

Review of published systematic reviews and meta-analyses on COVID-19

Nasrien E. Ibrahim^{1,2}, Ezzeldin M. Ibrahim³

¹Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, ²Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts; USA, ³International Medical Center, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Author for correspondence

Ezzeldin M. Ibrahim, MD
Professor of Medicine & Oncology
Director, Oncology Center, International Medical Center
PO Box 2172, Jeddah 21451, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Fax: +966521-650-9141
E-mail: ezzibrahim@imc.med.sa

Emails

Nasrien E. Ibrahim: nibrahim@mgh.harvard.edu

There is no conflict of interest to disclose

Abstract

Purpose: The rapid spread of the COVID-19 pandemic has prompted researchers from all over the world to share their experience. The results were numerous reports with variable quality. The latter has provided an impetus to examine all published meta-analyses and systematic reviews on COVID-19 to date to examine available evidence. **Methods:** Using predefined selection criteria, a literature search identified 43 eligible meta-analyses and/or systematic reviews. **Results:** Most (N=17) studies addressed clinical manifestations and associated comorbidity, 6 studies addressed clinical manifestations in pregnant women and younger individuals, 8 studies addressed diagnostic data, 9 studies addressed various interventions, and 9 studies addressed prevention and control. The number of studies included in the various systemic reviews and meta-analyses ranged from 2 to 89. While there were some similarities and consistency for some findings, e.g. the relation between comorbidities and disease severity, we also noted occasionally conflicting data. **Conclusion:** As more data are collected from patients infected with COVID-19 all over the world, more studies will undoubtedly be published and attention to scientific accuracy in the performance of trials must be exercised to inform clinical decision-making and treatment guidelines.

Keywords: COVID-19; Coronavirus; Diagnosis; Treatment; Prevention and Control

Introduction

In December 2019, an outbreak of a new infectious disease in Wuhan in the Hubei Province of China was announced (1). Little did we know; this disease would change the world. The disease was caused by a beta-coronavirus called severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), and the disease was recently named coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). On March 11, 2020, when there were around 120,000 confirmed COVID-19 cases in over 10 countries, the World Health Organization declared COVID-19 a pandemic. As of 30 April 2020, 3,250,267 cases have been reported across 185 countries, resulting in 234,701 deaths, and 1,052,550 people have recovered (2).

The rapid spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, its alarming severity and mortality, and the resultant detrimental impact on world economy and social and financial needs of millions of people across the globe, have prompted researchers and clinicians from all over the world to share their experience. For better or for worse, a mass of scientific research has been published, as COVID-19 has created the need for fast dissemination of information about the pandemic. Published and preprint manuscripts are shared widely via news and social media outlets, allowing the experiences to be shared across the globe. Nevertheless, there has been recent concern about the quality of COVID-19 research, and how rigorous the peer review processes were in this era of rapid dissemination (3, 4). While the experiences should be shared rapidly and broadly since this is a novel disease process, care must be taken to distinguish between anecdotal experiences and data from randomized controlled trials- the standard clinical trials based on which treatment guidelines are usually created.

In this review, we examined all published meta-analyses and systematic reviews about COVID-19 to date. While we did not intent to evaluate the quality of published studies, we planned to thoroughly examine the data provided and we attempted to compare studies that addressed similar research questions to establish consistency or discrepancy between reports.

Methods

Search strategy

Between January 1st, 2020 and April 30th, 2019, we identified eligible studies using electronic literature search of the following databases: MEDLINE, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library. We used Medical Subject Heading terms or keywords using a combination of the following search terms: "2019 novel coronavirus," OR "COVID-19," OR "Coronavirus," OR "SARS-CoV-2," OR "Chinese Coronavirus". The search terms were combined with the publication types "systematic review," OR "meta-analysis". Following screening of retrieved records for the relevant titles, the relevant abstracts were reviewed, subsequently, the full text articles were obtained to determine appropriateness for final inclusion.

Selection criteria

We included all studies that met the following criteria: (1) published in English language between January 1st, 2020 and April 30th, 2020; (2) only published as systematic review, or meta-analysis, or both; (3) examining any of the following: clinical features, diagnosis, associated comorbidity, treatment and intervention, or prevention and control of COVID-19. Studies that addressed any combination of those features were also considered eligible; and (4) including relevant data for any age, gender, race, or a specific risk group. We also intended to include duplicate articles if they provided additional relevant data.

Data extraction

All authors reviewed the full text of potential articles and discussed the data intended for extraction and decisions were documented. Extracted data included the following fields: first author last name, the purpose of the study, the type of the study being a systematic review; a meta-analysis; or both, number of included articles, number of included patients, pertinent cross references, and the relevant findings.

Results

We identified 7,330 potentially relevant articles. After exclusion of duplicate references, non-relevant literature, and those that did not satisfy the inclusion criteria, 43 systematic reviews/meta-analyses were included (5-47).

Table 1 depicts the summary of the 43 included systematic reviews/meta-analyses. Most (N=17) studies addressed clinical manifestations and associated comorbidity, 6 studies addressed clinical manifestations in pregnant women and younger individuals, 8 studies addressed diagnostic data, 9 studies addressed various interventions, and 9 studies addressed prevention and control. Several studies were designed to report on more than one aspect. The number of studies included in the various systemic reviews and meta-analyses ranged from 2 to 89 and some systemic reviews and meta-analyses included no COVID trials.

In Table 2 highlights the most significant findings derived from each systematic review/meta-analysis classified according to the research objective(s).

