The safety and efficacy of mesenchymal stem cells in the treatment of COVID-19-associated pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Wang Junwu^{a 1}, Shi Pengzhi^{b 1}, Chen Dong^a, Wang Shuguang^b, Wang Pingchuan^a, Feng Xinmin^a,
Zhang Liang^{a 2}

¹ Co-first authors.

Affiliations:

^a Department of Orthopedics, Clinical Medical College of Yangzhou University, Yangzhou 225001, China

^b Graduate School of Dalian Medical University, Dalian 116000, China

The full contact details of corresponding author Liang Zhang are list below:

²: Liang Zhang; PhD; Clinical Medical College of Yangzhou University, No.98 Nantong West Road, Yangzhou, 225001, Jiangsu province, China; Tel: 0086-18952578137; E-mail: zhangliang6320@sina.com

Abstract

Mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) therapy is considered one of the most promising treatments in the context of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. However, the safety and effectiveness of MSCs in the treatment of COVID-19-associated pneumonia patients need to be systematically reviewed and analyzed. Two independent researchers searched for the relevant studies published between October 2019 and April 2021 in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, WANG, and CNKI databases. A total of 22 studies involving 371 patients were included in the present study. MSCs were administered in 247 participants, and MSCs were allogeneic from umbilical cord, adipose tissue, menstrual blood, placenta, Wharton's jelly, or unreported sources. Combined results found that MSCs group significantly reduced the incidence of adverse events (OR = 0.43, 95%CI. = 0.22~0.84, P = 0.01) and mortality (OR = 0.17, 95%CI. = 0.06~0.49, P < 0.01), and the difference compared with control group was statistically significant. No MSCs treat-related serious adverse events were reported. The lung function and radiographic outcomes, and biomarker levels of inflammation and immunity all showed improvement trends. Therefore, MSCs therapy is an effective and safe method in the treatment of COVID-19-associated pneumonia and shows advantages in less adverse events and mortality. However, a standard and effective MSCs treatment program needs to be developed.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Mesenchymal stem cells, Mortality, Systematic review

Declarations

Funding

This study was supported by Jiangsu Provincial Medical Youth Talent [grant number QNRC2016342]; Project on Maternal and Child Health Talents of Jiangsu Province [grant number F201801]; and Six Talent Peaks Project in Jiangsu Province [grant number LGY2019035]. No benefits in any form have been or will be received from a commercial party related directly or indirectly to the subject of this manuscript.

Authors' contributions

Wang Junwu: Material preparation, Data collection and analysis, Methodology, Formal analysis, investigation, and Writing - original draft. **Shi Pengzhi:** Conceptualization, Material preparation, Data collection and analysis, Methodology, Formal analysis and investigation. **Chen Dong:** Material preparation, Data collection and analysis, Methodology, Formal analysis and investigation. **Wang Shuguang:** Material preparation, Data collection and analysis, Methodology, Formal analysis and investigation. **Wang Pingchuan:** Material preparation, Data collection and analysis, Formal analysis and investigation. **Feng Xinmin:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - review and editing, Supervision, Resources. **Zhang Liang:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - review and editing, Funding acquisition, Resources, Supervision. All authors contributed to the study conception and design.

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

The safety and efficacy of mesenchymal stem cells in the treatment of COVID-19-associated pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Abstract

Mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) therapy is considered one of the most promising treatments in the context of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. However, the safety and effectiveness of MSCs in the treatment of COVID-19-associated pneumonia patients need to be systematically reviewed and analyzed. Two independent researchers searched for the relevant studies published between October 2019 and April 2021 in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, WANGANG, and CNKI databases. A total of 22 studies involving 371 patients were included in the present study. MSCs were administered in 247 participants, and MSCs were allogeneic from umbilical cord, adipose tissue, menstrual blood, placenta, Wharton's jelly, or unreported sources. Combined results found that MSCs group significantly reduced the incidence of adverse events (OR = 0.43, 95%CI. = 0.22~0.84, P = 0.01) and mortality (OR = 0.17, 95%CI. = 0.06~0.49, P < 0.01), and the difference compared with control group was statistically significant. No MSCs treat-related serious adverse events were reported. The lung function and radiographic outcomes, and biomarker levels of inflammation and immunity all showed improvement trends. Therefore, MSCs therapy is an effective and safe method in the treatment of COVID-19-associated pneumonia and shows advantages in less adverse events and mortality. However, a standard and effective MSCs treatment program needs to be developed.

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Mesenchymal stem cells, Mortality, Systematic review

1 Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), an infectious disease caused by a novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has been sweeping the globe. According to data reported by the World Health Organization, as of 13 June 2021, 175 333 154 confirmed cases of

COVID-19 have been documented in global countries, areas, or territories with 3 793 230 deaths, and 2 655 782 new cases and 72 528 new deaths were reported in the past week [1]. COVID-19 has been associated with an intensive care unit (ICU) admission rate of 5% of proven infections [2] and a high mortality rate of critically ill patients [3]. This series of cruel numbers has prompted an urgent need for treatments that can solve serious cases and prevent fatal consequences [4].

Based on preclinical and clinical studies, mesenchymal stromal cells (MSCs) are found can regulate inflammation and remodeling processes, and restore the concept of alveolar-capillary dysfunction, and thus MSC is considered as a potential treatment for COVID-19 [5,6]. MSCs are pluripotent cells and can be obtained from a variety of tissues, preferably including bone marrow, adipose tissue, placenta, umbilical cord, and dental pulp [7-12]. It is noteworthy that a controlled study by Leng [13] showed that seven patients in MSCs treatment group were cured or the symptoms were significantly improved after 14 days of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) negative MSCs injection, and inflammation and immune function levels were also ameliorated without observed adverse effects. The outcomes of three patients in control group found one death, one acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), and one remained severely condition. Therefore, they believed that intravenous transplantation of MSCs was safe and effective for the treatment of patients with COVID-19 pneumonia, especially for the critically severe patients. Fortunately, the application of MSCs in the treatment of COVID-19 has been well studied not only in terms of symptomatic efficacy, but also in inflammation, immunity, and molecular mechanisms since then [14,15].

Therefore, this article conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of the currently available literature on MSCs treatment of COVID-19 since COVID-19 was first reported in 2019, to analyze its safety and efficacy and investigate the potential value of MSCs therapy in patients with COVID-19 infection.

2 Methods

2.1 Literature Search

The systematic review was performed according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines [16]. Literature was searched with no language restrictions by two independent researchers. Since COVID-19 was first reported in Wuhan China and subsequently confirmed [17,18], we searched for articles published between October 2019 and April 2021 in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, WAN FANG, and CNKI databases. The terms used for the search were as follows: “novel coronavirus” OR “2019 coronavirus disease” OR “novel coronavirus disease 2019” OR “2019-nCoV” OR “COVID-19” OR “SARS CoV-2” OR “severe acute respiratory syndrome-coronavirus-2” and “stem cell”. Articles from the same authors or institutions were examined, and duplicate data sets were excluded. The number of articles included and excluded was shown in a flow chart (**Fig. 1**).

2.2 Eligibility Criteria

We included randomized controlled trials (RCT), clinically controlled studies (CCT), retrospective studies, case reports, letters (with valid data), and case series that evaluated the safety and/or efficacy of MSCs administered to adult patients with a diagnosis of COVID-19 pneumonia from any cause. MSCs that were culture-expanded or minimally manipulated were included. Studies were excluded if they did not report original data (eg, reviews, editorials, letters, commentary, opinion, guidelines, or erratum).

2.3 Data Extraction

The extracted data were as follows. Data from articles were extracted independently by two reviewers and verified by the third reviewer if there was a disagreement.

2.3.1 General data

The general data were shown in **Table 1-3** (Author name, publication year, country, study design,

number of cases, age, gender, and follow-up were shown in **Table 1**; baseline disease severity, comorbidities, general condition, and imaging outcomes were shown in **Table 2**; the MSCs source, surface markers, MSCs dose per time, frequency, cells viability, and transplantation route were shown in **Table 3**). Following established clinical guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of COVID-19, the disease severity is classified as mild, common, severe, or critical [19,20].

2.3.2 Outcomes

The primary outcome was safety based on the number of patients with adverse events (AEs), frequency of AEs, serious AEs (SAEs), and if they were related to the treatment with MSCs. Clinical outcomes included the following: general clinical symptoms (such as fever, cough, dyspnea, respiratory rate, etc), blood oxygen index (arterial blood partial pressure of oxygen (PaO₂), fraction of inspiration O₂ (FiO₂), PaO₂/FiO₂, arterial blood or peripheral oxygen saturation (SaO₂ or SpO₂), etc), six- or seven- category scale, the time from intervention to recovery, and mortality. Radiographic outcomes: analysis of the lung CT scans or chest X-ray imaging. Laboratory outcomes included the time for nucleic acid turned to be negative, immune cells (dendritic cell (DC), lymphocyte (LYM), natural killer cell (NK cell), T cell, B cell, neutrophil (NE), and white blood cell (WBC)), and inflammatory cytokines (ALT, ammonia, AST, bilirubin, blood creatinine, B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP), blood urea nitrogen (BUN), creatine kinase (CK), CK-MB, C-reactive protein (CRP), cardiac troponin T (cTnT), D-dimer, ferritin, fibrinogen, granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF), interferon- γ (INF- γ or IFN- γ), IFN-g, interleukin-1RA (IL-1RA), IL-2, IL-4, IL-5, IL-6, IL-7, IL-8, IL-10, IL-18, IL-22, interferon-inducible protein-10 (IP-10), lactate (LAC); lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), monocyte chemotactic protein-1(MCP-1), macrophage inflammatory protein-1 α (MIP-1 α), myoglobin, procalcitonin (PCT), platelet derived growth factor-BB (PDGF-BB), regulated upon activation normal T cell expressed and secreted factor (RANTES), tumor necrosis factor- α (TNF- α), TNF- β , triglyceride, and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)).

2.4 Quality Assessment

The methodological quality of each study included in the present meta-analysis was evaluated by the National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) quality assessment tools (**Table S1**) [21]. All studies were classified as either good, fair, or poor.

2.5 Statistical Analysis

Data are presented as n (%) for categorical variables and mean $\pm$ standard deviation for continuous variables. Mortality and the number of patients with AEs were the only two outcomes deemed to be appropriate for meta-analysis. The Review Manager v.5.3 software was used to merge in each study and an overall estimate of the effect was shown in the form of forest plot. We used I^2 indicator to evaluate heterogeneity between studies. Sensitivity analysis by eliminating one of all included studies at a time and subgroup analysis was performed to examine the source of the heterogeneity when heterogeneity existed ($I^2 > 50\%$). The random-effects model was used if heterogeneity still existed. Otherwise, the fixed-effects model was used ($I^2 < 50\%$). The final selected model was used to summarize the odds ratio (OR) of the included studies. We were unable to evaluate publication bias due to the small number of available studies.

3 Results

The literature search identified 1582 unique citations. Abstract and full-text screening identified 22 studies with 371 patients to be included for the data extraction. All included studies were assessed as good [10,12,22-26,32,35,36,38,39] or fair [13,27-31,33,34,37,40] according to the NHLBI quality assessment tool (**Table S2**).

