

1 **Title page**

2
3 **Temporal trajectories of COVID-19 symptoms in adults with 22 months**
4 **follow-up in a prospective cohort study in Norway**

5
6
7 **Authors` names**

8 Merete Ellingjord-Dale* (0000-0001-9294-2510), Anders Nygaard* (0000-0003-1922-0751),
9 Nathalie C Støer (0000-0001-8994-9332), Ragnhild Bø (), Nils Inge Landrø (0000-0003-0354-
10 5148), Sonja Hjellegjerde Brunvoll (0000-0003-0917-9898), Mette Istre (0000-0001-5674-
11 3522), Karl Trygve Kalleberg(0000-0003-4968-2295), John Arne Dahl (0000-0002-4375-2697),
12 Linda Geng (0000-0002-9891-5705), Tsilidis, Kostas (0000-0001-5868-4984), Riboli, Elio
13 (0000-0001-6795-6080), Giske Ursin (0000-0002-0835-9507), Arne Vasli Lund Søråas (0000-
14 0003-1622-591X)

15 *Contributed equally

16
17 **Address for each author**

18 Oslo University Hospital, Department of Microbiology, PO Box 4950 Nydalen,
19 Oslo, Norway, Merete Ellingjord-Dale, postdoc Oslo University Hospital,
20 Department of Microbiology, PO Box 4950 Nydalen, Oslo, Norway, Anders
21 Nygaard, postdoc Cancer Registry of Norway, Research Department, 0379 Oslo,
22 Norway, Nathalie C Støer, statistician University of Oslo, Department of
23 Psychology, 0373 Oslo, Norway, Ragnhild Bø, postdoc University of Oslo,
24 Department of Psychology, 0373 Oslo, Norway, Nils Inge Landrø, professor Oslo

25 University Hospital, Department of Microbiology, PO Box 4950 Nydalen, Oslo,
26 Norway, Sonja Hjellegjerde Brunvoll, postdoc Oslo University Hospital,
27 Department of Microbiology, PO Box 4950 Nydalen, Oslo, Norway, Mette Istre,
28 molecular biologist Age Labs AS, 0373 Oslo, Norway, Karl Trygve Kalleberg,
29 CEO Oslo University Hospital, Department of Microbiology, PO Box 4950
30 Nydalen, Oslo, Norway, John Arne Dahl, researcher Department of Medicine,
31 Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA 94305, USA, Linda Geng,
32 researcher Imperial College London, School of Public Health, Department of
33 Epidemiology and Biostatistics, London SW7 2AZ, UK, University of Ioannina
34 School of Medicine, Department of Hygiene and Epidemiology, Ioannina, Greece,
35 Kostas Tsilidis, professor Imperial College London, School of Public Health,
36 Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, London SW7 2AZ, UK, University
37 of Ioannina School of Medicine, Department of Hygiene and Epidemiology,
38 Ioannina, Greece, Elio Riboli, professor Cancer Registry of Norway, Oslo,
39 Norway, University of Oslo, Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Department of
40 Nutrition, 0373 Oslo, Norway, University of Southern California, Department of
41 Preventive Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Giske Ursin, professor Department
42 of Microbiology, Oslo University Hospital, PO Box 4950 Nydalen, 0424 Oslo,
43 Norway. Phone: +47 90652904. E-mail: arvsoe@ous-hf.no, Arne Søråas,
44 researcher

45

46 Corresponding author: Arne Søråas, Department of Microbiology, Oslo University

47 Hospital, PO Box 4950 Nydalen, 0424 Oslo, Norway. Phone: +47 90652904. E-

48 mail: arne@meg.no and arvsoe@ous-hf.no, researcher

50 **What is already known of this topic**

- 51 • Cognitive difficulties and physical symptoms have been reported after infections with the
52 SARS-CoV-2 virus, but lack of studies with data before and after infections have sparked
53 a global debate regarding severity and duration of these symptoms.
- 54 • Post acute viral syndromes have been described after many different infections, but it is
55 unknown whether the symptoms of “long-COVID” or Post Acute Sequela after COVID-
56 19 (PASC) are specific to the SARS-CoV-2 or not.

57

58 **What this study adds**

- 59 • We found a significant and long-term increase in cognitive symptoms, anosmia and
60 dysgeusia, dyspnoea, fatigue, and self-assessed worsening of overall health after a
61 positive (COVID-19) but not a negative (indication of another infection) SARS-CoV-2
62 test.
- 63 • To our knowledge, this is the first large cohort study to report the trajectories of both
64 cognitive and physical symptoms from before and up to 22 months after a positive
65 SARS-CoV-2 test, compared to SARS-CoV-2 negative controls.

66

67

68 **Abstract**

69 **Objectives**

70 We aimed to describe the trajectories of cognitive and physical symptoms before, during, and
71 after a positive- or negative SARS-CoV-2 test and in untested controls.

72 **Design**

73 A prospective cohort study.

74 **Setting**

75 Norway, 27 March 2020 to 6 July 2022

76 **Participants**

77 A total of 146 065 volunteers were recruited. Of these, 120 605 participants (mean age 49 (SD
78 13.7), 69% female), were initially untested for the SARS-CoV-2 virus, completed one or more
79 follow-up questionnaires (response rates 72-90%) and were included for analysis. After 22
80 months of follow-up, 15 737 participants had a positive SARS-CoV-2 test, 67 305 a negative
81 test, and 37 563 were still untested.

82 **Main outcome measures**

83 We assessed reported symptoms the past three weeks of memory or concentration problems,
84 anosmia and dysgeusia, dyspnoea, fatigue, fever, headache, cough, muscular pain, nasal
85 symptoms, sore throat and abdominal pain at baseline and through four follow-up questionnaires.
86 In addition, overall health compared to a year before was measured with a five-point scale and

87 memory problems were measured using the Everyday Memory Questionnaire-13 at two
88 timepoints.

89 The exposure, SARS-CoV-2 test status (positive, negative or untested), was obtained from a
90 mandatory national registry or from self-report, and data were analysed using mixed model
91 logistic regression.

92 **Results**

93 A positive SARS-CoV-2-test was associated with the following persistent symptoms, compared
94 with participants with a negative test (1-3 months after a negative test); memory problems (3 to 6
95 months after a positive test: adjusted odds ratio (OR) 9.1, 95% confidence interval (CI) 7.5 to
96 10.9; 12 to 18 months: OR 7.8, CI 5.7 to 10.8), concentration problems (3 to 6 months: OR 6.1,
97 CI 4.8 to 6.5; 12 to 18 months: OR 5.3, CI 3.9 to 7.1), anosmia and dysgeusia, dyspnoea and
98 fatigue as well as self-assessed worsening of overall health.