Table 2 highlights the most significant findings derived from each systematic review/meta-analysis classified according to the research objective(s). The systematic reviews/meta-analyses we reviewed included studies with occasionally disparate outcomes. The systematic review by Vardavas et al (6) included studies that demonstrated no relationship between COVID-19 infection severity and smoking and others that did. Three systematic reviews/meta-analyses reported patients were predominantly middle-aged men (10) (19) (40), and 2 systematic reviews/meta-analyses reported the prevalence of hypertension and diabetes to be around 16% and 8%, respectively (17) (20). Fever (>80%) and cough (~60%) were the most common symptoms in 2 systemic reviews and meta-analyses (10) (19) (40). Hypertension and diabetes were reported to be associated with more severe disease in several systematic reviews/meta-analyses and ARDS was reported as complication in 9.4% to ~30% of COVID-19 infections. COVID-19 mortality varied anywhere from 3.2 to 14% (10) (20) (39). In pregnant women with COVID-19 infection, the caesarean section rate was >80% and 2 systematic reviews/meta-analyses showed no vertical transmission. Children with COVID-19 presented with mild to moderate symptoms and 2 systematic reviews/meta-analyses reported no deaths in children aged 0 to 9 years (**Table 2**).

The most frequent chest CT findings were GGO and bilateral infiltrates in several systematic reviews/meta-analyses and 1 meta-analysis showed increased procalcitonin concentrations were associated with higher risk for severe COVID-19 infections (23). With regards to medication interventions, 3 systematic reviews/meta-analyses reported no benefit for using antiviral drugs (15) (29) (35). One systematic review concluded neither benefit or harm with use on non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and that interleukin-1 and -6 have no modulatory effects on the course of COVID-19 infections (12). Systematic reviews/meta-analyses on the effects of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine showed varying results. One systematic review noted superior symptom control and improvement in radiographic imaging in one study and superior virological clearance compared to control in another study (13). Another systematic review/meta-analysis also showed reduction in radiologic progression of disease, but no significant benefit regarding virological cure or mortality reduction (24) (**Table 2**).

Systematic reviews/meta-analyses on prevention and control of COVID-19 provided occasionally conflicting results as well. For example, one review concluded that school closures did not contribute to control of SARS and modeling for COVID-19 predicted school closures would only prevent 2-4% disease mortality (45); while another review that combined COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 studies reported that quarantine combined with school closures and other measures was effective (5). One systematic review/meta-analysis examining medical masks vs N95 respirators for preventing COVID-19 in healthcare workers did not include any COVID-19 studies (26).

Discussion

Of the 7850 potentially relevant articles, 43 systematic reviews/meta-analyses met our inclusion/exclusion criteria were included (**Figure 1**). The various studies included addressed clinical manifestations and associated comorbidity, clinical manifestations in pregnant women and younger individuals, diagnostic data, various interventions, and prevention and control of COVID-19. As noted, we did not intent to evaluate the quality of published studies but noted occasionally conflicting data, large ranges for COVID-19 associated acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and mortality estimates, systematic reviews/meta-analyses that included non-COVID-19 trials, similarities for comorbidities increasing disease severity such as diabetes and hypertension, and predominance of middle-aged male patients with COVID-19 infections.

Following the outbreak of COVID-19 in Wuhan in the Hubei Province of China in December 2019 (*1*) and the subsequent declaration by the WHO of a pandemic that has caused alarming mortality and disruption of the world economy affecting several millions of people worldwide, there was need for rapid dissemination of information regarding this novel infection as more clinicians and scientists dealt with the reality of COVID-19. Technology and social media played a large part in the sharing of clinical information and experiences with disease management- Chinese clinicians communicated their experiences with European and American clinicians via virtual conferences, for example, because the virus had affected their community first. The information disseminated this way was based on clinical experiences and the patients seen in their hospitals who may differ in comorbidities from patients seen in Europe and North America, however, the dissemination of information was critical to guide clinicians.

We also witnessed a flood of published manuscripts in several journals, including highly impactful ones. Some published studies included small numbers of patients and it is likely the studies were published to share as much information as possible given the devastating effects of COVID-19 on millions globally. As more patients became ill with COVID-19, as hospitals became overwhelmed with sick patients with various ranges of disease severity and ran out of beds and ventilators, as personal protective equipment was challenging to secure in some countries, as various medications were attempted for prophylactic use and treatment, as financial institutions suffered major loses, as weaknesses in healthcare systems were exposed,

and most important, as millions of lives were lost, the internet served as an integral space to share both accurate and inaccurate information; including published and retracted studies.

There were common clinical manifestations and comorbidities in the systematic reviews/meta-analyses we included. Notably, patients were predominantly middle-aged men and comorbidities such as diabetes, hypertension, cardiovascular disease, and smoking were prevalent and associated with more severe disease. The most common clinical manifestations were fever, cough, and dyspnea. Rates of ARDS and mortality varied between studies. In pregnant women with COVID-19 infection, the caesarean section rate was >80% and children with COVID-19 presented with mild to moderate symptoms and no deaths were reported in children aged 0 to 9 years (**Table 2**). The most frequent chest CT findings were GGO and bilateral infiltrates. With regards to medication interventions, no benefit for using antiviral drugs was found, no benefit or harm with use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs was found, and no benefit with interleukin-1 and -6 was found. Radiographic improvement and better symptom control were reported with chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine. Finally, quarantining, social distancing, and school closures may contribute to reduction of disease spread and may be more effective if used in combination (**Table 2**).

The ability to rapidly disseminate information via the rapid review process some journals implemented is a double-edged sword. It remains of utmost importance to maintain the integrity of published science while keeping in mind the devastation this COVID-19 has caused and the desperate need for a cure, medications that will lessen disease severity, and/or a vaccine. Additionally, care must be taken to distinguish between anecdotal experiences and data from randomized controlled trials- the standard clinical trials based on which treatment guidelines are usually created.