3.1 Study characteristics

Of the 22 studies [10,12,13,22-40,], there were four CCTs, three RCTs, four case series, three Letters, and eight case reports. Seven were comparative studies with control groups. All 22 studies reported

mortality and laboratory outcomes (n = 371); 17 studies reported AEs and SAEs (n = 273); 20 studies reported general clinical symptoms and imaging outcomes after MSCs treatment (n = 324). A total of 247 patients received MSCs therapy, while 124 participated as controls (**Table 1**).

3.2 Patient characteristics

The 22 studies were from seven countries and regions, including China (n = 14) [12,13,22-25,29-31, 35,36,38-40], the United States (n = 1) [26], Germany (n = 1) [27], Spain (n = 2) [28,37], Iran (n = 1) [10], Mexico (n = 1) [32], and Turkey (n = 2) [33,34]. Eleven studies reported on baseline oxygenation indicators of patients [10,13,26,27,29,30,32,35,37,38,40]. General symptoms such as fever, cough, and dyspnea were reported in 16 studies [10,12,13,23,24,27,29,32-40], and lung imaging evaluation showed COVID-19 related pneumonia in 15 studies [10,12,23,25,27,29,32-40]. The disease severity of the patient's condition was Critical (n = 63), Severe (n = 260), and Moderate (n = 10) in 19 studies [10,12,13,22-25,27-34,36,38-40]; and the patients in one study were divided into "Mild-to-moderate" (n = 6) and "Moderate-to-severe" (n = 18) according to the severity of ARDS [26]. The average age of study participants was 45.1 to 61.0 years for MSCs group and 39.0 to 65.0 years for control group in the comparative studies[13,22-27]. In the comparative studies, the disease severity of MSCs group were Critical (n = 13), Severe (n = 115), and Moderate (n = 8), and those of control group were Critical (n = 11), Severe (n = 105), and Moderate (n = 8) [13,22-27]. The most common comorbidities including hypertension (HT, n = 105), diabetes mellitus (DM, n = 61), obesity(n = 19), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD, n = 11), and heart disease (HD, n = 9) had been reported in 18 studies [10,12,13,22,23,25-30,32-35,38-40]. There were also differences in the follow-up time after MSCs treatment in these studies, ranging from a week to two months, which mainly due to the point when patients were recovery or died and discharge from the hospital (**Table 1-2**).

3.3 Intervention method

Culture-expanded allogeneic MSCs were used in all 22 included studies. Allogeneic umbilical cord-derived MSCs were used in 13 studies [22-26,29,30,32,34,36-39], Wharton's jelly-derived MSCs in three studies [12,33,40], menstrual blood- or adipose tissue- or placenta- derived MSCs were separately used in one study [10,28,35]. Four studies did not report the tissue origin of the MSCs [13,27,31,37](**Table 3**). Characterization was reported in most studies, with significant differences in details. Characterization of MSCs was reported in 11 studies, with most of the following markers: positive for CD9, CD29, CD44, CD73, CD90, CD105, HLA-ABC, and negative for CD11b, CD14, CD19, CD31, CD34, CD45, CD79 α , CD133 and HLA-DR [10,12,13,22-26,32,35,39]. Viability was reported to be >80% [10,12,24-27,32,35,36,39].

MSCs were mainly injected intravenously (n = 245), and two other patients were injected intratracheally and intravenously [33,34]. MSCs infusion frequency ranged from a single administration to five administrations (n = 47, 43, 154, 2, 1). Dosing of MSCs ranged from 1 to 2 million cells per kilogram of body weight or a uniform dose of 30 to 200 million cells. Only one study did not report the dose [33].

3.4 Safety

3.4.1 Adverse events

We extracted data from 16 studies on the number of AEs and the number of patients with AEs to describe the occurrence of AEs (**Table 4**) [10,12,13,22,24-26,28,31-34,36-39]. In MSCs group, patients with AEs accounted for 48.33% (87/180), and the total number of AEs was 167. Additionally, according to research by Feng et al, hypoalbuminemia, insomnia, gastrointestinal diseases, and paroxysmal arrhythmia occurred in the surviving patients [30]. It is worth noting that 15 treatment-related AEs were reported in five studies. Meng et al reported that two patients receiving MSCs developed transient facial flushing and fever immediately on infusion, which resolved spontaneously within 4 h; another moderate patient had a transient fever within 2 h that resolved within 24 h [22]. Chen et al reported that three cases experienced treatment-related AEs,

specifically liver dysfunction, heart failure and allergic rash [31]. Hashemian et al reported that two cases developed shivering that occurred during the initial MSCs infusion, which was relieved by supportive treatment in less than 1 h [10]. Iglesias et al reported that a patient had muscle contractions in extremities, and another patient had muscle contractions in extremities and chest, PO₂ decreased 78%, arterial hypertension, and respiratory effort; the third patient developed hypotension [32]. In the study of Lanzoni et al, a treatment-related AE was reported without specific description [26]. Comparisons of AEs incidence between MSCs group and control group were made in five studies (n = 196) [13,22,24-26,]. The overall AEs incidences were 58.0% (69/119) for MSCs-treated patients and 77.9% (60 of 77) for controls, and the difference was statistically significant (P = 0.01, OR = 0.43, 95% CI = 0.22~0.84) (**Fig. 2**).

3.4.2 Serious adverse events

In our data extraction process, the number of deaths was included in the number of SAEs if the study did not describe SAEs in detail and only reported the mortality. The results showed that 32 SAEs occurred in the 219 MSCs-treated patients in 19 studies (**Table 4**) [10,12,13,22-30,32-34,36-39]. There were no reported MSCs treatment-related SAEs. The 10 SAEs reported in Xu's study included severe liver dysfunction (n = 1), expiratory dyspnea (n = 1), respiratory failure (n = 1), ARDS (n = 1), shock (n = 3), multifunctional organ failure (n = 2), and gastrointestinal bleeding (n = 1) [24]. Shi et al reported 1 case of pneumothorax in MSCs group, and the patient recovered naturally after conservative treatment [25]. Lanzoni et al reported 4 SAEs without detailed introduction [26]. Häberle et al reported a death case due to multiple organ failure [27]. Sanchez-Guijo et al reported that two patients died, one from massive gastrointestinal bleeding and another one from secondary fungal pneumonia by *Saccharomyces* spp [28]. Guo et al reported 4 patients died without detailed introduction [29]. There were two SAEs during the trial reported by Feng et al [30]. The two patients suffered from bacterial pneumonia and septic shock and died of multiple organ failure or circulation and respiratory failure, respectively. Hashemian et al reported deaths of 4 patients due to multiple

organ failure and 1 patient due to cardiac arrest [10]. Iglesias et al reported that a case developed to left lower extremity arterial thrombosis, deterioration of hemodynamics, D-dimer concentration of 7268 ng/mL and death; Enterobacter cloacae were cultured in aspirated samples from his trachea. The other patient developed hemodynamic alterations, epistaxis, hematuria, and died 13 days after MSCs infusion [32]. In the case report of Yilmaz, a patient was diagnosed with upper gastrointestinal bleeding, but his vital signs were stable after effective treatment [33]. Among the seven controlled studies, 136 patients in MSC groups had 16 SAEs, while 124 patients in control group had 49 SAEs [13,22-27].

3.5 Efficacy

3.5.1 Mortality

Mortality was reported in all included studies (**Table 4**), and the overall mortality rate was 12.94% (48/371). The mortality rate among MSCs-treated patients was 8.50% (21/247). Comparisons between MSCs group and control group were made in seven studies (n = 260), and there was a trend toward a decreased mortality rate in MSCs group in all seven studies [13,22-27]. The overall mortality rate was 3.68% (5/137) for MSCs-treated patients and 21.77% (27/124) for controls. There was a favorable trend and the difference was statistically significant ($P < 0.01$, OR = 0.17, 95%CI = 0.06~0.49). However, the certainty of the evidence on the impact on mortality was limited due to the differences in the baseline conditions of the included patients, and the imprecision and methodological limitations of the included trials (**Fig. 3, Table 1-2**).

3.5.2 Changes in general clinical symptoms and lung function

The results found that the average time from receiving the first injection to recovery or discharge from hospital ranged from about 2 to 24 days for MSCs-treated patients (**Table 5**) [10,12,13,22-24,26,28,32, 36-40]. In several controlled studies, Shu et al, Xu et al and Lanzoni et al reported that the average time taken to improve (or recovery) for MSCs group was shorter than that of control

group, and the difference was statistically significant [23,24,26]. However, Meng et al reported that the duration from admission to discharge between the two groups was close [22]; and Xu et al reported that there was no significant difference in either the length of hospital stay or the number of days in the ICU between the two groups [24].

Changes in general clinical symptoms and pulmonary function (including oxygenation index and chest radiology examinations) after treatment were recorded in 21 studies (**Table 5**) [10,12,13,22-25,27-40]. Different studies had different assessment indicators for lung function, which made it more difficult to extract the outcomes. The general clinical symptoms and pulmonary function (such as SaO₂, PaO₂/FiO₂, the oxygenation index, and chest CT or X-ray) were found to improve in the early days after MSCs treatment in most of the studies. Some studies reported that the clinical improvement of MSCs group showed a significant improvement than control group, and the oxygenation index of the MSCs group recovered to the normal range faster than control group [23,25,27], and CT scores, the number of lobes involved, ground-glass opacity, and consolidation, which reflected reduced lung inflammation of MSCs group, were significantly better than those of control group [22-25]. However, there was a study reported that the cough of MSCs group showed a significant improvement compared with control group at Day 1 after MSCs treatment but no difference was found at other time points; the expiratory dyspnea showed a significant improvement compared with control group at Day 1, 3, and 5, but no difference was found at Day 7, 14, and 30 [25]. There was also a study reported that the saturation of pulse oxygen significantly improved in survivors compared to non-survivors even if all patients received MSCs treatment [10].

3.4.3 Laboratory outcomes

The laboratory outcomes were shown in **Table 6**. The negative status of HCoV-19 nucleic acid was evaluated in 11 studies [12,13,22,24,26,29,35-39]. The average time from receiving the first injection to the nucleic acid turned to be negative ranged from about 4 to 15.8 days for MSCs-treated patients. Comparisons between MSCs group and control group were made in two studies, and there was no

significant difference between the two groups [24,26].

The immune cells were tested in 15 studies [12,13,23,25,27-30,32,33,35,36,38-40]. The increased of DC, LYM, NK cells, T cells and B cells, and the decrease of NE and WBC were found in most of the studies. While Guo et al reported that there was no significant difference in WBC before and after MSCs treatment [29], and Iglesias et al reported that only one patient (1/5) had a decrease in total LYM from 1570/ml to 984/ml at 7 days post-infusion[32]. In controlled studies, a significant reduction in WBC and NE, and a significant increase in LYM were be found in MSCs group compared with control group [23,27]. However, there was a study reported that there was no significant difference in the subsets of peripheral LYM counts (CD4+ T cells, CD8+ T cells, B cells, NK cells) between the two groups at Day 0, 6, 10, and 14 after the first MSCs injection [25].