99 **Conclusion**

100 A positive SARS-CoV-2 test was associated with new onset memory- and concentration
101 problems, anosmia and dysgeusia, dyspnoea and fatigue as well as self-assessed worsening of
102 overall health, which persisted for the length of the follow-up of 22 months, even when
103 correcting for symptoms before COVID-19 and compared to symptoms in negative controls.

104 **Trial registration**

105 ClinicalTrials ID: NCT04320732

106

107

108 **Introduction**

109 The World Health Organization (WHO) has reported more than 770 million COVID-19 cases,
110 including around 6.9 million deaths globally, as of August 25, 2023.¹ It has been estimated that
111 more than 65 million individuals around the world suffer from post-acute sequelae of severe
112 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection, often termed “long-
113 COVID”.² The definition of the phases of COVID-19 disease varies across studies.³⁻⁸ An acute
114 phase 0-1 month after diagnosis, followed by a post-acute phase 1-3 months, and a post-COVID-
115 19 phase >3 months have been described.⁴ The WHO’s description of the time frame for long-
116 COVID coincides with the post-COVID-19 phase.⁷

117 Previous studies have reported a range of potential long-COVID symptoms such as anosmia and
118 dysgeusia, fatigue, headache, muscle pain, abdominal pain, cough, dyspnoea, hair loss, and
119 cognitive symptoms.^{2,9-23} However, most of these studies lacked relevant control groups, data on
120 symptoms before COVID-19, and a long follow-up time. We initiated a large prospective cohort
121 study in which we examined the temporal trajectories of symptoms in SARS-CoV-2-positive, -
122 negative, and -untested participants, with a high response rate and a follow-up time of up to 22
123 months after the test date.

124 **Methods**

125 **Study population**

126 The Norwegian COVID-19 Cohort Study is a population-based, open cohort study of adult
127 participants (aged 18-96 years) from Norway. From March 27, 2020, participants were recruited
128 through social media, invitations, and nationwide media coverage. Participants completed a
129 baseline questionnaire at inclusion and were invited to regular follow-up questionnaires. All

130 participants had a Norwegian identification number and electronic access to the secure national
131 digital governmental identification service.

132 Between March 27, 2020, to April 15, 2021, a total of 146 065 participants completed the
133 baseline questionnaire (99 % before June 30, 2020). Of these, 127 798 participants were untested
134 at baseline according to the mandatory Surveillance System for Communicable Diseases (MSIS)
135 registry and confirmed this through self-report. We excluded 7193 participants who did not
136 complete any follow-up questionnaires.

137 Our final study population of 120 605 had completed a baseline questionnaire and at least one
138 follow-up questionnaire before July 6, 2022. The response rates for the first (May 2020), second
139 (July 2020), third (November 2020), and fourth follow-up (December 2021) questionnaires were
140 79.3%, 84.2%, 80.4%, and 72.1%, respectively (Supplementary eFigure 1).

141 In a substudy between the 3rd and 4th follow-ups (July 2021), 6279 participants (all SARS-CoV-
142 2-positive participants, and randomly selected negative and untested participants) were invited
143 for an extra questionnaire (89.9% responded) (Supplementary eMethods 1). To assess the impact
144 of non-response on our overall study, a random subset of these (n=2090) received telephone
145 reminders if unresponsive electronically (“phone cohort”), with a 97% response rate in that
146 group.

147 In another add-on study, from October 2020 to December 2021, 998 blood samples from 966
148 unvaccinated participants were collected and analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies
149 (Supplementary eMethods 2).

150 The study was approved by the Norwegian Regional Committee for Research Ethics (REK
151 124170), and all participants submitted electronic informed consent forms. The study is

152 registered in ClinicalTrials (<https://clinicaltrials.gov>; ID: NCT04320732), and reported according
153 to the STROBE guidelines for cohort studies.

154 **Assessment of exposure**

155 The exposure, SARS-CoV-2 status, was obtained through linkage of the participant's personal
156 identification numbers with the MSIS registry or self-report. COVID-19 became a compulsory
157 reportable disease to MSIS on January 31, 2020. SARS-CoV-2 tests were done by a
158 nasopharyngeal and/or oropharyngeal swab test and detected using real-time polymerase chain
159 reaction (rt-PCR) in any accredited Norwegian clinical microbiology laboratory. From early in
160 January, 2022, self-tests became increasingly available and PCR tests no longer mandated.
161 SARS-CoV-2 status were therefore increasingly based on self-report the in the last months of the
162 study. Participants could change their exposure status during the study period. We considered a
163 participant untested from inclusion until the date of a SARS-CoV-2 test (positive or negative). If
164 the first test was negative, a participant would be considered negative until the date of a later
165 positive test. A participant with only negative tests was considered SARS-CoV-2-negative
166 throughout the follow-up.

167 Community testing for SARS-CoV-2 status was free of charge and after the initial few months of
168 the pandemic widely available and strongly encouraged. Testing for international travel was
169 done at private facilities and required a fee and results were reported to MSIS like all other tests.
170 Testing criteria changed during the study period and is described in Supplementary eFigure 2.
171 From January 24, 2022, a PCR test was no longer routinely offered after a positive self-test.

172

173

174 **Assessment and definition of endpoints**

175 Outcome measures were self-reported symptoms assessed through electronic follow-up
176 questionnaires (Supplementary eMethods 3). Questionnaires were designed using existing
177 knowledge about COVID-19 symptoms and the International Severe Acute Respiratory and
178 Emerging Infection Consortium forms.²⁴ For each questionnaire, participants were asked to
179 check off symptoms they had experienced the past 3 weeks.

180 In the second follow-up questionnaire, a health transition question (“Compared to a year ago, or
181 before you had COVID-19, how will you describe your health?”) with a 5-point Likert scale (the
182 variable was dichotomized in the analyses), from the 36-Item Short Form Survey was added.²⁵
183 As several participants reported memory problems in the free-text fields in the second follow-up
184 questionnaire, questions on memory- and concentration were added to the third and fourth
185 follow-up questionnaires and in the substudy between these questionnaires. To assess memory-
186 and concentration problems, the Behaviour Rating Inventory of Executive Functions-adult
187 version (BRIEF-A)²⁶ was included in the substudy, while the 13-item Everyday Memory
188 Questionnaire-revised version (EMQ-R)²⁷ was included in the substudy and fourth follow-up.

