

1 **Interventions for the management of post COVID-19 condition (long**  
2 **COVID): Protocol for a living systematic review & network meta-**  
3 **analysis**  
4

5 Dena Zeraatkar

6 *Departments of Anesthesia and Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact*  
7 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

8 Michael Ling

9 *Departments of Anesthesia*  
10 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

11 Sarah Kirsh

12 *Departments of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact*  
13 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

14 Tanvir Jassal

15 *Departments of Anesthesia*  
16 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

17 Tyler Pitre

18 *Division of Respiriology, Department of Medicine*  
19 *University of Toronto, Toronto, ON*

20 Samantha Chakraborty

21 *Cochrane Australia, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine,*  
22 *Monash University, Melbourne, Australia*

23 Tari Turner

24 *Cochrane Australia, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine,*  
25 *Monash University, Melbourne, Australia*

26 Lyn Turkstra

27 *School of Rehabilitation Science and Program in Neuroscience*  
28 *McMaster University*

29 Roger S. McIntyre

30 *Department of Psychiatry and Pharmacology,*  
31 *University of Toronto, Toronto, ON*

32 Ariel Izcovich

33 *Department of Medicine*  
34 *Universidad del Salvador, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

35 Lawrence Mbuagbaw

36 *Departments of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact*  
37 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

38 Thomas Agoritsas

39 *Division General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine*  
40 *University Hospitals of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland*  
41 *Departments of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact*  
42 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

43 Signe A. Flottorp

44 *Centre for Epidemic Interventions Research*

45 *Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway*

46 Paul Garner

47 *Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine*

48 Rachel Couban

49 *Departments of Anesthesia*

50 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

51 Jason W. Busse

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

53 *McMaster University, Hamilton, ON*

54

55

56 \*Corresponding author:

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

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

67 **Data:** Not applicable.

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

70 **Word count:** 6,154

71

72 **Abstract**

73 **Background**

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

79 **Objective**

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

83 **Methods**

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

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

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

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

98 **Conclusion**

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

103

## 104 **Background**

105 The COVID-19 pandemic produced a global health crisis, affecting millions worldwide and causing  
106 significant health and economic consequences ([1](#), [2](#)). The prevalence of long COVID is difficult to  
107 establish, given most symptoms are nonspecific, and many studies lack sufficiently rigorous designs to  
108 confidently attribute symptoms to COVID-19 infection ([3](#), [4](#)). While most patients recover from COVID-  
109 19, evidence suggests that up to 15% of survivors may experience long-term health effects, including  
110 fatigue, myalgia, and impaired cognitive function—termed post COVID-19 condition or long COVID ([5](#)-  
111 [14](#)). The etiology of long COVID remains unclear and investigators have proposed several potential  
112 causes including viral persistence, autoimmunity, microclots, and psychological mechanisms ([15](#)).

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

120 There is considerable overlap of signs, symptoms, and medical history between long COVID and myalgic  
121 encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS) ([23](#)). For example, ME/CFS often emerges  
122 following viral infections, similar to long COVID that emerges following infection with SARS-CoV-2 ([23](#)).  
123 Notably, approximately half of patients diagnosed with long COVID also meet criteria for ME/CFS ([24](#)-  
124 [26](#)).

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

130 Several trials testing interventions for the management of long COVID have been published to date ([30](#)-  
131 [33](#)) and hundreds more are planned or ongoing ([34-36](#)). These trials, however, will be published faster  
132 than evidence users, such as clinicians and patients, can read them or make sense of them and will come  
133 with strengths and limitations that may not be immediately apparent.

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

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

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

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

## 155 **Methods**

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

### 158 ***Eligibility criteria***

159 Eligible studies will randomize adults with long COVID, defined by the World Health Organization (WHO)  
160 as symptoms at three or more months following laboratory confirmed, probable, or suspected COVID-19  
161 infection and that persist for at least two months, to pharmacologic or non-pharmacologic  
162 interventions, placebo, sham, usual care, or to alternative pharmacologic or non-pharmacologic  
163 interventions, without any restrictions on date or language of publication ([21](#)). Given the diverse  
164 manifestations of long COVID, our review will not further restrict eligibility based on diagnostic criteria  
165 ([21](#)). Subgroup analyses will, however, investigate the differences in the effectiveness of interventions  
166 according to diagnostic criteria.

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

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

174 At this time, there is too little known about long COVID to anticipate which interventions may be  
175 effective. Trials are investigating many types of interventions, including drugs (e.g., colchicine,  
176 sulodexide, beta-blockers), behavioral and physical therapies (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, aerobic  
177 exercise training), dietary supplements, and medical devices (transcranial direct current stimulation) ([28](#),  
178 [35](#), [53](#), [54](#)). We will not restrict eligibility based on the type of intervention and anticipate including trials  
179 addressing a diverse range of therapies.

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

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

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

### 196 ***Data sources and search strategy***

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

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

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

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

### 220 ***Study selection***

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

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

### 227 **Data extraction**

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

232 Reviewers will collect data on trial characteristics (e.g., trial design, country of origin, funding, diagnostic  
233 criteria for long COVID), patient characteristics (e.g., age, sex and gender, employment and education  
234 status, receipt of COVID-19 vaccination, method of acute COVID-19 diagnosis, severity of acute COVID-  
235 19 infection, duration of long COVID, number of infections, equity-related characteristics, long COVID  
236 symptoms), characteristics of interventions and comparators (e.g., type of intervention, treatment  
237 duration), and patient-important outcomes.