As more data is collected from patients infected with COVID-19 all over the world, more studies undoubtedly will be published. As clinicians, scientists, and members of society, we will look forward to the sharing of information. Scientists, reviewers, editors, and journals alike must work to maintain the integrity of the science shared. The internet, social media, the ability to hold virtual conferences across the globe, and the yearning to find a cure will promote

dissemination of clinical experiences and science. This pandemic will not only change the way we live, but also encourage the use of non-conventional methods to share science.

References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020; 382:727-733.
2. <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>.
3. Peyrin-Biroulet L. Will the Quality of Research Remain the Same During the COVID-19 Pandemic? *Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology*.
4. London AJ, Kimmelman J. Against pandemic research exceptionalism. *Science*. 2020;eabc1731.
5. Nussbaumer-Streit B, Mayr V, Dobrescu AI, Chapman A, Persad E, Klerings I, Wagner G, Siebert U, Christof C, Zachariah C, Gartlehner G. Quarantine alone or in combination with other public health measures to control COVID-19: a rapid review. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020; 4:Cd013574.
6. Vardavas CI, Nikitara K. COVID-19 and smoking: A systematic review of the evidence. *Tob Induc Dis*. 2020; 18:20.
7. Romney D, Fox H, Carlson S, Bachmann D, O'Mathuna D, Kman N. Allocation of Scarce Resources in a Pandemic: A Systematic Review of U.S. State Crisis Standards of Care Documents. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2020;1-19.
8. Castagnoli R, Votto M, Licari A, Brambilla I, Bruno R, Perlini S, Rovida F, Baldanti F, Marseglia GL. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020.
9. Cheung KS, Hung IF, Chan PP, et al. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples from the Hong Kong Cohort and Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology*. 2020.
10. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Cardona-Ospina JA, Gutiérrez-Ocampo E, et al. Clinical, laboratory and imaging features of COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2020;101623.
11. Asadi-Pooya AA, Simani L. Central nervous system manifestations of COVID-19: A systematic review. *J Neurol Sci*. 2020; 413:116832.
12. Russell B, Moss C, George G, Santaolalla A, Cope A, Papa S, Van Hemelrijck M. Associations between immune-suppressive and stimulating drugs and novel COVID-19-a systematic review of current evidence. *Ecancermedicalsecience*. 2020; 14:1022.
13. Singh AK, Singh A, Shaikh A, Singh R, Misra A. Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine in the treatment of COVID-19 with or without diabetes: A systematic search and a narrative review with a special reference to India and other developing countries. *Diabetes Metab Syndr*. 2020; 14:241-246.
14. Salehi S, Abedi A, Balakrishnan S, Gholamrezanezhad A. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Systematic Review of Imaging Findings in 919 Patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2020;1-7.
15. Ford N, Vitoria M, Rangaraj A, Norris SL, Calmy A, Doherty M. Systematic review of the efficacy and safety of antiretroviral drugs against SARS, MERS or COVID-19: initial assessment. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020; 23:e25489.
16. Di Mascio D, Khalil A, Saccone G, Rizzo G, Buca D, Liberati M, Vecchiet J, Nappi L, Scambia G, Berghella V, D'Antonio F. Outcome of Coronavirus spectrum infections (SARS, MERS, COVID 1 - 19) during pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2020;100107.
17. Emami A, Javanmardi F, Pirbonyeh N, Akbari A. Prevalence of Underlying Diseases in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Arch Acad Emerg Med*. 2020; 8:e35.

18. Park M, Cook AR, Lim JT, Sun Y, Dickens BL. A Systematic Review of COVID-19 Epidemiology Based on Current Evidence. *J Clin Med*. 2020; 9.
19. Lovato A, de Filippis C. Clinical Presentation of COVID-19: A Systematic Review Focusing on Upper Airway Symptoms. *Ear Nose Throat J*. 2020;145561320920762.
20. Hu Y, Sun J, Dai Z, Deng H, Li X, Huang Q, Wu Y, Sun L, Xu Y. Prevalence and severity of corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19): A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Virol*. 2020; 127:104371.
21. Wynants L, Van Calster B, Bonten MMJ, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. *Bmj*. 2020; 369:m1328.
22. Zaigham M, Andersson O. Maternal and perinatal outcomes with COVID-19: A systematic review of 108 pregnancies. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2020.
23. Lippi G, Plebani M. Procalcitonin in patients with severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): A meta-analysis. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2020; 505:190-191.
24. Sarma P, Kaur H, Kumar H, Mahendru D, Avti P, Bhattacharyya A, Prajapat M, Shekhar N, Kumar S, Singh R, Singh A, Dhibar DP, Prakash A, Medhi B. Virological and Clinical Cure in Covid-19 Patients Treated with Hydroxychloroquine: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
25. Song Y, Ren F, Sun D, Wang M, Baker JS, István B, Gu Y. Benefits of Exercise on Influenza or Pneumonia in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020; 17.
26. Bartoszko JJ, Farooqi MAM, Alhazzani W, Loeb M. Medical masks vs N95 respirators for preventing COVID-19 in healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2020.
27. Cortegiani A, Ingoglia G, Ippolito M, Giarratano A, Einav S. A systematic review on the efficacy and safety of chloroquine for the treatment of COVID-19. *J Crit Care*. 2020.
28. Chang TH, Wu JL, Chang LY. Clinical characteristics and diagnostic challenges of pediatric COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Formos Med Assoc*. 2020.
29. Yousefifard M, Zali A, Mohamed Ali K, Madani Neishaboori A, Zarghi A, Hosseini M, Safari S. Antiviral therapy in management of COVID-19: a systematic review on current evidence. *Arch Acad Emerg Med*. 2020; 8:e45.
30. Zhou M, Qi J, Li X, Zhang Z, Yao Y, Wu D, Han Y. The proportion of patients with thrombocytopenia in three human-susceptible coronavirus infections: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Haematol*. 2020.
31. Ludvigsson JF. Systematic review of COVID-19 in children shows milder cases and a better prognosis than adults. *Acta Paediatr*. 2020.
32. Bao C, Liu X, Zhang H, Li Y, Liu J. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) CT Findings: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2020.
33. Della Gatta AN, Rizzo R, Pilu G, Simonazzi G. COVID19 during pregnancy: a systematic review of reported cases. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2020.
34. Cao Y, Liu X, Xiong L, Cai K. Imaging and clinical features of patients with 2019 novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
35. Pang J, Wang MX, Ang IYH, et al. Potential Rapid Diagnostics, Vaccine and Therapeutics for 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV): A Systematic Review. *J Clin Med*. 2020; 9.
36. Shah S, Das S, Jain A, Misra DP, Negi VS. A systematic review of the prophylactic role of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine in Coronavirus Disease-19 (COVID-19). *Int J Rheum Dis*. 2020.
37. Zhang L, Liu Y. Potential interventions for novel coronavirus in China: A systematic review. *J Med Virol*. 2020; 92:479-490.