189 **Statistical analyses**

190 To investigate the temporal trajectory of symptoms after COVID-19, we examined the combined
191 effect of SARS-CoV-2 status (untested, negative, or positive) and time since a SARS-CoV-2 test
192 (0-1, 1-3, 3-6, 6-12, 12-18 and >18 months) on symptoms. Time since test was defined as the
193 time since the first positive or negative test, or the time since baseline (for the untested). We
194 included information from all questionnaires, and used mixed-effect logistic regression
195 calculating odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) of each symptom associated

196 with SARS-CoV-2 status and time since test (eMethods 4). We compared symptoms of SARS-
197 CoV-2-positive and untested participants with SARS-CoV-2-negative participants at one fixed
198 time point, 1-3 months after their first negative test. We also compared the symptoms of SARS-
199 CoV-2-positive and untested participants at each time point with the SARS-CoV-2-negative
200 participants.

201 Analyses were adjusted for potential confounders: age (10-year categories), gender (men,
202 women), body mass index (BMI, <25 kg/ m² >25kg/ m², missing), annual household income level
203 (< 299 999, 300 000-599 999, 600 000-100 0000, >1 000 000 NOK, missing), smoking status
204 (never, former, current, missing), underlying medical condition (no, yes, missing), and symptom
205 status for each symptom at baseline (no, yes, missing) or at the first questionnaire asking about
206 the symptom, but before the outcome symptom.

207 To illustrate the trajectories of symptoms before, during, and after a positive or negative test, we
208 calculated the unadjusted moving average (with 95% CI) prevalence of symptoms for each
209 exposure group (using the SARS-CoV-2-status at the last follow-up) over the whole study period
210 (supplementary eMethods 5).

211 We performed the following sensitivity analyses and only including; participants with pre-
212 omicron-variants, those who completed all questionnaires (not including the substudy), non-
213 hospitalized participants, and participants with self-reported SARS-CoV-2 status.

214 In the substudy and fourth follow-up, we used multivariate analysis of variance to test for
215 differences in subscales of BRIEF-A by SARS-CoV-2 status, and analysis of variance
216 (ANCOVA) to test for differences by SARS-CoV-2 status on EMQ-R, controlling for age and
217 sex. Pairwise-comparisons between SARS-CoV-2 status (untested, negative and positive) were

218 Bonferroni corrected. We used ANCOVA to investigate the difference in change in EMQ-R
219 between those who converted to positive and those who remained negative/untested. Point-serial
220 correlations between EMQ-R and BRIEF-A subscales and self-reported memory- and
221 concentration problems were investigated (supplementary eTable 1).

222 To examine the effect of non-response bias, we conducted a sensitivity analysis in randomly
223 selected participants invited to the substudy ($n=2090$). The non-responders were contacted by
224 telephone ($n = 343$; 56 untested, 237 negative, and 50 positive) and were compared with those
225 who had already responded through electronic reminders ($n = 1692$).

226 Analyses were performed using Stata (Stata Statistical Software, release 16 and 17, Stata Corp.,
227 College Station, TX), R (version 4.2.2), and SPSS 27 (IBM).

228 **Patient and Public Involvement statement**

229 We have involved patients in the Norwegian Corona Cohort since the spring of 2020. Our focus
230 on persisting cognitive symptoms were initiated after reports of such symptoms by a patient
231 representative which led to the inclusion of relevant questions in the following questionnaires.
232 The study has had a two-way communication with our participants through newsletters and free-
233 text-fields in the questionnaires. We have regular meetings with patients and the patient
234 organization Norwegian Covid Association.

235 **Results**

236 **Participants and follow-up**

237 Of 120 605 participants, 15 737 were SARS-CoV-2-positive (58% from MSIS and 42% self-
238 report), 67 305 negative, and 37 563 untested at the end of follow-up (July 6, 2022;

239 Supplementary eFigure 1). The follow-up varied between the groups and 710 SARS-CoV-2
240 positive, 35 309 negative, and 18 997 untested participants had >12 months follow-up after the
241 test (Table 1). In total, 530 200 questionnaires were included in the analyses. Of the participants,
242 69% were women, 41% had a per household income/ year >1 000 000 NOK (about US\$ 100
243 000), and the mean age was 49 years (SD = 13.7 years). SARS-CoV-2-positive were younger,
244 had a higher income, a lower BMI, and fewer underlying medical conditions, and were less
245 likely to be current smokers compared with negative and untested participants.

246 **Symptoms among SARS-CoV-2-positive participants**

247 The temporal trajectory of each symptom differed by SARS-CoV-2 status (Unadjusted: Figure 1
248 and Supplementary eFigure 3, and adjusted: Table 2, Supplementary eTables 2 and 3). When
249 comparing SARS-CoV-2-positive participants with negative participants (1-3 months after a
250 negative test), there were several persistent symptoms. The strongest findings in the adjusted
251 analyses were memory problems (3-6 months: adjusted odds ratio (OR) = 9.1, 95% confidence
252 interval (CI) = 7.5-10.9; 6-12 months: OR = 13.3, CI = 10.7-16.6; 12-18 months: OR = 7.8, CI =
253 5.7-10.8; >18 months: OR = 9.96, CI = 4.3-23.0), concentration problems (3-6 months: OR =
254 5.7, CI = 4.9-6.7; 6-12 months: OR = 7.5, CI = 6.1-9.1; 12-18 months: OR = 5.3, CI = 3.9-7.1;
255 >18 months: OR = 4.9, CI = 2.1-11.1), and anosmia and dysgeusia (3-6 months: OR = 5.2, 95%
256 CI = 4.4-6.2, 6-12 months: OR = 8.9, CI = 7.2-11; 12-18 months; OR = 5.5, CI = 4.0-7.5; >18
257 months: OR = 5.3, CI = 2.4-2.1) (Table 2). Self-assessed worsening of overall health was also
258 significantly higher among the SARS-CoV-2-positive participants, with the highest risk being at
259 18 months (OR = 3.7, CI = 2.0-6.8). The risk of reporting dyspnoea and fatigue was higher for
260 the positive than negative participants, but the risk attenuated over time. SARS-CoV-2 positive
261 participants were equally or less likely to report fever, headache, cough, muscular pain, nasal

262 symptoms, sore throat, and abdominal pain late in follow-up compared to the negative
263 participants (Supplementary eTable 2).