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

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

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

Fatigue	Modified Fatigue Impact Scale ( <a href="#">65</a> ); Fatigue Assessment Scale ( <a href="#">66</a> ); Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory ( <a href="#">67</a> ); Chalder Fatigue Questionnaire ( <a href="#">68</a> ); Checklist Individual Strength Fatigue Subscale ( <a href="#">69</a> )
Pain severity	Visual Analog Scale ( <a href="#">70</a> ); Numerical Rating Scale; Brief Pain Inventory (severity subscale) ( <a href="#">71</a> ), McGill Pain Questionnaire ( <a href="#">72</a> )

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



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

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

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

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

#### 304 ***Data synthesis and analysis***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

370 19, and SARS-CoV-2 variant (17). Should we choose to include evidence from ME/CFS trials, we will also  
371 consider ME/CFS as a potential source of incoherence. In the event that tests for effect modification are  
372 unable to identify a credible source of incoherence, we will downgrade the certainty of evidence.  
373 Conversely, if we confidently identify the source of incoherence, we will perform separate analyses  
374 based on that source.

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

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

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

### 390 ***Certainty of evidence and reporting***

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

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

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

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

### 432 **Reporting of results**

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

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

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

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

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

#### 460 ***Updating and triggers for retirement***

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

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

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

#### 478 ***Conflicts of interest***

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

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

#### 490 ***Patient involvement***

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

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

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

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

## 510 **Discussion**

### 511 ***Anticipated findings***

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

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

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

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

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

#### 540 ***Strengths and limitations***

541 Strengths of this living systematic review and network meta-analysis include a broad search strategy and  
542 inclusion criteria, consideration of outcomes of interest reflecting the values and preferences of  
543 patients, screening of studies and extraction of data in duplicate to reduce the opportunity for errors  
544 ([151-156](#)), application of GRADE to evaluate the certainty of evidence, and commitment to data sharing  
545 and open science practices ([157](#)).

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

550 Second, while there are many trials underway, trials have progressed at a slower pace than anticipated  
551 ([57](#)). Our ongoing surveillance of trial registries has identified over 200 eligible trials, indicating that  
552 considerable trial evidence is forthcoming. For example, the US RECOVER program includes five adaptive  
553 platform trials ([158](#)). In 2023, Canada funded a \$20 million research network, called Long Covid Web,  
554 which is also anticipated to support clinical trials ([159](#)). Further, RECLAIM, the Canadian platform trial  
555 investigating interventions for long COVID, will also contribute evidence for several therapeutic  
556 interventions. Our plan to integrate methods for prospective systematic reviews will also ensure that  
557 there will be sufficient data to make a living review both feasible and valuable for evidence users.

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

#### 568 **Conclusion**

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

573

## 574 References

- 575 1. Panneer S, Kantamaneni K, Palaniswamy U, Bhat L, Pushparaj RRB, Nayar KR, et al. Health,  
576 Economic and Social Development Challenges of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Strategies for Multiple and  
577 Interconnected Issues. *Healthcare*. 2022;10(5):770.
- 578 2. Delardas O, Kechagias KS, Pontikos PN, Giannos P. Socio-Economic Impacts and Challenges of the  
579 Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19): An Updated Review. *Sustainability*. 2022;14(15):9699.
- 580 3. Haslam A, Prasad V. Comparability of Control and Comparison Groups in Studies Assessing Long  
581 COVID. *Am J Med*. 2023.
- 582 4. Tracy Beth H, Shamez L, Vinay P. How methodological pitfalls have created widespread  
583 misunderstanding about long COVID. *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*. 2023:bmjebm-2023-112338.
- 584 5. Chen C, Hauptert SR, Zimmermann L, Shi X, Fritsche LG, Mukherjee B. Global Prevalence of Post-  
585 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Condition or Long COVID: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic  
586 Review *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2022;226(9):1593-607.
- 587 6. Nasserie T, Hittle M, Goodman SN. Assessment of the Frequency and Variety of Persistent  
588 Symptoms Among Patients With COVID-19: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Netw Open*.  
589 2021;4(5):e2111417.
- 590 7. Perlis RH, Lunz Trujillo K, Safarpour A, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Druckman J, et al. Association  
591 of Post-COVID-19 Condition Symptoms and Employment Status. *JAMA Network Open*.  
592 2023;6(2):e2256152-e.
- 593 8. Wulf Hanson S, Abbafati C, Aerts JG, Al-Aly Z, Ashbaugh C, Ballouz T, et al. Estimated Global  
594 Proportions of Individuals With Persistent Fatigue, Cognitive, and Respiratory Symptom Clusters  
595 Following Symptomatic COVID-19 in 2020 and 2021. *Jama*. 2022;328(16):1604-15.
- 596 9. Carfi A, Bernabei R, Landi F. Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *Jama*.  
597 2020;324(6):603-5.
- 598 10. Xiong Q, Xu M, Li J, Liu Y, Zhang J, Xu Y, et al. Clinical sequelae of COVID-19 survivors in Wuhan,  
599 China: a single-centre longitudinal study. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021;27(1):89-95.
- 600 11. Goërtz YMJ, Van Herck M, Delbressine JM, Vaes AW, Meys R, Machado FVC, et al. Persistent  
601 symptoms 3 months after a SARS-CoV-2 infection: the post-COVID-19 syndrome? *ERJ Open Res*.  
602 2020;6(4).
- 603 12. Nehme M, Braillard O, Alcoba G, Aebischer Perone S, Courvoisier D, Chappuis F, et al. COVID-19  
604 Symptoms: Longitudinal Evolution and Persistence in Outpatient Settings. *Ann Intern Med*.  
605 2021;174(5):723-5.
- 606 13. Perlis RH, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Safarpour A, Lunz Trujillo K, Simonson MD, et al.  
607 Prevalence and Correlates of Long COVID Symptoms Among US Adults. *JAMA Netw Open*.  
608 2022;5(10):e2238804.
- 609 14. Ceban F, Ling S, Lui LMW, Lee Y, Gill H, Teopiz KM, et al. Fatigue and cognitive impairment in Post-  
610 COVID-19 Syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2022;101:93-135.
- 611 15. Turner S, Khan MA, Putrino D, Woodcock A, Kell DB, Pretorius E. Long COVID: pathophysiological  
612 factors and abnormalities of coagulation. *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. 2023;34(6):321-44.
- 613 16. Reese JT, Blau H, Casiraghi E, Bergquist T, Loomba JJ, Callahan TJ, et al. Generalisable long COVID  
614 subtypes: findings from the NIH N3C and RECOVER programmes. *EBioMedicine*. 2023;87:104413.
- 615 17. Maglietta G, Diodati F, Puntoni M, Lazzarelli S, Marcomini B, Patrizi L, et al. Prognostic Factors for  
616 Post-COVID-19 Syndrome: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*  
617 [Internet]. 2022; 11(6).
- 618 18. Notarte KI, de Oliveira MHS, Peligro PJ, Velasco JV, Macaranas I, Ver AT, et al. Age, Sex and  
619 Previous Comorbidities as Risk Factors Not Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection for Long COVID-19: A  
620 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11(24).