The inflammatory cytokines were evaluated in all studies. Most of the studies found that serum cytokines, chemokines, and growth factors improve to varying degrees following MSCs therapy. Two controlled studies reported that the concentrations of CRP, GM-CSF, IFN-g, IL-5, IL-6, IL-7, TNF- α , TNF- β , PDGF-BB and RANTES in MSCs group were significantly lower than those in control group [23,26]. However, we also noticed that there was no significant difference in plasma markers (IL-6, IL-8, IFN- γ , IL-1Ra, IL-18, MCP-1, MIP-1 α , and IP-10) between the two groups reported in two controlled studies [25,27].

4. Discussion

It is exciting that some specific vaccines against the SARS-CoV-2 virus have been produced and promoted to vaccinate. In mainland China, people are being vaccinated for free in a planned way, and a total of 1 095.902 million doses of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines have been vaccinated as of June 23, 2021 [41]. However, the shortage of vaccines vaccine-related AEs and virus variant strains have kept some countries and regions in the shadow of the raging COVID-19 epidemic [42-46]. On this basis, other active treatments are still essential. At present, a considerable number of studies have analyzed

the possibility of MSCs in the treatment of COVID-19, and some clinical trial results have confirmed its effectiveness. Therefore, this meta-analysis inspected the published results of MSCs treatment of COVID-19 patients, with focused analysis on safety, efficacy, and related pulmonary responses and immunologic. Our analysis of the studies found that MSCs therapy is safe and shows the potential to extenuate the damage of immunity and inflammation to the lungs and other organs and decrease the mortality of COVID-19 patients.

4.1 Safety

Safety is the primary concern for any new therapies, especially in patients at high risk of death due to treatment, and was carefully assessed for MSCs-treated patients in the reviewed studies. This study analyzed the occurrence of AEs and found that MSCs group had fewer patients with AEs than control group in five controlled studies [13,22,24-26], and the difference was statistically significant. Fifteen transient AEs related to MSCs treatment were reported [10,22,26,31,32], but most of them resolved spontaneously in a short time. Regrettably, 32 SAEs occurred in the 219 MSCs-treated patients, but the authors of these studies believed that none of these SAEs were found to be related to MSCs therapy [10,12,13,22-30,32-34,36-39]. Additionally, the number of SAEs of MSCs group was also less than that of control group in the controlled studies [13,22-27]. The safety is consistent with the experience of other human clinical trials involving MSCs treatment [47,48].

The mortality of patients infected with COVID-19 was used as the primary outcome to analyze the potential efficacy of MSCs therapy in this study. All seven controlled studies reported that MSCs group is associated with reduced mortality [13,22-27], and the pooled estimates of mortality showed that the mortality rate of MSCs group is significantly lower than that of control group (3.68% vs. 21.77%). The difference suggests that MSCs treatment may be effective in reducing mortality of these patients.

The COVID-19 disease accompanied with notable hematological manifestations, thrombocytopenia, and coagulation abnormalities on presentation and associated with poor outcomes during the disease

courses [49]. There was a study reported that despite low molecular weight heparin prophylaxis or full anticoagulant therapy, the incidence of deep vein thrombosis, mainly asymptomatic, in hospitalized COVID-19 patients was 14.5% [50]. However, some patients had to suspend anticoagulation therapy due to bleeding or anemia and eventually died of hemodynamic disorders [32]. It is worth mentioning that 10 patients were already in very serious condition before receiving MSCs treatment and died of multiple organ failure or hemodynamic disorders [10,27,30,32,37]. Although their condition improved within a few days after MSCs transplantation, this sympathetic treatment failed to save their lives. Therefore, the authors of present study considered that although MSCs treatment could play a positive role in most COVID-19 patients and help save their lives, there are still individual differences in its efficacy.

4.2 Efficacy

The results of three studies showed that the average time of improvement (or recovery) in MSCs group was significantly shorter than that of control group [23,24,26], while two studies showed that the length of hospital stay was not different between the two groups [22,24]. The authors of present study believed that the reason for this difference was that the time from the onset of symptoms to the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 or hospitalization of patients was different in these studies. Therefore, it is not believed that the difference in the length of hospital stay is statistically significant in these studies with a small number of included cases and no uniform admission criteria.

Hashemian et al reported that non-survivors did not get the same amelioration in saturation of pulse oxygen as survivors even though all patients received MSCs treatment [10]. A case report showed that the patient's consciousness and mental state began to improve after MSCs treatment, and his pulmonary compliance increased significantly, but extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) and mechanical ventilation could not be resolved due to no significant improvement in lung function and chest CT scans. The treatment results were not satisfactory even after receiving five times MSCs injections, the patient was lucky enough to receive lung transplantation but unfortunately died of

transplant rejection [40]. However, the general clinical symptoms, pulmonary function and radiographic imaging were found to ameliorate at the early days after MSCs treatment in most of the included studies, and the improvement in MSCs group was significantly better than that of control group. It has been found that intravenously infused MSCs migrate directly to the lung, where they can secrete a variety of factors, which play an important role in immune regulation, protection of alveolar epithelial cells, resistance to pulmonary fibrosis, and amelioration of lung function. It shows great benefits for the treatment of severe lung diseases in COVID-19 [51,52]. The findings of this study also further support the consideration of using MSCs to treat COVID-19-related pulmonary function decline.

The occurrence and development of SARS-CoV-2 depend on the interaction between virus infection and the immune system. Dysregulation of immune system in COVID-19 patients can contribute to serious illness. Dysregulation of the immune system such as lymphopenia and cytokine storm could be a crucial factor related to the severity of COVID-19 [49,53]. Compared with moderate COVID-19 cases, severe cases more frequently had dyspnea, lymphopenia, and hypoalbuminemia, with higher levels of ALT, LDH, CRP, ferritin, and D-dimer as well as markedly higher levels of IL-2R, IL-6, IL-10, and TNF- α . Absolute numbers of T cells, CD4⁺ T cells, and CD8⁺ T cells decreased in nearly all the patients and were markedly lower in severe cases than moderate cases [20]. In severe cases, patients suffer from ARDS, which is usually associated with elevated levels of inflammatory cytokines. Therefore, rebalancing the high inflammatory response of the host immune system and the regeneration of damaged cells seems to be the main way to treat this disease [54]. The main mechanism of MSCs therapeutic effect is due to the secretion of soluble factors, such as cytokines, chemokines, angiogenic factors, growth factors, and exosomes and extracellular vesicles. It is these complex mechanisms making MSCs suitable for treating complex and multifactorial diseases for which no other reductionistic drug treatments are available yet, such as COVID-19-related ARDS and other similar inflammatory diseases that involve a cytokine storm [14,55,56]. The present study

found that MSCs therapy has a positive impact on the immune and inflammatory processes that lead to organ damage in COVID-19 patients. Most of the included studies showed that the number of immune cells ameliorated and serum cytokinflammatory factors gradually abated with MSCs treatment. Additionally, the WBC of patients had been corrected to the normal range before receiving MSCs injection, so there was no statistical difference before and after MSCs treatment in Guo's study [29].

4.3 Other findings

ACE2 is the main host cell receptor for SARS-CoV-2 entry, and the virus uses the host cell transmembrane serine protease II (TMPRSS2) for Spike envelope protein priming [57]. It is known that ACE2 and TMPRSS2 are present on the surface of a variety of human cells, such as alveolar cells and capillary endothelium, while immune cells, such as T cells and B cells, and macrophage are negative for ACE2 [58]. There were studies reported that human MSCs do express neither ACE2 nor TMPRSS2, and human MSCs derived from fetal and adult tissues are not permissive to SARS-CoV-2 infection [13,59].

We also find out about comorbidities that the three most common comorbidities are hypertension, diabetes mellitus and obesity, which are the same as the concerns of many previous authors [60-63]. As the course of diabetes mellitus prolongs and some elderly hypertension patients need to be treated with ACE inhibitors which may increase the expression of ACE2. In addition, it has been found that pioglitazone and liraglutide, which are used to control blood glucose level and up-regulate the expression of ACE2 in experimental models [64-66]. Previous studies also confirmed that comorbidities such as hypertension, diabetes, and obesity are risk factors for severe symptoms and increased mortality in COVID-19 patients [60-64,67].

4.4 Research significance

This comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of published reports of MSCs therapy for

COVID-19 have yielded several important findings. Primarily, the number of patients with AEs in MSCs group was significantly less than that in control group, and the mortality rate was also significantly slashed (3.68% vs. 21.77%). Only 36 SAEs occurred in 219 patients treated with MSCs, and none of them was related to MSCs transplantation. Additionally, MSCs therapy plays an active role in restoring lung function and improving symptoms. Furthermore, MSCs therapy is beneficial in coping with cytokine storms and correcting immune disorders. This study provides a sympathetic treatment option for doctors and patients in areas still under the shadow of the COVID-19 outbreak and accumulates experience for coping with new challenges in the future.

4.5 Limitations

Towards the end of this project, there are still not many clinical reports on MSCs for the treatment of COVID-19. Therefore, the limitations of this systematic review include the lack of large-scale RCTs, and no canonical treatment program and evaluation standard for MSCs. There are differences in the source, dose, activity, frequency, and inoculation interval of the MSCs in the included studies. It is unknown whether these will affect the treatment effect. Moreover, there may exist selection bias and insufficient description of the evaluation in published results.

5 Conclusion

This systematic review and meta-analysis of existing studies demonstrated the safety and effectiveness of MSCs in the treatment of COVID-19. There is an urgent need for adequately powered clinical trials to test the clinical results of MSCs therapy on patients with COVID-19 syndrome and SARS-CoV-2 infection, and to explore a standard MSCs therapy program.

References

1. Organization WH: Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19 - 15 June 2021. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---15-june-2021>.

443 Accessed June 20, 2021.

444 2. Murthy S, Gomersall C, Fowler R. Care for critically ill patients with COVID-19. JAMA.

445 2020;323:1499-500.

446 3. Bhatraju P, Ghassemieh B, Nichols M, et al. Covid-19 in critically ill patients in the Seattle

447 Region - Case Series. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:2012-22.

448 4. Zumla A, Hui D, Azhar E, et al. Reducing mortality from 2019-nCoV: host-directed therapies

449 should be an option. Lancet. 2020;395:e35-e36.

450 5. Khoury M, Ikonomou L, Dominici M, et al. The coronavirus pandemic: A pitfall or a fast track for

451 validating cell therapy products? Stem Cells Dev. 2021;30:119-27.

452 6. Esquivel D, Mishra R, Soni P, et al. Stem cells therapy as a possible therapeutic option in treating

453 COVID-19 patients. Stem Cell Rev Rep. 2021;17:144-52.

454 7. Sengupta V, Sengupta S, Lazo A, et al. Exosomes derived from bone marrow mesenchymal stem

455 cells as treatment for severe COVID-19. Stem Cells Dev. 2020;29:747-54.

