Supplemental Content

Incidence of Long-term Post-acute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection Related to Pain and Other Symptoms: A Living Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Hiroshi Hoshijima; Takahiro Mihara,; Hiroyuki Seki; Shunsuke Hyuga; Norifumi Kuratani; Toshiya Shiga.

eFigure 8a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Sore Throat

eFigure 9a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Ageusia

eFigure 10a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Alopecia

eFigure 11a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Anorexia

eFigure 12a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Anosmia

eFigure 13a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Anxiety

eFigure 14a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Chills

eFigure 15a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Confusion

eFigure 16a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Cough

eFigure 17a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Depression

eFigure 18a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Diarrhea

eFigure 19a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Dyspnea

eFigure 20a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Fatigue

eFigure 21a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Fever

eFigure 22a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Insomnia

eFigure 23a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Memory impairment

eFigure 24a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Nasal blockage

eFigure 25a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Nausea

eFigure 26a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Palpitation

eFigure 27a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Rhinorrhea

eFigure 28a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Sneezing

eFigure 29a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Sputum

eFigure 30a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Vertigo (Dizziness)

eFigure 31a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Vomiting

eFigure 32a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Weakness

eFigure 33a-e. Forest Plot, Bubble Plots (follow-up period, age and sex) and Funnel Plot on Weight loss

eAppendix1. Literature Search Strategy

1) **PubMed**

"long COVID"[All Fields] OR "long COVID-19"[All Fields] OR "long-haul covid"[All Fields] OR "Chronic COVID syndrome"[All Fields] OR "Post-COVID-19 syndrome"[All Fields] OR ("Long-term complications"[All Fields] AND "COVID"[All Fields]) OR ("long-term consequences"[All Fields] AND "COVID"[All Fields]) OR ("long-term sequelae"[All Fields] AND "COVID"[All Fields])

2) **EMBASE**

('long covid' OR 'long covid -19' OR 'long-haul covid' OR 'Chronic covid syndrome' OR 'Post-covid -19 syndrome' OR ('Long-term complications'AND 'covid') OR ('long-term consequences' AND 'covid') OR ('long-term sequelae' AND 'covid')

3) **Scopus**

("long COVID" OR "long COVID-19" OR "long-haul covid" OR "Chronic COVID syndrome" OR "Post-COVID-19 syndrome" OR ("Long-term complications" AND "COVID") OR ("long-term consequences" AND "COVID"))

4) **CHINAL**

long COVID [TI] OR long COVID-19 [TI] OR long-haul covid [TI] OR Chronic COVID syndrome [TI] OR Post-COVID-19 syndrome [TI] OR (Long-term complications of COVID [TI]) OR (long-term consequences of COVID [TI]) OR (long-term sequelae of COVID [TI])

5) **MedRχiv and BioRχiv**

("long COVID" OR "long COVID-19" OR "long-haul covid" OR "Chronic COVID syndrome" OR "Post-COVID-19 syndrome" OR ("Long-term complications" AND "COVID") OR ("long-term consequences" AND "COVID"))

eAppendix 2. R code

```
library(meta)
# meta-analysis of proportions, inverse variance method, DerSimonian-Laird estimator for tau^2, Logit
#transformation
meta<-metaprop(n, N, data=Abdominal_pain,studlab =paste(Author),method="Inverse",
                        comb.fixed = F,comb.random = T, method.tau="DL", sm="PLOGIT")
meta
forest(meta)

# Mixed-Effects model meta-regression for followup, Age and Sex as covariates
metareg1<-metareg(meta,followup)
metareg1
metareg2<-metareg(meta,meanAge)
metareg2
metareg3<-metareg(meta, maleGender)
metareg3

bubble1<-bubble(metareg1)
bubble2<-bubble(metareg2)
bubble3<-bubble(metareg3)

# Plot to assess funnel plot asymmetry
funnel(meta)
# Egger's linear regression test of funnel plot asymmetry
metabias(meta, method.bias = "linreg", k.min=3)
```

eAppendix 3. The system of Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale in cohort studies

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars (*) can be given for Comparability

