

1 **Diagnostic and prognostic value of hematological and**
2 **immunological markers in COVID-19 infection: A meta-**
3 **analysis of 6320 patients**

4 Rami M. Elshazli¹, Eman A Toraih^{2,3}, Abdelaziz Elgaml^{4,5}, Mohammed El-Mowafy⁴, Mohamed
5 El-Mesery⁶, Mohamed Nasreldien Amin⁶, Mohammad H Hussein², Mary T. Killackey⁷, Manal S
6 Fawzy^{8*}, Emad Kandil^{9*}

7 ¹ *Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Genetics, Faculty of Physical Therapy, Horus*
8 *University - Egypt, New Damietta, 34517, Egypt.*

9 ² *Department of Surgery, Tulane University, School of Medicine, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*

10 ³ *Genetics Unit, Department of Histology and Cell Biology, Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal*
11 *University, Ismailia, Egypt*

12 ⁴ *Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Mansoura University,*
13 *Mansoura 35516, Egypt.*

14 ⁵ *Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Horus University - Egypt, New Damietta,*
15 *34517, Egypt.*

16 ⁶ *Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, Mansoura University, Mansoura 35516,*
17 *Egypt.*

18 ⁷ *Tulane Transplant Institute, Tulane University, School of Medicine, New Orleans, LA, USA*

19 ⁸ *Department of Medical Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University, Ismailia,*
20 *Egypt*

21 ⁹ *Division of Endocrine and Oncologic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Tulane University,*
22 *School of Medicine, New Orleans, LA, USA*

23

24 ***Correspondence authors**

25 Email: ekandil@tulane.edu (EK)

26 Email: manal_mohamed@med.suez.edu.eg (MSF)

27 **Short Title:** COVID-19 infection and laboratory markers

28 **Abstract**

29 **Objective**

30 Evidence-based characterization of the diagnostic and prognostic value of the
31 hematological and immunological markers related to the epidemic of Coronavirus
32 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) is critical to understand the clinical course of the
33 infection and to assess in development and validation of biomarkers.

34 **Methods**

35 Based on systematic search in Web of Science, PubMed, Scopus, and Science
36 Direct up to April 22, 2020, a total of 52 eligible articles with 6,320 laboratory-
37 confirmed COVID-19 cohorts were included. Pairwise comparison between severe
38 *versus* mild disease, Intensive Care Unit (ICU) *versus* general ward admission, and
39 expired *versus* survivors were performed for 36 laboratory parameters. The pooled
40 standardized mean difference (SMD) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were
41 calculated using the DerSimonian Laird method/random effects model and
42 converted to Odds ratio (OR). The decision tree algorithm was employed to
43 identify the key risk factor(s) attributed to severe COVID-19 disease.

44 **Results**

45 Cohorts with elevated levels of white blood cells (WBCs) (OR=1.75), neutrophil
46 count (OR=2.62), D-dimer (OR=3.97), prolonged prothrombin time (PT)
47 (OR=1.82), fibrinogen (OR=3.14), erythrocyte sedimentation rate (OR=1.60),

48 procalcitonin (OR=4.76), IL-6 (OR=2.10), and IL-10 (OR=4.93) had higher odds
49 of progression to severe phenotype. Decision tree model (sensitivity=100%,
50 specificity=81%) showed the high performance of neutrophil count at a cut-off
51 value of more than $3.74 \times 10^9/L$ for identifying patients at high risk of severe
52 COVID-19. Likewise, ICU admission was associated with higher levels of WBCs
53 (OR=5.21), neutrophils (OR=6.25), D-dimer (OR=4.19), and prolonged PT
54 (OR=2.18). Patients with high IL-6 (OR=13.87), CRP (OR=7.09), D-dimer
55 (OR=6.36), and neutrophils (OR=6.25) had the highest likelihood of mortality.

56 **Conclusions**

57 Several hematological and immunological markers, in particular neutrophilic
58 count, could be helpful to be included within the routine panel for COVID-19
59 infection evaluation to ensure risk stratification and effective management.

60

61 **Keywords:** COVID-19; laboratory markers; mortality; prognosis; SARS-CoV-2

62

63

64 **Short Title:** COVID-19 infection and laboratory markers

65

66

67

68 **Introduction**

69 Coronavirus disease – 2019 (COVID-19) is a disease that was detected in
70 December 2019 in Wuhan, China, and led to the risk of mortality of about 2% [1].
71 This disease is caused due to infection with a recently arising zoonotic virus known
72 as the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) [2].
73 Previously, infection with coronaviruses appeared in 2002 within China in the
74 form of SARS-CoV, and it appeared later also in 2012 within Saudi Arabia that
75 was known as Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS-CoV) [3, 4]. All these
76 coronaviruses are enveloped positive-strand RNA viruses that are isolated from
77 bats that can be transferred from animals to humans, human to human, and animals
78 to animals [5]. They share a similarity in the clinical symptoms in addition to
79 specific differences that have been recently observed [5-7]. The symptoms of this
80 disease appear with different degrees that start in the first seven days with mild
81 symptoms such as fever, cough, shortness of breath, and fatigue [8]. Afterward,
82 critical symptoms may develop in some patients involving dyspnea and pneumonia
83 that require patient's management in intensive care units to avoid the serious
84 respiratory complications that may lead to death [9]. However, there are no
85 specific symptoms to diagnose coronavirus infection, and accurate testing depends
86 on the detection of the viral genome using the reverse transcription-polymerase
87 chain reaction (RT-PCR) analysis [10].

88 Unfortunately, COVID-19 is not limited to its country of origin, but it has spread
89 all over the world. Therefore, there is no wonder emerging research has been
90 directed to provide information and clinical data of patients infected with this virus
91 that may help to not only to the early detection in different patient categories, but it
92 will also help in the characterization of the viral complications with other chronic
93 diseases [1, 2, 6, 9]. However, there is no sufficient data that characterize the
94 changes in the hematological and immunological parameters in COVID-19
95 patients. In the current comprehensive meta-analysis study, we aimed to analyze
96 different hematological, inflammatory, and immunological markers in COVID-19
97 patients at different clinical stages in different countries that may help in the early
98 detection of COVID-19 infection and to discriminate between severity status of the
99 disease to decrease the death risk.

100 **Materials and Methods**

101 **Search strategy**

102 This current meta-analysis was carried out according to the Preferred Reporting
103 Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) statement [11] (**Table**
104 **S1**). Relevant literature was retrieved from Web of Science, PubMed, Scopus, and
105 Science Direct search engines up to April 22, 2020. Our search strategy included
106 the following terms: “Novel coronavirus 2019”, “2019 nCoV”, “COVID-19”,

107 “Wuhan coronavirus,” “Wuhan pneumonia,” or “SARS-CoV-2”. Besides, we
108 manually screened out the relevant potential article in the references selected. The
109 above process was performed independently by three participants.

110 **Study selection**

111 No time or language restriction was applied. Inclusion criteria were as follows: (1)
112 Types of Studies: retrospective, prospective, observational, descriptive or case
113 control studies reporting laboratory features of COVID-19 patients; (2) Subjects:
114 diagnosed patients with COVID-19 (3) Exposure intervention: COVID-19 patients
115 diagnosed with Real Time-Polymerase Chain Reaction, radiological imaging, or
116 both; with hematological testing included: complete blood picture (white blood
117 cells, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, monocyte count, eosinophils count,
118 basophils, red blood cells, hemoglobin, hematocrit, and platelet count), coagulation
119 profile (prothrombin time, international normalized ratio, activated partial
120 thromboplastin time, thrombin time, fibrinogen, and D-dimer) or immunological
121 parameters including inflammatory markers (ferritin, erythrocyte sedimentation
122 rate, procalcitonin, and C-reactive protein), immunoglobulins (IgA, IgG, and IgM),
123 complement tests (C3 and C4), interleukins (IL-4, IL-6, IL-8, IL-10, IL-2R, and
124 TNF- α), and immune cells (B lymphocytes, T lymphocytes, CD4⁺ T cells, and
125 CD8⁺ T cells); and (4) Outcome indicator: the mean and standard deviation or
126 median and interquartile range for each laboratory test. The following exclusion

127 criteria were considered: (1) Case reports, reviews, editorial materials, conference
128 abstracts, summaries of discussions, (2) Insufficient reported data information; or
129 (3) *In vitro* or *in vivo* studies.

130 **Data abstraction**

131 Four investigators separately conducted literature screening, data extraction, and
132 literature quality evaluation, and any differences were resolved through another
133 two reviewers. Information extracted from eligible articles in a predesigned form
134 in excel, including the last name of the first author, date and year of publication,
135 journal name, study design, country of the population, sample size, and quality
136 assessment.

137 **Quality assessment**

138 A modified version of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS) was adopted to evaluate
139 the process in terms of queue selection, comparability of queues, and evaluation of
140 results [12, 13]. The quality of the included studies was assessed independently by
141 three reviewers, and disagreements were resolved by the process described above.
142 Higher NOS scores showed a higher literature quality. NOS scores of at least six
143 were considered high-quality literature.

144 **Statistical analysis**

145 All data analysis was performed using OpenMeta[Analyst] [14] and
146 comprehensive meta-analysis software version 3.0 [15]. First, a single-arm
147 meta-analysis for laboratory tests was performed. The standardized mean
148 difference (SMD) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to estimate pooled
149 results from studies. Medians and interquartile range were converted to mean and
150 standard deviation (SD) using the following formulas: $[\text{Mean}=(Q1+\text{median}+Q3)/3]$
151 and $[\text{SD}=\text{IQR}/1.35]$, whereas, values reported in the articles as mean and 95%CI
152 were estimated using the following formula $[\text{SD}=\sqrt{N} * (\text{Upper limit of CI} - \text{Lower}$
153 $\text{limit of CI})/3.92]$. A continuous random-effect model was applied using the
154 DerSimonian-Laird (inverse variance) method [16, 17].