- 621 19. Wang S, Quan L, Chavarro JE, Slopen N, Kubzansky LD, Koenen KC, et al. Associations of  
622 Depression, Anxiety, Worry, Perceived Stress, and Loneliness Prior to Infection With Risk of Post-COVID-  
623 19 Conditions. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2022;79(11):1081-91.
- 624 20. Matta J, Wiernik E, Robineau O, Carrat F, Touvier M, Severi G, et al. Association of Self-reported  
625 COVID-19 Infection and SARS-CoV-2 Serology Test Results With Persistent Physical Symptoms Among  
626 French Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(1):19-25.
- 627 21. Soriano JB, Murthy S, Marshall JC, Relan P, Diaz JV. A clinical case definition of post-COVID-19  
628 condition by a Delphi consensus. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2022;22(4):e102-e7.
- 629 22. Fumagalli C, Zocchi C, Tassetti L, Silverii MV, Amato C, Livi L, et al. Factors associated with  
630 persistence of symptoms 1 year after COVID-19: A longitudinal, prospective phone-based interview  
631 follow-up cohort study. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2022;97:36-41.
- 632 23. Komaroff AL, Lipkin WI. ME/CFS and Long COVID share similar symptoms and biological  
633 abnormalities: road map to the literature. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2023;10:1187163.
- 634 24. Bonilla H, Quach TC, Tiwari A, Bonilla AE, Miglis M, Yang PC, et al. Myalgic  
635 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome is common in post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection  
636 (PASC): Results from a post-COVID-19 multidisciplinary clinic. *Front Neurol*. 2023;14:1090747.
- 637 25. Twomey R, DeMars J, Franklin K, Culos-Reed SN, Weatherald J, Wrightson JG. Chronic Fatigue  
638 and Postexertional Malaise in People Living With Long COVID: An Observational Study. *Phys Ther*.  
639 2022;102(4).
- 640 26. Kedor C, Freitag H, Meyer-Arndt L, Wittke K, Hanitsch LG, Zoller T, et al. A prospective  
641 observational study of post-COVID-19 chronic fatigue syndrome following the first pandemic wave in  
642 Germany and biomarkers associated with symptom severity. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):5104.
- 643 27. Subbaraman N. US health agency will invest \$1 billion to investigate 'long COVID'. *Nature*.  
644 2021;591(7850):356.
- 645 28. Harris E. Federal Government Announces Long COVID Trials, Research Office. *JAMA*. 2023.
- 646 29. Pitre T, Cheng S, Cusano E, Khan N, Mikhail D, Leung G, et al. Methodology and design of  
647 platform trials: a meta-epidemiological study. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023;157:1-12.
- 648 30. Hansen KS, Mogensen TH, Agergaard J, Schiøttz-Christensen B, Østergaard L, Vibholm LK, et al.  
649 High-dose coenzyme Q10 therapy versus placebo in patients with post COVID-19 condition: a  
650 randomized, phase 2, crossover trial. *Lancet Reg Health Eur*. 2023;24:100539.
- 651 31. Spencer LH, Hendry A, Mankanjuola A, Anthony BF, Davies J, Pisavadia K, et al. What interventions  
652 or best practice are there to support people with Long COVID, or similar post-viral conditions or  
653 conditions characterised by fatigue, to return to normal activities: a rapid review. *medRxiv*.  
654 2023:2023.01.24.23284947.
- 655 32. Veronese N, Bonica R, Cotugno S, Tulone O, Camporeale M, Smith L, et al. Interventions for  
656 Improving Long COVID-19 Symptomatology: A Systematic Review. *Viruses*. 2022;14(9).
- 657 33. Bramante C, Buse JB, Liebovitz D, Nicklas J, Puskarich M, Cohen KR, Belani H, Anderson B, Huling  
658 JD, Thompson J, Pullen M, Wirtz EL, Siegel L, Proper J, Odde DJ, Klatt N, Sherwood NE, Lindberg S, Karger  
659 AB, Beckman KB, Erickson S, Fenno S, Hartman K, Rose M, Mehta T, Patel B, Griffiths G, Bhat N, Murray  
660 TA, Boulware DR. Outpatient Treatment of COVID-19 and the Development of Long COVID Over 10  
661 Months: A Multi-Center, Quadruple-Blind, Parallel Group Randomized Phase 3 Trial. [Internet]. [accessed  
662 2022 Mar 7]. Available from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4375620> or  
663 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4375620>.
- 664 34. Chao Y-S, McGill SC, Gates M. Clinical classification and interventions for post-COVID-19  
665 condition: a scoping review. *Can J Health Technol*. 2022 May;2(5). Available from:  
666 <https://www.cadth.ca/post-covid-19-condition-scoping-review>. Accessed 2022 Dec 9.
- 667 35. Chee YJ, Fan BE, Young BE, Dalan R, Lye DC. Clinical trials on the pharmacological treatment of  
668 long COVID: A systematic review. *J Med Virol*. 2023;95(1):e28289.

