3 O'Sullivan O. Long-term sequelae following previous coronavirus epidemics, *Clin Med (Lond)* 2021;21:e68-70.
- 4 Pick HJ, Bolton CE, Lim WS, et al. Patient-reported outcome measures in the recovery of adults hospitalised with community-acquired pneumonia: a systematic review, *Eur Respir J* 2019;53:1802165 doi:10.1183/13993003.02165-2018 [published Online First: European Respiratory Society].
- 5 Halpin SJ, McIvor C, Whyatt G, et al. Postdischarge symptoms and rehabilitation needs in survivors of COVID-19 infection: A cross-sectional evaluation, *J Med Virol* 2021;93:1013-22.
- 6 Carfi A., Bernabei R., Landi F. Persistent symptoms in patients after acute COVID-19. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association* 2020;324:603-5.
- 7 Torres-Castro R, Vasconcello-Castillo L, Alsina-Restoy X, et al. Respiratory function in patients post-infection by COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis, *Pulmonology* 2020.
- 8 Lerum T.V., Skjonsberg O.H., Aalokken T.M., et al. Dyspnoea, lung function and CT findings 3 months after hospital admission for COVID-19, *European Respiratory Journal* 2021;57.
- 9 Berry P. Use patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) in treatment of long covid, *BMJ* 2021;373:n1260 doi:10.1136/bmj.n1260 [published Online First: British Medical Journal Publishing Group].
- 10 Sophie Middleton, Tricia. M. McKeever, Christos Chalitsios, Alex Jenkins, Charlotte. E. Bolton. Patient-reported respiratory outcome measures in the recovery of adults hospitalised with Covid-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. CRD42021242134. 2021.
- 11 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews, *BMJ* 2021;372:n71 doi:10.1136/bmj.n71 [published Online First: British Medical Journal Publishing Group].
- 12 Faes C, Abrams S, Van Beckhoven D, et al. Time between symptom onset, hospitalisation and recovery or death: statistical analysis of Belgian COVID-19 patients, *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2020;17:7560.

- 13 Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions, *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1998;52:377-84.
- 14 Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses, *Ottawa: Ottawa Hospital Research Institute* 2011:1-12.
- 15 Evans RA, McAuley H, Harrison EM, et al. Physical, cognitive, and mental health impacts of COVID-19 after hospitalisation (PHOSP-COVID): a UK multicentre, prospective cohort study, *The Lancet. Respiratory medicine* 2021;9:1275-87.
- 16 Bellan M., Soddu D., Balbo P.E., et al. Respiratory and psychophysical sequelae among patients with covid-19 four months after hospital discharge. *JAMA Network Open* 2021;4:Arte Number: 36142. ate of Pubaton: 27 Jan 2021.
- 17 Boari GEM, Bonetti S, Braglia-Orlandini F, et al. Short-Term Consequences of SARS-CoV-2-Related Pneumonia: A Follow Up Study, *High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev* 2021:1-9.
- 18 Carenzo L., Protti A., Dalla Corte F., et al. Short-term health-related quality of life, physical function and psychological consequences of severe COVID-19, *Annals of Intensive Care* 2021;11.
- 19 Carenzo L, Dalla Corte F, Haines RW, et al. Return to Work After Coronavirus Disease 2019 Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Intensive Care Admission: Prospective, Case Series at 6 Months From Hospital Discharge, *Crit Care Med* 2021.
- 20 Damanti S, Ramirez GA, Bozzolo EP, et al. 6-Month Respiratory Outcomes and Exercise Capacity of COVID-19 Acute Respiratory Failure Patients Treated With CPAP, *Intern Med J* 2021.
- 21 DE Lorenzo R, Cinel E., Cilla M., et al. Physical and psychological sequelae at three months after acute illness in COVID-19 survivors, *Panminerva Med* 2021.
- 22 Du H, Fang S, Wu S, et al. Six-month follow-up of functional status in discharged patients with coronavirus disease 2019, 2020.
- 23 Fayol A, Livrozet M, Boutouyrie P, et al. Cardiac performance in patients hospitalized with COVID-19: a 6 month follow-up study, *ESC Heart Fail* 2021.
- 24 Froidure A, Mahsouli A, Liistro G, et al. Integrative respiratory follow-up of severe COVID-19 reveals common functional and lung imaging sequelae, *Respir Med* 2021;181:106383.

