Title: Association of Obesity with COVID-19 Severity and Mortality: A Systemic Review and Meta-Regression

Authors: Romil Singh^{*1}, Sawai Singh Rathore^{*2}, Hira Khan³, Smruti Karale⁴, Abhishek Bhurwal⁵, Aysun Tekin¹, Nirpeksh Jain⁶, Ishita Mehra⁷, Sohini Anand⁸, Sanjana Reddy⁹, Guneet Singh Sidhu¹⁰, Anastasios Panagopoulos¹¹, Vishwanath Pattan¹², Rahul Kashyap¹, Vikas Bansal¹³

¹Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA

²Medical Student, Dr. Sampurnanand Medical College, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India

³Department of Internal Medicine, Islamic International Medical College, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

⁴Department of Internal Medicine, Government Medical College-Kolhapur, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India

⁵Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson School of Medicine, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA

⁶Department of Emergency Medicine, Marshfield Clinic, Marshfield, Wisconsin, USA

⁷Department of Internal Medicine, North Alabama Medical Center, Florence, Alabama, USA

⁸Medical Graduate, Patliputra Medical College and Hospital, Dhanbad, Jharkhand, India

⁹Medical Student, Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad, India

¹⁰Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA

¹¹Department of Cardiology, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, USA

¹²Division of Endocrinology, Wyoming Medical center, Casper, WY, USA

¹³Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA

Corresponding Author:

Vishwanath Pattan, MD

Division of Endocrinology

Wyoming Medical Center

419 S Washington St Suite 201

Casper, WY-82601

Email: vpattan@wyoymingmedicalcenter.org

Phone: (307) 577-2592

Word count: 3237

Tables: 2

Figures: 8, multi panel

Conflict of Interest: None of the co-authors have anything to declare.

Financial Support: There is no financial disclosure related to this study.

Author Contribution: *Authors 1(RS) and 2(SSR) contributed equally in defining the study outline and manuscript writing. Data review and collection were done by AT, GSS, HK, NJ, RS, SK, AP, and SSR; statistical analysis was done by AB, SK, and VB; risk of bias was done by AT, SA and SSR. Study design, Distribution of Articles for critical review done by IM, VP, RK, and VB. Final approval received by all authors. RS, SSR, VB and VP is the guarantor of the paper, taking responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole,

from inception to published article. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Abstract

Objective: To estimate the association of obesity with severity (defined as use of invasive mechanical ventilation or intensive care unit admission) and all-cause mortality in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients.

Patients and Methods: A systematic search was conducted from inception of COVID-19 pandemic through January 31st, 2021 for full-length articles focusing on the association of increased BMI/ Obesity and outcome in COVID-19 patients with help of various databases including Medline (PubMed), Embase, Science Web, and Cochrane Central Controlled Trials Registry. Preprint servers such as BioRxiv, MedRxiv, ChemRxiv, and SSRN were also scanned. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines were used for study selection and data extraction. The severity in hospitalized COVID-19 patients, such as requirement of invasive mechanical ventilation and intensive care unit admission with high BMI/ Obesity was the chief outcome. While all-cause mortality in COVID-19 hospitalized patients with high BMI/ Obesity was the secondary outcome.

Results: A total of 576,784 patients from 100 studies were included in this meta-analysis. Being obese was associated with increased risk of severe disease (RR=1.46, 95% CI 1.34-1.60, $p<0.001$, $I^2 = 92\%$). Similarly, high mortality was observed in obese patients with COVID-19 disease (RR=1.12, 95% CI 1.06-1.19, $p<0.001$, $I^2 = 88\%$). In a multivariate meta-regression on severity outcome, the covariate of female gender, pulmonary disease, diabetes, older age, cardiovascular diseases, and hypertension was found to be significant and explained $R^2 = 50\%$ of the between-study heterogeneity for severity. Similarly, for mortality outcome, covariate of female gender, proportion of pulmonary disease, diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular

diseases were significant, these covariates collectively explained $R^2=53\%$ of the between-study variability for mortality.

Conclusions:

Our findings suggest that obesity is significantly associated with increased severity and higher mortality among COVID-19 patients. Therefore, the inclusion of obesity or its surrogate body mass index in prognostic scores and streamlining the management strategy and treatment guidelines to account for the impact of obesity in patient care management is recommended.

Introduction:

The entire world is enduring the effects of the global coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic since its inception in December 2019 when pneumonia of unknown origin was diagnosed in Hubei province, Wuhan, China^{1,2}. It was later in January 2020 that the novel coronavirus strand was isolated and subsequently named severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in February 2020^{3,4}. As of now, till 4th April, 2021, the Covid-19 pandemic has affected 131,129,824 individuals and has led to 2,850,174 global deaths⁵. Despite the fact that many treatments have been proposed to combat COVID-19, there is currently no uniformly successful therapy⁶⁻¹². Although it is a widespread disease affecting multiple systems, obesity has been identified as one of the major comorbid factors in patients suffering from COVID-19¹³⁻²².

Overweight (BMI 25 kg/m²-29.9 kg/m²) and obesity (BMI 30 kg/m² or more) are a major public health problem, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, because of their association with increased morbidity and mortality^{23,24}. Berrington de Gonzalez et al. (2010) studied the association of overweight and obesity on overall mortality in 1.46 million white adults over a median follow-up period of 10 years. They found approximately linear relationship in the hazard ratios for the BMI. The hazard ratio for every 5-unit increment of BMI was 1.31 in the BMI range of 25 kg/m² to 49.9 kg/m².²⁵ According to the 2017-2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), about 42.5% of U.S. adults aged 20 or more are obese and approximately 9% have class 3 obesity or severe obesity (BMI 40 kg/m² or more)²⁶. The prevalence of obesity has been increasing rapidly in the last decade.

According to WHO, the prevalence of obesity has nearly tripled in the last four decades amounting to 13% of the entire world's adult population²⁷. This exponential rise in the obesity rates in the midst of the pandemic is a cause for concern. The interplay between obesity and diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular disease, stroke, dyslipidemia, influenza has been established for a long time. The presence of these comorbid determinants has been related to increased predisposition and severity of COVID-19²⁸⁻³¹. Many studies have reported increased rates of hospitalization, mechanical ventilation, and mortality in patients with higher BMI³²⁻³⁶.

To mitigate the impact of heightened morbidity and mortality associated with COVID-19 infection in patients with obesity, it is vital to be cognizant of the implications of increased BMI and its dynamic interaction with other comorbid components. Hence, we evaluated obesity as a paramount risk factor for mortality and severity in COVID-19 infection, independent of potential confounders via systematic review and meta-regression.

Methods:

Search method and Strategy

For documentation, we adopted the Preferred Systematic Analyses and Meta-Analysis Reporting Items recommendations³⁷. A systematic search was conducted from COVID-19 databases from the pandemic inception through January 31st, 2021 for full-length articles focusing on the association of increased BMI/ Obesity in COVID-19 using a pre-specified data extraction protocol including bibliographic information (year of publication, first author), study information (country, sample size), patient characteristics (age, baseline comorbidities, gender), treatment information and outcome data. The search strategy consisted of keywords "SARS-CoV-2", "COVID-19", "CORONAVIRUS", "OBESITY", "BMI", "OVERWEIGHT" across the

COVID-19 database which included articles from Medline (PubMed), Embase, Science Web, and Cochrane Central Controlled Trials Registry. Studies were included from all over the world, there were no language barriers. Other literature sources such as the BioRxiv (preprints), MedRxiv (preprints), ChemRxiv (preprints), and SSRN (preprints) were searched as well. After following a thorough search, full-length articles meeting the inclusion criteria were evaluated. In an attempt to discover further eligible studies, we manually searched the reference lists of the included studies, and previously published meta-analysis, systematic review, and the relevant literature. We also scanned the clinicaltrials.gov registry for completed, as well as in-progress randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Eligibility Criteria:

The inclusion criteria for the systematic review are as follows:

1. Studies reporting outcomes such as severity or mortality events, at least one functional endpoint of COVID-19 hospitalized patients with increased BMI.
2. Full text, peer-reviewed articles (Case-studies and case series, randomized controlled trials) were included.

Study selection

The authors (HK and SSR) downloaded all articles from electronic search to EndNote X9³⁸ and duplicates were eliminated. Based on the preset eligibility criteria, each study was reviewed by two reviewers (AT, GSS, HK, NJ, RS, SK and SSR) independently, and disagreements were discussed amongst all author-reviewers and resolved via a consensus. The cases included obese Covid-19 positive hospitalized patients and the controls included the non-obese Covid-19

positive hospitalized patients. Unadjusted and adjusted impact measurements were also extracted where appropriate. From each study, various details including first author name, study type, hospitalized total covid-19 positive patients, the definition of COVID-19 severity, definition of obesity, total obese & non-obese COVID-19 positive patients, patients with high severity and mortality, median age, gender (female sex proportion), hypertension proportion, pulmonary disease proportion, cardiovascular disease proportion, diabetes proportion, dyslipidemia proportion, liver disease proportion were mentioned in a tabulated format in excel sheet. These details are exhibited in Table 1. The included data was checked for accuracy by all authors. Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines were used. Figure 1.

Outcomes

All-cause severity in hospitalized COVID-19 patients with high BMI/ Obesity was the primary outcome. The severity rate was evaluated in comparison to the control group (non-obese COVID-19 hospitalized patients). While all-cause mortality in COVID-19 hospitalized patients with high BMI/ obesity was the secondary outcome.

Statistical analysis

The meta-analysis specifically included case-control and cohort studies comparing the effects of high BMI/Obesity in COVID-19 hospitalized patients comparing them to the non-obese COVID-19 hospitalized patients. All outcomes were analyzed using the Mantel-Haenszel method for dichotomous data to estimate pooled risk ratio (RR) utilizing the Review Manager (RevMan)-Version 5.4, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020. Meta-analysis was performed first for studies reporting severity of patients in both groups followed by that for studies reporting severity of

disease assuming independence of results for studies that reported both. Due to anticipated heterogeneity, summary statistics were calculated using a random-effects model. This model accounts for variability between studies as well as within studies. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using Q value and I^2 statistics.