155 Next, in the presence of individual patient data, single-armed observed values were
156 converted to two-armed data to act as each other's control group based on
157 covariate information. Only studies investigating different outcomes were
158 considered as potential matched pairs, and two-arm meta-analysis was applied to
159 compare between mild *versus* severe COVID-19 infection (based on the results of
160 the chest radiography, clinical examination, and symptoms), ICU admission *versus*
161 general ward admission, and expired *versus* survivors. Meta-analysis for each
162 outcome was processed using a random-effects model since heterogeneity among
163 studies was expected. For severity pairwise comparison, estimates of SMD served
164 as quantitative measures of the strength of evidence against the null hypothesis of

165 no difference in the population between mild and severe COVID-19
166 manifestations. SMD of <0.2, 0.2-0.8, and >0.8 indicated mild, moderate, and
167 severe strength. For ICU admission and survival analysis, overall effect size
168 estimates in SMD were then converted to the odds ratio (OR) with 95%CI for
169 better interpretation by clinical domains.

170 **Decision tree to identify predictors for poor outcomes**

171 Using laboratory features for clinical prediction, the decision tree algorithm was
172 employed to identify the key risk factors attributed to severe COVID-19 infection.
173 The accuracy of the model was measured by the Area Under the Receiver
174 Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve (AUC), which depicts the true positive rate
175 versus the false positive rate at various discrimination thresholds. The markers that
176 have the highest AUC were identified, and the sensitivity and specificity of the cut-
177 off threshold level were determined. R Studio was employed using the following
178 packages: *tidyverse*, *magrittr*, *rpart*, *caret*, and *pROC*.

179 **Trial sequential analysis (TSA)**

180 The statistical trustworthiness of this meta-analysis assessment was conducted
181 using TSA through combining the cumulative sample sizes of all appropriate
182 records with the threshold of statistical impact to diminish the accidental errors and
183 enhance the intensity of expectations [18]. Two side trials with “type I error (α)”

184 along with power set at 5% and 80% were employed. In the case of the “Z-curve”
185 traverses the TSA monitoring boundaries, a reasonable degree of impact was
186 accomplished, and no supplementary trials are crucial. Nevertheless, in case of the
187 “Z-curve” failed to achieve the boundary limits, the estimated information size has
188 not accomplished the required threshold to attract appropriate decisions and
189 advance trials are mandatory. TSA platform (version 0.9.5.10 beta) was operated in
190 the experiment.

191 **Assessment of heterogeneity and publication bias**

192 After that, the heterogeneity was evaluated using Cochran’s Q statistic and
193 quantified by using I^2 statistics, which represents an estimation of the total
194 variation across studies beyond chance. Articles were considered to have
195 significant heterogeneity between studies when the p-value less than 0.1 or I^2
196 greater than 50%. Subgroup analysis was performed based on the study sample
197 size (≤ 50 patients compared to > 50 patients) and the origin of patients (Wuhan city
198 versus others). In addition, sensitivity analyses and meta-regression with the
199 random-effects model using restricted maximum likelihood algorithm were
200 conducted to explore potential sources of heterogeneity.

201 Finally, publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot and quantified using
202 Begg’s and Mazumdar rank correlation with continuity correction and Egger’s
203 linear regression tests. Asymmetry of the collected studies’ distribution by visual

204 inspection or P-value < 0.1 indicated obvious publication bias [19]. The Duval and
205 Tweedie's trim and fill method's assumption were considered to reduce the bias in
206 pooled estimates [20].

207 **Results**

208 **Literature search**

209 A flowchart outlining the systematic review search results is described in **Fig 1A**.
210 A total of 4752 records were identified through four major electronic databases till
211 April 22, 2020 including Web of Science (n = 557), PubMed (n = 1688), Scopus (n
212 = 1105) and Science Direct (n = 1402). Upon reviewing the retrieved articles, a
213 total of 1230 records were excluded for duplication, and 3522 unique records were
214 initially identified. Following screening of titles and abstracts, several studies were
215 excluded for being case records (n = 44), review articles (n = 262), irrelevant
216 publications (n = 1355), or editorial materials (n = 1809). The resulted 424 full-text
217 publications were further assessed for eligibility, during which 372 records were
218 removed for lacking sufficient laboratory data. Ultimately, a total of 52 eligible
219 articles were included for the quantitative synthesis of this meta-analysis study,
220 with 52 records represented single-arm analysis, 16 records represented two-arms
221 severity analysis; meanwhile, 7 and 4 records were utilized for survival and ICU
222 admission analyses, respectively.

223 **Fig 1. Literature search process.**

224 (A) Workflow for screening and selecting relevant articles. (B) Map showing the
225 location of the studies. Studies conducted in China (red), Taiwan (green),
226 Singapore (blue), and USA (light blue) are shown with the number of studies
227 between brackets. Data source Tableau 2020.1 Desktop Professional Edition
228 (<https://www.tableau.com/>).

229 **Characteristics of the included studies**

230 Our review included 52 studies that were published from January 24 through April
231 22, 2020, including 48 articles from China [Wuhan (30), Chongqing (4), Zhejiang
232 (4), Shanghai (2), Ningbo (1), Hong Kong (1), Shenzhen (1), Anhui (1), Macau
233 (1), Hainan (1), Jiangsu (1), and Beijing (1)], two articles from Singapore
234 [Singapore and Sengkang], one article from Taiwan [Taichung], and one article
235 from USA [Washington] (**Fig 1B**). The main characteristics of eligible studies are
236 shown in **Table 1**. A total of 6320 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection were
237 enrolled across the articles. Most records (n = 47) were retrospective case studies,
238 while other study design included two prospective cohort studies, one
239 observational cohort study, one descriptive case series, and one case-control study.
240 Our team stratified 36 different laboratory parameters into seven subclasses,
241 including complete blood picture, coagulation profile, immunological markers,
242 immunoglobulins, complement tests, interleukins, and immune cells, as previously
243 described in the methodology. Regarding quality score assessment, 39 studies
244 achieved a score higher than six out of a maximum of nine (high quality), while the

245 remaining 13 studies earned a score equal or lower than six (low quality), as shown
246 in **Table 1**.

Table 1. General characteristics of the included studies

First Author	Year	Publication date (dd-mm)	Journal name	Continent	Country	Study design	Sample size	Quality score	Reference no
Zhu Z	2020	22-April	International J of Infectious Diseases	Ningbo	China	Retrospective case study	127	9	[35]
Liu X	2020	20-April	Acta Pharm Sin B	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	124	8	[36]
Chen X	2020	18-April	Clin Infect Dis	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	48	9	[37]
Chen G	2020	13-April	J Clinical Invest	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	21	8	[38]
He R	2020	12-April	J Clinical Virology	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	204	9	[27]
Zhang G	2020	09-April	J Clinical Virology	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	221	9	[39]
Lei S	2020	04-April	EClinicalMedicine	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	34	9	[40]
Wang L	2020	30-March	Journal of Infection	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	339	8	[41]
Guo T	2020	27-March	JAMA Cardiology	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	187	8	[42]
Zheng C	2020	27-March	Int J Infect Dis	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	55	7	[43]
Chen T	2020	26-March	BMJ	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	274	9	[9]
Tang X	2020	26-March	Chest	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	73	6	[44]
Shi S	2020	25-March	JAMA Cardiology	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	416	9	[45]
TO K	2020	23-March	Lancet Infectious Diseases	Hong Kong	China	Observational cohort study	23	9	[46]
Zhou Z	2020	24-March	Eur Radiol	Chongqing	China	Retrospective case study	62	9	[47]
Chen Z	2020	24-March	European Journal of Radiology	Zhejiang	China	Retrospective case study	98	6	[48]
Wan S	2020	21-March	J Med Virol	Chongqing	China	Retrospective case study	135	9	[49]
Cheng Y	2020	20-March	Kidney International	Wuhan	China	Prospective cohort study	701	9	[50]
Luo S	2020	20-March	Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	183	5	[51]
Deng Y	2020	20-March	Chin Med J (Engl)	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	225	8	[52]
Arentz M	2020	19-March	JAMA	Washington	USA	Retrospective case study	21	5	[53]
Chen J	2020	19-March	Journal of Infection	Shanghai	China	Retrospective case study	249	5	[54]
Cai Q	2020	18-March	Engineering	Shenzhen	China	Retrospective case study	80	9	[55]
Gao Y	2020	17-March	J Med Virol	Anhui	China	Retrospective case study	43	9	[56]
Qian G	2020	17-March	QJM	Zhejiang	China	Retrospective case study	91	5	[57]
Mo P	2020	16-March	Clin Infect Dis	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	155	8	[58]
Wang Z	2020	16-March	Clin Infect Dis	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	69	7	[59]
Lo I	2020	15-March	Int J Biol Sci	Macau	China	Retrospective case study	10	8	[60]
Cheng Z	2020	14-March	AJR Am J Roentgenol	Shanghai	China	Retrospective case study	11	5	[61]
Hsieh W	2020	13-March	J Microbiol Immunol Infect	Taichung	Taiwan	Retrospective case study	2	5	[62]
Wu C	2020	13-March	JAMA Internal Medicine	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	201	8	[63]
Qin C	2020	12-March	Clin Infect Dis	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	452	9	[64]
Zhao D	2020	12-March	Clin Infect Dis	Wuhan	China	Case-control study	19	7	[65]