38. Yang Z, Liu J, Zhou Y, Zhao X, Zhao Q, Liu J. The effect of corticosteroid treatment on patients with coronavirus infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect*. 2020.
39. Fu L, Wang B, Yuan T, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect*. 2020.
40. Zuin M, Rigatelli G, Zuliani G, Rigatelli A, Mazza A, Roncon L. Arterial hypertension and risk of death in patients with COVID-19 infection: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect*. 2020.
41. Huang I, Lim MA, Pranata R. Diabetes mellitus is associated with increased mortality and severity of disease in COVID-19 pneumonia - A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. *Diabetes Metab Syndr*. 2020; 14:395-403.
42. Wang B, Li R, Lu Z, Huang Y. Does comorbidity increase the risk of patients with COVID-19: evidence from meta-analysis. *Aging (Albany NY)*. 2020; 12:6049-6057.
43. Verbeek JH, Rajamaki B, Ijaz S, Sauni R, Toomey E, Blackwood B, Tikka C, Ruotsalainen JH, Kilinc Balci FS. Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020; 4:Cd011621.
44. Couper K, Taylor-Phillips S, Grove A, Freeman K, Osokogu O, Court R, Mehrabian A, Morley PT, Nolan JP, Soar J, Perkins GD. COVID-19 in cardiac arrest and infection risk to rescuers: a systematic review. *Resuscitation*. 2020.
45. Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, Packer J, Ward J, Stansfield C, Mytton O, Bonell C, Booy R. School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2020; 4:397-404.
46. Houghton C, Meskell P, Delaney H, Smalle M, Glenton C, Booth A, Chan XHS, Devane D, Biesty LM. Barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence with infection prevention and control (IPC) guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases: a rapid qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020; 4:Cd013582.
47. Santoso A, Pranata R, Wibowo A, Al-Farabi MJ, Huang I, Antariksa B. Cardiac injury is associated with mortality and critically ill pneumonia in COVID-19: A meta-analysis. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2020.
48. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020.
49. Lin HH, Wang SJ, Liu YC, Lee SS, Hwang CK, Chen YS, Wann SR, Shih YL. Quantitation of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus genome by real-time polymerase chain reaction assay using minor groove binder DNA probe technology. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect*. 2004; 37:258-265.
50. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *Jama*. 2020.
51. Cao B, Wang Y, Wen D, et al. A Trial of Lopinavir–Ritonavir in Adults Hospitalized with Severe Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020.
52. Li Y, Xie Z, Lin W, et al. An exploratory randomized controlled study on the efficacy and safety of lopinavir/ritonavir or arbidol treating adult patients hospitalized with mild/moderate COVID-19 (ELACOI). *medRxiv*. 2020;2020.2003.2019.20038984.
53. Committee on Guidance for Establishing Crisis Standards of Care for Use in Disaster S, Institute of M. In: *Crisis Standards of Care: A Systems Framework for Catastrophic Disaster Response* (National Academies Press (US)

Copyright 2012 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved., Washington (DC), 2012.

54. Loeb M, Dafoe N, Mahony J, John M, Sarabia A, Glavin V, Webby R, Smieja M, Earn DJ, Chong S, Webb A, Walter SD. Surgical mask vs N95 respirator for preventing influenza among health care workers: a randomized trial. *Jama*. 2009; 302:1865-1871.
55. Eubank S, Eckstrand I, Lewis B, Venkatramanan S, Marathe M, Barrett CL. Commentary on Ferguson, et al., "Impact of Non-pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs) to Reduce COVID-19 Mortality and Healthcare Demand". *Bull Math Biol*. 2020; 82:52.

