

1 **Title: Clinical and immunoserological status 12 weeks after infection with COVID-19:**
2 **prospective observational study**

3 **Authors:** Lucía Valiente-De Santis^{1 2}, Inés Pérez-Camacho^{1 2}, Beatriz Sobrino^{1 2}, Gracia
4 Eugenia González³, Juan Diego Ruíz-Mesa^{1 2}, Antonio Plata^{1 2}, Ignacio Márquez-Gómez^{1 2},
5 Marcial Delgado-Fernández^{1 2}, Manuel Castaño^{1 2}, Francisco Oñate^{1 2}, Francisco Orihuela^{1 2},
6 Begoña Palop⁴, José María Reguera^{1 2}.

7 ¹ IBIMA. Department of Infectious Diseases.

8 ² Regional University Hospital of Málaga. Department of Infectious Diseases.

9 ³ Regional University Hospital of Málaga. Department of Pneumology

10 ⁴ Regional University Hospital of Málaga. Department of Microbiology

11 **Abstract**

12 Objectives: to undertake a multidisciplinary follow-up at 12 weeks after an acute episode of
13 COVID-19 to assess the functional status, persistence of symptoms and immunoserological
14 situation.

15 Methods: this prospective, observational, single-centre study included outpatients reviewed
16 12 weeks after an acute infection with SARS-CoV-2. The clinical evaluation included data about
17 the acute episode and epidemiological and clinical variables. The patients were classified as
18 symptomatic or asymptomatic depending on the persistence or otherwise of symptoms. All
19 the patients underwent a full blood test and serology for SARS-CoV-2, as well as imaging tests
20 and spirometry if needed.

21 Results: The mean age of the 108 patients was 55.5 (SD: 15.4) years and 27.8% were health-
22 care workers; 75.9% presented some type of symptoms, with dyspnoea being the most

23 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
common. A D-dimer >500 ng/mL was detected in 32 (31.4%) patients. All the patients had

24 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. Being a health-care worker was associated with symptom
25 persistence, with age ≥ 65 years being a protective factor.

26 Conclusions: The persistence of symptoms in patients with COVID is usual 12 weeks after the
27 acute episode, especially in patients < 65 years and health-care workers. All our patients had
28 developed antibodies by 12 weeks.

29

30 **Introduction**

31 Respiratory infection (COVID-19) caused by SARS-CoV-2 is characterised by asthenia, fever, dry
32 cough, anosmia, arthromyalgia and dyspnoea, and less commonly by nasal congestion,
33 headache,odynophagia, vomiting and diarrhoea. One week into the course of the disease
34 some patients develop a very aggressive inflammatory response that can lead to respiratory
35 failure secondary to adult respiratory distress, septic shock or coagulation disorders (1,2),
36 which in turn can produce venous thromboembolism (3). Reports also exist of involvement of
37 the heart (4,5), nervous system (6), liver, kidney and skin (7) and eyes (8). Whether these
38 lesions heal definitively or whether they leave persisting damage is unknown. Accordingly, it
39 seems advisable to undertake monitoring and follow-up of patients who have had COVID-19 to
40 determine any possible sequelae (9).

41 Few data are currently available about the immunoserological response in convalescing
42 patients. Studies have suggested that the serological response with effect from 3 months after
43 symptom onset could reach 100% (10). Nevertheless, little information exists about the
44 duration of the presence of antibodies in COVID-19 patients. We therefore undertook a
45 multidisciplinary follow-up of all COVID-19 patients seen at our hospital to determine their
46 functional and immunoserological status, assess the presence of possible sequelae and
47 evaluate their course.

48 **Material and Methods**

49 Patients

50 This prospective, observational, single-centre study included the first patients seen at the
51 outpatients' office 12 weeks after acute SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosed between 14 March
52 and 15 April 2020 and who were discharged after hospital admission or after being seen at the
53 emergency service of the Regional University Hospital in Malaga, Spain but who did not
54 require admission, just home confinement during the acute phase. The patients were classified
55 during the acute phase as a confirmed case (symptoms compatible with COVID-19 and positive
56 result for the SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) (Cobas 6800, Roche) in respiratory
57 samples, or a suspected case (symptoms compatible with COVID-19 and negative PCR) (11).

58 All the patients were contacted by telephone 12 weeks after the acute phase to undertake a
59 first assessment of their clinical status and make an office appointment.

