

1 **Self-reported health, neuropsychological tests and biomarkers in fully recovered COVID-19 patients vs**
2 **patients with post-COVID cognitive symptoms: a pilot study**

3 Short title: Cognitive symptoms in long COVID-patients vs. fully recovered COVID patients

4 Michael R. Lawrence,^{1,2} Judith E. Arnetz,^{3*} Scott E. Counts,^{3,4} Aiesha Ahmed,² Bengt B. Arnetz³

5 ¹ Division of Clinical Neuropsychology, Corewell Health, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA

6 ² Department of Neurology, Corewell Health, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA

7 ³ Department of Family Medicine, College of Human Medicine, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA

8 ⁴ Department of Translational Neuroscience, College of Human Medicine, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

9

10 *Corresponding author: arnetzju@msu.edu

11 **Author Contributions**

12 Conceptualization: Aiesha Ahmed, Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence

13 Data Curation: Bengt B. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence

14 Formal Analysis: Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Scott E. Counts

15 Funding Acquisition: Aiesha Ahmed, Bengt B. Arnetz

16 Investigation: Michael R. Lawrence

17 Methodology: Aiesha Ahmed, Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence

18 Project Administration: Bengt B. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence

19 Resources: Bengt B. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence, Scott E. Counts

20 Software: Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz

21 Supervision: Bengt B. Arnetz

22 Validation: Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence, Scott E. Counts

23 Visualization: Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence

- 24 Writing – Original Draft Preparation: Aiesha Ahmed, Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Michael R.
25 Lawrence
- 26 Writing – Review & Editing: Aiesha Ahmed, Bengt B. Arnetz, Judith E. Arnetz, Michael R. Lawrence, Scott
27 E. Counts
- 28
- 29

30 **Abstract**

31 **Objective:** Substantial numbers of individuals who contract COVID-19 experience long-lasting cognitive
32 symptoms such as brain fog. Yet research to date has not compared these patients with healthy controls
33 with a history of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 infection, making it difficult to understand why certain
34 COVID patients develop post-COVID cognitive symptoms while others do not. The objective of this pilot
35 study was to compare two groups of laboratory-confirmed post-COVID patients, with and without
36 cognitive symptoms, on measures of cognitive and psychological functioning, self-reported perceptions
37 of functional status and quality of life, and biomarkers of stress, inflammation, and neuroplasticity.

38 **Methods:** Using a case-control design, 17 participants were recruited from a healthcare system in
39 western Michigan, USA in 2022 through 2024. All participants were aged 25-65 and had a positive
40 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test confirming previous COVID-19 infection. Ten participants reported
41 cognitive symptoms (long COVID group) while seven were fully recovered with no residual symptoms
42 (controls). All participants underwent an interview on their self-rated health and quality of life, a battery
43 of neurocognitive tests, and blood draw for biomarker analysis.

44 **Results:** No group differences were detected for neuropsychological test measures except for letter
45 fluency where the long COVID group scored significantly lower ($p < .05$). The long COVID group had
46 significantly lower ratings than controls on quality of life, physical health, emotional functioning, and
47 psychological well-being. Serum levels of nerve growth factor (NGF), a biomarker of brain plasticity,
48 were significantly lower in the long COVID group, which was significantly more likely than controls to
49 have serum levels of inflammatory marker (interleukin (IL)-10) values greater than or equal to the
50 median ($p = 0.015$).

51 **Conclusion:** Biomarker analyses suggest possible prolonged inflammatory processes in long COVID
52 patients compared to fully recovered patients. Results of decreased neuroplastic functioning give
53 credence to patients' reports of post-COVID changes in brain function.

54 **Introduction**

55 Post COVID conditions (PCC), or long COVID, is a clinical syndrome characterized by symptoms of COVID-
56 19 that extend well beyond the initial recovery period [1]. The clinical diagnosis, termed post-acute
57 sequela of COVID-19 (PASC), was officially defined and assigned in the International Classification of
58 Diseases (ICD) - 10 in October of 2021. However, a widely accepted case definition and associated
59 symptom timeframe is still under development [2]. Research suggests that approximately 30% of
60 individuals who contract COVID-19 will go on to develop a post COVID-19 condition and experience long-
61 lasting symptoms [3]. Although symptoms are often diverse, many patients experience persistent
62 cognitive complaints, including poor memory and “brain fog” [1,4]. To date, four years after the onset of
63 the COVID-19 pandemic, cognitive symptoms continue to plague a substantial proportion of individuals
64 who have experienced the viral infection [5].

65

66 A large survey of U.S. adults conducted during a six-month period in 2021-2022 found that 46% of those
67 with PCC reported either brain fog or impaired memory, which was associated with a decreased
68 likelihood of working full-time [6]. Another U.S. survey of nearly 15,000 adults with prior COVID-19
69 infection found that 57% of individuals with PCC experienced significantly more cognitive symptoms at
70 least daily compared to those without PCC [7]. The most commonly reported cognitive disturbances
71 involved attention, executive functioning and memory, with brain fog or processing speed deficits
72 reported in 40-60% of patients with long COVID [8]. Brain fog, or COVID fog [9] is often accompanied by
73 fatigue, anxiety, and depressive symptoms similar to those seen in chronic fatigue syndrome [10]. Post-
74 COVID cognitive symptoms are reported more frequently among individuals who had a mild initial
75 infection [10, 11, 12] and in individuals who report prior cognitive difficulties and a diagnosis of
76 depressive disorder [13]. Individuals with an elevated psychological symptom burden as part of their

77 post COVID-19 clinical picture report more perceived cognitive difficulties in day-to-day life [14]. Post-
78 COVID cognitive symptoms have also been associated with decreased quality of life and function [15].

79
80 Notably, research to date has not shown significant objective cognitive deficits in individuals with
81 cognitive complaints related to long COVID. A study of 51 adults with post-COVID cognitive symptoms
82 reported that they scored in the normal range on standardized neuropsychological measures. However,
83 that study lacked a control group [14]. The results of neuropsychological tests in 53 outpatients
84 diagnosed with COVID-19 revealed no scores in the impaired range, leading the authors to conclude that
85 objective cognitive performance was not affected by self-reported cognitive complaints [16]. One study
86 compared adults with post-COVID conditions (n=319) to healthy controls (n=109) and found no
87 significant group differences in neuropsychological test results. Healthy controls in that study had not
88 been infected with COVID-19. However, when dividing the PCC group into those with cognitive
89 complaints (n=123) and those without (n=196), they found that those with cognitive complaints scored
90 significantly worse on global cognition, learning, memory, processing speed, language, and executive
91 function [15].