456 8. Chen J, Hu C, Chen L, et al. Clinical study of mesenchymal stem cell treatment for acute

457 respiratory distress syndrome induced by epidemic influenza A (H7N9) infection: A hint for

458 COVID-19 treatment. Engineering. 2020;6:1153-61.

459 9. Gentile P, Sterodimas A, Pizzicannella J, Calabrese C, Garcovich S. Research progress on

460 mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs), adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cells (AD-MSCs), drugs, and

461 vaccines in inhibiting COVID-19 disease. Aging Dis. 2020;11:1191-201.

462 10. Hashemian S, Aliannejad R, Zarrabi M, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells derived from perinatal

463 tissues for treatment of critically ill COVID-19-induced ARDS patients: a case series. Stem Cell Res

464 Ther. 2021;12:91.

465 11. Croci S, Bonacini M, Dolci G, et al. Human dental pulp stem cells modulate cytokine production

466 in vitro by peripheral blood mononuclear cells from coronavirus disease 2019 patients. Front Cell

467 Dev Biol. 2020;8:609204.

468 12. Zhang Y, Ding J, Ren S, et al. Intravenous infusion of human umbilical cord Wharton's jelly-
469 derived mesenchymal stem cells as a potential treatment for patients with COVID-19 pneumonia.
470 Stem Cell Res Ther. 2020;11:207.

471 13. Leng Z, Zhu R, Hou W, et al. Transplantation of ACE2 mesenchymal stem cells improves the
472 outcome of patients with COVID-19 pneumonia. Aging Dis. 2020;11:216-28.

473 14. Jeyaraman M, John A, Koshy S, et al. Fostering mesenchymal stem cell therapy to halt cytokine
474 storm in COVID-19. Biochim Biophys Acta Mol Basis Dis. 2021;1867:166014.

475 15. Desterke C, Griscelli F, Imeri J, et al. Molecular investigation of adequate sources of
476 mesenchymal stem cells for cell therapy of COVID-19-associated organ failure. Stem Cells Transl
477 Med. 2021;10:568-71.

478 16. Liberati A, Altman D, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews
479 and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration.
480 BMJ. 2009;339:b2700.

481 17. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China,
482 2019. N Engl J Med. 2020;382:727-33.

483 18. WJ Tan, X Zhao, XJ Ma, et al. A novel coronavirus genome identified in a cluster of pneumonia
484 cases — Wuhan, China 2019–2020. China CDC Weekly. 2020;2:61-2.

485 19. Verity R, Okell L, Dorigatti I, et al. Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a
486 model-based analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20:669-77.

487 20. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, et al. Clinical and immunological features of severe and moderate
488 coronavirus disease 2019. J Clin Invest. 2020;130:2620-9.

489 21. Institute TNHLaB: Quality assessment tool for case series studies.
490 <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>. Accessed April 28, 2021.

491 22. Meng F, Xu R, Wang S, et al. Human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cell therapy in
492 patients with COVID-19: a phase 1 clinical trial. Signal Transduct Target Ther. 2020;5:172.

493 23. Shu L, Niu C, Li R, et al. Treatment of severe COVID-19 with human umbilical cord
494 mesenchymal stem cells. *Stem Cell Res Ther.* 2020;11:361.

495 24. Xu X, Jiang W, Chen L, et al. Evaluation of the safety and efficacy of using human menstrual
496 blood-derived mesenchymal stromal cells in treating severe and critically ill COVID-19 patients: An
497 exploratory clinical trial. *Clin Transl Med.* 2021;11:e297.

498 25. Shi L, Huang H, Lu X, et al. Effect of human umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells on
499 lung damage in severe COVID-19 patients: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 2
500 trial. *Signal Transduct Target Ther.* 2021;6:58.

501 26. Lanzoni G, Linetsky E, Correa D, et al. Umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells for COVID-19
502 acute respiratory distress syndrome: A double-blind, phase 1/2a, randomized controlled trial. *Stem*
503 *Cells Transl Med.* 2021;10:660-73.

504 27. Häberle H, Magunia H, Lang P, et al. Mesenchymal stem cell therapy for severe COVID-19
505 ARDS. *J Intensive Care Med.* 2021;36:681-8.

506 28. Sánchez-Guijo F, García-Arranz M, López-Parra M, et al. Adipose-derived mesenchymal stromal
507 cells for the treatment of patients with severe SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia requiring mechanical
508 ventilation. A proof of concept study. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020;25:100454.

509 29. Guo Z, Chen Y, Luo X, et al. Administration of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells in
510 patients with severe COVID-19 pneumonia. *Crit Care.* 2020;24:420.

511 30. Feng Y, Huang J, Wu J, et al. Safety and feasibility of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells in
512 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia: A pilot study. *Cell Prolif.* 2020;53:e12947.

513 31. Chen X, Shan Y, Wen Y, et al. Mesenchymal stem cell therapy in severe COVID-19: A
514 retrospective study of short-term treatment efficacy and side effects. *J Infect.* 2020;81:647-79.

515 32. Iglesias M, Butrón P, Torre-Villalvazo I, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells for the compassionate
516 treatment of severe acute respiratory distress syndrome due to COVID 19. *Aging Dis.* 2021;12:360-
517 70.

518 33. Yilmaz R, Adas G, Cukurova Z, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells treatment in COVID-19 patient
519 with multi-organ involvement. Bratisl Lek Listy. 2020;121:847-52.

520 34. Zengin R, Beyaz O, Koc E, et al. Mesenchymal stem cell treatment in a critically ill COVID-19
521 patient: a case report. Stem Cell Investig. 2020;7:17.

522 35. Tang L, Jiang Y, Zhu M, et al. Clinical study using mesenchymal stem cells for the treatment of
523 patients with severe COVID-19. Front Med. 2020;14:664-73.

524 36. Peng H, Gong T, Huang X, et al. A synergistic role of convalescent plasma and mesenchymal
525 stem cells in the treatment of severely ill COVID-19 patients: a clinical case report. Stem Cell Res
526 Ther. 2020;11:291.

527 37. Soler RR, Rius TJ, Melgosa CM. [Expanded mesenchymal stem cells: a novel therapeutic
528 approach of SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia (COVID-19). Concepts regarding a first case in Spain]. Med
529 Clin (Barc). 2020;155:318-9.

530 38. Zhu Y, Zhu R, Liu K, et al. Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells for adjuvant
531 treatment of a critically ill COVID-19 Patient: A case report. Infect Drug Resist. 2020;13:3295-300.

532 39. Liang B, Chen J, Li T, et al. Clinical remission of a critically ill COVID-19 patient treated by
533 human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells: A case report. Medicine (Baltimore).
534 2020;99:e21429.

535 40. Tao J, Nie Y, Wu H, et al. Umbilical cord blood-derived mesenchymal stem cells in treating a
536 critically ill COVID-19 patient. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2020;14:1138-45.

537 41. China NHCotPsRo: New coronavirus vaccination status.
538 <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/xcs/yqfkdt/202106/d38cff6ee53248ae93ae4f1b808357d6.shtml>. Accessed
539 June 23, 2021.

540 42. Loyo E, González M, Esparza J. Venezuela is collapsing without COVID-19 vaccines. Lancet.
541 2021;397:1806.

542 43. Kluge H, McKee M. COVID-19 vaccines for the European region: an unprecedented challenge.

543 Lancet. 2021;397:1689-91.

544 44. Jawad N, Taweeleh L, Elharake J, et al. Refugee access to COVID-19 vaccines in Lebanon.
545 Lancet. 2021;397:1884.

546 45. Blumenthal K, Robinson L, Camargo C, et al. Acute allergic reactions to mRNA COVID-19
547 Vaccines. JAMA. 2021;325:1562-5.

548 46. Al Kaabi N, Zhang Y, Xia S, et al. Effect of 2 inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccines on
549 symptomatic COVID-19 infection in adults: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2021: e218565.

550 47. Chen W, Liu W, Bai Y, et al. Transplantation of mesenchymal stem cells for spinal cord injury: a
551 systematic review and network meta-analysis. J Transl Med. 2021;19:178.

552 48. Glassberg M, Minkiewicz J, Toonkel R, Simonet E, Rubio G, DiFede D, et al. Allogeneic human
553 mesenchymal stem cells in patients with idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis via intravenous delivery
554 (AETHER): A phase I safety clinical trial. Chest. 2017;151:971-81.

555 49. Cheung C, Law M, Lui G, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): A haematologist's
556 perspective. Acta Haematol. 2021;144:10-23.

557 50. Baccellieri D, Bertoglio L, Apruzzi L, et al. Incidence of deep venous thrombosis in COVID-19
558 hospitalized patients during the first peak of the Italian outbreak. Phlebology. 2021;36:375-83.

559 51. Mahendiratta S, Bansal S, Sarma P, et al. Stem cell therapy in COVID-19: Pooled evidence from
560 SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and ARDS: A systematic review. Biomed Pharmacother.
561 2021;137:111300.

562 52. Li Z, Niu S, Guo B, et al. Stem cell therapy for COVID-19, ARDS and pulmonary fibrosis. Cell
563 Prolif. 2020;53:e12939.

564 53. Tavasolian F, Hatam G, Mosawi S, et al. The immune response and effectiveness of COVID-19
565 therapies. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2021;1321:115-26.

566 54. Afarid M, Sanie-Jahromi F. Mesenchymal stem cells and COVID-19: Cure, prevention, and
567 vaccination. Stem Cells Int. 2021;2021:6666370.

568 55. Mansourabadi A, Sadeghalvad M, Mohammadi-Motlagh H, Rezaei N. The immune system as a
569 target for therapy of SARS-CoV-2: A systematic review of the current immunotherapies for COVID-
570 19. Life Sci. 2020;258:118185.

571 56. Yadav P, Vats R, Bano A, Bhardwaj R. Mesenchymal stem cell immunomodulation and
572 regeneration therapeutics as an ameliorative approach for COVID-19 pandemics. Life Sci.
573 2020;263:118588.

574 57. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 cell entry depends on ACE2
575 and TMPRSS2 and is blocked by a clinically proven protease inhibitor. Cell. 2020;181:271-80.e278.

576 58. Sungnak W, Huang N, Bécavin C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 entry factors are highly expressed in nasal
577 epithelial cells together with innate immune genes. Nat Med. 2020;26:681-7.

578 59. Avanzini M, Mura M, Percivalle E, et al. Human mesenchymal stromal cells do not express
579 ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and are not permissive to SARS-CoV-2 infection. Stem Cells Transl Med.
580 2021;10:636-42.

581 60. Peña J, Rascón-Pacheco R, Ascencio-Montiel I, et al. (2021) Hypertension, diabetes and obesity,
582 major risk factors for death in patients with COVID-19 in Mexico. Arch Med Res. 52:443-9.

583 61. Dennis J, Mateen B, Sonabend R, et al. Type 2 diabetes and COVID-19-related mortality in the
584 critical care setting: A national cohort study in England, March-July 2020. Diabetes Care.
585 2021;44:50-7.

586 62. Abu-Farha M, Al-Mulla F, Thanaraj T, et al. Impact of diabetes in patients diagnosed with
587 COVID-19. Front Immunol. 2020;11:576818.