- 25 Frontera JA, Yang D, Lewis A, et al. A prospective study of long-term outcomes among hospitalized COVID-19 patients with and without neurological complications, *J Neurol Sci* 2021;426:117486.
- 26 Gamberini L, Mazzoli CA, Sintonen H, et al. Quality of life of COVID-19 critically ill survivors after ICU discharge: 90 days follow-up, *Qual Life Res* 2021:1-13.
- 27 Garrigues E, Janvier P, Kherabi Y, et al. Post-discharge persistent symptoms and health-related quality of life after hospitalization for COVID-19, *J Infect* 2020;81:e4-6.
- 28 Gautam N, Madathil S, Tahani N, et al. Medium-term outcome of severe to critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection, *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2021.
- 29 Ghosn J, Piroth L, Epaulard O, et al. Persistent COVID-19 symptoms are highly prevalent 6 months after hospitalization: results from a large prospective cohort, *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2021.
- 30 Gianella P, Rigamonti E, Marando M, et al. Clinical, radiological and functional outcomes in patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia: a prospective observational study, *BMC Pulm Med* 2021;21:136,021-01509-3.
- 31 Guler SA, Ebner L, Aubry-Beigelman C, et al. Pulmonary function and radiological features 4 months after COVID-19: first results from the national prospective observational Swiss COVID-19 lung study, *Eur Respir J* 2021;57:10.1183/13993003.03690,2020. Print 2021 Apr.
- 32 Huang C., Huang L., Li X., et al. 6-month consequences of COVID-19 in patients discharged from hospital: a cohort study. *The Lancet* 2021;397:220-32.
- 33 Latronico N, Peli E, Rodella F, et al. Three-month outcome in survivors of COVID-19 associated Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome, *Available at SSRN 3749226* 2021.
- 34 Latronico N, Peli E, Rodella F, et al. Six-Month Outcome in Survivors of COVID-19 Associated Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome, *Six-Month Outcome in Survivors of COVID-19 Associated Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome* 2020.
- 35 Lerum TV, Aalokken TM, Bronstad E, et al. Dyspnoea, lung function and CT findings 3 months after hospital admission for COVID-19, *Eur Respir J* 2021;57:10.1183/13993003.03448,2020. Print 2021 Apr.
- 36 Leth S, Gunst JD, Mathiasen V, et al. Persistent Symptoms in Patients Recovering From COVID-19 in Denmark. 2021;8:ofab042.

37 Meng X, Kang K, Gao Y, et al. Pulmonary Dysfunction in Patients Recovered from COVID-19 Pneumonia: A 6-Month Follow-up Study, 2020.

38 Menges D, Ballouz T, Anagnostopoulos A, et al. Estimating the burden of post-COVID-19 syndrome in a population-based cohort study of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals: Implications for healthcare service planning, *medRxiv* 2021.

39 Miyazato Y., Morioka S., Tsuzuki S., et al. Prolonged and Late-Onset Symptoms of Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2020;7:Arte Number: ofaa507. ate of Pubaton: 01 No 2020.

40 Monti G., Leggieri C., Fominskiy E., et al. Two-months quality of life of COVID-19 invasively ventilated survivors; an Italian single-center study. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2021:ate of Pubaton: 2021.

41 Morin L., Savale L., Pham T., et al. Four-Month Clinical Status of a Cohort of Patients after Hospitalization for COVID-19. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association* 2021:ate of Pubaton: 2021.

42 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.

43 Parker A.J., Humbir A., Tiwary P., et al. Recovery after critical illness in COVID-19 ICU survivors, *Br J Anaesth* 2021;126.

44 Qin W., Chen S., Zhang Y., et al. Diffusion Capacity Abnormalities for Carbon Monoxide in Patients with COVID-19 At Three-Month Follow-up. *The European respiratory journal* 2021:ate of Pubaton: 11 Feb 2021.

45 Shah A.S., Wong A.W., Hague C.J., et al. A prospective study of 12-week respiratory outcomes in COVID-19-related hospitalisations. *Thorax* 2021;76:402-4.

46 Shang YF, Liu T, Yu JN, et al. Half-year follow-up of patients recovering from severe COVID-19: Analysis of symptoms and their risk factors, *J Intern Med* 2021.

47 Sigfrid L, Drake TM, Pauley E, et al. Long Covid in adults discharged from UK hospitals after Covid-19: A prospective, multicentre cohort study using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol, *medRxiv* 2021.

48 Smet J, Stylemans D, Hanon S, et al. Clinical status and lung function 10 weeks after severe SARS-CoV-2 infection, *Respir Med* 2021;176:106276.

49 Spinicci M., Vellere I., Graziani L., et al. Clinical and Laboratory Follow-up after Hospitalization for COVID-19 at an Italian Tertiary Care Center, *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2021;8.