Table 1 Summary of the objectives and designs of the 43 included studies

Study	Objective	Study type	No. of included studies	No. of patients
<u>Clinical manifestations and comorbidity</u>				
Vardavas, et al. (6)	Studying the effect of smoking on disease outcome	SR	5	1,549
Cheung et al. (9)	Describing gastrointestinal manifestations and the virus RNA in stool samples	SR and MA	60	4243
Rodriguez-Morales (10)	Examining clinical, laboratory, and imaging	SR and MA	58	656
Asadi-Pooya et al. (11)	Describing central nervous system manifestations	SR and MA	6	765
Emami et al. (17)	Estimating the prevalence of underlying comorbidity	SR and MA	10	76,993
Park et. al. (18)	Study various epidemiologic aspects	SR	41	Estimating: DT = 235,587 R0 = NR IP = 821 SI = 583
Salehi et al. (14)	Describing imaging findings	SR	30	919
Lovato et al. (19)	Describing upper respiratory tract symptoms	SR	5	1,556
Hu et al. (20)	Clinical manifestations and associated comorbidity	SR and MA	21	47,344
Zhou et al. (30)	Describing the prevalence of thrombocytopenia in SARS, MERS, and COVID-19	SR and MA	19 (3 COVID-19)	2,103 (190 COVID-19)
FU et al. (39)	Clinical characteristics in China	SR and MA	43	3,600

Table 1 Cont.

Study	Objective	Study type	No. of included studies	No. of patients
Zuin et al. (40)	Determining the prevalence and risk of death from associated hypertension	SR and MA	3	419
Cao et al. (34)	Describing clinical and imaging findings	SR and MA	31	46,959
Pang et al. (35)	Examining diagnosis by RT-PCR, therapeutic drugs and vaccines for SARS, MERS, and COVID-19	SR	16 diagnostic studies (one for COVID-19)	NR
Huang et al. (41)	Describing disease severity and mortality among diabetics	SR and MA	30	6,452
Wang et al. (42)	Examining the relationship between the existence of underlying morbidity and COVID-19 risk	MA	6	1,558
Santoso et al. (47)	Examining the association between cardiac injury and the severity, progression, and mortality among patients with COVID-19 pneumonia	MA	13	2,389
<u>Clinical manifestations in pregnant women and young individuals</u>				
Di Mascio et al. (16)	Describing the outcome among pregnant patients (SARS, MERS, and COVA-19)	SR	19	79 (41 COVID-19)
Zaigham et al. (22)	Describing maternal and perinatal outcomes and cesarean section rate	SR	18	108
Della Gatta et al. (33)	Describing the disease outcome among pregnant patients (COVA-19)	SR	6	51
Castagnoli et al. (8)	Examining cases reported among young patients	SR	18	1065
Chang et al. (28)	Examining clinical and diagnostic manifestations in pediatric age group	SR	9	93

Table 1 Cont.

Study	Objective	Study type	No. of included studies	No. of patients
Ludvigsson et al. (31)	Examining cases reported among children	SR	45	Different no. for each feature
<u>Diagnostic studies</u>				
Cheung et al. (9)	Describing gastrointestinal manifestations and the virus RNA in stool samples	SR and MA	60	4243
Rodriguez-Morales (10)	Examining clinical, laboratory, and imaging	SR and MA	58	656
Wynants et al. (21)	Examining predicting models for diagnosis and prognosis	SR	27 studies (used to develop 31 models)	3,500,000* 10,400
Lippi et al. (23)	Determine if procalcitonin could distinguish patients with or without severe infection	MA	4	930
Bao et al. (32)	Describing chest computerized tomography findings	SR and MA	13	2,738
Chang et al. (28)	Examining clinical and diagnostic manifestations in pediatric age group	SR	9	93
Cao et al. (34)	Describing clinical and imaging findings	SR and MA	31	46,959
FU et al. (39)	Clinical characteristics in China	SR and MA	43	3,600
<u>Interventional studies</u>				
Russell et al. (12)	The associations of the infection to immune-suppressive and stimulating agents	SR	89	NR
Singh et al. (13)	Chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine in diabetic patients	SR	2	NR

Table 1 Cont.

Study	Objective	Study type	No. of included studies	No. of patients
Ford et al. (15)	Examining the efficacy and safety of antiretroviral against SARS, MERS or COVID-19	SR	21 (12 in COVID-19)	661
Sarma et al. (24)	Examining the efficacy and safety of hydroxychloroquine	SR and MA	7	1,358
Yousefifard et. al.(29)	Examining the efficacy of antiviral therapy	SR	22	2,855
Pang et al. (35)	Examining diagnosis by RT-PCR, therapeutic drugs and vaccines for SARS, MERS, and COVID-19	SR	16 diagnostic studies (one for COVID-19)	NR
Shah et al. (36)	Examining the prophylactic use of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine	SR	5 (2 clinical)	136 (China NR)
Yang et al. (38)	Examining the effect of corticosteroid treatment on patients with COVID-19 and SARS-CoV	SR and MA	15 (2 on COVID-19)	5,270
Zhang et al. (37)	Examining potential intervention strategies in China	SR	Multiple	NR
<u>Studies on prevention and control</u>				
Nussbaumer-Streit (5)	Comparing quarantine alone or in combination with other public health measures	Cochran systematic review	29 (10 on COVID-19)	Not relevant
Romney et al. (7)	Examining strategies and plans for allocation of scarce resources by analyzing the U.S. State Crisis Standards of Care documents	SR	31 plans	Not relevant
Song et al. (25)	Studying the effects of exercise on influenza or pneumonia in older adults	SR	13 RCTs 7 cross-sectional and observational	6,602 RCTs 49,296 others

Table 1 Cont.