- 669 36. Ledford H. Long-COVID treatments: why the world is still waiting. *Nature*. 2022;608(7922):258-  
670 60.
- 671 37. Davies M. Long covid patients travel abroad for expensive and experimental "blood washing".  
672 *Bmj*. 2022;378:o1671.
- 673 38. Ladyzhets B. 'Underwhelming': NIH trials fail to test meaningful long Covid treatments — after  
674 2.5 years and \$1 billion. *Stat News*. 2023.
- 675 39. Sellers F. Desperate covid long-haulers turn to costly, unproven treatments: *Washington Post*;  
676 2022 [Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/11/25/long-covid-treatments-unproven-brain-fog/>.  
677 [unproven-brain-fog/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2022/11/25/long-covid-treatments-unproven-brain-fog/).
- 678 40. Belluck P. Paxlovid may reduce risk of long Covid in eligible patients, study finds. *The New York*  
679 *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.
- 681 41. Califf DR. And preliminary epidemiological findings point to the distinct possibility of the bivalent  
682 vaccines and antivirals reducing risk of long covid. *Twitter*. 2022 Nov 14. Available from:  
683 [https://twitter.com/DrCaliff\\_FDA/status/1592269459133431809?s=20](https://twitter.com/DrCaliff_FDA/status/1592269459133431809?s=20). Accessed 2023 Feb 19.
- 684 42. Wilson C. Exercise programme helps people with long covid, but it's no panacea. 2024.
- 685 43. Tuller D. Trial By Error: Dutch CBT Study for Long Covid Proves that Unblinded Studies with  
686 Subjective Outcomes Generate Positive Reports: *Virology*; 2023 [Available from:  
687 <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/>.  
688 [unblinded-studies-with-subjective-outcomes-produce-positive-results-as-predicted/](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/).
- 689 44. Vink M, Vink-Niese A. Could Cognitive Behavioural Therapy Be an Effective Treatment for Long  
690 COVID and Post COVID-19 Fatigue Syndrome? Lessons from the Qure Study for Q-Fever Fatigue  
691 Syndrome. *Healthcare [Internet]*. 2020; 8(4).
- 692 45. Elliott JH, Synnot A, Turner T, Simmonds M, Akl EA, McDonald S, et al. Living systematic review:  
693 1. Introduction-the why, what, when, and how. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017;91:23-30.
- 694 46. Elliott JH, Turner T, Clavisi O, Thomas J, Higgins JP, Mavergames C, et al. Living systematic  
695 reviews: an emerging opportunity to narrow the evidence-practice gap. *PLoS Med*.  
696 2014;11(2):e1001603.
- 697 47. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al. The PRISMA  
698 extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health  
699 care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;162(11):777-84.
- 700 48. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020  
701 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj*. 2021;372:n71.
- 702 49. Zeraatkar D, Pitre T, Leung G, Cusano E, Agarwal A, Khalid F, et al. Consistency of covid-19 trial  
703 preprints with published reports and impact for decision making: retrospective review. *BMJ Medicine*.  
704 2022;1(1).
- 705 50. Davidson M, Evrenoglou T, Graña C, Chaimani A, Boutron I. Comparison of effect estimates  
706 between preprints and peer-reviewed journal articles of COVID-19 trials. *BMC Med Res Methodol*.  
707 2024;24(1):9.
- 708 51. Janda G, Khetpal V, Shi X, Ross JS, Wallach JD. Comparison of Clinical Study Results Reported in  
709 medRxiv Preprints vs Peer-reviewed Journal Articles. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(12):e2245847.
- 710 52. Weibel S, Popp M, Reis S, Skoetz N, Garner P, Sydenham E. Identifying and managing problematic  
711 trials: A research integrity assessment tool for randomized controlled trials in evidence synthesis. *Res*  
712 *Synth Methods*. 2023;14(3):357-69.
- 713 53. Kuut TA, Müller F, Aldenkamp A, Assmann-Schuilwerve E, Braamse A, Geerlings SE, et al. A  
714 randomised controlled trial testing the efficacy of Fit after COVID, a cognitive behavioural therapy  
715 targeting severe post-infectious fatigue following COVID-19 (ReCOVer): study protocol. *Trials*.  
716 2021;22(1):867.

