

1 **Evaluation of primary allied healthcare in patients recovering**
2 **from COVID-19: first results after six months follow-up in a**
3 **Dutch nationwide prospective cohort study**

4
5 Anne I. Slotegraaf^{1†}, Marissa H.G. Gerards^{2,3†}, Arie C. Verburg⁴, Marian A.E. de van der
6 Schueren^{1,5}, Hinke M. Kruijenga⁶, Maud J.L. Graff^{4,7}, Edith H.C. Cup⁷, Johanna G. Kalf⁷,
7 Antoine F. Lenssen³, Willemijn M. Meijer⁸, Renée A. Kool⁹, Rob A. de Bie², Philip J. van der
8 Wees^{4,7}, Thomas J. Hoogeboom⁴, on behalf of the Dutch Consortium Allied Healthcare
9 COVID-19.

10 †These authors contributed equally to this work.

11
12 *Author affiliations:*

13 ¹Division of Human Nutrition and Health, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen,
14 the Netherlands

15 ²Department of Epidemiology, Care and Public Health Institute (CAPHRI), Faculty of Health,
16 Medicine and Life sciences, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands

17 ³Department of Physical Therapy, Maastricht university medical centre, Maastricht, the
18 Netherlands

19 ⁴Radboud Institute for Health Sciences, IQ healthcare, Radboud university medical centre,
20 Nijmegen, the Netherlands

21 ⁵Department of Nutrition, Dietetics and Lifestyle, HAN University of Applied Sciences,
22 Nijmegen, the Netherlands

23 ⁶Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Nutrition &
24 Dietetics, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Aging and Vitality, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

25 ⁷Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Department of Rehabilitation, Radboud
26 university medical centre, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

27 ⁸Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research, Nivel, Utrecht, the Netherlands

28 ⁹Lung Foundation Netherlands, Amersfoort, the Netherlands
29

30 **Abstract**

31 *Objectives:* To report the recovery of patients receiving primary allied healthcare after a
32 COVID-19 infection at a six-month follow-up, and to explore which patient characteristics are
33 associated with the changes in outcomes between the baseline and six-month follow-up.

34 *Design:* Prospective cohort study.

35 *Setting:* Allied healthcare in Dutch primary care.

36 *Participants:* 1,452 adult patients recovering from COVID-19 and receiving treatment from one
37 or more primary care allied health professional(s) (i.e., dietitian, exercise therapist, occupational
38 therapist, physical therapist and/or speech and language therapist).

39 *Results:* For participation (USER-P range 0 to 100), estimated mean differences of at least 2.3
40 points were observed after six months. For HRQoL (EQ-VAS range 0 to 100), the mean
41 increase was 12.31 at six months. Furthermore, significant improvements were found for
42 fatigue (FSS range 1 to 7): the mean decrease was -0.7 at six months. For physical functioning
43 (PROMIS-PF range 13.8 to 61.3), the mean increase was 5.9 at six months. Mean differences
44 of -0.8 for anxiety (HADS range 0 to 21), and -1.5 for depression (HADS range 0 to 21), were
45 found after six months. A better baseline score, hospital admission and male sex were associated
46 with a positive change in score between the baseline and six-month follow-up, whereas age,
47 BMI, comorbidities and smoking status were not associated with mean changes in any outcome
48 measure.

49 *Conclusions:* Patients recovering from COVID-19 who receive primary allied healthcare make
50 progress in recovery, but still experience many limitations in their daily activities after six
51 months. Our findings provide reference values to healthcare providers and healthcare policy-
52 makers regarding what to expect from the recovery of patients who received health care from
53 one or more primary care allied health professionals.

54

55 *Trial registration:* Clinicaltrials.gov registry (NCT04735744).

56

57 **Introduction**

58

59 An estimated 32–57% of patients recovering from a COVID-19 infection experience severe and
60 long-term problems in daily functioning and participation.[1-3] It is becoming increasingly
61 clear that both patients with mild symptoms and those with serious symptoms during the acute
62 COVID-19 infection are at risk of developing post-COVID-19 syndrome.[1, 2, 4, 5] Post-
63 COVID-19 syndrome, also referred to as ‘long COVID’, is defined as ‘signs and symptoms that
64 develop during or after a COVID-19 infection, continuing for more than 12 weeks, [that] are
65 not explained by an alternative diagnosis’.[6-8] To date, it is unknown what treatment is needed
66 to support patients in their recovery from COVID-19.

67

68 Patients recovering from COVID-19 often experience persistent problems in their daily
69 activities related to limitations in physical, nutritional, cognitive and mental functioning.[3, 5,
70 9-11] Fatigue is the most prevalent and persistent symptom, irrespective of the severity of the
71 initial infection.[3, 5, 10, 12, 13] Longitudinal data suggest that fatigue does not resolve over
72 time in many patients, even if they receive healthcare.[3, 9, 10, 13, 14] Increased levels of
73 fatigue can result in lower levels of physical activity [15] and limit patients in activities of daily
74 living (e.g., housekeeping and grocery shopping) and outdoor pursuits.[16] Mental problems
75 such as anxiety and depression are common in patients recovering from COVID-19. A study
76 by Huang et al. (2021) showed that anxiety, depression and sleep difficulties were present in
77 approximately 25% of patients six months after the onset of COVID-19 symptoms.[17] Sisó-
78 Almirall et al. (2021) showed that 36% of patients still reported mental problems after three
79 months, and no significant associations were found with COVID-19 severity.[10] Furthermore,
80 previous studies observed a worsened health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in patients
81 recovering from COVID-19, both hospitalised and non-hospitalised, which did not recuperate
82 after a follow-up period of several months.[9, 18-21]

83

84 Based on the overall effects of primary allied healthcare, it is expected that allied health
85 professionals (i.e. dietitians, exercise therapists, occupational therapists, physical therapists and
86 speech and language therapists) can play a role in the recovery of patients with COVID-19 who
87 experience persistent limitations in daily physical functioning and participation.[22-25] In July
88 2020, the Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sports instated a temporary regulation in
89 primary allied health care to facilitate the treatment of patients recovering from COVID-19 and

90 to stimulate research. This regulation enables the reimbursement of primary allied health care
91 for every patient from basic health insurance coverage. With a referral from a general
92 practitioner (GP) or medical specialist, primary allied healthcare treatment is reimbursed for a
93 period of six months. If recovery during this period is insufficient, an extension by a second
94 six-month period is possible upon referral by a medical specialist. As COVID-19 is still a novel
95 condition and the evidence base for allied health treatment in patients with post-COVID-19
96 syndrome is small, it is vital that new data and insights are shared as soon as they are available;
97 therefore, the aim of the current paper is to present the results of recovery by patients receiving
98 primary allied healthcare after a COVID-19 infection. We provide outcomes at three- and six-
99 months follow-ups regarding participation, HRQoL, physical functioning, fatigue and
100 psychological well-being. In addition, we explore which baseline characteristics are associated
101 with changes in these outcomes between the baseline and six-month follow-up.