Study	Objective	Study type	No. of included studies	No. of patients
Bartoszko et al. (26)	Comparing the viral illness and respiratory infection prevention using medical masks vs N95 respirators among healthcare workers	SR and MA	4 (none is related to COVID-19 prevention)	8,736
Shah et al. (36)	Examining the prophylactic use of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine	SR	5 (2 clinical)	136 (China NR)
Verbeek et al. (43)	Examining personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases among healthcare workers	Cochran systematic review	24 (14 RCTs)	2278
Couper et al. (44)	Determining the risk of risk of COVID-19 transmission to rescuers delivering treatment for cardiac arrest	SR	6 (no COVID-19 study)	1,132
Viner et al. (45)	Study the contribution of school closure to the control COVID-19 outbreaks	SR	16 (SARS-based data)	Not relevant
Houghton et al. (46)	To identify barriers and facilitators that influence healthcare workers' adherence to infection control guidelines to protect them against respiratory infectious diseases	Cochran systematic review	20	NR

*US data as proxy events to predict hospital admissions

COVID-19; corona virus disease of 2019, DT; doubling time, IP; incubation period, MERS; Middle East respiratory syndrome, MA; meta-analysis, NR, not reported, R0; reproduction naught, RT-PCR; reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction, SARS; severe acute respiratory syndrome, SI; serial interval, SR; systematic review,

Table 2 Main findings of the 43 included studies

Study	Main findings
<u>Clinical manifestations and comorbidity</u>	
Vardavas, et al. (6)	Three of the included studies involved small number of patients (41, 140, and 190), and they showed no significant relation between smoking and COVID-19 infection severity. The largest study (1099 patients), showed that smokers were 1.4-fold more likely to have severe symptoms, and have 2.4-fold increase of requiring admission to intensive care unit (ICU); needed mechanical ventilation; or die as compared with non-smokers (48).
Cheung et al. (9)	The authors estimated a pooled prevalence of 18% of gastrointestinal tract symptoms among patients. Symptoms also occurred among those with mild COVID-19 illness (12%).
Rodriguez-Morales (10)	Patients median age was 52 years, and they were predominantly male (56%). 37% of patients had associated comorbidity. The most prevalent clinical manifestations were fever (88.7%), cough (57.6%), and dyspnea (45.6%). 20% of patients required ICU admission. Of the estimated complications, 33%, 13%, 8%, and 6% developed acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), cardiac insult, acute kidney injury, and shock, respectively. The mortality rate among hospitalized patients was 14%.
Asadi-Pooya et al. (11)	Two studies that had the largest number of patients (214 and 221 patients, respectively), reported an overall prevalence of central nervous system manifestations of 25%, with dizziness (17%) and headache (13%), were the most common symptoms. The authors acknowledged the limitation of available data.
Emami et al. (17)	The pooled prevalence of hypertension, cardiovascular disease, smoking, and diabetes among patients were estimated as 16%, 12%, 8%, and 8%, respectively.
Park et. al. (18)	In an extensive epidemiologic systematic review, the authors estimated that the epidemics takes 3-7 days to double in size. The analysis also showed that the incubation period varies between 4 to 6 days, while the serial interval was estimated to be 4-8 days. The basic reproduction number ranging from 1.9 to 6.5. At the time of the publication, the authors acknowledged that the true case fatality risk was not yet known, however, their model has estimated a mortality rate of 0.3% to 1.4%.
Lovato et al. (19)	In that systemic review, male represented 57.5% and the mean age was 49 years. Pooled data showed that pharyngodynia was present in 12% of patients, and nasal congestion in 3.7%. Other constitutional symptoms were fever (86%), cough (69%), and fatigue (39%).
Hu et al. (20)	The authors reported that the pooled prevalence estimates for fever, cough, fatigue, and dyspnea symptoms were 86%, 66%, 42%, and 21.4%, respectively. The prevalence of diabetes was 7.7% and hypertension was 15.6% and they were associated with critical cases in 44.5% and 42% of patients, respectively. Underlying malignancy was rare (1.2%). The reported complications were, ARDS (9.4%), acute cardiac injury (5.8%), acute kidney injury (2.1%). The risks of severity and mortality ranged from 12.6 to 23.5% and the pooled estimates of severe illness and mortality were 18.0 and 3.2%, respectively.

Table 2 Cont.

Study	Main findings
Zhou et al. (30)	The pooled estimate of the prevalence of thrombocytopenia was approximately 30% (for all the three human coronavirus diseases combined). For patients with COVID-19, no pooled estimate was reported. However, the prevalence in 3 COVID-19 studies were 3%, 5%, and 12%, respectively.
Fu et al. (39)	The most common symptoms were fever (83%), cough (60%), and fatigue (38). The overall estimated proportion of severe cases and mortality was 26%, and 3.6%, respectively.
Zuin et al. (40)	Patients were predominantly middle aged (mean age 56 years), males (62%). The pooled estimate of the prevalence of hypertension was 24%. As compared with normotensive patients, those with hypertension demonstrated 3.36- fold increase in mortality.
Cao et al. (34)	The meta-analysis showed that the most common clinical manifestations were fever (87%), cough (58%), dyspnea (38%), and fatigue (36%). Additional pooled estimates: ICU admission (29%), ARDS (29%), multiple organ failure (8.5%), mortality (6.8%).
Pang et al. (35)	The only study that included COVID-19 patients (228 samples) using RT-PCR assay that showed threshold sensitivity of 10 genome equivalents per reaction, with good reproducibility (49). The RT-PCR reaction was more sensitive than the nested PCR reaction.
Huang et al. (41)	Among patents with COVID-19 infection, diabetes is associated with more increased severity (RR = 2.45, 95% CI; 1.79-3.35, p<0.001), more disease progression (RR = 3.31, 95% CI; 1.08-10.14, p=0.04), and increased death rate (RR = 2.12, 95% CI; 1.44-3.11, p<0.001).
Wang et al. (42)	The authors found that the presence of hypertension, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cardiovascular disease, and cerebrovascular disease are associated with an odds ratio (OR) of COVID-19 infection of 2.29, 2.47, 5.97, 2.93, 3.89, respectively. The meta-analysis revealed no correlation between increased risk of COVID-19 and liver disease, malignancy, or kidney disease.
Santoso et al. (47)	The meta-analysis showed that cardiac injury was associated increased need for ICU admission (RR = 7.94, 95% CI; 1.51-41.78, p = 0.01), severer infection (RR = 13.81, 95% CI; 5.52-34.52, p <0.001), and higher mortality (RR = 7.95, 95% CI, 5.12-12.34, p <0.001).

