Diagnostic and prognostic value of hematological and immunological markers in COVID-19 infection: A meta 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
- ³ Genetics Unit, Department of Histology and Cell Biology, Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal
- 11 University, Ismailia, Egypt
- ⁴ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Mansoura University,
- 13 Mansoura 35516, Egypt.
- ⁵ Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Horus University Egypt, New Damietta,
- 15 *34517*, *Egypt*.
- ⁶ Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, Mansoura University, Mansoura 35516,
- 17 *Egypt*.
- 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*
- ⁹Division of Endocrine and Oncologic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Tulane University,
- 22 School of Medicine, New Orleans, LA, USA
- 23
- 24 *Correspondence authors
- 25 Email: <u>ekandil@tulane.edu</u> (EK)
- 26 Email: <u>manal_mohamed@med.suez.edu.eg</u> (MSF)
- 27 Short Title: COVID-19 infection and laboratory markers

28 Abstract

29 **Objective**

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

34 Methods

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

44 **Results**

Cohorts with elevated levels of white blood cells (WBCs) (OR=1.75), neutrophil
count (OR=2.62), D-dimer (OR=3.97), prolonged prothrombin time (PT)
(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 $3.74 \square x 10^9$ /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

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

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

Materials and Methods

101 Search strategy

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

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

110 Study selection

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

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

130 Data abstraction

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

137 Quality assessment

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

144 Statistical analysis

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

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

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

Decision tree to identify predictors for poor outcomes 170

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

179

Trial sequential analysis (TSA)

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

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

191 Assessment of heterogeneity and publication bias

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

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

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

207 **Results**

208 Literature search

A flowchart outlining the systematic review search results is described in Fig 1A. 209 A total of 4752 records were identified through four major electronic databases till 210 April 22, 2020 including Web of Science (n = 557), PubMed (n = 1688), Scopus (n211 = 1105) and Science Direct (n = 1402). Upon reviewing the retrieved articles, a 212 total of 1230 records were excluded for duplication, and 3522 unique records were 213 initially identified. Following screening of titles and abstracts, several studies were 214 excluded for being case records (n = 44), review articles (n = 262), irrelevant 215 publications (n = 1355), or editorial materials (n = 1809). The resulted 424 full-text 216 publications were further assessed for eligibility, during which 372 records were 217 removed for lacking sufficient laboratory data. Ultimately, a total of 52 eligible 218 articles were included for the quantitative synthesis of this meta-analysis study, 219 with 52 records represented single-arm analysis, 16 records represented two-arms 220 severity analysis; meanwhile, 7 and 4 records were utilized for survival and ICU 221 admission analyses, respectively. 222

Fig 1. Literature search process.

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

Characteristics of the included studies

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

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

First	Year	Publication	Journal name	Continent	Country	Study design	Sample	Quality	Reference n
Author		date (dd-mm)			-		size	score	
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]
Hsih 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]	(whi
Zhou F	2020	09-March	The Lancet	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	191	9	[67]	ch v
Xiong Y	2020	07-March	Invest Radiol	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	42	5	[68]	was
Fan B	2020	04-March	American journal of hematology	Singapore	Singapore	Retrospective case study	67	9	[69]	not
Young B	2020	03-March	JAMA	Sengkang	Singapore	Descriptive case series	18	7	[70]	Cei
Wu J	2020	29-February	Clin Infect Dis	Jiangsu	China	Retrospective case study	80	7	[71]	tifie
Li K	2020	29-February	Invest Radiol	Chongqing	China	Retrospective case study	83	9	[72]	ğ
Liu W	2020	28-February	Chin Med J (Engl)	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	78	9	[73]	y pe
Yang W	2020	26-February	Journal of Infection	Zhejiang	China	Retrospective case study	149	6	[74]	er i
Wu J	2020	25-February	Invest Radiol	Chongqing	China	Retrospective case study	80	6	[75]	evie
Shi H	2020	24-February	Lancet Infectious Diseases	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	81	7	[76]	₽Ň)
Yang X	2020	24-February	The Lancet Respiratory Medicine	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	52	9	[77]	is tł
Zhang J	2020	23-February	Allergy	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	138	9	[78]	ne a
Zhou W	2020	21-February	Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	15	8	[79]	res
Xu X	2020	19-February	BMJ	Zhejiang	China	Retrospective case study	62	7	[80]	or/fu
Pan F	2020	13-February	Radiology	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	21	6	[81]	d. 1
Chang D	2020	07-February	JAMA	Beijing	China	Retrospective case study	13	6	[82]	er, v
Wang D	2020	07-February	JAMA	Wuhan	China	Retrospective case study	138	9	[83]	vho
Huang C	2020	24-January	The Lancet	Wuhan	China	Prospective cohort study	41	9	[1]	has e al

Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters: Single-arm Metaanalysis

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

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

Laboratory testing	Number	Sample	Estimate	95% CI	Р-	Q	P-value	I ²	T ²
	studies	size			value				
СВС									
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

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

269

270

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

- Two-arms meta-analyses were then conducted for three pairwise comparisons; (1) Severe *versus* mild COVID, (2) ICU admitted patients *versus* the general ward,
- and (3) Expired *versus* survivors (**Table 3**).
- Laboratory parameters of 16 eligible records were utilized to compare between 276 severe and non-severe patients. Severe cohorts were more likely to have high blood 277 levels of white blood cells (OR = 1.75, 95%CI = 1.21 - 2.54, p = 0.002), neutrophil 278 count (OR = 2.62, 95%CI = 1.72 - 3.97, p < 0.001), prothrombin time (OR = 1.82, 279 95%CI = 1.00 - 3.33, p = 0.047), D-dimer (OR = 3.97, 95%CI = 2.62 - 6.02, p280 <0.001), fibrinogen (OR = 3.14, 95%CI = 1.64 - 6.00, p < 0.001), erythrocyte 281 sedimentation rate (OR = 1.60, 95%CI = 1.16 - 2.22, p < 0.001), procalcitonin (OR 282 = 4.76, 95% CI = 2.48 - 9.14, *p* < 0.001), IL-6 (OR = 2.10, 95% CI = 1.02 - 4.32, *p* = 283 284 0.043), and IL-10 (OR = 4.93, 95%CI = 2.18 - 11.1, p < 0.001). In contrast, patients with normal lymphocyte count (OR = 0.30, 95%CI = 0.19 - 0.47, p < 0.001), 285 platelet count (OR = 0.56, 95%CI = 0.42 - 0.74, p < 0.001), CD4⁺ T cells (OR = 286 0.04, 95% CI = 0.02 - 0.07, p < 0.001), and CD8⁺ T cells (OR = 0.03, 95% CI = 0.01) 287 - 0.09, p < 0.001) were less likely to develop severe form of COVID-19 disease 288

289 (**Table 3A**).