92
93 A number of studies [e.g.,17-23] have focused on biomarkers associated with post-COVID symptoms in
94 an effort to better understand PCC, improve diagnosis, and develop potential therapeutic treatments.
95 Lai et al. [21] identified interleukin (IL)-6, C-reactive protein (CRP), tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF-
96 alpha), and neurofilament light chain (NfL) as potential diagnostic indicators of long COVID. In a Brazilian
97 cohort, Queiroz et al. [22] found that patients with long COVID exhibited higher levels of IL-17 and IL-2,
98 whereas patients with no post-COVID symptoms had higher levels of IL-4, IL-6 and IL-10. While patients
99 in that study had all been diagnosed with COVID, the authors only compared biomarkers between
100 groups and did not report on cognitive complaints. However, due to the broad array of symptoms

101 associated with PCC, as well as the varied study designs employed, it is difficult to draw any definitive
102 conclusions regarding specific biomarkers. A few studies have focused more specifically on biomarkers
103 associated with cognitive impairment [24, 25]. In a study of 710 COVID survivors, Damiano et al. [24]
104 found no cytokines or inflammatory markers associated with cognitive performance. Vrettou et al. [25]
105 studied neural biomarkers in a cohort of 65 long COVID patients and 29 age and sex-matched healthy
106 controls with no known history of COVID infection. They found that levels of glial fibrillary acidic protein
107 (GFAP), a biomarker of neural inflammation, were significantly higher among long COVID patients, but
108 were not correlated with the presence of long COVID symptoms.

109
110 In summary, the literature to date offers sparse evidence of biomarker response to post-COVID cognitive
111 complaints, and we lack standardized phenotyping for biomarker analyses [26]. Moreover, patients with
112 PCC cognitive complaints do not seem to differ from healthy controls on neurocognitive testing but did
113 score worse than PCC patients without cognitive complaints [15]. However, patients with PCC cognitive
114 complaints may also differ in terms of psychological symptoms and self-perceived health and functional
115 status [14, 25, 27]. In any event, large numbers of individuals with PCC continue to suffer from cognitive
116 symptoms that do not seem to improve with time [5]. Studies to date have compared cognitive issues
117 between COVID laboratory-positive and laboratory-negative patients [27, 28] or followed longitudinal
118 cohorts of lab-confirmed COVID patients without comparison groups [12, 13]. The lack of studies
119 involving controls with a history of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 infection makes it difficult to
120 enhance our understanding of why certain COVID patients develop PCC cognitive symptoms while
121 others do not. To address these gaps in the literature, the aim of the present pilot study was to compare
122 two groups of laboratory confirmed post-COVID patients, with and without cognitive symptoms, on
123 measures of cognitive and psychological functioning, self-reported perceptions of functional status and
124 quality of life, and biomarkers of stress, inflammation, and neuroplasticity.

125

126 **Materials and Methods**

127 *Study design*

128 This was a pilot study utilizing a case-control design.

129 *Study participants*

130 The sample was comprised of a total of 17 participants who had previously contracted COVID-19. All

131 were recruited from Corewell Health medical facilities in western Michigan, U.S. Inclusion criteria

132 included being between the ages of 25-65, at least 6 months after COVID infection, and a positive

133 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test confirming COVID infection. All participants were placed into one

134 of two groups, a symptomatic group based upon self-report of cognitive symptoms (“long COVID”), or an

135 asymptomatic control group. The asymptomatic group was fully recovered from COVID, with no residual

136 symptoms. Attempts were made to age and sex match the symptomatic and control group.

137 *Data collection*

138 Recruitment took place between March 4, 2022 and April 10, 2024. Each participant met with a study

139 coordinator who verbally explained the nature of the study, the research intent, and risks. Participants

140 then read and signed informed consent forms prior to participation. All participants underwent an

141 interview on their self-rated health and quality of life, a battery of neurocognitive tests, and blood draw

142 for biomarker analysis. Each participant was reimbursed \$75 upon completion of the approximately 2 -

143 hour evaluation.

144 *Self-report symptoms*

145 All participants completed a brief structured interview assessing symptom complex and time

146 frame/course. The self-report measures focused specifically on mood, emotional functioning and quality

147 of life. Mood was measured using the Beck Depression Inventory [29] and Beck Anxiety Inventory [30].

148 Emotional functioning and quality of life were measured using the Short Form Health Survey SF-36 [31;
149 32] and the EuroQuol 5-Dimension EQ-5D [33]. Descriptions of each measure are provided in Table 1.

150

151 Table 1. Self-Report Questionnaires

Report Inventory	Description
<i>Mood</i>	
Beck Depression Inventory [29]	21-item self-report inventory measuring attitudes and symptoms of depression. Each item is rated on a scale from 0 to 3, with 0 indicating no symptoms and 3 indicating strong symptoms.
Beck Anxiety Inventory [30]	21-item self-report inventory measuring anxiety level and severity. Items are rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 3 (severely – it bothered me a lot).
<i>Emotional Functioning/Quality of Life</i>	
Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) [31,32]	36-item survey measuring 8 domains of health: (1) Limitations in physical activities due to health problems; (2) Limitations in social activities due to physical or emotional problems; (3) Limitations in usual role activities due to physical health problems; (4) Bodily pain; (5) General mental health; (6) Limitations in usual role activities due to emotional problems; (7) Vitality; (8) General health perceptions.
EuroQoL 5-Dimension (EQ-5D) [33]	Patient reported outcome that measures quality of life across 5 domains: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression. Each dimension is scored on a 3-level severity ranking that ranges from "no problems" through "extreme problems." Also includes a 0-100 visual analogue scale to assess patient's self-rated overall health (100 = the best health you can imagine; 0 = the worst health you can imagine).

152

153 *Neurocognitive testing*

154 The interview was followed by a 90-minute neurocognitive battery assessing various aspects of
155 cognition including estimated premorbid functioning, attention, processing speed, verbal fluency,
156 learning and memory, visual planning, and executive functioning (e.g., problem-solving, multitasking,
157 sustained concentration). An overview and description of the tests is provided in Table 2. All measures
158 used in the current study were well known for their strong psychometric properties.