60 Clinical assessment

61 The clinical assessment was undertaken jointly by an infectious diseases specialist and a
62 pulmonologist. The symptoms during the acute phase were classified as severe if the patient
63 required hospital admission and mild if not. Comorbidity was assessed with the age-adjusted
64 Charlson index. The patients was considered to have received specific treatment for COVID-19
65 if any of the following drugs were given for at least 24 hours: lopinavir/ritonavir,
66 hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine (with or without azithromycin), tocilizumab, anakinra and
67 steroids. A clinical history was taken of the current symptoms and all the patients underwent a
68 physical examination. The patients were asked about the presence of fever (temperature
69 $>37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$), cough, dyspnoea, chest pain, palpitations, arthromyalgia, asthenia, diarrhoea,
70 headache, anosmia, dysgeusia and psychological or cognitive changes (anxiety, mood
71 disorders, insomnia, loss of memory, difficulty concentrating). Patients were considered to be

72 symptomatic when they presented at least one of the symptoms and asymptomatic otherwise.
73 SARS-CoV-2 infection was ruled out in suspected cases with a negative COVID-19 PCR and
74 negative results for IgM and IgG on the serological study at 12 weeks in the absence of
75 immunosuppression. The patients were also classified according to whether they were health-
76 care workers or not.

77 Complementary studies

78 Prior to the office visit all the patients were shown to have a negative SARS-CoV-2 PCR in
79 nasopharyngeal exudate. The following complementary tests were all undertaken at the same
80 time: total leukocytes and lymphocytes, haematocrit, platelets, lymphocyte subsets, D-dimer,
81 creatinine, aspartate aminotransferase, alanine aminotransferase, gamma glutamyl
82 transferase, alkaline phosphatase (AP), lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), ferritin, interleukin 6 (IL-
83 6), immunoglobulins IgA, IgM and IgG and C3 and C4 fractions plus a plain chest radiograph.
84 Patients considered to require it also underwent respiratory function tests with diffusion
85 testing, computerised tomography (CT) or CT angiography of the chest, echo-Doppler of the
86 legs, ventilation/perfusion gammagraphy and echocardiogram.

87 Serological study

88 The patients also underwent blood tests for IgG and IgM + IgA antibodies against SARS-CoV-2
89 with the kits COVID-19 VIRCLIA® IgG MONOTEST (Vircell) and COVID-19 VIRCLIA® IgM+IgA
90 MONOTEST (Vircell) based on chemiluminescence (CLIA, ChemiLuminescent ImmunoAssay).
91 The following antigens were used in these kits: the spike protein (S protein) and the
92 nucleocapsid protein (N protein). The use of both types of antigen gives the tests excellent
93 sensitivity, in addition to that of the CLIA technique. For IgM a titre of 0.4-0.6 was considered
94 indeterminate and a titre >0.6 as positive. For IgG a titre of 1.4-1.6 was considered
95 indeterminate and a titre >1.6 as positive. In both cases lower titres were considered negative.

96 Lymphocyte subset analysis was with the BD Multitest 6-Color TBNK Reagent panel, which
97 includes T lymphocytes (CD4, CD8, CD16 natural killer), B lymphocytes (naive, with and without
98 isotope switching, transitional and plasma) and monocyte subsets (CD14, CD16 effector and
99 regulatory).

100 Posterior follow-up

101 All the cases classified during the acute phase as suspected were reclassified as confirmed if
102 they presented a positive SARS-CoV-2 serology at 12 weeks. All the patients will be given office
103 appointments each three months for a minimum follow-up of one year.

104 Statistical study

105 The continuous variables, expressed as the mean (standard deviation, SD), were compared
106 with the Mann-Whitney U test, and the categorical variables, expressed as number (%), were
107 compared with the χ^2 or Fisher's exact tests. A P value <0.05 was considered significant. The
108 statistical analysis was done with SPSS 22.0.0.0.

109 **Results**

110 Of the original 116 patients contacted 3 (2.5%) refused to attend. Of the remaining 113, 5
111 (4.4%) were excluded as they proved not to be COVID cases. Table 1 shows the baseline
112 characteristics of the patients during the acute episode. The mean age of the 108 patients was
113 55.5 (SD: 15.4) years, and 82 (75.9%) had some sort of symptom at the time of office revision.