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

295

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

Laboratory test	No of	Samj	ple size	E	Effect size				
	studies			SMD (95%CI)	OR (95% CI)	P-	I ²	P-value	
						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
D-dimer (C) Mortality	3	64 Alive	149 Died	0.79 (0.35, 1.24)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35)	<0.001	44.94	0.16
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells	3 6	64 Alive 736	149 Died 392	0.79 (0.35, 1.24)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05)	<0.001	44.94 78.05	0.16
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count	3 6 3	64 Alive 736 475	149 Died 392 222	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9	0.16 <0.001 <0.001
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count	3 6 3 7	64 Alive 736 475 756	149 Died 392 222 424	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count	3 6 3 7 4	64 Alive 736 475 756 483	149 Died 392 222 424 229	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin	3 6 3 7 4 5	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count	3 6 3 7 4 5 6	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.070 0.378 0.030
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 6	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 4	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 483	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001 0.646	 44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 4 5	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 483 620	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001 0.646 <0.001	 44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer Ferritin	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 6 4 5 3	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 483 620 338	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283 211	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18) 0.94 (0.26, 1.62)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58) 5.50 (1.6, 18.83)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.646 <0.001 0.006	 44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 91.63 	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34 <0.001
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer Ferritin ESR	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 4 5 3 2	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 640 640 338 201	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283 211 157	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18) 0.94 (0.26, 1.62) 0.33 (0.08, 0.58)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58) 5.50 (1.6, 18.83) 1.82 (1.16, 2.86)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 <0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001 0.646 <0.001 0.006 0.008	 44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 91.63 20.03 	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34 <0.001 0.263
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer Ferritin ESR Procalcitonin	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 6 4 5 3 2 3	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 640 640 640 580	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283 211 157 239	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18) 0.94 (0.26, 1.62) 0.33 (0.08, 0.58) 0.96 (0.43, 1.49)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58) 5.50 (1.6, 18.83) 1.82 (1.16, 2.86) 5.70 (2.18, 14.9)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001 0.646 <0.001 0.006 0.008 <0.001	 44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 91.63 20.03 81.48 	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34 <0.001 0.263 0.005
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer Ferritin ESR Procalcitonin C-reactive protein	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 6 6 4 5 3 2 3 4	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 483 620 338 201 580 591	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283 211 157 239 331	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18) 0.94 (0.26, 1.62) 0.33 (0.08, 0.58) 0.96 (0.43, 1.49) 1.08 (0.65, 1.52)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58) 5.50 (1.6, 18.83) 1.82 (1.16, 2.86) 5.70 (2.18, 14.9) 7.09 (3.23, 15.5)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001 0.646 <0.001 0.006 0.008 <0.001 <0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 91.63 20.03 81.48 87.31	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34 <0.001 0.263 0.005 <0.001
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer Ferritin ESR Procalcitonin C-reactive protein IL-6	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 4 5 6 4 5 3 2 3 4 4 5 3 2 3 4 4	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 483 620 338 201 580 591 612	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283 211 157 239 331 276	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18) 0.94 (0.26, 1.62) 0.33 (0.08, 0.58) 0.96 (0.43, 1.49) 1.08 (0.65, 1.52) 1.45 (1.11, 1.78)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58) 5.50 (1.6, 18.83) 1.82 (1.16, 2.86) 5.70 (2.18, 14.9) 7.09 (3.23, 15.5) 13.87 (7.6, 25.4)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.646 <0.001 0.006 0.008 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 91.63 20.03 81.48 87.31 75.44	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34 <0.001 0.263 0.005 <0.001 0.007
D-dimer (C) Mortality White blood cells Neutrophil count Lymphocyte count Monocyte count Hemoglobin Platelet count Prothrombin time APTT D-dimer Ferritin ESR Procalcitonin C-reactive protein IL-6 CD4 ⁺ T cells	3 6 3 7 4 5 6 4 5 3 2 3 4 2 3 4 2	64 Alive 736 475 756 483 600 640 640 640 640 6338 201 580 591 612 314	149 Died 392 222 424 229 271 315 315 229 283 211 157 239 331 276 109	0.79 (0.35, 1.24) 0.91 (0.61, 1.22) 1.01 (0.4, 1.63) -0.85 (-1.28, -0.41) -0.18 (-0.47, 0.1) 0 (-0.15, 0.15) -0.46 (-0.71, -0.21) 0.64 (0.25, 1.03) -0.096 (-0.51, 0.31) 1.02 (0.85, 1.18) 0.94 (0.26, 1.62) 0.33 (0.08, 0.58) 0.96 (0.43, 1.49) 1.08 (0.65, 1.52) 1.45 (1.11, 1.78) -0.67 (-1.01, -0.33)	4.19 (1.88, 9.35) 5.21 (3.00, 9.05) 6.25 (2.05, 19.0) 0.21 (0.10, 0.47) 0.72 (0.43, 1.21) 1.00 (0.76, 1.31) 0.43 (0.28, 0.68) 3.19 (1.58, 6.47) 0.83 (0.40, 1.75) 6.36 (4.72, 8.58) 5.50 (1.6, 18.83) 1.82 (1.16, 2.86) 5.70 (2.18, 14.9) 7.09 (3.23, 15.5) 13.87 (7.6, 25.4) 0.30 (0.16, 0.55)	<0.001 <0.001 0.001 0.21 0.99 <0.001 0.001 0.646 <0.001 0.006 0.008 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001	44.94 78.05 90.9 89.33 57.48 4.988 59.52 83.0 78.23 10.63 91.63 20.03 81.48 87.31 75.44 44.57	0.16 <0.001 <0.001 0.070 0.378 0.030 <0.001 0.003 0.34 <0.001 0.263 0.005 <0.001 0.007 0.17