264 **Symptoms among SARS-CoV-2-negative and untested participants**

265 Eighty percent of participants with a negative test reported at least one symptom indicating an
266 infection in the three-week period around testing (data not shown). At later follow-up periods,
267 SARS-CoV-2-negative participants had a higher risk of reporting symptoms compared to 1-3
268 months after the negative test. Memory problems (3-6 months: OR = 1.3, CI = 1.2-1.5; >18
269 months: OR = 2.0, CI = 1.7-2.3), fever (3-6 months: OR = 1.2, CI = 1.00-1.4; >18 months: OR =
270 2.1, CI = 1.8-2.3), and cough (3-6 months: OR = 1.0, CI = 0.94-1.1; >18 months: OR = 1.5, CI =
271 1.4-1.7) were increasingly reported over time among negative participants (Table 2 and
272 Supplementary eTable 2). We therefore conducted analyses comparing SARS-CoV-2-positive
273 with negative participants at each time point (Supplementary eTable 3). Untested participants
274 were less likely to report symptoms compared to SARS-CoV-2-negative participants.

275 **Disease severity and persisting symptoms**

276 A longer time bedridden with COVID-19 was associated with an increased risk of persisting
277 symptoms, except for sore throat and nasal symptoms. The strongest association in the adjusted
278 analyses was seen for memory problems (bedridden 1-6 days: OR = 2.1, CI = 2.0-2.7, bedridden
279 7-13 days: OR = 5.3, CI = 4.3-6.6, and bedridden \geq 14 days: OR 9.1, CI 6.5-12.8, compared to
280 not being bedridden during COVID-19) (Supplementary eMethods 6, and eTable 4).

281 **Sensitivity analyses**

282 When excluding participants with SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variants (BA.1 and BA.2), the results
283 were consistent (eFigure 4), but the ORs for memory problems, concentration problems, and

284 anosmia and dysgeusia 3-6 months after the positive test were higher compared to when all cases
285 were included (data not shown). In other sensitivity analyses, we included only those who
286 completed all questionnaires, excluded hospitalized COVID-19 participants (4%), and
287 participants with self-reported SARS-CoV-2 status, and the results remained largely unchanged
288 (data not shown). In one sensitivity analysis, only participants answering questionnaires both
289 before and after a positive or negative SARS-CoV-2 test were included and the results were
290 similar to when all questionnaires were included (data not shown).

291 **Validated questionnaires on cognitive function, phone cohort and serology**

292 Compared to SARS-CoV-2 negative participants, positive participants reported more functional
293 memory problems on the EMQ-R (Supplementary eFigure 5; substudy: Mean difference = 0.262,
294 CI = 0.204 - 0.321; fourth follow-up: Mean difference = 0.329, CI = 0.298 - 0.394), and poorer
295 working memory function (BRIEF-A subscale, Supplementary eFigure 6; Mean difference =
296 0.620, CI= 0.346-0.894). There were no significant differences on the other BRIEF-A subscales.
297 With regard to change in EMQ-R, those who converted to positive at fourth follow-up had larger
298 changes ($n = 223$; $M=.124$, $SD = .63$) than those who remained negative or untested ($n = 2489$;
299 $M=.029$, $SD = .449$), mean difference = .096, CI = .031, .160, $p = .004$). We performed
300 correlation tests between EMQ-R/BRIEF-A Working memory subscale, and self-reported
301 memory- and concentration problems and found small (Pearson's r from 0.26 to 0.40), but
302 significant correlations between these measurements (Supplementary eTable 1).

303 In the subgroup of participants contacted by telephone ($n=343$), a lower proportion, reported
304 symptoms compared with those who responded through electronic invitations. This difference
305 was more pronounced among positive than among negative participants (Supplementary eFigure
306 7).

307 In the add-on serology study of 966 participants, blood samples were analysed for SARS-CoV-2
308 antibodies, 3 (0.3%) were positive but classified as negative or untested at the time of sampling
309 (Supplementary eMethods 2).

310 **Discussion**

311 In this prospective cohort study, we have analysed the temporal trajectory of 14 symptoms (13
312 symptoms and self-assessed worsening of overall health) before, during and after a positive or
313 negative SARS-CoV-2 test. When comparing SARS-CoV-2-positive participants with negative
314 participants, persistent symptoms were memory- and concentration problems, anosmia and
315 dysgeusia, dyspnoea, fatigue, and self-assessed worsening of overall health. The cognitive
316 symptoms and self-assessed worsening of overall health did not attenuate over time. SARS-CoV-
317 2 positive participants also scored worse than negative participants in validated tests of
318 functional and working memory.

319 Our finding of memory- and concentration problems as long-COVID symptoms is in line with a
320 report by the WHO²⁸ and several studies.^{9,10,12-16,29} However, the results elaborates this
321 association with several important findings. Firstly, the association between COVID-19 and
322 memory- and concentration problems was strong, and after the acute phase – as strong as the
323 association between COVID-19 and anosmia and dysgeusia. Secondly, memory- and
324 concentration problems increased in the 0-6 months interval after a positive SARS-CoV-2 test
325 and persisted throughout the follow-up time up to 22 months. In contrast, the other symptoms
326 peaked in prevalence during the acute phase and thereafter exhibited a downwards trend. To our
327 knowledge, this has not previously been reported and may indicate that the pathophysiological
328 processes underlying the cognitive symptoms may differ from other long-COVID symptoms.

329 The strong association and a temporal trajectory specific for cognitive symptoms warrants
330 further research.

331 Several studies have examined the neuropathological effects of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and
332 possible mechanisms associated with COVID-19.³⁰⁻³³ Brain imaging studies have reported a
333 greater reduction of grey matter³⁰ and an increase of white matter lesions after COVID-19³¹,
334 whereas an autopsy study found the virus persisting in the brain of COVID-19 patients.³²

335 Another study has suggested that synaptic signalling of neurons may expand after COVID-19
336 disease³³ and could be linked to neurodegenerative and psychiatric disorders.³⁴⁻³⁶ The SARS-
337 CoV-2-positive participants' scores on BRIEF-A and EMQ-R in the current study indicate that
338 most participants reporting memory- and concentration problems had mild cognitive
339 impairments. However, even slight cognitive impairments can have profound effects on
340 everyday functioning because working memory supports decision-making, navigation, and
341 problem-solving, and it helps keep track of conversations.³⁷ The fact that cognitive symptoms are
342 persistent, and most of the population have been, or will be, infected by the SARS-CoV-2 virus,
343 makes it crucial that further research focuses on the pathophysiology, and treatment (including
344 whether immediate treatment upon symptom debut are effective) of these symptoms.³⁸

345 Our findings are consistent with a large recent cohort study examining cognitive trajectories in
346 older adults²⁹. They asked about history of COVID-19 in the year before each questionnaire, and
347 a decline in cognition was observed after COVID-19 compared to pre-pandemic year.