To explore differences between studies that might be expected to influence the effect size, we performed random effects (maximum likelihood method) univariate and multivariate meta-regression analyses. The potential sources of variability hypothesized were the gender of the study sample, the proportion of subjects with diabetes, pulmonary disease, cardiovascular disease, and hypertension. Covariates were selected for further modeling if they significantly ($P < 0.05$) modified the association between mortality or severity in the COVID-19 hospitalized patients with high BMI/Obesity. Two models were created, one for severity and the other for mortality of disease as outcomes. Subsequently, preselected covariates were included in a manual backward and stepwise multiple meta-regression analysis with $P = 0.05$ as a cutoff point for removal. $P < 0.05$. ($P < 0.10$ for heterogeneity) was considered statistically significant. All meta-analysis and meta-regression tests were 2-tailed. The meta-regression was done with the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software package (Biostat, Englewood, NJ, USA)^{14,39}.

We conducted sensitivity analysis with BMI categories (BMI $< 18 \text{ kg/m}^2$, BMI 18 kg/m^2 - 25 kg/m^2 , BMI 25 kg/m^2 - 29.9 kg/m^2 , BMI $> 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$, and BMI $> 40 \text{ kg/m}^2$) to decrease inherent selection bias in observational studies⁴⁰.

Risk of Bias

Risk of Bias assessment- The Newcastle-Ottawa (NOS) scale¹² was used for measuring the risk of bias in case-control studies and cohort studies. The following classes were rated per study:

low bias risk (9 points), moderate bias risk (5-7 points), and high bias risk (0-4 items. For a cross-sectional study, we used the modified version of NOS, assigning the study in the following groups: Low risk of bias (8-10), moderate risk (5-7), high risk of bias (0-4))⁴¹. Three reviewers (AT, SA, and SSR) evaluated the likelihood of bias independently, and any conflict was resolved by consensus (Table 2A and 2B).

Results

Study characteristics of included studies

For the primary endpoint, severity, a total of 100 studies, consisting of 576,784 patients were included in the meta-analysis. The median age for included patients was 61.4 (55.3-65) with average 42.9% females (Table 1). Of the comorbidities considered, 29.4% were diabetics, 37.9% had heart diseases overall. Similarly, for the primary endpoint, i.e. disease severity, a total of seventy reports were included in the meta-analysis^{32,42-110}. These had a combined sample size of 292,165 with 40,272 patients reaching the endpoint of high disease severity (Table 1). Similarly, a total of 51 studies were included for meta-analysis for the secondary outcome i.e. mortality^{42,45,46,48-52,55,63,66,75,79,80,82,85,88,89,92,101,109,111-140}. These had a combined sample size of 380,130 with 118,351 patients reaching the endpoint of mortality.

Meta-analysis for severity outcome: Findings from the meta-analysis showed that being obese was correlated with increased severity of COVID 19 infections in comparison to non-obese patients (RR=1.46, 95% CI 1.34-1.60, p<0.001). Heterogeneity was high with $I^2 = 92\%$ (Figure 2).

Meta-analysis for mortality outcome: Meta-analysis findings showed that obesity was associated with increased risk of mortality from COVID 19 infections in comparison to non-

obese patient population (RR=1.12, 95% CI 1.06-1.19, $p<0.001$). Heterogeneity was high with $I^2 = 88\%$ (Figure 3).

Multivariate meta-regression model for severity outcome: Multivariate meta-regression was performed to explain variations in the association between COVID-19 severity and obesity. We found female gender, pulmonary disease, diabetes, age, cardiovascular diseases, and hypertension covariates to be significant and this explained $R^2 = 50\%$ of the between-study heterogeneity in severity. The proportion of hypertension did not significantly affect the between-study variations and were therefore not included in the final equation. Figure 4 shows the resulting equation and individual covariate effect graphs.

Multivariate meta-regression model for mortality outcome: Multivariate meta-regression performed to explain variations in the association between mortality and obesity revealed that female gender, proportion of pulmonary disease, diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular diseases to be significant together. Overall, these covariates together explained $R^2 = 53\%$ of the between-study heterogeneity in mortality. Figure 5 shows the resulting equation and individual covariate effect graphs.

Publication Bias: Visual inspection of the standard error plots for the severity analysis also (Figure 7A) suggests symmetry without an underrepresentation of studies of any precision. However, in Egger's regression test the null hypothesis of no small study effects was rejected at $p<0.05$ (estimated bias coefficient = $-0.13 \pm 0.42SE$).

Similarly, visual inspection of the standard error plots for the mortality analysis (Figure 7B) suggests symmetry without an underrepresentation of studies of any precision. Corroborating

inspection findings, Egger's regression test, the null hypothesis of no small study effects, was rejected at $p < 0.05$ (estimated bias coefficient = $-0.17 \pm 0.42SE$).

Sensitivity analysis: We did not find any statistical significance for risk of mortality as well as the risk for severity with COVID-19 when analyzed by BMI categories. However, we observed that underweight status ($BMI < 18 \text{ kg/m}^2$) is associated with increased risk of mortality in COVID-19 (OR 1.52, 95% CI 1.19-1.94, $p < 0.001$; $I^2 = 0\%$) but not statistical significant to severity of COVID-19 (OR 1.10, 95% CI 0.81-1.48, $p = 0.54$; $I^2 = 0\%$) as compared to normal BMI category of 18 kg/m^2 - 25 kg/m^2 . We also did not observe any statistically significant changes while comparing BMI category 25 kg/m^2 to 29.9 kg/m^2 with respect to others in terms of mortality and severity of COVID-19 (Figure 6A-H).

Discussion

In this large meta-analysis with 100 studies, we found that obesity has a strong association with increased mortality & severity of COVID-19 infection. In addition, our meta-regression analysis suggests that obesity significantly increases the severity and mortality in COVID-19 patients. Using a random effects model, we found that obese patients showed higher odds for mortality and severity i.e. ICU admissions or mechanical ventilation. Our results suggest that obese individuals are 1.5 times more likely to experience severe outcomes and 1.12 times more likely to die when compared to non-obese individuals with COVID-19 disease. Our meta-regression severity model suggested that 50% of the heterogeneity could be explained by age, gender, diabetes, hypertension, pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases. The mortality meta-regression model suggested that 53% of the heterogeneity could be accounted for by gender, diabetes,

hypertension, pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases. Through these regression models, we were able to address major amount of heterogeneity seen in our meta-analysis.

In the existing literature, we found four meta-analysis (studies n=6, 17, 40, 76)¹⁴¹⁻¹⁴⁴ that explored the association of obesity and worse outcomes in COVID-19 and found a similar association. On the contrary, one study refuted the possibility of this association. Owing to their small sample population (Studies n=2), it is likely that they were underpowered to tease out the true difference or association¹⁴⁵. With a much larger sample size (n=100) our study provides a more robust evidence to establish this association.

Five meta-regression studies have evaluated the direct relationship between obesity and COVID-19 over the last year. Yang et al (studies n=41) concluded that, in COVID-19 patients, obesity is associated with increased mortality, increased rates of hospitalization, ICU admissions and the need for mechanical ventilation. However, they found no confounding factors causing heterogeneity in regards to hospitalization, ICU admission, and in-hospital mortality of COVID-19 patients¹⁴⁶. In another such study, Mesas et al (studies n=60) described that obesity was linked to increased mortality only in studies with fewer chronic or critical patients and reported mean age of patients as the most important source of heterogeneity, followed by sex and health condition¹⁴⁷. Soereto et al (studies n=16) reported that patients with higher BMI were at increased risk of developing 'poor outcomes' - defined as mortality, ICU admission, ARDS incidence, severe COVID-19, need for mechanical ventilation and hospitalization. In their meta regression, the heterogeneity in poor outcomes was explained by age, type 2 diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and gender¹⁴⁸. Du et al and Chu et al (studies n=16 and 22) found that the association between obesity and COVID-19 severity and that with mortality was significantly influenced by age, but not with gender or other co morbidities^{149,150}. Our meta-regression

identified the likely confounders to be age, gender, and co-morbidities such as diabetes, hypertension, pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases. Through this model, we were able to explain high heterogeneity with highest number of confounders, which other meta regression in the recent literature were not able to reach and define¹⁴⁶⁻¹⁵⁰. Thus, we were able to establish a strong association that obesity plays a remarkable role in worsening these outcomes in patients with COVID-19 infection. In the sensitivity analyses, we were only able to find statistically significant results for increased mortality in BMI<18 kg/m² as compared to BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m², however, such significance was not noted in any other BMI categories with severity and mortality in COVID-19. This could be due to BMI being a very crude estimate of adiposity, may not be sensitive enough to tease out the real difference. Visceral adiposity would probably be a more reliable estimate to study these differences. However, in their study, Anderson et al. found that patients with obesity have a greater chance of intubation or mortality, with people with class 3 obesity having the greatest risk compared to overweight patients⁴⁵.

Obesity is known to be associated with many adverse comorbid conditions¹⁵¹ including hypertension, atherogenic dyslipidemia, cardiovascular disease, insulin resistance or type 2 diabetes, altered cortisol metabolism, etc¹⁵². Obesity is associated with overexpression of ACE2 receptors and higher ACE2 receptors may aid infection and serve as viral reservoir¹⁵³. Moreover, obesity is known to be associated with endothelial dysfunction¹⁵⁴, the key pathogenic event in COVID-19 infection leading to mortality and morbidity^{155,156}. Obesity or increased adiposity plays a key role in endothelial dysfunction by activating several cascade of pathological events namely- activation of renin-angiotensin system¹⁵⁷, activation of procoagulant/hypercoagulation pathway¹⁵⁸, activation of proinflammatory mediators¹⁵⁹, insulin resistance¹⁶⁰, oxidative stress

¹⁶¹, platelet dysfunction ¹⁶² and immune dysregulation ¹⁶³. These events are summarized in Figure 8.