588 63. Tartof S, Qian L, Hong V, et al. Obesity and mortality among patients diagnosed with COVID-
589 19: Results from an integrated health care organization. Ann Intern Med. 2020;173:773-81.

590 64. Fang L, Karakiulakis G, Roth M. Are patients with hypertension and diabetes mellitus at
591 increased risk for COVID-19 infection? Lancet Respir Med. 2020;8:e21.

592 65. Romaní-Pérez M, Outeiriño-Iglesias V, Moya C, et al. Activation of the GLP-1 receptor by

593 liraglutide increases ACE2 expression, reversing right ventricle hypertrophy, and improving the
594 production of SP-A and SP-B in the lungs of type 1 diabetes rats. *Endocrinology*. 2015;156:3559-69.
595 66. Saha S, Chakrabarti S, Singh P, et al. Physiological relevance of angiotensin converting enzyme
596 2 as a metabolic linker and therapeutic implication of mesenchymal stem cells in COVID-19 and
597 hypertension. *Stem Cell Rev Rep*. 2021;17:132-43.
598 67. Singh A, Gillies C, Singh R, et al. Prevalence of co-morbidities and their association with
599 mortality in patients with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab*.
600 2020;22:1915-24.

601

Table 1 Study and patient characteristics

Authors & year & Country	Study design	Total, n MSC; Ctrl	Mean age(year) MSC; Ctrl	Gender, n, (Male/Female) MSC ; Ctrl	Follow-Up
Leng et al. 2020 China [13]	Phase 1, CCT	10(7; 3)	57.0; 65.0	4/3; 0/3	14 days
Meng et al. 2020 China [22]	Phase 1, CCT	18(9; 9)	45.1; 49.6	7/2; 4/5	28 days
Shu et al. 2020 China [23]	RCT	41(12; 29)	61.0; 57.9	8/4; 16/13	28 days
Xu et al. 2021 China [24]	Phase 1, CCT	44(26; 18)	58.3; 61.1	17/9; 13/5	30 days
Shi et al. 2021 China [25]	Phase 2, RCT	100(65; 35)	60.7; 59.9	37/28; 19/16	28 days
Lanzoni et al. 2021 United States [26]	Phase 1/2a, RCT	24(12; 12)	58.6; 58.8	5/7; 8/4	31 days
Häberle et al. 2021 Germany [27]	CCT	23(5; 18)	59; 39	3/2; 13/5	NR
Sánchez-Guijo et al. 2020 Spain [28]	Case series	13	60.3	1/12	28 days
Guo et al. 2020 China [29]	Research Letter	31	70 (median)	25/6	NR
Feng et al. 2020 China [30]	Case series	16	61.8	12/4	28 days
Chen et al. 2020 China [31]	Retrospective study, Letter	25	70 (median)	20/5	NR
Hashemian et al. 2021 Iran [10]	Case series	11	53.8	8/3	60 days
Iglesias et al. 2021 Mexico [32]	Case series	5	52.6	4/1	21 days
Yilmaz et al. 2020 Turkey [33]	Case report	1	51	1/0	14 days
Zengin et al. 2020 Turkey [34]	Case report	1	72	1/0	60 days
Tang et al. 2020 China [35]	Case report	2	Case 1: 37 Case 2: 71	1/1	14 days
Zhang et al. 2020 China [12]	Case report	1	54	1/0	7 days
Peng et al. 2020 China[36]	Case report	1	66	0/1	11 days
Soler et al. 2020 Spain [37]	Letter	1	NR	NR	7 days
Zhu et al. 2020 China [38]	Case report	1	48	1/0	14 days
Liang et al. 2020 China [39]	Case report	1	65	0/1	18 days
Tao et al. 2020 China [40]	Case report	1	72	1/0	41 days

602

Abbreviations: CCT: clinical controlled trial, **Ctrl**: control group, **MSC**: mesenchymal stem cell treatment group, RCT:

603

randomized controlled trial, NR: not reported

604

Table 2 Baseline general, imaging outcomes and disease severity

Authors	Baseline general, n	Imaging outcomes	Comorbidities, n MSC; Ctrl	Disease severity, n MSC; Ctrl
Leng et al.	MSC; Ctrl: Fever: 7; 2 Cough, weak, poor appetite: 7; 3 Shortness of breath: 7; 3 SaO ₂ : 92%; 92%	NR	HT: 1; NR	Severe: 4; 0 Critical: 3; 3
Meng et al.	NR	NR	HT: 1; 1 DM: 1; 0 FLD: 1; 0 Asthma: 0; 1	Moderate: 5; 5 Severe: 4; 4
Shu et al.	MSC; Ctrl: Fever: 10; 26 Cough: 8; 19 Respiratory rate > 24/min: 11; 20	MSC; Ctrl (Chest CT): Number of lobes involved: 4 (4, 5); 4 (3.5, 5) GGO: 12 (100%); 29 (100%) Linear opacities: 10 (83.33%); 26 (89.66%) Consolidation: 11 (91.67%); 25 (86.21%) Interlobular septal thickening: 10 (83.33%); 25 (86.21%) Crazy-paving pattern: 7 (58.33%); 15 (51.72%) Subpleural curvilinear line: 6 (50.00%); 10 (34.48%) Bronchial wall thickening: 8 (66.67%); 19 (65.52%) Lymph node enlargement: 5 (41.67%); 15 (51.72%) Pleural effusion: 2 (16.67%); 3 (10.34%)	HT: 3; 6 DM: 3; 5	Severe: 12; 29
Xu et al.	MSC; Ctrl: Fever: 13; 8 Cough: 16; 10 Expiratory dyspnea: 8; 8 Sore throat: 2; 2 Chest tightness: 6; 9	NR	NR	Severe: 16; 10 Critical: 10; 8
Shi et al.	NR	MSC; Ctrl (Chest CT): Lesion proportion (%): total lesion volume (in cm ³)/whole lung volume (in cm ³): 26.31 (11.62, 38.42); 27.98 (11.57, 44.14) Solid component lesion proportion (%): Solid component lesion volume (in cm ³)/whole lung volume (in cm ³): 2.59 (0.69, 5.20); 2.52 (0.77, 4.91)	HT: 17; 10 DM: 12; 5 CB: 2; 3 COPD: 2; 0	Severe: 65; 35
Lanzoni et al.	MSC; Ctrl: PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio (mmHg): 126.75; 117.75	NR	HT: 7; 9 DM: 5; 6 Obesity: 11; 5	ARDS severity: Mild-to-moderate: 3; 3 Moderate-to-

				Cancer: 0; 1 HD: 1; 3	severe: 9; 9
Häberle et al.	All patients have severe dyspnea. MSC; Ctrl: ECMO: 4/5; 9/18 Temperature, °C: 37 (IQR 36.6-38.2); 39 (IQR 38-39.4) PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio (mmHg): 68 (IQR 58-84); 87 (IQR 68-92)	MSC; Ctrl: Murray lung injury score: 2.8 (IQR 2.0-3.6); 3.5 (IQR 3.3-4)		HT: 1; 13 HD: 0; 5 CAF: 0; 2 COPD: 0; 1 Asthma: 0; 1 DM: 0; 2 Smoker: 0; 3	Severe: 5; 18
Sánchez-Guijo et al.	NR	NR		HT: 7 DM: 1 COPD: 2 Hypothyroidism: 1 HBV: 1 Smoker: 5	Critical: 13
Guo et al.	MSC: Fever: 24 (77.4%), cough: 25 (80.6%), dyspnea: 17 (54.8%), chest congestion: 14 (45.2%), fatigue: 12 (38.7%) PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ (mmHg): 242 (200-294) MSC: The oxygenation index in severe patients (n = 8) and critically severe patients (n = 7) was 285.50 (197.50-469.00) mmHg and 177.14 (92.50-316.00) mmHg, respectively with the mean oxygenation index in total 258.80 (92.50-469.00) mmHg	MSC (Chest CT): Bilateral pneumonia: 31 (100%), multiple mottling/GGO: 26 (83.9%)		HT: 13 COPD: 6 CAD: 5 DM: 5	Severe/Critical: 23/8
Feng et al.	NR	NR		HT: 8 DM: 6 CKD: 3 HBV: 1 BA: 1 AD: 1 Anaemia: 1	Severe/Critical: 9/7
Chen et al.	NR	NR		NR	Severe: 25
Hashemian et al.	MSC: Fever: 10 (91%), cough: 10 (91%), dyspnea: 10 (91%), respiratory rate (> 30): 11 (100%). PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio (IQR) 79.39% (35%)	MSC (Chest CT): Lung involvement, which included variable degrees of mixed GGO, crazy paving pattern, or consolidations with peripheral subpleural dominance, in addition to vascular dilation, traction bronchiectasis, and pleural effusion in some cases		HT: 3 DM: 4 CMP: 1 CLL: 1	Critical: 11
Iglesias et al.	MSC: All patients showed varying degrees of fever, cough, dyspnea, shortness of breath, rapid heartbeat, and PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ decreased to an average of about 73 mmHg	MSC: Chest CT of five patients all showed severe pneumonia		DM: 2 HT: 1 PAD: 1 Morbid obesity: 3 Hypothyroidism: 1 Dyslipidemia: 1 Pulmonary fibrosis: 1	Critical: 5
Yilmaz et al.	MSC: Cough, myalgia, high fever (39.5 °C), and diarrhea. The patient developed severe bilateral pneumonia, ARDS, and multiple organ failure	MSC (Chest CT): The upper and lower lobes of both lungs were commonly held. The lesions seen in both lungs had GGO, and areas of consolidation were		No	Critical

Zengin et al.	MSC: Fever, tonsillitis, aphthous stomatitis, shortness of breath	compatible with COVID-19 infection MSC (chest X-ray): Atelectatic areas in the middle and lower parts of the lungs, in addition to the earlier image of GGO and patchy infiltration MSC: Case 1: The chest X-ray indicated large, patchy, and high-density lesions in the bilateral lungs, and the costal diaphragm angle was not clear Case 2: The chest X-ray indicated patchy and high-density shadows in the lower lung fields and the left middle lung	HT, DM and hyperlipidemia	Critical
Tang et al.	MSC: Case 1: Fever. SaO ₂ : 92%; PaO ₂ : 66 mmHg, FiO ₂ : 100% Case 2: Dyspnea, cough, and shortness of breath. SaO ₂ : 98%, PaO ₂ : 99 mmHg, and FiO ₂ : 80%		Case 1: HT Case 2: NR	NR
Zhang et al.	MSC: High fever, weakness, shortness of breath, and low oxygen saturation	MSC: CT clearly showed evidence of pneumonia and GGO in bilateral lungs	DM	Critical
Peng et al.	MSC: On the fourth Day after convalescent plasma treatment (Treatment before MSC injection), the absorption of pulmonary exudative lesions was not obvious, the symptoms of dyspnea have not been significantly improved, and high-flow nasal cannula oxygen therapy were still required	MSC: Comparison of the two chest CT scans before MSC treatment, the pulmonary exudative lesions have no significant improvement	NR	Severe
Zhu et al.	MSC: Fever, cough, sputum, dyspnea, poor appetite, poor mental state, and fatigue SaO ₂ : 75–80%	MSC: CT images showed GGO in both lungs	NR	Critical
Soler et al.	MSC: General malaise, fever and weakness, cough attack, and anorexia, dyspnea SaO ₂ : 92%	MSC: CT showed a new ground-glass peripheral bronchopulmonary image at the bottom of the left upper lobe, and the persistent presence of thickened surrounding tissues of the right lung parenchyma and blood vessels	No	NR
Liang et al.	MSC: Severe pneumonia (mixed type), ARDS, multiorgan injury (liver, respiratory system, and blood), moderate anemia, electrolyte disturbance, immunosuppression, acute gastrointestinal bleeding, and other symptoms	MSC: X-ray examination showed GGO in right lung	DM, HT	Critical
Tao et al.	MSC: Fever, chest tightness, asthma PaO ₂ 48.0 mmHg, PaCO ₂ 51.0 mmHg, PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ 69 mmHg	MSC: Chest CT showed pneumonia-like properties and enlarged lesions with patchy consolidation on both sides of lung	DM, HT	Critical