- 717 54. Davis HE, McCorkell L, Vogel JM, Topol EJ. Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and  
718 recommendations. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2023;21(3):133-46.
- 719 55. Thaweethai T, Jolley SE, Karlson EW, Levitan EB, Levy B, McComsey GA, et al. Development of a  
720 Definition of Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA*. 2023;329(22):1934-46.
- 721 56. Dickersin K, Min YI. Publication bias: the problem that won't go away. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*.  
722 1993;703:135-46; discussion 46-8.
- 723 57. Wadman M. Long Covid is a 'national crisis.' So why are grants taking so long to get. *Science*.  
724 2022;376(6599):1262-3.
- 725 58. Verdugo-Paiva F, Vergara C, Ávila C, Castro-Guevara JA, Cid J, Contreras V, et al. COVID-19 Living  
726 Overview of Evidence repository is highly comprehensive and can be used as a single source for COVID-  
727 19 studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2022;149:195-202.
- 728 59. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane*  
729 *Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.3 (updated February 2022). Cochrane, 2022.  
730 Available from [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
- 731 60. Shankar-Hari M, Vale CL, Godolphin PJ, Fisher D, Higgins JPT, Spiga F, et al. Association Between  
732 Administration of IL-6 Antagonists and Mortality Among Patients Hospitalized for COVID-19: A Meta-  
733 analysis. *Jama*. 2021;326(6):499-518.
- 734 61. Sterne JAC, Murthy S, Diaz JV, Slutsky AS, Villar J, Angus DC, et al. Association Between  
735 Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A  
736 Meta-analysis. *Jama*. 2020;324(13):1330-41.
- 737 62. Siemieniuk RA, Bartoszko JJ, Zeraatkar D, Kum E, Qasim A, Martinez JPD, et al. Drug treatments  
738 for covid-19: living systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Bmj*. 2020;370:m2980.
- 739 63. Munblit D, Nicholson TR, Needham DM, Seylanova N, Parr C, Chen J, et al. Studying the post-  
740 COVID-19 condition: research challenges, strategies, and importance of Core Outcome Set development.  
741 *BMC Med*. 2022;20(1):50.
- 742 64. Munblit D, Nicholson T, Akrami A, Apfelbacher C, Chen J, De Groote W, et al. A core outcome set  
743 for post-COVID-19 condition in adults for use in clinical practice and research: an international Delphi  
744 consensus study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2022;10(7):715-24.
- 745 65. Fisk JD, Ritvo PG, Ross L, Haase DA, Marrie TJ, Schlech WF. Measuring the functional impact of  
746 fatigue: initial validation of the fatigue impact scale. *Clin Infect Dis*. 1994;18 Suppl 1:S79-83.
- 747 66. Michielsen HJ, De Vries J, Van Heck GL. Psychometric qualities of a brief self-rated fatigue  
748 measure: The Fatigue Assessment Scale. *J Psychosom Res*. 2003;54(4):345-52.
- 749 67. Smets EM, Garssen B, Bonke B, De Haes JC. The Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI)  
750 psychometric qualities of an instrument to assess fatigue. *J Psychosom Res*. 1995;39(3):315-25.
- 751 68. Chalder T, Berelowitz G, Pawlikowska T, Watts L, Wessely S, Wright D, et al. Development of a  
752 fatigue scale. *J Psychosom Res*. 1993;37(2):147-53.
- 753 69. Worm-Smeitink M, Gielissen M, Bloot L, van Laarhoven HWM, van Engelen BGM, van Riel P, et al.  
754 The assessment of fatigue: Psychometric qualities and norms for the Checklist individual strength. *J*  
755 *Psychosom Res*. 2017;98:40-6.
- 756 70. Hayes M. Experimental development of the graphic rating method. *Psychological Bulletin*.  
757 1921;18:98-9.
- 758 71. Cleeland CS, Ryan KM. Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Ann Acad Med*  
759 *Singap*. 1994;23(2):129-38.
- 760 72. Melzack R. The McGill Pain Questionnaire: major properties and scoring methods. *Pain*.  
761 1975;1(3):277-99.
- 762 73. Jason LA, Evans M, Porter N, Brown M, Brown A, Hunnell J, et al. The Development of a Revised  
763 Canadian Myalgic Encephalomyelitis Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Case Definition. *American Journal of*  
764 *Biochemistry and Biotechnology*. 2010;6(2).

- 765 74. Jason LA, Holtzman CS, Sunnquist M, Cotler J. The development of an instrument to assess post-  
766 exertional malaise in patients with myalgic encephalomyelitis and chronic fatigue syndrome. *J Health*  
767 *Psychol.* 2021;26(2):238-48.
- 768 75. Jaeger J. Digit Symbol Substitution Test: The Case for Sensitivity Over Specificity in  
769 Neuropsychological Testing. *J Clin Psychopharmacol.* 2018;38(5):513-9.
- 770 76. Roth RM, Isquith PK, Gioia GA. Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function®--Adult Version.  
771 *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology.* 2005.
- 772 77. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual  
773 framework and item selection. *Med Care.* 1992;30(6):473-83.
- 774 78. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand.*  
775 1983;67(6):361-70.
- 776 79. Hamilton M. The assessment of anxiety states by rating. *Br J Med Psychol.* 1959;32(1):50-5.
- 777 80. Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry.*  
778 1960;23(1):56.
- 779 81. Beck AT, Ward CH, Mendelson M, Mock J, Erbaugh J. An inventory for measuring depression.  
780 *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1961;4:561-71.
- 781 82. Mahler DA, Wells CK. Evaluation of clinical methods for rating dyspnea. *Chest.* 1988;93(3):580-6.
- 782 83. Group TE. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health*  
783 *policy.* 1990;16(3):199-208.
- 784 84. The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the  
785 World Health Organization. *Social Science & Medicine.* 1995;41(10):1403-9.
- 786 85. Carlisle JB. False individual patient data and zombie randomised controlled trials submitted to  
787 *Anaesthesia.* 2021;76(4):472-9.
- 788 86. Ioannidis JPA. Hundreds of thousands of zombie randomised trials circulate among us.  
789 *Anaesthesia.* 2021;76(4):444-7.
- 790 87. Mol BW, Lai S, Rahim A, Bordewijk EM, Wang R, van Eekelen R, et al. Checklist to assess  
791 Trustworthiness in RAndomised Controlled Trials (TRACT checklist): concept proposal and pilot. *Res*  
792 *Integr Peer Rev.* 2023;8(1):6.
- 793 88. Wilkinson J, Heal C, Antoniou GA, Flemyng E, Alfirevic Z, Avenell A, et al. Protocol for the  
794 development of a tool (INSPECT-SR) to identify problematic randomised controlled trials in systematic  
795 reviews of health interventions. *medRxiv.* 2023.
- 796 89. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for  
797 assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ.* 2019;366:l4898.
- 798 90. Zhao YM, Shang YM, Song WB, Li QQ, Xie H, Xu QF, et al. Follow-up study of the pulmonary  
799 function and related physiological characteristics of COVID-19 survivors three months after recovery.  
800 *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020;25:100463.
- 801 91. Graham EL, Clark JR, Orban ZS, Lim PH, Szymanski AL, Taylor C, et al. Persistent neurologic  
802 symptoms and cognitive dysfunction in non-hospitalized Covid-19 "long haulers". *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.*  
803 2021;8(5):1073-85.
- 804 92. Imam MS, Abdelazim MH, Abdelazim AH, Ismaiel WF, Gamal M, Abourehab MAS, et al. Efficacy  
805 of pentasodium diethylenetriamine pentaacetate in ameliorating anosmia post COVID-19. *Am J*  
806 *Otolaryngol.* 2023;44(4):103871.
- 807 93. Pitre T, Kirsh S, Jassal T, Anderson M, Padoan A, Xiang A, et al. The impact of blinding on trial  
808 results: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cochrane Evidence Synthesis and Methods.*  
809 2023;1(4):e12015.
- 810 94. Thorlund K, Walter SD, Johnston BC, Furukawa TA, Guyatt GH. Pooling health-related quality of  
811 life outcomes in meta-analysis-a tutorial and review of methods for enhancing interpretability. *Res Synth*  
812 *Methods.* 2011;2(3):188-203.