In the study by Danzinger et al. obesity was found to be associated with increased incidence of acute kidney injury and increase in short- and long-term mortality¹⁶⁴. Various meta-analyses were conducted to evaluate the association of obesity with mortality and severity of critically ill patients. The results were not universal, despite a wide variety of observations. In a total of 62,045 critically ill patients, Akinnusi et al compared the ICU mortality between obese and non-obese patients and found no dissimilarities¹⁶⁵. Hogue et al. (n=22) conducted a meta-analysis of 88,051 patients and found that obesity did not impact ICU mortality¹⁶⁶. However, Oliveros and Villamor et al. found that ICU mortality was increased only in underweight patients and reduced in overweight and obese patients¹⁶⁷. In another study Zhao et al. observed that having a high BMI is related to longer duration on mechanical ventilation but lower mortality¹⁶⁸. Therefore, it is unclear how obesity affects clinical outcomes in critically ill patients and more prospective studies are required to study the association between obesity and adverse outcomes in critical care.

The prime strength of this study is the large sample size. With an exhaustive search strategy, we compiled 100 studies conducted globally. We also added the most recent studies to our meta-analysis and meta-regression model including the studies that reported contradictory information. It enabled us to arrive at a more definitive conclusion about the risk associations. To define the heterogeneity in the meta-analysis, we also conducted a meta-regression analysis. For moderators, we used the most probable confounders based on the available evidence. This enabled us to delineate the impact of obesity as an independent risk factor for mortality and severity in COVID-19. However, our study is also subject to few limitations. We included five

studies from preprint databases^{71,76,83,96,101} that may not be comparable to peer-reviewed articles in terms of their quality of methodology. However, in view of the time-sensitive nature of this pandemic, benefit of early dissemination of critical information and its inclusion in various analyses outweighs the risk from minor methodological flaws. Second factor was the heterogeneity in the studies in terms of the study design and methodology, patient sample and treatment received. There was a lack of uniformity in the type of outcomes evaluated for severity and their definitions in different studies. For the same reason, it was not possible to deduce the effect of obesity on the individual outcomes- ICU admission and mechanical ventilation. Third limitation is that the analysis was done with hospitalized patients only; hence we cannot generalize our results for patients seen in the outpatient clinic or treated at home. Analyzing outpatient data as well may help us to get the complete picture of the impact of obesity on the overall COVID-19 outcomes. Fourth limitation is that our analysis did not compare the outcomes with respect to visceral obesity and only BMI was used. However, it was beyond the scope of this analysis because of the lack of those details in most of the included studies. We suggest that prospective studies should obtain and report this information about their sample population. Lastly, it is possible that some confounders which could have otherwise accounted for the residual heterogeneity were not evaluated in the meta-regression analysis due to limited information.

Conclusion: In summary, our findings suggest that obesity significantly increases the risk of severity and mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Therefore, the inclusion of obesity or surrogate body mass index or visceral obesity in prognostic scores and streamlining the management strategy and treatment guidelines to account for the impact of obesity would be vital to improve patient outcomes in hospitalized COVID-19 patients. Our finding also serves as

a call for the scientific community to further delve into its pathophysiology and identify potential pharmacological targets, since COVID-19 is an ever-evolving disease. Finally, this information must be disseminated to the general public to intensify the primary prevention of obesity.

References:

1. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10229):1054-1062.
2. Shah A, Kashyap R, Tosh P, Sampathkumar P, O'Horo JC. Guide to Understanding the 2019 Novel Coronavirus. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2020;95(4):646-652.
3. Wang C, Horby PW, Hayden FG, Gao GF. A novel coronavirus outbreak of global health concern. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):470-473.
4. Organization WH. Naming the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and the virus that causes it. World Health Organization. [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-2019\)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it). Published 2020. Accessed March 17, 2021.
5. Dong E, Du H, Gardner L. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(5):533-534.
6. Bansal V, Mahapure K, Bhurwal A, et al. Mortality Benefit of Remdesivir in COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2020;7:1124.
7. Jain R, Javeri Y, Nasa P, et al. Consensus Statement for Pharmacological Management of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Pragmatic Approach. *Asploro Journal of Biomedical and Clinical Case Reports*. 2020;3(3):241.
8. R Singh LS, I Mehra, R Kashyap, S Surani. Novel and Controversial Therapies in COVID-19. *The Open Respiratory Medicine Journal*. 2020;14.
9. Bansal V, Mahapure K, Mehra I, et al. Mortality Benefit of Convalescent Plasma in COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2021;8:250.
10. Singh R, Rathore SS, Khan H, et al. Mortality and Severity in COVID-19 Patients on ACEIs & ARBs - A Meta-Regression Analysis. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.2003.2014.21253557.
11. Singh R, Rathore SS, Khan H, et al. Mortality and Severity in COVID-19 Patients on ACEIs & ARBs- A Meta-Regression Analysis. *medRxiv*. 2021.
12. Karale S, Bansal V, Makadia J, et al. A Meta-analysis of Mortality, Need for ICU admission, Use of Mechanical Ventilation and Adverse Effects with Ivermectin Use in COVID-19 Patients. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.2004.2030.21256415.
13. Prevention CfDca. People with Certain Medical Conditions. CDC. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html>. Published 2021. Updated March 15, 2021. Accessed March 17, 2021.
14. Rathore SS, Rojas GA, Sondhi M, et al. Myocarditis associated with Covid-19 disease: a systematic review of published Case reports and Case series. *Authorea Preprints*. 2021.
15. Sheraton M, Deo N, Kashyap R, Surani S. A Review of Neurological Complications of COVID-19. *Cureus*. 2020;12(5):e8192.
16. Singh R, Kashyap R, Hutton A, Sharma M, Surani S. A Review of Cardiac Complications in Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Cureus*. 2020;12(5):e8034.
17. Shah K, Bedi S, Onyeaka H, Singh R, Chaudhari G. The Role of Psychological First Aid to Support Public Mental Health in the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Cureus*. 2020;12(6):e8821.
18. Shah K, Mann S, Singh R, Bangar R, Kulkarni R. Impact of COVID-19 on the Mental Health of Children and Adolescents. *Cureus*. 2020;12(8):e10051.
19. Menon T, Sharma R, Kataria S, et al. The Association of Acute Kidney Injury With Disease Severity and Mortality in COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cureus*. 2021;13(3).
20. Singh R, Shiza ST, Saadat R, Dawe M, Rehman U. Association of Guillain-Barre Syndrome With COVID-19: A Case Report and Literature Review. *Cureus*. 2021;13(3).

21. Menon T, Sharma R, Earthineni G, et al. Association of Gastrointestinal System With Severity and Mortality of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cureus*. 2021;13(2):e13317.
22. Menon T, Gandhi SAQ, Tariq W, et al. Impact of Chronic Kidney Disease on Severity and Mortality in COVID-19 Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Cureus*. 2021;13(4):e14279.
23. Whitlock G, Lewington S, Sherliker P, et al. Body-mass index and cause-specific mortality in 900 000 adults: collaborative analyses of 57 prospective studies. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9669):1083-1096.
24. Goyal P, Ringel JB, Rajan M, et al. Obesity and COVID-19 in New York City: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2020;173(10):855-858.
25. Berrington de Gonzalez A, Hartge P, Cerhan JR, et al. Body-mass index and mortality among 1.46 million white adults. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363(23):2211-2219.
26. Fryar CD, Carroll MD, Afful J. *Prevalence of Overweight, Obesity, and Severe Obesity Among Adults Aged 20 and Over: United States, 1960–1962 Through 2017–2018*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; December 2020 2020.
27. Organization WH. Obesity and overweight. WHO. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight>. Published 2020. Accessed March 17, 2021.
28. Barnes AS. The epidemic of obesity and diabetes: trends and treatments. *Tex Heart Inst J*. 2011;38(2):142-144.
29. Klop B, Elte JW, Cabezas MC. Dyslipidemia in obesity: mechanisms and potential targets. *Nutrients*. 2013;5(4):1218-1240.
30. Fifi JT, Mocco J. COVID-19 related stroke in young individuals. *Lancet Neurol*. 2020;19(9):713-715.
31. Jain S, Chaves SS. Obesity and Influenza. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2011;53(5):422-424.
32. Kalligeros M, Shehadeh F, Mylona EK, et al. Association of Obesity with Disease Severity Among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Obesity*. 2020;28(7):1200-1204.
33. Prevention CfDca. Obesity, Race/Ethnicity, and COVID-19. CDC. <https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/data/obesity-and-covid-19.html>. Published 2020. Accessed March 17, 2021.
34. Hendren NS, Lemos JAd, Ayers C, et al. Association of Body Mass Index and Age With Morbidity and Mortality in Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19. *Circulation*. 2021;143(2):135-144.
35. Domecq JP, Lal A, Sheldrick CR, et al. Outcomes of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Receiving Organ Support Therapies: The International Viral Infection and Respiratory Illness Universal Study Registry. *Critical Care Medicine*. 9000;Online First.
36. Walkey AJ, Kumar VK, Harhay MO, et al. The Viral Infection and Respiratory Illness Universal Study (VIRUS): An International Registry of Coronavirus 2019-Related Critical Illness. *Critical Care Explorations*. 2020;2(4).
37. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2700.
38. Hupe M. EndNote X9. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*. 2019;16(3-4):117-119.
39. Borenstein M, Hedges L, Higgins J, Rothstein H. Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Version 3. Biostat, Englewood, NJ 2013. <https://www.meta-analysis.com/index.php?cart=BBFA4702757>. Published 2013. Updated 03/11/2021. Accessed 03/11/2021.
40. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
41. Wells GA SB, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses.