114 Table 2 shows the symptoms, with a predominance of respiratory symptoms. Concerning the
115 number of symptoms, 18.6% reported just one, 19.5% two and 39.8% three or more
116 symptoms.

117 A blood test was performed in 102 (94.4%) of the 108 COVID-19 patients. Table 3 shows the
118 main changes, highlighting an increase in D-dimer >500 ng/mL in 32 (31.4%) patients. No
119 significant differences were seen according to the presence or absence of symptoms

120 Concerning imaging tests, 89 (82.4%) patients had a control chest radiograph at 12 weeks after
121 the acute episode. In 56 (62.9%) this was normal, in 24 (26.9%) the evolution of the images
122 was favourable and in 9 (10.1%) the radiological alterations seen during the acute phase had
123 persisted or worsened. A chest CT was done in 37 (41.5%) patients; it was normal in 7 (18.9%)
124 and pathological in the rest: 24 (64.9%) had ground-glass opacity, 3 (8.1%) a pattern of
125 pulmonary fibrosis, 2 (5.4%) pulmonary thromboembolism and 1 (2.7%) residual lobar
126 infiltrate.

127 Spirometry was performed in 32 (29.6%) patients. In 23 (71.9%) the result was normal, 4
128 (12.5%) had an obstructive pattern, 3 (9.4%) a mixed pattern and in 2 (6.3%) the alterations
129 were interpreted as secondary to poor collaboration. None of the baseline characteristics was
130 associated with radiological or respiratory function changes.

131 The serological test was not undertaken in 3 (2.7%) of the 108 patients. Table 3 shows the
132 serological response of the remaining 105 COVID-19 patients. All patients had a serological
133 response (IgG in 98.1%) and at 12 weeks 55% were positive for both IgM and IgG antibodies
134 (Table 4).

135 Being a health-care worker was associated with symptom persistence (OR = 4.79 [95% CI =
136 1.02-22.38], p=0.046), with age \geq 65 years being a protective factor (OR = 0.33 [95% CI = 0.12-
137 0.87], p=0.026) (Table 5).

138 **Discussion**

139 Few studies examining the course of patients with COVID-19 have included data about possible
140 sequelae and the immunoserological response against SARS-CoV-2. In our study most of the

141 infected patients (75.9%) in our preliminary SARS-CoV-2 cohort continued to have symptoms
142 12 weeks after the acute episode. This coincides with the results reported by Carfi et al., who
143 assessed the presence of residual symptoms in 143 patients after a mean of 60 days following
144 the acute episode (12); 87.4% of the patients reported persistence of symptoms.

145 Dyspnoea was the predominant symptom in most of our patients. A retrospective study
146 comprising 50 patients assessed one month after the acute episode found that over half
147 presented worsened lung function, mostly consisting of restrictive and diffusion alterations,
148 generally mild (13). Likewise, the persistence of diffusion alterations seems more common in
149 patients who have severe pneumonia during the acute episode (14). In our series, the
150 prevalence of alterations detected on spirometry was lower than in the previous series,
151 though our series included more patients with a mild acute episode than the others.
152 Additionally, as spirometry in our cohort was determined by the persistence of symptoms, a
153 lower percentage of patients underwent the test.

154 Although most of the patients with radiological alterations during the acute phase evolved
155 favourably, 37% still had some degree of persistence of symptoms. The chest CT in these
156 patients confirmed the presence of radiological lesions, most frequently persistence of the
157 ground-glass opacity. This is in contrast to the findings of Zhao et al, who assessed 55 patients
158 three months after acute infection with SARS-CoV-2 and found that 70% has persistence of
159 radiological alterations. However, whereas in our series it was persistence of ground-glass
160 opacity and *crazy paving* in their series it was interstitial thickening compatible with pulmonary
161 fibrosis (15). The three patients with fibrosis in our series had presented severe clinical
162 symptoms, with one having bilateral pneumonia and requiring admission to the intensive care
163 unit, which agrees with the literature (16). Of note is the high number of patients who
164 reported dyspnoea, sometimes with cough and chest pain, but who had no demonstrable
165 respiratory function or radiological alterations. The association of these systemic symptoms

166 together with asthenia and psychological disorders could constitute what has been called post-
167 viral or post-covid chronic fatigue syndrome (17). The presence of anxiety and depression have
168 been reported with SARS (18) and they may persist beyond the duration of the bout. In our
169 series, 16.7% of the patients experienced psychological or cognitive alterations after the acute
170 episode of COVID-19, which is in concordance with the impact that other outbreaks have had
171 for the mental health of the patients and the community in general (19). Nine of our patients
172 required psychiatric assessment.

