1 The isolated effect of age on the risk of COVID-19 severe outcomes: a systematic review with meta-
 2 analysis
 3 Karla Romero Starke^{1,2}, David Reissig¹, Gabriela Petereit-Haack³, Stefanie Schmauder¹, Albert
 4 Nienhaus^{4,5}, Andreas Seidler¹

5

6 ¹Institute and Policlinic of Occupational and Social Medicine (IPAS), Faculty of Medicine Carl Gustav
 7 Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, 01307 Dresden, Germany

8 ² Institute of Sociology, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Technische Universität Chemnitz,
 9 Thüringer Weg 9, 09126 Chemnitz, Germany

10 ³ Division of Occupational Health, Department of Occupational Safety, Regional Government of South
 11 Hesse, 65197 Wiesbaden, Germany

12 ⁴ Department of Occupational Medicine, Toxic Substances and Health Research, Institution for
 13 Statutory Social Accident Insurance and Prevention in the Health Care and Welfare Services (BGW),
 14 22089 Hamburg, Germany

15 ⁵ Competence Centre for Epidemiology and Health Services Research for Healthcare Professionals
 16 (CVcare), Institute for Health Service Research in Dermatology and Nursing (IVDP), University Medical
 17 Centre Hamburg-Eppendorf (UKE), 20251 Hamburg, Germany

18

19 Abstract

20 Introduction

21 Increased age has been reported to be a factor for COVID-19 severe outcomes. However, many
 22 studies do not consider the age-dependency of comorbidities, which influence the course of disease.
 23 Protection strategies often target individuals after a certain age, which may not necessarily be
 24 evidence-based. The aim of this review was to quantify the isolated effect of age on hospitalization,
 25 admission to ICU, mechanical ventilation, and death.

26 Methods

27 This review was based on an umbrella review, in which Pubmed, Embase, and pre-print databases
 28 were searched on December 10, 2020 for relevant reviews on COVID-19 disease severity. Two
 29 independent reviewers evaluated the primary studies using predefined inclusion and exclusion
 30 criteria. The results were extracted, and each study was assessed for risk of bias. The isolated effect
 31 of age was estimated by meta-analysis, and the quality of evidence was assessed using GRADE.

32 Results

33 Seventy studies met our inclusion criteria (case mortality n=14, in-hospital mortality n=44,
 34 hospitalization n=16, admission to ICU n=12, mechanical ventilation n=7). The risk of in-hospital and
 35 case mortality increased per age year by 5.7% and 7.4%, respectively (Effect Size (ES) in-hospital
 36 mortality=1.057, 95% CI:1.038-1.054; ES case mortality= 1.074, 95% CI:1.061-1.087), while the risk of
 37 hospitalization increased by 3.4% per age year (ES=1.034, 95% CI:1.021-1.048). No increased risk was
 38 observed for ICU admission and intubation by age year. There was no evidence of a specific age
 39 threshold at which the risk accelerates considerably. The confidence of evidence was high for
 40 mortality and hospitalization.

41 Conclusions

42 Our results show a best-possible quantification of the increase in COVID-19 disease severity due to
43 age. Rather than implementing age thresholds, prevention programs should consider the continuous
44 increase in risk. There is a need for continuous, high-quality research and “living” reviews to evaluate
45 the evidence throughout the pandemic, as results may change due to varying circumstances.

46

47 What is already known?

- 48 • Increasing age and comorbidities are risk factors for COVID-19 severe outcomes, such as
- 49 hospitalization and mortality. However, comorbidities such as diabetes, cardiovascular
- 50 disease, chronic pulmonary diseases increase with age, and the isolated effect of age on
- 51 COVID-19 disease severity is not known.

52 What are the new findings?

- 53 • The risk of COVID-19 disease severity due to the isolated effect of age increases by age year
- 54 and no specific age threshold was observed.
- 55 • A best possible quantification of the increase in risk of COVID-19 severe outcomes due to age
- 56 has been done.

57 What do the new findings imply?

- 58 • Any workplace restrictions targeting a particular older age group are rather arbitrary, and
- 59 may contribute to ageism in the society.
- 60 • If scores are to be built to assess an individual's risk for COVID-19 severe outcomes in
- 61 workplace settings, these should be based on per-age increases.

62

63

64 1. Introduction

65 Since identified in Wuhan, China in December 2019 (1), COVID-19 has caused more than 3.4 million
66 deaths worldwide (2). Early on, the increase COVID-19 adverse outcomes in the older population was
67 observed (3-6). Chronic diseases, which increase with age, are also established risk factors for COVID-
68 19 disease severity (7, 8). However, age and age-related risk factors, are often not de-coupled in
69 studies (9). Since mortality rates are often presented by age groups (10), prevention strategies
70 targeting older age groups in the workplace were started. After the first wave, the Federal State of
71 Lower Saxony in Germany encouraged teachers over the age of 60 years to work from home.
72 Recently, an IKKA score was developed in Germany for workers in order to establish, among other
73 things, age-based criteria that could decide on the admissibility of work attendance (11). The risk
74 score was partly-based on the age group of the individual (<50 years: score=0; 50-59 years: score=4;
75 ≥60 years: score=10). There have been discussions concluding in a consensus over the need to
76 improve the risk score based on current evidence regarding the isolated effect of age on COVID-19
77 disease severity (12). In general, we should be careful to classify 60 years of age as risk persons (or
78 any other age group starting at a particular “arbitrary” age), as this can considerably reduce the
79 chances of older unemployed people finding a job or make them “targets” for layoffs.

80 In mid-2020, we published a rapid review investigating the isolated effect of age on COVID-19 disease
81 severity - that is, the direct effect of age after accounting for important age-related risk factors such
82 as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and chronic pulmonary disease. The result was that the effect of
83 age was rather small (13). This review was based mainly on Chinese studies published early in the
84 pandemic. As more studies have been published worldwide, a different picture might emerge, and it
85 is necessary to examine the newly acquired evidence on the isolated effect of age on COVID-19
86 disease severity.

87 We aim to gather information on published studies to answer the following:

1. What is the isolated effect of age on COVID-19 disease severity (hospitalization, admission to the intensive care unit (ICU), mechanical ventilation or death due to COVID-19), after adjusting for important age-related risk factors?
2. Is there evidence of an age threshold in which the risk of COVID-19 increases rapidly?

2. Methods

Search, selection, and data extraction

This systematic review was based on an umbrella review on pre-existing health conditions and severe COVID-19 outcomes published elsewhere (14). To summarize, on December 11, 2020 a systematic search for systematic reviews was done in PubMed and Embase, with hand searches on preprint servers (search string in supplement). The included systematic reviews investigated the association between at least one chronic health condition and a severe COVID-19 outcome, such as hospitalization, ICU admission, intubation, or death. After screening the titles and abstracts, followed by full text screening, 120 systematic reviews were included (Figure S1). Then, primary studies included in these reviews were screened. They were included in the analysis if they reported at least one quantitative measure of association in persons with pre-existing health conditions and at least one age-adjusted estimate. 160 primary studies were included in the umbrella review (Figure S2) (14).

