

Title: COVID-19 gender difference pattern in Iranian population compared to the global pattern;
a systematic review and meta-analysis

Running title: Gender-based differences in COVID-19

Authors and affiliations:

Misagh Rajabinejad^{1,3}. Hossein Asgarian-Omran^{1,2*}

¹ Department of Immunology, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences,
Sari, Iran

² Gastrointestinal Cancer Research Center, Non-Communicable Diseases Institute, Mazandaran
University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran

³ Student Research Committee, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical
Sciences, Sari, Iran

* **Correspondence:** Hossein Asgarian-Omran, Ph.D.; Associate Professor, Department of
Immunology, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran; Tel:
+98 11 33543081, Fax: +98 1133543249, E-mails: asgarianhossein@yahoo.com,
hasgarian@mazums.ac.ir.

ORCID: 0000-0003-3816-8792

ABSTRACT

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has highlighted Sex-related immune responses. In this review, gender differences in seroprevalence, severity, mortality, and recovery in the Iranian population were systematically compared to the COVID-19 global pattern. This compressive meta-analysis was conducted on studies published up to April 1, 2021, examining seroprevalence in the general population as well as disease outcomes in hospitalized patients. Data were analyzed based on gender to determine differences between men and women in COVID-19. The PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar, WOS, medRxiv, and bioRxiv were searched. The odds ratio (OR) was calculated based on the random-effects model, with a corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI), according to the number of participants reported in papers. Subgroup analyses were performed according to the age, antibody isotype, and detection assay. Overall, 61 studies with 225799 males and 237017 females were eligible for meta-analysis. Seroprevalence was 1.13 times higher (95% CI: 1.03, 1.24), mortality was 1.45 times higher (95% CI: 1.19, 1.77), and severity was up to 1.37 times higher (95% CI: 1.13, 1.67) in males than those of females in the general population across the globe. Mortality was higher in Iranian patients up to 26% in men (95% CI: 1.20, 1.33), but no significant difference was observed between disease severity and serum prevalence between men and women. Besides, the rate of recovery was 29% (global pattern) and 21% (Iran pattern) lower in males than in females. The results of subgroup analyses for seroprevalence were not significant for the age, antibody isotype, and detection methods. The results of our meta-analyses showed that the patient mortality and recovery patterns are similar in Iran and other countries in the context of gender differences, and the disease is more fatal in men.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; Sex; Gender; Seroprevalence; Severity; Mortality; Recovery.

1. BACKGROUND

It has been almost a year and a half since the first case of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was reported in Wuhan, China. In January 2020 the World Health Organization (WHO) declared it as a Public Health Emergency of International Concern, and shortly thereafter in March 2020, it was officially declared as a pandemic (1). The cause of this pandemic is a virus, with an unclear origin, from the coronavirus strain called severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (2). This virus has a single-stranded RNA genome encoding several open reading frames, including structural proteins spike (S), matrix (M), envelope (E), and nucleocapsid (N) (3). Despite the start of vaccination in most parts of the world, many countries, including Iran, are still severely affected by the high prevalence of the disease. The unknown pathogenic and immunological dimensions of SARS-CoV-2 have caused a very high amount of mortality.

One of the most important key points of this pandemic is to understand the individual differences in disease severity and mortality. Although the COVID-19 pandemic has become a global infodemic, many aspects of the disease remain unknown, and even serious disagreements and contradictions have arisen among scientists on some issues. From the beginning, reports showed a higher mortality rate in men than women, highlighting the role of chromosome X in host immune response (4). It was initially reported that the reasons for this discrepancy are stronger adaptive and innate immune responses in women, and even better antiviral responses such as early production of interferons (5, 6); but over time, controversy arose over COVID-19 gender difference (7). Preliminary studies have suggested that estrogen, 17 β -estradiol, may play a protective role by regulating ACE2 expression as the major cell entry receptor for SARS-CoV-2. However, the results of studies on the effects of estrogen on ACE2 expression are controversial

and cannot be commented on with complete certainty (Table 1). For this reason, researchers are now debating the effects of estrogen on regulation of ACE2 and how it affects the pathogenesis of SARS-CoV-2. Another factor that is somewhat questionable is the effect of interferon responses on virus inhibition and its role in the gender differences in COVID-19. Recent studies show that only early interferon type 1 responses can control the virus pathogenesis (8). In addition, various studies have been performed on the effect of interferons on ACE2 expression, and these results are slightly different (Table 2). However, most of these studies have reported that type 1 and 2 interferons in both *in vivo* and *in vitro* environments may be associated with increased expression of ACE2, whereas how interferon can play a role in gender differences is still controversial.

COVID-19 can be compared to an iceberg which more than half of it is underwater and invisible (9). Therefore, if the goal is to evaluate the mortality, severity, or pathogenicity of coronavirus, the underwater part should also be clearly seen. Seroprevalence studies can give a good view of the coronavirus infection in the general population and estimate the frequency of challenged people (10). These types of studies identify and report the number of people who have a negative RT-PCR test but a positive serology test for anti-coronavirus IgM or IgG. Summarizing this group of information can provide a very good view of the number of asymptomatic patients in the population, and may eventually be used to refute or confirm the controversial theory of herd immunity (11).

The most important step in treatment and vaccination is to fully understand all differences in the target population, and perhaps the first step in achieving personalized medicine is to know the gender characteristics in treatment and vaccination. The potential gender differences in COVID-19 pathogenicity can also affect the effectiveness and safety of ongoing vaccination. For these

reasons, and of course the lack of a comprehensive systematic study to examine gender differences in seroprevalence, mortality, severity, and recovery of COVID-19, the present study was designed and conducted. This study tried to focus on the differences between women and men in the general population and provide information that would help to care, follow-up, and monitoring of high-risk groups. Comparing the results of the global meta-analyses and the results of studies conducted in Iran can provide a very good insight for researchers in the context of herd immunity and gender-related mortality.

2. METHODS

2.1 Study design

Systematic review and meta-analysis on gender-related COVID-19 outcomes were conducted according to the standard protocols. The review protocol was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42020216637).

2.2 Inclusion criteria

2.2.1 Types of studies

All published and/or online papers as of April 1, 2021, that examined gender-based seroprevalence, severity, mortality, or patient recovery in COVID-19 were included in our study.

The types of studies considered for inclusion were cross-sectional, case-control, and cohort studies. Papers from any country concerning gender-specific outcomes were included if they were written in English. We only included studies that reported the exact number or percentage of participants by gender (sex-disaggregated), as well as the exact type of detection method and the population studied. For papers reporting both IgG and IgM, only IgG data were included in the total seroprevalence analyses. Studies conducted on healthcare workers, patients of other disorders or infections, as well as those participants with unknown exposure were excluded to assess the true effect of gender on COVID-19 seroprevalence. However, to evaluate other outcomes, including severity, mortality, and recovery of patients, meta-analyses were performed on studies with COVID-19 confirmed cases. Reviews, meta-analyses, case reports, abstracts, and overlapping papers were excluded. Moreover, the references of relevant studies were reviewed to ensure the absence of the missing articles. Besides, due to the significant difference in the rate of vaccination of the population in Iran and some developed countries, as well as the effect of

vaccination, especially on seroprevalence and mortality, only papers whose sampling date was until the end of 2020 and before general vaccination were included in global meta-analyses.

2.2.2 Types of participants

Eligible studies for seroprevalence analysis have to include participants of any age or sex from the general population (local population, residents, households, and blood donors). Eligible studies for severity, mortality, and recovery have to include patients with confirmed COVID-19 by molecular diagnostic methods (RT-PCR) and the information of their death or recovery and discharge was clearly reported. We also included studies in which participants did not have any other medical disorders, such as autoimmunity, primary or secondary immunodeficiency, malignancy, allergy, and acute or chronic infections (except COVID-19). We didn't use any restrictions concerning age, sex, and COVID-19 related comorbidity.