Liu K	2020	11-March	Journal of Infection	Hainan	China	Retrospective case study	18	7	[66]
Zhou F	2020	09-March	The Lancet	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	191	9	[67]
Xiong Y	2020	07-March	Invest Radiol	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	42	5	[68]
Fan B	2020	04-March	American journal of hematology	Singapore	Singapore	Retrospective case study	67	9	[69]
Young B	2020	03-March	JAMA	Sengkang	Singapore	Descriptive case series	18	7	[70]
Wu J	2020	29-February	Clin Infect Dis	Jiangsu	China	Retrospective case study	80	7	[71]
Li K	2020	29-February	Invest Radiol	Chongqing	China	Retrospective case study	83	9	[72]
Liu W	2020	28-February	Chin Med J (Engl)	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	78	9	[73]
Yang W	2020	26-February	Journal of Infection	Zhejiang	China	Retrospective case study	149	6	[74]
Wu J	2020	25-February	Invest Radiol	Chongqing	China	Retrospective case study	80	6	[75]
Shi H	2020	24-February	Lancet Infectious Diseases	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	81	7	[76]
Yang X	2020	24-February	The Lancet Respiratory Medicine	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	52	9	[77]
Zhang J	2020	23-February	Allergy	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	138	9	[78]
Zhou W	2020	21-February	Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	15	8	[79]
Xu X	2020	19-February	BMJ	Zhejiang	China	Retrospective case study	62	7	[80]
Pan F	2020	13-February	Radiology	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	21	6	[81]
Chang D	2020	07-February	JAMA	Beijing	China	Retrospective case study	13	6	[82]
Wang D	2020	07-February	JAMA	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	138	9	[83]
Huang C	2020	24-January	The Lancet	Wuhan	China	Prospective cohort study	41	9	[1]

248 **Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters: Single-arm Meta-**
 249 **analysis**

250 The final pooled estimates of single-arm meta-analysis included 52 eligible
 251 articles. The pooled mean of laboratory parameters and 95%CI among SARS-
 252 CoV-2 infected patients, including hematological, immunological, and
 253 inflammatory variables, is illustrated in **Table 2**. Our results depicted a wide
 254 variability between studies for each laboratory marker. Apart from
 255 immunoglobulins, IL-2R, and IL-8, significant heterogeneity was observed.
 256 Subgroup analysis by sample size and city of origin and sensitivity analysis failed
 257 to reveal the source of variation for each parameter. Additionally, meta-regression
 258 also rendered insignificant results.

259
 260 **Table 2. Pooled estimates of single-arm meta-analysis for laboratory**
 261 **parameters in COVID-19 patients**

Laboratory testing	Number studies	Sample size	Estimate	95% CI	P-value	Q	P-value	I ²	T ²
CBC									
White blood cells	47	5967	5.82	5.24, 6.40	<0.001	7136.1	<0.001	99.35	3.83
Neutrophil count	31	3814	3.70	3.48, 3.92	<0.001	525.8	<0.001	93.9	0.31
Lymphocyte count	45	6017	0.99	0.91, 1.08	<0.001	7645.2	<0.001	99.3	0.07
Monocyte count	18	2586	0.42	0.39, 0.44	<0.001	263.7	<0.001	93.5	0.003
Eosinophils count	4	546	0.02	0.01, 0.024	<0.001	10.6	0.014	71.6	0.0
Red blood cells	2	507	4.42	3.81, 4.67	<0.001	50.8	<0.001	98.03	0.095
Hemoglobin	26	3114	129.1	125.0, 133.3	<0.001	1504.3	<0.001	98.3	103.4
Platelet count	34	4347	178.4	171.9, 184.9	<0.001	390.2	<0.001	91.5	273.5
Coagulation profile									

Prothrombin time	22	3287	12.38	11.8, 12.9	<0.001	3415.7	<0.001	99.3	1.905
APTT	19	3023	31.8	30.2, 33.4	<0.001	1312.1	<0.001	98.6	11.96
Thrombin time	2	754	21.9	8.29, 35.57	0.002	1908.1	<0.001	99.94	96.86
D-dimer	27	3857	1.25	0.67, 1.82	<0.001	40947.5	<0.001	99.9	2.22
Fibrinogen	2	781	2.45	0.61, 4.29	0.009	46.19	<0.001	97.83	1.729
Inflammatory markers									
Ferritin	8	528	889.5	773.2, 1005.7	<0.001	16.61	0.020	57.8	14138.9
ESR	13	1013	37.85	29.07, 46.6	<0.001	692.4	<0.001	98.26	239.7
Procalcitonin	25	3010	0.10	0.07, 0.12	<0.001	3913.6	<0.001	99.3	0.003
C-reactive protein	36	4409	28.11	24.7, 31.4	<0.001	3432.1	<0.001	98.9	79.35
Immunoglobulins									
IgA	2	101	2.21	2.15, 2.27	<0.001	0.089	0.76	0.0	0.0
IgG	2	101	11.54	11.2, 11.8	<0.001	1.88	0.17	46.9	0.023
IgM	2	101	1.00	0.96, 1.04	<0.001	1.11	0.29	10.32	0.0
Complement test									
C3	2	101	0.95	0.80, 1.10	<0.001	28.02	<0.001	96.43	0.011
C4	2	101	0.24	0.21, 0.27	<0.001	28.08	<0.001	96.44	0.0
Interleukins									
IL-2R	2	101	762.3	732.4, 792.2	<0.001	0.33	0.56	0.0	0.0
IL-4	2	276	2.98	1.09, 4.87	0.002	958.765	<0.001	99.9	1.85
IL-6	12	926	11.56	9.82, 13.3	<0.001	144.7	<0.001	92.4	6.19
IL-8	2	101	18.4	17.08, 19.84	<0.001	1.54	0.21	35.3	0.39
IL-10	3	292	6.33	4.39, 8.27	<0.001	133.1	<0.001	98.4	2.89
TNF- α	3	292	6.72	1.33, 12.12	0.015	2933.6	<0.001	99.9	22.7
Immune cells									
CD4 ⁺ T cells	6	296	361.1	254.0, 468.2	<0.001	88.7	<0.001	94.3	15973.1
CD8 ⁺ T cells	5	285	219.6	157.1, 282.0	<0.001	46.17	<0.001	91.3	4437.2
T lymphocytes	2	167	704.3	254.5, 1154.0	0.002	27.6	<0.001	96.3	101500

262 Test of association: standardized mean difference, Random model. 95% CI: 95% confidence interval, Q statistic: a measure of
 263 weighted squared deviations that denotes the ratio of the observed variation to the within-study error, I^2 : the ratio of true
 264 heterogeneity to total observed variation, T^2 : Tau squared, and it is referred to the extent of variation among the effects
 265 observed in different studies. Laboratory markers (INR and B lymphocytes) were reported in only one study thus were not
 266 shown. CBC: Complete blood picture, APTT: Activated partial thromboplastin time, ESR: Erythrocyte sedimentation rate. Ig:
 267 immunoglobulin, IL-2R: Interleukin-2 receptor, TNF- α : tumor necrosis factor-alpha.

268

269

270

271 **Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters according to disease**
272 **severity: Pairwise Meta-analysis**

273 Two-arms meta-analyses were then conducted for three pairwise comparisons; (1)
274 Severe *versus* mild COVID, (2) ICU admitted patients *versus* the general ward,
275 and (3) Expired *versus* survivors (**Table 3**).

276 Laboratory parameters of 16 eligible records were utilized to compare between
277 severe and non-severe patients. Severe cohorts were more likely to have high blood
278 levels of white blood cells (OR = 1.75, 95%CI = 1.21 - 2.54, $p = 0.002$), neutrophil
279 count (OR = 2.62, 95%CI = 1.72 - 3.97, $p < 0.001$), prothrombin time (OR = 1.82,
280 95%CI = 1.00 - 3.33, $p = 0.047$), D-dimer (OR = 3.97, 95%CI = 2.62 - 6.02, p
281 < 0.001), fibrinogen (OR = 3.14, 95%CI = 1.64 - 6.00, $p < 0.001$), erythrocyte
282 sedimentation rate (OR = 1.60, 95%CI = 1.16 - 2.22, $p < 0.001$), procalcitonin (OR
283 = 4.76, 95%CI = 2.48 - 9.14, $p < 0.001$), IL-6 (OR = 2.10, 95%CI = 1.02 - 4.32, $p =$
284 0.043), and IL-10 (OR = 4.93, 95%CI = 2.18 - 11.1, $p < 0.001$). In contrast, patients
285 with normal lymphocyte count (OR = 0.30, 95%CI = 0.19 - 0.47, $p < 0.001$),
286 platelet count (OR = 0.56, 95%CI = 0.42 - 0.74, $p < 0.001$), CD4⁺ T cells (OR =
287 0.04, 95%CI = 0.02 - 0.07, $p < 0.001$), and CD8⁺ T cells (OR = 0.03, 95%CI = 0.01
288 - 0.09, $p < 0.001$) were less likely to develop severe form of COVID-19 disease

289 **(Table 3A).**

290 Significant heterogeneity was observed in eight of these parameters, namely WBC
 291 ($I^2 = 62.9\%$, $p < 0.001$), neutrophil count ($I^2 = 67.6\%$, $p < 0.001$), lymphocyte count
 292 ($I^2 = 77.4\%$, $p < 0.001$), prothrombin time ($I^2 = 72\%$, $p = 0.003$), D-dimers ($I^2 =$
 293 55.6% , $p = 0.021$), procalcitonin ($I^2 = 86.1\%$, $p < 0.001$), IL-6 ($I^2 = 84.4\%$, p
 294 < 0.001), and IL-10 ($I^2 = 82.8\%$, $p = 0.003$).