To find adequate primary studies for the purpose of our research question regarding age and COVID-19 disease severity, we excluded studies investigating special populations, such as cancer patients or persons with diabetes. Studies were included if the age effect had been adjusted for at least three of the following comorbidities: diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular disease, cancer/immunodeficiency, chronic kidney disease, chronic liver disease, and chronic pulmonary disease (see Table 1 for eligibility criteria). Two independent scientists screened the full texts of the studies. In case of disagreement, a consensus decision was sought between both scientists. If no agreement was achieved, the decision was made by a third reviewer.

114 **Table 1.** Eligibility criteria

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	General population infected with COVID-19 (both sexes, all ages)	Special populations such as studying only cancer patients or persons with diabetes
Exposure	Age, in years	All other exposures which do not include age
Comparator/control	Age reference, in years	
Outcomes	Due to infection with COVID-19: risk of hospitalization, admission to ICU, intubation, and death. Risks measured as hazard ratios, risk ratios, odds ratios	Other outcomes, including outcomes of composite disease severity.
Study design	cross-sectional, case-control, and cohort studies	RCTs, qualitative studies, ecological studies, case reports, experiments, congress abstracts, posters

115 Excluded are studies only reporting univariate (unadjusted) effect values of age.
116 Excluded are studies in which the age effect is not adjusted at least for three comorbidities listed
117 here: diabetes mellitus, cardiovascular disease, cancer or immunodeficiency, chronic kidney disease,
118 chronic liver disease, and chronic pulmonary disease .
119

120 Data extraction was done by one reviewer and checked by another one. In case of missing
121 information, study authors were contacted. The data extraction form included information on the
122 first author, publication year, country of origin, study population, age and sex characteristics,
123 outcome assessment, confounders, analysis methods, and results. A protocol of the review was
124 registered a priori with the PROSPERO database of systematic reviews
125 (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=220614).
126

127 **Risk of Bias Assessment**

127 We evaluated the overall risk of bias for each study as “low” or “high”, and followed the procedure
128 for assessment based on Ijaz et al. 2013 (15), with modifications (13, 16). We also considered the
129 criteria described by SIGN (Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines, 2012) (17) and CASP (Critical Appraisal
130 Skills Programme) (18). We assessed eight domain: 1) recruitment procedure and follow-up 2)
131 exposure definition and measurement, 3) outcome definition and measurement, 4) inclusion of
132 important age-dependent risk factors, 5) analysis method, 6) chronology, 7) funding, and 8) conflict
133 of interest. Each domain was characterized as having a low, high, or unclear risk of bias (see

supplementary material for a detailed description). Domains 1-5 and 6-8 were major and minor domains, respectively. A study was evaluated as having an overall low risk of bias if all major domains had a low risk of bias.

Data synthesis

We evaluated studies using age categories and calculated the median of each of the age categories. If lower and upper categories were open ended, we used reasonable values based on the youngest and oldest participants included. For the younger open-ended age groups, we chose a lower boundary of 18 years if the population encompassed adults only. The median value of 18 years and the upper boundary of the lower open-ended age category was estimated. For the older open-ended age groups an upper boundary of 95 years of age was chosen and a median value was similarly calculated. However, these values were also modified in a sensitivity analysis. If studies only had risks of binary categories of age, such as >60 years vs ≤60 years, they were excluded from the meta-analysis. A log-linear model and a log-cubic model was constructed weighted for variance, and the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) for each model was evaluated. The log of the relative risk (RR) was then plotted against the age mid-points to assess linearity for the specific outcome studied, first for each individual study, and then for all studies using categorized age. We wanted to assess whether (a) there is an age threshold present at which the $\ln(RR)$ increases and (b) whether a log-linear relationship for the categorical studies would be a reasonable assumption. If a log-linear association could be assumed, a risk effect per year was obtained by using the Generalized Least Squares for trend estimation of summarized dose-response data (*g/st*) (19). If the number of cases per age category was unknown, the risk estimate was obtained by variance-weighted least squares (*vw/s*). If the log-linear association could be assumed, then the studies using categorical values were pooled with the ones using continuous values through a random-effects meta-analysis using the *metan* package (20). A similar procedure has been done before (15, 21). If two studies investigated the same population, the study with the highest quality was chosen. Odds ratios (OR) were converted to RRs using the formula proposed by Zhang and Yu 1998 (22) when the prevalence in the reference group was greater than 10% to avoid an overestimation of the RRs.

We compared the pooled effects of studies using continuous values for age and those using categorical values. Heterogeneity was assessed by I^2 values, and publication bias was explored using Funnel plots and Egger's test (*metabias*) if there were at least ten studies. Stata Version 14.2 (StatCorp, College Station, TX, USA) was used.

2.4 Assessment of the quality of the total body of evidence

We used the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach for grading the quality of the total body of evidence (23), following the example of Hulshof et al. 2019 (24), with modifications (25). The quality of evidence was either high, moderate, or low. Since only observational studies were included, the starting level was set to "moderate". The quality was downgraded based on four factors: study limitations, indirectness, inconsistency, imprecision, and publication bias. If study findings had large effect sizes, if there were dose-response relationships, or if the presence of residual confounding was suspected (increasing the confidence in the association), the quality of evidence was upgraded. For the effect size evaluation, we considered the difference in risk due to age between a person entering adulthood (18 years) and the worldwide life expectancy (72 years) (26), a difference of 54 years.

Results

After reviewing the 160 included primary studies from the umbrella review (14), we included 70 studies (27-96) (Figure 1). Table S1 lists the excluded studies with reasons.

Figure 1. Selection process for primary studies from original Umbrella Review (Treskova et al. 2020)

Except for Gu et al. 2020 (51), a case control study, all studies were either retrospective or prospective cohort studies. Most originated from USA (34), while 14 studies came from Europe, 8

from Latin America (Mexico and Brazil), 10 from China, two from South Korea, and one each from South Africa and Israel. Details on study characteristics are in Table S2.

In-hospital mortality

Forty-four studies investigating the risk of in-hospital mortality, meaning the risk of mortality in hospitalized patients, were included. Most studies were set in Western countries, such as USA (n=21), Europe (n=13), and Latin America (n=2). Six studies were set in China, one in South Africa, and one in South Korea. Nineteen studies reported the risk of in-hospital mortality per age year, while the others used age categories to report the effect of age on risk. The results can be seen in Table S3.

From the 44 studies, eight studies (28, 30, 34, 48, 64, 72, 75, 77) were assessed as having a low risk of bias. The majority had a high risk of bias because not all six age-dependent comorbidities were included in the model, while some used rough age categories in their models (greater than 10 years or a binary age category such as >60 years vs ≤60 years) (Table S4).