159 Table 2. Neuropsychological Test Measures

Test Measure	Test Description
<i>Premorbid Intellect</i>	
Test of Premorbid Functioning [34]	Estimate of premorbid intellect as measured by single word reading ability
<i>Attention</i>	

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Digit Span (WAIS-IV Digit Span) [35]	Auditory attention task assessing working memory capacity; the forward memory span involves repeating sequence of numbers verbatim, while the backward memory span involves recalling numbers in reverse order. A sequencing span task is also administered in which participant orders numbers from lowest to highest.
<i>Processing Speed</i>	
Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT) [36]	Digit-symbol transcription task involving selective attention, visual scanning, and cognitive speed; Using a reference key, participant has 90 seconds to pair specific numbers with given geometric figures. Responses can be written or given orally.
<i>Language</i>	
Letter fluency (COWAT) [37]	Speeded word retrieval based on letter cues; performance is based on total number of correct responses.
Semantic Fluency (Animal fluency) [37]	Rapid word generation for a semantic category; performance is based on total number of correct responses.
<i>Visual Planning</i>	
Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure Test [38]	Figure copy task assessing visuo-constructional ability as well as planning/organization.
<i>Learning and Memory</i>	
California Verbal Learning Test (CVLT-II) [39]	Measure of learning and recall of a word list; after the initial learning phase, participants are asked to recall the list after a 20-minute delay. Indices examined include total recall (trials 1-5), free/cued short-delay recall, and free/cued long delay free recall.
<i>Executive Functioning</i>	
Trail Making Test [40]	Part A involves visual search and speed; participants draw a continuous line through 25 consecutively numbered circles. Part B introduces added cognitive demand of mental set-shifting; participant draws a continuous line through consecutive numbers and letters, alternating the order each time a connection is made (1-A-2-B-3-C, etc.).
Tower of London (TOL-2) [41]	Participant arranges puzzle designs using as few moves as possible. Assesses executive planning proficiency and problem-solving. Outcomes include initiation time, execution time, total time of completion, time/rule violations, and a total achievement score.

160

161 *Biomarker analysis*

162 Blood serum and plasma specimens were taken for biomarker analysis. All blood sampling was
163 conducted at the health system laboratory. For each participant, 30 mL blood was drawn by a licensed
164 phlebotomist, and the time of day of sample collection was recorded. All samples were frozen and
165 stored in a -80 °C freezer for later analysis. Analysis focused on biomarkers of stress (cortisol), anti-
166 stress or recovery (dehydroepiandrosterone sulphate, DHEA-S), inflammation (IL-6, IL-10),
167 neuroplasticity (brain-derived neurotrophic factor, BDNF, and nerve growth factor, NGF) and
168 neurodegenerative disease (neurofilament light chain, NfL). Analyte concentrations in both serum and

169 plasma samples were measured using human-specific 96 well ELISAs with the exception of NfL, which
170 was analyzed by Single Molecule Array (SIMOA) technology. The following kits were used to generate
171 data: Cortisol (Boster #EK7002, Pleasanton, CA; sensitivity > 20 ng/ml), DHEA-S (Invitrogen #EIAD HEA,
172 Carlsbad, CA; > 90.9 ng/ml), IL-6 (BioLegend #430507, San Diego, CA; > 1.6 pg/ml), IL-10 (BioLegend
173 #430607, San Diego, CA; > 2 pg/ml), BDNF (Origene #EA100205, Rockville, MD; > 2 pg/ml), NGF (AVIVA
174 #OKEH00186, San Diego, CA; > 15.6 pg/ml), and NfL (Quanterix #193186, Billerica, MA; > 1.38 pg/ml).
175 Manufacturer's instructions were followed for all assays. Duplicate samples were quantified using
176 standard curves based on calibrators of known concentration; intra-assay % CVs \leq 5.2% for all assays.

177 *Data analysis*

178 Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS Statistics version 29 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY), with a two-
179 sided p value <.05 deemed statistically significant. Due to the small sample size, all comparisons
180 between the long COVID and asymptomatic control groups on self-report measures and neurocognitive
181 tests were conducted using non-parametric tests, specifically, Chi square or Fishers' exact tests for
182 discrete variables and Mann-Whitney U-tests for continuous variables. Group comparisons for
183 biomarker values utilized the natural log (Ln) for all biomarkers and were conducted using independent
184 samples T-tests. Since the study is based on relatively few participants and there are no published data
185 on recommended cut-off levels for biomarkers applicable to PCC patients, additional analyses were
186 conducted by dichotomizing the biomarkers into below the median vs equal to or above the median
187 based on aggregate data for all participants. Using these cutoffs, group comparisons were conducted to
188 examine whether the proportion of participants across the two groups above and below the median
189 differed statistically. In a final step, a pro-inflammatory index was created by summing up the absolute
190 values for IL-10 and IL6. The long COVID scores were compared with the controls using total scores as
191 well as the Ln transformed scores. The serum pro-inflammatory Index was dichotomized into less than

192 the median (=5.4005 pg/mL) vs greater than or equal to the median. Fisher's exact 2-sided test was used
193 for these analyses, with significance set at $p < .05$.

194

195 *Ethical Considerations*

196 The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Corewell Health (IRB nr. 2020-601).

197

198 **Results**

199 Demographic characteristics of study participants are summarized and compared by group in Table 3.

200 The mean age was 42 years in the long COVID group and 44.32 in the controls. All but one participant

201 was female, all but two identified as White, and none identified as Hispanic. Most participants in both

202 groups had a high school diploma or associate degree as their highest educational degree. All seven

203 control group participants were employed, compared to 6 of 10 in the long COVID group. Three of the 4

204 unemployed reported that their unemployment was due to their post COVID condition. None of the

205 group differences were statistically significant.

206 Table 3. Demographics of long COVID (n=10) vs Controls (n=7)

	Long COVID	Controls	<i>p</i>
Age years (SE)	42.00 (3.18)	44.32 (4.89)	ns
	N (%)	N (%)	
Gender			ns
Male	1 (10)	0	
Female	9 (90)	7 (100)	
Race			ns
Black/African American	0	1 (14.3)	
White/Caucasian	10 (100)	5 (71.4)	
Other	0	1 (14.3)	
Highest educational degree			ns
High school diploma	5 (50)	4 (57.1)	
Associate's	2 (20)	2 (28.6)	
Bachelor's	3 (30)	0	
Master's	0	1 (14.3)	