Selection

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

a) truly representative of the average _____ (describe) in the community *

b) somewhat representative of the average _____ in the community *

c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers

d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Selection of the non exposed cohort

a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort *

b) drawn from a different source

c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

3) Ascertainment of exposure

a) secure record (eg surgical records) *

b) structured interview *

c) written self report

d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

a) yes *

b) no

Comparability

1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

a) study controls for _____ (select the most important factor) *

b) study controls for any additional factor * (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome

a) independent blind assessment *****

b) record linkage *****

c) self report

d) no description

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur

a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) *****

b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts

a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for *****

b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > 80 % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) *****

c) follow up rate < 80% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost

d) no statement

eTable 1. Summary of studies included in the meta-analysis

First author	Year published	Location	Patinet setting	Sample size (n)	Diagnotic criteria of SARS-CoV-2	Respiratory support	Age (mean or median)	Sex, % male	Follow-up period, (maximum) (month)	Patient follow-up (n/total)
Arnold, D[19]	2020	UK	Non-hospitalized	110	Positive PCR and clinico-radiological diagnosis	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	60	56	3	110/110
Boscolo-Rizzo, P[20]	2020	Italy	Hospitalized	187	PCR	NS	56	44.9	1	187/202
Carfi, A[21]	2020	Italy	Hospitalized	143	RT-PCR	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	56.5	62.9	2	143/143
Carvalho-Schneider, C[22]	2021	France	Hospitalized and non-hospitalized	150	RT-PCR	NS	48.8	56	2	130/293
Cheng, DO[23]	2020	UK	Hospitalized	109	PCR and clinical symptoms	NS	73	55.8	2.3	109/1946

Chiesa-Estomb, CN[24]	2020	Spain	Hospitalized and non-hospitalized	751	RT-PCR and serology	NS	41	36.5	1.6	751/1231
Cirulli, E[25]	2020	USA	Hospitalized and non-hospitalized	357	No description	NS	56	35.9	3	216/357
Davis, HE[26]	2020	56 countries	Hopitalized and non-hospitalized	3762	PCR, antigen, antibody positive	NS	50.5	78.9	7	3762/3762
Dennis, A[27]	2020	UK	Hospitalized and non-hospitalized	201	RT-PCR, serology and symptoms	NS	44	30.3	5.3	201/unreported
Eiros, R[28]	2020	Spain	Hopitalized and non-hospitalized	139	RT-PCR and serology	Oxygen	52	28.1	2.8	139/142
Geortz, YNJ[29]	2020	Netherlands	Hopitalized and non-hospitalized	2113	PCR and CT	NS	47	14.7	3.2	2113/2113
Halpin, SJ[30]	2020	UK	Hospitalized	100	PCR positive	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	66.7	54	2	100/191

Huang, C[31]	2021	China	Hospitalized	1733	SARS-CoV2 antibody	NS	57	52	6.6	1733/2469
Klein, H[32]	2020	Israel	Hopitalized and non-hospitalized	112	RT-PCR positive	NS	35	64.3	6	112/114
Lavoto, A[33]	2020	Italy	except for ICU	121	Swab PCR positive	NS	46.7	40.5	1.4	121/121
Mandal, S[34]	2020	UK	Hospitalized	384	Swab PCR positive	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	59.9	62	1.5	384/479
Moradian, ST[35]	2021	Iran	Hospitalized	200	RT-PCR	NS	55.6	80	1.5	200/300
Neto, DB[36]	2020	Brazil	Hospitalized	545	RT-PCR	NS	37.7	36.3	4	545/669
Petersen, M[37]	2020	Denmark	Non-hospitalized	180	RT-PCR of an oropharyngeal swab	NS	39.9	45.6	7	180/180
Pilotto, A[38]	2020	Italy	Hospitalized	165	NS	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	64.8	24	6	165/208

Poncet-Megemont, L[39]	2020	France	Hospitalized and non-hospitalized	139	PCR and chest CT	NS	48.5	37.4	1.1	139/180
Rahmani, H[40]	2020	Iran	Hospitalized	173	PCR , clinical data and chest CT	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	60	53.1	1.9	173/213
Savarraj, JPJ[41]	2020	USA	Hospitalized	48	RT-PCR	NS	50	34.3	3	48/140
Salmon-Ceron, D[42]	2021	France	Hopitalized and non-hospitalized	70	positive PCR and serology	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	45	78.6	2	70/70
Stavem, K[43]	2020	Norway	Non-hospitalized	451	PCR	NS	49.8	44	4.2	451/451
Sudre, C[44]	2020	UK, US, Sweden	NS	4182	PCR	NS	42	28.5	2	4182/4182
Tenforde, MW[45]	2020	US	Non-hospitalized	270	RT-PCR positive	NS	39.6	48.1	1	270/274
Tomasoni, D[46]	2020	Italy	Hospitalized	105	NS	Oxygen alone, CPAP or IV	55	73.3	3	105/105