Thirty-one studies were included in the meta-analysis. Six studies (27, 37, 58, 65, 67, 83) were excluded because of the use of a binary age category, while one was excluded because the risk was reported by an age z-score, making it hard to compare to the other studies (81). Four studies were excluded from the main meta-analysis because they investigated mortality only on critically-ill hospitalized patients or patients with COVID-19 cytokine storm (43, 50, 53, 72). Two studies (36, 56) investigated the same study population, but Carter and Collins et al. 2020 (36) was chosen because this study had adjusted for more age-related risk factors. Likewise, Shi et al. 2020 (84) and Zhao et al. 2020 (95) used the same population. The former study was used because it reported age as a continuous factor, rather than a very rough age category. For the studies using age as categorical variables, the age and log of RR were modeled as linear and cubic relationships and plotted (Figure S3). Although the weighted cubic model had a lower AIC value (-71.8) than the weighted linear model (-62.5), the cubic model showed no evidence of a rapid increase in the slope at a specific age. At around age 70, there was a downturn in the slope which did not follow the points, indicating a possible better fit with a fractional or higher-level polynomial relationship. We assumed a log-linear relationship for simplicity, as at least for the ranges 20 to 70 years there seemed to be no conflict

with that assumption. A per-year effect was calculated for studies using age categories and they were included in the meta-analysis.

The pooled RR for the 31 studies was 1.046 (95% CI: 1.039-1.054) per age year (Table 2). The funnel plot was asymmetric (Figure S4; Egger's test $p < 0.0001$), but the funnel plot using age as a continuous variable differed from the one using age derived from categories (Figure S5a-b). Upon closer look, the pooled RR of studies using age as a continuous variable (16 studies, 52%) was higher than the pooled RR of studies dividing age into categories ($RR_{\text{age continuous}} = 1.057$; 95% CI 1.047-1.067; $RR_{\text{age categories}} = 1.037$; 95% CI 1.028-1.046). Since the calculated midpoints from the age categories might be inaccurate, we hypothesized that the RR of studies using a higher number of age categories would be closer to the $RR_{\text{age continuous}}$. Indeed, studies having more than four age categories had a pooled RR of 1.039 (95% CI 1.026-1.053), whereas studies with four or less age categories had a pooled RR of 1.030 (95% CI 1.020-1.041). We divided studies by age category width (5 vs. 10 vs. 10+ years intervals) and found that the effect estimate was lowest with studies using the widest age categories (10+ years $RR = 1.030$; 95% CI 1.021-1.039), followed by studies using 10-year categories ($RR = 1.046$; 95% CI 1.040-1.051). Only one study used a 5-year age category, having the highest estimate ($RR = 1.060$; 95% CI 1.051-1.070). Because of probable bias using different age categories, further analyses for in-hospital mortality focused on studies using age as a continuous variable (Table 2). The pooled RR did not differ by study quality. Studies from USA, Europe, and South Korea had similar pooled RRs, whereas as the pooled RR for the Chinese studies was lower ($RR = 1.041$; 95% CI 0.999-1.085). The unadjusted and adjusted RRs on studies reporting both values were similar ($RR_{\text{unadjusted}} = 1.060$, 95% CI: 1.034-1.086; $RR_{\text{adjusted}} = 1.059$, 95% CI: 1.037-1.081).

233 **Table 2.** Results of pooled risks from meta-analyses

	Pooled ES (per age year)	Risk estimates (n)	I ²
In-hospital mortality			
All studies	1.046 (1.038-1.054)	31	93.2%
Age: continuous	1.057 (1.047-1.067)	16	64.1%
Age: categories	1.037 (1.028-1.046)	15	94.9%
Quality: high*	1.057 (1.045-1.070)	12	58.7%
Quality: low*	1.057 (1.040-1.074)	4	77.7%
Region: USA*	1.059 (1.045-1.072)	8	74.5%
Region: Europe*	1.060 (1.044-1.077)	5	40.3%
Region: China*	1.041 (0.999-1.085)	2	78.8%
Region: South Korea*	1.055 (1.003-1.109)	1	-
Case mortality			
All studies	1.074 (1.061-1.087)	11	85.3%
Age: continuous	1.063 (1.043-1.084)	3	68.7%
Age: categories	1.078 (1.059-1.097)	8	73.7%
Quality: high	1.094 (1.082-1.106)	2	0%
Quality: low	1.069 (1.056-1.083)	9	82.0%
Region: USA	1.061 (1.048-1.073)	5	67.1%
Region: Europe	1.100 (1.075-1.125)	3	76.6%
Region: South Africa	1.072 (1.057-1.088)	1	-
Region: South America	1.090 (1.058-1.122)	1	-
Region: China	1.040 (1.015-1.065)	1	-
Hospitalization			
All studies	1.034 (1.021-1.048)	11	99.9%
Age: continuous	1.039 (1.016-1.062)	3	86.8%
Age: categories	1.034 (1.018-1.049)	8	99.9%
Quality: high	1.051 (1.040-1.061)	4	97.2%
Quality: low	1.025 (1.019-1.032)	7	98.1%
Region: USA	1.033 (1.025-1.042)	7	93.5%
Region: Europe	1.047 (1.034-1.060)	3	98.2%
Region: South America	1.016 (1.016-1.017)	1	-
ICU admission			
All studies	1.006 (0.999-1.013)	8	51.2%
Age: continuous	1.003 (0.996-1.010)	5	19.0%
Age: categories	1.013 (0.998-1.028)	3	31.6%
Quality: high	1.004 (0.996-1.013)	3	76.1%
Quality: low	1.011 (0.996-1.026)	5	30.7%
Region: USA	1.007 (1.000-1.013)	6	50.4%
Region: China	1.033 (0.939-1.136)	2	74.9%
Intubation			
All studies	1.006 (0.995-1.018)	6	74.8%
Age: continuous	1.008 (0.992-1.024)	3	0.0%
Age: categories	1.006 (0.991-1.021)	3	88.1%

234 *for age continuous; ES= effect size

235

236

Case Mortality

Fourteen studies investigating case mortality were included, in which mortality was ascertained in individuals who had tested positive for COVID-19. Five studies were from USA (52, 54, 61, 90, 92), three studies originated from Europe (34, 78, 79), three from Latin America (35, 86, 87), and one each from China (51), South Africa (33), and South Korea (66). The results can be seen in Table S5. Three studies (21%) were rated as having a low risk of bias. Most of the studies had a high risk of bias because they did not adjust for all age-dependent risk factors, the age categories were quite wide, and the recruitment procedure indicated a possible selection bias (i.e. such as recruitment of only symptomatic people or people who presented for care at hospitals without being hospitalized, or if ICD codes used for recruitment were not necessarily related to COVID-19) (Table S6). Eleven studies were included in the meta-analysis, of which the majority used age categories (8 of 11). One study was excluded due to the use of binary age categories (87). One study (54) reported the age year RR within age categories, and therefore it was not possible to compare to the other studies. Two studies used the same study population (35, 86), but Solis et al. 2020 (86) was chosen because the study had adjusted for more age-related factors and it had used a higher number of age categories. The cubic model showed a relatively flat relationship between log(RR) and age from ages 40 to 85 years (Figure S6). Because both models had similar AIC values (linear: -157.4; cubic: -159.3), we assumed a linear model. The meta-analysis resulted in a pooled RR of 1.074 (95% CI 1.061-1.087) per age year (Table 4). The respective funnel plot showed asymmetry (Figure S7), although Egger's test was not significant ($p=0.320$). The pooled RR of studies using continuous ($RR=1.063$; 95% CI 1.043-1.084) and categorical ($RR=1.078$; 1.059-1.097) age variables differed. However, since the 95% CI values overlapped, there was no significant difference observed. We divided studies by age category width (5 vs. 10 vs. 10+ year intervals) and again found that the effect estimate was lowest with studies using the widest age categories (10+ years $RR=1.042$; 95% CI 1.028-1.056; 10 years $RR=1.080$; 95% CI 1.057-1.103) and highest for studies using the most narrow age of five years ($RR=1.094$; 95% CI 1.082-1.107).