295

296 **Table 3. Pooled estimates of two-arms meta-analysis for laboratory**
 297 **parameters in COVID-19 patients.**

Laboratory test	No of studies	Sample size		Effect size			Heterogeneity	
				SMD (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	P-value	I^2	P-value
(A) Severity		Mild	Severe					
White blood cells	14	1007	634	0.31 (0.11, 0.52)	1.75 (1.21, 2.54)	0.002	62.9	<0.001
Neutrophil count	14	959	599	0.53 (0.3, 0.76)	2.62 (1.72, 3.97)	<0.001	67.61	<0.001
Lymphocyte count	16	680	1128	-0.66 (-0.9, -0.41)	0.30 (0.19, 0.47)	<0.001	77.36	<0.001
Monocyte count	5	390	500	-0.08 (-0.23, 0.05)	0.86 (0.67, 1.12)	0.23	0.0	0.49
Hemoglobin	4	70	200	-0.22 (-0.51, 0.06)	0.67 (0.40, 1.12)	0.12	0.0	0.91
Platelet count	7	219	588	-0.32 (-0.47, -0.16)	0.56 (0.42, 0.74)	<0.001	0.0	0.76
Prothrombin time	6	215	521	0.33 (0.004, 0.67)	1.82 (1.00, 3.33)	0.047	72.0	0.003
APTT	5	146	386	-0.23 (-0.79, 0.33)	0.66 (0.24, 1.82)	0.42	85.5	<0.001
D-dimer	9	301	719	0.76 (0.53, 0.99)	3.97 (2.62, 6.02)	<0.001	55.65	0.021
Ferritin	2	297	176	1.003 (-0.08, 2.09)	6.17 (0.87, 43.9)	0.07	79.21	0.028
Fibrinogen	3	45	144	0.63 (0.27, 0.99)	3.14 (1.64, 6.00)	<0.001	0.0	0.81
ESR	2	302	277	0.26 (0.08, 0.44)	1.60 (1.16, 2.22)	0.004	0.0	0.43
Procalcitonin	10	565	716	0.86 (0.5, 1.22)	4.76 (2.48, 9.14)	<0.001	86.1	<0.001
C-reactive protein	13	605	928	1.02 (0.65, 1.4)	6.36 (3.22, 12.5)	<0.001	88.2	<0.001
IgA	2	355	301	0.13 (-0.03, 0.29)	1.27 (0.95, 1.69)	0.11	3.398	0.30
IgG	2	355	301	0.21 (-0.301, 0.72)	1.46 (0.58, 3.69)	0.41	88.3	0.003

IgM	2	355	301	-2.37 (-6.64, 1.89)	0.01 (0.00, 30.6)	0.27	99.56	<0.001
Complement 3	2	355	301	0.18 (-0.1, 0.47)	1.39 (0.83, 2.32)	0.20	64.70	0.09
Complement 4	2	355	301	0.13 (-0.16, 0.43)	1.27 (0.74, 2.16)	0.38	66.83	0.08
IL-4	2	355	301	1.01 (-0.85, 2.87)	6.25 (0.2, 181.1)	0.28	97.17	<0.001
IL-6	7	85	246	0.41 (0.014, 0.81)	2.10 (1.02, 4.32)	0.043	84.38	<0.001
IL-10	3	371	412	0.88 (0.43, 1.33)	4.93 (2.18, 11.1)	<0.001	82.81	0.003
TNF- α	3	371	412	0.6 (-0.17, 1.37)	2.97 (0.74, 11.9)	0.12	94.28	<0.001
CD4 ⁺ T cells	2	80	145	-1.87 (-2.39, -1.36)	0.03 (0.01, 0.09)	<0.001	29.8	0.23
CD8 ⁺ T cells	2	80	145	-1.8 (-2.12, -1.48)	0.04 (0.02, 0.07)	<0.001	0.0	0.71
(B) Admission		Floor	ICU					
White blood cells	3	64	149	0.85 (0.54, 1.15)	4.67 (2.70, 8.10)	<0.001	0.0	0.56
Neutrophil count	4	73	207	1.86 (0.59, 3.14)	29.1 (2.9, 291.8)	0.004	93.14	<0.001
Lymphocyte count	4	73	207	-0.81 (-1.36, -0.27)	0.23 (0.09, 0.62)	0.003	68.59	0.023
Monocyte count	3	60	179	-0.308 (-1.15, 0.53)	0.57 (0.13, 2.59)	0.47	83.77	0.002
Hemoglobin	2	22	86	-1.1 (-1.97, -0.24)	0.14 (0.03, 0.64)	0.012	66.31	0.08
Platelet count	4	73	207	-0.06 (-0.33, 0.2)	0.90 (0.56, 1.45)	0.64	0.0	0.54
Prothrombin time	3	64	149	0.43 (0.09, 0.76)	2.18 (1.19, 3.99)	0.012	14.28	0.31
APTT	3	64	149	-0.22 (-0.51, 0.07)	0.67 (0.40, 1.13)	0.14	0.0	0.78
D-dimer	3	64	149	0.79 (0.35, 1.24)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35)	<0.001	44.94	0.16
(C) Mortality		Alive	Died					
White blood cells	6	736	392	0.91 (0.61, 1.22)	5.21 (3.00, 9.05)	<0.001	78.05	<0.001
Neutrophil count	3	475	222	1.01 (0.4, 1.63)	6.25 (2.05, 19.0)	0.001	90.9	<0.001
Lymphocyte count	7	756	424	-0.85 (-1.28, -0.41)	0.21 (0.10, 0.47)	<0.001	89.33	<0.001
Monocyte count	4	483	229	-0.18 (-0.47, 0.1)	0.72 (0.43, 1.21)	0.21	57.48	0.070
Hemoglobin	5	600	271	0 (-0.15, 0.15)	1.00 (0.76, 1.31)	0.99	4.988	0.378
Platelet count	6	640	315	-0.46 (-0.71, -0.21)	0.43 (0.28, 0.68)	<0.001	59.52	0.030
Prothrombin time	6	640	315	0.64 (0.25, 1.03)	3.19 (1.58, 6.47)	0.001	83.0	<0.001
APTT	4	483	229	-0.096 (-0.51, 0.31)	0.83 (0.40, 1.75)	0.646	78.23	0.003
D-dimer	5	620	283	1.02 (0.85, 1.18)	6.36 (4.72, 8.58)	<0.001	10.63	0.34
Ferritin	3	338	211	0.94 (0.26, 1.62)	5.50 (1.6, 18.83)	0.006	91.63	<0.001
ESR	2	201	157	0.33 (0.08, 0.58)	1.82 (1.16, 2.86)	0.008	20.03	0.263
Procalcitonin	3	580	239	0.96 (0.43, 1.49)	5.70 (2.18, 14.9)	<0.001	81.48	0.005
C-reactive protein	4	591	331	1.08 (0.65, 1.52)	7.09 (3.23, 15.5)	<0.001	87.31	<0.001
IL-6	4	612	276	1.45 (1.11, 1.78)	13.87 (7.6, 25.4)	<0.001	75.44	0.007
CD4 ⁺ T cells	2	314	109	-0.67 (-1.01, -0.33)	0.30 (0.16, 0.55)	<0.001	44.57	0.17
CD8 ⁺ T cells	2	314	109	-0.832 (-1.1, -0.59)	0.22 (0.15, 0.34)	<0.001	0.0	0.423

298 Continuous Random-Effects model, SMD: Standardized mean difference, OR 95% CI: Odds ratio 95%
299 confidence interval, I^2 : the ratio of true heterogeneity to total observed variation. APTT: Activated
300 partial thromboplastin time, ESR: Erythrocyte sedimentation rate. Ig: immunoglobulin, IL: Interleukin,
301 TNF- α : tumor necrosis factor-alpha.

302 **Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters according to ICU** 303 **admission: Pairwise Meta-analysis**

304 A total of 4 eligible articles were recognized to include laboratory features of ICU
305 and floor patients. Our data revealed having elevated levels of WBCs (OR = 5.21,
306 95%CI = 3.0 – 9.05, $p < 0.001$), neutrophils (OR = 6.25, 95%CI = 2.05 – 19.0, $p =$
307 0.001), D-dimer (OR = 4.19, 95%CI = 1.88 - 9.35, $p < 0.001$), and prolonged
308 prothrombin time (OR = 2.18, 95%CI = 1.19 - 3.99, $p = 0.012$) were associated
309 with increased odds of ICU admission, while normal lymphocyte count (OR =
310 0.23, 95%CI = 0.09 - 0.62, $p = 0.003$) and hemoglobin (OR = 0.14, 95%CI = 0.03 -
311 0.64, $p = 0.012$) conferred lower risk of ICU admission (**Table 3B**).

312 Remarkable heterogeneity was obvious in studies of neutrophil count ($I^2 = 93.1\%$,
313 $p < 0.001$), lymphocyte count ($I^2 = 68.5\%$, $p = 0.023$), and hemoglobin ($I^2 = 66.3\%$,
314 $p = 0.08$). These parameters were enclosed in two to four studies; therefore, further
315 tracing for the source of heterogeneity was not applicable.