- 813 95. Sadeghirad B, Foroutan F, Zoratti MJ, Busse JW, Brignardello-Petersen R, Guyatt G, et al. Theory  
814 and practice of Bayesian and frequentist frameworks for network meta-analysis. *BMJ Evid Based Med.*  
815 2022.
- 816 96. Langan D, Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Bowden J, Veroniki AA, Kontopantelis E, et al. A comparison of  
817 heterogeneity variance estimators in simulated random-effects meta-analyses. *Res Synth Methods.*  
818 2019;10(1):83-98.
- 819 97. Higgins JP TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA, editor(s). *Cochrane Handbook*  
820 *for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2nd ed. Chichester (UK): John Wiley & Sons; 2019.
- 821 98. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med.*  
822 2002;21(11):1539-58.
- 823 99. Mittlböck M, Heinzl H. A simulation study comparing properties of heterogeneity measures in  
824 meta-analyses. *Stat Med.* 2006;25(24):4321-33.
- 825 100. Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Carpenter JR, Schumacher M. Undue reliance on I(2) in assessing  
826 heterogeneity may mislead. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2008;8:79.
- 827 101. Mueller KF, Meerpohl JJ, Briel M, Antes G, von Elm E, Lang B, et al. Methods for detecting,  
828 quantifying, and adjusting for dissemination bias in meta-analysis are described. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
829 2016;80:25-33.
- 830 102. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations for  
831 examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *Bmj.*  
832 2011;343:d4002.
- 833 103. Chaimani A, Salanti G, Leucht S, Geddes JR, Cipriani A. Common pitfalls and mistakes in the set-  
834 up, analysis and interpretation of results in network meta-analysis: what clinicians should look for in a  
835 published article. *Evid Based Ment Health.* 2017;20(3):88-94.
- 836 104. Trinquart L, Attiche N, Bafeta A, Porcher R, Ravaud P. Uncertainty in Treatment Rankings:  
837 Reanalysis of Network Meta-analyses of Randomized Trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 2016;164(10):666-73.
- 838 105. Mbuagbaw L, Rochweg B, Jaeschke R, Heels-Andsell D, Alhazzani W, Thabane L, et al.  
839 Approaches to interpreting and choosing the best treatments in network meta-analyses. *Syst Rev.*  
840 2017;6(1):79.
- 841 106. Thom H, Leahy J, Jansen JP. Network Meta-analysis on Disconnected Evidence Networks When  
842 Only Aggregate Data Are Available: Modified Methods to Include Disconnected Trials and Single-Arm  
843 Studies while Minimizing Bias. *Med Decis Making.* 2022;42(7):906-22.
- 844 107. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-  
845 GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2011;64(4):383-94.
- 846 108. van Valkenhoef G, Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Automated generation of node-splitting models  
847 for assessment of inconsistency in network meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods.* 2016;7(1):80-93.
- 848 109. Ceban F, Kulzhabayeva D, Rodrigues NB, Di Vincenzo JD, Gill H, Subramaniapillai M, et al. COVID-  
849 19 vaccination for the prevention and treatment of long COVID: A systematic review and meta-analysis.  
850 *Brain Behav Immun.* 2023;111:211-29.
- 851 110. Fields WS, Lemak NA, Frankowski RF, Hardy RJ, Bigelow RH. Controlled trial of aspirin in cerebral  
852 ischemia. *Circulation.* 1980;62(6 Pt 2):V90-6.
- 853 111. A randomized trial of aspirin and sulfinpyrazone in threatened stroke. *N Engl J Med.*  
854 1978;299(2):53-9.
- 855 112. Collaborative overview of randomised trials of antiplatelet therapy--I: Prevention of death,  
856 myocardial infarction, and stroke by prolonged antiplatelet therapy in various categories of patients.  
857 *Antiplatelet Trialists' Collaboration. Bmj.* 1994;308(6921):81-106.
- 858 113. Amery A, Birkenhäger W, Brixko P, Bulpitt C, Clement D, de Leeuw P, et al. Influence of  
859 antihypertensive drug treatment on morbidity and mortality in patients over the age of 60 years.