The high-quality studies had a higher RR per age than low quality studies ($RR_{\text{high quality}}=1.094$, 95% CI: 1.082-1.106; $RR_{\text{low quality}}=1.069$; 95% CI: 1.056-1.083). European studies ($n=3$) had the highest pooled RR ($RR=1.100$; 95% CI 1.075-1.125), followed by USA studies ($RR=1.061$; 95% CI 1.075-1.125). Other regions had only one study, so a reliable comparison was not possible. The unadjusted and adjusted RRs on studies reporting both values were similar ($RR_{\text{unadjusted}}=1.079$; 95% CI: 1.062-1.097; $RR_{\text{adjusted}}=1.072$; 95% CI: 1.054-1.091).

Hospitalization

A summary of the results of studies investigating risk of hospitalization by age can be seen in Table S7. The study population typically used were individuals who were positive for COVID-19, some of which were hospitalized due to complications related to the infection. Sixteen studies were included, of which nine originated in the USA (29, 38, 47, 52, 63, 76, 77, 91, 96), three in Europe (34, 78, 79), three in Latin America (35, 49, 85), and one in Israel (70). Four (25%) of the studies had a low risk of bias, and the reasons for high risk of bias were mainly the lack of adjustment for all pre-defined age-related risk factors and the use of binary or rough age categories (Table S8).

Of the sixteen studies, eleven were included in the meta-analysis. Ebinger et al. 2020 (47) was excluded because the outcome was complex with reference categories that could not be compared to other studies (hospitalized/non-ICU vs. ICU/non-intubated vs ICU/intubated). Carrillo-Vega et al. 2020 (35) and Giannouchos et al. 2020 (49) used the same study population, but the latter was used because the study had more age categories and adjusted for a higher number of age-related risk factors. Furthermore, two studies (70, 85) used binary age categories and one did not provide confidence intervals (63). Most studies (8 of 11) used age categories.

The results of the weighted linear and cubic models of studies using age categories are shown in Figure S8. Although the AIC values for the linear model were higher than for the cubic model (-57.2 vs -21.7, we did choose the linear model because of a lack of threshold where the rate increases with age and because the age range modeled appeared as a linear relationship.

The pooled RR for all studies was 1.034 (95% CI: 1.021-1.048). The funnel plot looked asymmetric (Figure S9), but Egger's test was statistically not-significant ($p=0.439$). The RR of studies using continuous and categorical age values were very similar (Table 4), noting that most studies (63%) using age categories utilized more than four age categories. Again, using a finer age width increased the RR for studies using age categories (10+ years RR=1.024 95% CI: 1.018-1.030; 10 years RR=1.040 95%CI: 1.037-1.043; 5 years RR=1.056 95% CI:1.055-1.057). The pooled effect for high-quality studies was higher than for low quality studies ($RR_{\text{high quality}}=1.051$, 95% CI: 1.040-1.061; $RR_{\text{low quality}}=1.025$; 95% CI: 1.019-1.032). Moreover, the European studies had a higher pooled risk (RR=1.047; 95% CI: 1.034-1.060) than the USA studies (RR=1.033, 95% CI: 1.025-1.042), but the difference was not statistically significant. The unadjusted RR values were slightly higher than the adjusted values ($RR_{\text{unadjusted}}=1.045$, 95% CI: 1.026-1.065; $RR_{\text{adjusted}}=1.031$, 95% CI: 1.009-1.053).

Admission to ICU

Twelve studies investigated the effect of age on admission to ICU. Typically, the studies used hospitalized individuals as the study population and followed them up (retrospectively or prospectively). Eight studies originated in the USA (28, 55, 61, 64, 77, 82, 88, 96) and four were from China (32, 46, 51, 89). A summary of the results can be seen in Table S9. Four (33%) of the studies were of high quality (low risk of bias). Similar to the other outcomes, the reasons for a high risk of bias were mainly due to the confounding domain, and to a lesser extent, to the exposure domain (rough age categories) (Table S10).

Eight studies were included in the meta-analysis. Du et al. 2020 (46) was not included. Due to the nature of its complex outcome, it could not be compared to other studies. Two studies evaluated the risk of ICU on individuals who had tested positive to COVID-19 (51, 96), and one study used a binary age category (88).

The pooled RR for the studies was 1.006 (95% CI: 0.999-1.013). Five studies (63%) used age as a continuous variable, and these studies had only a slightly lower RR (1.003; 95% CI: 0.996-1.010) compared to the ones using age as a categorical value (RR=1.013; 95% CI: 0.998-1.028), but still the

effect was statistically not-significant for both. The high quality studies had a slightly lower RR than the low quality studies ($RR_{\text{high quality}}=1.004$, 95% CI: 0.996-1.013; $RR_{\text{low quality}}=1.011$; 95% CI: 0.996-1.026), but again both estimates were not statistically-significant (Table 4).

Mechanical ventilation (intubation)

Seven studies investigated the effect of age on the risk of intubation, using individuals hospitalized due to COVID-19. All studies were set in the USA (42, 55, 74, 82, 88, 91), and a summary of the results can be seen in Table S11. No studies had a low risk of bias (high quality), either due to the “confounding” or “exposure assessment” domain (Table S12). Half of the studies used age categories, and the effect estimate was similar for studies using a continuous and a categorical age variable. One study (88) was excluded from the meta-analysis because it used a binary category for age. The pooled RR showed a very weak statistically not-significant increase in risk per age year ($RR=1.006$; 95% CI 0.995-1.018) (Table 4).

Quality of evidence

Since only observational studies were included, the initial level of evidence was set at “moderate”. After decreasing a level for unclear publication bias, and increasing two levels for dose-response effect and two levels for a large effect estimate, the overall certainty of evidence was high for both risk of in-hospital mortality and case mortality. For hospitalization, after downgrading for high inconsistency and unclear publication bias, and upgrading for dose response, effect estimate, and effect size, the overall certainty of evidence was high (Table 5).

There was no statistically-significant effect observed for admission to ICU and intubation. Hence, these outcomes were not included in the assessment.

338 **Table 5.** Assessment of evidence for the risk of studied outcomes based on Grades of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation framework
339 (GRADE).

Risk	Quality of study limitations: ↓	Indirectness of evidence: ↓	Inconsistency: ↓	Imprecision, range confidence interval effect size >2.0: ↓	Publication bias, yes or unclear: ↓	Effect estimate >2.0: ↑ >5.0: ↑↑	Dose-response effect: ↑	Residual confounding: ↑	Overall certainty (high, moderate, low)
In-hospital mortality	no (-) ¹	no (-)	no (-) ²	no (-)	unclear ↓	yes ↑↑ ³	yes ↑	no (-)	high
Case mortality	no (-) ¹	no (-)	no (-) ⁴	no (-)	unclear ↓	yes ↑↑ ⁵	yes ↑	no (-)	high
Hospitalization	no (-) ¹	no (-)	yes ↓ ⁶	no (-)	unclear ↓	yes ↑↑ ⁷	yes ↑	no (-)	high

340

¹ High quality studies also reported a significant association between age and risk of outcome.