316 **Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters according to mortality:**

317 **Pairwise Meta-analysis**

318 Of the included articles, 7 studies contained separate results for laboratory testing
319 in survival *versus* expired patients. As depicted in **Table 3C**, our data revealed
320 increased odds of having elevated levels of WBC (OR = 5.21, 95%CI = 3.0 – 9.05,
321 $p < 0.001$), neutrophils (OR = 6.25, 95%CI = 2.05 – 19.0, $p = 0.001$), prothrombin
322 time (OR = 3.19, 95%CI = 1.58 – 6.47, $p = 0.001$), D-dimer (OR = 6.36, 95%CI =
323 4.72 - 8.58, $p < 0.001$), ferritin (OR = 5.50, 95%CI = 1.6 - 18.8, $p = 0.006$), ESR
324 (OR = 1.82, 95%CI = 1.16 - 2.86, $p = 0.008$), procalcitonin (OR = 5.70, 95%CI =
325 2.18 - 14.9, $p < 0.001$), CRP (OR = 7.09, 95%CI = 3.23 - 15.5, $p < 0.001$), and IL-6
326 (OR = 13.87, 95%CI = 7.6 - 25.4, $p < 0.001$) in expired cases. However, patients
327 with normal lymphocyte count (0.21 (0.10, 0.47, $p < 0.001$), platelet count (0.43
328 (0.28, 0.68, $p < 0.001$), CD4⁺ T cells (OR = 0.30 (0.16, 0.55, $p < 0.001$), and CD8⁺
329 T cells (OR = 0.22 (0.15, 0.34, $p < 0.001$) had higher chance of survival (**Table**
330 **3C**).

331 Considerable heterogeneity was also noted in some of these parameters, namely
332 WBC ($I^2 = 78.0\%$, $p < 0.001$), neutrophilic count ($I^2 = 90.9\%$, $p < 0.001$),
333 lymphocyte count ($I^2 = 89.3\%$, $p < 0.001$), platelet count ($I^2 = 59.5\%$, $p = 0.030$),
334 ferritin ($I^2 = 91.6\%$, $p < 0.001$), procalcitonin ($I^2 = 81.5\%$, $p = 0.005$), CRP ($I^2 =$
335 87.3% , $p < 0.001$), and IL-6 ($I^2 = 75.4\%$, $p = 0.007$). Given the small number of
336 enrolled studies with discriminated data on patients who survived or died, we

337 failed to identify the source of heterogeneity.

338 **Subgroup and sensitivity analysis**

339 For the studies which included a comparison between mild and severe patients,
340 subgroup and sensitivity analyses were performed for five laboratory markers
341 (WBC, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, procalcitonin, and CRP). First, to
342 identify how each study affects the overall estimate of the rest of the studies, we
343 performed leave-one-out sensitivity analyses. Results did not contribute to give
344 explanations to heterogeneity. In contrast, subgroup analysis revealed homogeneity
345 with certain categorizations. For WBCs lab results, heterogeneity was resolved on
346 stratification by the origin of study population [Wuhan population: $I^2 = 73.4\%$, $p =$
347 0.002 , other cities: $I^2 = 0\%$, $p = 0.53$] and month of publication [April: $I^2 = 74.5\%$,
348 $p = 0.001$, February/March: $I^2 = 47.5\%$, $p = 0.06$]. Regarding neutrophilic count,
349 the variance in the results resolved in articles with large sample size >50 patients
350 ($I^2 = 46.2\%$, $p = 0.06$). Moreover, the degree of dissimilarities of procalcitonin
351 results found in different studies was ameliorated in April publications ($I^2 = 41.5\%$,
352 $p = 0.16$) and in those with low sample size ($I^2 = 0\%$, $p = 0.80$). Similarly,
353 homogeneity was generated in CRP results in articles with low sample size ($I^2 =$
354 0% , $p = 0.58$) (**Table 4**).

355 **Meta-regression analysis**

356 Considering the number of the included studies with severity, ICU admission, and
357 mortality data was rather small, we performed meta-regression analyses for only
358 five parameters (mentioned above) in studies comparing mild and severe disease
359 **(Table 4)**.

360
361

Table 4. Tracing the source of heterogeneity of laboratory markers in studies comparing mild and severe COVID-19 patients

Lab test	Feature	Categories	Count of studies	Pooled estimates				Heterogeneity		Meta-regression			
				SMD	LL	UL	P-value	I ²	P-value	Coefficient	LL	UL	P-value
White blood cells	Overall		14	0.317	0.113	0.52	0.002	62.90%	0.001				
	Origin of patients	Others	8	0.113	-0.083	0.308	0.26	0%	0.53	<i>Reference</i>			
		Wuhan	6	0.490	0.198	0.783	0.00	73.40%	0.002	0.31	0.03	0.58	0.029
	Sample size	≤50	5	0.164	-0.553	0.881	0.65	71.30%	0.007	<i>Reference</i>			
		>50	9	0.387	0.208	0.566	<0.001	52.60%	0.031	0.30	-0.10	0.72	0.14
	Publication month	Feb/Mar	8	0.251	0.039	0.464	0.021	47.50%	0.06	<i>Reference</i>			
April		6	0.445	0.005	0.884	0.047	74.50%	0.001	0.11	-0.16	0.38	0.43	
Neutrophils	Overall		14	0.534	0.306	0.762	<0.001	67.62%	<0.001				
	Origin of patients	Others	8	0.439	0.139	0.740	0.004	50.88%	0.047	<i>Reference</i>			
		Wuhan	6	0.632	0.280	0.985	<0.001	78.29%	<0.001	0.045	-0.21	0.30	0.20
	Sample size	≤50	5	0.286	-0.503	1.076	0.47	75.94%	0.002	<i>Reference</i>			
		>50	9	0.65	0.472	0.828	<0.001	46.2%	0.06	0.606	0.20	1.01	0.003
	Publication month	Feb/Mar	8	0.428	0.181	0.675	<0.001	54.4%	0.032	<i>Reference</i>			
April		6	0.709	0.273	1.44	0.001	73.19%	0.002	0.312	0.06	0.55	0.014	
Lymphocytes	Overall		16	-0.663	-0.909	-0.417	<0.001	77.36%	<0.001				
	Origin of patients	Others	9	-0.626	-0.962	-0.291	<0.001	66.51%	0.002	<i>Reference</i>			
		Wuhan	7	-0.710	1.097	-0.323	<0.001	85.72%	<0.001	0.092	-0.31	0.49	0.64
	Sample size	≤50	5	-0.506	-1.169	0.156	0.13	66.1%	0.019	<i>Reference</i>			
		>50	11	-0.714	-0.983	-0.444	<0.001	80.98%	<0.001	-0.342	-0.85	0.169	0.18
	Publication month	Feb/Mar	9	-0.452	-0.712	-0.192	<0.001	66.65%	0.002	<i>Reference</i>			
April		7	-0.979	-1.354	-0.604	<0.001	70.53%	0.002	-0.572	-0.97	-0.17	0.006	
Procalcitonin	Overall		10	0.868	0.508	1.228	<0.001	88.16%	<0.001				

	Origin of patients	Others	5	1.038	0.370	1.706	<0.001	86.16%	<0.001	<i>Reference</i>			
		Wuhan	5	0.686	0.331	1.041	<0.001	75.38%	0.003	-0.318	-0.97	0.33	0.34
	Sample size	≤50	3	0.768	0.334	1.203	<0.001	0%	0.80	<i>Reference</i>			
		>50	7	0.903	0.459	1.348	<0.001	88.62%	<0.001	0.054	-0.72	0.83	0.89
	Publication month	Feb/Mar	6	0.956	0.404	1.509	<0.001	91.51%	<0.001	<i>Reference</i>			
April		4	0.757	0.409	1.105	<0.001	41.54%	0.16	-0.096	-0.80	0.61	0.78	
C-reactive protein	Overall		13	1.027	0.65	1.40	<0.001	88.2%	<0.001				
	Origin of patients	Others	8	1.24	0.65	1.83	<0.001	87.8%	<0.001	<i>Reference</i>			
		Wuhan	5	0.389	0.30	1.07	<0.001	80.7%	<0.001	-0.58	-1.27	0.10	0.09
	Sample size	≤50	3	0.831	0.341	1.322	<0.001	0%	0.58	<i>Reference</i>			
		>50	10	1.08	0.651	1.512	<0.001	82.3%	<0.001	0.37	-0.55	1.29	0.42
Publication month	Feb/Mar	8	1.014	0.502	1.525	<0.001	88.23%	<0.001	<i>Reference</i>				
	April	5	1.07	0.548	1.600	<0.001	75.1%	0.003	0.13	-0.59	0.86	0.71	

362 SMD: Standardized mean difference, LL: lower limit, UL: upper limit, I^2 : the ratio of true heterogeneity to total observed variation.

363 Significant values indicate significance at $P < 0.05$.

364 For WBCs, higher difference between mild and severe cohorts was noted in
365 Wuhan studies than other population (coefficient = 0.31, 95%CI = 0.03, 0.58, $p =$
366 0.029). Moreover, articles with larger sample size exhibited a wider variation of
367 neutrophilic count between severe and non-severe cases (coefficient = 0.60, 95%CI
368 = 0.20, 1.01, $p = 0.003$). For the same marker, later studies published in April also
369 showed higher difference compared to those published in February and March
370 (coefficient = 0.31, 95%CI = 0.06, 0.55, $p = 0.014$). In contrast, more reduction of
371 lymphocytes was observed in April articles than earlier ones (coefficient = -0.57,
372 95%CI = -0.97, -0.17, $p = 0.006$).