2.2.3 Types of clinical outcomes

1. Gender-related differences in seroprevalence in Iran compared to the global pattern (frequency of individuals who are seropositive and RT-PCR negative for COVID-19 in the general population).
2. Gender-related differences in COVID-19 severity in Iran compared to the global pattern (frequency of COVID-19 male and female patients, whose disease conditions were reported to be severe and critical).
3. Gender-related differences in COVID-19 mortality in Iran compared to the global pattern (frequency of deceased male and female COVID-19 patients).

4. Gender-related differences in recovery and discharge of COVID-19 patients in Iran compared to the global pattern (frequency of recovered or discharged male and female COVID-19 patients).

2.3 Electronic searches

PubMed (1th April 2021), Scopus (1th April 2021), Google Scholar (3rd April 2021), Web of Science (WOS-4th April 2021), and two preprints servers (medRxiv and bioRxiv) were searched using the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms “male”, “female”, “men”, “women”, “sex”, “gender”, “corona”, “COVID-19”, “Cov2”, “SARS”, “SARS-COV-2”, “SARS-2”, “SARS-corona”, “severe acute respiratory syndrome”, “mortality”, “morbidity”, “death”, “clinical course”, “clinical presentation”, “intensive care”, “hospital stay”, “seroprevalence”, “seroincidence”, “seroconversion”, “seronegative”, “seropositive”, “seroepidemiologic”, “serologic”, “serosurvey”, “antibody”, “attack rate”, “severity”, “critical”, “recovery”, and “discharge”. The references listed in related publications were also searched. There was not any restriction on searching.

2.4 Data collection and analysis

2.4.1 Selection of studies and data extraction

Both two authors (MRN, HAO) independently screened all search records and identified those that were fully published and fulfilled the inclusion criteria. To homogenize the data as much as possible, only studies that reported the exact number of participants in both male and female groups were included.

2.4.2 Measurements of treatment effects

All reported seroprevalence, severity, mortality, and recovery data were pooled to investigate gender-related outcomes. Statistical analysis was performed using the Cochrane software Review Manager v5.3 (RevMan v5.3). For the dichotomous outcome, the odds ratio (OR) was calculated based on the random-effects model, with a corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI), according to the number of participants reported in the papers. For continuous variables, standardized mean difference and *p*-value were calculated according to the mean, standard deviation (SD), and the number of participants reported in the papers. We only performed meta-analyses for the outcomes that were homogenous, and the number of participants was clearly reported by gender. Subgroup analyses were performed for seroprevalence and mortality based on the age group. Type of antibody and detection method-based subgroup analyses were also performed for seroprevalence. The unadjusted (crude) data were used in our analyses to prevent heterogeneity in different studies. The bias risk of the included studies was assessed by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (12). The statistical heterogeneity between trials was also evaluated using the Q-test of heterogeneity and the I^2 test of inconsistency. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion among the review authors.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Search results

The study selection process for this systematic review is shown in Figure 1 as the PRISMA flow chart. After the initial searches, 8532 records (PubMed 1668, Scopus 1590, Google Scholar 2746, WOS 1039, MedRxiv, and BioRxiv 1489) were identified. After removing duplicates, reviews, and unrelated papers, 61 papers that matched our inclusion criteria were found. In 20 out of these 61 studies, seroprevalence was reported in the general population (18 global, 2 Iran). The remaining 41 papers reported the severity, mortality, and recovery by gender. Of these 49 articles, 19 (16 global, 3 Iran) were included for severity analysis, 27 (16 global, 11 Iran) for mortality analysis, and 19 (8 global, 11 Iran) for recovery analysis (some papers reported several outcomes). Overall, 61 studies with 225799 males and 237017 females were eligible for meta-analysis. Among those, 20 papers with 141350 males and 165433 females fulfilled our criteria for odds ratio (OR) meta-analysis in seroprevalence, whereas the data from 41 papers (35 cohorts, 4 cross-sectional, and 2 case series) with 84449 males and 71584 females were used for mortality (66663 M, 52988 F), severity (19150 M, 19502 F) and recovery (43216 M, 32040 F) analyses. Tables 3 and 4 provide an overview of the included studies for meta-analysis.

3.2 Meta-analysis of seroprevalence

Nine out of twenty seroprevalence studies measured only IgG, nine reported both IgG and IgM, and two studies measured total antibodies. Multiple detection methods were used in the studies, including chemiluminescent immunoassay (CLIA), lateral flow immunoassay (LFIA), and enzyme-linked immune sorbent assay (ELISA). The largest number of included papers for seroprevalence analyses was from the USA (seven studies), whereas the largest number of included papers for other analyses was from China. Comparing males and females, who were

RT-PCR negative for COVID-19, showed that there was a significant difference in the global seroprevalence rate. Analysis indicated that males (4395 out of 139285) were 13% more seropositive than females (5071 out of 163417) in the general population [OR 1.13 (95% CI: 1.03, 1.24), p -value =0.009, Fig. 2a]. However, no significant difference was seen in the seroprevalence rate between males and females in Iran [OR 0.93 (95% CI: 0.79, 1.11), p -value =0.43, Fig. 2b]. For exploring differences in seroprevalence based on age, subgroup analyses were performed for three subgroups [young (Y), <40 years; middle-aged (M), 40-60 years; old (O), >60 years]. The results showed no significant difference between young, middle-aged, and old individuals in terms of seroprevalence rate [(OR for Y/M=0.88, 95% CI: 0.74 to 1.04, p = 0.14, Fig 3a) (OR for O/M= 0.85, 95% CI: 0.61 to 1.18, p = 0.32, Fig 3b) (OR for Y/O= 1.00, 95% CI: 0.71 to 1.42, p = 0.98, Fig 3c)]. Subgroup analyses according to the type of antibody and detection assay were also performed. Antibody isotype-based analyses confirmed the higher seroprevalence rate in men, but the differences were not significant for both IgG and IgG/IgM, ([OR]=1.13, 95% [CI]: 0.98 to 1.31, p = 0.09, Fig 4a) and ([OR] = 1.05, 95% [CI]: 0.95 to 1.16, p = 0.33, Fig 4b), respectively. Total subgroups analyses based on the detection method showed similar results for CLIA, LFIA, and ELISA assays in males and females, ([OR]=1.11, 95% [CI]: 0.88 to 1.41, p = 0.38, Fig 4c) and ([OR] = 1.01, 95% [CI]: 0.94 to 1.08, p = 0.78, Fig 4d) and ([OR]=1.13, 95% [CI]: 0.93 to 1.37, p = 0.23, Fig 4e).

3.3 Meta-analysis of mortality

Sex-specific comparison in COVID-19 confirmed cases across the globe (76844 patients) indicated that there was a significant difference in mortality between males and females, which was 45% higher in men (4789 out of 41982) than women (2792 out of 34862 individuals) [OR 1.45 (95% CI: 1.19, 1.77), p -value <0.001, Fig. 5a]. The results of the meta-analysis for

mortality of Iranian patients were in line with the global pattern (4612 death in 24681 M and 2858 death in 18126 F) and 26% higher in men [OR 1.26 (95% CI: 1.20, 1.33), p -value <0.001 , Fig. 5b]. For exploring associations between mortality and age, subgroup analysis was performed based on mean (SD) comparison between victims and survivors. The results demonstrated a significant standardized mean difference of death by 2.71 years [95% [CI]: 1.44 to 3.98, $p < 0.001$, Fig 5c), while this difference was just 0.73 years for Iranian patients [95% [CI]: 0.54 to 0.92, $p < 0.001$, Fig 5d).

3.4 Meta-analysis of severity and recovery

Sex-based meta-analysis in COVID-19 confirmed cases (37351 patients) showed that the disease is 37% more severe in men (4604 out of 18290) than women in the global pattern (4123 out of 19061) [OR 1.37 (95% CI: 1.13, 1.67), p -value =0.002, Fig. 5a]. Although, there was no significant difference in the severity of the disease between Iranian men and women [OR 1.01 (95% CI: 0.63, 1.64), p -value =0.95, Fig. 5b]. As expected, the rate of recovery and hospital discharge in males (7305 out of 18535) were 29% lower than females in the global pattern (6313 out of 13914 individuals) [OR 0.71 (95% CI: 0.61, 0.82), p -value <0.001 , Fig. 5c]. The recovery rate is also 21% higher in Iranian women (15269 out of 18126 individuals) compared to men (20068 out of 24681 individuals) [OR 0.79 (95% CI: 0.54, 0.92), p -value <0.001 , Fig. 5d].