² Moderate heterogeneity ($I^2=64.1\%$) was observed on studies using age as a continuous variable and on high-quality studies ($I^2= 58.7\%$)

³ Although per age RR is 1.057, when comparing different adult groups can have an effect size of greater than 5.0 (i.e., a 54-year difference, 18 years vs 72 years results in a RR of 20.0)

⁴ Moderate heterogeneity ($I^2=68.7\%$) was observed on studies using age as a continuous variable and on high-quality studies heterogeneity was very low ($I^2= 0\%$)

⁵ Although per age RR is 1.074, when comparing different adult groups can have an effect size of greater than 5.0 (i.e., a 54-year difference, 18 years vs 72 years results in a RR of 47.2)

⁶ High heterogeneity observed ($I^2 > 85\%$)

⁷ Although per age RR is 1.034, when comparing different adult groups can have an effect size of greater than 5.0 (i.e., a 54-year difference, 18 years vs 72 years results in a RR of 6.08)

Discussion

An increased age-related risk of COVID-19 in-hospital mortality, case mortality, and hospitalization of 5.7%, 7.4%, and 3.4% per age year, respectively, was observed, with a high quality of evidence.

Further, there was no evidence of an age threshold at which the risk of disease severity increased, with the age effect appearing to be linear. The association between age and both ICU admission and mechanical ventilation was weak and not statistically-significant. Although effects varied slightly by region, there were no obvious trends observed.

Our results for case mortality are in agreement with a review which found a log-linear association between age and infection fatality rate, but which did not include comorbidities in their analysis (9).

Strengths and limitations

To our knowledge, since our rapid review published (13), this is the first systematic review primarily focused on estimating the isolated effect of age on the risk of COVID-19 disease severity, including case and in-hospital mortality, hospitalization, ICU admission, and intubation. It encompasses 70 primary studies with data from more than 400,000 participants and includes only studies adjusting for important age-related factors associated with COVID-19 disease severity (14). Adjusting for comorbidities allows to explicitly “factor out” the mediating effect of comorbidities in order to get the isolated effect of age, or the risk presented by a person of a given age who has no preexisting conditions.

The results in this review should be considered in light of its limitations. For studies reporting age as a categorical value, since the age categories used in the studies could not be compared because of their heterogeneity, the median of the age category represented the age for the reported effect size. This procedure could have led to inaccuracies of the effect size. This was evident in that effect sizes increased when using finer age categories, indicating that the use of wide age categories most likely leads to an underestimation of the age effect. We reported the pooled effect sizes for studies using age as a continuous variable for the outcome in-hospital mortality. For the other outcomes we reported the pooled effect size for studies using categorical and continuous age variables together since their effect was similar.

The funnel plots were asymmetrical, which was especially obvious for in-hospital mortality, where half of the studies used age as a categorical variable. However, funnel plot asymmetry has other possible causes besides publication bias (97). In this case, we believe that the cause is due to the heterogeneity of the exposure-namely when using studies with age as categorical variables. This was indeed shown when plotting funnel plots separately for studies using continuous and categorical age variables. The studies using continuous variables did not show obvious asymmetry in the funnel plots, while the studies using categorical age variables did show asymmetry. However, they had a narrow range of standard errors, which is also a contraindication for using funnel plots (97, 98). Even though we downgraded for publication bias in our GRADE evaluation, the overall assessment of evidence was still rated as high.

The adjusted effect estimates were only slightly lower than the unadjusted estimates, or at least the difference was not as great as observed in our previous rapid review. An explanation could be a potential interaction effect between age and certain chronic diseases, or a possible selection effect. This was observed in the related umbrella review by Treskova et al. 2021 (14) and the review by Mesas et al. 2021 (99) where younger individuals who had heart failure and kidney disease had a higher risk of in-hospital mortality compared to the risk observed in older individuals. This effect was also seen for hypertension (99). It may be that older patients are more quickly admitted to the hospital with less severe concomitant diseases than younger patients, which may be reflected as an increased in-hospital mortality for younger patients, essentially due to a selection effect in the hospital admission.

There was no increased risk by age year for being admitted to the ICU or for mechanical ventilation, but this result is hard to reconcile, given the strength of association between age and mortality. The included studies mostly occurred during the first and second waves, when ICU capacity was limited. How this lack of association is due to the possibility of triage in some scenarios is unknown, but worth considering.

Lastly most of the primary studies included were done in the first or second wave of the pandemic, and new mutations which may affect the association between age and disease severity were not considered.

Methodological quality of the included studies

Although high-quality studies were present for every outcome except mechanical ventilation, low-quality studies dominated. High-quality studies had the same effect estimate as low-quality studies for in-hospital mortality, but for case mortality and hospitalization, low-quality studies underestimated the isolated effect of age. The main reason for a low risk of bias was the lack of adjustment for all age-related risk factors in the domain “confounding”. Moreover, considering the “recruitment” domain, some studies included participants who used clinical symptoms as a COVID-19 case, which is less accurate than a RT-PCR test. It should be mentioned that the recruitment domain could have potentially been high risk for most studies, as in the early stages of the pandemic, RT-PCR testing was relatively scarce, and only individuals with symptoms or who had direct contact with a positive person were tested in some countries. Furthermore, some studies used rough age categories which will lead to an inaccurate risk effect. Lastly, some studies corrected for biomarkers or factors (such as fever, d-Dimer level, lymphocyte count) that reflect disease severity. When studying associations between disease severity and age and chronic factors, using such markers in the model should be avoided to avoid overadjustment.

Implications for practice, policy, and future research

During the COVID-19 pandemic, it is necessary to accurately define risk groups for COVID-19 disease severity when implementing contact or work restrictions. This review shows that increased age year is associated with mortality and hospitalization, and an age threshold for which there is a marked increase in risk was not apparent. Therefore, targetting persons above a certain (arbitrary) age threshold is not recommended in the workplace, as it may lead to ageism, permeating in the community and in the workplace (100). If workers older than 60 years are not allowed to perform a work task because of perceived higher risk of disease severity starting at that age, it is difficult to argue why a person can still perform that activity at age 59, but must stop it or needs special

protection on their 60th birthday. Rather, individualized risk profiles should be made by considering a continuous increase in risk by age-year.

Contrary to workplace restrictions, the use of an isolated, per-age year increase when prioritizing vaccinations is not recommended. Government agencies often divide the population in age groups- but this categorization is not purely about age-related effects. Rather, the high-age groups always include a higher proportion of individuals with pre-existing conditions. In this respect, our result of an approximately linear increase in isolated age risk cannot be used as an argument against the definition of vaccination prioritization groups.