102 **Methods**

103

104 **Study design and setting**

105 As part of a nationwide project to evaluate the recovery of patients receiving primary allied
106 healthcare after a COVID-19 infection, a prospective cohort study was set up in collaboration
107 with various patient organisations (i.e., the Lung Foundation Netherlands, the Netherlands
108 Patient Federation and Harteraad) and with input from patients contacted through these
109 organisations.[26] In this prospective cohort study, patients were included at the start of their
110 treatment with one or more allied health professionals. The patients received follow-ups at
111 three-month intervals for one year after inclusion. All treatment trajectories offered by allied
112 health professionals in daily practice were part of usual care, and were preferably based on
113 recommendations and guidelines published by the professional bodies of the respective care
114 providers as available at the start of the research.[22-25] The inclusion period for the cohort
115 study was between 29th March 2021 and 19th June 2021. Primary outcome measures were
116 assessed at the baseline (T0), and again after three months (T1), six months (T2), nine months
117 (T3) and 12 months (T4). The primary endpoint of the study was set at six months (T2). In the
118 present paper, we will report the results of our primary outcome measures at the three- and six-
119 month follow-ups.

120

121 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the medical ethics committee of Radboud
122 university medical centre (Registration #2020-7278). The study has been registered in the
123 clinicaltrials.gov registry (NCT04735744). Informed consent was obtained from all patients
124 before enrolment in the study.

125

126 **Participants**

127 Adult patients (aged ≥ 18 years) were eligible for inclusion in the cohort if they were recovering
128 from COVID-19 and started treatment with one or more primary care allied health professionals
129 (i.e., a dietitian, exercise therapist, occupational therapist, physical therapist and/or speech and
130 language therapist). Patients may have followed trajectories with one or more allied health
131 professionals during the course of the study. Patients were included regardless of their hospital
132 admission status during the acute phase of COVID-19. Patients who were unable to complete
133 questionnaires in Dutch and patients who were receiving palliative care were excluded from the
134 study.

135

136 **Data collection**

137 Patients could enrol in the study by a) signing up after an invitation by their treating allied
138 health professional, or b) signing up on their own initiative, upon which the research team also
139 invited the treating allied health professional to participate. The enrolment procedure of this
140 study is described in detail in the published study protocol.[26] Both patients and allied health
141 professionals reported data via the specifically designed YourResearch® application. Patients
142 were asked to download an application on their smartphones or make use of a web application.
143 Questionnaires were sent out through this application at the start of the treatment (baseline),
144 and after three, six, nine and 12 months. Patients unable to participate via digital methods were
145 given the opportunity to complete the questionnaires on paper and return them by post. Allied
146 health professionals were asked to use a web application and report data on patient
147 characteristics and profession-specific outcome measures. These profession-specific outcome
148 measures are not included in the present paper but will be reported elsewhere.

149

150

151 **Outcome measures**

152 Data on patient characteristics were collected by the treating allied health professional at the
153 start of the treatment. Patient-reported outcome domains participation, HRQoL, fatigue and
154 physical functioning were assessed at the baseline, and after three and six months. Data on
155 psychological well-being were collected at the baseline and after six months.

156

157 *Patient characteristics*

158 Patient characteristics were collected via an online record form and contained the following
159 items on demographics: age, sex, height (in cm), weight (in kg) both at the start of treatment
160 and before COVID-19 infection, living status and whether the patient had an informal caregiver.
161 Furthermore, data on symptom severity at the onset of treatment (i.e., mild to moderate (mild
162 symptoms up to mild pneumonia), severe (dyspnoea, hypoxia, or <50% lung involvement on
163 imaging), or critical (respiratory failure, shock, or multiorgan system dysfunction), definitions
164 as described in [27]), as well as hospital admissions during the acute phase of COVID-19 (i.e.,
165 no hospital admission, admission to hospital ward or intensive care unit), were recorded. The
166 following items were included about the allied healthcare treatment trajectory: referring
167 physician, treatment goals, and mono- or multidisciplinary treatment. Additionally, data on
168 comorbidities (i.e., cardiovascular disease, chronic lung disease, diabetes mellitus, kidney

169 disease, liver disease, immune disease, oncological disease, chronic neuromuscular disorders)
170 and smoking status were collected. Body weight and height were used to calculate each
171 patient's body mass index (BMI) ($\text{weight}/\text{height}^2$) and was categorised as defined by the World
172 Health Organisation (WHO).[28]

173

174 *Participation*

175 Participation was assessed with the Utrecht Scale for Evaluation of Rehabilitation-Participation
176 (USER-P). The USER-P is a 31-item self-administered questionnaire reflecting a patient's
177 participation in daily life, divided over three subscales: frequencies, restrictions and
178 satisfaction. The total scores range from 0 to 100 for each subscale, with higher scores
179 indicating better participation (higher frequency, fewer restrictions and higher satisfaction).[29]
180 We arbitrarily assumed a 5.0-point difference on one of these USER-P scales to be clinically
181 relevant for patients recovering from COVID-19.

182

183 *Health-related quality of life*

184 HRQoL was assessed with the EQ-5D-5L, a five-item questionnaire measuring a person's status
185 in five dimensions of health: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and
186 anxiety/depression.[30] Furthermore, the EQ visual analogue scale (VAS) was recorded by the
187 patients. The EQ-VAS provides a quantitative measure of the patient's perception of their
188 overall health in a score ranging from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating a higher HRQoL.
189 A difference of 8.0 points on the EQ-VAS was considered clinically relevant.[31]

190

191 *Fatigue*

192 Fatigue was assessed with the Fatigue Severity Scale (FSS), a nine-item scale measuring the
193 severity of fatigue and its effect on patients' activities and lifestyle. the scoring of each item
194 ranges from 1 to 7, where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 7 indicates strong agreement.
195 The total score is calculated by the mean value of the nine items, with a score of 4 or more
196 indicating severe fatigue.[32] A difference of 0.45 points on the FSS mean score was considered
197 clinically relevant.[33]

198

199 *Physical functioning*

200 Limitations in physical functioning were assessed with the PROMIS Physical Functioning
201 Short Form 10b (PROMIS-PF-10b), a 10-item questionnaire measuring the self-reported ability
202 to perform the activities of daily life. Items reflect four subcategories: upper extremities