- 375 http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp. Published 2009. Accessed
376 August 20, 2020.
- 377 42. Al Heialy S, Hachim MY, Hachim IY, et al. Combination of obesity and co-morbidities leads to
378 unfavorable outcomes in COVID-19 patients. *Saudi J Biol Sci*. 2021;28(2):1445-1450.
- 379 43. Al-Sabah S, Al-Haddad M, Al-Youha S, Jamal M, Almazeedi S. COVID-19: Impact of Obesity and
380 Diabetes in Disease Severity. *Clin Obes*. 2020;10(6):e12414.
- 381 44. Alkhatib AL, Kreniske J, Zifodya JS, et al. BMI is Associated with Coronavirus Disease 2019
382 Intensive Care Unit Admission in African Americans. *Obesity*. 2020;28(10):1798-1801.
- 383 45. Anderson MR, Geleris J, Anderson DR, et al. Body Mass Index and Risk for Intubation or Death in
384 SARS-CoV-2 Infection : A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;173(10):782-790.
- 385 46. Arjun S, Farraj K, Yeroushalmi K, et al. EVALUATING OBESITY PARADOX IN COVID 19: INSIGHTS
386 FROM A SAFETY-NET HOSPITAL IN NEW YORK. *Chest*. 2020;158(4, Supplement):A302.
- 387 47. Bhatraju PK, Ghassemieh BJ, Nichols M, et al. Covid-19 in Critically Ill Patients in the Seattle
388 Region — Case Series. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(21):2012-2022.
- 389 48. Biscarini S, Colaneri M, Ludovisi S, et al. The obesity paradox: Analysis from the SMAtteo COvid-
390 19 REgistry (SMACORE) cohort. *Nutrition, Metabolism and Cardiovascular Diseases*.
391 2020;30(11):1920-1925.
- 392 49. Burrell AJ, Pellegrini B, Salimi F, et al. Outcomes for patients with COVID-19 admitted to
393 Australian intensive care units during the first four months of the pandemic. *Medical Journal of
394 Australia*. 2021;214(1):23-30.
- 395 50. Busetto L, Bettini S, Fabris R, et al. Obesity and COVID-19: An Italian Snapshot. *Obesity*.
396 2020;28(9):1600-1605.
- 397 51. Cai Q, Chen F, Wang T, et al. Obesity and COVID-19 Severity in a Designated Hospital in
398 Shenzhen, China. *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(7):1392-1398.
- 399 52. Cariou B, Hadjadj S, Wargny M, et al. Phenotypic characteristics and prognosis of inpatients with
400 COVID-19 and diabetes: the CORONADO study. *Diabetologia*. 2020;63(8):1500-1515.
- 401 53. Caussy C, Wallet F, Laville M, Disse E. Obesity is Associated with Severe Forms of COVID-19.
402 *Obesity*. 2020;28(7):1175-1175.
- 403 54. Chao JY, Derespina KR, Herold BC, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of Hospitalized
404 and Critically Ill Children and Adolescents with Coronavirus Disease 2019 at a Tertiary Care
405 Medical Center in New York City. *J Pediatr*. 2020;223:14-19.e12.
- 406 55. Czernichow S, Beeker N, Rives-Lange C, et al. Obesity Doubles Mortality in Patients Hospitalized
407 for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Paris Hospitals, France: A Cohort Study
408 on 5,795 Patients. *Obesity*. 2020;28(12):2282-2289.
- 409 56. Dreher M, Kersten A, Bickenbach J, et al. The Characteristics of 50 Hospitalized COVID-19
410 Patients With and Without ARDS. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2020;117(16):271-278.
- 411 57. Ebinger JE, Achamallah N, Ji H, et al. Pre-existing traits associated with Covid-19 illness severity.
412 *PLoS One*. 2020;15(7):e0236240.
- 413 58. Feuth T, Saaresranta T, Karlsson A, et al. Is sleep apnea a risk factor for Covid-19? findings from a
414 retrospective cohort study. *Sleep Medicine and Disorders: International Journal*. 2020;4(3).
- 415 59. Gao F, Zheng KI, Wang X-B, et al. Obesity Is a Risk Factor for Greater COVID-19 Severity. *Diabetes
416 Care*. 2020;43(7):e72-e74.
- 417 60. Gerotziafas GT, Sergentanis TN, Voiriot G, et al. Derivation and Validation of a Predictive Score
418 for Disease Worsening in Patients with COVID-19. *Thromb Haemost*. 2020;120(12):1680-1690.
- 419 61. Goyal P, Choi JJ, Pinheiro LC, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Covid-19 in New York City. *New
420 England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(24):2372-2374.

62. Guner R, Hasanoglu I, Kayaaslan B, et al. COVID-19 experience of the major pandemic response center in the capital: results of the pandemic's first month in Turkey. *Turk J Med Sci.* 2020;50(8):1801-1809.
63. Hajifathalian K, Kumar S, Newberry C, et al. Obesity is Associated with Worse Outcomes in COVID-19: Analysis of Early Data from New York City. *Obesity.* 2020;28(9):1606-1612.
64. Hur K, Price CPE, Gray EL, et al. Factors Associated With Intubation and Prolonged Intubation in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19. *Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery.* 2020;163(1):170-178.
65. Iaccarino G, Grassi G, Borghi C, et al. Gender differences in predictors of intensive care units admission among COVID-19 patients: The results of the SARS-RAS study of the Italian Society of Hypertension. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(10):e0237297.
66. Ioannou GN, Locke E, Green P, et al. Risk Factors for Hospitalization, Mechanical Ventilation, or Death Among 10 131 US Veterans With SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(9):e2022310.
67. Kaeuffer C, Le Hyaric C, Fabacher T, et al. Clinical characteristics and risk factors associated with severe COVID-19: prospective analysis of 1,045 hospitalised cases in North-Eastern France, March 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(48).
68. Lighter J, Phillips M, Hochman S, et al. Obesity in Patients Younger Than 60 Years Is a Risk Factor for COVID-19 Hospital Admission. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 2020;71(15):896-897.
69. Lodigiani C, Iapichino G, Carenzo L, et al. Venous and arterial thromboembolic complications in COVID-19 patients admitted to an academic hospital in Milan, Italy. *Thromb Res.* 2020;191:9-14.
70. Mejía-Vilet JM, Córdova-Sánchez BM, Fernández-Camargo DA, Méndez-Pérez RA, Morales Buenrostro LE, Hernández-Gilsoul T. A risk score to predict admission to the intensive care unit in patients with Covid-19: the ABC-GOALS score. *Salud Publica Mex.* 2020;2020.2005.2012.20099416.
71. Mendy A, Apewokin S, Wells AA, Morrow AL. Factors Associated with Hospitalization and Disease Severity in a Racially and Ethnically Diverse Population of COVID-19 Patients. *medRxiv.* 2020;2020.2006.2025.20137323.
72. Monteiro AC, Suri R, Emeruwa IO, et al. Obesity and smoking as risk factors for invasive mechanical ventilation in COVID-19: A retrospective, observational cohort study. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(12):e0238552.
73. Mughal MS, Kaur IP, Jaffery AR, et al. COVID-19 patients in a tertiary US hospital: Assessment of clinical course and predictors of the disease severity. *Respir Med.* 2020;172:106130.
74. Nachea JB, Ishoso DK, Otokoye JO, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of Patients Hospitalized for COVID-19 in Africa: Early Insights from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.* 2020;103(6):2419-2428.
75. Nakeshbandi M, Maini R, Daniel P, et al. The impact of obesity on COVID-19 complications: a retrospective cohort study. *Int J Obes (Lond).* 2020;44(9):1832-1837.
76. Newton S, Zollinger B, Freeman J, et al. Factors associated with clinical severity in Emergency Department patients presenting with symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv.* 2020;2020.2012.2008.20246017.
77. Ortiz-Brizuela E, Villanueva-Reza M, Gonzalez-Lara MF, et al. Clinical and Epidemiological Characteristics of Patients Diagnosed with Covid-19 in a Tertiary Care Center in Mexico City: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Rev Invest Clin.* 2020;72(3):165-177.
78. Palaodimos L, Kokkinidis DG, Li W, et al. Severe obesity, increasing age and male sex are independently associated with worse in-hospital outcomes, and higher in-hospital mortality, in a cohort of patients with COVID-19 in the Bronx, New York. *Metabolism.* 2020;108:154262.

79. Pepe M, Maroun-Eid C, Romero R, et al. Clinical presentation, therapeutic approach, and outcome of young patients admitted for COVID-19, with respect to the elderly counterpart. *Clinical and Experimental Medicine*. 2021.
80. Petersen A, Bressemer K, Albrecht J, et al. The role of visceral adiposity in the severity of COVID-19: Highlights from a unicenter cross-sectional pilot study in Germany. *Metabolism*. 2020;110:154317.
81. Petrilli CM, Jones SA, Yang J, et al. Factors associated with hospital admission and critical illness among 5279 people with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York City: prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1966.
82. Pettit NN, MacKenzie EL, Ridgway JP, et al. Obesity is Associated with Increased Risk for Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2020;28(10):1806-1810.
83. Philipose Z, Smati N, Wong CSJ, Aspey K, Mendall M. Obesity, old age, and frailty are the true risk factors for COVID-19 mortality and not chronic disease or ethnicity. *MedRxiv*. 2020.
84. Pongpirul WA, Wiboonchutikul S, Charoenpong L, et al. Clinical course and potential predictive factors for pneumonia of adult patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A retrospective observational analysis of 193 confirmed cases in Thailand. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2020;14(10):e0008806.
85. Ramlall V, Thangaraj PM, Meydan C, et al. Immune complement and coagulation dysfunction in adverse outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(10):1609-1615.
86. Rao X, Wu C, Wang S, et al. The importance of overweight in COVID-19: A retrospective analysis in a single center of Wuhan, China. *Medicine*. 2020;99(43).
87. Reilev M, Kristensen KB, Pottegård A, et al. Characteristics and predictors of hospitalization and death in the first 11 122 cases with a positive RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 in Denmark: a nationwide cohort. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;49(5):1468-1481.
88. Rodríguez-Molinero A, Gálvez-Barrón C, Miñarro A, et al. Association between COVID-19 prognosis and disease presentation, comorbidities and chronic treatment of hospitalized patients. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(10):e0239571.
89. Rottoli M, Bernante P, Belvedere A, et al. How important is obesity as a risk factor for respiratory failure, intensive care admission and death in hospitalised COVID-19 patients? Results from a single Italian centre. *Eur J Endocrinol*. 2020;183(4):389-397.
90. Shekhar R, Upadhyay S, Sheikh A, Atencio J, Kapuria D. Early experience with COVID-19 patients at academic hospital in Southwestern United States. *Infect Dis (Lond)*. 2020;52(8):596-599.
91. Simonnet A, Chetboun M, Poissy J, et al. High Prevalence of Obesity in Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) Requiring Invasive Mechanical Ventilation. *Obesity*. 2020;28(7):1195-1199.
92. Steinberg E, Wright E, Kushner B. In Young Adults with COVID-19, Obesity Is Associated with Adverse Outcomes. *West J Emerg Med*. 2020;21(4):752-755.
93. Suleyman G, Fadel RA, Malette KM, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Morbidity Associated With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in a Series of Patients in Metropolitan Detroit. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(6):e2012270.
94. Tonetti T, Grasselli G, Zanella A, et al. Use of critical care resources during the first 2 weeks (February 24–March 8, 2020) of the Covid-19 outbreak in Italy. *Annals of Intensive Care*. 2020;10(1):133.
95. Urra JM, Cabrera CM, Porras L, Ródenas I. Selective CD8 cell reduction by SARS-CoV-2 is associated with a worse prognosis and systemic inflammation in COVID-19 patients. *Clin Immunol*. 2020;217:108486.