Employment status			ns
Employed	6 (60)	7 (100)	
Unemployed	4 (40)	0	

207 SE = standard error; significance tested using Mann-Whitney U-tests and Chi square statistics
208

209 *Self-report measures and neurocognitive tests*

210 Group differences on self-report measures for emotional functioning/quality of life and mood, and on
211 objective neuropsychological tests are summarized in Table 4. On self-report measures, individuals with
212 long COVID scored significantly higher than controls, indicating a higher level of problems on the quality
213 of life measures for usual activity (2.20 vs. 1.00, $p=.002$) and pain/discomfort (2.20 vs. 1.17, $p=.007$), as
214 well as on the EuroQol 5-Dimension (EQ-5D EQ5D3L) total score (9.50 vs. 5.50, $p<.001$). There were no
215 significant group differences for mobility, self-care, and anxiety/depression. The long COVID group
216 scored significantly lower (mean 38.10) than the non-symptomatic group (mean 89.17) on the visual
217 analogue scale (VAS) for self-rated health, ranging from 0 (worst health you can imagine) to 100 (best
218 health you can imagine). On the SF-36 quality of life measures, the long COVID group scored significantly
219 lower than the healthy controls on all eight dimensions ($p<.01$). Thus, those with post-COVID cognitive
220 complaints experienced greater limitations in physical and social activities due to physical and emotional
221 health problems, and reported worse bodily pain, general mental health, and lower vitality, i.e., less
222 energy and more fatigue, than controls. The long COVID group also scored significantly higher on both
223 mood measures (depression, mean 27.50 vs. 3.86, $p<.001$; anxiety, 21.40 vs. 4.57, $p=.002$) than healthy
224 controls.

Table 4. Self-report Measures and Neurocognitive Testing of Long COVID (n=10) vs Controls (n = 7)

	Long COVID	Controls	
	mean	mean	<i>p</i>
<i>Quality of Life: EuroQol 5-Dimension (EQ-5D)</i>			
Mobility	1.60	1.00	ns
Self-Care	1.40	1.00	ns
Usual Activity	2.20	1.00	.002
Pain/Discomfort	2.20	1.17	.007
Anxiety/Depression	2.10	1.33	ns
VASRaw	38.10	89.17	.005
EQ5D3L Raw	9.50	5.50	<.001

Quality of Life: SF-36

Phys Funct Raw	46.00	97.50	.003
Role Funct Phys Raw	10.00	100.00	.002
Role funct Emo Raw	9.93	100.00	<.001
Energy Fatigue Raw	17.00	70.00	<.001
Emo Well-Being Raw	48.80	82.67	.003
Social Funct Raw	21.25	93.75	<.001
Pain Raw	45.25	96.25	.003
Gen Health Raw	28.00	81.67	<.001

Mood

Beck Depression Raw	27.50	3.86	<.001
Beck Anxiety Raw	21.40	4.57	.002

Learning and Memory: California Verbal Learning Test (CVLT-II)

Cali Verbal 1-5 Learning Total Raw	46.30	53.43	ns
Cali Verbal 1-5 Learning Total T Score	45.70	52.29	ns
Cali Verbal Learning Trial 1 Raw	5.90	6.43	ns
Cali Verbal Learning Trial 1 Z-Score	-0.65	-0.36	ns
Cali Verbal Learning Trial 5 Raw	11.40	13.14	ns
Cali Verbal Learning Trial 5 Z-Score	-0.60	-0.07	ns
Cali Verbal Learning List B Raw	5.00	5.43	ns
Cali Verbal Learning List B Z-Score	-0.75	-0.50	ns
Cali Verbal Test 1-5 Learning Slope Raw	1.38	1.69	ns
Cali Verbal Test 1-5 Learning Slope Z-Score	-0.10	0.36	ns
Cali Verbal Test Short Delay Free Recall Raw	10.60	11.00	ns
Cali Verbal Test Short Delay Free Recall Z-Score	-0.20	-0.14	ns
Cali Verbal Test Short Delay Cued Recall Raw	11.90	11.86	ns
Cali Verbal Test Short Delay Cued Recall Z-Score	-0.15	-0.21	ns
Cali Verbal Test Long Delay Free Recall Raw	10.20	12.00	ns
Cali Verbal Test Long Delay Free Recall Z-Score	-0.45	0.07	ns
Cali Verbal Test Long Delay Cued Recall Raw	11.40	12.29	ns
Cali Verbal Test Long Delay Cued Recall Z-Score	-0.45	-0.21	ns
Cali Verbal Test Recognition Hits Raw	13.50	15.14	ns
Cali Verbal Test Recognition Hits Z Score	-1.20	-0.29	ns
Cali Verbal Test False Pos Raw	2.00	0.71	ns
Cali Verbal Test False Pos Z Score	0.10	-0.43	ns
Cali Verbal Test Recognition Discrimination Raw	2.87	3.53	ns
Cali Verbal Test Recognition Discrimination ZScore	-0.35	0.50	ns

Attention: Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale Digit Span (WAIS-IV Digit Span)

Wechsler Digit Forward Raw	9.70	10.14	ns
Wechsler Digit Backward Raw	7.70	6.86	ns
Reliable Digit Span Raw	9.00	8.57	ns
Wechsler Seq Span Raw	6.70	8.00	ns
Wechsler Digit Span Scaled Score	8.63	8.71	ns

Processing Speed: Symbol Digits Modality Test

Symbol Digit Mod Raw	43.50	50.43	ns
----------------------	-------	-------	----

Symbol Digit Mod Z Score	-0.99	0.17	ns
<i><u>Executive Functioning: Trail Making Test</u></i>			
Trail Making Part A Raw	31.60	22.86	ns
Trail Making Part A T Score	45.10	56.57	ns
Trail Making Part A Errors Score	0.33	0.40	ns
Trail Making Part B Raw	94.12	69.00	ns
Trail Making Part B T Score	40.20	51.14	ns
Trail Making Part B Errors Score	0.56	0.20	ns
<i><u>Executive Functioning: Tower of London (TOL-2)</u></i>			
London Drexel Total Move Raw	32.67	36.00	ns
London Drexel Total Move Standard Score	98.89	96.00	ns
London Drexel Total Correct Raw	3.78	4.00	ns
London Drexel Total Correct Standard Score	97.56	98.57	ns
London Drexel Total Rule Viol Raw Score	0.33	0.00	ns
London Drexel Total Rule Viol Standard Score	94.67	104.29	ns
London Drexel Total Time Viol Raw	0.89	0.86	ns
London Drexel Total Time Viol Standard Score	93.78	93.14	ns
London Drexel Total Initiation Time Raw	78.00	51.29	ns
London Drexel Total Initiation Standard Score	108.89	100.00	ns
London Drexel Total Execution Raw	220.22	207.86	ns
London Drexel Total Execution Standard Score	97.78	98.29	ns
London Drexel Total Prob Solv Raw	298.22	265.43	ns
London Drexel Total Prob Solv Standard Score	94.89	98.86	ns
<i><u>Language: Controlled Oral Word Assoc. Test (COWAT)</u></i>			
Control Oral Assoc Letter Fluency Raw	26.80	38.00	.043
Control Oral Assoc Letter Fluency T Score	34.10	46.71	.019
Control Oral Assoc Semantic Fluency Raw	16.20	18.14	ns
Control Oral Assoc Semantic Fluency T Score	34.80	45.00	ns
<i><u>Premorbid Intellect: Test of Premorbid Functioning</u></i>			
Premorbid Funct Raw	36.20	28.14	ns
Premorbid Funct T Score	93.80	86.57	ns
<i><u>Visual Planning: Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure Test</u></i>			
Rey Osterrieth Raw	28.50	29.86	ns
Rey Osterrieth T Score	-0.49	-0.69	ns