Townsend, L[47]	2020	Ireland	Hospitalized	128	RT-PCR	NS	49.5	53.9	1.5	128/223
Wang, X[48]	2020	China	Hospitalized	131	NS	NS	49	45	1	131/147
Weerahandi, H[49]	2020	USA	Hospitalized	152	laboratory-confirmed	Oxygen	62	63	1.3	152/161
Wu, C[50]	2020	China	Hospitalized	370	RT-PCR	NS	50.5	54.9	0.8	370/370
Xiong, Q[51]	2020	China	Hospitalized	538	according to WHO guidance	NS	52	45.5	3.6	538/2641
Yan, N[52]	2020	China	Hospitalized	337	RT-PCR positive	NS	44	45.7	0.5	296/337
Zhao, Y[53]	2020	China	Hospitalized	55	RT-PCR positive	Oxygen	47.8	58.2	3	55/55

RT-PCR: Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction, CPAP: Continuous Positive Airway Pressure, IV: Invasive Ventilation, NS:not specified.

eTable 2. The Results of the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for Included Studies

First author	1) Representativeness	2) None exposed cohort	3) Ascertainment of exposure	4) Demonstration	5) Comparability	6) Assessment of outcome	7) Was follow-up long enough	8) Adequacy of follow-up	Score
Arnold, D[19]	a	NA	a	b	NA	a	a	a	6
Boscolo-Rizzo, P[20]	a	NA	b	b	NA	c	a	b	5
Carfi, A[21]	a	NA	a	a	NA	a	a	a	6
Carvalho-Schneider, C[22]	a	NA	b	a	NA	a	a	a	6
Cheng, DO[23]	a	NA	b	a	NA	a	a	a	6
Chiesa-Estomb, CN[24]	a	NA	b	a	NA	a	a	b	6
Cirulli, E[25]	a	NA	b	b	NA	c	a	a	5
Davis, HE[26]	b	NA	b	b	NA	c	a	a	5

Dennis, A[27]	a	NA	a	a	NA	c	a	d	3
Eiros, R[28]	c	NA	b	a	NA	b	a	b	5
Geortz, YNJ[29]	b	NA	c	a	NA	c	a	d	3
Halpin, SJ[30]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	c	4
Huang, C[31]	a	NA	a	a	NA	a	a	c	5
Klein, H[32]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Lavoto, A[33]	c	NA	a	a	NA	c	a	d	3
Mandal, S[34]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Moradian, ST[35]	a	NA	b	a	NA	a	a	a	6
Neto, DB[36]	b	NA	c	b	NA	c	a	b	4
Petersen, M[37]	a	NA	a	b	NA	c	a	a	5
Pilotto, A[38]	a	NA	b	a	NA	a	a	a	6
Poncet-Megemont, L[39]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Rahmani, H[40]	b	NA	a	a	NA	a	a	b	6

Savarraj, JPJ[41]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Salmon-Ceron, D[42]	a	NA	a	a	NA	b	a	b	6
Stavem, K[43]	a	NA	a	b	NA	c	a	a	5
Sudre, C[44]	a	NA	b	b	NA	c	a	a	5
Tenforde, MW[45]	b	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Tomasoni, D[46]	a	NA	b	b	NA	a	a	a	6
Townsend, L[47]	a	NA	b	a	NA	a	a	a	6
Wang, X[48]	a	NA	a	b	NA	a	a	b	6
Weerahandi, H[49]	b	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Wu, C[50]	a	NA	b	a	NA	d	a	b	6
Xiong, Q[51]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	a	b	5
Yan, N[52]	a	NA	b	a	NA	c	b	b	5
Zhao, Y[53]	a	NA	a	a	NA	b	a	a	6

NA: not applicable.

eFigure 1a. Forest Plot on Abdominal Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 1b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Abdominal Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.25 (95% confidence interval:-0.12-0.62).(*P*=0.18).

eFigure 1c. Bubble Plots (age) on Abdominal Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.08 (95% confidence interval:-0.19-0.04).(*P*=0.20).

eFigure 1d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Abdominal Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.01 (95% confidence interval:--0.06-0.03).(*P*=0.59).

eFigure 1e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting Abdominal Pain



Egger's *P* was 0.09, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 2a. Forest Plot on Arthralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 2b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Arthralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.18 (95% confidence interval:-0.22-0.57).(*P*=0.37).