96. Vaquero-Roncero LM, Sánchez-Barrado E, Escobar-Macias D, et al. C-Reactive protein and SOFA score as early predictors of critical care requirement in patients with COVID-19 pneumonia in Spain. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2005.2022.20110429.
97. Wang R, Xie L, Du P, Fan H, Song M. Clinical characteristics of 96 hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019. *Chinese Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. 2020;19(2):144-147.
98. Zheng KI, Gao F, Wang XB, et al. Letter to the Editor: Obesity as a risk factor for greater severity of COVID-19 in patients with metabolic associated fatty liver disease. *Metabolism*. 2020;108:154244.
99. Gregoriano C, Koch D, Haubitz S, et al. Characteristics, predictors and outcomes among 99 patients hospitalised with COVID-19 in a tertiary care centre in Switzerland: an observational analysis. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2020;150:w20316.
100. Di Fusco M, Shea KM, Lin J, et al. Health outcomes and economic burden of hospitalized COVID-19 patients in the United States. *J Med Econ*. 2021;24(1):308-317.
101. Carrillo G, Méndez-Domínguez N, Santos-Zaldivar KD, et al. Clinical course and severity outcome indicators among COVID-19 hospitalized patients in relation to comorbidities distribution: Mexican cohort. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.2007.2031.20165480.
102. Hu L, Chen S, Fu Y, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Clinical Outcomes in 323 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Hospitalized Patients in Wuhan, China. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020;71(16):2089-2098.
103. Frank RC, Mendez SR, Stevenson EK, Guseh JS, Chung M, Silverman MG. Obesity and the Risk of Intubation or Death in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Critical Care Medicine*. 2020;48(11).
104. Wang J, Zhu L, Liu L, et al. Overweight and Obesity are Risk Factors of Severe Illness in Patients with COVID-19. *Obesity*. 2020;28(11):2049-2055.
105. Ong SWX, Young BE, Leo Y-S, Lye DC. Association of Higher Body Mass Index With Severe Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Younger Patients. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020;71(16):2300-2302.
106. Xie J, Zu Y, Alkhatib A, et al. Metabolic Syndrome and COVID-19 Mortality Among Adult Black Patients in New Orleans. *Diabetes Care*. 2021;44(1):188-193.
107. Argenziano MG, Bruce SL, Slater CL, et al. Characterization and clinical course of 1000 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York: retrospective case series. *Bmj*. 2020;369:m1996.
108. Hsu HE, Ashe EM, Silverstein M, et al. Race/Ethnicity, Underlying Medical Conditions, Homelessness, and Hospitalization Status of Adult Patients with COVID-19 at an Urban Safety-Net Medical Center — Boston, Massachusetts, 2020. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) Web site. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6927a3.htm?s_cid=mm6927a3_w. Published 2020. Updated July 10, 2020. Accessed March 17, 2021.
109. Min W, Fang Y, Xinxin Z, et al. Clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients with new coronavirus pneumonia with different body mass indexes. *Chinese Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*. 2020;36.
110. Motaib I, Zbiri S, Elamari S, Dini N, Chadli A, El Kettani C. Obesity and Disease Severity Among Patients With COVID-19. *Cureus*. 2021;13(2):e13165.
111. Chand S, Kapoor S, Orsi D, et al. COVID-19-Associated Critical Illness—Report of the First 300 Patients Admitted to Intensive Care Units at a New York City Medical Center. *Journal of Intensive Care Medicine*. 2020;35(10):963-970.
112. Ciceri F, Castagna A, Rovere-Querini P, et al. Early predictors of clinical outcomes of COVID-19 outbreak in Milan, Italy. *Clin Immunol*. 2020;217:108509.

113. Cravedi P, Mothi SS, Azzi Y, et al. COVID-19 and kidney transplantation: Results from the TANGO International Transplant Consortium. *Am J Transplant*. 2020;20(11):3140-3148.
114. de Andrade CLT, de Aguiar Pereira CC, Martins M, Lima SML, Portela MC. COVID-19 hospitalizations in Brazil's Unified Health System (SUS). *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12):e0243126.
115. Bellan M, Patti G, Hayden E, et al. Fatality rate and predictors of mortality in an Italian cohort of hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):20731.
116. Rossi AP, Gottin L, Donadello K, et al. Obesity as a risk factor for unfavourable outcomes in critically ill patients affected by Covid 19. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 2021;31(3):762-768.
117. Carrillo-Vega MF, Salinas-Escudero G, García-Peña C, Gutiérrez-Robledo LM, Parra-Rodríguez L. Early estimation of the risk factors for hospitalization and mortality by COVID-19 in Mexico. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9):e0238905.
118. Cedano J, Fabian Corona E, Gonzalez-Lara M, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of patients with COVID-19 in an intensive care unit of a community hospital; retrospective cohort study. *J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect*. 2021;11(1):27-32.
119. 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.
120. de Souza FSH, Hojo-Souza NS, de Oliveira Batista BD, da Silva CM, Guidoni DL. On the analysis of mortality risk factors for hospitalized COVID-19 patients: A data-driven study using the major Brazilian database. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(3):e0248580.
121. Giacomelli A, Ridolfo AL, Milazzo L, et al. 30-day mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 during the first wave of the Italian epidemic: A prospective cohort study. *Pharmacol Res*. 2020;158:104931.
122. Giorgi Rossi P, Marino M, Formisano D, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of a cohort of COVID-19 patients in the Province of Reggio Emilia, Italy. *PLoS one*. 2020;15(8):e0238281. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0238281. Accessed 2020.
123. Halasz G, Leoni ML, Villani GQ, Nolli M, Villani M. Obesity, overweight and survival in critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia: is there an obesity paradox? Preliminary results from Italy. *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*. 2020.
124. Kates OS, Haydel BM, Florman SS, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Solid Organ Transplant: A Multicenter Cohort Study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
125. Klang E, Kassim G, Soffer S, Freeman R, Levin MA, Reich DL. Severe Obesity as an Independent Risk Factor for COVID-19 Mortality in Hospitalized Patients Younger than 50. *Obesity*. 2020;28(9):1595-1599.
126. Murillo-Zamora E, Hernandez-Suarez CM. Survival in adult inpatients with COVID-19. *Public Health*. 2021;190:1-3.
127. Olivas-Martínez A, Cárdenas-Fragoso JL, Jiménez JV, et al. In-hospital mortality from severe COVID-19 in a tertiary care center in Mexico City; causes of death, risk factors and the impact of hospital saturation. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(2):e0245772.
128. Parker A, Koegelenberg CFN, Moolla MS, et al. High HIV prevalence in an early cohort of hospital admissions with COVID-19 in Cape Town, South Africa. *S Afr Med J*. 2020;110(10):982-987.
129. Parra-Bracamonte GM, Lopez-Villalobos N, Parra-Bracamonte FE. Clinical characteristics and risk factors for mortality of patients with COVID-19 in a large data set from Mexico. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2020;52:93-98.e92.
130. Rodríguez A, Moreno G, Gómez J, et al. Severe infection due to the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus: Experience of a tertiary hospital with COVID-19 patients during the 2020 pandemic. *Med Intensiva*. 2020;44(9):525-533.