606 asthma, CAD: coronary artery disease, CAF: chronic atrial fibrillation, CB: chronic bronchitis, CKD: chronic kidney
607 failure, CLL: chronic lymphocytic leukemia, CMP: cardiomyopathy, COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, **Ctrl**:
608 control group, DM: diabetes mellitus, ECMO: extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, FLD: fatty liver disease, GGO:
609 ground-glass opacity, HBV: hepatitis B virus, HD: heart disease, HT: hypertension, IQR: intensive care unit, **MSC**:
610 mesenchymal stem cell treatment group, NR: not reported, PAD: peripheral artery disease, PaCO₂: arterial blood partial
611 pressure of CO₂, PaO₂/FiO₂: arterial blood partial pressure of oxygen (PaO₂)/fraction of inspiration O₂ (FiO₂), SaO₂:
612 oxygen saturation

613

Table 3 Characteristics of MSCs and intervention methods

Authors	MSC source	Surface marker	MSC dose per time	Viability, %	Frequency, n(%)	Transplantation route
Leng et al.	NR	Negative: CD19, CD34, CD14, CD45, HLA-DR Positive: CD73, CD105, CD90	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Once 7(100%)	IV
Meng et al.	UC	Negative: CD19, CD34, CD11b, CD45, HLA-DR Positive: CD73, CD105, CD90	3 x 10 ⁷ cells	NR	Three times 9(100%)	IV
Shu et al.	UC	Negative: CD34, CD45, CD14, CD11b, CD79α, CD19, HLA-DR Positive: CD73, CD105, CD90	2 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Once 12(100%)	IV
Xu et al.	UC	Negative: CD117, CD34, CD45, HLA- DR Positive: CD29, CD73, CD105, CD90	3 x 10 ⁷ cells	>90	Three times 26(100%)	IV
Shi et al.	UC	Negative: CD19, CD34, CD11b, CD45, HLA-DR Positive: CD73, CD105, CD90	4 x 10 ⁷ cells	88.4	Three times 65(100%)	IV
Lanzoni et al.	UC	CD90/CD105 > 95%, CD34/CD45 < 5%	98.7 x 10 ⁶ cells	>80	Twice 12(100%)	IV
Häberle et al.	NR	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	>90	Twice 3 (60%) Three times 2 (40%)	IV
Sánchez-	AT	NR	1 x 10 ⁶	NR	Once (15.4%)	IV

Guijo et al.			cells/kg		Twice 10 (76.9%) Three times 1 (7.7%) Once 11 (35.5%)	
Guo et al.	UC	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Twice 9 (29.0%) Three times 11 (35.5%) Three times 15 (93.8%)	IV
Feng et al.	UC	NR	1 x 10 ⁸ cells	NR	Four times 1 (6.2%) Once 7 (28.0%) Twice 7 (28.0%) Three times 11 (44.0%)	IV
Chen et al.	NR	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Twice 1 (9.1%) Three times 10 (90.9%)	IV
Hashemian et al.	UC or PL	Negative: CD31, CD45, CD34, CD11b, HLD-R; Positive: CD29, CD105, CD90, CD73	200 x 10 ⁶ cells	92.7(88.7~94.2)	Twice 1 (9.1%) Three times 10 (90.9%)	IV
Iglesias et al.	UC	Negative: CD45, CD34, HLA-DR; Positive: CD44, CD105, CD90, CD73	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	99.95	Once 5 (100%)	IV
Yilmaz et al.	WJ	NR	NR	NR	Four times 1 (100%)	The first three times: IV; The fourth time: IV + intrathecal
Zengin et al.	UC	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Twice 1 (100%)	Intratracheal + IV
Tang et al.	MB	Negative: CD34, CD45, CD133, HLA-DR; Positive: CD29, CD73, CD90, CD105, CD9, CD44, HLA-ABC	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	90 ~ 95	Three times 2 (100%)	IV
Zhang et al.	WJ	Negative: CD45, CD34;	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	> 90	Once 1 (100%)	IV

			Positive: CD73, CD105, CD90,			
Peng et al.	UC	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	95.78	Three times 1(100%)	IV
Soler et al.	NR	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Once 1(100%)	IV
Zhu et al.	UC	NR	1 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Once 1(100%)	IV
			Negative: CD19, CD34, CD11b, CD45, HLA-DR; Positive:			
Liang et al.	UC		5 x 10 ⁷ cells	>90	Three times 1(100%)	IV
			CD73, CD105, CD90, CD44			
Tao et al.	WJ	NR	1.5 x 10 ⁶ cells/kg	NR	Five times 1(100%)	IV

614 Abbreviations: AT: adipose tissue, IV: intravenous, MB: menstrual blood, MSC: mesenchymal stem cell, NR: not
615 reported, PL: placenta, UC: umbilical cord, WJ: Wharton's jelly

616

Table 4 Adverse events and mortality

Authors	Number of patients with AEs, n(%) MSC; Ctrl	Number of AEs, n MSC; Ctrl	Number of SAEs, n MSC; Ctrl	Number of AEs treatment-related, n MSC; Ctrl	Mortality, n(%) MSC; Ctrl
Leng et al.	0; 2(33.3%)	0; 2	0; 2	No; NR	0; 1(33.3%)
Meng et al.	4(44.44%); 9(100%)	5; 9	0	3; NR	0; 0
Shu et al.	NR	NR	0; 3	NR	0; 3(10.3%)
Xu et al.	20(76.92%); 18(100%)	56; 59	10; 15	NR	2(7.7%); 6(33.3%)
Shi et al.	37(56.92%); 21(60.00%)	37; 21	1; 0	NR	0; 0
Lanzoni et al.	8(66.7%); 11(91.7%)	35; 53	4; 19	Possible 1; 1	2(16.7%); 7(58.3%)
Häberle et al.	NR	NR	1; 10	NR	1(20%); 10(55.6%)
Sánchez-Guijo et al.	2(15.38%); -	2; -	2; -	0; -	2(15.4%); -
Guo et al.	NR; -	NR; -	4; -	0; -	4(12.9%); -
Feng et al.	Hypoalbuminemia, insomnia, gastrointestinal diseases, and paroxysmal arrhythmia have occurred in the surviving patients	NR; -	2; -	0; -	2(12.5%); -
Chen et al.	3; -	3; -	NR; -	3; -	0; -
Hashemian et al.	7; -	7; -	5; -	2; -	5(45.5%); -
Iglesias et al.	5; -	17; -	2; -	6; -	2(40%); -
Yilmaz et al.	1; -	1; -	1; -	0; -	0; -
Zengin et al.	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -
Tang et al.	NR; -	NR; -	NR; -	NR; -	0; -
Zhang et al.	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -
Peng et al.	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -
Soler et al.	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -
Zhu et al.	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -
Liang et al.	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -	0; -
Tao et al.	NR; -	NR; -	NR; -	0; -	1; -

617 Abbreviations: AE: adverse events, **Ctrl**: control group, **MSC**: mesenchymal stem cell treatment group, NR: not reported,

618 SAE: serious adverse event

619

Table 5 Clinical symptoms and imaging outcomes

Authors	The time from intervention to recovery	General clinical symptoms	Imaging outcomes
Leng et al.	NR	MSC: Day 4 , the respiratory rate was decreased to the normal range, fever and shortness of breath disappeared, and SaO ₂ rose from 89% to 98% Ctrl: NR	MSC: Day 9 , the GGO and pneumonia infiltration were largely reduced Ctrl: NR
Meng et al.	The interval between admission and discharge: MSC vs. Ctrl : 20.00(17.50, 24.50) days vs. 23.00(20.00, 27.00) days	MSC : In most severe patients, the PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio improved	MSC : CT scans indicated that patients showed absorption of pulmonary pathological changes. The severe patient 9 showed that the lung lesions were well controlled within 6 days, and completely faded away within 2 weeks Ctrl : The lung lesions of the severe patient 7 still existed at discharge
Shu et al.	The time to clinical improvement in MSC group was shorter than that in Ctrl group: 9.0 (6.0, 13.0) days vs. 14.0 (9.5, 21.0) days, P<0.01	The oxygenation index of MSC group recovered to the normal range faster than Ctrl group MSC vs. Ctrl Clinical improvement, n (%): Day 3 : 2(16.67%) vs. 1(3.45%). Day 7 : 7(58.33%) vs. 5(17.24%), P<0.05. Day 14 : 11(91.67%) vs. 15(51.72%), P<0.05. Day 28 : 12(100%) vs. 25(86.21%) Hospital stay: median (IQR): 20.00(16.00, 24.00) days; 24.00 (20.00, 26.50) days Seven-category scale (scale 1~7): Day 7 : 0/1/7/3/1/0/0 vs. 0/0/3/19/5/2/0. Day 14 : 0/5/6/1/0/0/0 vs. 0/5/17/1/2/1/3	Two weeks : Chest CT indicated that CT scores, the number of lobes involved, GGO, and consolidation, which reflected reduced lung inflammation in MSC group, were significantly better than those in Ctrl group MSC vs. Ctrl CT score : 8.50 (7.25, 9.00) vs. 10.00 (8.50, 12.50); P<0.05 Number of lobes involved : 2 (2, 2) vs. 3 (2, 3); P< 0.01 GGO : 4 (33.33%) vs. 19 (70.37%); P<0.05 Consolidation : 4 (33.33%) vs. 20 (74.07%); P<0.05
Xu et al.	The average time to improvement: MSC vs. Ctrl : (3.00 ± 3.05) d vs. (8.80 ± 10.77) d, P<0.05 There was no significant difference in either the length of hospital stay or in the number of days in the ICU between the two groups	MSC : There were no significant differences in FiO ₂ and SaO ₂ before and after MSCs infusion, but SpO ₂ (from 94.72 ± 3.4% to 96.04 ± 5.93%) and PaO ₂ (from 78.89 ± 25.86 mmHg to 95.62 ± 39.49 mmHg) were significantly improved	One month : The relative improvement rate was higher for MSC group than it was for Ctrl group. MSC vs. Ctrl : 85.0% (17/20) vs. 50% (6/12)
Häberle et al.	NR	At discharge, the MSC -treated patients showed a significantly lower Murray score of 0.3 + 0.1 than the Ctrl patients, who presented an average score of 1.3 + 1.1	NR
Lanzoni et al.	Time to recovery was significantly shorter in MSC group than in Ctrl group (P<0.05). The hazard ratio for recovery comparing Ctrl group with MSC group was 0.29	NR	NR