Continuous Random-Effects model, SMD: Standardized mean difference, OR 95% CI: Odds ratio 95%
confidence interval, I²: the ratio of true heterogeneity to total observed variation. APTT: Activated
partial thromboplastin time, ESR: Erythrocyte sedimentation rate. Ig: immunoglobulin, IL: Interleukin,
TNF-α: tumor necrosis factor-alpha.

302 Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters according to ICU

admission: Pairwise Meta-analysis

A total of 4 eligible articles were recognized to include laboratory features of ICU 304 and floor patients. Our data revealed having elevated levels of WBCs (OR = 5.21, 305 95%CI = 3.0 – 9.05, p <0.001), neutrophils (OR = 6.25, 95%CI = 2.05 – 19.0, p = 306 0.001), D-dimer (OR = 4.19, 95%CI = 1.88 - 9.35, p < 0.001), and prolonged 307 prothrombin time (OR = 2.18, 95%CI = 1.19 - 3.99, p = 0.012) were associated 308 with increased odds of ICU admission, while normal lymphocyte count (OR =309 0.23, 95% CI = 0.09 - 0.62, p = 0.003) and hemoglobin (OR = 0.14, 95\% CI = 0.03 -310 0.64, p = 0.012) conferred lower risk of ICU admission (**Table 3B**). 311 Remarkable heterogeneity was obvious in studies of neutrophil count ($I^2 = 93.1\%$, 312 p < 0.001), lymphocyte count (I² = 68.5%, p = 0.023), and hemoglobin (I² = 66.3%,

- 313 p < 0.001), lymphocyte count (I² = 68.5%, p = 0.023), and hemoglobin (I² = 66.3%,
- p = 0.08). These parameters were enclosed in two to four studies; therefore, further tracing for the source of heterogeneity was not applicable.

Pooled estimates of laboratory parameters according to mortality:

317 Pairwise Meta-analysis

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

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

failed to identify the source of heterogeneity.

338 Subgroup and sensitivity analysis

For the studies which included a comparison between mild and severe patients, 339 subgroup and sensitivity analyses were performed for five laboratory markers 340 (WBC, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, procalcitonin, and CRP). First, to 341 identify how each study affects the overall estimate of the rest of the studies, we 342 performed leave-one-out sensitivity analyses. Results did not contribute to give 343 explanations to heterogeneity. In contrast, subgroup analysis revealed homogeneity 344 with certain categorizations. For WBCs lab results, heterogeneity was resolved on 345 stratification by the origin of study population [Wuhan population: $I^2 = 73.4\%$, p =346 0.002, other cities: $I^2 = 0\%$, p = 0.53] and month of publication [April: $I^2 = 74.5\%$, 347 p = 0.001, February/March: I² = 47.5%, p = 0.06]. Regarding neutrophilic count, 348 the variance in the results resolved in articles with large sample size >50 patients 349 $(I^2 = 46.2\%, p = 0.06)$. Moreover, the degree of dissimilarities of procalcitonin 350 results found in different studies was ameliorated in April publications ($I^2 = 41.5\%$, 351 p = 0.16) and in those with low sample size (I² = 0%, p = 0.80). Similarly, 352 homogeneity was generated in CRP results in articles with low sample size ($I^2 =$ 353 0%, p = 0.58) (Table 4). 354