173 The most frequent symptoms after respiratory symptoms were neurological symptoms,
174 occurring in about one in every 10 patients, mainly persistence of headache, anosmia and
175 dysgeusia. The presence of these symptoms during the acute infection is common (6,20) and
176 although most cases appear to resolve in less than 4 weeks (21), our results suggest that these
177 alterations may persist in some patients for at least three months.

178 During the acute phase of SARS-CoV-2 there can be involvement of the myocardium,
179 producing myocarditis. Whilst the prognosis for this appears favourable, we are unaware of
180 the long-term consequences of this myocardial damage, and it may be part of the genesis of
181 the palpitations and chest pain sometimes reported by patients at revision (22). Another
182 important cardiovascular aspect we have noted is the persistence in the rise in D-dimer in over
183 30% of the patients three months after the acute phase; one of our patients even showed
184 pulmonary thromboembolism on the control CT. This all suggests the need to maintain the
185 patients anticoagulated for an indeterminate period (23). Unfortunately, we are unable to
186 provide a response to this as our study was not designed with this in mind.

187 Almost all our patients had a humoral immune response by three months after the acute
188 episode. Furthermore, this serological response was independent of the severity of the acute
189 symptoms and the symptoms at the time of revision. Between 2 and 6 weeks after diagnosis of
190 COVID-19 most patients develop antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, as shown in the study by Lin

191 et al. (24) that included 334 patients with COVID-19 confirmed by SARS-CoV-2 PCR. Specific
192 IgM or IgG antibodies were detected in all the patients. It has been suggested that
193 asymptomatic patients could seroconvert to a lesser extent than patients with severe
194 symptoms and could even become negative during the convalescence (25). However, we failed
195 to see this as all our patients had detectable antibodies 3 months after the acute episode.
196 Subsequent follow-up of our patients will show the evolution of the immunoserological
197 response.

198 Care of patients with COVID-19 has an important impact on the health of health-care workers
199 (26,27). This impact has both physical and mental consequences (27). A retrospective cohort
200 study found that symptoms of infection by COVID-19 in health-care workers are mild or
201 moderate in 91% of cases (28). Nonetheless, our data show that health-care workers more
202 often have residual symptoms that persist after the acute episode. It would, therefore, be
203 recommendable to undertake an evolutionary follow-up of this group after SARS-CoV-2
204 infection. Moreover, health-care workers have a greater risk of post-traumatic stress, with the
205 younger workers more often developing this condition (26). In our study the patients <65 years
206 had a greater risk of residual symptoms.

207 In conclusion, 12 weeks after the acute episode residual symptoms are common in patients
208 with COVID, the most frequent being respiratory involvement. Health-care workers and
209 patients <65 years have a greater risk of presenting persistent symptoms after the acute
210 episode. An increase in D-dimer suggests the possibility of a state of hypercoagulability
211 persisting after the acute phase. All our patients had developed IgM or IgG antibodies against
212 SARS-CoV-2 by 12 weeks.

References

1. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020 Feb 7 doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.1585.
2. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395:497–506. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5.
3. Toshiaki Iba, Jerrold H. Levy, Marcel Levi, Jean Marie Connors, Jecko Thachil. Coagulopathy of Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Crit Care Med*. 2020 May 26: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000004458. Published online 2020 May 22. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000004458.
4. Arentz M., Yim E., Klaff L. Characteristics and outcomes of 21 critically ill patients with COVID-19 in Washington state. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 19;4720:2019–21.
5. Chen C., Zhou Y., Wang D.W. SARS-CoV-2: a potential novel etiology of fulminant myocarditis. *Herz*. 2020 Mar;5:10–12.
6. Mao L, Wang M, Chen S, et al. Neurological manifestations of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective case series study. *SSRN Journal* 202010.2139/ssrn.3544840.
7. Xu XW, Wu XX, Jiang XG, Xu KJ, Ying LJ, Ma CL. Clinical findings in a group of patients infected with the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) outside of Wuhan, China: retrospective case series. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m606.
8. Wu P, Duan F, Luo C, Liu Q, Qu X, Liang L. Characteristics of ocular findings of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hubei Province, China. *JAMA Ophthalmol*. 2020;138:575–8.
9. Balachandar V, Mahalaxmi I, Subramaniam M, et al. Follow-up studies in COVID-19 recovered patients - is it mandatory? *Sci Total Environ*. 2020 Aug 10; 729: 139021.

10. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020.
11. https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov-China/documentos/COVID19_Estrategia_vigilancia_y_control_e_indicadores.pdf
12. Carfi A, Bernabei R, Landi F. Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *JAMA* 2020;324:603-5.
13. Frija-Masson J, Debray M-P, Gilbert M, et al. Functional characteristics of patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia at 30 days post infection. *Eur Respir J* 2020; in press (<https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01754-2020>).
14. Mo X, Jian W, Su Z, et al. Abnormal pulmonary function in COVID-19 patients at time of hospital discharge. *Eur Respir J*. 2020 Jun; 55(6): 2001217.
15. Zhao YM, Shang YM, Song WB, et al. Follow-up study of the pulmonary function and related physiological characteristics of COVID-19 survivors three months after recovery [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 15]. *E Clinical Medicine*. 2020;100463. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100463.
16. Fang Y, Zhou J, Ding X, Ling G, Yu S. Pulmonary fibrosis in critical ill patients recovered from COVID-19 pneumonia: Preliminary experience [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 19]. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2020;doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2020.05.120.
17. Perrin R, Riste L, Hann M, Walther A, Mukherjee A, Heald A. Into the looking glass: Post-viral syndrome post COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 27]. *Med Hypotheses*. 2020; 144: 10055.
18. Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, Rubin GJ. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. *Lancet*. 2020 Mar 14; 395(10227):912-20.

- 19.** Wong LP, Hung CC, Alias H, Lee TS. Anxiety symptoms and preventive measures during the COVID-19 outbreak in Taiwan. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2020;20(1):376. Published 2020 Jul 16. doi:10.1186/s12888-020-02786-8.
- 20.** Chen X, Laurent S, Onur OA, et al. A systematic review of neurological symptoms and complications of COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 20]. *J Neurol*. 2020;1-11. doi:10.1007/s00415-020-10067-3
- 21.** Meini S, Suardi LR, Busoni M, Roberts AT, Fortini A. Olfactory and gustatory dysfunctions in 100 patients hospitalized for COVID-19: sex differences and recovery time in real-life [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 4]. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2020;1-5. doi:10.1007/s00405-020-06102-8.
- 22.** Mitrani RD, Dabas N, Goldberger JJ. COVID-19 cardiac injury: Implications for long-term surveillance and outcomes in survivors [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 26]. *Heart Rhythm*. 2020;S1547-5271(20)30625-1. doi:10.1016/j.hrthm.2020.06.026
- 23.** Violi F, Pastori D, Cangemi R, Pignatelli P, Loffredo L. Hypercoagulation and Antithrombotic Treatment in Coronavirus 2019: A New Challenge. *Thromb Haemost*. 2020;120:949-56.
- 24.** Lin L, Luo S, Qin R, et al. Long-term infection of SARS-CoV-2 changed the body's immune status. *Clin Immunol*. 2020 Sep; 218: 108524. Published online 2020 Jul 11. doi: 10.1016/j.clim.2020.108524.
- 25.** Long, Q., Tang, X., Shi, Q. et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0965-6>.
- 26.** Carmassi C, Foghi C, Dell'Oste V, et al. PTSD symptoms in healthcare workers facing the three coronavirus outbreaks: What can we expect after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;292:113312. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113312.
- 27.** Shaukat N, Ali DM and Razzak J. Physical and mental health impacts of COVID-19 on healthcare workers: a scoping review. *Int J Emerg Med*. 2020;13:40.