Note: Significance tested using Mann-Whitney U tests; ns=non-significant

225
 226 With regard to objective neuropsychological test measures, there were no statistically significant group
 227 differences detected for premorbid functioning, learning and memory, attention, processing speed,
 228 executive functioning, or visual planning. By contrast, the long COVID group scored significantly lower on
 229 two measures of language related to letter fluency (raw score, 26.80 vs. 38.00, $p=.043$; T-Score 34.10 vs.
 230 46.71, $p=.019$, Table 4).

231 *Blood Biomarkers*

232 Comparison of mean biomarker values between groups is presented in Table 5. The only significant
233 difference between groups was for serum NGF levels, which was significantly lower in the long COVID
234 group (mean 9.72) compared to the control group (13.52, $p = .038$).
235

Table 5. Biomarkers of Long COVID (n=10) vs Controls (n = 7)

	Long COVID	Controls	
	mean*	mean	<i>p</i>
Cortisol Plasma	81.38	64.52	ns
Cortisol Serum	70.09	61.29	ns
DHEA-S Plasma	6058.83	1943.27	ns
DHEA-S Serum	3227.34	2773.22	ns
IL6 Plasma	1.25	1.29	ns
IL6 Serum	1.80	0.84	ns
IL10 Plasma	2.00	2.20	ns
IL10 Serum	4.45	2.96	ns
BDNF Plasma	897.45	779.73	ns
BDNF Serum	1502.62	1635.18	ns
NGF Plasma	27.24	25.98	ns
NGF Serum	9.72	13.52	.038
NfL Plasma	7.52	12.91	ns
NfL Serum	10.33	13.36	ns

Note: Significance tested using independent samples t tests and log-transformed biomarkers; ns=non-significant; DHEA-S = Dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate; IL=interleukin; BDNF=brain-derived neurotrophic factor; NGF=nerve growth factor; NfL=neurofilament light chain; *units for cortisol and DHEA-S = ng/ml, all other biomarkers = pg/ml

236 When comparing groups based on biomarker scores below and above the median, the long COVID group
237 was significantly more likely than controls to have serum IL-10 values \geq the median ($p=0.015$). Eight out
238 of ten participants in the long COVID group were classified into the \geq median group vs 1 of 7 in the
239 control group. The increased inflammatory drive in long COVID patients was confirmed in terms of the
240 combined pro-inflammatory index, which included IL-6 as well as IL-10. Nine out of 10 patients in the
241 long COVID group exhibited serum pro-inflammatory index values \geq the median compared to one out of
242 seven in the control group (Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.042$). For all other biomarkers, there were no
243 significant differences in terms of distribution of variables into below vs equal to and above the median.

244

245 **Discussion**

246 This exploratory pilot study compared two groups of laboratory-confirmed post-COVID patients at least
247 6 months after having been diagnosed with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19. One group was comprised
248 of individuals who had fully recovered (controls) and the other those continuing to experience cognitive
249 difficulties, referred to here as the long COVID group. To the best of our knowledge, this study of
250 cognitive symptoms was the first to use a study design where both the PCC (long COVID) and control
251 groups had a history of PCR-verified COVID-19 infection. Previous studies on cognitive impairment
252 defined healthy controls as individuals who had not had laboratory-confirmed COVID [7, 15, 25, 28]. In
253 an effort to understand why long COVID patients experience prolonged cognitive difficulties such as
254 brain fog, the current study aimed to examine and compare self-reported and objective measures in PCC
255 patients with cognitive complaints with fully recovered COVID patients. The overall study objective was
256 to inform the current understanding of neuropathophysiological disease mechanisms contributing to
257 non-recovery from COVID-19. Moreover, we were interested in findings that might inform the clinical
258 management of PCC.

259

260 From a cognitive standpoint, no significant differences were seen between the two groups as it
261 pertained to educational attainment or reading ability which is the most commonly used premorbid
262 estimate for neuropsychological purposes. Given comparable premorbid estimates, with the exception
263 of the letter fluency scores on the Controlled Oral Word Association Test (COWAT), this study found no
264 significant differences between groups in the neurocognitive test battery. This is in line with previous
265 research that found normal cognitive test results in adults with post-COVID cognitive symptoms [14, 16].
266 By contrast, when dividing the PCC group into those with and without cognitive complaints, Ariza et al.
267 [15] found that those with cognitive complaints scored significantly worse on global cognition, learning,

268 memory, processing speed, language, and executive function. However, although our findings were
269 isolated to COWAT, this finding per se is novel since it has never been reported before, and the finding
270 supports PCC patients' self-reports of cognitive inefficiency and perhaps COVID fog. Specifically, this
271 task measures one's ability to engage in higher level thinking (a language task) under time constraint.
272 This could help to explain patients' reports of being able to cognitively engage but feeling that they are
273 foggy and that things take longer and do not seem as automatic.

274

275 More consistent group differences were found on self-report measures assessing functional status,
276 quality of life and mood. Specifically, the long COVID group in this study scored significantly and
277 consistently worse than controls on most validated self-report measures, indicating lower ratings on
278 quality of life, physical health, emotional functioning, and psychological well-being. Ariza et al. [15] also
279 reported lower quality of life and functioning scores among post-COVID patients compared to healthy
280 controls. However, unlike the present study that focused only on PCC patients with cognitive
281 complaints, the study by Ariza et al. [15] encompassed patients with a variety of post-COVID complaints.
282 Moreover, the control group in that study had not had a COVID-19 infection. By contrast, controls in the
283 current study were fully recovered COVID-19-infected patients who had not experienced any post-
284 COVID symptoms.