203 (dexterity), lower extremities (walking or mobility), and central regions (neck and back), as
204 well as instrumental activities of daily living, such as running errands.[34] Total scores range
205 from 13.8 (severely physically impaired) to 61.3 (not physically impaired), with a mean score
206 of 50 (SD 10) representing the mean score of a reference population.[35] A difference of 3.6
207 points was considered clinically relevant.[36]

208

209 *Psychological well-being*

210 The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) was used to assess psychological well-
211 being. This 14-item self-administered questionnaire describes symptoms of anxiety and
212 depression. The HADS is divided into an Anxiety score (HADS-A) and a Depression score
213 (HADS-D), each containing seven items. The total score ranges from 0 to 21 for both subscales,
214 where a total score of 11 or more indicates a probable clinical diagnosis of depression or
215 anxiety.[37, 38] A difference of 1.7 points was considered clinically relevant.[39]

216

217 **Statistical analyses**

218 Descriptive statistics were used to describe the patient population and to analyse the primary
219 outcome measures at the baseline and after three and six months, using numbers and proportions
220 for categorical variables, means with standard deviations (SD), and medians with interquartile
221 ranges (IQR) for continuous variables. Linear mixed model analyses were used to evaluate
222 recovery over time for participation, HRQoL, fatigue and physical functioning. This analysis
223 accounts for correlation between repeated measures on the same subject and uses all available
224 data from this subject. A model with a random intercept and all other variables fixed was also
225 generated. The primary outcomes were used as dependent variables, while time (categorical:
226 baseline, three and six months) was used as a fixed factor. Paired samples t-tests were performed
227 to evaluate recovery of psychological well-being at the six-month follow-up.

228

229 Uni- and multivariate regression analyses were used to explore which baseline characteristics
230 were associated with the change in score for the main outcome measures between the baseline
231 (T0) and the six-month follow-up (T2). This analysis used data from complete cases, and
232 missingness at random (MAR) was tested (Supplemental File 1). Univariate analyses were
233 performed to determine which baseline characteristics (i.e., age, sex, BMI, hospitalisation,
234 comorbidities, baseline score and smoking status) were associated with the mean change in
235 each outcome measure. Comorbidities were coded into three categories: none, 1, and 2 or more
236 comorbidities. Variables with $p < 0.157$ in the univariate regression were included in the

237 multivariate model [40]. The backward elimination of variables was then performed in order of
238 statistical significance until only factors that were significantly associated with the outcome
239 remained. A p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant for all analyses, based on
240 two-sided testing. All data were analysed using SPSS statistics 25(IBM).

241

242 **Patient and public involvement**


243 During the development of the current study, we involved patients to give feedback on the
244 readability and appropriateness of proposed measures. The usability of the smartphone and
245 web-based applications was also tested by patients. Participating patients received updates on
246 the status of the study via their smartphone or the web application. Furthermore, various patient
247 organisations (i.e., the Lung Foundation Netherlands, the Netherlands Patient Federation and
248 Harteraad) participated during routine research meetings.

249 **Results**

250

251 **Patient characteristics**

252 In total, 1,452 patients were included in this study (Figure 1), receiving 1,708 different allied
253 healthcare treatment trajectories. Their mean age was 49 (SD 13) years, and 64% of the patient
254 population was female (Table 1). The majority (77%) had not been hospitalised for COVID-
255 19, and 76% had experienced a mild to moderate severity of symptoms during the infection
256 period. The mean (SD) BMI was 28 (6) kg/m², and 69% of the patient population was classified
257 as being overweight or obese (BMI > 25 kg/m²). One comorbidity was reported by 31% of the
258 patients, and two or more comorbidities were reported by 12% of the patients. Cardiovascular
259 disease (15%) and chronic lung disease (14%) were the most prevalent comorbidities. Most
260 patients (82%) had been referred for primary allied healthcare by their GP.



261

262 **Figure 1.** Flow diagram inclusion of patients recovering from COVID-19 receiving primary allied healthcare, with
263 follow-ups after three and six months from the start of treatment. *Abbreviations:* USER-P: Utrecht Scale for
264 Evaluation of Rehabilitation Participation. EQ-VAS: EuroQol Visual Analogue Scale. FSS: Fatigue Severity
265 Scale. PROMIS: Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System. HADS: Hospital Anxiety and
266 Depression Scale.

267 **Table 1.** General characteristics of patients recovering from COVID-19 receiving primary allied
 268 healthcare.

	Total group (n = 1452)
Treatment trajectories, n (%)	1708
Physical therapy/exercise therapy	1005 (59)
Occupational therapy	364 (21)
Dietary care	224 (13)
Speech and language therapy	115 (7)
Sex, n (%)	^a n = 1330
Male	482 (36)
Female	848 (64)
Age, mean ± SD	^a n = 1331 49 ± 13
COVID-19 severity, n (%)	^a n = 1311
Mild/moderate	1002 (76)
Serious	271 (21)
Very serious	38 (3)
Admission to hospital for COVID-19 infection, n (%)	^a n = 1315
Hospitalised including intensive care	87 (7)
Hospitalised	213 (16)
Not hospitalised	1015 (77)
BMI, mean ± SD	^a n = 1071 28 ± 6
Underweight (<18.5 kg/m ²)	10 (1)
Normal weight (18.5–25 kg/m ²)	323 (30)
Overweight (25–30 kg/m ²)	404 (38)
Obesity (>30 kg/m ²)	334 (31)
Smoking status, n (%)	^a n = 1305
Current	63 (5)
Former	166 (13)
Never	1076 (82)
Living status, n (%)	^a n = 1322
Alone	212 (16)
Cohabiting	1110 (84)
Informal carer, n (%)	^a n = 1319
Yes	526 (40)
No	793 (60)
Comorbidities, n (%)	^a n = 1331
No comorbidities	766 (57)
One comorbidity	410 (31)
Two or more comorbidities	155 (12)

269 ^aData were not fully available for all patients: the n within the table denotes the number of patients with available
 270 data.