- 860 European Working Party on High blood pressure in the Elderly (EWPHE) results: sub-group analysis on  
861 entry stratification. *J Hypertens Suppl.* 1986;4(6):S642-7.
- 862 114. Gueyffier F, Bulpitt C, Boissel JP, Schron E, Ekblom T, Fagard R, et al. Antihypertensive drugs in  
863 very old people: a subgroup meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *INDANA Group. Lancet.*  
864 1999;353(9155):793-6.
- 865 115. Weisberg LA. The efficacy and safety of ticlopidine and aspirin in non-whites: analysis of a  
866 patient subgroup from the Ticlopidine Aspirin Stroke Study. *Neurology.* 1993;43(1):27-31.
- 867 116. Gorelick PB, Richardson D, Kelly M, Ruland S, Hung E, Harris Y, et al. Aspirin and ticlopidine for  
868 prevention of recurrent stroke in black patients: a randomized trial. *Jama.* 2003;289(22):2947-57.
- 869 117. Rothwell PM. Treating individuals 2. Subgroup analysis in randomised controlled trials:  
870 importance, indications, and interpretation. *Lancet.* 2005;365(9454):176-86.
- 871 118. Wallach JD, Sullivan PG, Trepanowski JF, Sainani KL, Steyerberg EW, Ioannidis JP. Evaluation of  
872 Evidence of Statistical Support and Corroboration of Subgroup Claims in Randomized Clinical Trials. *JAMA*  
873 *Intern Med.* 2017;177(4):554-60.
- 874 119. Schandelmaier S, Chang Y, Devasenapathy N, Devji T, Kwong JSW, Colunga Lozano LE, et al. A  
875 systematic survey identified 36 criteria for assessing effect modification claims in randomized trials or  
876 meta-analyses. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2019;113:159-67.
- 877 120. Donegan S, Williams L, Dias S, Tudur-Smith C, Welton N. Exploring treatment by covariate  
878 interactions using subgroup analysis and meta-regression in cochrane reviews: a review of recent  
879 practice. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(6):e0128804.
- 880 121. Kasenda B, Schandelmaier S, Sun X, von Elm E, You J, Blümle A, et al. Subgroup analyses in  
881 randomised controlled trials: cohort study on trial protocols and journal publications. *Bmj.*  
882 2014;349:g4539.
- 883 122. Sun X, Briel M, Busse JW, You JJ, Akl EA, Mejza F, et al. Credibility of claims of subgroup effects in  
884 randomised controlled trials: systematic review. *Bmj.* 2012;344:e1553.
- 885 123. Dahabreh IJ, Hayward R, Kent DM. Using group data to treat individuals: understanding  
886 heterogeneous treatment effects in the age of precision medicine and patient-centred evidence. *Int J*  
887 *Epidemiol.* 2016;45(6):2184-93.
- 888 124. Koopman L, van der Heijden GJ, Hoes AW, Grobbee DE, Rovers MM. Empirical comparison of  
889 subgroup effects in conventional and individual patient data meta-analyses. *Int J Technol Assess Health*  
890 *Care.* 2008;24(3):358-61.
- 891 125. Fisher DJ, Carpenter JR, Morris TP, Freeman SC, Tierney JF. Meta-analytical methods to identify  
892 who benefits most from treatments: daft, deluded, or deft approach? *Bmj.* 2017;356:j573.
- 893 126. Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, Schmid CH, Devasenapathy N, Hayward RA, et al.  
894 Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in  
895 randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses. *Cmaj.* 2020;192(32):E901-e6.
- 896 127. Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G. Graphical tools for network meta-  
897 analysis in STATA. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(10):e76654.
- 898 128. Team RDC. *Network Meta-Analysis using Frequentist Methods.* R Foundation for Statistical  
899 Computing; 2022.
- 900 129. Brignardello-Petersen R, Bonner A, Alexander PE, Siemieniuk RA, Furukawa TA, Rochwerg B, et al.  
901 Advances in the GRADE approach to rate the certainty in estimates from a network meta-analysis. *J Clin*  
902 *Epidemiol.* 2018;93:36-44.
- 903 130. Puhan MA, Schünemann HJ, Murad MH, Li T, Brignardello-Petersen R, Singh JA, et al. A GRADE  
904 Working Group approach for rating the quality of treatment effect estimates from network meta-  
905 analysis. *Bmj.* 2014;349:g5630.

- 906 131. Brignardello-Petersen R, Mustafa RA, Siemieniuk RAC, Murad MH, Agoritsas T, Izcovich A, et al.  
907 GRADE approach to rate the certainty from a network meta-analysis: addressing incoherence. *J Clin*  
908 *Epidemiol.* 2019;108:77-85.
- 909 132. Zeng L, Brignardello-Petersen R, Hultcrantz M, Mustafa RA, Murad MH, Iorio A, et al. GRADE  
910 Guidance 34: update on rating imprecision using a minimally contextualized approach. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
911 2022;150:216-24.
- 912 133. Mouelhi Y, Jouve E, Castelli C, Gentile S. How is the minimal clinically important difference  
913 established in health-related quality of life instruments? Review of anchors and methods. *Health Qual*  
914 *Life Outcomes.* 2020;18(1):136.
- 915 134. Schünemann HJ, Neumann I, Hultcrantz M, Brignardello-Petersen R, Zeng L, Murad MH, et al.  
916 GRADE guidance 35: update on rating imprecision for assessing contextualized certainty of evidence and  
917 making decisions. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2022;150:225-42.
- 918 135. Zeng L, Li SA, Yang M, Yan L, Helsing LM, Bretthauer M, et al. Qualitative study of guideline  
919 panelists: innovative surveys provided valuable insights regarding patient values and preferences. *J Clin*  
920 *Epidemiol.* 2023;161:173-80.
- 921 136. Brignardello-Petersen R, Tomlinson G, Florez I, Rind DM, Chu D, Morgan R, et al. Grading of  
922 recommendations assessment, development, and evaluation concept article 5: addressing intransitivity  
923 in a network meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2023;160:151-9.
- 924 137. Santesso N, Glenton C, Dahm P, Garner P, Akl EA, Alper B, et al. GRADE guidelines 26: informative  
925 statements to communicate the findings of systematic reviews of interventions. *Journal of Clinical*  
926 *Epidemiology.* 2020;119:126-35.
- 927 138. Brignardello-Petersen R, Florez ID, Izcovich A, Santesso N, Hazlewood G, Alhazanni W, et al.  
928 GRADE approach to drawing conclusions from a network meta-analysis using a minimally contextualised  
929 framework. *Bmj.* 2020;371:m3900.
- 930 139. Phillips MR, Sadeghirad B, Busse JW, Brignardello-Petersen R, Cuello-Garcia CA, Kenji Nampo F, et  
931 al. Development and design validation of a novel network meta-analysis presentation tool for multiple  
932 outcomes: a qualitative descriptive study. *BMJ Open.* 2022;12(6):e056400.
- 933 140. Akl EA, El Khoury R, Khamis AM, El Mikati IK, Pardo-Hernandez H, Farran S, et al. The life and  
934 death of living systematic reviews: a methodological survey. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2023.
- 935 141. Murad MH, Wang Z, Chu H, Lin L, El Mikati IK, Khabsa J, et al. Proposed triggers for retiring a  
936 living systematic review. *BMJ Evid Based Med.* 2023;28(5):348-52.
- 937 142. Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Macdonald H, Guyatt GH, Brandt L, Vandvik PO. Introduction to *BMJ*  
938 *Rapid Recommendations.* *Bmj.* 2016;354:i5191.
- 939 143. Guest G, Namey E, Chen M. A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in  
940 qualitative research. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(5):e0232076.
- 941 144. Maurer M, Siegel JE, Firminger KB, Lowers J, Dutta T, Chang JS. Lessons Learned from Developing  
942 Plain Language Summaries of Research Studies. *Health Lit Res Pract.* 2021;5(2):e155-e61.
- 943 145. Stoll M, Kerwer M, Lieb K, Chasiotis A. Plain language summaries: A systematic review of theory,  
944 guidelines and empirical research. *PLoS One.* 2022;17(6):e0268789.
- 945 146. World Health O. WHO handbook for guideline development. 2nd ed. Geneva: World Health  
946 Organization; 2014 2014.
- 947 147. Hill J, Bullock I, Alderson P. A summary of the methods that the National Clinical Guideline Centre  
948 uses to produce clinical guidelines for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Ann Intern*  
949 *Med.* 2011;154(11):752-7.
- 950 148. Wonderling D, Sawyer L, Fenu E, Lovibond K, Laramée P. National Clinical Guideline Centre cost-  
951 effectiveness assessment for the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Ann Intern Med.*  
952 2011;154(11):758-65.