285

286 With regard to blood biomarkers, the current study presents intriguing evidence in terms of decreased
287 neuroplastic functioning in PCC patients vs the control group, as reflected in decreased serum levels of
288 nerve growth factor (NGF). NGF is a neurotrophic protein that helps regulate neuronal and neurite
289 growth [42] as well as neuronal phenotypic maintenance and immune function [43]. Brain plasticity and
290 neuro-immunological functioning are closely related. Our findings suggest a sustained attenuation of
291 brain neuroplastic activity. Such findings might contribute to the numerous patient-perceived reports of

292 attenuated neurocognitive functioning, although possibly not severe enough to be reflected in a
293 systematic decrease in objective neuropsychiatric test scores. Of note, self-rated health is a much better
294 predictor of future health and morbidity status than any clinical sign or laboratory test [44, 45]. It might
295 be that the body's internal sensor system is more sensitive and advanced than our current arsenal of
296 clinical and laboratory testing.

297

298 However, when comparing groups based on biomarker scores below and above the median, the long
299 COVID group was significantly more likely than controls to have serum values \geq the median for both IL-
300 10 alone as well as for the inflammatory index of IL-6 and IL-10 combined. Lai et al. [21] identified
301 interleukin (IL)-6 as a potential indicator of long COVID, while Queiroz et al. [22] found that patients with
302 no post-COVID symptoms had higher levels of IL-4, IL-6 and IL-10. However, neither of those studies
303 focused specifically on long COVID patients with cognitive complaints. Two studies that did study long
304 COVID patients with cognitive complaints found no cytokines or inflammatory markers associated with
305 cognitive performance [24,25]. Another common limitation in the above cited work is the lack of
306 objective verification of COVID-19 infection history. This limits the ability to determine whether findings
307 are related to COVID-19 infection history specifically or due to other possible confounders.

308

309 When inflammatory marker scores were grouped above and below the median, a larger proportion of
310 long COVID patients fell into the \geq median group for IL-10. IL-10 represents both a pro- and anti-
311 inflammatory marker [46]. In the current study, we used it as a pro-inflammatory marker. Prior research
312 has also suggested that IL-10 is related to self-reported energy [47]. In the latter case, our findings might
313 suggest a compensatory mechanism by which the body is trying to increase energy to counter the low
314 energy and high fatigue symptoms reported by a majority of long COVID patients. These findings of \geq
315 median levels of IL-6 and IL-10 support the hypothesis that there is residual activation of the

316 inflammatory systems in the long COVID group versus those that have recovered fully from PCR-verified
317 COVID-19. Looking at the proportion of participants falling into the high vs. low serum pro-inflammatory
318 group, all except one person in the long COVID group fell into the high serum pro-inflammatory group vs
319 one out of seven in the control group. Thus, overall, using several different definitions of pro-
320 inflammation, the long COVID group systematically showed a pattern of heightened inflammation as
321 compared to the control group that has fully recovered from their COVID-19 infection.

322

323 **Limitations**

324 These results should be viewed in consideration of several study limitations. First and foremost is the
325 small sample size, which makes generalizability to other populations difficult, although we used a
326 rigorous assessment scheme. Small sample sizes have reduced statistical power to detect true effects
327 and results may be affected by outliers. However, we saw a consistent pattern of lower scores on all
328 self-rated health and quality of life measures, and higher depression and anxiety scores in the long-
329 COVID group, which serves as validation for the group differences seen on biomarkers when examining
330 values above and below median scores. The study sample was not diverse, as participants were
331 primarily female and White. Notably, this was an exploratory pilot study that was, to the best of our
332 knowledge, unique in the comparison of COVID survivors with and without post-illness cognitive
333 symptoms. Thus, our control group had lab-verified histories of COVID infection from which they had
334 fully recovered.

335

336 *Implications for clinical care*

337 Results of this pilot study point to few but possibly clinically important differences between long COVID
338 and control patients with regard to neurocognitive tests, but substantial differences related to physical
339 and emotional functioning and quality of life. Although this was a small sample, results also suggest

340 possible prolonged inflammation in the long COVID group, which has been suggested previously [27],
341 however, without using a proper reference group. An interesting observation is the parallel between
342 this disorder and chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS), as both have patients reporting mood issues such as
343 anxiety [48]. This raises the question of what we can learn from the experience of patients with CFS and
344 whether that can be applied to long COVID patients with cognitive complaints. This may include
345 consideration of the types of clinical teams necessary to support the patients and their caregivers as well
346 as treatment. For example, there is no standard of care when it comes to treatment for CFS. Anhydrous
347 Enol-Oxaloacetate, (AEO) a nutritional supplement, has been anecdotally reported to relieve physical
348 and mental fatigue and is diminished in CFS patients [49]. Could this be a direction for us to consider for
349 quality-of-life outcomes for long COVID patients as well? Another factor to consider is the resources
350 needed to create longitudinal and multidisciplinary interventions that can support patients long-term -
351 encompassing perceptions of quality of life, physical functioning, emotional health and wellbeing and
352 vocational rehabilitation - and the cost associated with such efforts. Combined exercise and behavioral
353 support, developed with extensive patient and stakeholder engagement, is being tested in a randomized
354 controlled trial in the United Kingdom [50]. Should it prove to be clinically cost-effective for people with
355 long-COVID, there is an opportunity to create similar programs.

356

357 In addition to the above, our results also support the importance of considering neuroinflammatory
358 processes as treatment to this point has mostly focused on behavioral and cognitive interventions,
359 assuming there are no residual neuro-inflammatory processes or deficits. This points to the importance
360 of applying a multidisciplinary approach in addressing long COVID patients, including a rigorous
361 assessment to detect possible residual systemic inflammation and reduced neuroplasticity. Such an
362 approach could help to identify which patients may transition to experiencing long COVID and is likely to

363 expand the arsenal of choices of promising and evidence-based treatment strategies with the ultimate
364 aim to design rigorous clinical trials.

365

366 **Conclusions**

367 Long COVID patients with cognitive complaints experience significantly more anxiety and depression,
368 lower self-rated health, and lower physical and emotional functioning and quality of life compared to
369 fully recovered COVID-19 patients, although only one neurocognitive test differed between groups.

370 Biomarker analyses suggest possible prolonged inflammatory processes in long COVID patients.

371 Moreover, results of decreased neuroplastic functioning give credence to patients' reports of changes in
372 brain function. Future studies in larger, more diverse samples are required to fully understand these
373 differences and to develop effective clinical treatments for those with cognitive difficulties.