271 **Primary outcome measures**

272 Table 2 presents data on the outcome measures at the baseline, and at the three- and six-month
 273 follow-ups. Additionally, clinically relevant improvements at the six-month follow-up are
 274 presented in Supplemental File 2. After six months, the majority of patients showed a clinically
 275 relevant improvement on the USER-P restrictions and satisfaction scales (65% and 61% of
 276 patients, respectively), while 60% of patients showed a clinically relevant improvement on the
 277 EQ-VAS (mean 67.4 (SD 19.1) points) compared with the baseline (55.5 (SD 17.8) points).
 278 Severe fatigue was reported by 94% of patients at the baseline, persisting after six months in
 279 80% of patients. A clinically relevant improvement on the FSS mean score was found in 54%
 280 of patients. Based on PROMIS-PF-10b scores, over two thirds of the patients reported to be
 281 more than 60% impaired, limited or restricted in physical functioning at the baseline, which
 282 decreased to 38% after six months; 57% of patients experienced a clinically relevant
 283 improvement in physical functioning. The majority of patients scored less than 7 points on the
 284 HADS anxiety and depression scores both at the baseline and at six months, which indicates no
 285 anxiety disorder or depression. At the baseline, the HADS anxiety score indicated a probable
 286 clinical diagnosis of anxiety disorder in 23% of the patients, which decreased slightly to 18%
 287 after six months. A probable clinical diagnosis of depression was indicated by the HADS
 288 depression score in 22% of the patients at the baseline, decreasing to 15% at the six-month
 289 follow-up.

290

291 **Table 2.** General outcome measures at the baseline, and after three and six months in patients
 292 recovering from COVID-19 receiving primary allied healthcare

	Baseline (T0)	Three months (T1)	Six months (T2)
Participation, mean ± SD	^a n = 1271	^a n = 945	^a n = 921
USER-P frequencies scale	27.5 ± 10.3	30.5 ± 10.5	31.3 ± 10.1
USER-P restrictions scale	65.8 ± 20.1	73.6 ± 19.4	77.3 ± 19.8
USER-P satisfaction scale	48.6 ± 17.8	54.8 ± 19.5	58.1 ± 19.9
Health-related quality of life	^a n = 1289	^a n = 954	^a n = 932
EQ-VAS, mean ± SD	55.5 ± 17.8	64.3 ± 18.2	67.4 ± 19.1
Fatigue	^a n = 1281	^a n = 951	^a n = 929
FSS mean score, mean ± SD	5.6 ± 1.0	5.2 ± 1.2	4.9 ± 1.3
≥4 points, n (%)	1205 (94)	815 (86)	742 (80)
Physical functioning	^a n = 1279	^a n = 951	^a n = 929
PROMIS-PF T-score, mean ± SD	37.7 ± 6.0	41.5 ± 7.6	43.5 ± 8.5
100% impaired, limited or restricted	2 (0)	2 (0)	0
80–99% impaired, limited or restricted	427 (33)	176 (19)	140 (15)
60–79% impaired, limited or restricted	452 (35)	276 (29)	211 (23)
40–59% impaired, limited or restricted	259 (20)	227 (24)	202 (21)
20–39% impaired, limited or restricted	97 (8)	133 (14)	157 (17)
1–19% impaired, limited or restricted	39 (3)	95 (10)	150 (16)

0% impaired, limited or restricted	4 (0)	42 (4)	72 (8)
Psychological well-being	^a n = 1271		^a n = 926
HADS anxiety score, <i>mean ± SD</i>	7.1 ± 4.5		6.3 ± 4.7
≤7 points, <i>n (%)</i>	746 (59)		613 (66)
8–10 points	233 (18)		143 (16)
≥11 points	292 (23)		170 (18)
HADS depression score, <i>mean ± SD</i>	7.3 ± 4.2		5.7 ± 4.3
≤7 points, <i>n (%)</i>	689 (54)		638 (69)
8–10 points	297 (24)		151 (16)
≥11 points	285 (22)		137 (15)

293 *Abbreviations:* USER-P: Utrecht Scale for Evaluation of Rehabilitation Participation. EQ-VAS: EuroQol Visual
294 Analogue Scale. FSS: Fatigue Severity Scale. PROMIS: Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information
295 System. HADS: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. SD: Standard Deviation.

296 ^aData were not fully available for all patients: the n within the table denotes the number of patients with available
297 data.

298

299 **Patient-reported recovery over time**

300 Table 3 shows the effect of time on the outcome measures. For all dependent variables, a
301 random intercept model was the best-fitting model. No variables were significantly related to
302 missing values in the outcome measures at any point in time. A significant effect of time was
303 observed for all outcome measures at the three- and six-month follow-ups ($p < 0.001$). For
304 participation, estimated mean differences of at least 2.9 points ($p < 0.001$) were observed for
305 all three scales at all time points. For HRQoL, the mean increase was 9.0 points (95% CI 7.8 to
306 10.2) at three months and 12.3 points (95% CI 11.1 to 13.6) after six months. Furthermore,
307 significant improvements were found for fatigue and physical functioning at all time points.
308 The greatest improvements were seen after just three months for all outcome measures
309 measured at both three and six months. Paired-samples t-tests showed mean differences at six
310 months of -0.8 (95% CI -1.0 to -0.5) on the HADS anxiety score and -1.5 (95% CI -1.8 to $-$
311 1.3) on the HADS depression score.

312

313 **Table 3.** Results of linear mixed model analysis for the outcome measures participation, health-related quality of life, fatigue and physical
 314 functioning.

	Baseline (T0)		Three months (T1)		Six months (T2)		Estimated mean difference (95% CI); p-value			
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	At three months	p-value	At six months	p-value
Participation										
USER-P frequencies scale	27.5	0.3	30.5	0.3	31.5	0.3	2.9 (2.3, 3.7)	<0.001	3.9 (3.3, 4.7)	<0.001
USER-P restrictions scale	64.6	0.6	73.7	0.6	77.6	0.6	9.1 (7.9, 10.3)	<0.001	13.0 (11.8, 14.2)	<0.001
USER-P satisfaction scale	48.7	0.5	54.7	0.6	58.4	0.6	5.9 (4.8, 7.2)	<0.001	9.7 (8.5, 10.9)	<0.001
Health-related quality of life										
EQ-VAS	55.6	0.5	64.6	0.6	67.9	0.7	9.0 (7.8, 10.2)	<0.001	12.3 (11.1, 13.6)	<0.001
Fatigue										
FSS mean score	5.6	0.03	5.2	0.04	4.9	0.04	-0.4 (-0.5, -0.4)	<0.001	-0.7 (-0.8, -0.6)	<0.001
Physical functioning										
PROMIS-PF T-score	37.7	0.2	41.6	0.2	43.7	0.2	3.9 (3.5, 4.3)	<0.001	5.9 (5.6, 6.4)	<0.001
Psychological well-being*										
HADS anxiety score	7.1	0.2			6.3	0.2			-0.8 (-1.0, -0.5)	<0.001
HADS depression score	7.3	0.1			5.7	0.1			-1.5 (-1.8, -1.3)	<0.001

315 *Abbreviations:* USER-P: Utrecht Scale for Evaluation of Rehabilitation Participation. EQ-VAS: EuroQol Visual Analogue Scale. FSS: Fatigue Severity Scale. PROMIS:

316 Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System. SE: Standard error. CI: Confidence interval.