- 953 149. White H, McDonald SJ, Barber B, Davis J, Burr L, Nair P, et al. Care for adults with COVID-19: living  
954 guidelines from the National COVID-19 Clinical Evidence Taskforce. *Med J Aust.* 2022;217(7):368-78.
- 955 150. Michelen M, Manoharan L, Elkheir N, Cheng V, Dagens A, Hastie C, et al. Characterising long  
956 COVID: a living systematic review. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2021;6(9).
- 957 151. Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, Alonso J, Patrick DL, de Vet HCW, et al. COSMIN guideline  
958 for systematic reviews of patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res.* 2018;27(5):1147-57.
- 959 152. Wang Z, Nayfeh T, Tetzlaff J, O'Blenis P, Murad MH. Error rates of human reviewers during  
960 abstract screening in systematic reviews. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(1):e0227742.
- 961 153. Gartlehner G, Affengruber L, Titscher V, Noel-Storr A, Dooley G, Ballarini N, et al. Single-reviewer  
962 abstract screening missed 13 percent of relevant studies: a crowd-based, randomized controlled trial. *J*  
963 *Clin Epidemiol.* 2020;121:20-8.
- 964 154. Waffenschmidt S, Knelangen M, Sieben W, Bühn S, Pieper D. Single screening versus  
965 conventional double screening for study selection in systematic reviews: a methodological systematic  
966 review. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2019;19(1):132.
- 967 155. Buscemi N, Hartling L, Vandermeer B, Tjosvold L, Klassen TP. Single data extraction generated  
968 more errors than double data extraction in systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2006;59(7):697-703.
- 969 156. Jones AP, Remington T, Williamson PR, Ashby D, Smyth RL. High prevalence but low impact of  
970 data extraction and reporting errors were found in Cochrane systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
971 2005;58(7):741-2.
- 972 157. McKiernan EC, Bourne PE, Brown CT, Buck S, Kenall A, Lin J, et al. How open science helps  
973 researchers succeed. *Elife.* 2016;5.
- 974 158. Tanne JH. Covid-19: US agency launches raft of clinical trials of treatments for long covid. *Bmj.*  
975 2023;382:1797.
- 976 159. Cheung AMG, Susie E; Graves, Donna Lorraine; Archambault, Patrick; Awadalla, Philip; Bakal,  
977 Jeffrey A; Bhéreur, Anne; Brotto, Lori Anne; Busse, Jason W; Cameron, Jill I; Churchill, Katie; Crawley,  
978 Angela M; Décary, Simon; Durand, Madeleine; Falcone, Emilia L; Fowler, Robert A; Gommerman, Jennifer  
979 L; Graham, Kathryn E; Graham, Simon J; Groot, Gary; Gross, Douglas P; Guyatt, Gordon H; Halas, Gayle;  
980 Ho, Chester; Hohl, Corinne M; Holroyd, Brian R; Janjua, Naveed Z; Johnson, Pauline; Juando Prats, Clara;  
981 Kashuba, Sherri; Katz, Alan; Kho, Michelle E; Lam, Grace Y; Lamontagne, Francois; Langlois, Marc-Andre;  
982 Lavis, John N; Law, Susan K; LeBlanc, Annie; Levin, Adeera; Liu-Ambrose, Teresa Y; Liu, Peter P; Lix, Lisa  
983 M; Mandhane, Piush; Mann, Balraj; McGrail, Kimberlyn M; McNagny, Kelly M; Miciak, Maxi A; Mishra,  
984 Sharmistha; Muhajarine, Nazeem; Mukherjee, Manali; Mushquash, Christopher J; Nacul, Luis; O'Brien,  
985 Kelly K; Osgood, Nathaniel D; Papatathanasoglou, Elisavet; Penninger, Josef; Piche, Alain; Pinto, Andrew D;  
986 Quinn, Kieran L; Rafferty, Ellen; Raj, Satish R; Razak, Fahad; Russell, James A; Sander, Beate H; Sekuler,  
987 Allison B; Soares, Claudio D; Tailfeathers, Esther; Tomlinson, George A; Tricco, Andrea C; Valdez, Yanet;  
988 Verma, Amol; Vohra, Sunita; Walmsley, Sharon L; Walsh, Jillian; Weeks, Laura C; Williams, Kienan; Wu,  
989 Jianhong; Yeung, Rae S. Long COVID Web: Pan-Canadian Post-COVID Condition Research Network 2022  
990 [Available from: [https://webapps.cihr-](https://webapps.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/decisions/p/project_details.html?applId=474666&lang=en)  
991 [irsc.gc.ca/decisions/p/project\\_details.html?applId=474666&lang=en](https://webapps.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/decisions/p/project_details.html?applId=474666&lang=en).
- 992 160. Guyatt GH, Ebrahim S, Alonso-Coello P, Johnston BC, Mathioudakis AG, Briel M, et al. GRADE  
993 guidelines 17: assessing the risk of bias associated with missing participant outcome data in a body of  
994 evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2017;87:14-22.
- 995