373 **Publication bias**

374 Publication bias was performed to the same five parameters with study count ≥ 10
375 (**Fig. S1**). Visual inspection of the funnel plots suggested symmetrical distribution
376 for all laboratory parameters tested. The Egger test ($p > 0.1$) confirmed that there
377 was no substantial evidence of publication bias; Egger's regression p values were
378 0.44, 0.50, 0.68, 0.56, and 0.22 for WBC, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count,
379 procalcitonin, and CRP, respectively.

380 **Decision tree and Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve**

381 To identify predictors for severity, decision tree analysis was applied using
382 multiple laboratory results. High performance of classification was found with the

383 usage of a single parameter; neutrophilic count identified severe patients with
384 100% sensitivity and 81% specificity at a cut-off value of >3.74 identified by the
385 specified decision tree model. Further analysis of the area under the curve of input
386 data is shown in **Table 5**.

387 **Table 5. Receiver Operating Characteristics results**

Lab test	AUC	Threshold	Sensitivity	Specificity	P-value
WBC	0.801 ± 0.09	5.47	85.7	85.7	0.007
Neutrophil	0.831 ± 0.09	3.74	78.5	100	0.003
Lymphocyte	0.867 ± 0.06	0.98	81.2	87.5	<0.001
Platelets	0.836 ± 0.11	177.6	71.4	71.4	0.035
PT	0.583 ± 0.17	12.9	50.0	83.3	0.63
Procalcitonin	0.845 ± 0.09	0.06	80.0	90.0	0.007
D-dimer	0.876 ± 0.08	0.48	88.9	77.8	0.007
CRP	0.875 ± 0.08	38.2	84.6	92.3	0.001
IL-6	0.632 ± 1.6	22.9	71.4	71.4	0.40

388 AUC: area under the curve, WBC: white blood cells, PT: prothrombin time, CRP: C-reactive
389 protein, IL-6: interleukin 6. Bold values indicate significance at $P < 0.05$.

390

391 **Trial sequential analysis**

392 As elaborated by the decision tree algorithm for the role of neutrophilic count on
393 decision-making to discriminate between COVID-19 patients with a mild and
394 severe presentation, TSA was employed on that particular laboratory parameter to

395 test for the presence of sufficient studies from which results were drawn. The
396 sample size of studies containing neutrophilic count information and classifying
397 cohorts into mild and severe COVID-19 infection accounted for a total of 1,558
398 subjects. TSA illustrated crossing of the monitoring boundary by the cumulative Z-
399 curve before reaching the required sample size, suggesting that the cumulative
400 proof was acceptable, and no additional future studies are needed to authenticate
401 the significances (**Fig 2**).

402
403 **Fig 2 Trial sequential analysis.** Trial sequential analysis (TSA) for the neutrophil
404 count. The obtained sample size of the neutrophil count was 1558 subjects and the
405 cumulative Z-curve crossed the monitoring boundary before reaching the required
406 sample size, suggesting that the cumulative proof was reliable, and no additional
407 trials are required to achieve the significances.

408 **Discussion**

409 During the last few months, the prevalence of COVID-19 infection was increased
410 daily among different countries overall in the world. Thus, the need to assess the
411 disease severity and mortality are required to limit the pervasiveness of this
412 pandemic [21]. A diverse of abnormal laboratory parameters including
413 hematological, inflammatory as well as immunological markers thought to be

414 raised throughout COVID-19 outbreak [2, 22]. In this comprehensive meta-
415 analysis, our team attempted to interpret the distinct questions raised about the
416 various spectrum of laboratory parameters associated with the severity and
417 mortality of COVID-19. At the beginning of this workflow, our team investigated
418 different hematological, inflammatory, and immunological variables of 6320
419 patients diagnosed with COVID-19. Our findings using random-effect models
420 revealed increased levels of WBCs and neutrophil counts that were significantly
421 associated with higher odds ratio among severe, ICU admission and Expired
422 patients with COVID-19. On the contrary, the levels of lymphocyte and platelet
423 counts were lowered among severe and expired patients with COVID-19. Also, we
424 observed depletion in quantities of CD4⁺ T cells and CD8⁺ T cells among severe
425 and mortality patients.

426 Nevertheless, in patients with the COVID-19 outbreak, the WBC count can vary
427 [23]. Other reports indicated that leukopenia, leukocytosis, and lymphopenia have
428 been reported, although lymphopenia appears most common [24, 25]. Another
429 study supported that lymphopenia is an effective and reliable indicator of the
430 severity and hospitalization in COVID-19 patients [26]. The additional report
431 suggested that COVID-19 illness might be implicated with CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells
432 depletion through acting on lymphocytes, especially T lymphocytes [27]. A recent
433 meta-analysis study discovered that the severity among COVID-19 patients might

434 correlate with higher levels of WBCs count and lower levels of lymphocyte, CD4⁺
435 T cells, and CD8⁺ T cells counts [22]. In this respect, we could speculate that the
436 depletion in the number of lymphocytes count is directly proportional with the
437 severity of COVID-19 infection and the high survival rate of the disease is
438 associated with the ability to renovate lymphocyte cells, particularly T
439 lymphocytes which are crucial for destroying the infected viral particles [28].
440 During disease severity, remarkable thrombocytopenia was observed and
441 confirmed by Lippi and his colleagues that revealed a reduction of platelet count
442 among severe and died patients with COVID-19 supporting that thrombocytopenia
443 could consider as an exacerbating indicator during the progression of the disease
444 [29]. Therefore, our findings could support Shi et al. conclusion that high WBC
445 count with lymphopenia could be considered as a differential diagnostic criterion
446 for COVID-19 [30].

447 Considering coagulation profile, our team observed a prolonged in most
448 coagulation markers among severe, ICU and expired patients, especially
449 prothrombin time, fibrinogen, D-dimer, but with normal proportions of activated
450 partial thromboplastin time (APTT) that could focus the light on the pathogenesis
451 of COVID-19 infection through interfering with extrinsic coagulation pathway. A
452 recently published report concluded similar findings in the form of observation of
453 higher levels prothrombin time, D-dimer along fibrin degradation products among

454 non-survival compared with survival patients [31].

455 Numerous studies illustrated the pathogenesis action of COVID-19 with the
456 induction of cytokine storm throughout the progressive phase of the infection [22,
457 32, 33]. The generation of cytokine storm within COVID-19 patients required
458 increased levels of IFN- γ and IL-1 β that could stimulate the cellular response of T
459 helper type 1 (Th1) which has a crucial function in the acceleration of specific
460 immunity against COVID-19 outbreak [32]. Due to the elevated levels of IL-2R
461 and IL-6 accompanied by the advancement of COVID-19, several cytokines
462 secreted by T helper type 2 (Th2) cells that could neutralize the inflammatory
463 responses including IL-4 and IL-10 [22, 32]. Our findings revealed a significantly
464 associated with elevated levels of anti-inflammatory cytokines involving IL-6 and
465 IL-10 among severe and expired patients with COVID-19. A recent study indicated
466 a similar assumption with these findings and identified elevated levels of IL-6 and
467 IL-10 among non-survived compared with survived patients [9]. Another
468 confirmation of this conclusion is confirmed by a newly published meta-analysis
469 report that indicated an exaggerated elevation of IL-6 and IL-10 throughout the
470 severe level of COVID-19 infection [22].

471 Concerning the inflammatory markers associated with the COVID-19 pandemic,
472 this comprehensive meta-analysis study observed higher concentrations of C-
473 reactive protein (CRP) and procalcitonin besides elevated erythrocyte

474 sedimentation rate (ESR) levels among severe and expired patients with COVID-
475 19. Recently, Henry et al. established a meta-analysis survey and corroborated this
476 finding with a higher significance of CRP and procalcitonin levels [22]. Other
477 recent reports identified higher levels of CRP among severe patients with COVID-
478 19 infection [26]. An additional meta-analysis survey established based on four
479 recent articles indicated prolonged levels of procalcitonin among severe patients
480 with COVID-19 [34]. In this respect, we might speculate the potential role of
481 procalcitonin as a prognostic biomarker during the severe status of COVID-19.
482 Finally, our team revealed increased levels of serum ferritin among non-survived
483 patients compared with survived patients, and this significant outcome was
484 observed in another meta-analysis study among severe and non-survival patients
485 with COVID-19 infection [22].

486 This comprehensive meta-analysis confronted several limitations that raised
487 throughout the processing of the outcomes. First, the insufficient laboratory data
488 concerning the interest of design causing the increasing bias among different
489 covariates. Second, the variation in the characteristics among different articles
490 concerning the severity and survival of COVID-19. Third, the small sample sizes
491 of some studies besides most of the concerned articles were established within
492 China, especially Wuhan. Finally, there was an observed publication bias and
493 heterogeneity in this comprehensive meta-analysis.

494 **Conclusion**

495 In conclusion, several laboratory parameters could associate with the severity and
496 mortality of COVID-19 infection and should be screened and measured
497 continuously during the progression of this pandemic. These parameters included
498 WBCs count, lymphocytes, platelet count, prothrombin time, D-dimer, and
499 fibrinogen. Also, various interleukins could serve as anti-inflammatory markers
500 such as IL-6, and IL-10 and should be evaluated. The estimation of other
501 inflammatory biomarkers like CRP and procalcitonin could be helpful in the
502 monitor the severity of the disease.