3.6 Risk of bias and quality assessment

Studies' risk of biases is provided in Table 5-6. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was used to assess the overall quality. For the included studies to evaluate seroprevalence, three criteria were evaluated, including the study population and participants' characteristics, detection assay, and outcomes. For the rest of the studies the type of study and study population, the comparability,

and the outcomes were evaluated. Most of the included studies had moderate to high quality of evidence. Besides, a total of twelve studies were evaluated as low quality.

4. DISCUSSION

Since the introduction of serological diagnostic kits for SARS-CoV-2 and their availability to researchers around the world, various studies and papers have been published to investigate seroprevalence rates among various ethnic populations (13). These types of studies can be a very valuable screenshot to check the immune status as well as the previous exposure to the virus. However, many factors can affect seroprevalence in the general population, including sampling time, epidemic status in the studied country, use of personal protective equipment (PPE), type of targeted antigen, type of detection assay, antibody isotype, and its cut-off value. Although the WHO has defined a population-based serological study protocol (14), our searches showed that, to date, at least a small number of studies have met these standard protocols (13). For this reason, heterogeneity could be high in our reviewed published papers. In addition to the subgroup analyses which were performed in the present study, every effort was made to include studies that have the maximum similarity for meta-analyses. In order to reduce the impact of jobs, exposure, and the use of PPE on main outcomes, only studies conducted on the general population were reviewed. However, the information reported in the papers on how and to what extent possible exposure to the virus was very incomplete, and this was one of the major limitations we faced.

The results of our pooled analysis showed that there was a significant difference in seroprevalence rate between males and females which males 13% more likely to be seropositive than females in the general population. Although the results of the meta-analysis were not significant for seroprevalence among the Iranian population, it did not seem to follow the global pattern and the prevalence of anti-COVID-19 Ab was higher in women (7%). Of course, this difference can be due to the variations in the number of articles included for the analysis. There

was no significant difference in subgroup analyses based on age, antibody isotype, and detection assays. The difference between male and female seroprevalence in the global pattern can be due to several reasons. First, males may be more exposed to COVID-19 than women and may use less PPE (15, 16). Second, based on the previous knowledge about stronger immune responses in females, perhaps the reason for the lower seroprevalence in them is the stronger innate immune response including type 1 interferon at the onset of the disease (17-19). Although, the results obtained from analyses in Iranian population showed that this pattern is not similar in all countries and regions. Besides, no significant difference was observed in seroprevalence analyses based on age, which is an effective factor in the rate of exposure. A recent systematic review study reported a positive association between seroprevalence and age among participants younger than 65 years and no significant difference between males and females (20), unlike our study. However, this study was performed on all populations, including healthcare workers and close contacts, and was not limited to the general population.

Consistent with the results of two recent systematic reviews (21, 22), we have also found that males have more severe disease and a worse prognosis than females and their mortality rate is up to 45% higher than females. The results of the analysis on the Iranian population also showed a similar pattern, albeit with a milder slope (26%). The meta-analyses also showed that the age difference between the dead and rescued people in the Iranian population is only 0.73 years, while this number is 2.71 years for other countries.

Our present study also examined the number of men and women who were recovered and discharged from the hospital, and the results showed that, as expected, males have up to 29% less recovery and discharge than females. The results in the Iranian population, in line with the global pattern, also showed a recovery of up to 21% more in women than men. There are several

reasons for this situation that have not been proven with certainty to date. Studies have shown that Angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2), expressed on the PAR region of the X chromosome, is regulated by estrogen (23). *Lambert et al.* showed in their study on SARS-CoV-1 that females may express more circulating ACE2 which can protect them against acute respiratory distress syndrome (24). Besides, both humoral and cellular immunity is stronger in women (25), and it has been shown that early IFN responses and the production of neutralizing antibodies are highly effective in reducing disease severity (8, 26). But as shown in Tables 1 and 2, there are conflicting results about the effects of estrogen as the main female hormone on ACE2 expression. Also, despite the proven strong antiviral effects of interferons, especially interferon type 1, it is still not possible to comment with certainty on its role in gender differences.

5. CONCLUSION

In summary, by aggregating the results of meta-analyses for seroprevalence, severity, mortality, and recovery, it is clear that there are gender differences in COVID-19. Also, comparing the mortality and recovery rate in global pattern with Iran showed similar results. However, there seem to be interesting differences in serum prevalence between different populations of the world. The reason for this difference is not completely understood, but what is clear and has been proven in many autoimmune diseases is that there are sex biases in immune responses. Therefore, it seemed that a new approach should be taken in the fight against COVID-19 and the population of men, especially older men, should be further studied and cared for. Besides, the results of this study and similar studies can be a warning to those who have started a dangerous game with herd immunity regardless of scientific support. Hoping for COVID-19-free days.

6. ABBREVIATIONS

ACE2, Angiotensin-converting enzyme 2; CLIA, Chemiluminescent immunoassay; CI, Confidence interval; COVID-19, Coronavirus disease 2019; ELISA, Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; IgG, Immunoglobulin G; IgM, Immunoglobulin M; LFIA, Lateral flow immunoassay; OR, odds ratio; PPE, Personal protective equipment; RT-PCR, Real-time polymerase chain reaction; SARS-CoV-2, Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SD, Standard deviation; WHO, World Health Organization.

7. DECLARATIONS

7.1 Ethical Approval and Consent to participate

Not applicable.

7.2 Consent for publication

Not applicable.

7.3 Availability of supporting data

Not applicable.

7.4 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

7.5 Funding

No specific funding has been provided for this research.

7.6 Authors' contributions

HAO and MRN conceived the study and wrote the manuscript. MRN performed the literature search and selected the relevant studies. HAO and MRN provided methodological support in the study design and classified retrieved articles according to the level of evidence. HAO critically revised the manuscript and provided the final approval.

7.7 Acknowledgements

The authors thank the immunology department of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences for their kind and prompt support.

8. REFERENCES

1. Cascella M, Rajnik M, Cuomo A, Dulebohn SC, Di Napoli R. Features, evaluation and treatment coronavirus (COVID-19). Statpearls [internet]: StatPearls Publishing; 2020.
2. Shereen MA, Khan S, Kazmi A, Bashir N, Siddique R. COVID-19 infection: Origin, transmission, and characteristics of human coronaviruses. *Journal of Advanced Research*. 2020.
3. Walls AC, Park Y-J, Tortorici MA, Wall A, McGuire AT, Veesler D. Structure, function, and antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein. *Cell*. 2020.
4. 50/50 GH. COVID-19 Sex-disaggregated Data Tracker. 2020 [Available from: <https://globalhealth5050.org/covid19/sex-disaggregated-data-tracker/>].
5. Oertelt-Prigione S. The influence of sex and gender on the immune response. *Autoimmunity reviews*. 2012;11(6-7):A479-A85.
6. Webb K, Peckham H, Radziszewska A, Menon M, Oliveri P, Simpson F, et al. Sex and Pubertal Differences in the Type 1 Interferon Pathway Associate With Both X Chromosome Number and Serum Sex Hormone Concentration. *Front Immunol*. 2018;9:3167.
7. Viveiros A, Rasmuson J, Vu J, Mulvagh SL, Yip CY, Norris CM, et al. Sex differences in COVID-19: Candidate pathways, genetics of ACE2, and sex hormones. *American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology*. 2021;320(1):H296-H304.
8. Lee JS, Shin E-C. The type I interferon response in COVID-19: implications for treatment. *Nature Reviews Immunology*. 2020;20(10):585-6.
9. Munster VJ, Koopmans M, van Doremalen N, van Riel D, de Wit E. A novel coronavirus emerging in China—key questions for impact assessment. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(8):692-4.
10. Eckerle I, Meyer B. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in COVID-19 hotspots. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10250):514-5.
11. Griffin S. Covid-19: Herd immunity is “unethical and unachievable,” say experts after report of 5% seroprevalence in Spain. *British Medical Journal Publishing Group*; 2020.
12. Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. *European journal of epidemiology*. 2010;25(9):603-5.
13. Arora RK, Joseph A, Van Wyk J, Rocco S, Atmaja A, May E, et al. SeroTracker: a global SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence dashboard. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
14. World Health O. Population-based age-stratified seroepidemiological investigation protocol for COVID-19 virus infection, 17 March 2020. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020 2020. Contract No.: WHO/2019-nCoV/Seroepidemiology/2020.1.
15. Bwire GM. Coronavirus: Why Men are More Vulnerable to Covid-19 Than Women? *SN Compr Clin Med*. 2020:1-3.
16. Johnson HD, Sholcosky D, Gabello K, Ragni R, Ogonosky N. Sex differences in public restroom handwashing behavior associated with visual behavior prompts. *Perceptual and motor skills*. 2003;97(3):805-10.
17. Jin J-M, Bai P, He W, Wu F, Liu X-F, Han D-M, et al. Gender Differences in Patients With COVID-19: Focus on Severity and Mortality. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2020;8(152).