Clinical manifestations in pregnant women and young individuals

Di Mascio et al. (16)	Of 41 infected hospitalized pregnant women, preterm birth <37 weeks occurred in 41% of patients, while the rate of perinatal death was 7%. Cesarean section (CS) rate was 84%. No vertical transmission was reported in the 41 newborns.
Zaigham et al. (22)	Like in non-pregnant women, the most frequent symptoms were fever (68%) and cough (34%). While the most frequent laboratory abnormalities were lymphocytopenia (59%) with elevated C-reactive protein (70%). ICU admission was required for 2.8% of women with no maternal mortality. CS rate was 91%. One neonatal death and one intrauterine fetal death were reported.

Table 2 Cont.

Study	Main findings
Della Gatta et al. (33)	The CS rate among pregnant women infected with COVID-19 was 96%. The authors reported no vertical transmission, but one still birth and one neonatal death.
Castagnoli et al. (8)	Of the included young population, 42% were younger than 10 year, and 58% were aged between 10 and 19 years. Those young patients presented with mild symptoms (fever, dry cough, fatigue, and other upper respiratory symptoms, such as nasal congestion). No deaths were reported in children aged 0 to 9 years, while a single mortality was reported in the age range of 10 to 19 (50).
Chang et al. (28)	75% of the children had a household contact history. Most patients had mild to moderate symptoms (98%), with only 2 patients (2%) required ICU admission. Fever occurred in 59% of patients and cough in 46%. 26% of patients were asymptomatic.
Ludvigsson et al. (31)	Of all COVID-19 patients, children represented 1 to 5% of all reported cases. Children present with mild or moderate symptoms and they may be asymptomatic at diagnosis. The authors acknowledged that the data on laboratory abnormalities in children were rare. As reported also by Castagnoli et al. (8), no deaths were reported in children aged 0 to 9 years, while a single mortality was reported in the age range of 10 to 19 (50).
<u>Diagnostic studies</u>	
Cheung et al. (9)	The study showed that stool samples were tested positive for the virus RNA in 48% of patients. Stool samples remained positive among 70% of patients after clearance of the virus from the respiratory specimens.
Rodriguez-Morales (10)	The pooled estimates showed the following prevalence: hypoalbuminemia (75%), abnormal liver functions > 50%, lymphopenia (43%), and raised C-reactive protein (CRP) (58%). Chest images showed bilateral pneumonic infiltrates (73%), and ground glass opacity (68%).
Salehi et al. (14)	The most common initial CT findings include bilateral, multi-lobar ground-glass opacity (GGO) mainly in the lower lobes and less frequently within the right middle lobe. Pleural effusion, pericardial effusion, lymphadenopathy, and cavitation are less common. Follow-up CT in the intermediate stages of the disease shows progressive transformation of GGO into consolidation and septal thickening. The worst severity of CT findings appears around day 10 after symptom onset. The imaging signs associated with clinical improvement usually occur after week 2 of the disease course.
Wynants et al. (21)	The included studies were used to develop 3, 18, and 10 models to predict hospital admission due to pneumonia and other events, diagnosis; and prognosis, respectively. Predictors of COVID-19 diagnosis included age, body temperature, and signs and symptoms. While the prognostic predictors of severe infections included age, sex, features derived from CT scan, CRP, lactic dehydrogenase, and lymphocyte count. Although the performance of those models was acceptable, the authors of this systematic review concluded that most reports did not include a description of the study population or intended use of the models, and rarely calibrate the prediction outcomes.
Lippi et al. (23)	The meta-analysis showed that increased procalcitonin values were associated with an almost 5-fold higher risk of severe COVID-19 infection (OR = 4.76; 95% CI; 2.74–8.29).

Table 2 Cont.