317 *A paired-samples t-test was used to evaluate recovery at the six-month follow-up because the HADS was only assessed at the baseline (T0) and at six months (T2)

318 **Factors associated with the change in score in the main outcome measures**

319 Multivariable regression models were estimated to identify factors associated with the change
 320 in scores between the baseline and the six-month follow-up in each outcome measure. Table 4
 321 provides an overview of the final regression models. All univariable and multivariable
 322 regression models are shown in Supplemental Files 3 and 4. Better baseline scores were related
 323 to greater improvements for all outcome measures. For all three scales of the USER-P and
 324 physical functioning, patients admitted to hospital during the infection period of COVID-19
 325 showed greater improvements in scores than non-hospitalised patients, even when correcting
 326 for the baseline scores. In terms of HRQoL, patients admitted to a hospital ward showed greater
 327 improvements than patients who had not been hospitalised, although no associations were found
 328 with ICU admission. Male participants showed greater improvements than female participants
 329 on all outcome measures, except for psychological well-being, for which no association was
 330 found for sex. The baseline age, BMI, comorbidities and smoking status were not significantly
 331 associated with the mean change in any of the outcome measures in our patient population.

332

333 **Table 4.** Multivariable logistic regression models on the outcome measures.

Outcome measure / Factor	β	95% confidence interval	p-value
Participation (USER-P frequencies scale)	R² overall model: 0.272 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Hospital admission			.001
No	ref		
Hospital ward	2.556	0.851 – 4.262	.003
ICU	3.079	0.611 – 5.547	.015
Baseline score	-0.496	-0.558 – -0.435	.000
Participation (USER-P restrictions scale)	R² overall model: 0.277 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Sex			<0.001
Male	ref		
Female	-5.337	-7.813 – -2.861	<0.001
Hospital admission			<0.001
No	ref		
Hospital ward	3.581	0.316 – 6.845	.032
ICU	9.165	4.522 – 13.809	<0.001
Baseline score	-0.462	-0.520 – -0.405	<0.001
Participation (USER-P satisfaction scale)	R² overall model: 0.159 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Hospital admission			.003
No	ref		
Hospital ward	3.577	0.356 – 6.798	.030
ICU	6.728	2.144 – 11.311	.004
Baseline score	-0.402	-0.467 – -0.338	<0.001
Health-related quality of life (EQ-VAS)	R² overall model: 0.245 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Sex			<0.001
Male	ref		
Female	-4.855	-7.378 – -2.333	<0.001
Hospital admission			.097
No	ref		
Hospital ward	3.594	0.231 – 6.957	.036
ICU	2.106	-2.615 – 6.827	.381

Baseline score	-0.524	-0.589 – -0.459	<0.001
Fatigue (FSS mean score)	R² overall model: 0.070 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Sex			<0.001
Male	ref		
Female	0.284	0.130 – 0.438	<0.001
Baseline score	-0.301	-0.381 – -0.222	<0.001
Physical functioning (PROMIS-PF T-score)	R² overall model: 0.064 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Sex			<0.001
Male	ref		
Female	-2.342	-3.341 – -1.343	<0.001
Hospital admission			
No	ref		.004
Hospital ward	1.149	-0.165 – 2.463	.087
ICU	2.917	1.064 – 4.771	.002
Baseline score	-0.125	-0.203 – -0.046	.002
Psychological well-being (HADS anxiety)	R² overall model: 0.160 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Baseline score	-0.354	-0.407 – -0.301	<0.001
Psychological well-being (HADS depression)	R² overall model: 0.179 (<i>p</i> < 0.001)		
Baseline score	-0.392	-0.447 – -0.337	<0.001

334 *Abbreviations:* USER-P: Utrecht Scale for Evaluation of Rehabilitation Participation. EQ-VAS: EuroQol Visual
335 Analogue Scale. FSS: Fatigue Severity Scale. PROMIS: Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information
336 System. SE: Standard error. CI: Confidence interval. Ref: Reference value.

337

338

339 **Discussion**

340

341 This study presents the first results of our evaluation of the recovery of our unique cohort of
342 patients with COVID-19 receiving primary allied healthcare until their six-month follow-up.
343 We explored which baseline characteristics were associated with the change in scores for the
344 main outcome measures over this six-month period. Most patients showed a clinically relevant
345 improvement in all outcome measures; however, despite improvement, many patients still
346 experienced persistent problems in their daily lives, with limitations in physical and mental
347 functioning. A better baseline score, hospital admission and, for some outcome measures, male
348 sex were associated with a positive change in outcome score between the baseline and the six-
349 month follow-up; however, age, BMI, comorbidities and smoking status were not associated
350 with the mean change in any of the outcome measures.

351

352 **Comparison with other studies**

353 The majority of our patient population showed a clinically relevant improvement six months
354 after starting treatment provided by one or more primary care allied health professional(s);
355 nevertheless, a large group of patients experienced persistent problems in their daily lives. The
356 mean EQ-VAS score of our patient population (67 points) remained well below the population
357 norm in the Netherlands, which is 82 points.[41] These results are consistent with previous
358 findings that HRQoL was impaired in the majority of post-COVID-19 patients.[12, 15, 17, 42-
359 45] Persistent fatigue was highly prevalent among the patients included in our study, with 80%
360 still reporting severe fatigue (measured with the FSS) after six months. These results are
361 consistent with previous studies in patients recovering from COVID-19 showing that fatigue
362 was the most common complaint,[5, 10, 14, 44, 46-48] even after six months.[13, 15, 49-51]
363 The mean PROMIS T-score of our population (43.5 (SD 8.5)) remained well below the
364 population norm in the Netherlands (mean score of 50 (SD 10)). These results are also
365 consistent with previous studies,[15, 44] and indicate that persistent symptoms due to COVID-
366 19 may lead to experienced limitations in physical functioning.