374

375 **Acknowledgements**

376 The authors extend their gratitude to the patients who participated in the study and to John Beck, BS for
377 conducting the biomarker analysis. This study was financially supported by a grant from the Spectrum
378 Health Foundation (Grant nr. FDN 35911-2020-601).

379

380 **References**

- 381 1. Hampshire A, Azor A, Atchison C, Trender W, Hellyer PJ, Giunchiglia V, et al. Cognition and
382 memory after Covid-19 in a large community sample. *N Engl J Med*. 2024;390(9):806-818. doi:
383 10.1056/NEJMoa2311330.
- 384 2. Scott A, Ansari W, Khan F, Chambers R, Benigno M, Di Fusco M, et al. Substantial health and
385 economic burden of COVID-19 during the year after acute illness among US adults at high risk of
386 severe COVID-19. *BMC Med*. 2024;22(1):46. doi: 10.1186/s12916-023-03234-6.
- 387 3. Haider FH, Szczepek, AJ. Editorial: Neurological consequences of long COVID. *Front Neurol*
388 2022; 13:1087896. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2022.1087896. eCollection 2022.
- 389 4. Nalbandian A, Sehgal K, Gupta A, Madhavan MV, McGroder C, Stevens JS, et al. Post-acute
390 COVID-19 syndrome. *Nat Med* 2021; 27(4):601-615. doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z.
- 391
- 392
- 393

- 394
395 5. Greenhalgh T, Sivan M, Perlowski A, Nicolich JZ. Long COVID: a clinical update. *Lancet* 2024;
396 404(10453):707-724. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(24)01136-X.
397
398 6. Perlis RH, Trujillo KL, Safarpour A, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Druckman J, et al. *JAMA Netw*
399 *Open* 2024; 6(2):e2256152. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.56152.
400
401 7. Jaywant A, Gunning FM, Oberlin FE, Santillana M, Ognyanova K, Druckman JN, et al. *JAMA Netw*
402 *Open* 2024; 7(2):e2356098. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.56098.
403
404 8. Ceban F, Ling S, Lui LMW, Lee Y, Gill H, Teopiz KM, et al. *Brain Behav Immun* 2022; 101:93-135.
405 doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2021.12.020.
406
407 9. Kao J, Frankland PW. *Cell* 2022; 185(14):2391-2393. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2022.06.020.
408
409 10. Altuna M, Sanchez-Saudinos MB, Lleo A. Cognitive symptoms after COVID-19. *Neurol Perspect*
410 2021; S16-S24. doi: 10.1016/j.neurop.2021.10.005.
411
412 11. Davis HE, McCorkell L, Vogel JM, Topol EJ. Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and
413 recommendations. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2023; 21(3):133-146. doi: 10.1038/s41579-022-00846-2.
414
415 12. Hellmuth J, Barnett TA, Asken BM, Kelly JD, Torres L, Stephens ML, et al. Persistent COVID-19-
416 associated neurocognitive symptoms in non-hospitalized patients. *J Neurovirol* 2021; 27(1):191-
417 195. doi: 10.1007/s13365-021-00954-4.
418
419 13. Liu TC, Yoo SM, Sim MS, Motwani Y, Viswanathan M, Wenger NS. Perceived cognitive deficits in
420 patients with symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 and their association with post-COVID-19 condition.
421 *JAMA Netw Open* 2023; 6(5):e2311974. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.11974.
422
423 14. Rennison VLA, Chovaz CJ, Zirul S. Cognition and psychological well-being in adults with post
424 COVID-19 condition and analyses of symptom sequelae. *Clin Neuropsychol* 2024; 38(2):326-353.
425 doi: 10.1080/13854046.2023.2227407.
426
427 15. Ariza M, Cano N, Segura B, Bejar J, Barrue C, NAUTILUS Project Collaborative Group, et al.
428 Cognitive and emotional predictors of quality of life and functioning after COVID-19. *Ann Clin*
429 *Transl Neurol* 2024; 11(2):302-320. doi: 10.1002/acn3.51952.
430
431 16. Whiteside DM, Basso MR, Naini SM, Porter J, Holker E, Waldron EJ, et al. Outcomes in post-
432 acute sequelae of COVID-19 (PASC) at 6 months post-infection Part 1: Cognitive functioning. *Clin*
433 *Neuropsychol* 2022; 36(4):806-828. doi: 10.1080/13854046.2022.2030412.
434
435 17. Battaglini D, Lopes-Pacheco M, Castro-Faria-Neto HC, Pelosi P, Rocco PRM. Laboratory
436 biomarkers for diagnosis and prognosis in COVID-19. *Front Immunol* 2022; 13:857573. doi:
437 10.3389/fimmu.2022.857573.
438
439 18. Conti V, Corbi G, Sabbatino F, De Pascale D, Sellitto C, Stefanelli B, et al. Long COVID: clinical
440 framing, biomarkers, and therapeutic approaches. *J Pers Med* 2023; 13(2):334.doi:

- 441 10.3390/jpm13020334.
442
443 19. Espin E, Yang C, Shannon CP, Assadian S, He D, Tebbutt SJ. Cellular and molecular biomarkers of
444 long COVID: a scoping review. *EBioMedicine* 2023; 91:104552. doi:
445 10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104552.
446
447 20. Kermali M, Khalsa RK, Pillai K, Ismail Z, Harky A. The role of biomarkers in diagnosis of COVID-19
448 – A systematic review. *Life Sciences* 2020; 254:117788. doi.org/10.1016/j.lfs.2020.117788.
449
450 21. Lai Y-J, Liu S-H, Manachevakul S, Lee T-A, Kuo C-T, Bello D. Biomarkers in Long COVID-19: a
451 systematic review. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2023; 10:1085988. doi:
452 10.3389/fmed.2023.1085988. eCollection 2023.
453
454 22. Queiroz MAF, Moura das Neves PF, Lima SS, da Costa Lopes J, da Silva Torres MK, Vallinoto
455 IMVC, et al. Cytokine profiles associated with acute COVID-19 and Long COVID-19 Syndrome.
456 *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2022; 12:922422. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2022.922422. eCollection 2022.
457
458 23. Tsilingiris D, Vallianou NG, Karampela I, Christodoulatus GS, Papavasileiou G, et al. Laboratory
459 findings and biomarkers in long COVID: what do we know so far? Insights into epidemiology,
460 pathogenesis, therapeutic perspectives and challenges. *Int J Mol Sci* 2023; 24(13):10458. doi:
461 10.3390/ijms241310458.
462
463 24. Damiano RF, de Almeida Rocco CC, de Padua Serafim A, Loftis JM, Talib LL, Petropoulou D, et al.
464 Cognitive impairment in long-COVID and its association with persistent dysregulation in
465 inflammatory markers. *Front Immunol* 2023; 14:1174020. doi:
466 10.3389/fimmu.2023.1174020. eCollection 2023.
467
468 25. Vrettou CS, Vassiliou AG, Keskinidou C, Mourelatos P, Asimakos A, Spetsioti S, et al. A
469 prospective study on neural biomarkers in patients with long-COVID symptoms. *J Pers Med*
470 2024; 14(3):313. doi: 10.3390/jpm14030313.
471
472 26. Frontera JA, Simon NM. Bridging knowledge gaps in the diagnosis and management of
473 neuropsychiatric sequelae of COVID-19. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2022; 79(8):811-817. doi:
474 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.1616.
475
476 27. Lamontagne SJ, Winters MF, Pizzagalli DA, Olmstead MC. Post-acute sequelae of COVID-19:
477 evidence of mood and cognitive impairment. *Brain Behav Immun Health* 2021; 17:100347. doi:
478 10.1016/j.bbih.2021.100347.
479
480 28. Graham EL, Clark JR, Orban ZS, Lim PH, Szymanski AL, Taylor C, et al. Persistent neurologic
481 symptoms and cognitive dysfunction in non-hospitalized COVID-19 “long haulers.” *Ann Clin*
482 *Transl Neurol* 2021; 8(5):1073-1085. doi: 10.1002/acn3.51350.
483
484 29. Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown G. Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory-II. San Antonio, TX:
485 Psychological Corporation, 1996.
486

- 487 30. Beck A, Steer R. Beck Anxiety Inventory manual. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation:
488 1993.
489
- 490 31. Ware, J., Sherbourne, C. The MOS 36-item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36): conceptual
491 framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992; 30(6): 473-83.
492
- 493 32. McHorney CA, Ware JE, Lu JF, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-
494 36): III. Tests of data quality, scaling assumptions, and reliability across diverse patient groups.
495 *Med Care* 1994; 32(1): 40-66. doi: 10.1097/00005650-199401000-00004.
496
- 497 33. The EuroQol Group. EuroQol - a new facility for the measurement of health related quality of
498 life. *Health Policy* 1990; 16(3), 199-208. doi: 10.1016/0168-8510(90)90421-9.
499
- 500 34. Wechsler, D. The test of premorbid function (TOPF). San Antonio, TX: The Psychological
501 Corporation, 2011.
502
- 503 35. Wechsler, D. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale - Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV) Technical and
504 Interpretive Manual. San Antonio, TX: Pearson, 2008.
505
- 506 36. Smith, A. Symbol Digits Modalities Test: Manual. Los Angeles Western Psychological Services,
507 2007.
508
- 509 37. Benton AL, Spreen O, Hamsher KD. Contributions to Neuropsychological Assessment: A Clinical
510 Manual. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1983.
511
- 512 38. Meyers, J., Meyers, K. Rey complex figure test and recognition trial: Professional manual. PAR,
513 Inc, 1995.
514
- 515 39. Delis DC, Kramer JH, Kaplan E, Ober BA. California Verbal Learning Test. 2nd ed. San Antonio, TX:
516 Psychological Corporation, 2000.
517
- 518 40. Reitan, R., Wolfson, D. The Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery: Theory &
519 Interpretation. Tucson, AZ: Neuropsychology Press, 1985.
520
- 521 41. Culbertson, W., Zillmer, E. Tower of London – Drexel University. 2nd ed. Canada: Multi-Health
522 Systems Inc, 2005.
523
- 524 42. Levi-Montalcini R, Dal Toso R, della Valle F, Skaper SD, Leon A. Update of the NGF saga. *J Neurol*
525 *Sci* 1995; 130(2):119-27. doi: 10.1016/0022-510x(95)00007-o.
526
- 527 43. Minnone G, De Benedetti F, Bracci-Lauderio L. NGF and its receptors in the regulation of
528 inflammatory response. *Int J Mol Sci* 2017; 18(5):1028. doi: 10.3390/ijms18051028.
529
- 530 44. Halford C, Anderzen I, Arnetz B. Endocrine measures of stress and self-rated health: a
531 longitudinal study. *J Psychosom Res* 2003; 55(4):317-20. doi: 10.1016/s0022-3999(02)00634-7.
532
- 533 45. Halford C, Ekselius L, Anderzen I, Arnetz B, Svärdsudd K. Self-rated health, life-style, and
534 psychoendocrine measures of stress in healthy adult women. *Ups J Med Sci* 2010; 115(4):266-

- 535 74. doi: 10.3109/03009734.2010.496910.
536
537 46. Keaton SA, Arnetz J, Jamil H, Dhalimi A, Stemmer PM, Ruden DM, et al. IL-10: a possible
538 immunological component of positive mental health in refugees. *Compre*
539 *Psychoneuroendocrinol* 2021; 8:100097. doi: 10.1016/j.cpnec.2021.100097.
540
541 47. Keaton S, Krzyzanowski S, Arnetz J, Hikmet J, Dhalimi A, Stemmer P, et al. IL-10 is associated with
542 increased energy in newly arrived traumatized Middle Eastern refugees in the US. *Biol Psychiatry*
543 2017; 81:S140–S276. www.sobp.org/journal.
544
545 48. Azcue N, Gomez-Esteban JC, Acera M, Tijero B, Fernandez T, Ayo-Mentxakatorre N, et al. Brain
546 fog of post-COVID-19-condition and Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, same medical disorder? *J Transl*
547 *Med* 2022; 20(1):569. doi: 10.1186/s12967-022-03764-2.
548
549 49. Cash A, Kaufman DL. Oxaloacetate treatment for mental and physical fatigue in Myalgic
550 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (ME/CFS) and Long-COVID fatigue patients: a non-
551 randomized controlled clinical trial. *J Transl Med* 2022; 20(1):295. doi: 10.1186/s12967-022-
552 03488-3.
553
554 50. Ennis S, Heine P, Sandhu H, Sheehan B, Yeung J, McWilliams, D, et al. Development of an online
555 intervention for the rehabilitation exercise and psychological support after covid-19 Infection
556 (REGAIN) trial. *NIHR Open Res* 2023; 3:10. doi: 10.3310/nihropenres.13371.2. eCollection 2023.
557
558

559 **Supporting Information**

560 S1 Dataset (XLSX)

561

562

563