This comprehensive review contradicts our previous rapid review (13), which encompassed mainly Chinese studies and indicated a weak influence of age on COVID-19 disease severity. This highlights the need for continuous, “living” reviews of the available evidence throughout the pandemic, as results may change due to more available evidence available or to new variants affecting the association between age and disease severity. Further, as there are hints of possible effect modifications between age and certain chronic diseases (14), future studies should focus on quantifying these interactions.

Conclusions

A best-possible quantification of the increase in COVID-19 disease severity due to age was achieved. Age-related workplace prevention programs should consider the continuous increase in risk, rather than implementing age thresholds. There is a need for continuous, high-quality research to characterize age associations with disease severity in light of new variants.

Acknowledgments

Our heartfelt thanks to Dr. Thomas Harder and Dr. Marina Treskova from the Robert Koch Institute for their recommendations and for giving us access to their study database.

Patient and Public Involvement

447 Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination
448 plans of our research.

References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(8):727-33.
2. WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, 2021 2021 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019>.
3. Chen T, Dai Z, Mo P, Li X, Ma Z, Song S, et al. Clinical characteristics and outcomes of older patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China (2019): a single-centered, retrospective study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2020:glaa089.
4. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, Yan W, Yang D, Chen G, et al. Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m1091.
5. Dudley JP, Lee NT. Disparities in Age-specific Morbidity and Mortality From SARS-CoV-2 in China and the Republic of Korea. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
6. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020:S1473-3099(20)30243-7.
7. Robert Koch Institut (RKI). Informationen und Hilfestellungen für Personen mit einem höheren Risiko für einen schweren COVID-19-Krankheitsverlauf 2020 [updated 05/28/2020. Available from: https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Risikogruppen.html.
8. CDC. Underlying medical conditions associated with high risk for severe COVID-19: Information for healthcare providers. National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD), Division of Viral Diseases; 2021 March 29, 2021.
9. Levin AT, Hanage WP, Owusu-Boaitey N, Cochran KB, Walsh SP, Meyerowitz-Katz G. Assessing the age specificity of infection fatality rates for COVID-19: systematic review, meta-analysis, and public policy implications. *European Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;35(12):1123-38.
10. Robert Koch Institut (RKI). Todesfälle nach Sterbedatum (2.4.2021). https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Projekte_RKI/COVID-19_Todesfaelle.html: RKI; 2021.
11. Wolfschmidt A, Ochmann U, Nowak D, Drexler H. Schwerpunkt-Themen.
12. Kaifie A, Starke KR, Kämpf D, Tautz A, Petereit-Haack G, Angerer P, et al. Schwerpunkt-Themen.
13. Romero Starke K, Petereit-Haack G, Schubert M, Kämpf D, Schliebner A, Hegewald J, et al. The Age-Related Risk of Severe Outcomes Due to COVID-19 Infection: A Rapid Review, Meta-Analysis, and Meta-Regression. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(16):5974.
14. Treskova-Schwarzbach M, Haas L, Reda S, Pilic A, Borodova A, Karimi K, et al. Pre-Existing Health Conditions and Severe COVID-19 Outcomes: Umbrella Review and Meta-Analysis of Global Evidence. *SSRN*; 2021.
15. Ijaz S, Verbeek J, Seidler A, Lindbohm ML, Ojajarvi A, Orsini N, et al. Night-shift work and breast cancer--a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2013;39(5):431-47.
16. Johnson PI, Koustas E, Vesterinen HM, Sutton P, Atchley DS, Kim AN, et al. Application of the Navigation Guide systematic review methodology to the evidence for developmental and reproductive toxicity of triclosan. *Environment international*. 2016;92:716-28.
17. Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN). Methodology checklist 3: cohort studies Edinburgh: SIGN; [updated 30.05.2018. Available from: <http://www.sign.ac.uk>.
18. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP Cohort Study Checklist 2018 [Available from: <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>.
19. Orsini N, Bellocco R, Greenland S. Generalized least squares for trend estimation of summarized dose-response data. *The stata journal*. 2006;6(1):40-57.
20. Harris RJ, Deeks JJ, Altman DG, Bradburn MJ, Harbord RM, Sterne JA. Metan: fixed-and random-effects meta-analysis. *The Stata Journal*. 2008;8(1):3-28.

21. Seidler A, Romero Starke K, Freiberg A, Hegewald J, Nienhaus A, Bolm-Audorff U. Dose–Response Relationship between Physical Workload and Specific Shoulder Diseases—A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(4):1243.
22. Zhang J, Kai FY. What's the relative risk?: A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort studies of common outcomes. *Jama*. 1998;280(19):1690-1.
23. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2011;64(4):383-94.
24. Hulshof CT, Colosio C, Daams JG, Ivanov ID, Prakash K, Kuijer PP, et al. WHO/ILO work-related burden of disease and injury: Protocol for systematic reviews of exposure to occupational ergonomic risk factors and of the effect of exposure to occupational ergonomic risk factors on osteoarthritis of hip or knee and selected other musculoskeletal diseases. *Environment international*. 2019;125:554-66.
25. Petereit-Haack G, Bolm-Audorff U, Romero Starke K, Seidler A. Occupational Risk for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Trauma-Related Depression: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(24):9369.
26. Zijdeman R, Ribeira da Silva F. Life Expectancy at Birth (Total). V1 ed: IISH Data Collection; 2015.
27. Antwi-Amoabeng D, Beutler B, Awad M, Kanji Z, Mahboob S, Ghuman J, et al. Sociodemographic predictors of outcomes in COVID-19: examining the impact of ethnic disparities in Northern Nevada. *medRxiv*. 2020.
28. Argenziano M, Bruce S, Slater C. Characterization and Clinical Course of 1000 Patients with COVID-19 in New York: retrospective case series. *medRxiv*. 2020:10.1101.
29. Azar KMJ, Shen Z, Romanelli RJ, Lockhart SH, Smits K, Robinson S, et al. Disparities In Outcomes Among COVID-19 Patients In A Large Health Care System In California. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2020;39(7):1253-62.
30. Baqui P, Bica I, Marra V, Ercole A, van der Schaar M. Ethnic and regional variations in hospital mortality from COVID-19 in Brazil: a cross-sectional observational study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2020;8(8):e1018-e26.
31. Bello-Chavolla OY, Bahena-López JP, Antonio-Villa NE, Vargas-Vázquez A, González-Díaz A, Márquez-Salinas A, et al. Predicting Mortality Due to SARS-CoV-2: A Mechanistic Score Relating Obesity and Diabetes to COVID-19 Outcomes in Mexico. *The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism*. 2020;105(8):dgaa346.
32. Bi Q, Hong C, Meng J, Wu Z, Zhou P, Ye C, et al. Characterizing clinical progression of COVID-19 among patients in Shenzhen, China: an observational cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.22.20076190.
33. Boule A, Davies M-A, Hussey H, Ismail M, Morden E, Vundle Z, et al. Risk factors for COVID-19 death in a population cohort study from the Western Cape Province, South Africa. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2020:ciaa1198.
34. Burn E, Tebe C, Fernandez-Bertolin S, Aragon M, Recalde M, Roel E, et al. The natural history of symptomatic COVID-19 in Catalonia, Spain: a multi-state model including 109,367 outpatient diagnoses, 18,019 hospitalisations, and 5,585 COVID-19 deaths among 5,627,520 people. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.13.20152454.
35. 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.
36. Carter B, Collins JT, Barlow-Pay F, Rickard F, Bruce E, Verduri A, et al. Nosocomial COVID-19 infection: examining the risk of mortality. *The COPE-Nosocomial Study (COVID in Older PEople)*. *The Journal of hospital infection*. 2020;106(2):376-84.