367

368 Relative to other outcome measures, a smaller percentage of patients showed a clinically
369 relevant improvement in psychological well-being. This was due to an observed ceiling effect,
370 as 59% and 54% of patients showed no indication of an anxiety disorder or depression at the
371 baseline, respectively. Data from these patients is still informative however, as they could also

372 have deteriorated throughout the follow-up period. With scores indicating a probable clinical
373 diagnosis of anxiety disorder or depression in 18% and 15% of patients, respectively, after six
374 months, our findings are similar to those reported in previous studies, which showed prevalence
375 rates ranging from 11% to 40%. [8, 17, 43, 45, 48, 51-54]

376

377 We found that male participants showed greater improvements than female participants in
378 participation, HRQoL, fatigue and physical functioning. These results are consistent with
379 previous studies showing that female participants experience more persistent symptoms after a
380 COVID-19 infection. [10, 14, 21, 42, 46, 48] Furthermore, patients admitted to the hospital for
381 COVID-19 showed greater improvements than non-hospitalised patients in terms of
382 participation, HRQoL and physical functioning, which is in line with previous studies. [12, 21,
383 42, 48] We observed no associations between fatigue and hospital admission, age, BMI,
384 comorbidities or smoking status, which is also consistent with other studies, [10, 14, 48, 50, 51]
385 indicating that fatigue is highly prevalent in patients recovering from COVID-19, irrespective
386 of the severity of initial infection and patient characteristics. We found that better baseline
387 scores were related to more improvement in anxiety and depressive symptoms; however, no
388 associations with any patient characteristics were found. Similar to our results, previous studies
389 found no associations between the frequency of anxiety or depressive symptoms and disease
390 severity or hospital admission. [10, 43, 45, 46, 54] In contrast, other studies found female sex
391 [51, 55, 56] and older age [51, 53] to be predictors of anxiety or depressive symptoms in patients
392 with COVID-19.

393

394 **Strengths and limitations**

395 This is a unique comprehensive study presenting longitudinal results for patients recovering
396 from a COVID-19 infection treated by one or more primary care allied health professionals.
397 This large nationwide study used patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) to evaluate the
398 primary care allied health recovery trajectories, whereas previous studies mainly reported the
399 prevalence of persistent symptoms in patients recovering with COVID-19. The use of PROMs
400 can measure the quality of care based on the perceived health and functioning of patients, and
401 leads to better communication and decision-making between health professionals and
402 patients. [57-59]

403

404 Due to ethical considerations, this study did not include a control group to determine the
405 potential effects of primary allied healthcare by comparing outcome measures with patients

406 who did not receive this type of care. In addition, with a lack of available pre-COVID data for
407 our population, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the impact of pre-existing conditions
408 versus problems in the daily activities and participation of these patients due to their COVID-
409 19 infection.

410
411 For the interpretation of the results, it is important to consider that the baseline measurement in
412 this study was taken at the start of the treatment by one or more primary care allied health
413 professional(s). It is possible that a patient had already experienced symptoms for some time
414 and only consulted an allied health professional at a later stage. Additionally, it should be taken
415 into account that not all patients received treatment by one or more allied health professional(s)
416 during the entire six-month follow-up period of this study. Some patients received short-term
417 treatment, while others were still receiving treatment at six months. Based on the inclusion
418 period, which was between March and July 2021, our population most likely had the Wuhan or
419 Alpha variant of the coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 [60]. Different variants may cause different
420 symptoms, and the recovery trajectories of patients infected with other variants (e.g., Delta or
421 Omicron) may differ from our population. A total of 25 patients dropped out during this study
422 (Figure 1). Although a proportion of the patients did not complete all questionnaires, the
423 response rates were still sufficient: 93% at the baseline, 68% after three months, and 67% after
424 six months [61]. There was no selective missingness of data based on patient characteristics
425 (including disease severity) and scores on the outcome measures (Supplemental File 1).

426

427 **Implications and future perspectives**

428 The results of this study show that patients recovering from COVID-19 and receiving primary
429 allied healthcare make progress in recovery, but many still experience limitations in their daily
430 activities and participation after six months. The findings of our study provide reference values
431 for healthcare providers and healthcare policy-makers about what to expect from the recovery
432 of patients who receive or have received healthcare from one or more primary care allied health
433 professional(s).

434

435 Future research and in-depth analyses of our data are needed to gain more insight into the
436 outcome measures and recovery trajectories of patients recovering from COVID-19 who visit
437 one or more primary care allied health professionals. Future papers will include the results after
438 a 12-month follow-up, determining the related healthcare costs and the profession-specific
439 outcomes per allied health discipline.

440 *Funding:* This project was funded by ZonMw Efficiency Studies (10390062010001), and
441 received additional funding for setting up the data collection tool by the Royal Dutch Society
442 for Physiotherapy, the Association for Quality in Physical Therapy, the Nivel Netherlands
443 Institute for Health Services Research, Stichting Revalidatie en Wetenschap, and Maastricht
444 University.

445
446 *Conflict of interest:* All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
447 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: all authors had financial support from ZonMw
448 for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an
449 interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities
450 that could appear to have influenced the submitted work

451 **References**

- 452 1. Taquet, M., et al., *Incidence, co-occurrence, and evolution of long-COVID features: A*
453 *6-month retrospective cohort study of 273,618 survivors of COVID-19*. PLoS medicine,
454 2021. **18**(9): p. e1003773.
- 455 2. Webber, S.C., B.J. Tittlemier, and H.J. Loewen, *Apparent discordance between the*
456 *epidemiology of COVID-19 and recommended outcomes and treatments: a scoping*
457 *review*. Physical therapy, 2021. **101**(11): p. pzab155.
- 458 3. Ballering, A.V., et al., *Persistence of somatic symptoms after COVID-19 in the*
459 *Netherlands: an observational cohort study*. Lancet, 2022. **400**(10350): p. 452-461.
- 460 4. Augustin, M., et al., *Post-COVID syndrome in non-hospitalised patients with COVID-*
461 *19: a longitudinal prospective cohort study*. The Lancet Regional Health-Europe, 2021.
462 **6**: p. 100122.
- 463 5. Goërtz, Y.M., et al., *Persistent symptoms 3 months after a SARS-CoV-2 infection: the*
464 *post-COVID-19 syndrome?* ERJ open research, 2020. **6**(4).
- 465 6. NICE, *COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing the long-term effects of COVID-19*. 2020,
466 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Clinical Guidelines: London.
- 467 7. Shah, W., et al., *Managing the long term effects of covid-19: summary of NICE, SIGN,*
468 *and RCGP rapid guideline*. bmj, 2021. **372**.
- 469 8. Nalbandian, A., et al., *Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome*. Nature medicine, 2021. **27**(4):
470 p. 601-615.
- 471 9. Carfi, A., R. Bernabei, and F. Landi, *Persistent symptoms in patients after acute*
472 *COVID-19*. Jama, 2020. **324**(6): p. 603-605.
- 473 10. Sisó-Almirall, A., et al., *Long Covid-19: proposed primary care clinical guidelines for*
474 *diagnosis and disease management*. International journal of environmental research and
475 public health, 2021. **18**(8): p. 4350.
- 476 11. Maxwell, E., *Living with Covid19*. National Institute for Health Research, 2020.
- 477 12. Malik, P., et al., *Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome (PCS) and health-related quality of*
478 *life (HRQoL)—A systematic review and meta-analysis*. Journal of medical virology,
479 2022. **94**(1): p. 253-262.
- 480 13. Van Herck, M., et al., *Severe Fatigue in Long COVID: Web-Based Quantitative Follow-*
481 *up Study in Members of Online Long COVID Support Groups*. Journal of Medical
482 Internet Research, 2021. **23**(9): p. e30274.
- 483 14. Townsend, L., et al., *Persistent fatigue following SARS-CoV-2 infection is common and*
484 *independent of severity of initial infection*. Plos one, 2020. **15**(11): p. e0240784.
- 485 15. Tabacof, L., et al., *Post-acute COVID-19 Syndrome Negatively Impacts Physical*
486 *Function, Cognitive Function, Health-Related Quality of Life, and Participation*.
487 American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation, 2022. **101**(1): p. 48.
- 488 16. Humphreys, H., et al., *Long COVID and the role of physical activity: a qualitative study*.
489 BMJ open, 2021. **11**(3): p. e047632.
- 490 17. Huang, C., et al., *6-month consequences of COVID-19 in patients discharged from*
491 *hospital: a cohort study*. The Lancet, 2021. **397**(10270): p. 220-232.
- 492 18. Nguyen, H.C., et al., *People with suspected COVID-19 symptoms were more likely*
493 *depressed and had lower health-related quality of life: the potential benefit of health*
494 *literacy*. Journal of clinical medicine, 2020. **9**(4): p. 965.
- 495 19. Zhang, Y. and Z.F. Ma, *Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and quality*
496 *of life among local residents in Liaoning Province, China: A cross-sectional study*.
497 International journal of environmental research and public health, 2020. **17**(7): p. 2381.
- 498 20. Qu, G., et al., *Health-related quality of life of COVID-19 patients after discharge: a*
499 *multicenter follow-up study*. Journal of clinical nursing, 2021. **30**(11-12): p. 1742-1750.