- 28.** García IS, López MJMA, Vicente AS, Abascal PL. SARS-CoV-2 infection among healthcare workers in a hospital in Madrid, Spain [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 20]. *J Hosp Infect.* 2020;S0195-6701(20)30351-0. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.07.020.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the patients during the acute episode

Characteristic	Total N = 108	Symptomatic N = 82	Asymptomatic N = 26	p
Sex, N (%)				
· Female	60 (55.6)	47 (57.3)	13 (50)	NS
· Male	48 (44.4)	35 (42.7)	13 (50)	
Age ≥65 years	29 (26.9)	17 (20.7)	12 (46.2)	0.011
Health-care worker, N (%)	30 (27.8)	28 (34.1)	2 (7.7)	0.009
Charlson > 3, N (%)	21 (19.4)	11 (13.4)	10 (38.5)	0.005
Acute symptoms, N (%)				
· Mild	64 (59.3)	48 (58.5)	16 (61.5)	NS
· Severe	44 (40.7)	34 (41.5)	10 (38.5)	
ICU during acute episode, N (%)	4 (3.7)	3 (3.7)	1 (3.8)	NS
Treatment during acute episode	86 (79.6)	63 (76.8)	23 (88.5)	NS
Laboratory results during acute episode				
Lymphocytes during acute episode* **				
· Lymphopenia	33 (33)	24 (32.4)	9 (34.6)	NS
· No lymphopenia	67 (67)	50 (67.6)	17 (65.4)	
D-dimer during acute episode*				
· D-dimer >500	71 (77.2)	52 (74.3)	19 (86.4)	NS
· D-dimer <500	21 (22.8)	18 (25.7)	3 (13.6)	
Ferritin during acute episode*				
· Ferritin ≤1000 ng/L				NS
· Ferritin >1000 ng/L	38 (76)	29 (74.3)	9 (81.8)	

	12 (24)	10 (25.6)	2 (18.2)	
LDH during acute episode*				
· LDH ≤246 U/L	20 (35.1)	17 (42.5)	3 (17.6)	NS
· LDH >246 U/L	37 (64.9)	23 (57.5)	14 (82.4)	

*De los patients que estaba disponible

**Cifra de linfocitos menor de 900

ICU, intensive care unit; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase

Table 2: Symptoms 12 weeks after the acute episode

Symptoms	N (%)
	82 (75.9)
Dyspnoea	60 (55.6)
Asthenia	48 (44.9)
Cough	28 (25.9)
Chest pain	28 (25.9)
Palpitations	24 (22.2)
Headache	10 (9.3)
Anosmia	10 (9.3)
Dysgeusia	5 (5.6)
Fever	4 (3.7)
Chills	4 (3.7)
Arthromyalgia	3 (2.8)
Hair loss	3 (2.8)
Diarrhoea	2 (1.9)
Psychological and cognitive disorders:	18 (16.7)
· Anxiety	7 (6.4)
· Sadness	7 (6.4)
· Insomnia	2 (1.9)
· Loss of memory	2 (1.9)
· Difficulty concentrating	2 (1.9)

Table 3: Main results of the laboratory studies

Parameters	N (%)
Leukopenia (leukocytes <4000)	6 (5.8)
Lymphopenia (lymphocytes <900)	7 (6.8)
CD4/CD8 ratio <1	6 (5.8)
D-dimer >500 ng/mL	32 (31.3)
LDH > 246 U/L	7 (6.8)
CRP >2.9 mg/dL	25 (24.5)
Ferritin >252 ng/mL	9 (8.8)
IL-6 >40 pg/mL	4 (3.9)
IgM <40 mg/dL	6 (5.8)
IgG <600 mg/dL	11 (10.7)

LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein

Table 4: Serological response

Antibodies, N (%)	Total	Symptomatic	Asymptomatic	p
IgM positive	60 (57.1)	45 (56.3)	15 (60)	NS
IgM negative	35 (33.3)	28 (35.5)	7 (28)	NS
IgM indeterminate	10 (9.5)	7 (8.8)	3 (12)	NS
IgG positive	103 (98.1)	79 (98.8)	24 (96)	NS
IgG negative	2 (9.1)	1 (1.3)	1 (4)	NS
IgM and IgG positive	58 (55.5)	44 (55)	14 (56)	NS

Table 5: Risk factors for persistence of symptoms

Variable	OR multivariate analysis (95% CI)	p
Age >65 years	0.33 (0.12-0.87)	0.026
Health-care worker	4.79 (1.02-22.38)	0.046
Mild or severe acute episode	-	0.087
Charlson > 3	-	0.130
D-dimer >500 ng/mL	-	0.317
Specific treatment for COVID-19	-	0.435