(95% CI: 0.09-0.95)			
Shi et al.	NR	<p>MSC: Day 1, the cough showed a significant improvement compared to the Ctrl group, but no difference was found at other time points. Day 1, 3, and 5, the expiratory dyspnea showed a significant improvement compared to the Ctrl group, but no difference was found at Day 7, 14, and 30</p> <p>MSC vs. Ctrl</p> <p>Six-category scale (scale 1~6): Day 10, 11/8/44/2/0/0; 6/6/23/0/0/0 6-MWT: Day 28, median (IQR): 420.00 (392.00, 465.00) m vs. 403.00 (352.00, 447.00) m mMRC dyspnea score (grade 0~4): 29/24/5/3/0 vs. 13/16/4/1/1 SaO₂: 97.10% vs. 96.97%</p>	<p>MSC vs. Ctrl</p> <p>Day 28: The change of total lesion proportion of the whole lung volume (median, 95% CI, %): -19.40 (-53.40, -2.62) vs. -7.30 (-46.59, 19.12) The change of solid component lesions (median, 95% CI, %): -57.70 (-74.95, -36.56) vs. -44.45 (-62.24, -8.82); $P < 0.05$ The change of GGO (%): -14.95 (-51.55, 7.29) -3.94 (-43.99, 32.55)</p>
Sánchez-Guijo et al.		<p>MSC: After a median follow-up of 16 days (IQR 9 days) after the first dose of MSCs, 9 (70%) patients had improved clinically and 7 (53%) were extubated with a median time from the first MSCs dose to extubation of 7 days (IQR 14 days)</p>	<p>NR</p> <p>MSC: Radiological improvement in sequential X-rays was confirmed in 4 patients</p>
Guo et al.	NR	<p>MSC: PaO₂/FiO₂: Increased from 242 (200–294) mmHg to 332 (288–364) mmHg, $P < 0.01$</p> <p>MSC: The oxygenation index increased into 329.00 (197.70–604.00) mmHg and 316.84 (93.30–531.00) mmHg in severe patients (n = 9) and critically severe patients (n = 6) with the oxygenation index in total 325.70 (93.30–604.00) mmHg on Day 7</p> <p>The oxygenation index was 356.95 (107.50–452.40) mmHg and 453.79 (306.00–552.30) mmHg in severe patients (n = 4) and critically severe patients (n = 4) with the oxygenation index in total 394.79 (107.50–552.30) mmHg on Day 14</p>	<p>NR</p>
Feng et al.	NR	<p>The oxygenation index was 356.95 (107.50–452.40) mmHg and 453.79 (306.00–552.30) mmHg in severe patients (n = 4) and critically severe patients (n = 4) with the oxygenation index in total 394.79 (107.50–552.30) mmHg on Day 14</p>	<p>MSC: The radiological presentations (GGO) all showed improvement compared with baseline</p>
Chen et al.	NR	<p>MSC: All cases gained clinical improvement</p>	<p>MSC: After MSCs therapy, 16 cases (64%) gained CT scan improvement</p>
Hashemian et al.		<p>MSC: Five patients significantly improved and were discharged from the ICU, 2 to 7 days after the infusions</p>	<p>MSC: The results of the survivors showed that the median time to relief after the first infusion was 2.5 days for fever, 3 days for respiratory rate ($\leq 24/\text{min}$), and 2 days for cough (mild or absent). Most patients described significant relief of their</p> <p>MSC: The lung CT was available after therapy in three survived cases. The lung CT scans of two patients showed significant resolution of opacities and the subpleural bands after completion of MSCs therapy</p>

			dyspnea and there was a decrease in respiratory rate within 48–96 h after the first cell infusion. The saturation of pulse oxygen significantly improved in survivors (9.2 [3.7 – 14.6]%) compared to non-survivors (6.6 [5.01–11.0]%)	
Iglesias et al.		<p>MSC: Patient 1: Discharged from the ICU on Day 10 and discharged from the hospital 2 weeks later. Patient 2: Discharged from the ICU on Day 12 and discharged from the hospital 4 days later. Patient 3: Discharged from the hospital on Day 21. Patients 4 and 5 died</p>	<p>MSC: The $\text{PaO}_2/\text{FiO}_2$ value improved immediately after injection of MSCs, and gradually increased in the next 7 days</p>	<p>MSC: Chest CT showed that the proportion of damaged lung parenchyma in the three surviving patients was significantly reduced following MSCs treatment, while that in the two patients who died did not decrease but increased</p>
Yilmaz et al.	NR		<p>MSC: After the first 2 times MSCs injection, the patient was awakened and extubated. The patient's vital signs were improved, especially after intrathecal and systemic MSCs transplantation. After the patient had been extubated, his neurological symptoms regressed, consciousness restored, and he could speak. After system transplantation of MSCs, the ejection fraction increased from 25% during cardiac arrest to 60%. After four times MSCs transplantation, the patient's heart functions have returned to normal</p>	<p>MSC: After the last time MSCs transplantation, bilateral lung symptoms regressed on control thorax CT</p>
Tang et al.	NR		<p>MSC: Case 1: Day 5: The symptoms of fever and dyspnea improved. SaO_2: 97%, PaO_2: 86 mmHg, FiO_2: 55%</p> <p>Case 2: Day 7: SaO_2: 99%, PaO_2: 169 mmHg, and FiO_2: 30%</p>	<p>MSC: Case 1: The X-ray on Day 1 and Day 5 showed the absorption of the exudate lesions in the bilateral lungs</p> <p>Case 2: The chest X-ray showed the absorption of high-density exudate in the lower lung fields and left middle lung</p>
Zhang et al.		<p>MSC: After 1 week of MSCs treatment, the patient felt better and was discharged after another day</p>	<p>MSC: Day 2, fever and shortness of breath disappeared. All the symptoms disappeared, and the SaO_2 rose to 98% at rest after transplantation 2~7 days</p> <p>MSC: Following MSCs transplantation, the need for inotropic agents started to disappear, hypoxemia, acidosis and electrolyte imbalance started to improve.</p> <p>Day 10, the patient was extubated and continued to be monitored in the ward, initially receiving nasal oxygen which was later discontinued. Two months, the patient had normal</p>	<p>MSC: Day 6, chest CT imaging showed that the GGO and pneumonia infiltration had largely reduced</p>
Zengin et al.	NR			<p>MSC: Day 7, lung chest X-ray showed slight regression in the GGO imaged infiltration in the middle right lung periphery and significant regression in the low-density infiltrations in the lower right lung and lateral left lung</p>

		clinical and laboratory signs and no adverse effects due to the procedure were identified	
Peng et al.	MSC: Day 11 , the patient recovered and discharged	MSC: The symptoms of dyspnea and dry cough improved significantly, and the endurance of daily activities improved. Oxygenation index and PaO ₂ gradually increased	MSC: Day 5 , the chest CT showed the bilateral infiltration was absorbed obviously
Soler et al.	MSC: Day 6 , the patient was discharged from the hospital	MSC: Day 4 , the lung function test was completely normal. Day 5 , the clinical symptoms related to the coronavirus had disappeared, but the loss of appetite and fatigue were maintained	MSC: Day 5 , CT showed significant improvement in the right pneumonia
Zhu et al.	MSC: Day 13 , the patient was discharged from the hospital	MSC: Day 2 , SpO ₂ recovered from 87% to 95%. Day 6 , the cough symptoms of the patient were relieved, and there was no sputum when coughing, and the ventilator was removed	MSC: Day 7 , CT showed that the GGO and pneumonia infiltration had reduced obviously
Liang et al.	MSC: Day 18 , the patient was discharged from the hospital	MSC: Day 8 , the patient was transferred out of ICU, and most of the vital signs and clinical laboratory indexes recovered to the normal level	MSC: CT images showed that the pulmonary inflammatory reaction was greatly alleviated
Tao et al.	MSC: Day 11 , the patient received lung transplantation. But died 77 days after lung transplantation because of transplant rejection	MSC: Day 2 , the consciousness and mental status began to get better. Pulmonary static compliance increased significantly, and PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ mostly maintained above 200 mmHg. ECMO and mechanical ventilation couldn't be removed due to no significant improvement in lung function	MSC: CT scan revealed more patchy shadows, grid-like changes, and enlarged heart, with shadows of gas and effusion in mediastinum and thoraxes, respectively

Abbreviations: **Ctrl**: Control group, ECMO: extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, GGO: ground-glass opacity, IQR: interquartile range, ICU: intensive care unit, **MSC**: mesenchymal stem cell treatment group, MSCs: mesenchymal stem cells, NR: not reported, PaO₂/FiO₂: arterial blood partial pressure of oxygen (PaO₂)/fraction of inspiration O₂ (FiO₂), SaO₂: oxygen saturation, SpO₂: peripheral oxygen saturation, 6-MWT: the 6-minute walk test