503 **Acknowledgments**

504 We thank all authors who provided published information for our meta-analysis.

505 **Funding** None

506 **References**

- 507 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of
508 patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*.
509 2020; 395(10223): 497-506.
- 510 2. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Cardona-Ospina JA, Gutiérrez-Ocampo E,
511 Villamizar-Peña R, Holguin-Rivera Y, Escalera-Antezana JP, et al. Clinical,
512 laboratory and imaging features of COVID-19: A systematic review and
513 meta-analysis. *Travel medicine and infectious disease*. 2020; 101623.
- 514 3. Al-Tawfiq JA, Gautret P. Asymptomatic Middle East Respiratory Syndrome

- 515 Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) infection: Extent and implications for infection
516 control: A systematic review. *Travel Med Infect Dis*, 2019; 27:27-32.
- 517 4. Ksiazek TG, Erdman D, Goldsmith CS, Zaki SR, Peret T, Emery S, et al. A
518 novel coronavirus associated with severe acute respiratory syndrome. *New*
519 *England journal of medicine*. 2003; 348(20):1953-66.
- 520 5. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Bonilla-Aldana DK, Balbin-Ramon GJ, Rabaan AA,
521 Sah R, Paniz-Mondolfi A, et al. History is repeating itself: Probable zoonotic
522 spillover as the cause of the 2019 novel Coronavirus Epidemic. *Infez Med*.
523 2020; 28:3-5.
- 524 6. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and
525 clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in
526 Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *The Lancet*. 2020; 395:507-13.
- 527 7. Yin Y, Wunderink RG. MERS, SARS and other coronaviruses as causes of
528 pneumonia. *Respirology*. 2018; 23:130-137.
- 529 8. Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, Place S, Van Laethem Y, Cabaraux P,
530 Mat Q, et al. Clinical and Epidemiological Characteristics of 1,420 European
531 Patients with mild to moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Journal of*
532 *Internal Medicine*. 2020.
- 533 9. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, Yan W, Yang D, Chen G, et al. Clinical
534 characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019:
535 retrospective study. *Bmj*. 2020; 368.
- 536 10. Udugama B, Kadhiresan P, Kozlowski HN, Malekjahani A, Osborne M, Li
537 VY, et al. Diagnosing COVID-19: the disease and tools for detection. *ACS*
538 *nano*. 2020.
- 539 11. McInnes MD, Moher D, Thombs BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, Clifford
540 T, et al. Preferred reporting items for a systematic review and meta-analysis
541 of diagnostic test accuracy studies: the PRISMA-DTA statement. *Jama*.

- 542 2018; 319:388-396.
- 543 12. Kapadia MZ, Park CK, Beyene J, Giglia L, Maxwell C, McDonald SD.
544 Weight loss instead of weight gain within the guidelines in obese women
545 during pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analyses of maternal and
546 infant outcomes. *PloS one*. 2015; 10(7).
- 547 13. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the
548 assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses.
549 *European Journal of Epidemiology*. 2010; 25: 603-605.
- 550 14. Wallace BC, Dahabreh IJ, Trikalinos TA, Lau J, Trow P, Schmid CH.
551 Closing the gap between methodologists and end-users: R as a
552 computational back-end. *J Stat Softw*. 2012; 49:1-5.
- 553 15. Pierce CA. Software Review: Borenstein, M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT and
554 Rothstein HR (2006). *Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (Version 2.2.*
555 *027)[Computer software]*. Englewood, NJ: Biostat. *Organizational Research*
556 *Methods*. 2008; 11:188-191.
- 557 16. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials*.
558 1986; 7:177-188.
- 559 17. Andreano A, Rebora P, Valsecchi MG. Measures of single arm outcome in
560 meta-analyses of rare events in the presence of competing risks. *Biometrical*
561 *Journal*. 2015; 57: 649-660.
- 562 18. Elshazli RM, Toraih EA, Elgaml A, Kandil E, Fawzy MS. Genetic
563 polymorphisms of TP53 (rs1042522) and MDM2 (rs2279744) and colorectal
564 cancer risk: An updated meta-analysis based on 59 case-control studies.
565 *Gene*. 2020;144391.
- 566 19. Lin L, Chu H. Quantifying publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*.
567 2018; 74:785-794.
- 568 20. Duval S, Tweedie R, Nonparametric A. “Trim and Fill” Method of

- 569 Accounting for Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the American*
570 *Statistical Association*. 2000; 95:89-98.
- 571 21. Emami A, Javanmardi F, Pirbonyeh N, Akbari A. Prevalence of Underlying
572 Diseases in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: a Systematic Review and
573 Meta-Analysis. *Arch Acad Emerg Med*. 2020; 8:e35.
- 574 22. Henry BM, De Oliveira MH, Benoit S, Plebani M, Lippi G. Hematologic,
575 biochemical and immune biomarker abnormalities associated with severe
576 illness and mortality in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a meta-
577 analysis. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2020.
- 578 23. Di Gennaro F, Pizzol D, Marotta C, Antunes M, Racalbuto V, Veronese N,
579 et al. Coronavirus Diseases (COVID-19) Current Status and Future
580 Perspectives: A Narrative Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;
581 17.
- 582 24. Lippi G, Simundic AM, Plebani M. Potential preanalytical and analytical
583 vulnerabilities in the laboratory diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019
584 (COVID-19). *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2020.
- 585 25. Lagier JC, Colson P, Dupont HT, Salomon J, Doudier B, Aubry C., et al.,
586 Testing the repatriated for SARS-Cov2: Should laboratory-based quarantine
587 replace traditional quarantine? *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020; 101624.
- 588 26. Tan C, Huang Y, Shi F, Tan K, Ma Q, Chen Y, et al. C-reactive protein
589 correlates with computed tomographic findings and predicts severe COVID-
590 19 early. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
- 591 27. He R, Lu Z, Zhang L, Fan T, Xiong R, Shen X, et al. The clinical course and
592 its correlated immune status in COVID-19 pneumonia. *Journal of Clinical*
593 *Virology*. 2020; 104361.
- 594 28. Henry BM. COVID-19, ECMO, and lymphopenia: a word of caution.
595 *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020; 8: e24.

- 596 29. Lippi G, Plebani M, Henry BM. Thrombocytopenia is associated with severe
597 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infections: A meta-analysis. *Clinica*
598 *Chimica Acta*. 2020; 506:145-148.
- 599 30. Shi Y, Wang Y, Shao C, Huang J, Gan J, Huang X, et al. COVID-19
600 infection: the perspectives on immune responses. *Cell Death Differ*. 2020;
601 27: 1451-1454.
- 602 31. Tang N, Li D, Wang X, Sun Z. Abnormal coagulation parameters are
603 associated with poor prognosis in patients with novel coronavirus
604 pneumonia. *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*. 2020; 18:844-847.
- 605 32. Ye Q, Wang B, Mao J. The pathogenesis and treatment of the 'Cytokine
606 Storm' in COVID-19. *J Infect*. 2020.
- 607 33. Zhao M. Cytokine storm and immunomodulatory therapy in COVID-19:
608 Role of chloroquine and anti-IL-6 monoclonal antibodies. *Int J Antimicrob*
609 *Agents*. 2020; 105982.
- 610 34. Lippi G, Plebani M. Procalcitonin in patients with severe coronavirus
611 disease 2019 (COVID-19): A meta-analysis. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2020;
612 505:190-191.
- 613 35. Zhu Z, Cai T, Fan L, Lou K, Hua X, Huang Z., et al. Clinical value of
614 immune-inflammatory parameters to assess the severity of coronavirus
615 disease 2019. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 616 36. Liu X, Li Z, Liu S, Sun J, Chen Z, Jiang M, et al. Potential therapeutic
617 effects of dipyridamole in the severely ill patients with COVID-19. *Acta*
618 *Pharm Sin B*. 2020.
- 619 37. Chen X, Zhao B, Qu Y, Chen Y, Xiong J, Feng Y, et al. Detectable serum
620 SARS-CoV-2 viral load (RNAemia) is closely correlated with drastically
621 elevated interleukin 6 (IL-6) level in critically ill COVID-19 patients. *Clin*
622 *Infect Dis*. 2020.