355 Meta-regression analysis

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

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	Pooled	estimate	s		Heteroge	neity	Meta-regres	sion		
			studies	SMD	LL	UL	P-value	\mathbf{I}^2	P-value	Coefficient	LL	UL	P-value
White blood	Overall		14	0.317	0.113	0.52	0.002	62.90%	0.001				
cells	Origin of	Others	8	0.113	-0.083	0.308	0.26	0%	0.53	Reference			
	patients	Wuhan	6	0.490	0.198	0.783	0.00	73.40%	0.002	0.31	0.03	0.58	0.029
	Sample	≤50	5	0.164	-0.553	0.881	0.65	71.30%	0.007	Reference			
	size	>50	9	0.387	0.208	0.566	< 0.001	52.60%	0.031	0.30	-0.10	0.72	0.14
	Publication	Feb/Mar	8	0.251	0.039	0.464	0.021	47.50%	0.06	Reference			
	month	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	Others	8	0.439	0.139	0.740	0.004	50.88%	0.047	Reference			
	patients	Wuhan	6	0.632	0.280	0.985	< 0.001	78.29%	< 0.001	0.045	-0.21	0.30	0.20
	Sample	≤50	5	0.286	-0.503	1.076	0.47	75.94%	0.002	Reference			
	size	>50	9	0.65	0.472	0.828	< 0.001	46.2%	0.06	0.606	0.20	1.01	0.003
	Publication	Feb/Mar	8	0.428	0.181	0.675	< 0.001	54.4%	0.032	Reference			
	month	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	Others	9	-0.626	-0.962	-0.291	< 0.001	66.51%	0.002	Reference			
	patients	Wuhan	7	-0.710	1.097	-0.323	< 0.001	85.72%	< 0.001	0.092	-0.31	0.49	0.64
	Sample	≤50	5	-0.506	-1.169	0.156	0.13	66.1%	0.019	Reference			
	size	>50	11	-0.714	-0.983	-0.444	< 0.001	80.98%	< 0.001	-0.342	-0.85	0.169	0.18
	Publication	Feb/Mar	9	-0.452	-0.712	-0.192	< 0.001	66.65%	0.002	Reference			
	month	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				
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1

	Origin of	Others	5	1.038	0.370	1.706	< 0.001	86.16%	< 0.001	Reference			
	patients	Wuhan	5	0.686	0.331	1.041	< 0.001	75.38%	0.003	-0.318	-0.97	0.33	0.34
	Sample	≤50	3	0.768	0.334	1.203	< 0.001	0%	0.80	Reference			
	size	>50	7	0.903	0.459	1.348	< 0.001	88.62%	< 0.001	0.054	-0.72	0.83	0.89
	Publication	Feb/Mar	6	0.956	0.404	1.509	< 0.001	91.51%	< 0.001	Reference			
	month	April	4	0.757	0.409	1.105	< 0.001	41.54%	0.16	-0.096	-0.80	0.61	0.78
C-reactive	Overall		13	1.027	0.65	1.40	< 0.001	88.2%	< 0.001				
protein	Origin of	Others	8	1.24	0.65	1.83	< 0.001	87.8%	< 0.001	Reference			
	patients	Wuhan	5	0.389	0.30	1.07	< 0.001	80.7%	< 0.001	-0.58	-1.27	0.10	0.09
	Sample	≤50	3	0.831	0.341	1.322	< 0.001	0%	0.58	Reference			
	size	>50	10	1.08	0.651	1.512	< 0.001	82.3%	< 0.001	0.37	-0.55	1.29	0.42
	Publication	Feb/Mar	8	1.014	0.502	1.525	< 0.001	88.23%	< 0.001	Reference			
	month	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	Р	<	0.05.
-----	-------------	--------	----------	--------------	----	---	---	-------

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

373 **Publication bias**

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

Decision tree and Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve

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

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

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	$0.\overline{632 \pm 1.6}$	22.9	71.4	71.4	0.40

Table 5. Receiver Operating Characteristics results

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

390

391 **Trial sequential analysis**

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

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

402

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

408 **Discussion**

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

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

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

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

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].

