Study name	PCR	Fatigue Assessment	Time point (Days)	Statist	ics for eac	:h study		E <u>vent</u>	rate and 9	95% CI	
				Event rate	Lower limit	Upper limit					
Bliddal et al 2021	+	Self-report	14	0.162	0.117	0.220					
Cirulli et al 2020	+	Self-report	16	0.054	0.030	0.094					
				0.097	0.031	0.262				•	
							-1.00	-0.50	0.00	0.50	1.00

Figure S-4a. Prevalence of self-reported fatigue during the first month of COVID-19 recovery within samples recruited through patient registries or epidemiological datasets.

Study name	PCI	R Fatigue Assessment	Time point (Days)					Event	rate and 9	95% CI	
				Event rate	Lower limit	Upper limit					
Bliddal et al 20	21 +	Self-report	70	0.163	0.109	0.237					
Cirulli et al 202	0 +	Self-report	76	0.080	0.042	0.146					
Horvath et al 20	020 +	Self-report	69	0.029	0.010	0.087					
				0.082	0.034	0.188			•		
							-1 00	-0.50	0.00	0.50	1 00

Figure S-4b. Prevalence of self-reported fatigue during the third month of COVID-19 recovery within samples recruited through patient registries or epidemiological datasets.

Study name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Statis	stics for ea	ch study			Risk	ratio and 9	5% CI	
			Risk ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Woo et al. 2021	Surivors vs. Controls	85	4.053	0.230	71.379	0.956	0.339		-	_		—
Cirulli et al 2020	Surivors vs. Controls	76	5.530	2.746	11.136	4.789	0.000			.	╼═┵	
Xiong et al 2020	Surivors vs. Controls	97	3.058	1.907	4.905	4.637	0.000			-   -∎	╋	
			3.688	2.502	5.436	6.592	0.000			-	<b>→</b>	
								0.01	0.1	1	10	100

Figure S-4c. Fatigue incidence comparison between COVID-19 recovery and Healthy Controls during follow-up conducted 76 to 97 days post-recovery.

Study name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Stati	stics for ea	ch study			Risk	ratio and 9	5% <b>C</b> I	
			Risk ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Landi et al 2021	PCR Neg vs. Pos	47	1.028	0.651	1.621	0.117	0.907			-		
Su et al 2020	PCR Neg vs. Pos	30	0.599	0.341	1.052	-1.783	0.075					
			0.806	0.476	1.363	-0.806	0.420			<b>*</b>		
								0.01	0.1	1	10	100

Figure S-4d. Fatigue incidence comparison between patients with negative PCR results and patients retested positive for COVID-19

Study name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Statis	tics for ea	ch study			Odds	ratio and 9	95% CI	
			Odds ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Bliddal et al. 2021	Females vs. Males	84	2.200	1.015	4.769	1.997	0.046			<b>⊢=</b>	_	
Huang et al 2020	Females vs. Males	180	1.330	1.055	1.677	2.409	0.016					
Xiong et al 2020	Females vs. Males	97	1.887	1.280	2.782	3.205	0.001			-		
Sykes et al 2021	Females vs. Males	113	2.937	1.404	6.145	2.860	0.004			-	- │	
			1.782	1.273	2.495	3.366	0.001			•		
								0.01	0.1	4	10	100

Figure S-4e. Self-reported Fatigue incidence comparison between Female and Male that recovered from COVID-19.

Group by	Study name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Statist	ics for ea	ch study			Odd	ds ratio and 95	% CI	
Report type				Odds ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Self-report	Bliddal et al. 2021	Females vs. Males	84	2.200	1.015	4.769	1.997	0.046		1	<b>├</b>	<b>-</b>	
Self-report	Huang et al 2020	Females vs. Males	180	1.330	1.055	1.677	2.409	0.016					
Self-report	Xiong et al 2020	Females vs. Males	97	1.887	1.280	2.782	3.205	0.001			- <del></del> -		
Self-report	Sykes et al 2021	Females vs. Males	113	2.937	1.404	6.145	2.860	0.004			—	<b>-</b>	
Self-report				1.904	1.124	3.226	2.394	0.017				•	
Validated	Venturelli et al. 2021	Females vs. Males	81	0.847	0.621	1.156	-1.046	0.295					
Validated	Townsend et al 2020	Females vs. Males	72	2.867	1.478	5.559	3.117	0.002			-	<b>-</b>	
Validated	El Sayed et al 2020	Females vs. Males	12	0.596	0.358	0.993	-1.988	0.047			-		
Validated	Halpin et al 2020	Females vs. Males	48	2.827	1.241	6.441	2.474	0.013			-	<b></b> ∣	
Validated				1.285	0.751	2.199	0.915	0.360			-		
									0.01	0.1	1	10	100

Figure S-4f. Gender differences in fatigue grouped by fatigue report type.

Study name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Statis	tics for ea	ch study			Odds	ratio and 9	<u>5% C</u> I	
			Odds ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Mandal et al 2020	Severe vs. Non-severe	54	1.592	0.765	3.310	1.244	0.214			+=-		1
Xiong et al 2020	Severe vs. Non-severe	97	1.284	0.876	1.881	1.281	0.200					
			1.344	0.958	1.886	1.711	0.087			•		
								0.01	0.1	1	10	100

Figure S-4g. Self-reported Fatigue incidence comparison between recovery from severe and non-severe COVID-19.

Study name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Statist	ics for ea	ch study			Odds	s ratio and 95	5% CI	
			Odds ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value					
Halpin et al. 2020	ICU vs. Ward	48	1.683	0.677	4.185	1.120	0.263			+=-	-	
Townsend et al 2020	ICU vs. Ward	72	0.550	0.194	1.556	-1.127	0.260		-			
			0.991	0.332	2.960	-0.017	0.987			<b>*</b>		
								0.01	0.1	1	10	100

Figure S-4h. Fatigue incidence measured by validated scale between patients discharged from ICU and hospital Wards.

udy name	Comparison	Time point (Days)		Statis	stics for eac	:h study			
			Odds ratio	Lower limit	Upper limit	Z-Value	p-Value		
kes et al 2020	ICU vs. Ward	113	0.716	0.295	1.740	-0.738	0.461		
e Graaf et al. 2021	ICU vs. Ward	42	2.229	0.416	11.944	0.936	0.350		
Garrigues et al 2020	ICU vs. Ward	97	1.185	0.479	2.929	0.367	0.714		
			1.024	0.566	1.853	0.078	0.938		
								0.01	c

Figure S-4i. Self-reported Fatigue incidence comparison between patients discharged from ICU and hospital Wards.