348 A recently published report from the Lifelines Study analysed 23 somatic (not cognitive) self-
349 reported symptoms from 76 000 participants, 90-150 days after COVID-19, and had a matched
350 non-infected control group.² Our findings on anosmia and dysgeusia, dyspnoea, and fatigue are
351 consistent with their findings. However, we included a control group with negative tests (80% of

352 the participants with a negative test reported ≥ 1 symptoms of an infection at the time of testing),
353 allowing us to identify symptoms specific to the SARS-CoV-2 virus compared to other
354 infections. This could be one of the reasons why the current study did not find any association
355 between COVID-19 and persisting fever, headache, cough, nasal symptoms, sore throat, or
356 abdominal pain when we compared SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative participants. We
357 observed an upwards trend in symptoms associated with upper respiratory tract infections
358 (URTI) among the SARS-CoV-2-negative participants over time. This was probably because
359 lockdown measures were gradually relaxed throughout the pandemic.

360 Our findings are also consistent with findings from a large cohort study following 138 818
361 SARS-CoV-2-positive and 5 985 227 controls from the US Department of Veterans Affairs.³⁹ In
362 that study, diagnoses were tracked up to two years after COVID-19 and the risk of 27 of 79
363 diagnoses were still elevated 2 years after COVID-19 compared to non-infected controls.
364 Furthermore, in a cross-sectional study (EPILOC) on 50 457 SARS-CoV-2 positive participants
365 reported that fatigue, neurocognitive impairment, dyspnoea, anosmia, and dysgeusia persisted 6-
366 12 months after the SARS-CoV-2 infection.⁴⁰

367 The current study is a large prospective cohort with a long follow-up period, and multiple
368 follow-up questionnaires, including before disease, with a high response rate. The study included
369 a SARS-CoV-2-negative control group, making it possible to capture differences between
370 COVID-19 and other infections. The SARS-CoV-2 status was obtained from accredited
371 laboratories through MSIS which covers nearly 100% of the population. Another strength is the
372 proportion of missing data which was $< 3\%$ for most of the covariates.

373 Participants were asked to report symptoms experienced in the last three weeks in each
374 questionnaire, and we cannot rule out recall bias. Knowledge of exposure status and media

375 reports on long-COVID symptoms may have biased the self-reported outcome assessment
376 leading to exaggerated ORs for known long-COVID symptoms, at least later in the follow-up
377 period once these became common knowledge (“nocebo effect”). Since data on the symptoms
378 were reported as a three-week symptom prevalence, participants reporting “no symptoms” could
379 still have had symptoms at some point in time. Our coverage of long-COVID symptoms is not
380 exhaustive, and symptoms not known to be related to acute or long-COVID early in the
381 pandemic are not included (i.e., orthostatic intolerance, dysautonomia, palpitations, light-
382 headedness, or post-exertional malaise). There may be testing bias in the comparison between
383 the tested and untested participants. For this reason, we provided results both on positive,
384 negative and untested participants.

385 We cannot rule out non-differential measurement error caused by false negative SARS-CoV-2
386 tests. However, in our add-on study with serological screening, we only identified 3 out of 966
387 (0.3%) unacknowledged cases of COVID-19. In the sensitivity analysis of the substudy, we
388 contacted a subgroup of participants by telephone, and found that a lower proportion reported
389 symptoms compared with those who responded through electronic invitations. This difference
390 was more pronounced among SARS-CoV-2-positive, than among negative participants and
391 could have led to an overestimation of the effect of COVID-19 on symptoms. We did not adjust
392 for multiple testing in the statistical analyses. Nevertheless, the clinical relevance of the actual
393 differences and sizes is the most essential.

394
395 The generalizability of our findings is limited by our cohort composition, which has lower
396 proportions of males, non-white ethnic groups, individuals with lower income, older individuals
397 and no children compared to the Norwegian population. Persistent long-COVID symptoms

398 lasting up to 22 months were memory- and concentration problems, anosmia and dysgeusia,
399 dyspnoea, fatigue and self-assessed worsening of overall health. We could not establish an
400 association between COVID-19 and persisting fever, headache, cough, nasal symptoms, sore
401 throat, or abdominal pain suggesting that the role of previous COVID-19 infections in patients
402 presenting with such symptoms may not be important.

403 The core long-COVID-19 symptoms may have a long-lasting negative impact on peoples' lives
404 and should be in focus in further research and in long-COVID rehabilitation.

405 **Table 1.** Frequency distribution and mean values of covariates by SARS-CoV-2 status at fourth follow-up^a (*n* = 120
406 605).

	SARS-CoV-2 positive^a (<i>n</i> = 15 737)	SARS-CoV-2-negative (<i>n</i> = 67 305)	Untested^b (<i>n</i> = 37 563)
Characteristics			
	Median (IQR)^c		
Time since test (days)^d	55 (15-106)	419 (292-501)	637 (633-669)
	Mean (SD)		
Age (years)	46 (12.1)	48 (13.3)	51 (14.7)
	n (%)		
18-29	1298 (8)	5081 (8)	3150 (8)
30-39	3956 (25)	14 331 (21)	6490 (17)
40-49	4899 (31)	17 108 (26)	7769 (21)
50-59	3429 (22)	16 164 (24)	8765 (24)
60-69	1608 (10)	10 325 (15)	7166 (19)
70+	547 (4)	4296 (6)	4223 (11)
Sex			
Men	4287 (27)	18 879 (28)	13 750 (37)
Women	11 450 (73)	48 426 (72)	23 813 (63)
Income (NOK per household and year)			
< 299 999	477 (3)	2422 (4)	1492 (4)
300 000-599 999	2181(14)	12 185 (18)	7049 (19)
600 000-1000 000	4148 (26)	19 323 (29)	9905 (26)
>1000 000	7096 (45)	27 681 (41)	11 890 (32)
Missing	1835 (12)	5692 (8)	7227 (19)
Body mass index (kg/ m²)			
<25	7603 (48)	30 902 (46)	16 924 (45)
≥25	8018 (51)	35 946 (53)	20 301 (54)
Missing	116 (1)	457 (1)	338 (1)
Smoking status			
Never	8443 (54)	35 418 (53)	18 947 (50)
Former	6109 (39)	25 651 (38)	14 344 (38)
Current	890 (5)	4913 (7)	3313 (9)
Missing	295 (2)	1323 (2)	959 (3)
Underlying medical conditions^e			
No	11 817 (75)	47 947 (71)	25 654 (68)
Yes	3777 (24)	18 622 (28)	11 393 (31)
Missing	143 (1)	736 (1)	516 (1)