131. Salacup G, Lo KB, Gul F, et al. Characteristics and clinical outcomes of COVID-19 patients in an underserved-inner city population: A single tertiary center cohort. *J Med Virol.* 2021;93(1):416-423.
132. Shah P, Owens J, Franklin J, et al. Demographics, comorbidities and outcomes in hospitalized Covid-19 patients in rural southwest Georgia. *Annals of Medicine.* 2020;52(7):354-360.
133. Di Castelnuovo A, Bonaccio M, Costanzo S, et al. Common cardiovascular risk factors and in-hospital mortality in 3,894 patients with COVID-19: survival analysis and machine learning-based findings from the multicentre Italian CORIST Study. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis.* 2020;30(11):1899-1913.
134. Favà A, Cucchiari D, Montero N, et al. Clinical characteristics and risk factors for severe COVID-19 in hospitalized kidney transplant recipients: A multicentric cohort study. *American Journal of Transplantation.* 2020;20(11):3030-3041.
135. Kalyanaraman Marcello R, Dolle J, Grami S, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in New York City's public hospital system. *PLOS ONE.* 2020;15(12):e0243027.
136. Soares RCM, Mattos LR, Raposo LM. Risk Factors for Hospitalization and Mortality due to COVID-19 in Espírito Santo State, Brazil. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;103(3):1184-1190.
137. Mikami T, Miyashita H, Yamada T, et al. Risk Factors for Mortality in Patients with COVID-19 in New York City. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2021;36(1):17-26.
138. Yudong P, Kai M, Liang L, et al. Clinical characteristics and outcome of 112 patients with cardiovascular disease infected with novel coronavirus pneumonia. *Chinese Journal of Cardiovascular Diseases.* 2020;48(6):450-455.
139. Halvatsiotis P, Kotanidou A, Tzannis K, et al. Demographic and clinical features of critically ill patients with COVID-19 in Greece: The burden of diabetes and obesity. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2020;166:108331.
140. Borobia AM, Carcas AJ, Arnalich F, et al. A Cohort of Patients with COVID-19 in a Major Teaching Hospital in Europe. *J Clin Med.* 2020;9(6).
141. Földi M, Farkas N, Kiss S, et al. Visceral Adiposity Elevates the Risk of Critical Condition in COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Obesity (Silver Spring).* 2021;29(3):521-528.
142. Poly TN, Islam MM, Yang HC, et al. Obesity and Mortality Among Patients Diagnosed With COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Medicine.* 2021;8(28):620044.
143. Aghili SMM, Ebrahimpur M, Arjmand B, et al. Obesity in COVID-19 era, implications for mechanisms, comorbidities, and prognosis: a review and meta-analysis. *Int J Obes (Lond).* 2021:1-19.
144. Booth A, Reed AB, Ponzo S, et al. Population risk factors for severe disease and mortality in COVID-19: A global systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(3):e0247461.
145. Ng WH, Tipih T, Makoah NA, et al. Comorbidities in SARS-CoV-2 Patients: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *mBio.* 2021;12(1).
146. Yang J, Tian C, Chen Y, Zhu C, Chi H, Li J. Obesity aggravates COVID-19: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol.* 2020.
147. Mesas AE, Cavero-Redondo I, Álvarez-Bueno C, et al. Predictors of in-hospital COVID-19 mortality: A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis exploring differences by age, sex and health conditions. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(11):e0241742.
148. Soeroto AY, Soetedjo NN, Purwiga A, et al. Effect of increased BMI and obesity on the outcome of COVID-19 adult patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Metab Syndr.* 2020;14(6):1897-1904.
149. Du Y, Lv Y, Zha W, Zhou N, Hong X. Association of body mass index (BMI) with critical COVID-19 and in-hospital mortality: A dose-response meta-analysis. *Metabolism.* 2021;117:154373.

150. Chu Y, Yang J, Shi J, Zhang P, Wang X. Obesity is associated with increased severity of disease in COVID-19 pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Med Res*. 2020;25(1):64.
151. Khaodhlar L, McCowen KC, Blackburn GL. Obesity and its comorbid conditions. *Clin Cornerstone*. 1999;2(3):17-31.
152. Dube S, Norby BJ, Pattan V, Carter RE, Basu A, Basu R. 11 β -hydroxysteroid dehydrogenase types 1 and 2 activity in subcutaneous adipose tissue in humans: implications in obesity and diabetes. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2015;100(1):E70-76.
153. Kruglikov IL, Scherer PE. The Role of Adipocytes and Adipocyte-Like Cells in the Severity of COVID-19 Infections. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2020;28(7):1187-1190.
154. Tounian P, Aggoun Y, Dubern B, et al. Presence of increased stiffness of the common carotid artery and endothelial dysfunction in severely obese children: a prospective study. *Lancet*. 2001;358(9291):1400-1404.
155. Jin Y, Ji W, Yang H, Chen S, Zhang W, Duan G. Endothelial activation and dysfunction in COVID-19: from basic mechanisms to potential therapeutic approaches. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*. 2020;5(1):293.
156. Gavrilaki E, Anyfanti P, Gavrilaki M, Lazaridis A, Douma S, Gkaliagkousi E. Endothelial Dysfunction in COVID-19: Lessons Learned from Coronaviruses. *Curr Hypertens Rep*. 2020;22(9):63.
157. Cabandugama PK, Gardner MJ, Sowers JR. The Renin Angiotensin Aldosterone System in Obesity and Hypertension: Roles in the Cardiorenal Metabolic Syndrome. *Med Clin North Am*. 2017;101(1):129-137.
158. Blokhin IO, Lentz SR. Mechanisms of thrombosis in obesity. *Curr Opin Hematol*. 2013;20(5):437-444.
159. Kwaifa IK, Bahari H, Yong YK, Noor SM. Endothelial Dysfunction in Obesity-Induced Inflammation: Molecular Mechanisms and Clinical Implications. *Biomolecules*. 2020;10(2).
160. Prieto D, Contreras C, Sánchez A. Endothelial dysfunction, obesity and insulin resistance. *Curr Vasc Pharmacol*. 2014;12(3):412-426.
161. Virdis A. Endothelial Dysfunction in Obesity: Role of Inflammation. *High Blood Press Cardiovasc Prev*. 2016;23(2):83-85.
162. Anfossi G, Russo I, Trovati M. Platelet dysfunction in central obesity. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*. 2009;19(6):440-449.
163. Daryabor G, Kabelitz D, Kalantar K. An update on immune dysregulation in obesity-related insulin resistance. *Scand J Immunol*. 2019;89(4):e12747.
164. Danziger J, Chen KP, Lee J, et al. Obesity, Acute Kidney Injury, and Mortality in Critical Illness. *Critical care medicine*. 2016;44(2):328-334.
165. Akinnusi ME, Pineda LA, El Solh AA. Effect of obesity on intensive care morbidity and mortality: a meta-analysis. *Crit Care Med*. 2008;36(1):151-158.
166. Hogue CW, Jr., Stearns JD, Colantuoni E, et al. The impact of obesity on outcomes after critical illness: a meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med*. 2009;35(7):1152-1170.
167. Oliveros H, Villamor E. Obesity and mortality in critically ill adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2008;16(3):515-521.
168. Zhao Y, Li Z, Yang T, Wang M, Xi X. Is body mass index associated with outcomes of mechanically ventilated adult patients in intensive critical units? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(6):e0198669.
169. Motaib I, Zbiri S, Elamari S, Dini N, Chadli A, El Kettani C. Obesity and Disease Severity Among Patients With COVID-19. *Cureus Journal of Medical Science*. 2021;13(2):e13165.

703 170. National Heart L, and Blood Institute,. Development and Use of Study Quality Assessment Tools.
 704 <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>. Updated 04/14/2021.
 705 Accessed 04/14/2021, 2020.

706

707

Legends:

Figure 1: Prisma flow diagram

Figure 2: Forest plot for severity analysis

Figure 3: Forest plot for mortality analysis

Figure 4: Severity meta-regression analysis

Figure 5: Mortality meta-regression analysis

Figure 6: 6A: Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI 30 kg/m²-40

kg/m², **6B:** Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI >40 kg/m², **6C:**

Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI <18 kg/m² vs BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m², **6D:** Sensitivity

analysis for mortality for BMI 18 kg/m²-24.9 kg/m² vs BMI 25 kg/m²-29.9 kg/m², **6E:**

Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI <18 kg/m² vs BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m², **6F:**

Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI 30 kg/m² – 40

kg/m², **6G:** Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI >40

kg/m², **6H:** Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI 25

kg/m²-29.9 kg/m².

Figure 7. 7A: Standard error plot for severity analysis, **7B:** Standard error plot for mortality

analysis.

Figure 8: Several mechanisms of obesity's role in endothelial dysfunction: A central event in

pathogenicity of COVID-19 infection

Table 1: Study characteristics

Table 2: Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies, **2a:**

Cohort studies, **2b:** Case control studies

Figure 1: Prisma flow diagram

Figure 2: Forest plot for severity analysis.

Figure 3: Forest plot for mortality analysis.

Figure 4: Severity meta-regression analysis

Regression of Log odds ratio on Gender

Regression of Log odds ratio on Pulmonary disease

Regression of Log odds ratio on Cardiovascular disease

Regression of Log odds ratio on Hypertension

Regression of Log odds ratio on Diabetes

Figure 5: Mortality meta-regression analysis

Figure 6A: Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI 30 kg/m²-40 kg/m²

Figure 6B: Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI >40 kg/m²

Figure 6C: Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI <18 kg/m² vs BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m²

Figure 6D: Sensitivity analysis for mortality for BMI 18 kg/m²-24.9 kg/m² vs BMI 25 kg/m²-29.9 kg/m²

Figure 6E: Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI <18 kg/m² vs BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m²

Figure 6F: Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI 30 kg/m²-40 kg/m²

Figure 6G: Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI >40 kg/m²

Figure 6H: Sensitivity analysis for severity of COVID-19 BMI 18 kg/m²-25 kg/m² vs BMI 25 kg/m²-29.9 kg/m²

Figure 7A: Standard error plot for severity analysis.

Figure 7B: Standard error plot for mortality analysis.