- 500 21. Arab-Zozani, M., et al., *Health-related quality of life and its associated factors in*
501 *COVID-19 patients*. *Osong public health and research perspectives*, 2020. **11**(5): p. 296.
- 502 22. *KNGF-Standpunt Fysiotherapie bij patienten met COVID-19: Royal Dutch Society for*
503 *Physical Therapy (KNGF)*. 2020; Available from:
504 [https://www.kngf.nl/binaries/content/assets/kennisplatform/onbeveiligd/coronavirus/k](https://www.kngf.nl/binaries/content/assets/kennisplatform/onbeveiligd/coronavirus/kngf_standpunt_fysiotherapie_covid-19_v3.0_22022022.pdf)
505 [ngf_standpunt_fysiotherapie_covid-19_v3.0_22022022.pdf](https://www.kngf.nl/binaries/content/assets/kennisplatform/onbeveiligd/coronavirus/kngf_standpunt_fysiotherapie_covid-19_v3.0_22022022.pdf).
- 506 23. *Position statement COVID-19 version 1.4: Dutch Society for speech-language therapy*
507 *(NVLf)*. 2020; Available from: [https://www.nvlf.nl/wp-](https://www.nvlf.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/06/Factsheet-Intramurale-instellingen.pdf)
508 [content/uploads/sites/2/2020/06/Factsheet-Intramurale-instellingen.pdf](https://www.nvlf.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/06/Factsheet-Intramurale-instellingen.pdf).
- 509 24. *Handreiking ergotherapie bij COVID-19 cliënten in de herstelfase Dutch society for*
510 *occupational therapy (EN)*. 2021; Available from:
511 [https://info.ergotherapie.nl/file/download/default/6A5E0AC0401E6972DA637BB919](https://info.ergotherapie.nl/file/download/default/6A5E0AC0401E6972DA637BB919F13500/26-01-21%20-%20Handreiking%20ergotherapie%20bij%20COVID-19%20in%20de%20herstelfase%20-%20versie%20januari%202021.pdf)
512 [F13500/26-01-21%20-%20Handreiking%20ergotherapie%20bij%20COVID-](https://info.ergotherapie.nl/file/download/default/6A5E0AC0401E6972DA637BB919F13500/26-01-21%20-%20Handreiking%20ergotherapie%20bij%20COVID-19%20in%20de%20herstelfase%20-%20versie%20januari%202021.pdf)
513 [19%20in%20de%20herstelfase%20-%20versie%20januari%202021.pdf](https://info.ergotherapie.nl/file/download/default/6A5E0AC0401E6972DA637BB919F13500/26-01-21%20-%20Handreiking%20ergotherapie%20bij%20COVID-19%20in%20de%20herstelfase%20-%20versie%20januari%202021.pdf).
- 514 25. *Treatment plan of dietitian at COVID-19 after hospital discharge The recovery phase*
515 *after discharge from hospital: dietetics treatment in (Post) COVID-19 patients in a*
516 *rehabilitation center: Dutch society for dietitians (NVD)*. 2021; Available from:
517 [https://nvdietist.nl/artikelen/behandelplan-van-dietist-binnen-paramedische-](https://nvdietist.nl/artikelen/behandelplan-van-dietist-binnen-paramedische-herstelzorg-covid-19/)
518 [herstelzorg-covid-19/](https://nvdietist.nl/artikelen/behandelplan-van-dietist-binnen-paramedische-herstelzorg-covid-19/).
- 519 26. De Bie, R.A., et al., *Evaluation of Allied Healthcare in Patients Recovering from Covid-*
520 *19: Study Protocol and Baseline Data of a National Prospective Cohort Study*. *Journal*
521 *of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 2022: p. jrm00309-jrm00309.
- 522 27. CDC. *Interim Clinical Guidance for Management of Patients with Confirmed*
523 *Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19)*. 2022; Available from:
524 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html)
525 [patients.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html).
- 526 28. WHO. *Body Mass Index - BMI*. Available from: [https://www.who.int/europe/news-](https://www.who.int/europe/news-room/fact-sheets/item/a-healthy-lifestyle---who-recommendations)
527 [room/fact-sheets/item/a-healthy-lifestyle---who-recommendations](https://www.who.int/europe/news-room/fact-sheets/item/a-healthy-lifestyle---who-recommendations).
- 528 29. Post, M.W., et al., *Validity of the utrecht scale for evaluation of rehabilitation-*
529 *participation*. *Disability and rehabilitation*, 2012. **34**(6): p. 478-485.
- 530 30. Herdman, M., et al., *Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version*
531 *of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L)*. *Quality of life research*, 2011. **20**(10): p. 1727-1736.
- 532 31. Zanini, A., et al., *Estimation of minimal clinically important difference in EQ-5D visual*
533 *analog scale score after pulmonary rehabilitation in subjects with COPD*. *Respiratory*
534 *care*, 2015. **60**(1): p. 88-95.
- 535 32. Valko, P.O., et al., *Validation of the fatigue severity scale in a Swiss cohort*. *Sleep*, 2008.
536 **31**(11): p. 1601-1607.
- 537 33. Rooney, S., et al., *Minimally important difference of the fatigue severity scale and*
538 *modified fatigue impact scale in people with multiple sclerosis*. *Multiple sclerosis and*
539 *related disorders*, 2019. **35**: p. 158-163.
- 540 34. Cella, D., et al., *The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System*
541 *(PROMIS): progress of an NIH Roadmap cooperative group during its first two years*.
542 *Medical care*, 2007. **45**(5 Suppl 1): p. S3.
- 543 35. Terwee, C., et al., *Dutch–Flemish translation of 17 item banks from the patient-reported*
544 *outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS)*. *Quality of Life Research*, 2014.
545 **23**(6): p. 1733-1741.
- 546 36. Sandvall, B., et al., *Minimal clinically important difference for PROMIS physical*
547 *function in patients with distal radius fractures*. *The Journal of Hand Surgery*, 2019.
548 **44**(6): p. 454-459. e1.