407 ^a The SARS-CoV-2 status of the negative participants was obtained from the Norwegian Messaging System for Reporting of Infectious Diseases
408 (MSIS) registry. The SARS-CoV-2-positive status was obtained from the MSIS registry 58% or self-report 42%. Only one SARS-CoV-2-
409 positive-test was included for each participant.

410 ^b Participants that remained untested for the whole follow-up period

411 ^c Interquartile range.

412 ^d Time from the first SARS-CoV-2 positive test or first SARS-CoV-2 negative test to last follow up. For participants remaining untested, time
413 from baseline to the last follow-up is shown.

414 ^e Chronic heart disease, high blood pressure, chronic lung disease (not asthma), asthma, diabetes, receiving immunodeficiency treatment, cancer
415 (under treatment).




Figure 1. The frequencies (moving average and 95% confidence intervals) of symptoms reported before, during and after a positive or negative SARS-CoV-2 test. Participants are grouped by their SARS-CoV-2 status at the end of follow-up. Participants remaining untested for the complete study period (without a test date) are represented with a horizontal (flat) line representing their average (supplementary eMethods 5). The horizontal grey dashed line represents the mean response for untested study participants. The vertical line represents the day of the positive- or negative SARS-CoV-2 test. The figure is based on all completed questionnaires (N=530 200). In each questionnaire, the presence of a symptom the past three weeks was reported by the participant. Note that the 95% confidence interval for the Tested, negative group falls inside the line and it is therefore not visible.

Table 2. Odds ratio (OR) estimates and 95% confidence interval (CI) for reporting each symptom at different time-intervals after a positive or negative SARS-CoV-2 test (or inclusion for untested) with symptoms reported 1-3 months after a negative test as reference (n = 120 605)*.

		Time since test (months) [#]											
		0-1		>1-3		>3-6		>6-12		>12-18		>18	
Symptoms	SARS-CoV-2 status	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)
Memory problems ^a	Untested	--	0.8 (0.22-2.97)	4 (3.6)	1.01 (0.28-3.65)	22 (2.2)	0.61 (0.36-1.04)	1502 (2.5)	0.72 (0.64-0.81)	58 (4.3)	2.6 (1.81-3.73)	441 (2.4)	1 (0.84-1.19)
	Negative	253 (2.7)	0.8 (0.66-0.96)	604 (3.4)	1 (Ref.)	720 (4.1)	1.33 (1.16-1.54)	836 (4.1)	1.54 (1.34-1.78)	1289 (4.6)	1.49 (1.32-1.69)	417 (6)	1.98 (1.68-2.34)
	Positive	395 (6.8)	3.34 (2.78-4.02)	502 (9.8)	6.18 (5.16-7.42)	481 (12)	9.05 (7.49-10.94)	339 (17.3)	13.3 (10.69-16.55)	101 (13.7)	7.83 (5.68-10.79)	13 (15.5)	9.96 (4.31-23.01)
Concentration problems ^a	Untested	--	1.46 (0.08-25.56)	7 (6)	0.85 (0.29-2.54)	46 (4.5)	0.71 (0.47-1.06)	2812 (4.7)	0.64 (0.58-0.71)	92 (6.8)	2.34 (1.72-3.19)	698 (3.7)	0.8 (0.69-0.92)
	Negative	586 (6)	0.95 (0.82-1.09)	1276 (7)	1 (Ref.)	1336 (7.6)	1.17 (1.04-1.3)	1490 (7.2)	1.31 (1.17-1.47)	2179 (7.5)	1.16 (1.05-1.27)	672 (9.6)	1.46 (1.27-1.68)
	Positive	1040 (17.8)	6.05 (5.23-7)	830 (16.2)	5.61 (4.81-6.54)	662 (16.6)	5.71 (4.85-6.73)	423 (21.6)	7.46 (6.11-9.1)	141 (19)	5.27 (3.93-7.06)	17 (20.2)	4.86 (2.13-11.07)
Anosmia and dysgeusia ^b	Untested	6898 (3.5)	1.01 (0.91-1.13)	495 (1.4)	0.65 (0.56-0.74)	1018 (1.3)	0.58 (0.51-0.65)	564 (1)	0.37 (0.33-0.43)	15 (1.1)	0.73 (0.42-1.28)	258 (1.4)	0.69 (0.58-0.81)
	Negative	929 (5.8)	3.27 (2.88-3.71)	575 (2.4)	1 (Ref.)	398 (2)	0.83 (0.72-0.96)	459 (2.2)	0.96 (0.83-1.11)	704 (2.4)	1.13 (0.99-1.28)	234 (3.4)	1.31 (1.09-1.57)
	Positive	2004 (33.8)	66.22 (57.75-75.93)	587 (11.4)	9.65 (8.31-11.21)	310 (7.7)	5.22 (4.38-6.22)	248 (12.6)	8.88 (7.24-10.88)	80 (10.8)	5.47 (4-7.48)	13 (15.5)	5.28 (2.44-11.43)

Table 2 cont.