18. Takahashi T, Ellingson MK, Wong P, Israelow B, Lucas C, Klein J, et al. Sex differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease outcomes. *Nature*. 2020.
19. Klein SL, Dhakal S, Ursin RL, Deshpande S, Sandberg K, Mauvais-Jarvis F. Biological sex impacts COVID-19 outcomes. *PLoS pathogens*. 2020;16(6):e1008570.
20. Chen X, Chen Z, Azman AS, Deng X, Chen X, Lu W, et al. Serological evidence of human infection with SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020.
21. Kelada M, Anto A, Dave K, Saleh SN. The Role of Sex in the Risk of Mortality From COVID-19 Amongst Adult Patients: A Systematic Review. *Cureus*. 2020;12(8).
22. Ortolan A, Lorenzin M, Felicetti M, Doria A, Ramonda R. Does gender influence clinical expression and disease outcomes in COVID-19? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020;99:496-504.
23. Brosnihan KB, Hodgins JB, Smithies O, Maeda N, Gallagher P. Tissue-specific regulation of ACE/ACE2 and AT1/AT2 receptor gene expression by oestrogen in apolipoprotein E/oestrogen receptor- α knock-out mice. *Experimental physiology*. 2008;93(5):658-64.
24. Lambert DW, Yarski M, Warner FJ, Thornhill P, Parkin ET, Smith AI, et al. Tumor necrosis factor- α convertase (ADAM17) mediates regulated ectodomain shedding of the severe-acute respiratory syndrome-coronavirus (SARS-CoV) receptor, angiotensin-converting enzyme-2 (ACE2). *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2005;280(34):30113-9.
25. Ursin RL, Shapiro JR, Klein SL. Sex-biased immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Trends in Microbiology*. 2020.
26. Wadman M. Can interferons stop COVID-19 before it takes hold? : American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020.
27. Stelzig KE, Canepa-Escaro F, Schiliro M, Berdnikovs S, Prakash Y, Chiarella SE. Estrogen regulates the expression of SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 in differentiated airway epithelial cells. *American Journal of Physiology-Lung Cellular and Molecular Physiology*. 2020;318(6):L1280-L1.
28. Chen J, Jiang Q, Xia X, Liu K, Yu Z, Tao W, et al. Individual variation of the SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 gene expression and regulation. *Aging Cell*. 2020;19(7):e13168.
29. Abdelkader NF, Abd El-Latif AM, Khat tab MM. Telmisartan/17 β -estradiol mitigated cognitive deficit in an ovariectomized rat model of Alzheimer's disease: modulation of ACE1/ACE2 and AT1/AT2 ratio. *Life sciences*. 2020;245:117388.
30. Chadchan SB, Maurya VK, Popli P, Kommagani R. The SARS-CoV-2 receptor, Angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) is required for human endometrial stromal cell decidualization. *bioRxiv*. 2020.
31. Kalidhindi RSR, Borkar NA, Ambhore NS, Pabelick CM, Prakash Y, Sathish V. Sex steroids skew ACE2 expression in human airway: a contributing factor to sex differences in COVID-19? *American Journal of Physiology-Lung Cellular and Molecular Physiology*. 2020;319(5):L843-L7.
32. Aguilar Pineda J, Albaghdadi M, Jiang W, Vera Lopez K, Davila Del-Carpio G, Gomez Valdez B, et al. Structural and functional analysis of female sex hormones against SARS-Cov2 cell entry. Available at SSRN 3671734. 2020.
33. Shoemaker R, Tannock LR, Su W, Gong M, Gurley SB, Thatcher SE, et al. Adipocyte deficiency of ACE2 increases systolic blood pressures of obese female C57BL/6 mice. *Biology of sex differences*. 2019;10(1):1-12.
34. Bukowska A, Spiller L, Wolke C, Lendeckel U, Weinert S, Hoffmann J, et al. Protective regulation of the ACE2/ACE gene expression by estrogen in human atrial tissue from elderly men. *Experimental Biology and Medicine*. 2017;242(14):1412-23.
35. Mompeón A, Lázaro-Franco M, Bueno-Betí C, Pérez-Cremades D, Vidal-Gómez X, Monsalve E, et al. Estradiol, acting through ER α , induces endothelial non-classic renin-angiotensin system increasing angiotensin 1–7 production. *Molecular and cellular endocrinology*. 2016;422:1-8.

36. Wang Y, Shoemaker R, Thatcher SE, Batifoulier-Yiannikouris F, English VL, Cassis LA. Administration of 17 β -estradiol to ovariectomized obese female mice reverses obesity-hypertension through an ACE2-dependent mechanism. *American Journal of Physiology-Endocrinology and Metabolism*. 2015;308(12):E1066-E75.
37. Bundalo M, Zivkovic M, Tepavcevic S, Culafic T, Koricanac G, Stankovic A. Fructose-rich diet-induced changes in the expression of the renin angiotensin system molecules in the heart of ovariectomized female rats could be reversed by estradiol. *Hormone and Metabolic Research*. 2015;47(07):521-7.
38. Xue B, Zhang Z, Beltz TG, Guo F, Hay M, Johnson AK. Estrogen regulation of the brain renin-angiotensin system in protection against angiotensin II-induced sensitization of hypertension. *American Journal of Physiology-Heart and Circulatory Physiology*. 2014;307(2):H191-H8.
39. Wang H, Jessup JA, Zhao Z, Da Silva J, Lin M, MacNamara LM, et al. Characterization of the cardiac renin angiotensin system in oophorectomized and estrogen-replete mRen2. Lewis rats. *PloS one*. 2013;8(10):e76992.
40. Gupte M, Thatcher SE, Boustany-Kari CM, Shoemaker R, Yiannikouris F, Zhang X, et al. Angiotensin converting enzyme 2 contributes to sex differences in the development of obesity hypertension in C57BL/6 mice. *Arteriosclerosis, thrombosis, and vascular biology*. 2012;32(6):1392-9.
41. Sampson AK, Hilliard LM, Moritz KM, Thomas MC, Tikellis C, Widdop RE, et al. The arterial depressor response to chronic low-dose angiotensin II infusion in female rats is estrogen dependent. *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*. 2012;302(1):R159-R65.
42. Shenoy V, Grobe J, Qi Y, Ferreira A, Fraga-Silva R, Collamat G, et al. 17 β -Estradiol modulates local cardiac renin-angiotensin system to prevent cardiac remodeling in the DOCA-salt model of hypertension in rats. *Peptides*. 2009;30(12):2309-15.
43. Ji H, Menini S, Zheng W, Pesce C, Wu X, Sandberg K. Role of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 and angiotensin (1–7) in 17 β -oestradiol regulation of renal pathology in renal wrap hypertension in rats. *Experimental physiology*. 2008;93(5):648-57.
44. Ojeda NB, Grigore D, Robertson EB, Alexander BT. Estrogen protects against increased blood pressure in postpubertal female growth restricted offspring. *Hypertension*. 2007;50(4):679-85.
45. Busnadiego I, Fernbach S, Pohl MO, Karakus U, Huber M, Trkola A, et al. Antiviral activity of type i, ii, and iii interferons counterbalances ace2 inducibility and restricts sars-cov-2. *MBio*. 2020;11(5).
46. Wang P-H, Cheng Y. Increasing host cellular receptor—angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) expression by coronavirus may facilitate 2019-nCoV infection. *BioRxiv*. 2020.
47. Ziegler CG, Allon SJ, Nyquist SK, Mbano IM, Miao VN, Tzouanas CN, et al. SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 is an interferon-stimulated gene in human airway epithelial cells and is detected in specific cell subsets across tissues. *Cell*. 2020;181(5):1016-35. e19.
48. Smith JC, Sausville EL, Girish V, Yuan ML, Vasudevan A, John KM, et al. Cigarette smoke exposure and inflammatory signaling increase the expression of the SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2 in the respiratory tract. *Developmental cell*. 2020;53(5):514-29. e3.
49. Lee HK, Jung O, Hennighausen L. Activation of ACE2 and interferon-stimulated transcriptomes in human airway epithelium is curbed by Janus Kinase inhibitors. *bioRxiv*. 2020.
50. Onabajo OO, Banday AR, Yan W, Obajemu A, Stanifer ML, Santer DM, et al. Interferons and viruses induce a novel primate-specific isoform dACE2 and not the SARS-CoV-2 receptor ACE2. *BioRxiv*. 2020.
51. Ng KW, Attig J, Bolland W, Young GR, Major J, Wrobel AG, et al. Tissue-specific and interferon-inducible expression of nonfunctional ACE2 through endogenous retroelement co-option. *Nature Genetics*. 2020;52(12):1294-302.