- 549 37. Snaith, R.P., *The hospital anxiety and depression scale*. Health and quality of life
550 outcomes, 2003. **1**(1): p. 1-4.
- 551 38. Zigmond, A.S. and R.P. Snaith, *The hospital anxiety and depression scale*. Acta
552 psychiatrica scandinavica, 1983. **67**(6): p. 361-370.
- 553 39. Lemay, K.R., et al., *Establishing the minimal clinically important difference for the*
554 *hospital anxiety and depression scale in patients with cardiovascular disease*. Journal
555 of cardiopulmonary rehabilitation and prevention, 2019. **39**(6): p. E6-E11.
- 556 40. Steyerberg, E.W., *Clinical Prediction Models: A Practical Approach to Development,*
557 *Validation, and Updating*. 2009, New York: Springer Sciences + Business Media, LLC.
- 558 41. Janssen, B. and A. Szende, *Population norms for the EQ-5D*. Self-reported population
559 health: an international perspective based on EQ-5D, 2014: p. 19-30.
- 560 42. Garrigues, E., et al., *Post-discharge persistent symptoms and health-related quality of*
561 *life after hospitalization for COVID-19*. Journal of Infection, 2020. **81**(6): p. e4-e6.
- 562 43. Rass, V., et al., *Neurological outcome and quality of life 3 months after COVID-19: A*
563 *prospective observational cohort study*. European journal of neurology, 2021. **28**(10):
564 p. 3348-3359.
- 565 44. Vaes, A.W., et al., *Recovery from COVID-19: a sprint or marathon? 6-month follow-*
566 *up data from online long COVID-19 support group members*. ERJ open research, 2021.
567 **7**(2).
- 568 45. Van den Borst, B., et al., *Comprehensive health assessment 3 months after recovery*
569 *from acute coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)*. Clinical Infectious Diseases, 2021.
570 **73**(5): p. e1089-e1098.
- 571 46. Ceban, F., et al., *Fatigue and cognitive impairment in Post-COVID-19 Syndrome: A*
572 *systematic review and meta-analysis*. Brain, behavior, and immunity, 2022. **101**: p. 93-
573 135.
- 574 47. Pavli, A., M. Theodoridou, and H.C. Maltezou, *Post-COVID syndrome: Incidence,*
575 *clinical spectrum, and challenges for primary healthcare professionals*. Archives of
576 medical research, 2021. **52**(6): p. 575-581.
- 577 48. Shanbehzadeh, S., et al., *Physical and mental health complications post-COVID-19:*
578 *Scoping review*. Journal of psychosomatic research, 2021. **147**: p. 110525.
- 579 49. Alkodaymi, M.S., et al., *Prevalence of post-acute COVID-19 syndrome symptoms at*
580 *different follow-up periods: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. Clinical
581 Microbiology and Infection, 2022.
- 582 50. Ezzat, M.M. and A.A. Elsherif, *Prevalence of fatigue in patients post COVID-19*.
583 European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine, 2021. **8**(3): p. 1330-1340.
- 584 51. Menges, D., et al., *Burden of post-COVID-19 syndrome and implications for healthcare*
585 *service planning: A population-based cohort study*. PloS one, 2021. **16**(7): p. e0254523.
- 586 52. González, J., et al., *Pulmonary function and radiologic features in survivors of critical*
587 *COVID-19: a 3-month prospective cohort*. Chest, 2021. **160**(1): p. 187-198.
- 588 53. Morin, L., et al., *Four-month clinical status of a cohort of patients after hospitalization*
589 *for COVID-19*. Jama, 2021. **325**(15): p. 1525-1534.
- 590 54. Renaud-Charest, O., et al., *Onset and frequency of depression in post-COVID-19*
591 *syndrome: A systematic review*. Journal of psychiatric research, 2021. **144**: p. 129-137.
- 592 55. Mazza, M.G., et al., *Persistent psychopathology and neurocognitive impairment in*
593 *COVID-19 survivors: effect of inflammatory biomarkers at three-month follow-up*.
594 Brain, behavior, and immunity, 2021. **94**: p. 138-147.
- 595 56. Righi, E., et al., *Determinants of persistence of symptoms and impact on physical and*
596 *mental wellbeing in Long COVID: A prospective cohort study*. Journal of Infection,
597 2022. **84**(4): p. 566-572.

- 598 57. Kessel, P.v., M. Triemstra, and D.d. Boer, *Handreiking voor het meten van kwaliteit*
599 *van zorg met Patient Reported Outcome Measures*. 2014.
- 600 58. Nelson, E.C., et al., *Patient reported outcome measures in practice*. *Bmj*, 2015. **350**.
- 601 59. Gibbons, C., et al., *Routine provision of feedback from patient-reported outcome*
602 *measurements to healthcare providers and patients in clinical practice*. *Cochrane*
603 *Database Syst Rev*, 2021. **10**(10): p. Cd011589.
- 604 60. RIVM. *Coronadashboard - Varianten van het coronavirus*. 2022; Available from:
605 <https://coronadashboard.rijksoverheid.nl/landelijk/varianten>.
- 606 61. Nulty, D.D., *The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be*
607 *done?* *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, 2008. **33**(3): p. 301-314.
- 608