Figure 8: Several mechanisms of obesity's role in endothelial dysfunction: A central event in pathogenicity of COVID-19 infection

Table 1: Study characteristics

Study	Study Design	Definition of Severity	Total COVID-19 Positive Patients	Total Patients with Obesity	Median Age	Female Sex Proportion	Diabetes Proportion	Heart Disease Proportion	Pulmonary Disease Proportion	Hypertension Proportion
Al Heialy <i>et al.</i> ⁴²	Cohort	ICU admissions	286	102	46.9	27.2	26.2	3.8	3.8	25.8
Al-Sabah <i>et al.</i> ⁴³	Cohort	ICU admissions	1158	157	40.5	18.4	23.4	N/A	N/A	20.4
Alkhatib <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁴	Retrospective cohort	ICU admissions	158	96	57	61.4	48.1	13.3	17.5	67.7
Anderson <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁵	Retrospective cohort	Intubation	2466	785	67	42	40	7	17	52
Andrea Rossi <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁶	Cohort	Not valid	95	35	N/A	18	19	38.9	N/A	47.4
Argenziano <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰⁷	Cohort	ICU admission	1000	352	63	40.4	37.2	23.3	22.3	60.1
Arjun S <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁶	Cohort	ICU admissions	142	54	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bellan <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁵	Cohort	Not valid	407	60	71	41	24	30	3	58
Bhatraju <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁷	Cohort	ICU admissions	24	13	64	38	58	N/A	16	N/A
Biscarin <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁸	Retrospective cohort	ICU admissions	427	80	67	31.8	19	28	N/A	50
Borobia <i>et al.</i> ¹⁴⁰	Cohort	Not valid	2226	242	61	51.8	17.1	19.3	13.3	41.3
Burrell <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁹	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	204	80	63.5	31	28	20	11	24
Busetto <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁰	Cohort	ICU admission	92	29	70.5	39.1	30.4	31.5	13	64.1
Cai <i>et al.</i> ⁵¹	Cohort	ICU admission	383	41	48	52.2	7.3	4.9	N/A	15.1
Cariou <i>et al.</i> ⁵²	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	1117	428	69.8	35.1	88.5	11.6	10.4	77.2
Carrillo-Vega <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁷	Cohort	Not valid	3922	987	54.2	35	30	5.1	8.1	34.1
Castelnuova <i>et al.</i> ¹³³	Cohort	Not valid	3894	376	67	38.3	19	21.1	14.3	49.4
caussy <i>et al.</i> ⁵³	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	291	96	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cedano <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁸	Cohort	Not valid	132	59	63	41	45	24	13	59
Chand <i>et al.</i> ¹¹¹	Cohort	Not valid	300	163	58.2	39.3	44.7	13.7	18.7	66.7
Chao <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁴	Cohort	ICU admissions	46	12	13.1	32.7	N/A	2.1	24	N/A
Ciceri <i>et al.</i> ¹¹²	Prospective case control	Not valid	410	78	65	27.1	17.8	12.4	5.3	49.5
Claudia <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁹	Cohort	ICU admissions	99	27	67	37	22	28	21	57

Table 1: Study characteristics (continued)

Cravedi <i>et al.</i>¹¹³	Cohort	Not valid	144	71	62	34.02	52	28	18.8	95
Czernichow <i>et al.</i>⁵⁵	Cohort	ICU admissions	5,795	1264	58	34.5	42.6	4.5	N/A	53.4
de Andrade <i>et al.</i>¹¹⁴	Cohort	Not valid	89405	655	58.9	43.5	1.5	N/A	N/A	4.2
Docherty <i>et al.</i>¹¹⁹	Cohort	Not valid	20133	1685	72.9	40.1	20.7	30.9	16.11	N/A
Dreher <i>et al.</i>⁵⁶	Cohort	ARDS	50	17	65	34	58	N/A	50	70
Ebinger <i>et al.</i>⁵⁷	Cohort	ICU admissions	214	44	62	37	40	21	20	54.6
Fava <i>et al.</i>¹³⁴	Cohort	Not valid	104	28	59.7	42.3	30.8	29.8	15.4	86.5
Feuth <i>et al.</i>⁵⁸	Cohort	ICU admissions	28	10	56	46	25	N/A	21	43
Fusco <i>et al.</i>¹⁰⁰	Cohort	ICU admission + Mechanical ventilation	173942	46965	63	48.9	40.7	73.5	22.2	64.8
Gao <i>et al.</i>⁵⁹	Cohort	Not mentioned	150	75	48	37.8	19.3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Genny Carrillo <i>et al.</i>¹⁰¹	Retrospective cohort	Mechanical ventilation	69334	16272	55.29	37.38	30.92	4.21	5.65	34.41
Gerotziafas <i>et al.</i>⁶⁰	Cohort	ICU admissions	430	67	64.3	61	21.6	N/A	9	47.7
Giacomelli <i>et al.</i>¹²¹	Cohort	Not valid	233	38	61	30.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Giorgi Rossi <i>et al.</i>¹²²	Cohort	Not valid	1075	34	63.2	38.8	17	31	8.4	26
Goyal <i>et al.</i>⁶¹	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	393	136	62.2	39.4	25.2	13.7	17.6	50.1
Guner <i>et al.</i>⁶²	Cohort	ARDS, sepsis, and septic shock	222	77	50.6	40.5	13.5	23.6	5.4	23.4
Hajifathalian <i>et al.</i>⁶³	Cohort	ICU admissions	770	277	64	39.2	31	21	17.4	56.1
Halasz <i>et al.</i>¹²³	Cohort	Not valid	242	48	64	18.2	15.3	14.5	8.7	45.5
Halvatsiotis <i>et al.</i>¹³⁹	Cohort	Not valid	90	31	65.5	20	18.8	21.1	12	50
Hojo de Souza <i>et al.</i>¹²⁰	Retrospective cohort	Not valid	44128	3633	N/A	45.85	39.82	52.02	6.31	N/A
Hsu <i>et al.</i>¹⁰⁸	Cohort	ICU admissions	1088	565	63	45	35.7	19.7	24.3	57
Hur <i>et al.</i>⁶⁴	Cohort	Intubation	486	259	59	44.2	32.9	22.8	16	54.9
Ioannou <i>et al.</i>⁶⁶	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	3465	1412	61.1	19.6	48.8	47.3	33	75
John Xie <i>et al.</i>¹⁰⁶	Retrospective cohort	ICU admissions	287	187	61.5	56.8	53.6	14.3	20.5	80.1
Kaeuffer <i>et al.</i>⁶⁷	Cohort	Death or admission to ICU	1045	351	66.3	41.4	25.3	11.6	16.5	52.4
Kalligeros <i>et al.</i>³²	Cohort	ICU admissions	103	49	60	39.8	36.8	24.2	19.5	64
Kates <i>et al.</i>¹²⁴	Cohort	Not valid	482	166	57.5	28.8	51	30.1	10.4	77.4
Klang <i>et al.</i>	Cohort	Not valid	3406	1231	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Laccarino <i>et al.</i>⁶⁵	Cohort	ICU admissions	2378	157	68.2	37.4	18.2	26.4	8.5	58.5

Table 1: Study characteristics (continued)

Lighter <i>et al.</i>⁶⁸	Cohort	ICU admissions	3615	1370	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ling Hu <i>et al.</i>¹⁰²	Cohort	Not mentioned	323	13	61	48.6	14.6	12.7	10.9	32.5
Lodigiani <i>et al.</i>⁶⁹	Cohort	ICU admissions	361	87	66	32	22.7	N/A	N/A	47.2
Marcello <i>et al.</i>¹³⁵	Cohort	Not valid	6248	2278	61	38	33	31	11	37
Mejía-Vilet.⁷⁰	Cohort	ICU admissions	329	132	49	36	24	N/A	N/A	27
Mendy <i>et al.</i>⁷¹	Cohort	Death or admission to ICU	216	53	60	44.4	43.5	77.3	16.7	N/A
Menezes Soares <i>et al.</i>¹³⁶	Cohort	Not valid	1152	111	N/A	42.8	24	45.6	9.6	N/A
Mikami <i>et al.</i>¹³⁷	Cohort	Not valid	3708	288	66	43	24.3	N/A	8.7	34.3
Monteiro <i>et al.</i>⁷²	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	112	40	61	34	64	15	17.4	50
Motaib <i>et al.</i>¹⁶⁹	Cohort	ICU admissions	107	24	53	40	15	15	8.4	30.8
Mughal <i>et al.</i>⁷³	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	129	18	63	37.2	19.4	17.1	10.9	43.3
Murillo-Zamora <i>et al.</i>¹²⁶	Cohort	Not valid	5393	1197	N/A	36.4	31.1	N/A	7.8	36.6
Nachega <i>et al.</i>⁷⁴	Cohort	ICU admissions	766	39	46	34.4	14	3.9	3.4	25.4
Nakeshbandi <i>et al.</i>⁷⁵	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	504	215	68	48	53	19	16	83
Newton <i>et al.</i>⁷⁶	Cohort	Death or admission to ICU	370	102	62.2	51.8	42.3	17.4	2.5	66.8
Olivas-Martínez <i>et al.</i>¹²⁷	Cohort	Not valid	800	357	51.9	39	26	4.6	2.3	30
Ortiz-Brizuela <i>et al.</i>⁷⁷	Cohort	ICU admissions	140	50	49	29.3	22.9	4.3	2.8	32
Palaiodimos <i>et al.</i>⁷⁸	Cohort	ICU admissions	200	46	64	51	39.5	33.5	27.5	76
Parker <i>et al.</i>¹²⁸	Cohort	Not valid	113	32	48	61	39	5.4	17.2	42
Parra-Bracamonte <i>et al.</i>¹²⁹	Cohort	Not valid	95458	22390	44	38.1	31.3	4.2	5.8	35.1
Peng <i>et al.</i>¹³⁸	Cohort	Not mentioned	112	33	62	59	N/A	55.3	N/A	82
Pepe <i>et al.</i>⁷⁹	Cohort	ICU admission	2214	440	49.6	40.2	9.1	8	12.3	26.2
Petersen, A. <i>et al.</i>⁸⁰	Cohort	ICU admissions	30	19	65.6	12	5	5	3	15
Petrilli <i>et al.</i>⁸¹	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation and ICU admission	2741	1081	63	38.8	34.7	34.8	16.5	62
Pettit <i>et al.</i>⁸²	Cohort	ICU admissions	238	146	58.5	52.5	28.6	21.4	26.5	52.9
Philipose <i>et al.</i>⁸³	Cohort	Not mentioned	368	125	72	40.5	35.4	33.6	28.1	50.2
Pongpirul <i>et al.</i>⁸⁴	Cohort	Not mentioned	193	22	37	41.5	8.3	1	1.6	16.1
Rachel <i>et al.</i>¹⁰³	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	305	127	60	42	35	21	18	52

Table 1: Study characteristics (continued)