37. Chen J, Bai H, Liu J, Chen G, Liao Q, Yang J, et al. Distinct Clinical Characteristics and Risk Factors for Mortality in Female Inpatients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Sex-stratified, Large-scale Cohort Study in Wuhan, China. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
38. Chhiba KD, Patel GB, Vu THT, Chen MM, Guo A, Kudlaty E, et al. Prevalence and characterization of asthma in hospitalized and nonhospitalized patients with COVID-19. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2020;146(2):307-14.e4.
39. Chilimuri S, Sun H, Alemam A, Mantri N, Shehi E, Tejada J, et al. Predictors of Mortality in Adults Admitted with COVID-19: Retrospective Cohort Study from New York City. *West J Emerg Med*. 2020;21(4):779-84.
40. Ciardullo S, Zerbini F, Perra S, Muraca E, Cannistraci R, Lauriola M, et al. Impact of diabetes on COVID-19-related in-hospital mortality: a retrospective study from Northern Italy. *J Endocrinol Invest*. 2020.
41. Conversano A, Melillo F, Napolano A, Fominskiy E, Spessot M, Ciceri F, et al. Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System Inhibitors and Outcome in Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Pneumonia: A Case Series Study. *Hypertension*. 2020;76(2):e10-e2.
42. Costa Monteiro AC, Suri R, Emeruwa IO, Stretch RJ, Cortes Lopez RY, Sherman A, et al. Obesity and Smoking as Risk Factors for Invasive Mechanical Ventilation in COVID-19: a Retrospective, Observational Cohort Study. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.08.12.20173849.
43. Cummings MJ, Baldwin MR, Abrams D, Jacobson SD, Meyer BJ, Balough EM, et al. Epidemiology, clinical course, and outcomes of critically ill adults with COVID-19 in New York City: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2020.
44. Di Castelnuovo A, Bonaccio M, Costanzo S, Gialluisi A, Antinori A, Berselli N, 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):1899-913.
45. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, Hardwick HE, Pius R, Norman L, 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.
46. Du R, Liang L, Yang C, Li M, Guo G, van Halm-Lutterodt N, et al. Patient Predisposition at Hospital Admission Indirectly Dictates Disease Severity, Clinical Course and Outcomes of COVID-19 Pneumonia Patients in Wuhan, China. *SSRN*. 2020.
47. Ebinger JE, Achamallah N, Ji H, Claggett BL, Sun N, Botting P, et al. Pre-existing traits associated with Covid-19 illness severity. *PloS one*. 2020;15(7):e0236240-e.
48. Giacomelli A, Ridolfo AL, Milazzo L, Oreni L, Bernacchia D, Siano M, et al. 30-day mortality in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 during the first wave of the Italian epidemic: A prospective cohort study. *Pharmacological Research*. 2020;158:104931.
49. Giannouchos TV, Sussman RA, Mier JM, Poulas K, Farsalinos K. Characteristics and risk factors for COVID-19 diagnosis and adverse outcomes in Mexico: an analysis of 89,756 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases. *Eur Respir J*. 2020.
50. Grasselli G, Greco M, Zanella A, Albano G, Antonelli M, Bellani G, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Mortality Among Patients With COVID-19 in Intensive Care Units in Lombardy, Italy. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180(10):1345-55.
51. Gu T, Chu Q, Yu Z, Fa B, Li A, Xu L, et al. History of coronary heart disease increased the mortality rate of patients with COVID-19: a nested case-control study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(9):e038976.
52. Gu T, Mack JA, Salvatore M, Prabhu Sankar S, Valley TS, Singh K, et al. Characteristics Associated With Racial/Ethnic Disparities in COVID-19 Outcomes in an Academic Health Care System. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(10):e2025197-e.
53. Gupta S, Hayek SS, Wang W, Chan L, Mathews KS, Melamed ML, et al. Factors Associated With Death in Critically Ill Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in the US. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180(11):1-12.

54. Harrison SL, Fazio-Eynullayeva E, Lane DA, Underhill P, Lip GYH. Comorbidities associated with mortality in 31,461 adults with COVID-19 in the United States: A federated electronic medical record analysis. *PLOS Medicine*. 2020;17(9):e1003321.
55. Hashemi N, Viveiros K, Redd WD, Zhou JC, McCarty TR, Bazarbashi AN, et al. Impact of chronic liver disease on outcomes of hospitalized patients with COVID-19: A multicentre United States experience. *Liver international : official journal of the International Association for the Study of the Liver*. 2020;40(10):2515-21.
56. Hewitt J, Carter B, Vilches-Moraga A, Quinn TJ, Braude P, Verduri A, et al. The effect of frailty on survival in patients with COVID-19 (COPE): a multicentre, European, observational cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(8):e444-e51.
57. Hwang J-M, Kim J-H, Park J-S, Chang MC, Park D. Neurological diseases as mortality predictive factors for patients with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study. *Neurological sciences : official journal of the Italian Neurological Society and of the Italian Society of Clinical Neurophysiology*. 2020;41(9):2317-24.
58. Imam Z, Odish F, Gill I, O'Connor D, Armstrong J, Vanood A, et al. Older age and comorbidity are independent mortality predictors in a large cohort of 1305 COVID-19 patients in Michigan, United States. *J Intern Med*. 2020;288(4):469-76.
59. Jun T, Nirenberg S, Kovatch P, Huang K-l. Sex-specificity of mortality risk factors among hospitalized COVID-19 patients in New York City: prospective cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.07.29.20164640.
60. Kabarriti R, Brodin NP, Maron MI, Guha C, Kalnicki S, Garg MK, et al. Association of Race and Ethnicity With Comorbidities and Survival Among Patients With COVID-19 at an Urban Medical Center in New York. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(9):e2019795-e.
61. Kalligeros M, Shehadeh F, Mylona EK, Benitez G, Beckwith CG, Chan PA, et al. Association of Obesity with Disease Severity Among Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Obesity*. 2020;28(7):1200-4.
62. Khalil K, Agbontaen K, McNally D, Love A, Mandalia S, Banya W, et al. Clinical characteristics and 28-day mortality of medical patients admitted with COVID-19 to a central London teaching hospital. *The Journal of infection*. 2020;81(3):e85-e9.
63. Killerby M, Link-Gelles R, Haight S, Schrodt C, England L, Gomes D, et al. Characteristics Associated with Hospitalization Among Patients with COVID-19 — Metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia, March–April 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69.
64. Kim L, Garg S, O'Halloran A, Whitaker M, Pham H, Anderson EJ, et al. Risk Factors for Intensive Care Unit Admission and In-hospital Mortality Among Hospitalized Adults Identified through the US Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)-Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network (COVID-NET). *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
65. 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 (Silver Spring)*. 2020.
66. Lee H-Y, Ahn J, Kang CK, Won S-H, Park J-H, Kang C, et al. Association of Angiotensin II Receptor Blockers and Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme Inhibitors on COVID-19-Related Outcome. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. 2020.
67. Li J, Guo T, Dong D, Zhang X, Chen X, Feng Y, et al. Defining heart disease risk for death in COVID-19 infection. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine*. 2020.
68. Magleby R, Westblade LF, Trzebucki A, Simon MS, Rajan M, Park J, et al. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load on Risk of Intubation and Mortality Among Hospitalized Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2020:ciaa851.
69. Meng Y, Lu W, Guo E, Liu J, Yang B, Wu P, et al. Cancer history is an independent risk factor for mortality in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: a propensity score-matched analysis. *Journal of Hematology & Oncology*. 2020;13(1):75.