50 SuarezRobles M., IguaranBermudez M.R., GarciaKlepizg J.L., et al. Ninety days post-hospitalization evaluation of residual covid-19 symptoms through a phone call check list. *Pan African Medical Journal* 2020;37:Arte Number: 289. ate of Pubaton: Setember,eember 2020.

51 Sykes D.L., Holdsworth L., Jawad N., et al. Post-COVID-19 Symptom Burden: What is Long-COVID and How Should We Manage It?. *Lung* 2021:ate of Pubaton: 2021.

52 Taboada M., Moreno E., Carinena A., et al. Quality of life, functional status, and persistent symptoms after intensive care of COVID-19 patients. *Br J Anaesth* 2021;126:e110-3.

53 Todt BC, Szlejf C, Duim E, et al. Clinical outcomes and quality of life of COVID-19 survivors: A follow-up of 3 months post hospital discharge, *Respir Med* 2021;184:106453.

54 Vaes AW, Goërtz YMJ, Van Herck M, et al. Recovery from COVID-19: a sprint or marathon? 6-month follow-up data from online long COVID-19 support group members, *ERJ Open Res* 2021;7:00141,2021. doi: 10.1183/23120541.00141-2021. eCollection 2021 Apr.

55 van den Borst B., Peters J.B., Brink M., et al. Comprehensive health assessment three months after recovery from acute COVID-19. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2020:ate of Pubaton: 21 No 2020.

56 Walle-Hansen MM, Ranhoff AH, Mellingsæter M, et al. Health-related quality of life, functional decline, and long-term mortality in older patients following hospitalisation due to COVID-19, *BMC Geriatr* 2021;21:199,021-02140-x.

57 Wong A.W., Shah A.S., Johnston J.C., et al. Patient-reported outcome measures after COVID-19: A prospective cohort study. *European Respiratory Journal* 2020;56:Arte Number: 2003276. ate of Pubaton: Noember 2020.

58 Wu Q., Zhong L., Li H., et al. A Follow-Up Study of Lung Function and Chest Computed Tomography at 6 Months after Discharge in Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Canadian Respiratory Journal* 2021;2021:Arte Number: 6692409. ate of Pubaton: 2021.

59 Wu Q, Hou X, Li H, et al. A follow-up study of respiratory and physical function after discharge in patients with re-detectable positive SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid results following recovery from COVID-19, *Int J Infect Dis* 2021;107:5-11.

60 Wu X, Liu X, Zhou Y, et al. 3-month, 6-month, 9-month, and 12-month respiratory outcomes in patients following COVID-19-related hospitalisation: a prospective study, *Lancet Respir Med* 2021.

61 Xiong Q., Xu M., Li J., et al. Clinical sequelae of COVID-19 survivors in Wuhan, China: a single-centre longitudinal study. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2021;27:89-95.

62 Zhao Y, Shang Y, Song W, 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.

63 González J, Benítez ID, Carmona P, et al. Pulmonary Function and Radiological Features in Survivors of Critical Covid-19: a 3-Month Prospective Cohort, *Chest* 2021.

64 Janssen M, Szende A, Cabases J, et al. Population norms for the EQ-5D-3L: a cross-country analysis of population surveys for 20 countries, *The European Journal of Health Economics* 2019;20:205-16.

65 Ahmed H, Patel K, Greenwood DC, et al. Long-term clinical outcomes in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus outbreaks after hospitalisation or ICU admission: A systematic review and meta-analysis, *J Rehabil Med* 2020;52:jrm00063-2694.

66 Al-Aly Z, Xie Y, Bowe B. High-dimensional characterization of post-acute sequelae of COVID-19, *Nature* 2021;594:259-64.

67 Nyberg T, Twohig KA, Harris RJ, et al. Risk of hospital admission for patients with SARS-CoV-2 variant B.1.1.7: cohort analysis, *BMJ* 2021;373:n1412 doi:10.1136/bmj.n1412 [published Online First: British Medical Journal Publishing Group].

68 Stavem K, Ghanima W, Olsen MK, et al. Persistent symptoms 1.5–6 months after COVID-19 in non-hospitalised subjects: a population-based cohort study, *Thorax* 2021;76:405-7 doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-216377 [published Online First: BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and British Thoracic Society].

69 Lund LC, Hallas J, Nielsen H, et al. Post-acute effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection in individuals not requiring hospital admission: a Danish population-based cohort study, *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021.

70 Rajan S, Khunti K, Alwan N, et al. In the wake of the pandemic, *Preparing for Long COVID*. *Policy Brief* 2021;39.

71 Parker AM, Brigham E, Connolly B, et al. Addressing the post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a multidisciplinary model of care, *The Lancet. Respiratory medicine* 2021;9:1328-41.