52. Hennighausen L, Lee HK. Activation of the SARS-CoV-2 receptor Ace2 by cytokines through pan JAK-STAT enhancers. *bioRxiv*. 2020.
53. de Lang A, Osterhaus AD, Haagmans BL. Interferon- γ and interleukin-4 downregulate expression of the SARS coronavirus receptor ACE2 in Vero E6 cells. *Virology*. 2006;353(2):474-81.
54. Amorim Filho L, Szwarcwald CL, Mateos SdOG, Leon ACMPd, Medronho RdA, Veloso VG, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 among blood donors in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Revista de saude publica*. 2020;54:69.
55. Biggs HM, Harris JB, Breakwell L, Dahlgren FS, Abedi GR, Szablewski CM, et al. Estimated community seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies—two Georgia counties, April 28–May 3, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69(29):965.
56. Bogogiannidou Z, Vontas A, Dadouli K, Kyritsi MA, Soteriades S, Nikoulis DJ, et al. Repeated leftover serosurvey of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies, Greece, March and April 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(31):2001369.
57. Hallal PC, Hartwig FP, Horta BL, Silveira MF, Struchiner CJ, Vidaletti LP, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence in Brazil: results from two successive nationwide serological household surveys. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2020;8(11):e1390-e8.
58. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, Montgomery JM, Klena JD, Hall AJ, et al. Seroprevalence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 sites in the United States, March 23–May 12, 2020. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2020.
59. Menachemi N, Yiannoutsos CT, Dixon BE, Duszynski TJ, Fadel WF, Wools-Kaloustian KK, et al. Population point prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection based on a statewide random sample—Indiana, April 25–29, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69(29):960.
60. Merkely B, Szabó AJ, Kosztin A, Berényi E, Sebestyén A, Lengyel C, et al. Novel coronavirus epidemic in the Hungarian population, a cross-sectional nationwide survey to support the exit policy in Hungary. *GeroScience*. 2020;42(4):1063-74.
61. Pollán M, Pérez-Gómez B, Pastor-Barriuso R, Oteo J, Hernán MA, Pérez-Olmeda M, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in Spain (ENE-COVID): a nationwide, population-based seroepidemiological study. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10250):535-44.
62. Rosenberg ES, Tesoriero JM, Rosenthal EM, Chung R, Barranco MA, Styer LM, et al. Cumulative incidence and diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection in New York. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.05.25.20113050.
63. Sood N, Simon P, Ebner P, Eichner D, Reynolds J, Bendavid E, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2–Specific Antibodies Among Adults in Los Angeles County, California, on April 10–11, 2020. *Jama*. 2020.
64. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, Azman AS, Lauer SA, Baysson H, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *The Lancet*. 2020.
65. Bendavid E, Mulaney B, Sood N, Shah S, Ling E, Bromley-Dulfano R, et al. COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.14.20062463.
66. Chamie G, Marquez C, Crawford E, Peng J, Petersen M, Schwab D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Community Transmission During Shelter-in-Place in San Francisco. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.06.15.20132233.
67. Erikstrup C, Hother CE, Pedersen OBV, Mølbak K, Skov RL, Holm DK, et al. Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 infection fatality rate by real-time antibody screening of blood donors. *medRxiv*. 2020.
68. Nawa N, Kuramochi J, Sonoda S, Yamaoka Y, Nukui Y, Miyazaki Y, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibodies in Utsunomiya City, Greater Tokyo, after first pandemic in 2020 (U-CORONA): a household-and population-based study. *medRxiv*. 2020.
69. Tess BH, Granato CF, Alves MC, Pintao MC, Rizzatti E, Nunes MC, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in the municipality of São Paulo, Brazil, ten weeks after the first reported case. *medRxiv*. 2020.
70. Uyoga S, Adetifa IM, Karanja HK, Nyagwange J, Tuju J, Wanjiku P, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Kenyan blood donors. *medRxiv*. 2020.

71. Ward H, Atchison C, Whitaker M, Ainslie K, Elliott J, Okell L. Antibody prevalence for SARS-CoV-2 following the peak of the pandemic in England: REACT2 study in 100,000 adults. medRxiv 2020; published online August 21. DOI.10(2020.08):12.20173690.
72. Shakiba M, Nazari SSH, Mehrabian F, Rezvani SM, Ghasempour Z, Heidarzadeh A. Seroprevalence of COVID-19 virus infection in Guilan province, Iran. medRxiv. 2020.
73. Poustchi H, Darvishian M, Mohammadi Z, Shayanrad A, Delavari A, Bahadorimonfared A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody seroprevalence in the general population and high-risk occupational groups across 18 cities in Iran: a population-based cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2021;21(4):473-81.
74. AL-Rousan N, AL-Najjar H. Data analysis of coronavirus COVID-19 epidemic in South Korea based on recovered and death cases. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020;92(9):1603-8.
75. Asfahan S, Deokar K, Dutt N, Niwas R, Jain P, Agarwal M. Extrapolation of mortality in COVID-19: Exploring the role of age, sex, co-morbidities and health-care related occupation. *Monaldi Archives for Chest Disease*. 2020;90(2).
76. Borobia AM, Carcas AJ, Arnalich F, Álvarez-Sala R, Monserrat-Villatoro J, Quintana M, et al. A Cohort of Patients with COVID-19 in a Major Teaching Hospital in Europe. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(6).
77. Cao J, Tu W-J, Cheng W, Yu L, Liu Y-K, Hu X, et al. Clinical Features and Short-term Outcomes of 102 Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020;71(15):748-55.
78. Chu J, Yang N, Wei Y, Yue H, Zhang F, Zhao J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 54 medical staff with COVID-19: A retrospective study in a single center in Wuhan, China. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020;92(7):807-13.
79. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, Hardwick HE, Pius R, Norman L, et al. Features of 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: prospective observational cohort study. *Bmj*. 2020;369:m1985.
80. Du R-H, Liang L-R, Yang C-Q, Wang W, Cao T-Z, Li M, et al. Predictors of mortality for patients with COVID-19 pneumonia caused by SARS-CoV-2: a prospective cohort study. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2020;56(3):2050524.
81. Guan W-j, Ni Z-y, Hu Y, Liang W-h, Ou C-q, He J-x, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(18):1708-20.
82. Li X, Xu S, Yu M, Wang K, Tao Y, Zhou Y, et al. Risk factors for severity and mortality in adult COVID-19 inpatients in Wuhan. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. 2020;146(1):110-8.
83. Liu K-C, Xu P, Lv W-F, Qiu X-H, Yao J-L, Gu J-F, et al. CT manifestations of coronavirus disease-2019: A retrospective analysis of 73 cases by disease severity. *European Journal of Radiology*. 2020;126.
84. Meng Y, Wu P, Lu W, Liu K, Ma K, Huang L, et al. Sex-specific clinical characteristics and prognosis of coronavirus disease-19 infection in Wuhan, China: A retrospective study of 168 severe patients. *PLOS Pathogens*. 2020;16(4):e1008520.
85. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, Guo H, Hao X, Wang Q, et al. Association of Public Health Interventions With the Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1915-23.
86. Qin L, Li X, Shi J, Yu M, Wang K, Tao Y, et al. Gendered effects on inflammation reaction and outcome of COVID-19 patients in Wuhan. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020;92(11):2684-92.
87. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area. *JAMA*. 2020;323(20):2052-9.
88. Shi Y, Yu X, Zhao H, Wang H, Zhao R, Sheng J. Host susceptibility to severe COVID-19 and establishment of a host risk score: findings of 487 cases outside Wuhan. *Critical Care*. 2020;24(1):108.

89. Suleyman G, Fadel RA, Malette KM, Hammond C, Abdulla H, Entz A, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Morbidity Associated With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in a Series of Patients in Metropolitan Detroit. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(6):e2012270-e.
90. 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(4):844-7.
91. Tian S, Hu N, Lou J, Chen K, Kang X, Xiang Z, et al. Characteristics of COVID-19 infection in Beijing. *Journal of Infection*. 2020;80(4):401-6.
92. Wang R, Pan M, Zhang X, Han M, Fan X, Zhao F, et al. Epidemiological and clinical features of 125 Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19 in Fuyang, Anhui, China. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;95:421-8.
93. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia Ja, Liu H, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2020;8(5):475-81.
94. Yuan M, Yin W, Tao Z, Tan W, Hu Y. Association of radiologic findings with mortality of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(3):e0230548.
95. Zeng F, Dai C, Cai P, Wang J, Xu L, Li J, et al. A comparison study of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody between male and female COVID-19 patients: A possible reason underlying different outcome between sex. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2020;92(10):2050-4.
96. 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-.
97. Zhang J, Wang X, Jia X, Li J, Hu K, Chen G, et al. Risk factors for disease severity, unimprovement, and mortality in COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2020;26(6):767-72.
98. Zhang J, Liu P, Wang M, Wang J, Chen J, Yuan W, et al. The clinical data from 19 critically ill patients with coronavirus disease 2019: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Z Gesundh Wiss*. 2020:1-4.
99. Zhang G, Zhang J, Wang B, Zhu X, Wang Q, Qiu S. Analysis of clinical characteristics and laboratory findings of 95 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a retrospective analysis. *Respiratory Research*. 2020;21(1):74.
100. Zhao W, Zhong Z, Xie X, Yu Q, Liu J. Relation Between Chest CT Findings and Clinical Conditions of Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pneumonia: A Multicenter Study. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2020;214(5):1072-7.
101. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, Feng B, Lou B, Zou Q, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2020;369:m1443-m.
102. Zheng F, Tang W, Li H, Huang YX, Xie YL, Zhou ZG. Clinical characteristics of 161 cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Changsha. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*. 2020;24(6):3404-10.
103. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10229):1054-62.
104. Zali A, Gholamzadeh S, Mohammadi G, Looha MA, Akrami F, Zarean E, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Associated Factors of Mortality in COVID-19 Patients; an Analysis of 16000 Cases in Tehran, Iran. *Archives of academic emergency medicine*. 2020;8(1).
105. Nikpouraghdam M, Farahani AJ, Alishiri G, Heydari S, Ebrahimnia M, Samadinia H, et al. Epidemiological characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients in IRAN: A single center study. *Journal of Clinical Virology*. 2020;127:104378.

106. Jalili M, Payandemehr P, Saghaei A, Sari HN, Safikhani H, Kolivand P. Characteristics and mortality of hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Iran: a National Retrospective Cohort Study. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2021;174(1):125-7.
107. Alizadehsani R, Alizadeh Sani Z, Behjati M, Roshanzamir Z, Hussain S, Abedini N, et al. Risk factors prediction, clinical outcomes, and mortality in COVID-19 patients. *Journal of medical virology*. 2021;93(4):2307-20.
108. Homayounieh F, Zhang EW, Babaei R, Karimi Mobin H, Sharifian M, Mohseni I, et al. Clinical and imaging features predict mortality in COVID-19 infection in Iran. *Plos one*. 2020;15(9):e0239519.
109. Alamdari NM, Afaghi S, Rahimi FS, Tarki FE, Tavana S, Zali A, et al. Mortality risk factors among hospitalized COVID-19 patients in a major referral center in Iran. *The Tohoku Journal of Experimental Medicine*. 2020;252(1):73-84.
110. Sobhani S, Aryan R, Kalantari E, Soltani S, Malek N, Pirzadeh P, et al. Association between Clinical Characteristics and Laboratory Findings with Outcome of Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients: A Report from Northeast Iran. *Interdisciplinary perspectives on infectious diseases*. 2021;2021.
111. Salari A, Mahdavi-Roshan M, Ghorbani Z, Mortazavi SS, Naghshbandi M, Faraghnia F, et al. An investigation of risk factors of in-hospital death due to COVID-19: a case-control study in Rasht, Iran. *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971-)*.1-13.
112. Baghaei P, Nadji SA, Marjani M, Moniri A, Hashemian SM, Sheikhzade H, et al. Clinical Manifestations of Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in a Referral Center in Iran. *Tanaffos*. 2020;19(2):122.
113. Shahriarirad R, Khodamoradi Z, Erfani A, Hosseinpour H, Ranjbar K, Emami Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical features of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) in the South of Iran. *BMC infectious diseases*. 2020;20(1):1-12.
114. Toutkaboni MP, Askari E, Khalili N, Tabarsi P, Jamaati H, Velayati AA, et al. Demographics, laboratory parameters and outcomes of 1061 patients with coronavirus disease 2019: a report from Tehran, Iran. *New Microbes and New Infections*. 2020;38:100777.

Table 1. Effect of estrogen on ACE2 expression.

Year	Sample type	ACE2 expression	Reference
2020	Differentiated normal human bronchial epithelial cells	Decreased	(27)
2020	Mouse thymus	Increased	(28)
2020	Female Wistar rats	Increased	(29)
2020	Ovariectomized CD1 mice	Decreased	(30)
2020	Human airway smooth muscle cells	Decreased	(31)
2020	Human umbilical vein endothelial cells and C57BL/6 mice	Decreased	(32)
2019	Obese female C57BL/6 mice	Increased	(33)
2017	Human atrial tissue from male donors	increased	(34)
2015	Human umbilical vein endothelial cells	Increased	(35)
2015	HF-fed OVX female mice	Increased	(36)
2014	Ovariectomized fructose fed female Wistar rats	Increased	(37)
2014	OVX Sprague-Dawley female rats and Sprague-Dawley male rats	Increased	(38)
2013	Female OVX-mRen2.Lewis's rat	Decreased	(39)
2012	OVX HF-fed female C57BL/6 mice	Increased	(40)
2011	Female OVX Sprague-Dawley rats	Increased	(41)
2009	DOCA-salt model of hypertension in female OVX Sprague-Dawley rats	Increased	(42)
2008	Female OVX Sprague-Dawley rats	Increased	(43)
2008	Female ApoE ^{-/-} mice, with or without ER α on a C57Bl6/J genetic background	Decreased	(23)
2007	Pregnant Sprague-Dawley rats	Increased	(44)

Table 2. Effect of IFN on ACE2 expression

Year	Sample type	Type of IFN	ACE2 expression	Reference
2020	Primary human bronchial epithelial cell (BEpC) and the human lung epithelial cell line model Calu-3	IFN- β , IFN γ , and IFN λ 1	Increased (especially for IFN- β)	(45)
2020	Human bronchial epithelial cells (IFN- β), human primary keratinocytes (IFN- α & IFN γ)	IFN- α and IFN- β , and IFN- γ	Increased	(46)
2020	Human nasal epithelial and lung tissue, C57BL/6J mice nasal, and olfactory Epithelium and Tracheal Cells	IFN α 2, IFN γ , IFN β	Increased	(47)
2020	Primary epithelial cells from either the small airways or the trachea	IFN α 2, IFN γ , IFN β	Increased	(48)
2020	Human small airway epithelial cells (SAEC)	IFN α 2b, IFN γ , IFN β , IFN λ 3	Increased	(49)
2020	primary normal human bronchial epithelial (NHBE) cells and human intestinal (colon and ileum) organoid cultures	IFN- α , IFN- λ 3, IFN- β , a cocktail of IFN λ 1-3, and IFN- γ	Increased	(50)
2020	SCC-4 and SCC-25 cells (for IFN- α or IFN- γ), NHBE cells (for IFN- α , IFN- β or IFN- λ)	IFN- α , IFN- β , IFN λ , and IFN- γ	Increased	(51)
2020	Human bronchial cell line (BEAS-2B) and airway basal cells from human donors	IFN α 2 and IFN γ	Increased	(52)
2006	vero E6 cells (ATCC)	IFN γ	Decreased	(53)

Table 3. Included studies for seroprevalence meta-analysis

Study	Country	Target population	Num. of participants	Assay	Ag	Isotype	Cut-off value
Global							
Amorim Filho, 2020 (54)	Brazil	blood donors	2857	Rapid test	-	IgG, IgM	NA
Biggs, 2020 (55)	USA	community household residents	694	CLIA	SP	Total Ab	NA
Bogogiannidou, 2020 (56)	Greece	leftover blood samples from nationwide labs	6586	CLIA	NP	IgG	NA
Hallal, 2020 (57)	Brazil	community residents	24995	LFIA	-	IgG, IgM	NA
Havers, 2020 (58)	USA	general population	16025	ELISA	-	Pan Ab	The specimen was considered reactive at a background-corrected OD of 0.4 and a serum dilution of 1:100
Menachemi, 2020 (59)	USA	Indiana residents	3651	CLIA	-	IgG	NA
Merkely, 2020 (60)	Hungary	Hungarian population	10504	CLIA	NP	IgG	NA
Pollan, 2020 (61)	Spain	general population	51958	LFIA	SP	IgG, IgM	NA
Rosenberg, 2020 (62)	USA	general population	15101	Microsphere immunoassay	NP	IgG	NA
Sood, 2020 (63)	USA	general population	863	LFIA	-	IgG, IgM	NA
Stringhini, 2020 (64)	Switzerland	general population	2766	ELISA	SP	IgG	The index value cutoff of 1.10 was considered positive
Bendavid 2020 (65)	USA	local residents	3330	LFIA	SP	IgG, IgM	NA
Chamie, 2020 (66)	USA	local residents	3637	CLIA	NP	IgG	NA
Erikstrup, 2020 (67)	Denmark	blood donors	9496	LFIA	NP, SP	IgG, IgM	Samples were concluded as reactive if the IgM, the IgG, or both bands were visible.
Nawa, 2020 (68)	Japan	households randomly selected from Utsunomiya City's basic resident	742	CLIA	NP, SP	IgG	A cut-off value of 10 AU/ml was considered positive
Tess, 2020 (69)	Brazil	local inhabitants	517	CLIA	NP, SP	IgG, IgM	IgG: reagent >1.1 UA/mL, IgM: reagent >1.0UA/mL
Uyoga, 2020 (70)	Kenya	blood donors	3174	ELISA	SP	IgG	A cut-off value of IgG seropositivity as an OD ratio >2
Ward, 2020 (71)	England	community adults	105651	LFIA	-	IgG	NA
Iran							

Shakiba, 2020 (72)	Iran	household residents	551	Rapid test	-	IgG, IgM	NA
Poustchi, 2021(73)	Iran	general population	3530	ELISA	-	IgG, IgM	NA

CLIA, Chemiluminescent immunoassay; LFIA, Lateral flow immunoassay; ELISA, Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; IgG, Immunoglobulin G; IgM, Immunoglobulin M; SP, Spike; NP, nucleocapsid.

Table 4. Included studies for severity, mortality, and recovery meta-analyses

Study	Country	Target population	Type of study	Mean age	Severity	Mortality	Recovery
Global							
AL-Rousan, 2020 (74)	South Korea	data from the Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for COVID-19	Cross-sectional	-		✓	✓
Asfahan, 2020 (75)	China	data of 44,672 patients of China's Centre for Disease Control	Cohort	-		✓	
Borobia, 2020 (76)	Spain	COVID-19 patients hospitalized in the wards (or emergency department) of La Paz University Hospital	Cohort	61 (46–78)		✓	✓
Cao, 2020 (77)	China	patients with COVID-19 admitted to Wuhan University Zhong nan Hospital in Wuhan, China.	Cohort	54 (37–67)		✓	
Chu, 2020 (78)	China	54 medical staff of Tongji Hospital hospitalized due to COVID-19.	Cross-sectional	39 (26–73)	✓		
Docherty, 2020 (79)	UK	208 acute care hospitals in England, Wales, and Scotland	Cohort	73 (58-82)		✓	✓
Du, 2020 (80)	China	179 patients with COVID-19 hospitalized in Wuhan Pulmonary Hospital.	Cohort	58 (14)		✓	
Guan, 2020 (81)	China	hospitalized patients and outpatients with COVID-19, as reported to the National Health Commission.	Cross-sectional	47 (35.0–58.0)	✓		
Li, 2020 (82)	China	hospitalized patients with COVID-19 enrolled at Sino-French New City Branch of Tongji Hospital, Huazhong University of Science and Technology in Wuhan.	Cohort	60 (48–69)	✓		
Liu, 2020 (83)	China	data of patients from 6 hospitals in Anhui province, China.	Cohort	41.6 (14.5)	✓		
Meng, 2020 (84)	China	168 patients with COVID-19 hospitalized at Tongji Hospital in Wuhan, China.	Cohort	56.7(15.1)		✓	✓
Pan, 2020 (85)	China	data of 32583 patients with COVID-19 from the municipal Notifiable Disease Report System.	Cohort	57 (43-67)	✓		
Qin, 2020 (86)	China	548 COVID-19 inpatients from Tongji Hospital	Cohort	-	✓	✓	
Richardson, 2020 (87)	USA	5700 patients with COVID-19 hospitalized in the New York City area.	Cohort	63 (52-75)		✓	✓

Shi, 2020 (88)	China	487 patients in Zhejiang Province of China.	Cohort	46 (19)	✓		
Suleyman, 2020 (89)	USA	463 patients with COVID-19 admitted to a 5-hospital system serving metropolitan Detroit.	Case Series	57.5(16.8)			✓
Tang, 2020 (90)	China	183 patients with COVID-19 in Tongji hospital.	Cohort	54.1 (16.2)		✓	
Tian, 2020 (91)	China	patients with COVID-19 transferred from the hospitals of Beijing to the designated hospitals for special treatment of infectious diseases by Beijing Emergency Medical Service (EMS)	Cohort	47.5(1–94)	✓		
Wang, 2020 (92)	China	patients diagnosed with COVID-19 at the NO.2 People’s Hospital of Fuyang City.	Cohort	38.76 (13.799)	✓		
Yang, 2020 (93)	China	52 patients with COVID-19 admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) of Wuhan Jin Yin-tan hospital (Wuhan, China)	Cohort	59.7 (13.3)		✓	
Yuan, 2020 (94)	China	COVID-19 patients in the Central Hospital of Wuhan.	Cohort	60 (47–69)		✓	
Zeng, 2020 (95)	China	cases from Wuhan Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science and Technology.	Cohort	-	✓		✓
Zhang, 2020, a (96)	China	221 patients with COVID-19 hospitalized at a university hospital.	Cohort	55 (39–66)	✓	✓	
Zhang, 2020, b (97)	China	patients with COVID-19 admitted to the Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University	Cohort	55.6 (44–69)	✓	✓	✓
Zhang, 2020, c (98)	China	COVID-19 cases in the Liyuan Hospital intensive care unit (ICU) of Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology.	Cohort	73 (38–91)		✓	
Zhang, 2020, d (99)	China	95 patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan Xinzhou District People’s Hospital	Cohort	49 (39.0–58.0)	✓		
Zhao, 2020 (100)	China	data on 101 cases of COVID-19 from four institutions in Hunan, China.	Cohort	43	✓		
Zheng, 2020, a (101)	China	patients with COVID-19 admitted to the First Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University.	Cohort	55 (44–65)	✓		
Zheng, 2020, b (102)	China	patients with COVID-19 admitted to the North Hospital of Changsha First Hospital.	Cohort	45 (33.5, 57)	✓		
Zhou, 2020 (103)	China	adult patients (≥18 years old) with COVID-19 from Jinyintan Hospital and Wuhan Pulmonary Hospital (Wuhan, China)	Cohort	56 (46.0–67.0)		✓	
Iran							
Zali, 2020 (104)	Iran	COVID-19 patients hospitalized in 19 public hospitals affiliated to Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran	Cross-sectional	-		✓	✓