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

471 Concerning the inflammatory markers associated with the COVID-19 pandemic,
472 this comprehensive meta-analysis study observed higher concentrations of C473 reactive protein (CRP) and procalcitonin besides elevated erythrocyte

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

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

494 **Conclusion**

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

503 Acknowledgments

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

505 **Funding** None

506 **References**

 Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet.
 2020; 395(10223): 497-506.

Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Cardona-Ospina JA, Gutiérrez-Ocampo E,
 Villamizar-Peña R, Holguin-Rivera Y, Escalera-Antezana JP, et al. Clinical,
 laboratory and imaging features of COVID-19: A systematic review and
 meta-analysis. Travel medicine and infectious disease. 2020; 101623.

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.
- 5. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Bonilla-Aldana DK, Balbin-Ramon GJ, Rabaan AA,
 Sah R, Paniz-Mondolfi A, et al. History is repeating itself: Probable zoonotic
 spillover as the cause of the 2019 novel Coronavirus Epidemic. Infez Med.
 2020; 28:3-5.
- 6. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and
 clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in
 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.
- Lechien JR, Chiesa Estomba CM, Place S, Van Laethem Y, Cabaraux P,
 Mat Q, et al. Clinical and Epidemiological Characteristics of 1,420 European
 Patients with mild to moderate Coronavirus Disease 2019. Journal of
 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.
- Udugama B, Kadhiresan P, Kozlowski HN, Malekjahani A, Osborne M, Li
 VY, et al. Diagnosing COVID-19: the disease and tools for detection. ACS
 nano. 2020.
- McInnes MD, Moher D, Thombs BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, Clifford
 T, et al. Preferred reporting items for a systematic review and meta-analysis
 of diagnostic test accuracy studies: the PRISMA-DTA statement. Jama.

542 2018; 319:388-396.

- Kapadia MZ, Park CK, Beyene J, Giglia L, Maxwell C, McDonald SD.
 Weight loss instead of weight gain within the guidelines in obese women
 during pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analyses of maternal and
 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.
- Pierce CA. Software Review: Borenstein, M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT and
 Rothstein HR (2006). Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (Version 2.2.
 027)[Computer software]. Englewood, NJ: Biostat. Organizational Research
 Methods. 2008; 11:188-191.
- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials.
 1986; 7:177-188.
- Andreano A, Rebora P, Valsecchi MG. Measures of single arm outcome in
 meta-analyses of rare events in the presence of competing risks. Biometrical
 Journal. 2015; 57: 649-660.
- Elshazli RM, Toraih EA, Elgaml A, Kandil E, Fawzy MS. Genetic
 polymorphisms of TP53 (rs1042522) and MDM2 (rs2279744) and colorectal
 cancer risk: An updated meta-analysis based on 59 case-control studies.
 Gene. 2020;144391.
- Lin L, Chu H. Quantifying publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics.
 2018; 74:785-794.
- 568 20. Duval S, Tweedie R, Nonparametric A. "Trim and Fill" Method of

- Accounting for Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis. Journal of the American
 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.
- Henry BM, De Oliveira MH, Benoit S, Plebani M, Lippi G. Hematologic,
 biochemical and immune biomarker abnormalities associated with severe
 illness and mortality in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a metaanalysis. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2020.
- Di Gennaro F, Pizzol D, Marotta C, Antunes M, Racalbuto V, Veronese N,
 et al. Coronavirus Diseases (COVID-19) Current Status and Future
 Perspectives: A Narrative Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;
 17.
- Lippi G, Simundic AM, Plebani M. Potential preanalytical and analytical
 vulnerabilities in the laboratory diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019
 (COVID-19). Clin Chem Lab Med. 2020.
- Lagier JC, Colson P, Dupont HT, Salomon J, Doudier B, Aubry C,, et al.,
 Testing the repatriated for SARS-Cov2: Should laboratory-based quarantine
 replace traditional quarantine? Travel Med Infect Dis. 2020; 101624.
- Tan C, Huang Y, Shi F, Tan K, Ma Q, Chen Y, et al. C-reactive protein
 correlates with computed tomographic findings and predicts severe COVID19 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.