Ramlall <i>et al.</i>⁸⁵	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	6393	831	57.1	50.3	14.2	26.6	N/A	31.1
Rao <i>et al.</i>⁸⁶	Cohort	Not mentioned	240	114	48	53.8	9.6	17.9	1.2	N/A
Reilev <i>et al.</i>⁸⁷	Cohort	ICU admissions	450	50	81	38	26	45	28	74
Rodriguez <i>et al.</i>¹³⁰	Cohort	Not valid	43	11	65.5	27.2	18.6	14	9.3	30.2
Rodríguez-Molinero <i>et al.</i>⁸⁸	Cohort	Need for oxygen therapy via nonrebreather mask or mechanical ventilation	418	74	N/A	57	23.7	24.1	N/A	52
Rottoli <i>et al.</i>⁸⁹	Cohort	ICU admissions	482	104	66.2	37.3	15.2	21.2	13.1	51.7
Salacup G <i>et al.</i>¹³¹	Cohort	Not valid	242	97	66	49.17	49	14.8	19.8	74
Shah <i>et al.</i>¹³²	Cohort	Not valid	522	481	63	58.2	42.3	22.6	22	79.7
Shekhar <i>et al.</i>⁹⁰	Cohort	ICU admissions	50	20	55.5	54	36	14	16	34
Simmonet <i>et al.</i>¹⁵²	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	124	59	60	27	23	N/A	N/A	49
Steinberg <i>et al.</i>⁹²	Cohort	Mechanical ventilation	210	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Suleyman <i>et al.</i>⁹³	Cohort	ICU admission	355	210	61.4	53.5	43.4	29.1	40.3	72.7
Tonetti <i>et al.</i>⁹⁴	Cohort	ICU admissions	700	176	69.4	23	21.8	61.8	14.4	N/A
Urre <i>et al.</i>⁹⁵	Retrospective case control	ICU admissions	172	17	N/A	39.5	22.6	16.27	9.8	50.5
Vaquero-Roncero <i>et al.</i>⁹⁶	Cohort	ICU admissions	146	46	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wang J <i>et al.</i>¹⁰⁴	Cohort	ICU admissions	297	40	44.3	44.7	8.41	2.02	4.04	16.16
Wang Min <i>et al.</i>³	Retrospective cohort	Respiratory failure	541	60	52	45.29	8.69	5.36	N/A	24.77
Wang R <i>et al.</i>⁹⁷	Cohort	Not mentioned	96	44	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	52.1
Xiang Ong <i>et al.</i>¹⁰⁵	Cohort	ICU admissions	91	40	55	44	19.7	9.9	N/A	33
Zheng <i>et al.</i>⁹⁸	Cohort	Not mentioned	66	45	47	74.2	24.2	N/A	N/A	28.8

Table 2: Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies ¹⁷⁰

2A: Cohort studies

Criteria	Al Heialy <i>et al.</i> ⁴²	Al-Sabah <i>et al.</i> ⁴³	Alkhatab <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁴	Andersson <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁵	Andrea Rossi <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁶	Argenzi <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰⁷	Arjun S <i>et al.</i> ⁴⁶	Bellani <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁵
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	NA
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	NA	NA	No	No	No	No	No	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	CD	CD	CD	Yes	NA	Yes
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor)	Good	Good	Low	Good	Good	Good	Low	Good
Risk of Bias	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Bhatraju et al. ⁴⁷	Biscarini et al. ⁴⁸	Borobio et al. ¹⁴⁰	Burrell et al. ⁴⁹	Busetto et al. ⁵⁰	Cai et al. ⁵¹	Cariou et al. ⁵²	Cravedi et al. ¹¹³
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	NA	No	NO	No	No	No	NA	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	NA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	CD	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	NA	NA	Na	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	CD	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	CD	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor)	Low	High	High	Good	Low	Good	Good	Good
Risk of Bias	Moderate	Very low	Very low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Carrillo-Vega <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁷	Castelnuova <i>et al.</i> ¹³³	Caussy <i>et al.</i> ⁵³	Cedano <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁸	Chand <i>et al.</i> ¹¹¹	Chao <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁴	Claudia <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁹	Czernichow <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁵
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	NO	NA	No	No	No	NO	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	No	Yes	CD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CD
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	NA	Yes	Na	NA
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	CD	CD	NA	CD	Yes	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor)	Good	Good	Low	Good	Good	High	High	Good
Risk of Bias	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Very low	Very low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	de Andrade <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁴	Docherty <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁹	Dreher <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁶	Ebinger <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁷	Fava <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁴	Feuth <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁸	Fusco <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰⁰	Gao <i>et al.</i> ⁵⁹
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	NO
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	NR	Yes	CD	CD	Yes	CD	Yes	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor)	Good	High	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Risk of Bias	Low	Very low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Genny Carrillo <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰¹	Gerotziafas <i>et al.</i> ⁶⁰	Giacome Ili <i>et al.</i> ¹²¹	Giorgirossi <i>et al.</i> ¹²²	Goyal <i>et al.</i> ⁶¹	Guner <i>et al.</i> ⁶²	Hajifathalian <i>et al.</i> ⁶³	Halasz <i>et al.</i> ¹²³
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NO	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	NO	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	NO
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	No	CD	No	CD	CD	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor)	Fair	Fair	Good	Good	Low	Good	High	Good
Risk of Bias	Unclear	Unclear	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Very low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Halvatsi otis et al. ¹³⁹	Hojo de Souza et al. ¹²⁰	Hsu et al. ¹⁰⁸	Hur et al. ⁶⁴	Laccarin o et al. ⁶⁵	Ioannou et al. ⁶⁶	John Xie et al. ¹⁰⁶	Kaeuffer et al. ⁶⁷
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes'	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	CD	CD	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	CD	Yes
Quality Rating (Good, Fair, or Poor)	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	High	High	High
Risk of Bias	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Very low	Very low	Very low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Kalligero <i>s et al.</i> ³²	Kates <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁴	Klang <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁵	Lighter <i>et al.</i> ⁶⁸	Ling Hu <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰²	Lodigiani <i>et al.</i> ⁶⁹	Marcello <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁵	Mejía-Vilet <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁰
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	No	No	No	CD	CD	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	CD	CD	Yes	Yes	No	No
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating	High	Good	Good	Fair	High	Good	Good	High
Risk of Bias	Very low	Low	Low	Unclear	Very low	Low	Low	Very low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Mendy <i>et al.</i> ⁷¹	Menezes Soares <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁶	Mikami <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁷	Monteir o <i>et al.</i> ⁷²	Motaib <i>et al.</i> ¹⁶⁹	Mughal <i>et al.</i> ⁷³	Murillo- Zamora <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁶	Nachega <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁴
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	CD	CD	No	CD	CD	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating	High	High	Good	High	Good	High	High	Good
Risk of Bias	Very low	Very low	Low	Very low	Low	Very low	Very low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Nakeshb andi <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁵	Newton <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁶	Olivas- Martí'ne z <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁷	Ortiz- Brizuela <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁷	Palaiodi mos <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁸	Parker <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁸	Parra- Bracamo nte <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁹	Peng <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁸
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	CD	CD	No	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	CD	CD	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	CD	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating	Good	High	High	Good	High	Good	Good	Good
Risk of Bias	Low	Very low	Very low	Low	Very low	Low	Low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Pepe <i>et al.</i> ⁷⁹	Petersen <i>et al.</i> ⁸⁰	Petrilli <i>et al.</i> ⁸¹	Pettit <i>et al.</i> ⁸²	Philipos <i>e et al.</i> ⁸³	Pongpiru <i>l et al.</i> ⁸⁴	Rachel <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰³	Ramlall <i>et al.</i> ⁸⁵
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	CD	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	NO
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	NR	CD	CD	Yes	CD	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	CD	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating	Good	High	Good	Good	Good	High	High	Good
Risk of Bias	Low	Very low	Low	Low	Low	Very low	Very low	Low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Rao <i>et al.</i> ⁸⁶	Reilev <i>et al.</i> ⁸⁷	Rodríguez <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁰	Rodríguez-Molinero <i>et al.</i> ⁸⁸	Salacup <i>G et al.</i> ¹³¹	Rottoli <i>et al.</i> ⁸⁹	Shah <i>et al.</i> ¹³²	Shekhar <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁰	Simmonet <i>et al.</i> ¹⁵²
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	CD	No	CD	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	Yes	CD	CD	CD	CD	CD	No	CD	Yes
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating	High	Good	High	Good	Good	Good	High	Good	High
Risk of Bias	Very low	Low	Very low	Low	Low	Low	Very low	Low	Very low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported

2A: Cohort studies (continued)

Criteria	Steinberg <i>et al.</i> ⁹²	Suleyman <i>et al.</i> ⁹³	Tonetti <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁴	Vaquero-Roncer <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁶	Wang J <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰⁴	Wang Min <i>et al.</i> ³	Wang R <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁷	Xiang <i>et al.</i> ¹⁰⁵	Zheng <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁸
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	NO	No	No	No	No	NO	No	No	No
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Yes	Yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	No	No	No	No	NO	No	No	No	No
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	CD	CD	CD	Yes	CD	CD	CD	CD	CD
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	CD	CD	CD	Yes
Quality Rating	Good	Good	Good	High	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
Risk of Bias	Low	Low	Low	Very low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

2B: Case control studies

Criteria	Ciceri <i>et al.</i> ¹¹²	Urra <i>et al.</i> ⁹⁵
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated and appropriate?	Yes	Yes
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	Yes
Did the authors include a sample size justification?	Yes	Yes
Were controls selected or recruited from the same or similar population that gave rise to the cases (including the same timeframe)?	Yes	Yes
Were the definitions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, algorithms or processes used to identify or select cases and controls valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes
Were the cases clearly defined and differentiated from controls?	Yes	Yes
If less than 100 percent of eligible cases and/or controls were selected for the study, were the cases and/or controls randomly selected from those eligible?	Yes	Yes
Was there use of concurrent controls?	Yes	No
Were the investigators able to confirm that the exposure/risk occurred prior to the development of the condition or event that defined a participant as a case?	Yes	Yes
Were the measures of exposure/risk clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently (including the same time period) across all study participants?	Yes	Yes
Were the assessors of exposure/risk blinded to the case or control status of participants?	NR	NR
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically in the analyses? If matching was used, did the investigators account for matching during study analysis?	Yes	Yes
Quality Rating	High	High
Risk of Bias	Very low	Very low

CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported