

Interventions for the management of post COVID-19 condition (long COVID): Protocol for a living systematic review & network meta-analysis

Dena Zeraatkar

Departments of Anesthesia and Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Michael Ling

Departments of Anesthesia

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Sarah Kirsh

Departments of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Tanvir Jassal

Departments of Anesthesia

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Tyler Pitre

Division of Respiriology, Department of Medicine

University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Samantha Chakraborty

Cochrane Australia, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine,

Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Tari Turner

Cochrane Australia, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine,

Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Lyn Turkstra

School of Rehabilitation Science and Program in Neuroscience

McMaster University

Roger S. McIntyre

Department of Psychiatry and Pharmacology,

University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Ariel Izcovich

Department of Medicine

Universidad del Salvador, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Lawrence Mbuagbaw

Departments of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Thomas Agoritsas

Division General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine

University Hospitals of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

Departments of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Signe A. Flottorp

Centre for Epidemic Interventions Research

Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway
Paul Garner
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
Rachel Couban
Departments of Anesthesia
McMaster University, Hamilton, ON
Jason W. Busse
Departments of Anesthesia and Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact
McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

*Corresponding author:

Competing interests and Disclosures: Dr. Roger S. McIntyre has received research grant support from CIHR/GACD/National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) and the Milken Institute; speaker/consultation fees from Lundbeck, Janssen, Alkermes, Neumora Therapeutics, Boehringer Ingelheim, Sage, Biogen, Mitsubishi Tanabe, Purdue, Pfizer, Otsuka, Takeda, Neurocrine, Neurawell, Sunovion, Bausch Health, Axsome, Novo Nordisk, Kris, Sanofi, Eisai, Intra-Cellular, NewBridge Pharmaceuticals, Viatrix, Abbvie and Atai Life Sciences. Dr. S. Roger McIntyre is a CEO of Braxia Scientific Corp.

Funding: This project is supported in part by a subgrant from the Canadian Long Covid Web. JWB is supported, in part, by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Canada Research Chair in the prevention and management of chronic pain.

Data: Not applicable.

Authors' Contributions: DZ and JWB conceived the study. All authors reviewed the protocol, provided input, and approved the final manuscript.

Word count: 6,154

Abstract

Background

Up to 15% of survivors of COVID-19 infection experience long-term health effects, including fatigue, myalgia, and impaired cognitive function, termed post COVID-19 condition or long COVID. Several trials that study the benefits and harms of various interventions to manage long COVID have been published and hundreds more are planned or are ongoing. Trustworthy systematic reviews that clarify the benefits and harms of interventions are critical to promote evidence-based practice.

Objective

To create and maintain a living systematic review and network meta-analysis addressing the benefits and harms of pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic interventions for the treatment and management of long COVID.

Methods

Eligible trials will randomize adults with long COVID, to pharmacologic or non-pharmacologic interventions, placebo, sham, or usual care. We will identify eligible studies by searches of MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, PsycInfo, AMED, and CENTRAL, from inception, without language restrictions.

Reviewers will work independently and in duplicate to screen search records, collect data from eligible trials, including trial and patient characteristics and outcomes of interest, and assess risk of bias. Our outcomes of interest will include fatigue, pain, post-exertional malaise, changes in education or employment status, cognitive function, mental health, dyspnea, quality of life, patient-reported physical function, recovery, and serious adverse events.

For each outcome, when possible, we will perform a frequentist random-effects network meta-analysis. When there are compelling reasons to suspect that certain interventions are only applicable or effective for a subtype of long COVID, we will perform separate network meta-analyses. The GRADE approach will guide our assessment of the certainty of evidence.

We will update our living review biannually, upon the publication of a seminal trial, or when new evidence emerges that may change clinical practice.

Conclusion

This living systematic review and network meta-analysis will provide comprehensive, trustworthy, and up-to-date summaries of the evidence addressing the benefits and harms of interventions for the treatment and management of long COVID. We will make our findings available publicly and work with guideline producing organizations to inform their recommendations.

Background

The COVID-19 pandemic produced a global health crisis, affecting millions worldwide and causing significant health and economic consequences ([1](#), [2](#)). The prevalence of long COVID is difficult to establish, given most symptoms are nonspecific, and many studies lack sufficiently rigorous designs to confidently attribute symptoms to COVID-19 infection ([3](#), [4](#)). While most patients recover from COVID-19, evidence suggests that up to 15% of survivors may experience long-term health effects, including fatigue, myalgia, and impaired cognitive function—termed post COVID-19 condition or long COVID ([5-14](#)). The etiology of long COVID remains unclear and investigators have proposed several potential causes including viral persistence, autoimmunity, microclots, and psychological mechanisms ([15](#)).

There is heterogeneity in the definition of long COVID and some evidence indicates it may comprise several distinct phenotypes ([16](#)). Risk factors include sex, comorbidities, and patient-reported psychological distress ([17-19](#)). Conversely, severity of acute COVID-19 infection does not appear to predict long COVID and even non-hospitalized patients with mild infections are susceptible ([20](#)). Symptoms of long COVID may persist following acute infection or may relapse and remit ([21](#)). Evidence on the long term trajectory of the condition is limited but existing studies suggest that patients experience a significant reduction of symptoms at one year following the initial acute infection ([22](#)).

There is considerable overlap of signs, symptoms, and medical history between long COVID and myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS) ([23](#)). For example, ME/CFS often emerges following viral infections, similar to long COVID that emerges following infection with SARS-CoV-2 ([23](#)). Notably, approximately half of patients diagnosed with long COVID also meet criteria for ME/CFS ([24-26](#)).

Considerable resources have been invested to study long COVID, including \$1 billion by the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) ([27](#)). In August 2023, the NIH established the Office of Long COVID Research and Practice and launched a suite of clinical trials investigating treatments, among them five adaptive platform trials—trials that compare several interventions simultaneously with the option to add or remove interventions based on emerging evidence ([28](#), [29](#)).

Several trials testing interventions for the management of long COVID have been published to date ([30-33](#)) and hundreds more are planned or ongoing ([34-36](#)). These trials, however, will be published faster than evidence users, such as clinicians and patients, can read them or make sense of them and will come with strengths and limitations that may not be immediately apparent.

Ongoing discourse in the literature shows that there is uncertainty about optimal treatment modalities for long COVID ([37-39](#)). In the absence of trustworthy summaries of the evidence, patients living with long COVID are receiving unproven treatments—many of which are costly and some of which may be harmful ([37-41](#)). For interventions for which trials have been published, for example trials testing exercise and cognitive behavioral therapy, patients and healthcare providers have questioned their credibility ([42-44](#)). Trustworthy systematic reviews that clarify the benefits and harms of available interventions are critical to promote the evidence-based care of patients.

We present a protocol for a living systematic review and network meta-analysis of all pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic interventions for long COVID. Unlike a traditional systematic review that is only up-to-date at a single point in time, we will update this living review as new evidence emerges ([45](#), [46](#)). This

review will provide comprehensive, trustworthy, and up-to-date summaries of the evidence addressing interventions for the management of long COVID.

We anticipate that the living systematic review and network meta-analysis will become a trusted reference point for clinicians, patients, and national and international professional associations and authoritative organizations that intend to produce guideline recommendations on the treatment and management of long COVID. We have already engaged a committee of evidence users, including healthcare professionals and guideline-producing organizations, in the design of this initiative. This committee will frequently be asked for feedback on our methods and the presentation of our results, to ensure that our products align with their needs. We hope that our findings will expedite the identification of the most effective interventions for patients with long COVID and inform future guideline development efforts.

Methods

We report our protocol according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) extension for protocols (47, 48).

Eligibility criteria

Eligible studies will randomize adults with long COVID, defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as symptoms at three or more months following laboratory confirmed, probable, or suspected COVID-19 infection and that persist for at least two months, to pharmacologic or non-pharmacologic interventions, placebo, sham, usual care, or to alternative pharmacologic or non-pharmacologic interventions, without any restrictions on date or language of publication (21). Given the diverse manifestations of long COVID, our review will not further restrict eligibility based on diagnostic criteria (21). Subgroup analyses will, however, investigate the differences in the effectiveness of interventions according to diagnostic criteria.

We anticipate that trials will likely largely include patients that meet the WHO criteria for long COVID but some trials may not report the time since the acute COVID-19 infection or duration of long COVID symptoms. We will include such trials in our primary analysis but will also perform additional sensitivity analyses that exclude these trials to test the robustness of our findings.

Based on empirical evidence that preprint and published reports of randomized trials generally provide consistent results (49-51), we will include both preprint and published trial reports, but will also perform sensitivity analyses excluding preprints (49, 52).

At this time, there is too little known about long COVID to anticipate which interventions may be effective. Trials are investigating many types of interventions, including drugs (e.g., colchicine, sulodexide, beta-blockers), behavioral and physical therapies (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, aerobic exercise training), dietary supplements, and medical devices (transcranial direct current stimulation) (28, 35, 53, 54). We will not restrict eligibility based on the type of intervention and anticipate including trials addressing a diverse range of therapies.

We will exclude pseudorandomized trials, trials involving animals, trials investigating treatments for acute COVID-19, trials testing interventions to prevent long COVID, and trials including patients that do not meet criteria for long COVID (21, 55). We will also exclude randomized trials with fewer than 25 participants in each arm. We anticipate that smaller trials are unlikely to meaningfully contribute to

meta-analyses, are more likely to include unrepresentative samples, arms that are prognostically imbalanced, and are at higher risk of publication bias (56).

While there are hundreds of long COVID trials underway, trials have progressed at a slower pace than anticipated (57). Depending on feasibility, for select interventions of high potential interest to evidence users, in the first year of the living systematic review, we will consider including indirect evidence from trials addressing interventions for ME/CFS. The decision to consider indirect evidence from ME/CFS will be made with input from clinical experts and by evidence users. Subgroup analyses will investigate differences between the effects of interventions for long COVID and ME/CFS. If we find evidence that the effects of interventions are inconsistent between patients with long COVID and ME/CFS, we will only present results of trials addressing long COVID. Similar to long COVID, we will include trials that recruit patients according to published diagnostic criteria for ME/CFS but perform subgroup analyses investigating potential differences in the effects of interventions based on these diagnostic criteria.

Data sources and search strategy

An experienced medical research librarian developed a comprehensive search strategy for MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, PsycInfo, AMED, CENTRAL, and preprint servers (MedRxiv and ResearchSquare), from inception (Appendix). Our search strategy combines terms related to long COVID with a filter for randomized trials. Additionally, we plan to supplement our search using the Epistemonikos COVID-19 Repository—a living catalogue of COVID-19 research—and by reviewing the references of relevant systematic reviews (32, 35, 58).

The medical research librarian will update the searches at minimum biannually to facilitate biannual updates of the living review. We aim to update the search no more than three months before the publication of each iteration of the review.

To ensure our review remains up-to-date, for select interventions identified by our network of evidence users as highly important with great potential for efficacy, we will integrate methods for prospective systematic reviews—systematic reviews that include unpublished and interim data from ongoing and completed trials (59). During the COVID-19 pandemic, trialists reported trouble publishing trials due to null results, inability to achieve the target sample size, and waning interest from journals. In response, the WHO REACT Working Group performed prospective systematic reviews for select topics (60, 61). These reviews sourced ongoing trials via trial registries and invited trialists to share their interim or completed data. This model proved successful and also mitigated the influence of publication bias on review results (60, 61). We plan to emulate a similar model for critical interventions of long COVID. Our experience with other living systematic reviews and the experience of other research groups suggest that some trial groups are receptive to sharing unpublished trial data (60-62).

For interventions for which we consider evidence from ME/CFS trials, we will work with an experienced research medical librarian to devise additional search strategies specific to the interventions for which we will consider indirect evidence.

Study selection

Following training and calibration exercises to ensure sufficient agreement, pairs of reviewers will work independently and in duplicate to screen the titles and abstracts of search records and subsequently the full-texts of records deemed eligible at the title and abstracts screening stage using Covidence (<https://www.covidence.org>), an online systematic review software for screening titles and abstracts

and full-text articles. Reviewers will resolve disagreements by discussion, or, if necessary, by adjudication by a third reviewer.

Data extraction

Following training and calibration exercises to ensure sufficient agreement, pairs of reviewers will work independently and in duplicate to collect data from eligible trials using a pilot-tested data collection form in an Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft Office Excel 2019). Reviewers will resolve disagreements by discussion or by consultation with a third reviewer, if necessary.

Reviewers will collect data on trial characteristics (e.g., trial design, country of origin, funding, diagnostic criteria for long COVID), patient characteristics (e.g., age, sex and gender, employment and education status, receipt of COVID-19 vaccination, method of acute COVID-19 diagnosis, severity of acute COVID-19 infection, duration of long COVID, number of infections, equity-related characteristics, long COVID symptoms), characteristics of interventions and comparators (e.g., type of intervention, treatment duration), and patient-important outcomes.

For dichotomous outcomes, reviewers will extract the number of patients and events in each arm, and, for continuous outcomes, the number of patients, a measure of central tendency (mean or median), and a measure of variability (e.g., standard deviation, standard error, 95% confidence interval, p-value) for each arm. For continuous outcomes, reviewers will prioritize extracting changes in the outcome from baseline, and if not reported, the outcome at follow-up. For each outcome, reviewers will preferentially extract the results from intention-to-treat analyses without any imputations for missing data, when reported.

We will also prioritize outcome data at the longest reported timepoint at which the intervention is still being administered to allow for potential cumulative effects of interventions to emerge without effects waning due to termination of the intervention. When trials report data at timepoints at which the intervention is no longer being administered but randomized groups are still maintained, we may consult experts who are blind to the results of the trial about the duration of time the interventions being tested are expected to exert effects. If appropriate, we will consider extracting and analyzing data at the longest reported point of follow-up even if the intervention is no longer administered.

Our outcomes of interest are informed by a published core outcome set for long COVID and will include at minimum fatigue, pain, post-exertional malaise, changes in education or employment status, cognitive function, mental health, dyspnea, quality of life, patient-reported physical function, recovery, and serious adverse events (as defined by each trial) ([63](#), [64](#)). We will extract data for all validated instruments measuring our outcomes of interest. Table 1 presents examples. We will re-evaluate and potentially revise our choice of outcomes annually by discussion with patient partners and Knowledge Users and by considering emerging evidence. If we find important reasons to include additional outcomes, we will revisit previously extracted trials to collect data on additional outcomes.

Table 1: Example eligible instruments for outcomes of interest	
Fatigue	Modified Fatigue Impact Scale (65); Fatigue Assessment Scale (66); Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (67); Chalder Fatigue Questionnaire (68); Checklist Individual Strength Fatigue Subscale (69)
Pain severity	Visual Analog Scale (70); Numerical Rating Scale; Brief Pain Inventory (severity subscale) (71), McGill Pain Questionnaire (72)

Post exertional malaise	DePaul Symptom Questionnaire (73); DePaul Post-Exertional Malaise Questionnaire (74)
Cognitive function	Digit Symbol Substitution Test (75); Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function – Adult Version (BRIEF-A) (76)
Mental health	SF-36 (mental health) (77); SF-36 (mental component summary) (77); Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (78); Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale (79); Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (80); Beck Depression Inventory (81)
Dyspnea	Modified Medical Research Council Dyspnea Scale (82)
Quality of life	EuroQol-5D (83); SF-36 (77); World Health Organization quality of life questionnaire (84)
Physical function	SF-36 (physical functioning) (77); SF-36 (physical component summary) (77)

260

261 Given the relapse and remission patterns associated with long COVID and the potential for interventions
 262 to have long term effects, for crossover trials, we will only collect data for the first phase of the trial
 263 before washout and crossover of patients.

264 For trials initially available as a preprint that are subsequently published, we will rely on the results of
 265 the published trial unless the preprint reports additional outcome data not included in the published
 266 trial report.

267 In response to growing concerns about the prevalence of potentially fabricated or falsified research (85,
 268 86), reviewers will use the TRACT checklist to evaluate each trial for the risk of data falsification or
 269 fabrication (87). This checklist includes 19 items in seven domains (governance, author group,
 270 plausibility of intervention, timeframe, dropouts, baseline characteristics, and outcomes) addressing the
 271 integrity and trustworthiness of trials. The checklist does not include a cutoff at which a trial is
 272 considered suspicious and there is currently limited experience using the checklist in systematic reviews.
 273 Therefore, the authorship group will discuss all trials that are flagged as raising concerns for one or more
 274 domains. We will perform sensitivity analyses excluding trials that are deemed suspicious. We are also
 275 aware of another instrument to assess the risk of falsified or fabricated data in trials currently under
 276 development (88). Upon its publication, we will review the instrument and consider incorporating in our
 277 workflow.

278 We anticipate that the effects of interventions may depend on diagnostic criteria for long COVID or
 279 ME/CFS, severity of acute COVID-19, time since infection, number of infections, vaccination status, and
 280 SARS-CoV-2 variant (17). When reported, we will extract stratified data based on these factors to
 281 facilitate subgroup analyses.

282 **Risk of bias assessment**

283 Following training and calibration, reviewers will work independently and in duplicate to assess risk of
 284 bias using a modified version of the Cochrane-endorsed Risk of Bias (RoB) 2.0 tool—the gold standard
 285 for assessing limitations in trials that may bias results (89). The RoB 2.0 assesses the risk of bias across
 286 five domains: bias due to randomization (e.g., random sequence generation, allocation concealment),
 287 bias due to deviations from the intended intervention (e.g., lack of blinding leading to imbalances in co-
 288 interventions across trial arms), bias due to missing outcome data (e.g., attrition), bias due to

measurement of the outcome (e.g., unblinded outcome assessment), and selective reporting (e.g., selective reporting of outcome measures based on results).

To assess the risk of bias due to deviations from the intended intervention, we will consider the effect of assignment rather than adherence to the intervention—since this effect is likely to be the observed effect in clinical settings and of the greatest interest to evidence users. Our modified version of the tool includes the same domains, but with revised response options (i.e., definitely low risk of bias, probably low risk of bias, probably high risk of bias, and definitely high risk of bias) and guidance tailored to issues relevant for the present review (e.g., removing guidance for assessing risk of bias of adhering to the intervention, listing important cointerventions).

Unless we encounter compelling reasons to do otherwise, we will consider trials without blinding of patients, healthcare providers, and investigators at high risk of bias due to deviations from intended intervention. This decision is based on the potential for unequal distribution of potentially effective cointerventions (e.g., physical activity, social engagement, energy management) across trial arms.

Reviewers will resolve disagreements by discussion or by consultation with a third reviewer, if necessary.

Data synthesis and analysis

To describe trials and participants, we will present descriptive characteristics. Means and medians and associated measures of variability (e.g., 95% CI, SD) will describe continuous variables and counts and proportions dichotomous and categorical variables.

Given the heterogeneity in the definition of long COVID and evidence indicating that it may comprise several distinct phenotypes (16), we anticipate that some interventions may be better suited for patients with certain phenotypes of long COVID. For example, pulmonary rehabilitation will likely only be effective for patients who are experiencing pulmonary sequelae related to COVID-19 (90), interventions targeting cognitive function will likely only be effective for patients experiencing neurocognitive sequelae related to COVID-19 (91), and interventions aimed at restoring sense of smell will only be effective for patients experiencing anosmia (92). Other interventions may be suitable for patients experiencing general symptoms related to long COVID, such as fatigue, post-exertional malaise, and headaches. We will perform separate syntheses when there are compelling clinical reasons to suspect that certain interventions are only applicable or effective for a subtype of long COVID. Clinical experts in our authorship group will lead these decisions and regularly revisit them based on new evidence.

To summarize the comparative efficacy and harms of interventions, we will perform network and pairwise meta-analyses. Network meta-analyses compare three or more interventions, grouped into nodes, by pooling direct and indirect evidence (59). To facilitate network meta-analysis, we will classify interventions into “nodes” considering the drug class for pharmacologic interventions, class of therapy (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, aerobic exercise) for behavioral and physical interventions, and characteristics of the therapy for other non-pharmacologic interventions. We will group all therapeutic doses of the same drug class in the same node. If we find evidence that the effects of interventions are different based on their mode (group versus individual, online or in-person), intensity, or dose of delivery, we will create separate nodes. We will group placebo and sham interventions and standard care in the same node (93).

We anticipate that trials may measure the same constructs using different instruments. We plan to pool the results of each unique instrument separately. We will avoid converting effects across instruments, due to potential differences in the range of the construct covered by each instrument, or using standardized mean difference, due to its potential to be influenced by differences in variability across trial populations (94).

For each outcome and outcome measure, random-effects network meta-analysis using a frequentist framework with the restricted maximum likelihood (REML) heterogeneity estimator—a conservative approach to network meta-analysis—will pool the results of trials (95, 96). Our choice of a frequentist over a Bayesian framework is motivated by evidence that there are seldom important differences between the results of Bayesian and frequentist networks and the computational complexity associated with analyzing large networks under a Bayesian framework (95).

Relative risks (RRs) will summarize the results of dichotomous outcomes—except for serious adverse events that will be summarized using risk difference (RD) due to the propensity for trials to frequently report 0 events which precludes calculation of RRs and odds ratios—and mean differences (MDs) continuous outcomes, along with associated 95% confidence intervals. When network meta-analysis is not possible, we will perform pairwise random-effects meta-analysis with the REML heterogeneity estimator (96).

We will use I^2 statistics to summarize the magnitude of heterogeneity in meta-analyses and interpret an I^2 value of 0% to 40% as not important, 30% to 60% as moderate heterogeneity, and 50% to 90% as substantial heterogeneity, and 75% to 100% as considerable heterogeneity (97, 98). The I^2 value, however, is prone to misinterpretation since even small degrees of unimportant inconsistency may translate to high I^2 values if estimates from studies are highly precise (99, 100). Hence, we will also consider the absolute magnitude of differences in effect estimates across studies. For analyses that include 10 or more studies, we will test for publication bias using Egger’s test and qualitatively review funnel plots for evidence of asymmetry (101, 102).

A feature of network meta-analyses is their ability to generate treatment rankings. However, based on empirical evidence and theoretical considerations that suggest that ranking methods for network meta-analyses may be misleading, we will avoid interpreting our results based on rankings (103-105).

Diverse trial outcomes or outcome measures may lead to disconnected networks or preclude network formation. In such situations, consistent with established guidance, we will present the results of disconnected networks separately (59). We refrain from model-based approaches to link networks because of their novelty and limited evidence supporting their reliability (106). If networks cannot be formed, we will present pairwise meta-analyses. With the emergence of more trial evidence, we anticipate that disconnected networks will eventually combine to become connected.

To enhance interpretability of results, we will transform relative effects (e.g., RRs) to absolute effects (e.g., number of events per 1,000 patients), using the median risk of the outcome reported across the control groups of trials (107).

We will test for incoherence using node-splitting (108). In case of incoherence, we will investigate potential sources considering our *a priori* defined hypotheses for effect modification: diagnostic criteria for long COVID, time since infection, number of infections, vaccination status, severity of acute COVID-

19, and SARS-CoV-2 variant (17). Should we choose to include evidence from ME/CFS trials, we will also consider ME/CFS as a potential source of incoherence. In the event that tests for effect modification are unable to identify a credible source of incoherence, we will downgrade the certainty of evidence. Conversely, if we confidently identify the source of incoherence, we will perform separate analyses based on that source.

We have also generated similar *a priori* factors to explain potential heterogeneity in results across trials: diagnostic criteria for long COVID, time since infection, number of infections, vaccination status, severity of acute COVID-19, and SARS-CoV-2 variant (17, 109). Meta-regressions and subgroup analyses will test for subgroup effects based on these factors. Notably, we will avoid pooling trials rated at low and high risk of bias indiscriminately. Instead, we will test for differences between the results of these trials, and when we detect important differences, rely on trials at low risk of bias. If we choose to include evidence from ME/CFS trials, we will also perform subgroup analyses comparing the results of trials addressing long COVID and ME/CFS.

Inferences of subgroup effects often prove spurious (110-119). Such spurious claims may be attributed to testing many factors, leading to apparent but inaccurate evidence of effect modification due to chance, selective reporting, or improper statistical analysis (119-125). To avoid misleading claims, we will assess the credibility of subgroup effects using the ICEMAN tool—the gold standard tool for evaluating effect modification in trials and systematic reviews (126).

We will perform all analyses using the *meta* and *netmeta* packages in R (Vienna, Austria; Version 4.1.2) and make all code to reproduce our results freely accessible on Open Science Framework (127, 128).

Certainty of evidence and reporting

Results from studies may appear impressive, but we may not have much confidence in those results due to the limitations of the evidence. The GRADE approach for network meta-analysis will guide our assessment of the certainty (quality) of evidence (129-131). The GRADE approach rates the evidence as either high, moderate, low, or very low certainty based on considerations of risk of bias (i.e., study limitations), inconsistency (i.e., heterogeneity in results across trials), indirectness (i.e., differences between the questions addressed in studies and the question of interest), publication bias (i.e., the tendency for studies with statistically significant results or positive results to be published, published faster, or published in journals with higher visibility), imprecision (i.e., random error), intransitivity (i.e., violation of joint randomizability), and incoherence (i.e., differences between direct and indirect estimate). High certainty evidence indicates situations in which we are confident that the estimated effect represents the true effect and low or very low certainty evidence indicates situations in which the estimated effect may be substantially different from the true effect.

A minimally contextualized approach will guide our judgments related to imprecision (132). The minimally contextualized approach does not consider statistical significance as the only indicator of whether an intervention is effective. An estimate may not be statistically significant but may still have evidence of moderate certainty for benefit or harm, depending on whether the confidence intervals cross the thresholds of clinical significance. Conversely, an intervention may produce results that are statistically significant but that indicate no important benefit or harm. The minimally contextualized approach considers only whether the effect estimates exceed the minimum important difference (MID)—the smallest difference in an outcome that patients find important—and does not consider whether the effect is small, moderate, or large.

We will source MIDs either from the literature, or, when not available, survey our review authors and patient partners. MIDs of patient-reported outcomes are typically determined either using anchor-based methods or distribution-based methods (133). Anchor-based methods use an external "anchor" to interpret the magnitude of change in a measure or outcome. Distribution-based methods rely on the distribution of the data to interpret the importance of change in a measure. We will prioritize anchor-based MIDs over distribution-based MIDs, since anchor-based estimates reflect patients' direct experiences. We anticipate that guideline producing organizations will fully contextualize the results to formulate recommendations (134). Finally, should a published MID be unavailable for any of the outcomes of interest, particularly for dichotomous outcomes like recovery and return to work/education for which MIDs are typically not derived, we will survey patient partners and our partner evidence users on reasonable ranges using a previously established process (135).

To make judgements about intransitivity, we will consider the potential effect modifiers within the network, including the credibility of effect modification, the strength of effect modification, and the distribution of effect modifiers across direct comparisons (136). There is currently limited evidence on potential effect modifiers of interventions for long COVID. We anticipate that the effects of interventions may vary based on diagnostic criteria, severity of acute COVID-19, time since infection, number of infections, vaccination status, and SARS-CoV-2 variant. If we find credible evidence of effect modification based on these or other factors, we will consider rating down for intransitivity when appropriate. For comparisons that include evidence from ME/CFS trials, we will additionally rate down for indirectness.

Reporting of results

We will report our living review according to the PRISMA checklist for network meta-analyses (47, 48). PRISMA flow diagrams will illustrate the total number of search records, the number of records excluded, reasons for exclusion, and the total number of trials included in the review. Network and forest plots will present network geometry and results from meta-analyses, respectively. GRADE Evidence Profiles will summarize effect estimates and the certainty of evidence (107).

We will describe our results using GRADE plain language summaries (i.e., describing high certainty evidence with declarative statements, moderate certainty evidence with 'probably', low certainty evidence with 'may' and very low with 'very uncertain') (137).

For each outcome, we will place interventions in categories from best to worst (138, 139). First, we will classify interventions according to whether they are more or less effective than placebo or standard care. If the 95% confidence intervals of effect estimates comparing interventions with placebo or standard care cross the MID, the intervention will remain in the same group as placebo or standard care. If, on the other hand, the interval does not cross the MID, the intervention can be classified as more or less effective than placebo or standard care, depending on the direction of the effect. Subsequently, we will compare the interventions classified as more effective than placebo or standard care against each other by examining whether the differences in effects between them exceed the MID. In the final step, we will further categorize interventions according to their certainty of evidence.

Each iteration of the living review will also be accompanied by a plain language summary (each <800 words) that describe our findings in simple language for healthcare providers and patients who may not be familiar with network meta-analysis methods. We will draft these summaries according to

established guidance by Cochrane: they will describe the types of interventions tested and describe the benefits and harms of interventions supported by moderate or high certainty evidence (59). We anticipate that these plain language summaries will reduce the opportunity for misinterpretation of our findings by healthcare providers, patients, and other decision-makers who may not be familiar with network meta-analysis methods or the interpretation of evidence according to the GRADE approach. For each iteration of the review, we will engage three to five patient partners and three to five healthcare providers to review the plain language summaries for readability and acceptability.

Updating and triggers for retirement

We will update our living systematic review and network meta-analysis every 6 months or sooner in the event of the publication of practice-changing evidence (e.g., publication of a seminal trial, when the certainty of evidence or the magnitude or direction of the effect of an intervention importantly changes). Preprints and journal publications will communicate the results of each iteration of our review. This approach adheres to best practices in updating living reviews: it balances the need for up-to-date evidence with the time needed to ensure that the review is sufficiently rigorous, focuses our efforts on disseminating critical findings, and maximizes the feasibility of the project (45, 140).

We will retire the living systematic review when the evidence base becomes stable with few to no new trials, if we reach high or moderate certainty evidence for all interventions and outcomes suggesting that new evidence is unlikely to change current estimates, when our network of evidence users suggest that the findings of the living systematic review are no longer relevant to them, or if we deplete our funding, or can no longer maintain the personnel needed to continue the living review (141). At this time, given the timeline of planned trials and the funding available to us, we intend to continue to maintain the living systematic review for three years (28, 29).

Our Open Science Framework repository dedicated to the living review will inform evidence users of the status of the review (whether it is active or retired), the anticipated date of the next update, and the results of the most recent iteration of the review (osf.io/9h7zm).

Conflicts of interest

Systematic reviews necessitate subjective judgments about the magnitudes of benefits and harms of interventions and the certainty of the evidence. To ensure such judgments are not unduly influenced, we will screen all co-authors and members of our team for financial and intellectual conflicts of interest using a standardized procedure developed by the *BMJ* (142).

Financial conflicts will include stocks, grants, research contracts, royalties, and speaking fees and travel accommodations and intellectual conflicts will include academic publications or statements on social or traditional media that could make reviewers attached to a particular intervention or point of view. We will exclude individuals with financial conflicts and restrict intellectual conflicts to no more than 25% of the team. Only reviewers completely free of both financial and intellectual conflicts of interest will be involved with screening search records, data extraction, risk of bias assessments, data analysis, and the assessment of the certainty of evidence.

Patient involvement

As part of our funding application, the Long Covid Web Patient Advisory Council reviewed and offered feedback on the protocol.

When interpreting our results, we will rely on patients' judgements about whether they consider benefits of a particular therapy to outweigh harms. To do this, we will perform semi-structured interviews with purposively selected groups of patient partners, aiming for diversity in demographics (e.g., age, sex, underrepresented racial or ethnic groups, income, abilities) and experiences of long COVID (e.g., severity, duration). These interviews will be intended to offer explanations for why certain therapies may be preferential to others. Consistent with guidance for qualitative research, we will involve enough patient partners until we reach saturation and no new insights are provided (143). Our previous experiences performing similar semi-structured interviews suggest that we will need to involve at minimum six to seven patients for each iteration of the review.

For each iteration of the review, three to four patient partners will also review plain language summaries that describe our findings using language that will be accessible to the general public for readability and acceptability (144, 145).

We anticipate that the living systematic review will become a trusted reference point for national and international professional associations and authoritative organizations that intend to produce guideline recommendations on the management of long COVIDs. We will prioritize engaging organizations that involve patients in the guideline development process and consider patient values and preferences—consistent with standards for producing trustworthy guidelines (146-149).

Discussion

Anticipated findings

Our living systematic review and network meta-analysis will provide comprehensive, trustworthy, and up-to-date summaries of the evidence addressing interventions for the management of long COVID. We expect to produce at minimum six iterations of the living review. Each iteration will be accompanied by plain language summaries for patients, healthcare providers, and other decision-makers who may not be familiar with network meta-analysis methods. We hope that our findings will accelerate the identification of the most effective interventions for patients with long COVID.

To our knowledge, this is the first living network meta-analysis investigating the benefits and harms of pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic interventions for long COVID. Discussions with our network and searches of research databases confirm that the proposed review is original and there are no existing reviews of the same scope or rigor as we propose. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) living review only provides a descriptive summary of trials, without quantitative synthesis or rigorous appraisal (34). Other living reviews addressing long COVID do not focus on interventions for management of the condition, perform network meta-analysis, or evaluate the certainty of evidence (150).

We anticipate that this living systematic review and network meta-analysis will become a trusted reference point for clinicians, patients, and national and international professional associations and authoritative organizations that intend to produce guideline recommendations on the treatment and management of long COVIDs. We invite guideline producing organizations that are either publishing or planning clinical practice guidelines addressing long COVID to join our committee of evidence users, who inform the type of data that we collect and our methodological approaches to ensure that our products align with their needs. Our model of simultaneously providing trustworthy summaries of evidence to

several guideline developing organizations will prove more efficient than each organization performing its own overlapping evidence syntheses and optimize the translation of research into clinical practice.

We also invite clinical trialists to share interim or completed trial data for inclusion in the living systematic review. We are especially interested in trials that may not be published due to null findings, insufficient sample sizes, or lack of interest from journals—trials at risk of the "file drawer" effect. Sharing this data helps prevent publication bias and honors the commitment of trial participants, funders, and investigators by ensuring that their efforts improve patient care.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths of this living systematic review and network meta-analysis include a broad search strategy and inclusion criteria, consideration of outcomes of interest reflecting the values and preferences of patients, screening of studies and extraction of data in duplicate to reduce the opportunity for errors (151-156), application of GRADE to evaluate the certainty of evidence, and commitment to data sharing and open science practices (157).

We also acknowledge potential limitations. First, despite our comprehensive search strategy, it is possible we will not identify all eligible randomized trials. To mitigate this issue, we will supplement our search with the Epistemonikos COVID-19 repository, which independently performs searches and screens for relevant randomized trials (58).

Second, while there are many trials underway, trials have progressed at a slower pace than anticipated (57). Our ongoing surveillance of trial registries has identified over 200 eligible trials, indicating that considerable trial evidence is forthcoming. For example, the US RECOVER program includes five adaptive platform trials (158). In 2023, Canada funded a \$20 million research network, called Long Covid Web, which is also anticipated to support clinical trials (159). Further, RECLAIM, the Canadian platform trial investigating interventions for long COVID, will also contribute evidence for several therapeutic interventions. Our plan to integrate methods for prospective systematic reviews will also ensure that there will be sufficient data to make a living review both feasible and valuable for evidence users.

Finally, we have made certain methodological decisions to ensure the feasibility of our living systematic review. One such decision is our approach to evaluating the risk of bias due to missing outcome data. We plan to assess the risk of bias due to missing outcome data by considering the proportion of participants with missing outcome data, reasons for missingness, and whether missing data could importantly influence the effect estimate. An alternative approach to assessing risk of bias due to missing outcome data involves imputing missing data across a range of plausible scenarios and making a judgment based on the robustness of the results to imputation (160). This approach, however, is also impractical due to the anticipated numbers of outcomes and comparisons in the living systematic review and network meta-analysis (160). We believe the proposed methods strike a reasonable balance between rigor and feasibility.

Conclusion

This protocol describes the planned methods of a living systematic review and network meta-analysis addressing the comparative effectiveness of interventions for the management of long COVID. We anticipate that our findings will inform clinical practice, clinical practice guidelines and guide the investigation of promising interventions for future trials.

References

1. Panneer S, Kantamaneni K, Palaniswamy U, Bhat L, Pushparaj RRB, Nayar KR, et al. Health, Economic and Social Development Challenges of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Strategies for Multiple and Interconnected Issues. *Healthcare*. 2022;10(5):770.
2. Delardas O, Kechagias KS, Pontikos PN, Giannos P. Socio-Economic Impacts and Challenges of the Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19): An Updated Review. *Sustainability*. 2022;14(15):9699.
3. Haslam A, Prasad V. Comparability of Control and Comparison Groups in Studies Assessing Long COVID. *Am J Med*. 2023.
4. Tracy Beth H, Shamez L, Vinay P. How methodological pitfalls have created widespread misunderstanding about long COVID. *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*. 2023;bmjebm-2023-112338.
5. Chen C, Hauptert SR, Zimmermann L, Shi X, Fritsche LG, Mukherjee B. Global Prevalence of Post-Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Condition or Long COVID: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2022;226(9):1593-607.
6. Nasserie T, Hittle M, Goodman SN. Assessment of the Frequency and Variety of Persistent Symptoms Among Patients With COVID-19: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(5):e2111417.
7. Perlis RH, Lunz Trujillo K, Safarpour A, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Druckman J, et al. Association of Post-COVID-19 Condition Symptoms and Employment Status. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(2):e2256152-e.
8. Wulf Hanson S, Abbafati C, Aerts JG, Al-Aly Z, Ashbaugh C, Ballouz T, et al. Estimated Global Proportions of Individuals With Persistent Fatigue, Cognitive, and Respiratory Symptom Clusters Following Symptomatic COVID-19 in 2020 and 2021. *Jama*. 2022;328(16):1604-15.
9. Carfi A, Bernabei R, Landi F. Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *Jama*. 2020;324(6):603-5.
10. Xiong Q, Xu M, Li J, Liu Y, Zhang J, Xu Y, et al. Clinical sequelae of COVID-19 survivors in Wuhan, China: a single-centre longitudinal study. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021;27(1):89-95.
11. Goërtz YMJ, Van Herck M, Delbressine JM, Vaes AW, Meys R, Machado FVC, et al. Persistent symptoms 3 months after a SARS-CoV-2 infection: the post-COVID-19 syndrome? *ERJ Open Res*. 2020;6(4).
12. Nehme M, Braillard O, Alcoba G, Aebischer Perone S, Courvoisier D, Chappuis F, et al. COVID-19 Symptoms: Longitudinal Evolution and Persistence in Outpatient Settings. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;174(5):723-5.
13. Perlis RH, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Safarpour A, Lunz Trujillo K, Simonson MD, et al. Prevalence and Correlates of Long COVID Symptoms Among US Adults. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(10):e2238804.
14. Ceban F, Ling S, Lui LMW, Lee Y, Gill H, Teopiz KM, et al. Fatigue and cognitive impairment in Post-COVID-19 Syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2022;101:93-135.
15. Turner S, Khan MA, Putrino D, Woodcock A, Kell DB, Pretorius E. Long COVID: pathophysiological factors and abnormalities of coagulation. *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. 2023;34(6):321-44.
16. Reese JT, Blau H, Casiraghi E, Bergquist T, Loomba JJ, Callahan TJ, et al. Generalisable long COVID subtypes: findings from the NIH N3C and RECOVER programmes. *EBioMedicine*. 2023;87:104413.
17. Maglietta G, Diodati F, Puntoni M, Lazzarelli S, Marcomini B, Patrizi L, et al. Prognostic Factors for Post-COVID-19 Syndrome: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* [Internet]. 2022; 11(6).
18. Notarte KI, de Oliveira MHS, Peligro PJ, Velasco JV, Macaranas I, Ver AT, et al. Age, Sex and Previous Comorbidities as Risk Factors Not Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection for Long COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11(24).

19. Wang S, Quan L, Chavarro JE, Slopen N, Kubzansky LD, Koenen KC, et al. Associations of Depression, Anxiety, Worry, Perceived Stress, and Loneliness Prior to Infection With Risk of Post-COVID-19 Conditions. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2022;79(11):1081-91.
20. Matta J, Wiernik E, Robineau O, Carrat F, Touvier M, Severi G, et al. Association of Self-reported COVID-19 Infection and SARS-CoV-2 Serology Test Results With Persistent Physical Symptoms Among French Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(1):19-25.
21. Soriano JB, Murthy S, Marshall JC, Relan P, Diaz JV. A clinical case definition of post-COVID-19 condition by a Delphi consensus. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2022;22(4):e102-e7.
22. Fumagalli C, Zocchi C, Tasseti L, Silverii MV, Amato C, Livi L, et al. Factors associated with persistence of symptoms 1 year after COVID-19: A longitudinal, prospective phone-based interview follow-up cohort study. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2022;97:36-41.
23. Komaroff AL, Lipkin WI. ME/CFS and Long COVID share similar symptoms and biological abnormalities: road map to the literature. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2023;10:1187163.
24. Bonilla H, Quach TC, Tiwari A, Bonilla AE, Miglis M, Yang PC, et al. Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome is common in post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC): Results from a post-COVID-19 multidisciplinary clinic. *Front Neurol*. 2023;14:1090747.
25. Twomey R, DeMars J, Franklin K, Culos-Reed SN, Weatherald J, Wrightson JG. Chronic Fatigue and Postexertional Malaise in People Living With Long COVID: An Observational Study. *Phys Ther*. 2022;102(4).
26. Kedor C, Freitag H, Meyer-Arndt L, Wittke K, Hanitsch LG, Zoller T, et al. A prospective observational study of post-COVID-19 chronic fatigue syndrome following the first pandemic wave in Germany and biomarkers associated with symptom severity. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):5104.
27. Subbaraman N. US health agency will invest \$1 billion to investigate 'long COVID'. *Nature*. 2021;591(7850):356.
28. Harris E. Federal Government Announces Long COVID Trials, Research Office. *JAMA*. 2023.
29. Pitre T, Cheng S, Cusano E, Khan N, Mikhail D, Leung G, et al. Methodology and design of platform trials: a meta-epidemiological study. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023;157:1-12.
30. Hansen KS, Mogensen TH, Agergaard J, Schiøttz-Christensen B, Østergaard L, Vibholm LK, et al. High-dose coenzyme Q10 therapy versus placebo in patients with post COVID-19 condition: a randomized, phase 2, crossover trial. *Lancet Reg Health Eur*. 2023;24:100539.
31. Spencer LH, Hendry A, Makanjuola A, Anthony BF, Davies J, Pisavadia K, et al. What interventions or best practice are there to support people with Long COVID, or similar post-viral conditions or conditions characterised by fatigue, to return to normal activities: a rapid review. *medRxiv*. 2023:2023.01.24.23284947.
32. Veronese N, Bonica R, Cotugno S, Tulone O, Camporeale M, Smith L, et al. Interventions for Improving Long COVID-19 Symptomatology: A Systematic Review. *Viruses*. 2022;14(9).
33. Bramante C, Buse JB, Liebovitz D, Nicklas J, Puskarich M, Cohen KR, Belani H, Anderson B, Huling JD, Thompson J, Pullen M, Wirtz EL, Siegel L, Proper J, Odde DJ, Klatt N, Sherwood NE, Lindberg S, Karger AB, Beckman KB, Erickson S, Fenno S, Hartman K, Rose M, Mehta T, Patel B, Griffiths G, Bhat N, Murray TA, Boulware DR. Outpatient Treatment of COVID-19 and the Development of Long COVID Over 10 Months: A Multi-Center, Quadruple-Blind, Parallel Group Randomized Phase 3 Trial. [Internet]. [accessed 2022 Mar 7]. Available from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4375620> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4375620>.
34. Chao Y-S, McGill SC, Gates M. Clinical classification and interventions for post-COVID-19 condition: a scoping review. *Can J Health Technol*. 2022 May;2(5). Available from: <https://www.cadth.ca/post-covid-19-condition-scoping-review>. Accessed 2022 Dec 9.
35. Chee YJ, Fan BE, Young BE, Dalan R, Lye DC. Clinical trials on the pharmacological treatment of long COVID: A systematic review. *J Med Virol*. 2023;95(1):e28289.

36. Ledford H. Long-COVID treatments: why the world is still waiting. *Nature*. 2022;608(7922):258-60.
37. Davies M. Long covid patients travel abroad for expensive and experimental "blood washing". *Bmj*. 2022;378:o1671.
38. Ladyzhets B. 'Underwhelming': NIH trials fail to test meaningful long Covid treatments — after 2.5 years and \$1 billion. *Stat News*. 2023.
39. Sellers F. Desperate covid long-haulers turn to costly, unproven treatments: *Washington Post*; 2022 [Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/11/25/long-covid-treatments-unproven-brain-fog/>].
40. Belluck P. Paxlovid may reduce risk of long Covid in eligible patients, study finds. *The New York Times*. 2022 Nov 7. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/11/07/health/paxlovid-long-covid.html?smid=tw-share>. Accessed 2023 Feb 19.
41. Califf DR. And preliminary epidemiological findings point to the distinct possibility of the bivalent vaccines and antivirals reducing risk of long covid. *Twitter*. 2022 Nov 14. Available from: https://twitter.com/DrCaliff_FDA/status/1592269459133431809?s=20. Accessed 2023 Feb 19.
42. Wilson C. Exercise programme helps people with long covid, but it's no panacea. 2024.
43. Tuller D. Trial By Error: Dutch CBT Study for Long Covid Proves that Unblinded Studies with Subjective Outcomes Generate Positive Reports: *Virology*; 2023 [Available from: <https://virology.ws/2023/05/25/trial-by-error-dutch-cbt-study-for-long-covid-reports-proves-that-unblinded-studies-with-subjective-outcomes-produce-positive-results-as-predicted/>].
44. Vink M, Vink-Niese A. Could Cognitive Behavioural Therapy Be an Effective Treatment for Long COVID and Post COVID-19 Fatigue Syndrome? Lessons from the Qure Study for Q-Fever Fatigue Syndrome. *Healthcare [Internet]*. 2020; 8(4).
45. Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, Simmonds M, Akl EA, McDonald S, et al. Living systematic review: 1. Introduction-the why, what, when, and how. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017;91:23-30.
46. Elliott JH, Turner T, Clavisi O, Thomas J, Higgins JP, Mavergames C, et al. Living systematic reviews: an emerging opportunity to narrow the evidence-practice gap. *PLoS Med*. 2014;11(2):e1001603.
47. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;162(11):777-84.
48. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj*. 2021;372:n71.
49. Zeraatkar D, Pitre T, Leung G, Cusano E, Agarwal A, Khalid F, et al. Consistency of covid-19 trial preprints with published reports and impact for decision making: retrospective review. *BMJ Medicine*. 2022;1(1).
50. Davidson M, Evrenoglou T, Graña C, Chaimani A, Boutron I. Comparison of effect estimates between preprints and peer-reviewed journal articles of COVID-19 trials. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2024;24(1):9.
51. Janda G, Khetpal V, Shi X, Ross JS, Wallach JD. Comparison of Clinical Study Results Reported in medRxiv Preprints vs Peer-reviewed Journal Articles. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(12):e2245847.
52. Weibel S, Popp M, Reis S, Skoetz N, Garner P, Sydenham E. Identifying and managing problematic trials: A research integrity assessment tool for randomized controlled trials in evidence synthesis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2023;14(3):357-69.
53. Kuut TA, Müller F, Aldenkamp A, Assmann-Schuilwerpe E, Braamse A, Geerlings SE, et al. A randomised controlled trial testing the efficacy of Fit after COVID, a cognitive behavioural therapy targeting severe post-infectious fatigue following COVID-19 (ReCOVer): study protocol. *Trials*. 2021;22(1):867.

54. Davis HE, McCorkell L, Vogel JM, Topol EJ. Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and recommendations. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2023;21(3):133-46.
55. Thaweethai T, Jolley SE, Karlson EW, Levitan EB, Levy B, McComsey GA, et al. Development of a Definition of Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA*. 2023;329(22):1934-46.
56. Dickersin K, Min YI. Publication bias: the problem that won't go away. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1993;703:135-46; discussion 46-8.
57. Wadman M. Long Covid is a 'national crisis.' So why are grants taking so long to get. *Science*. 2022;376(6599):1262-3.
58. Verdugo-Paiva F, Vergara C, Ávila C, Castro-Guevara JA, Cid J, Contreras V, et al. COVID-19 Living Overview of Evidence repository is highly comprehensive and can be used as a single source for COVID-19 studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2022;149:195-202.
59. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.3 (updated February 2022). Cochrane, 2022. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
60. Shankar-Hari M, Vale CL, Godolphin PJ, Fisher D, Higgins JPT, Spiga F, et al. Association Between Administration of IL-6 Antagonists and Mortality Among Patients Hospitalized for COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *Jama*. 2021;326(6):499-518.
61. Sterne JAC, Murthy S, Diaz JV, Slutsky AS, Villar J, Angus DC, et al. Association Between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Meta-analysis. *Jama*. 2020;324(13):1330-41.
62. Siemieniuk RA, Bartoszko JJ, Zeraatkar D, Kum E, Qasim A, Martinez JPD, et al. Drug treatments for covid-19: living systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Bmj*. 2020;370:m2980.
63. Munblit D, Nicholson TR, Needham DM, Seylanova N, Parr C, Chen J, et al. Studying the post-COVID-19 condition: research challenges, strategies, and importance of Core Outcome Set development. *BMC Med*. 2022;20(1):50.
64. Munblit D, Nicholson T, Akrami A, Apfelbacher C, Chen J, De Groote W, et al. A core outcome set for post-COVID-19 condition in adults for use in clinical practice and research: an international Delphi consensus study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2022;10(7):715-24.
65. Fisk JD, Ritvo PG, Ross L, Haase DA, Marrie TJ, Schlech WF. Measuring the functional impact of fatigue: initial validation of the fatigue impact scale. *Clin Infect Dis*. 1994;18 Suppl 1:S79-83.
66. Michielsen HJ, De Vries J, Van Heck GL. Psychometric qualities of a brief self-rated fatigue measure: The Fatigue Assessment Scale. *J Psychosom Res*. 2003;54(4):345-52.
67. Smets EM, Garssen B, Bonke B, De Haes JC. The Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI) psychometric qualities of an instrument to assess fatigue. *J Psychosom Res*. 1995;39(3):315-25.
68. Chalder T, Berelowitz G, Pawlikowska T, Watts L, Wessely S, Wright D, et al. Development of a fatigue scale. *J Psychosom Res*. 1993;37(2):147-53.
69. Worm-Smeitink M, Gielissen M, Bloot L, van Laarhoven HWM, van Engelen BGM, van Riel P, et al. The assessment of fatigue: Psychometric qualities and norms for the Checklist individual strength. *J Psychosom Res*. 2017;98:40-6.
70. Hayes M. Experimental development of the graphic rating method. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1921;18:98-9.
71. Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann Acad Med Singap*. 1994;23(2):129-38.
72. Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: major properties and scoring methods. *Pain*. 1975;1(3):277-99.
73. Jason LA, Evans M, Porter N, Brown M, Brown A, Hunnell J, et al. The Development of a Revised Canadian Myalgic Encephalomyelitis Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Case Definition. *American Journal of Biochemistry and Biotechnology*. 2010;6(2).

74. Jason LA, Holtzman CS, Sunnquist M, Cotler J. The development of an instrument to assess post-exertional malaise in patients with myalgic encephalomyelitis and chronic fatigue syndrome. *J Health Psychol.* 2021;26(2):238-48.
75. Jaeger J. Digit Symbol Substitution Test: The Case for Sensitivity Over Specificity in Neuropsychological Testing. *J Clin Psychopharmacol.* 2018;38(5):513-9.
76. Roth RM, Isquith PK, Gioia GA. Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function®--Adult Version. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology.* 2005.
77. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care.* 1992;30(6):473-83.
78. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.* 1983;67(6):361-70.
79. Hamilton M. The assessment of anxiety states by rating. *Br J Med Psychol.* 1959;32(1):50-5.
80. Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry.* 1960;23(1):56.
81. Beck AT, Ward CH, Mendelson M, Mock J, Erbaugh J. An inventory for measuring depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1961;4:561-71.
82. Mahler DA, Wells CK. Evaluation of clinical methods for rating dyspnea. *Chest.* 1988;93(3):580-6.
83. Group TE. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health policy.* 1990;16(3):199-208.
84. The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the World Health Organization. *Social Science & Medicine.* 1995;41(10):1403-9.
85. Carlisle JB. False individual patient data and zombie randomised controlled trials submitted to Anaesthesia. *Anaesthesia.* 2021;76(4):472-9.
86. Ioannidis JPA. Hundreds of thousands of zombie randomised trials circulate among us. *Anaesthesia.* 2021;76(4):444-7.
87. Mol BW, Lai S, Rahim A, Bordewijk EM, Wang R, van Eekelen R, et al. Checklist to assess Trustworthiness in RAndomised Controlled Trials (TRACT checklist): concept proposal and pilot. *Res Integr Peer Rev.* 2023;8(1):6.
88. Wilkinson J, Heal C, Antoniou GA, Flemyng E, Alfievic Z, Avenell A, et al. Protocol for the development of a tool (INSPECT-SR) to identify problematic randomised controlled trials in systematic reviews of health interventions. *medRxiv.* 2023.
89. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2019;366:l4898.
90. Zhao YM, Shang YM, Song WB, Li QQ, Xie H, Xu QF, et al. Follow-up study of the pulmonary function and related physiological characteristics of COVID-19 survivors three months after recovery. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020;25:100463.
91. Graham EL, Clark JR, Orban ZS, Lim PH, Szymanski AL, Taylor C, et al. Persistent neurologic symptoms and cognitive dysfunction in non-hospitalized Covid-19 "long haulers". *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2021;8(5):1073-85.
92. Imam MS, Abdelazim MH, Abdelazim AH, Ismaiel WF, Gamal M, Abourehab MAS, et al. Efficacy of pentasodium diethylenetriamine pentaacetate in ameliorating anosmia post COVID-19. *Am J Otolaryngol.* 2023;44(4):103871.
93. Pitre T, Kirsh S, Jassal T, Anderson M, Padoan A, Xiang A, et al. The impact of blinding on trial results: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cochrane Evidence Synthesis and Methods.* 2023;1(4):e12015.
94. Thorlund K, Walter SD, Johnston BC, Furukawa TA, Guyatt GH. Pooling health-related quality of life outcomes in meta-analysis-a tutorial and review of methods for enhancing interpretability. *Res Synth Methods.* 2011;2(3):188-203.

95. Sadeghirad B, Foroutan F, Zoratti MJ, Busse JW, Brignardello-Petersen R, Guyatt G, et al. Theory and practice of Bayesian and frequentist frameworks for network meta-analysis. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2022.
96. Langan D, Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Bowden J, Veroniki AA, Kontopantelis E, et al. A comparison of heterogeneity variance estimators in simulated random-effects meta-analyses. *Res Synth Methods*. 2019;10(1):83-98.
97. Higgins JP TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA, editor(s). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2nd ed. Chichester (UK): John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
98. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2002;21(11):1539-58.
99. Mittlböck M, Heinzl H. A simulation study comparing properties of heterogeneity measures in meta-analyses. *Stat Med*. 2006;25(24):4321-33.
100. Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Carpenter JR, Schumacher M. Undue reliance on I^2 in assessing heterogeneity may mislead. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2008;8:79.
101. Mueller KF, Meerpohl JJ, Briel M, Antes G, von Elm E, Lang B, et al. Methods for detecting, quantifying, and adjusting for dissemination bias in meta-analysis are described. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;80:25-33.
102. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *Bmj*. 2011;343:d4002.
103. Chaimani A, Salanti G, Leucht S, Geddes JR, Cipriani A. Common pitfalls and mistakes in the set-up, analysis and interpretation of results in network meta-analysis: what clinicians should look for in a published article. *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2017;20(3):88-94.
104. Trinquart L, Attiche N, Bafeta A, Porcher R, Ravaud P. Uncertainty in Treatment Rankings: Reanalysis of Network Meta-analyses of Randomized Trials. *Ann Intern Med*. 2016;164(10):666-73.
105. Mbuagbaw L, Rochweg B, Jaeschke R, Heels-Andsell D, Alhazzani W, Thabane L, et al. Approaches to interpreting and choosing the best treatments in network meta-analyses. *Syst Rev*. 2017;6(1):79.
106. Thom H, Leahy J, Jansen JP. Network Meta-analysis on Disconnected Evidence Networks When Only Aggregate Data Are Available: Modified Methods to Include Disconnected Trials and Single-Arm Studies while Minimizing Bias. *Med Decis Making*. 2022;42(7):906-22.
107. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction- GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):383-94.
108. van Valkenhoef G, Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Automated generation of node-splitting models for assessment of inconsistency in network meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2016;7(1):80-93.
109. Ceban F, Kulzhabayeva D, Rodrigues NB, Di Vincenzo JD, Gill H, Subramaniapillai M, et al. COVID-19 vaccination for the prevention and treatment of long COVID: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2023;111:211-29.
110. Fields WS, Lemak NA, Frankowski RF, Hardy RJ, Bigelow RH. Controlled trial of aspirin in cerebral ischemia. *Circulation*. 1980;62(6 Pt 2):V90-6.
111. A randomized trial of aspirin and sulfinpyrazone in threatened stroke. *N Engl J Med*. 1978;299(2):53-9.
112. Collaborative overview of randomised trials of antiplatelet therapy--I: Prevention of death, myocardial infarction, and stroke by prolonged antiplatelet therapy in various categories of patients. Antiplatelet Trialists' Collaboration. *Bmj*. 1994;308(6921):81-106.
113. Amery A, Birkenhäger W, Brixko P, Bulpitt C, Clement D, de Leeuw P, et al. Influence of antihypertensive drug treatment on morbidity and mortality in patients over the age of 60 years.

European Working Party on High blood pressure in the Elderly (EWPHE) results: sub-group analysis on entry stratification. *J Hypertens Suppl.* 1986;4(6):S642-7.

114. Gueyffier F, Bulpitt C, Boissel JP, Schron E, Ekblom T, Fagard R, et al. Antihypertensive drugs in very old people: a subgroup meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *INDANA Group. Lancet.* 1999;353(9155):793-6.

115. Weisberg LA. The efficacy and safety of ticlopidine and aspirin in non-whites: analysis of a patient subgroup from the Ticlopidine Aspirin Stroke Study. *Neurology.* 1993;43(1):27-31.

116. Gorelick PB, Richardson D, Kelly M, Ruland S, Hung E, Harris Y, et al. Aspirin and ticlopidine for prevention of recurrent stroke in black patients: a randomized trial. *Jama.* 2003;289(22):2947-57.

117. Rothwell PM. Treating individuals 2. Subgroup analysis in randomised controlled trials: importance, indications, and interpretation. *Lancet.* 2005;365(9454):176-86.

118. Wallach JD, Sullivan PG, Trepanowski JF, Sainani KL, Steyerberg EW, Ioannidis JP. Evaluation of Evidence of Statistical Support and Corroboration of Subgroup Claims in Randomized Clinical Trials. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2017;177(4):554-60.

119. Schandelmaier S, Chang Y, Devasenapathy N, Devji T, Kwong JSW, Colunga Lozano LE, et al. A systematic survey identified 36 criteria for assessing effect modification claims in randomized trials or meta-analyses. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2019;113:159-67.

120. Donegan S, Williams L, Dias S, Tudur-Smith C, Welton N. Exploring treatment by covariate interactions using subgroup analysis and meta-regression in cochrane reviews: a review of recent practice. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(6):e0128804.

121. Kasenda B, Schandelmaier S, Sun X, von Elm E, You J, Blümle A, et al. Subgroup analyses in randomised controlled trials: cohort study on trial protocols and journal publications. *Bmj.* 2014;349:g4539.

122. Sun X, Briel M, Busse JW, You JJ, Akl EA, Mejza F, et al. Credibility of claims of subgroup effects in randomised controlled trials: systematic review. *Bmj.* 2012;344:e1553.

123. Dahabreh IJ, Hayward R, Kent DM. Using group data to treat individuals: understanding heterogeneous treatment effects in the age of precision medicine and patient-centred evidence. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2016;45(6):2184-93.

124. Koopman L, van der Heijden GJ, Hoes AW, Grobbee DE, Rovers MM. Empirical comparison of subgroup effects in conventional and individual patient data meta-analyses. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care.* 2008;24(3):358-61.

125. Fisher DJ, Carpenter JR, Morris TP, Freeman SC, Tierney JF. Meta-analytical methods to identify who benefits most from treatments: daft, deluded, or deft approach? *Bmj.* 2017;356:j573.

126. Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, Schmid CH, Devasenapathy N, Hayward RA, et al. Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses. *Cmaj.* 2020;192(32):E901-e6.

127. Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G. Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(10):e76654.

128. Team RDC. Network Meta-Analysis using Frequentist Methods. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022.

129. Brignardello-Petersen R, Bonner A, Alexander PE, Siemieniuk RA, Furukawa TA, Rochwerf B, et al. Advances in the GRADE approach to rate the certainty in estimates from a network meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2018;93:36-44.

130. Puhan MA, Schünemann HJ, Murad MH, Li T, Brignardello-Petersen R, Singh JA, et al. A GRADE Working Group approach for rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-analysis. *Bmj.* 2014;349:g5630.

131. Brignardello-Petersen R, Mustafa RA, Siemieniuk RAC, Murad MH, Agoritsas T, Izcovich A, et al. GRADE approach to rate the certainty from a network meta-analysis: addressing incoherence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2019;108:77-85.
132. Zeng L, Brignardello-Petersen R, Hultcrantz M, Mustafa RA, Murad MH, Iorio A, et al. GRADE Guidance 34: update on rating imprecision using a minimally contextualized approach. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2022;150:216-24.
133. Mouelhi Y, Jouve E, Castelli C, Gentile S. How is the minimal clinically important difference established in health-related quality of life instruments? Review of anchors and methods. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2020;18(1):136.
134. Schünemann HJ, Neumann I, Hultcrantz M, Brignardello-Petersen R, Zeng L, Murad MH, et al. GRADE guidance 35: update on rating imprecision for assessing contextualized certainty of evidence and making decisions. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2022;150:225-42.
135. Zeng L, Li SA, Yang M, Yan L, Helsing LM, Bretthauer M, et al. Qualitative study of guideline panelists: innovative surveys provided valuable insights regarding patient values and preferences. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023;161:173-80.
136. Brignardello-Petersen R, Tomlinson G, Florez I, Rind DM, Chu D, Morgan R, et al. Grading of recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation concept article 5: addressing intransitivity in a network meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023;160:151-9.
137. Santesso N, Glenton C, Dahm P, Garner P, Akl EA, Alper B, et al. GRADE guidelines 26: informative statements to communicate the findings of systematic reviews of interventions. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2020;119:126-35.
138. Brignardello-Petersen R, Florez ID, Izcovich A, Santesso N, Hazlewood G, Alhazanni W, et al. GRADE approach to drawing conclusions from a network meta-analysis using a minimally contextualised framework. *Bmj*. 2020;371:m3900.
139. Phillips MR, Sadeghirad B, Busse JW, Brignardello-Petersen R, Cuello-Garcia CA, Kenji Nampo F, et al. Development and design validation of a novel network meta-analysis presentation tool for multiple outcomes: a qualitative descriptive study. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(6):e056400.
140. Akl EA, El Khoury R, Khamis AM, El Mikati IK, Pardo-Hernandez H, Farran S, et al. The life and death of living systematic reviews: a methodological survey. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023.
141. Murad MH, Wang Z, Chu H, Lin L, El Mikati IK, Khabsa J, et al. Proposed triggers for retiring a living systematic review. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2023;28(5):348-52.
142. Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Macdonald H, Guyatt GH, Brandt L, Vandvik PO. Introduction to BMJ Rapid Recommendations. *Bmj*. 2016;354:i5191.
143. Guest G, Namey E, Chen M. A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(5):e0232076.
144. Maurer M, Siegel JE, Firminger KB, Lowers J, Dutta T, Chang JS. Lessons Learned from Developing Plain Language Summaries of Research Studies. *Health Lit Res Pract*. 2021;5(2):e155-e61.
145. Stoll M, Kerwer M, Lieb K, Chasiotis A. Plain language summaries: A systematic review of theory, guidelines and empirical research. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(6):e0268789.
146. World Health O. WHO handbook for guideline development. 2nd ed. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014 2014.
147. Hill J, Bullock I, Alderson P. A summary of the methods that the National Clinical Guideline Centre uses to produce clinical guidelines for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011;154(11):752-7.
148. Wonderling D, Sawyer L, Fenu E, Lovibond K, Laramée P. National Clinical Guideline Centre cost-effectiveness assessment for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011;154(11):758-65.

149. White H, McDonald SJ, Barber B, Davis J, Burr L, Nair P, et al. Care for adults with COVID-19: living guidelines from the National COVID-19 Clinical Evidence Taskforce. *Med J Aust.* 2022;217(7):368-78.
150. Michelen M, Manoharan L, Elkheir N, Cheng V, Dagens A, Hastie C, et al. Characterising long COVID: a living systematic review. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2021;6(9).
151. Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, Alonso J, Patrick DL, de Vet HCW, et al. COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews of patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res.* 2018;27(5):1147-57.
152. Wang Z, Nayfeh T, Tetzlaff J, O'Brien P, Murad MH. Error rates of human reviewers during abstract screening in systematic reviews. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(1):e0227742.
153. Gartlehner G, Affengruber L, Titscher V, Noel-Storr A, Dooley G, Ballarini N, et al. Single-reviewer abstract screening missed 13 percent of relevant studies: a crowd-based, randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2020;121:20-8.
154. Waffenschmidt S, Knelangen M, Sieben W, Bühn S, Pieper D. Single screening versus conventional double screening for study selection in systematic reviews: a methodological systematic review. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2019;19(1):132.
155. Buscemi N, Hartling L, Vandermeer B, Tjosvold L, Klassen TP. Single data extraction generated more errors than double data extraction in systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2006;59(7):697-703.
156. Jones AP, Remington T, Williamson PR, Ashby D, Smyth RL. High prevalence but low impact of data extraction and reporting errors were found in Cochrane systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2005;58(7):741-2.
157. McKiernan EC, Bourne PE, Brown CT, Buck S, Kenall A, Lin J, et al. How open science helps researchers succeed. *Elife.* 2016;5.
158. Tanne JH. Covid-19: US agency launches raft of clinical trials of treatments for long covid. *Bmj.* 2023;382:1797.
159. Cheung AMG, Susie E; Graves, Donna Lorraine; Archambault, Patrick; Awadalla, Philip; Bakal, Jeffrey A; Bhéreur, Anne; Brotto, Lori Anne; Busse, Jason W; Cameron, Jill I; Churchill, Katie; Crawley, Angela M; Décary, Simon; Durand, Madeleine; Falcone, Emilia L; Fowler, Robert A; Gommerman, Jennifer L; Graham, Kathryn E; Graham, Simon J; Groot, Gary; Gross, Douglas P; Guyatt, Gordon H; Halas, Gayle; Ho, Chester; Hohl, Corinne M; Holroyd, Brian R; Janjua, Naveed Z; Johnson, Pauline; Juando Prats, Clara; Kashuba, Sherri; Katz, Alan; Kho, Michelle E; Lam, Grace Y; Lamontagne, Francois; Langlois, Marc-Andre; Lavis, John N; Law, Susan K; LeBlanc, Annie; Levin, Adeera; Liu-Ambrose, Teresa Y; Liu, Peter P; Lix, Lisa M; Mandhane, Piush; Mann, Balraj; McGrail, Kimberlyn M; McNagny, Kelly M; Miciak, Maxi A; Mishra, Sharmistha; Muhajarine, Nazeem; Mukherjee, Manali; Mushquash, Christopher J; Nacul, Luis; O'Brien, Kelly K; Osgood, Nathaniel D; Papathanasoglou, Elisavet; Penninger, Josef; Piche, Alain; Pinto, Andrew D; Quinn, Kieran L; Rafferty, Ellen; Raj, Satish R; Razak, Fahad; Russell, James A; Sander, Beate H; Sekuler, Allison B; Soares, Claudio D; Tailfeathers, Esther; Tomlinson, George A; Tricco, Andrea C; Valdez, Yanet; Verma, Amol; Vohra, Sunita; Walmsley, Sharon L; Walsh, Jillian; Weeks, Laura C; Williams, Kienan; Wu, Jianhong; Yeung, Rae S. Long COVID Web: Pan-Canadian Post-COVID Condition Research Network 2022 [Available from: https://webapps.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/decisions/p/project_details.html?applId=474666&lang=en.
160. Guyatt GH, Ebrahim S, Alonso-Coello P, Johnston BC, Mathioudakis AG, Briel M, et al. GRADE guidelines 17: assessing the risk of bias associated with missing participant outcome data in a body of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2017;87:14-22.