- 623 38. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, Cao Y, Huang D, Wang H, et al. Clinical and
624 immunological features of severe and moderate coronavirus disease 2019. *J*
625 *Clin Invest.* 2020.
- 626 39. Zhang G, Hu C, Luo L, Fang F, Chen Y, Li J, et al. Clinical features and
627 short-term outcomes of 221 patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *J*
628 *Clin Virol.* 2020; 127:104364.
- 629 40. Lei S, Jiang F, Su W, Chen C, Chen J, Mei W, et al. Clinical characteristics
630 and outcomes of patients undergoing surgeries during the incubation period
631 of COVID-19 infection. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020; 100331.
- 632 41. Wang L, He W, Yu X, Hu D, Bao M, Liu H, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019
633 in elderly patients: Characteristics and prognostic factors based on 4-week
634 follow-up. *J Infect.* 2020.
- 635 42. Guo T, Fan Y, Chen M, Wu X, Zhang L, He T, et al., Cardiovascular
636 Implications of Fatal Outcomes of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019
637 (COVID-19). *JAMA Cardiol.* 2020.
- 638 43. Zheng C, Wang J, Guo H, Lu Z, Ma Y, Zhu Y, et al. Risk-adapted
639 Treatment Strategy For COVID-19 Patients. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020; 94: 74-
640 77.
- 641 44. Tang X, Du R, Wang R, Cao T, Guan L, Yang C et al. Comparison of
642 Hospitalized Patients With ARDS Caused by COVID-19 and H1N1. *Chest.*
643 2020.
- 644 45. Shi S, Qin M, Shen B, Cai Y, Liu T, Yang F et al. Association of Cardiac
645 Injury With Mortality in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 in Wuhan,
646 China. *JAMA Cardiol.* 2020.
- 647 46. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, et al. Temporal
648 profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum
649 antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational

- 650 cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020.
- 651 47. Zhou Z, Guo D, Li C, Fang Z, Chen L, Yang R, et al. Coronavirus disease
652 2019: initial chest CT findings. *Eur Radiol.* 2020.
- 653 48. Chen Z, Fan H, Cai J, Li Y, Wu B, Hou Y, et al. High-resolution computed
654 tomography manifestations of COVID-19 infections in patients of different
655 ages. *Eur J Radiol.* 2020; 126:108972.
- 656 49. Wan S, Xiang Y, Fang W, Zheng Y, Li B, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features and
657 treatment of COVID-19 patients in northeast Chongqing. *J Med Virol.* 2020.
- 658 50. Cheng Y, Luo R, Wang K, Zhang M, Wang Z, Dong L, et al. Kidney
659 disease is associated with in-hospital death of patients with COVID-19.
660 *Kidney Int.* 2020.
- 661 51. Luo S, Zhang X, Xu H. Don't Overlook Digestive Symptoms in Patients
662 With 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). *Clin Gastroenterol*
663 *Hepatol.* 2020.
- 664 52. Deng Y, Liu W, Liu K, Fang YY, Shang J, Wang K, et al. Clinical
665 characteristics of fatal and recovered cases of coronavirus disease 2019
666 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China: a retrospective study. *Chin Med J (Engl).*
667 2020.
- 668 53. Arentz M, Yim E, Klaff L, Lokhandwala S, Riedo FX, Chong M, et al.
669 Characteristics and Outcomes of 21 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19
670 in Washington State. *JAMA.* 2020.
- 671 54. Chen J, Qi T, Liu L, Ling Y, Qian Z, Li T, et al. Clinical progression of
672 patients with COVID-19 in Shanghai, China. *J Infect.* 2020; 80: e1-e6.
- 673 55. Cai Q, Yang M, Liu D, Chen J, Shu D, Xia J, et al., Experimental Treatment
674 with Favipiravir for COVID-19: An Open-Label Control Study.
675 *Engineering.* 2020.
- 676 56. Gao Y, Li T, Han M, Li X, Wu D, Xu Y, et al. Diagnostic utility of clinical

- 677 laboratory data determinations for patients with the severe COVID-19. J
678 Med Virol. 2020.
- 679 57. Qian GQ, Yang NB, Ding F, Ma AH, Wang ZY, Shen YF, et al.
680 Epidemiologic and Clinical Characteristics of 91 Hospitalized Patients with
681 COVID-19 in Zhejiang, China: A retrospective, multi-centre case series.
682 QJM. 2020.
- 683 58. Mo P, Xing Y, Xiao Y, Deng L, Zhao Q, Wang H, et al. Clinical
684 characteristics of refractory COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. Clin
685 Infect Dis. 2020.
- 686 59. Cao J, Tu WJ, Cheng W, Yu L, Liu YK, Hu X, et al. Clinical Features of 69
687 Cases with Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. Clin Infect Dis.
688 2020.
- 689 60. Lo IL, Lio CF, Cheong HH, Lei CI, Cheong TH, Zhong X, et al. Evaluation
690 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in clinical specimens and clinical
691 characteristics of 10 patients with COVID-19 in Macau. Int J Biol Sci. 2020;
692 16:1698-1707.
- 693 61. Cheng Z, Lu Y, Cao Q, Qin L, Pan Z, Yan F, et al. Clinical Features and
694 Chest CT Manifestations of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in a
695 Single-Center Study in Shanghai, China. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2020; 1-6.
- 696 62. Hsieh WH, Cheng MY, Ho MW, Chou CH, Lin PC, Chi CY, et al. Featuring
697 COVID-19 cases via screening symptomatic patients with epidemiologic
698 link during flu season in a medical center of central Taiwan. Journal of
699 Microbiology, Immunology and Infection. 2020.
- 700 63. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, Zhou X, Xu S, Huang H, et al. Risk Factors
701 Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients
702 With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA Intern
703 Med. 2020.

- 704 64. Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, Zhang S, Yang S, Tao Y, et al. Dysregulation of
705 immune response in patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect*
706 *Dis*, 2020.
- 707 65. Zhao D, Yao F, Wang L, Zheng L, Gao Y, Ye J, et al., A comparative study
708 on the clinical features of COVID-19 pneumonia to other pneumonias. *Clin*
709 *Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 710 66. Liu K, Chen Y, Lin R, Han K. Clinical features of COVID-19 in elderly
711 patients: A comparison with young and middle-aged patients. *J Infect*, 2020.
- 712 67. Zhou, F., et al., Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult
713 inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study.
714 *Lancet*. 2020; 395:1054-1062.
- 715 68. Xiong Y, Sun D, Liu Y, Fan Y, Zhao L, Li X, et al. Clinical and High-
716 Resolution CT Features of the COVID-19 Infection: Comparison of the
717 Initial and Follow-up Changes. *Invest Radiol*. 2020.
- 718 69. Fan BE, Chong VC, Chan SS, Lim GH, Lim KG, Tan GB, et al.,
719 Hematologic parameters in patients with COVID-19 infection. *Am J*
720 *Hematol*. 2020.
- 721 70. Young BE, Ong SW, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, et al.
722 Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With
723 SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 724 71. Wu J, Liu J, Zhao X, Liu C, Wang W, Wang D, et al. Clinical
725 Characteristics of Imported Cases of COVID-19 in Jiangsu Province: A
726 Multicenter Descriptive Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 727 72. Li K, Wu J, Wu F, Guo D, Chen L, Fang Z, et al. The Clinical and Chest CT
728 Features Associated with Severe and Critical COVID-19 Pneumonia. *Invest*
729 *Radiol*. 2020.
- 730 73. Liu W, Tao ZW, Wang L, Yuan ML, Liu K, Zhou L, et al. Analysis of

- 731 factors associated with disease outcomes in hospitalized patients with 2019
732 novel coronavirus disease. *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2020.
- 733 74. Yang W, Cao Q, Qin L, Wang X, Cheng Z, Pan A, et al. Clinical
734 characteristics and imaging manifestations of the 2019 novel coronavirus
735 disease (COVID-19):A multi-center study in Wenzhou city, Zhejiang,
736 China. *J Infect*. 2020; 80: 388-393.
- 737 75. Wu J, Wu X, Zeng W, Guo D, Fang Z, Chen L, et al. Chest CT Findings in
738 Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 and Its Relationship With Clinical
739 Features. *Invest Radiol*. 2020; 55:257-261.
- 740 76. Shi H, Han X, Jiang N, Cao Y, Alwalid O, Gu J, et al. Radiological findings
741 from 81 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive
742 study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 743 77. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Liu H, Wu Y, et al. Clinical course and
744 outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan,
745 China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir
746 Med*. 2020.
- 747 78. Zhang JJ, Dong X, Cao YY, Yuan YD, Yang YB, Yan YQ, et al. Clinical
748 characteristics of 140 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China.
749 *Allergy*. 2020.
- 750 79. Zhou W, Liu Y, Tian D, Wang C, Wang S, Cheng J, et al. Potential benefits
751 of precise corticosteroids therapy for severe 2019-nCoV pneumonia. *Signal
752 Transduction and Targeted Therapy*. 2020; 5(1).
- 753 80. Xu XW, Wu XX, Jiang XG, Xu KJ, Ying LJ, Ma CL, et al. Clinical findings
754 in a group of patients infected with the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-
755 2) outside of Wuhan, China: retrospective case series. *BMJ*. 2020; 368:
756 m606.
- 757 81. Pan F, Ye T, Sun P, Gui S, Liang B, Li L, et al. Time Course of Lung

- 758 Changes On Chest CT During Recovery From 2019 Novel Coronavirus
759 (COVID-19) Pneumonia. *Radiology*. 2020; 200370.
- 760 82. Chang D, Lin M, Wei L, Xie L, Zhu G, Cruz CS, et al. Epidemiologic and
761 Clinical Characteristics of Novel Coronavirus Infections Involving 13
762 Patients Outside Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020; 323:1092-1093.
- 763 83. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical Characteristics
764 of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected
765 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020; 323: 1061-1069.


Supporting Materials:

- Table S1 PRISMA Checklist.

766 - Fig S1 Publication bias

767 Funnel plot of standard error by the standardized difference in means for (A) White
768 blood cells, (B) Neutrophil count, (C) Lymphocyte count, (D) Procalcitonin, and
769 (E) C-reactive protein. The standard error provides a measure of the precision of
770 the effect size as an estimate of the population parameter. It starts with zero at the
771 top. Studies with smaller sample sizes produce less precise estimated effects with a
772 broader base. The pooled estimated effects would be expected to scatter
773 symmetrically around the total overall estimate of the meta-analysis (represented
774 by the vertical line). Each circle represents a study (black circle). In the case of
775 asymmetry, Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill method predict the missing studies
776 (red circle). Begg's and Egger's tests were performed. *P* values <0.1 were set to
777 have a significant bias.

(A)



(B)



Cumulative Z-score

Neutrophil count

Sample size = 1,558