		Time since test (months) [#]											
		0-1		>1-3		>3-6		>6-12		>12-18		>18	
Symptoms	SARS-CoV-2 status	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)	Yes: n (%)	OR (95% CI)
Dyspnoea ^b	Untested	17386 (8.7)	0.98 (0.91-1.05)	1445 (4.2)	0.58 (0.53-0.64)	2672 (3.5)	0.48 (0.44-0.51)	2152 (3.3)	0.48 (0.44-0.52)	91 (6.8)	1.62 (1.22-2.14)	664 (3.5)	0.58 (0.52-0.65)
	Negative	2212 (13.8)	3.04 (2.78-3.32)	1761 (7.2)	1 (Ref.)	1348 (6.9)	0.99 (0.9-1.08)	1380 (6.7)	0.95 (0.87-1.05)	1858 (6.4)	0.99 (0.91-1.07)	625 (9)	0.97 (0.86-1.09)
	Positive	1765 (29.7)	14.14 (12.69-15.76)	769 (14.9)	4.07 (3.6-4.6)	449 (11.1)	2.44 (2.12-2.81)	247 (12.6)	2.66 (2.2-3.21)	82 (11.1)	2.02 (1.49-2.73)	10 (11.9)	2.03 (0.9-4.59)
Fatigue ^b	Untested	34532 (17.4)	0.51 (0.49-0.54)	3779 (11)	0.47 (0.44-0.49)	8332 (10.9)	0.43 (0.41-0.45)	7667 (11.7)	0.57 (0.54-0.6)	227 (16.9)	1.43 (1.19-1.73)	1982 (10.5)	0.63 (0.59-0.68)
	Negative	5617 (35)	2.92 (2.76-3.1)	5245 (21.5)	1 (Ref.)	4306 (22)	1.08 (1.02-1.15)	4359 (21)	1.14 (1.08-1.21)	6578 (22.8)	1.23 (1.17-1.3)	1953 (28)	1.44 (1.33-1.55)
	Positive	4236 (71.4)	27.63 (25.25-30.23)	1735 (33.5)	2.86 (2.62-3.12)	1182 (29.3)	2.02 (1.83-2.23)	647 (32.9)	2.47 (2.16-2.82)	218 (29.5)	1.78 (1.44-2.2)	26 (31)	1.3 (0.72-2.36)
Self-assessed worsening of overall health ^c	Untested	27 (13.3)	0.5 (0.3-0.82)	1625 (11.9)	0.49 (0.45-0.53)	8070 (10.6)	0.42 (0.39-0.44)	8652 (13.3)	0.66 (0.62-0.69)	107 (10.7)	0.52 (0.4-0.66)	2137 (11.5)	0.55 (0.51-0.59)
	Negative	2308 (16.5)	0.84 (0.78-0.9)	4461 (18.7)	1 (Ref.)	3740 (19.4)	1.06 (1-1.13)	3811 (18.8)	1.02 (0.96-1.09)	5193 (18.1)	1 (0.95-1.06)	1432 (20.7)	1.01 (0.93-1.1)
	Positive	1717 (29.7)	2.38 (2.18-2.59)	1537 (30.6)	2.61 (2.38-2.85)	1041 (28.0)	2.32 (2.1-2.57)	618 (37.1)	3.63 (3.15-4.19)	238 (36.2)	3.44 (2.77-4.26)	30 (40.0)	3.77 (2.05-6.94)

^a Adjusted for age (10-years categories), gender (men, women) body mass index (<25 kg/ m², ≥25 kg/ m²), income level per household (< 299 999, 300 000-599 999, 600 000-1000 000, >1000 000 NOK, missing), smoking status (never, former, current, missing), underlying medical condition (no, yes, missing) and symptom status at baseline (no, yes, missing).

[#] For the untested, time since baseline was used in place of time since a positive- or negative SARS-CoV-2 test.

^a n = 200 778 questionnaires, 120 605 participants

^b n = 530 200 questionnaires, 120 605 participants

^c n = 304 958 questionnaires, 120 605 participants

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr Fridtjof Lund Johansen at Oslo University Hospital for organizing and carrying out the serological analyses.

Author contributions

Merete Ellingjord-Dale, Anders B. Nygaard, and Arne Søråas had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Merete Ellingjord-Dale and Anders B. Nygaard contributed equally as co-first authors.

Conceptualization: Arne Søråas and Karl Trygve Kalleberg.

Design of study and analyses: Merete Ellingjord-Dale, Anders B. Nygaard, Karl Trygve Kalleberg, John Arne Dahl, Sonja H. Brunvoll, Nathalie C. Støer, Linda Geng, Giske Ursin and Arne Søråas.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: all authors.

Data curation and statistical analysis: Merete Ellingjord-Dale, Anders B. Nygaard, Ragnhild Bø, Nils Inge Landrø and Arne Søråas.

Drafting of the manuscript: Merete Ellingjord-Dale, Anders B. Nygaard, Sonja H. Brunvoll, Nathalie C. Støer, Giske Ursin, and Arne Søråas.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: all authors.

Administrative and technical support: Mette S. Istre.

Supervision: Giske Ursin, Nathalie C. Støer and Arne Søråas.

Final approval of the manuscript and work: all authors.

Conflict of interest disclosures

All authors declared no potential conflicts of interest. However, Karl Trygve Kalleberg and Arne Søråas are founders and shareholders of the company Age Labs AS which develops epigenetic tests, including one for COVID-19 severity.

Funding

This work was funded by the Research Council of Norway (no: 324274) and Southern and Eastern Norway Regional Health Authority (internal funding). The funder had no role in the conduction, collection of data or interpretation of results.

Additional contributions

The authors would like to thank all the participants in the study.

Transparency statement

The lead authors (MED and ABN) affirm that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the trial being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned, and registered have been explained.

Data availability statement

Individual level data from the study for the purposes outlined in the consent form can be shared with other researchers in a timely fashion. The data are regulated under the European GDPR regulative and sharing of data must be approved by the Data Protection Officer at Oslo

University Hospital. Data will be made available for researchers whose proposed use of the data has been approved.