Nikpouraghdam, 2020 (105)	Iran	COVID-19 patients admitted to Baqiyatallah Hospital in Tehran, Iran	Cohort	-		✓	✓
Jalili, 2021 (106)	Iran	COVID-19 patients admitted to any of the 1034 hospitals in Iran	Cohort	57.33 (17.67)		✓	✓
Alizadehsani, 2021 (107)	Iran	COVID-19 patients admitted to the imaging department of OMID hospital, Tehran, Iran	Cohort	-		✓	✓
Homayounieh, 2020 (108)	Iran	COVID-19 patients admitted to a tertiary hospital (Firoozgar Hospital, Tehran, Iran).	Cohort	-		✓	✓
Alamdari, 2020 (109)	Iran	patients admitted to Shahid Modarres Hospital, Tehran, Iran	Cross-sectional	61.79 (11.89)		✓	✓
Sobhani, 2021 (110)	Iran	hospitalized COVID-19 patients in Imam Reza Hospital, northeast Iran.	Cohort	60.6		✓	✓
Salari, 2020 (111)	Iran	COVID-19 patients admitted to Razi University Hospital in Rasht, Guilan, Northern Iran	Case-Control	-		✓	✓
Baghaei, 2020 (112)	Iran	COVID-19-suspected cases, admitted to Masih Daneshvari Hospital, Tehran, Iran	Cohort	54.1 (13.4)	✓	✓	✓
Shahriarirad, 2020 (113)	Iran	confirmed cases of COVID-19 admitted to university affiliated hospitals in Shiraz, Iran	Cohort	53.75	✓	✓	✓
Toutkaboni, 2020 (114)	Iran	COVID-19 who were admitted to Masih Daneshvari Hospital in Tehran, Iran	Cohort	55 (44-66)	✓	✓	✓

Table 5. Risk of bias of included studies for seroprevalence

Study	Newcastle-Ottawa Score			
	Study population and characteristics (max=3)	Detection method and validation (max=3)	Outcomes (max=4)	Total quality (L<6, M=7-8, H>8)
Amorim Filho, 2020	1	1	3	Low
Biggs, 2020	3	3	2	Moderate
Bogogiannidou, 2020	0	3	4	Moderate
Hallal, 2020	3	3	3	High
Havers, 2020	1	2	4	Moderate
Menachemi, 2020	3	0	2	Low
Merkely, 2020	3	1	2	Low
Pollan, 2020	3	3	2	Moderate
Poustchi, 2021	3	3	3	High
Rosenberg, 2020	1	3	4	Moderate
Sood, 2020	3	3	4	High
Stringhini, 2020	3	2	4	High
Bendavid 2020	1	3	4	Moderate
Chamie, 2020	1	1	4	Low
Erikstrup, 2020	1	3	2	Low
Nawa, 2020	2	1	2	Low
Shakiba, 2020	3	1	4	Moderate
Tess, 2020	2	3	2	Moderate
Uyoga, 2020	1	2	4	Moderate
Ward, 2020	2	1	4	Moderate

Table 6. Risk of bias of included studies for severity, mortality, and recovery

Study	Newcastle-Ottawa score			Total quality (L<6, M=7-8, H>8)
	Study population and type of study (max=4)	Comparability (max=3)	Outcomes (max=3)	
AL Rousan, 2020	2	2	2	Low
Alamdari, 2020	2	2	2	Low
Alizadehsani, 2021	3	2	2	Moderate
Asfahan, 2020	3	2	2	Moderate
Baghaei, 2020	3	1	2	Low
Borobia, 2020	3	3	2	Moderate
Cao, 2020	3	1	3	Moderate
Chu, 2020	2	1	2	Low
Docherty, 2020	3	2	2	Moderate
Du, 2020	4	2	3	High
Guan, 2020	2	1	3	Low
Homayounieh, 2020	3	2	2	Moderate
Jalili, 2021	3	3	3	High
Li, 2020	4	3	3	High
Liu, 2020	3	1	2	Low
Meng, 2020	3	3	3	High
Nikpouraghdam, 2020	3	2	2	Moderate
Pan, 2020	4	3	3	High
Qin, 2020	3	2	3	Moderate
Richardson, 2020	4	1	3	Moderate
Salari, 2020	2	1	1	Low
Shi, 2020	3	1	1	Low
Shahriarirad, 2020	3	2	2	Moderate
Sobhani, 2021	3	2	2	Moderate
Suleyman, 2020	2	2	2	Low
Tang, 2020	4	1	3	Moderate
Tian, 2020	4	1	2	Moderate
Toutkaboni, 2020	3	1	1	Low
Wang, 2020	3	2	2	Moderate
Yang, 2020	4	3	2	High
Yuan, 2020	4	1	3	Moderate
Zali, 2020	2	2	2	Low
Zeng, 2020	4	1	2	Moderate
Zhang, 2020, a	4	1	3	Moderate
Zhang, 2020, b	4	3	3	High
Zhang, 2020, c	4	1	2	Moderate
Zhang, 2020, d	3	1	3	Moderate
Zhao, 2020	3	1	2	Moderate
Zheng, 2020, a	4	1	3	Moderate
Zheng, 2020, b	4	1	2	Moderate
Zhou, 2020	4	1	2	Moderate

Figures:




Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process




Figure 2. Gender difference meta-analysis of COVID-19 seroprevalence in included studies.

Global (a), Iran (b).




Figure 3. Subgroup meta-analysis based on age for COVID-19 seroprevalence. Young vs. middle-aged (a), elderly vs. middle-aged (b), young vs. elderly (c).




Figure 4. Subgroup meta-analysis based on antibody isotype and detection assay for COVID-19 seroprevalence. IgG (a), IgG/IgM (b), CLIA (c), LFIA (d), ELISA (e).




Figure 5. Gender difference meta-analysis of COVID-19 mortality in included studies.

Mortality based on sex: Global (a), Iran (b). mortality based on mean age (SD): Global (c), Iran (d).




Figure 6. Gender difference meta-analysis of COVID-19 severity and recovery in included studies. Severity: Global (a), Iran (b). Recovery and discharge: Global (c), Iran (d).

WOS

(SP:95, S:321, M:538, R:85)

PubMed

(SP:163, S:528, M:833, R:144)

Scopus

(SP:185, S:621, M:670, R:114)

Google Scholar

(SP:380, S:978, M:1050, R:338)

medRxiv & bioRxiv (1489)

8532 records were identified through databases searches

8463 studies were excluded, including duplicates, meta-analysis and reviews, ongoing studies, unpublished, and unrelated papers

69 studies reviewed in depth

8 studies that not fulfilled our inclusion criteria were excluded

61 eligible studies for meta-analysis

41 studies

Seroprevalence

20

Mortality

27

Severity

19



Recovery




19






Identification





Screening

Eligibility


a**b**

a**b****c**







a



b



c



d