- Lippi G, Plebani M, Henry BM. Thrombocytopenia is associated with severe
 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infections: A meta-analysis. Clinica
 Chimica Acta. 2020; 506:145-148.
- Shi Y, Wang Y, Shao C, Huang J, Gan J, Huang X, et al. COVID-19
 infection: the perspectives on immune responses. Cell Death Differ. 2020;
 27: 1451-1454.
- Tang N, Li D, Wang X, Sun Z. Abnormal coagulation parameters are
 associated with poor prognosis in patients with novel coronavirus
 pneumonia. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis. 2020; 18:844-847.
- 32. Ye Q, Wang B, Mao J. The pathogenesis and treatment of the `Cytokine
 Storm' in COVID-19. J Infect. 2020.
- 33. Zhao M. Cytokine storm and immunomodulatory therapy in COVID-19:
 Role of chloroquine and anti-IL-6 monoclonal antibodies. Int J Antimicrob
 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.
- 35. Zhu Z, Cai T, Fan L, Lou K, Hua X, Huang Z, et al. Clinical value of
 immune-inflammatory parameters to assess the severity of coronavirus
 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 (RNAaemia) is closely correlated with drastically
 621 elevated interleukin 6 (IL-6) level in critically ill COVID-19 patients. Clin
 622 Infect Dis. 2020.

- 38. Chen G, Wu D, Guo W, Cao Y, Huang D, Wang H, et al. Clinical and
 immunological features of severe and moderate coronavirus disease 2019. J
 Clin Invest. 2020.
- 39. Zhang G, Hu C, Luo L, Fang F, Chen Y, Li J, et al. Clinical features and
 short-term outcomes of 221 patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. J
 Clin Virol. 2020; 127:104364.
- 40. Lei S, Jiang F, Su W, Chen C, Chen J, Mei W, et al. Clinical characteristics
 and outcomes of patients undergoing surgeries during the incubation period
 of COVID-19 infection. EClinicalMedicine. 2020; 100331.
- 41. Wang L, He W, Yu X, Hu D, Bao M, Liu H, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019
 in elderly patients: Characteristics and prognostic factors based on 4-week
 follow-up. J Infect. 2020.
- Guo T, Fan Y, Chen M, Wu X, Zhang L, He T, et al., Cardiovascular
 Implications of Fatal Outcomes of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019
 (COVID-19). JAMA Cardiol. 2020.
- 43. Zheng C, Wang J, Guo H, Lu Z, Ma Y, Zhu Y, et al. Risk-adapted
 Treatment Strategy For COVID-19 Patients. Int J Infect Dis. 2020; 94: 7477.
- 44. Tang X, Du R, Wang R, Cao T, Guan L, Yang C et al. Comparison of
 Hospitalized Patients With ARDS Caused by COVID-19 and H1N1. Chest.
 2020.
- 45. Shi S, Qin M, Shen B, Cai Y, Liu T, Yang F et al. Association of Cardiac
 Injury With Mortality in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 in Wuhan,
 China. JAMA Cardiol. 2020.
- 46. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, et al. Temporal
 profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum
 antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational

- cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020.
- 47. Zhou Z, Guo D, Li C, Fang Z, Chen L, Yang R, et al. Coronavirus disease
 2019: initial chest CT findings. Eur Radiol. 2020.
- 48. Chen Z, Fan H, Cai J, Li Y, Wu B, Hou Y, et al. High-resolution computed
 tomography manifestations of COVID-19 infections in patients of different
 ages. Eur J Radiol. 2020; 126:108972.
- 49. Wan S, Xiang Y, Fang W, Zheng Y, Li B, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features and
 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.
- 51. Luo S, Zhang X, Xu H. Don't Overlook Digestive Symptoms in Patients
 With 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). Clin Gastroenterol
 Hepatol. 2020.
- 52. Deng Y, Liu W, Liu K, Fang YY, Shang J, Wang K, et al. Clinical
 characteristics of fatal and recovered cases of coronavirus disease 2019
 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China: a retrospective study. Chin Med J (Engl).
 2020.
- Arentz M, Yim E, Klaff L, Lokhandwala S, Riedo FX, Chong M, et al.
 Characteristics and Outcomes of 21 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19
 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.
- 56. Gao Y, Li T, Han M, Li X, Wu D, Xu Y, et al. Diagnostic utility of clinical

laboratory data determinations for patients with the severe COVID-19. JMed Virol. 2020.

- G79 57. Qian GQ, Yang NB, Ding F, Ma AH, Wang ZY, Shen YF, et al.
 Epidemiologic and Clinical Characteristics of 91 Hospitalized Patients with
 COVID-19 in Zhejiang, China: A retrospective, multi-centre case series.
 QJM. 2020.
- 58. Mo P, Xing Y, Xiao Y, Deng L, Zhao Q, Wang H, et al. Clinical
 characteristics of refractory COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. Clin
 Infect Dis. 2020.
- 59. Cao J, Tu WJ, Cheng W, Yu L, Liu YK, Hu X, et al. Clinical Features of 69
 Cases with Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. Clin Infect Dis.
 2020.
- 60. Lo IL, Lio CF, Cheong HH, Lei CI, Cheong TH, Zhong X, et al. Evaluation
 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in clinical specimens and clinical
 characteristics of 10 patients with COVID-19 in Macau. Int J Biol Sci. 2020;
 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. Hsih 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.
- Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, Zhou X, Xu S, Huang H, et al. Risk Factors
 Associated With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients
 With Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA Intern
 Med. 2020.

- Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, Zhang S, Yang S, Tao Y, et al. Dysregulation of
 immune response in patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. Clin Infect
 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.
- Liu K, Chen Y, Lin R, Han K. Clinical features of COVID-19 in elderly
 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.
- Kiong Y, Sun D, Liu Y, Fan Y, Zhao L, Li X, et al. Clinical and HighResolution CT Features of the COVID-19 Infection: Comparison of the
 Initial and Follow-up Changes. Invest Radiol. 2020.
- Fan BE, Chong VC, Chan SS, Lim GH, Lim KG, Tan GB, et al.,
 Hematologic parameters in patients with COVID-19 infection. Am J
 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

- factors associated with disease outcomes in hospitalized patients with 2019
 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).
- Xu XW, Wu XX, Jiang XG, Xu KJ, Ying LJ, Ma CL, et al. Clinical findings
 in a group of patients infected with the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov2) outside of Wuhan, China: retrospective case series. BMJ. 2020; 368:
 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

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

Records identified Records identified Records **Records identified** through Web of through PubMed identified in through Science Science searching searching **Scopus searching Direct searching** (n = 557) (n = 1688) (n = 1105) (n = 1402) Identification Records screened (n = 4752) Exclude records for duplication (n = 1230) Screening **Records screened with titles and abstract** (n = 3522) Exclude case records (n = 44) Exclude review articles (n = 262) Exclude irrelevant articles (n = 1355) Exclude Editorial material (n = 1809) Eligibility Full-text article assessed for eligibility (n = 424) Exclude for no laboratory data (284) Exclude no sufficient data (n=88) Studies included in qualitative synthesis (n = 52) Included Studies included in quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) (n = 52) Single arm records (n = 52) Severity records (n = 16) Survival records (n = 7) ICU records (n = 4)

(B)