Study	Main findings
Bao et al. (32)	Among 2,738, the pooled positive rate of the CT imaging was approximately 90%. The most prevalent radiology findings were ground glass opacities (GGO) (83%), GGO with consolidation (58%), adjacent pleura thickening (52%), septal thickening (49%), and air bronchogram (47%). Less commonly were signs of crazy paving pattern (15%), pleural effusion (6%), bronchiectasis (5%), pericardial effusion (5%), and lymphadenopathy (4%).
Chang et al. (28)	In a children population, the most common radiographic findings were GGO (48%) and patchy consolidation (31%).
Cao et al. (34)	The main CT imaging findings were bilateral pneumonia (76%) and GGO (70%).
FU et al. (39)	The authors reported the pooled estimates of the most common laboratory abnormalities. Raised CRP was prevalent in 67% of patients, while lymphopenia and elevated lactate dehydrogenase were demonstrated with pooled estimates of 58%, and 52%, respectively. GOG (80%), and bilateral pneumonia (73%) were the most frequently reported findings on CT.
<u>Interventional studies</u>	
Russell et al. (12)	The review concluded that the use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs is not associated with either benefit or harm in patients infected with COVID-19. Furthermore, it was concluded that interleukin-6 or interleukin-1 inhibitors have no modulatory effect on the course of the infection. No specific studies exist to support a potential beneficial role for cytotoxic chemotherapy or a contraindication for their use in patients with COVID-19 infection.
Singh et al. (13)	The authors reported on two small human studies that have been conducted with both chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine in COVID-19 and have shown significant improvement in some parameters in patients with COVID-19. In the first study, the authors quoted a Chinese trial involving more than 100 patients of COVID-19. The study found that, compared with control group, users of chloroquine had superior symptoms control, slower progression of pneumonia, radiologic images improvement, and higher rate of seroconversion. In the second non-randomized French study (36 patients), the virological clearance at day-6 post-inclusion, hydroxychloroquine vs. control was 70.0% versus 12.5%, respectively (p <0.001).
Ford et al. (15)	In one randomized trial, 99 patients with severe COVID-19 disease were randomized to receive the antiviral agents lopinavir/ritonavir and 100 patients to receive the standard of care for 14 days (51). The antiviral use was not associated clinical benefit; however, the mortality rate was lower in the treatment arm (14%) vs. that in the control arm (25%), a difference that was not statistically significant. The second trial (21 lopinavir/ritonavir vs. 16 control), was also negative (52).
Sarma et al. (24)	The analysis concluded that the use of hydroxychloroquine was associated with 69% reduction in the radiological progression of lung disease, however, the drug showed no significant benefit concerning virological cure or mortality reduction.
Yousefifard et. al.(29)	The authors reported the results of the randomized trial that was described earlier (51). Additionally, examining 21 case-series and case-report studies where antiviral agents were used for COVID-19 infection, the authors concluded that there is not enough evidence to support a potential benefit for using antiviral drugs.

Table 2 Cont.

Study	Main findings
Pang et al. (35)	The authors concluded that there is no available vaccine yet for COVID-19 infection, neither there are effective specific antivirals nor drug combinations that are supported by high-level evidence.
Shah et al. (36)	Although pre-clinical studies suggested a prophylactic effect of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine, at present, there are no original clinical studies on their prophylactic role against COVID-19.
Yang et al. (38)	In the two studies that involved COVID-19 patients, patients with severe infection were more likely to receive corticosteroid (RR = 2.36, 95% CI; 1.31–4.28, $P = 0.004$). In that population, corticosteroid use was not associated with improvement in mortality rate (RR = 2.56, 95% CI; 0.99–6.63, $P = 0.053$). Moreover, among SARS-CoV patients, corticosteroid use was associated with detrimental effects.
Zhang et al. (37)	Extrapolating from studies of other viral infections, the authors suggested that the nutritional status of patients should be assessed, and patients should receive various vitamins and other elements like iron, zinc, and selenium. The authors also concluded that COVID-19 patients should receive standard care, coronavirus - specific treatments, and antiviral treatments. However, no high-level evidence data were provided.

Studies on prevention and control

Nussbaumer-Streit (5)	The examined models showed a benefit of quarantine measures averted 44% to 81% incidence case with a 31% to 63% reduction in mortality compared to no measures, Furthermore, combining quarantine with other measures such as school closures, travel restrictions and social distancing was more effective than individual measures alone.
Romney et al. (7)	The authors reviewed plans on the crisis standards of care for 31 states, and only the plans from 5 states fulfilled the the 5 elements crisis standards of care recommended by the National Academy of Medicine (53). Of those 5 states, only the plans from two states had all the hazards documents required for public protection and safety.
Song et al. (25)	Based on that systematic review, it is suggested that prolonged moderate aerobic exercise could decrease the risk of influenza-related infection and it improve individual immune response to viral infection.
Bartoszko et al. (26)	As compared with N95 respirators, using medical masks was no associated with increased risk of respiratory viral infection among healthcare workers. No data related to COVID-19 infection were reported. Of the four included studies, only one study reported on the occurrence of non-COVID-19 coronavirus infection (54).
Verbeek et al. (43)	Compared with N95 mask, the use of a powered, air-purifying respirator with coverall provides better protection against contamination (RR = 0.27, 95% CI; 0.17 to 0.43), however; their use was less convenient and associated with high non-compliance rate (RR = 7.5, 95% CI; 1.81 to 31.1). The authors examined the protective efficacy of several modifications in the personal protective equipment (PPE) and they showed that the modifications provided significantly better protection as compared with standard PPE.
Couper et al. (44)	The authors could not demonstrate a relationship between either chest compression or defibrillation with aerosol generation or transmission of infection. No study describing patients with COVID-19.

Table 2 Cont.

Study	Main findings
Viner et al. (45)	Based on data derived from SARS preventive measures, the systematic review concluded that the school closures did not contribute to the control of the disease. Various modelling studies of COVID-19 predicted that school closures alone would prevent only 2–4% of disease mortality (55).
Houghton et al. (46)	Among the identified barriers: guidelines are long and ambiguous, guidelines did not reflect international recommendations, guidelines constantly changing, recommended measures increased workload and fatigue, etc. The review also identified several facilitators: clear and effective communication, effective training and readiness, provision of sufficient space (isolation rooms, anterooms, showers, etc.), ensure adequate supply of PPE, emphasize the value and benefit of adherence, etc.

ARDS; acute respiratory distress syndrome, CS; cesarean section, COVID-19; corona virus disease of 2019, CRP; C-reactive protein, CT; computerized tomography, GOG; ground glass opacities, ICU; intensive care unit, OR; odds ratio, PPE; personal protective equipment, RR; risk ratio, RT-PCR; reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction, SARS; severe acute respiratory syndrome

Figure legend

Figure 1 The flowchart of the literature search and the selection of the 43 studies. Some studies have addressed more than one question.

Figure 1