70. Merzon E, Tworowski D, Gorohovski A, Vinker S, Golan Cohen A, Green I, et al. Low plasma 25(OH) vitamin D level is associated with increased risk of COVID-19 infection: an Israeli population-based study. *The FEBS journal*. 2020;10.1111/febs.15495.
71. Murillo-Zamora E, Hernandez-Suarez CM. Survival in adult inpatients with COVID-19. *Public Health*. 2020.
72. Narain S, Stefanov DG, Chau AS, Weber AG, Marder G, Kaplan B, et al. Comparative Survival Analysis of Immunomodulatory Therapy for Coronavirus Disease 2019 Cytokine Storm. *Chest*. 2020:S0012-3692(20)34901-1.
73. Palaodimos L, Kokkinidis DG, Li W, Karamanis D, Ognibene J, Arora S, 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.
74. Patel NG, Bhasin A, Feinglass JM, Belknap SM, Angarone MP, Cohen ER, et al. Clinical Outcomes of Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19 on Therapeutic Anticoagulants. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.08.22.20179911.
75. Perez-Guzman PN, Daunt A, Mukherjee S, Crook P, Forlano R, Kont MD, et al. Clinical characteristics and predictors of outcomes of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in a multi-ethnic London NHS Trust: a retrospective cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
76. Petrilli CM, Jones SA, Yang J, Rajagopalan H, O'Donnell L, Chernyak Y, 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.
77. Price-Haywood EG, Burton J, Fort D, Seoane L. Hospitalization and Mortality among Black Patients and White Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
78. Reilev M, Kristensen KB, Pottegård A, Lund LC, Hallas J, Ernst MT, 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:dyaa140.
79. Rossi PG, Marino M, Formisano D, Venturelli F, Vicentini M, Grilli R. Characteristics and outcomes of a cohort of SARS-CoV-2 patients in the Province of Reggio Emilia, Italy. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.13.20063545.
80. Salacup G, Lo KB, Gul F, Peterson E, De Joy R, Bhargav R, et al. Characteristics and clinical outcomes of COVID-19 patients in an underserved-inner city population: A single tertiary center cohort. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020;n/a(n/a).
81. Sapey E, Gallier S, Mainey C, Nightingale P, McNulty D, Crothers H, et al. Ethnicity and risk of death in patients hospitalised for COVID-19 infection in the UK: an observational cohort study in an urban catchment area. *BMJ Open Respiratory Research*. 2020;7(1):e000644.
82. Seiglie J, Platt J, Cromer SJ, Bunda B, Foulkes AS, Bassett IV, et al. Diabetes as a Risk Factor for Poor Early Outcomes in Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19. *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(12):2938-44.
83. Shah P, Owens J, Franklin J, Mehta A, Heymann W, Sewell W, et al. Demographics, comorbidities and outcomes in hospitalized Covid-19 patients in rural southwest Georgia. *Ann Med*. 2020;52(7):354-60.
84. Shi S, Qin M, Shen B, Cai Y, Liu T, Yang F, et al. Association of Cardiac Injury With Mortality in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Cardiology*. 2020.
85. Soares RdCM, Mattos LR, Raposo LM. Risk Factors for Hospitalization and Mortality due to COVID-19 in Espírito Santo State, Brazil. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*. 2020;103(3):1184-90.
86. Solís P, Carreño H. COVID-19 Fatality and Comorbidity Risk Factors among Diagnosed Patients in Mexico. *medRxiv*. 2020.
87. Sousa GJB, Garces TS, Cestari VRF, Florêncio RS, Moreira TMM, Pereira MLD. Mortality and survival of COVID-19. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2020;148:e123.
88. Suleyman G, Fadel RA, Malette KM, Hammond C, Abdulla H, Entz A, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Morbidity Associated With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in a Series of Patients in Metropolitan Detroit. *JAMA network open*. 2020;3(6):e2012270-e.

89. Tai S, Tang J, Yu B, Tang L, Wang Y, Zhang H, et al. Association between Cardiovascular Burden and Requirement of Intensive Care among Patients with Mild COVID-19. *Cardiovascular Therapeutics*. 2020;2020:9059562.
90. Tartof SY, Qian L, Hong V, Wei R, Nadjafi RF, Fischer H, et al. Obesity and Mortality Among Patients Diagnosed With COVID-19: Results From an Integrated Health Care Organization. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2020;173(10):773-81.
91. van Gerwen M, Alsen M, Little C, Barlow J, Genden E, Naymagon L, et al. Risk factors and outcomes of COVID-19 in New York City; a retrospective cohort study. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
92. Wang A-L, Zhong X, Hurd Y. Comorbidity and Sociodemographic determinants in COVID-19 Mortality in an US Urban Healthcare System. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.06.11.20128926.
93. Wang L, He W, Yu X, Hu D, Bao M, Liu H, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 in elderly patients: Characteristics and prognostic factors based on 4-week follow-up. *J Infect*. 2020;80(6):639-45.
94. Yehia BR, Winegar A, Fogel R, Fakih M, Ottenbacher A, Jesser C, et al. Association of Race With Mortality Among Patients Hospitalized With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) at 92 US Hospitals. *JAMA network open*. 2020;3(8):e2018039-e.
95. Zhao M, Wang M, Zhang J, Gu J, Zhang P, Xu Y, et al. Comparison of clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 at different ages. *Aging*. 2020;12(11):10070-86.
96. Rentsch CT, Kidwai-Khan F, Tate JP, Park LS, King JT, Skanderson M, et al. Covid-19 Testing, Hospital Admission, and Intensive Care Among 2,026,227 United States Veterans Aged 54-75 Years. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.09.20059964.
97. Sterne JAC, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ*. 2011;343:d4002.
98. Page M, Higgins J, Sterne J. Chapter 13: Assessing risk of bias due to missing results in synthesis. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Version 6.2 ed: Cochrane; 2021.
99. Mesas AE, Caverio-Redondo I, Álvarez-Bueno C, Sarriá Cabrera MA, Maffei de Andrade S, Sequí-Dominguez I, 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.
100. Monahan C, Macdonald J, Lytle A, Apriceno M, Levy SR. COVID-19 and ageism: How positive and negative responses impact older adults and society. *American Psychologist*. 2020;75(7):887-96.