Note: Day: Time starts from the first injection of MSCs

625

Table 6 Laboratory outcome

Authors	HCoV-19 nucleic acid detection	Immune cells	Inflammatory cytokines
Leng et al.	<p>MSC: The critically severe patient 1: 13 days after transplantation, nucleic acid turned to be negative. Patients 3, 4, and 5 also turned to be negative for nucleic acid until this report date</p> <p>Ctrl: NR</p>	<p>MSC: Two common type patients (Patient 4 and 5): there was nearly no increase of regulatory T cells (CXCR3-) or DC (CXCR3-). The severe patients: both the regulatory T cells and DC increased after the cell therapy. The critically severe patient 1: Day 6, the overactivated T cells and NK cells nearly disappeared and the numbers of the other cell subpopulations were almost restored to the normal levels, especially the regulatory DC (CD14+CD11c+CD11b^{mid}) population</p> <p>Ctrl: No significant DC (CXCR3-) enhancement was observed</p>	<p>MSC: The critically severe patient 1: CRP level decreased from 105.5 g/L to 10.1g/L; AST, CK activity and myoglobin were decreased to normal reference values in 2~4 days after treatment.</p> <p>Compared with Ctrl group, the decrease ratio of TNF-α and the increase ratio of IL-10 before and after MSC treatment of MSC group were significant ($p < 0.05$). The serum levels of IP-10 and VEGF were both increased, though not significantly</p> <p>The laboratory parameters improved in both groups</p> <p>MSC: two moderate type patients and two severe type patients with high baseline IL-6 exhibited a decline of IL-6 within 3 days after MSCs infusion and remained stable during the following 4 days. No such trend in the patients with lower plasma IL-6 levels, which suggested that the patients with high IL-6 might be more likely to benefit from MSCs treatment</p> <p>There was a reduced trend in the levels of inflammatory cytokines (including IFN-γ, TNF-α, MCP-1, IP-10, IL-22, IL-1Ra, IL-18, IL-8, and MIP-1) within 14 days</p> <p>Ctrl: NR</p>
Meng et al.	<p>The anti-SARSCoV-2 IgM antibody tests were positive for all patients. The median IgG and IgM antibodies titer numerically but not statistically decreased between the two group</p>	NR	
Shu et al.	NR	Compared with Ctrl group, the time for the LYM count of MSC group to return to the normal range was significantly faster	Day 3: Compared with Ctrl group, CRP and IL-6 levels were significantly decreased from of stem cell infusion in MSC group
Xu et al.	<p>The nucleic acid turns into negative</p> <p>time:MSC (15.75 ± 13.71) days; Ctrl (18.31 ± 9.86) days</p>	NR	<p>MSC: There were no significant differences in CRP and IL-6 before and after MSC infusion</p> <p>Ctrl: NR</p>
Shi et al.	NR	There was no significant difference in the subsets of peripheral LYM counts (CD4+ T cells , CD8+ T cells , B cells , NK cells) between Ctrl group and MSC group at Day 0 , 6 , 10 , and 14	There was no significant difference in plasma markers (IL-6 , IL-8 , IFN-γ , IL-1Ra , IL-18 , MCP-1 , MIP-1α , and IP-10) between Ctrl group and MSC group at Day 0 , 6 , 10 , and 14
Häberle et al.	NR	MSC: Compared with Ctrl group, significant reduction in WBCs and NE , and significant increase in LYM were be found	MSC: Compared with Ctrl group, CRP and IL-6 were not significant difference; but ferritin levels showed a significant increase
Lanzoni et	The median viral	NR	Day 6 , the concentrations of GM-CSF ,

al.	load at Day 0 or Day 6 did not differ significantly between MSC group and Ctrl group		IFN-g, IL-5, IL-6, IL-7, TNF-α, TNF-β, PDGF-BB and RANTES in MSC group were significantly lower than those in Ctrl group ($P < 0.05$). The difference of IL-2 is very close to statistical significance ($P = 0.051$). In longitudinal analysis, only in MSC group, the inflammatory cytokine concentration showed a statistically significant decrease from Day 0 to Day 6
Sánchez-Guijo et al.	NR	MSC: LYM subset analysis was available in six improved patients at Day 10 , and the levels of total LYMs (5/6), B (4/6) and CD4+ (5/6) and CD8+ (5/6) and T (6/6) cells were observed an increase	MSC: Day 5 , a decrease in inflammatory parameters associated with MSC therapy was observed in the nine improved clinically patients (n): D-dimer: 5/8; Ferritin: 5/8; CRP: 8/9; Fibrinogen: 5/9; LDH: 9/9 MSC: Comparison before and after MSC treatment: CRP (mg/L): 13.39 (1.30–38.86) vs. 0.50 (0.50–6.40) $P < 0.01$ PCT (ng/ml): 0.07 (0.05–0.09) vs. 0.04 (0.03–0.06) $P < 0.01$ IL-6 (pg/ml): 13.78 (5.69–25.26) vs. 4.86 (2.13 – 8.19) $P < .001$ D-dimer (ng/ml): 495 (320–727) vs. 288 (197–537) $P < 0.01$
Guo et al.	MSC: After the first infusion of MSCs, the SARS-CoV-2 PCR results of 30 patients (96.8%) became negative after a mean time of 10.7 $\pm$ 4.2 days	MSC: Comparison before and after MSC treatment: WBC ($\times 10^9$ /ml): 6.72 ± 2.62 vs. 6.43 ± 1.72 , $P = 0.3461$; LYM ($\times 10^9$ /ml): 1.09 (0.68–1.35) vs. 1.43 (1.02–2.20) $P < 0.01$	
Feng et al.	NR	MSC: The WBC count was similar in each follow-up, whereas the LYM count showed recovery after MSCs transplantation Only got 5 (5/16) patients' results enrolled at Day 28 : The CD4+ T cells , CD8+ T cells and NK cells , showed recovery after MSCs transplantation	MSC: The cytokines, including IL-2, IL-4, IL-6, IL-10, TNF-α, IFN-γ and CRP , varied in the normal range after MSCs transplantation. PCT level was relatively low in the enrolled patients
Chen et al.	NR	NR	MSC: Inflammation indexes, including WBC counts, CRP , PCT and IL-6 did not change significantly after MSCs therapy. However, the serum levels of LAC , cTnT and CK-MB elevated significantly MSC: Analysis of biomarkers on Day 0 (baseline) and Day 5 after the first infusion (24 h after the last infusion) showed a significant reduction in IL-8, TNF-α, and CRP in all six survivors . Serum IL-6 levels decreased in five (5/6) patients and INF-γ levels decreased in four (4/6) patients. Anti-inflammatory cytokines including IL-4 and IL-10 levels increased in four (4/6) patients, but the differences were not statistically significant
Hashemian et al.	NR	NR	MSC: All patients developed increased D-dimer concentrations after
Iglesias et al.	NR	MSC: Total LYMs were minimally elevated 7 days post-infusion. Only	

		patient 1 had a decrease in total LYMs from 1570/ml to 984/ml	the first 24 hours post-infusion of between 2738 ng/ml and 4712 ng/ml. After this time, D-dimer concentrations decreased; however, there were value fluctuations due to patients' added complications. CRP concentrations remained normal in patients 1, 2, and 3 during the first 7 days. In the patients who died (Patients 4 and 5), CRP concentrations increased during the same period
Yilmaz et al.	NR	MSC: The number of TH-2 cells increased, and the number of TH-1 cells decreased in the immune modulation after MSC transplantation. After the first MSC transplant, the proportions of CD4+T cells and CD8+T cells were 66 % and 26.7 %, respectively. After the second and third MSC transplantations, the proportion of CD4+T cells was 42.9 % and 39.1 %, while that of CD8+T cells was 18.7 % and 22 %, respectively	MSC: After the first MSC transplantation, the values of AST , ALT , LDH , CK , pro-BNP , ferritin , triglyceride , fibrinogen , ammonia , and myoglobin began to decrease. The second time the MSCs had been given, CRP reached normal values
Zengin et al.	NR	NR	MSC: The CRP levels regressed
Tang et al.	MSC: Case 1: The patient's nucleic acid test turned negative Case 2: The patient's nucleic acid test turned negative on Day 8	MSC: Case 1: The LYM increased. Case 2: The LYM increased.	MSC: Case 1: The inflammation indicators (CRP , IL-6) decreased Case 2: The inflammation indicators (CRP) decreased
Zhang et al.	MSC: Day 6 , nucleic acid turned to be negative	MSC: The immunoregulatory function of MSCs contributed to the main efficacy outcome. The percentage and counts of CD3+ T cell , CD4+ T cell , and CD8+ T cell were increased	MSC: The CRP levels and inflammatory factors (IL-6 and TNF-α) were all decreased after MSC treatment
Peng et al.	MSC: Day 4 , the nucleic acid test was negative	MSC: The absolute NE count continued to decrease; the absolute LYM count gradually increased MSC: One week, the absolute number of LYMs of the patient was significantly increased (Total LYMs: from 201/ml to 651/ml; T cells: from 152/ml to 547/ml; B cells: from 21.8/ml to 46.8/ml; NK cells from 17.9/ml to 29.3/ml). Day 13 , the number of LYM and NE returned to normal	MSC: IL-6 continued to decrease
Zhu et al.	MSC: Day 13 , the nucleic acid was negative		MSC: Time to return to normal range: Day 5: BUN ; Day 10: AST , ALT ; Day 13: CRP , PCT
Soler et al.	MSC: Day 4 , the nucleic acid was negative	NR	MSC: Day 5 , all biochemical indicators were within the normal range
Liang et al.	MSC: Day 8 , the nucleic acid was negative	MSC: After the second administration, the WBC count and NE count decreased to the normal level, along with the LYM count increased to the normal level as well. The counts of CD3+ T cell , CD4+ T cell , and CD8+	MSC: After the second administration, the concentrations of serum bilirubin , CRP , ALT and AST gradually reduced, along with some other vital signs also improved. The D-dimer levels also decreased gradually

Tao et al. **T cell** also remarkably increased to normal levels. The **NE-to-LYM** ratio also decreased gradually
MSC: The number of **LYM** began to increase. However, the number of **WBC** and **NEs** remained high **MSC: Blood creatinine** and **BUN** declined remarkably, suggesting renal function began to improve

Abbreviations: ALT: alanine aminotransferase, AST: aspartate transaminase, BNP: B-type natriuretic peptide, BUN: blood urea nitrogen; CK: creatine kinase, CK-MB: creatine kinase-MB, CRP: C-reactive protein, cTnT: cardiac troponin T, **Ctrl**: Control group, DC: dendritic cells, GM-CSF: granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor, INF- γ or IFN- γ : interferon- γ , IFN-g: interferon-g, IL-1RA: interleukin-1RA, IL-2: interleukin-2, IL-4: interleukin-4, IL-5: interleukin-5, IL-6: interleukin-6, IL-7: interleukin-7, IL-8: interleukin-8, IL-10: interleukin-10, IL-18: interleukin-18, IL-22: interleukin-22, IP-10: interferon-inducible protein-10, LAC: lactate; LDH: lactate dehydrogenase, LYM: lymphocyte, MCP-1: monocyte chemotactic protein-1, MIP-1 α : macrophage inflammatory protein-1 α , **MSC**: mesenchymal stem cell treatment group, MSC: mesenchymal stem cell, NE: Neutrophil, NK: natural killer, NR: not reported, PCT: procalcitonin, PDGF-BB: platelet derived growth factor-BB, RANTES: regulated upon activation normal T cell expressed and secreted factor, TNF- α : tumor necrosis factor- α , TNF- β : tumor necrosis factor- β , VEGF: vascular endothelial growth factor, WBC: white blood cell
Note: Day: Time starts from the first injection of MSCs

638 **Figure Legends**

639 **Figure 1** Flow chart

640 **Figure 2** Pooled estimate for the number of adverse events

641 **Figure 3** Pooled estimate for mortality. **A** Forest plots of mortality. **B** Funnel plot of mortality

Identification

Records identified through
database searching
(n = 1582)

Screening

Records after duplicates
removed
(n = 1582)

Records screened
(n = 1582)

Records excluded by title and
abstract
(n = 1413)

Eligibility

Full-text articles assessed
for eligibility
(n = 169)

Full-text articles excluded
with reasons (n = 147):
Studies on the treatment of
MSC-derived exosomes or
extracellular vesicles (n = 29)
Reviews, Letters (without
data), editorials, commentary,
opinion (n = 112)
Repetition (n = 3)
Study on follow-up data after
discharge (n = 1)
No full-text available (n = 1)
Study with incomplete data
(n = 1)

Studies included in
qualitative synthesis
(n = 22)

Included

Studies included in
quantitative synthesis
(meta-analysis)
(n = 22)

A

B