References

1. WHO. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2021. <https://covid19.who.int/> (accessed April 6 2023).
2. Ballering AV, van Zon SKR, olde Hartman TC, Rosmalen JGM. Persistence of somatic symptoms after COVID-19 in the Netherlands: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet* 2022; **400**(10350): 452-61.
3. Rando HM, Bennett TD, Byrd JB, et al. Challenges in defining Long COVID: Striking differences across literature, Electronic Health Records, and patient-reported information. *medRxiv* 2021.
4. Fernandez-de-Las-Penas C, Palacios-Cena D, Gomez-Mayordomo V, Cuadrado ML, Florencio LL. Defining Post-COVID Symptoms (Post-Acute COVID, Long COVID, Persistent Post-COVID): An Integrative Classification. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; **18**(5).
5. Alwan NA, Johnson L. Defining long COVID: Going back to the start. *Med (N Y)* 2021; **2**(5): 501-4.
6. Sivan M, Taylor S. NICE guideline on long covid. *Bmj* 2020; **371**: m4938.
7. WHO. World Health Organization. Post COVID-19 condition (Long COVID). 2021. <https://www.who.int/srilanka/news/detail/16-10-2021-post-covid-19-condition> (accessed April 14 2023).
8. COVID.gov. Department of Health and Human Services. What is Long COVID? <https://www.covid.gov/longcovid/definitions> (accessed April 14 2023).
9. Davis HE, McCorkell L, Vogel JM, Topol EJ. Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and recommendations. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2023.
10. Davis HE, Assaf GS, McCorkell L, et al. Characterizing long COVID in an international cohort: 7 months of symptoms and their impact. *EClinicalMedicine* 2021; **38**: 101019.
11. Lopez-Leon S, Wegman-Ostrosky T, Perelman C, et al. More Than 50 Long-Term Effects of COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Res Sq* 2021.
12. Hampshire A, Trender W, Chamberlain S, et al. Cognitive deficits in people who have recovered from COVID-19 relative to controls: An N=84,285 online study. *medRxiv*; 2020.
13. Soraas A, Bo R, Kalleberg KT, Stoer NC, Ellingjord-Dale M, Landro NI. Self-reported Memory Problems 8 Months After COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(7): e2118717.
14. Becker JH, Lin JJ, Doernberg M, et al. Assessment of Cognitive Function in Patients After COVID-19 Infection. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(10): e2130645.
15. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, Transmission, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Review. *JAMA* 2020; **324**(8): 782-93.
16. Prescott HC, Angus DC. Enhancing Recovery From Sepsis: A Review. *JAMA* 2018; **319**(1): 62-75.
17. Invernizzi A, Renzetti S, van Thriel C, et al. Covid-19 related cognitive, structural and functional brain changes among Italian adolescents and young adults: a multimodal longitudinal case-control study. *medRxiv* 2023: 2023.07. 19.23292909.
18. Vakani K, Ratto M, Sandford-James A, Antonova E, Kumari V. COVID-19 and Cognitive Function: Evidence for Increased Processing Speed Variability in COVID-19 Survivors and Multifaceted Impairment with Long-COVID Symptoms. *European Psychiatry* 2023: 1-34.
19. Kopańska M, Ochojska D, Muchacka R, Dejniewicz-Velitchkov A, Banaś-Ząbczyk A, Szczygielski J. Comparison of qeeg findings before and after onset of post-COVID-19 brain fog symptoms. *Sensors* 2022; **22**(17): 6606.
20. Ballering AV, van Zon SK, Olde Hartman TC, Rosmalen JG. Persistence of somatic symptoms after COVID-19 in the Netherlands: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet* 2022; **400**(10350): 452-61.
21. Quan M, Wang X, Gong M, Wang Q, Li Y, Jia J. Post-COVID cognitive dysfunction: current status and research recommendations for high risk population. *The Lancet Regional Health—Western Pacific* 2023; **38**.

22. Lapin B, Katzan IL. Health-Related Quality of Life Mildly Affected Following COVID-19: a Retrospective Pre-post Cohort Study with a Propensity Score-Matched Control Group. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022; **37**(4): 862-9.
23. Durstenfeld MS, Peluso MJ, Peyser ND, et al. Factors Associated With Long COVID Symptoms in an Online Cohort Study. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2023; **10**(2): ofad047.
24. ISARIC. COVID-19 Long Term Protocol. Tier 1 Initial Follow up Survey. 2020. <https://isaric.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Tier-1-Initial-Follow-up-survey.pdf> (accessed April 14 2023).
25. RAND. RAND Health Care. 36-Item Short Form Survey Instrument (SF-36). https://www.rand.org/health-care/surveys_tools/mos/36-item-short-form/survey-instrument.html (accessed April 14 2023).
26. Roth R, Isquith P, Gioia G. Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function - Adult Version (BRIEF-A); 2005.
27. Royle J, Lincoln NB. The Everyday Memory Questionnaire-revised: development of a 13-item scale. *Disabil Rehabil* 2008; **30**(2): 114-21.
28. WHO. World Health Organization. Post COVID-19 condition (Long COVID). 2022. <https://www.who.int/europe/news-room/fact-sheets/item/post-covid-19-condition> (accessed April 14 2023).
29. Corbett A, Williams G, Creese B, et al. Cognitive decline in older adults in the UK during and after the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal analysis of PROTECT study data. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity* 2023; **4**(11): e591-e9.
30. Douaud G, Lee S, Alfaro-Almagro F, et al. SARS-CoV-2 is associated with changes in brain structure in UK Biobank. *Nature* 2022; **604**(7907): 697-707.
31. Lambrecq V, Hanin A, Munoz-Musat E, et al. Association of Clinical, Biological, and Brain Magnetic Resonance Imaging Findings With Electroencephalographic Findings for Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021; **4**(3): e211489.
32. Stein SR, Ramelli SC, Grazioli A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and persistence in the human body and brain at autopsy. *Nature* 2022; **612**(7941): 758-63.
33. Gidon A, Zolnik TA, Fidzinski P, et al. Dendritic action potentials and computation in human layer 2/3 cortical neurons. *Science* 2020; **367**(6473): 83-7.
34. Velmeshev D, Schirmer L, Jung D, et al. Single-cell genomics identifies cell type-specific molecular changes in autism. *Science* 2019; **364**(6441): 685-9.
35. Beck JW, Flow A. The effects of contracting Covid-19 on cognitive failures at work: implications for task performance and turnover intentions. *Scientific Reports* 2022; **12**(1): 8826.
36. Reiken S, Sittenfeld L, Dridi H, Liu Y, Liu X, Marks AR. Alzheimer's-like signaling in brains of COVID-19 patients. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* 2022; **18**(5): 955-65.
37. Logie RH, Camos V, Cowan N. 1C1The State of the Science of Working Memory: An Introduction. In: Logie R, Camos V, Cowan N, eds. Working Memory: The state of the science: Oxford University Press; 2020: 0.
38. Sheehy LM. Considerations for Postacute Rehabilitation for Survivors of COVID-19. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* 2020; **6**(2): e19462.
39. Bowe B, Xie Y, Al-Aly Z. Postacute sequelae of COVID-19 at 2 years. *Nature Medicine* 2023.
40. Peter RS, Nieters A, Kräusslich H-G, et al. Post-acute sequelae of covid-19 six to 12 months after infection: population based study. *BMJ* 2022; **379**: e071050.