eFigure 2c. Bubble Plots (age) on Arthralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.02 (95% confidence interval:-0.13-0.09).(*P*=0.78).

eFigure 2d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Arthralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.003 (95% confidence interval:-0.05-0.05).(*P*=0.90).

eFigure 2e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Arthralgia



Egger's *P* was 0.9, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 3a. Forest Plot on Chest Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 3b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Chest Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.15 (95% confidence interval:-0.15-0.45).(*P*=0.34).

eFigure 3c. Bubble Plots (age) on Chest Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.07 (95% confidence interval:-0.15-0.02).(*P*=0.14).

eFigure 3d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Chest Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.002 (95% confidence interval:-0.027-0.03).(*P*=0.88).

eFigure 3e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Chest Pain



Egger's *P* was 0.03, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 4a. Forest Plot on Ear Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 4b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Ear Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.58 (95% confidence interval:-0.35-1.51).(*P*=0.22).

eFigure 4c. Bubble Plots (age) on Ear Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.31 (95% confidence interval:-1.06-0.44).(*P*=0.42).

eFigure 4d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Ear Pain



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.003 (95% confidence interval:-0.090-0.08).(*P*=0.94).

eFigure 4e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Ear Pain



Egger's *P* was 0.28, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 5a. Forest Plot on Headache



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 5b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Headache



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.07 (95% confidence interval:-0.33-0.47).(*P*=0.74).

eFigure 5c. Bubble Plots (age) on Headache



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.07 (95% confidence interval:-0.33-0.47).(*P*=0.74).

eFigure 5d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Headache



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.01 (95% confidence interval:-0.05-0.03).(*P*=0.62).

eFigure 5e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Headache



Egger's *P* was 0.0006, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 6a. Forest Plot on Myalgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 6b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Myalgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.38 (95% confidence interval:--0.07-0.83).(*P*=0.09).

eFigure 6c. Bubble Plots (age) on Myalgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.03 (95% confidence interval:-0.09-0.14).(*P*=0.66).

eFigure 6d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Myalgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.01 (95% confidence interval:-0.07-0.05).(*P*=0.72).

eFigure 6e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Myalgia



Egger's *P* was 0.011, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 7a. Forest Plot on Neuralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 7b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Neuralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.39 (95% confidence interval:0.29-0.48).(*P*<0.001).

eFigure 7c. Bubble Plots (age) on Neuralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.40 (95% confidence interval:-0.60—0.19).(*P*=0.0002).

eFigure 7d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Neuralgia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.005 (95% confidence interval:0.001-0.10).(*P*=0.045).

eFigure 7e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Neuralgia



Egger's *P* was 0.14, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 8a. Forest Plot on Sore Throat



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 8b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Sore Throat



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.20 (95% confidence interval:-0.17-0.58).(*P*=0.29).

eFigure 8c. Bubble Plots (age) on Sore Throat



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.15-0.08).(*P*=0.53).

eFigure 8d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Sore Throat



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.02 (95% confidence interval: -0.05-0.02).(*P*=0.40).

eFigure 8e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Sore Throat



Egger's *P* was 0.40, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 9a. Forest Plot on Ageusia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 9b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Ageusia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.12 (95% confidence interval:-0.37-0.12).(*P*=0.32).

eFigure 9c. Bubble Plots (age) on Ageusia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.06 (95% confidence interval:-0.13-0.01).(*P*=0.11).

eFigure 9d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Ageusia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.08 (95% confidence interval:-0.03-0.02).(*P*=0.51).

eFigure 9e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Ageusia



Egger's *P* was 0.03, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 10a. Forest Plot on Alopecia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 10b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Alopecia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.27 (95% confidence interval:-0.46-1.00).(*P*=0.46).

eFigure 10c. Bubble Plots (age) on Alopecia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.002 (95% confidence interval:-0.07-0.06).(*P*=0.95).

eFigure 10d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Alopecia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.15 (95% confidence interval:-0.29—0.01).(*P*=0.03).

eFigure 10e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Alopecia



Egger's *P* was 0.052, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 11a. Forest Plot on Anorexia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 11b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Anorexia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.34 (95% confidence interval:-0.23-0.90).(*P*=0.24).

eFigure 11c. Bubble Plots (age) on Anorexia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.023 (95% confidence interval:-0.14-0.09).(*P*=0.68).

eFigure 11d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Anorexia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.0013 (95% confidence interval:-0.08-0.08).(*P*=0.97).

eFigure 11e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Anorexia



Egger's *P* was 0.036, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 12a. Forest Plot on Anosmia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 12b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Anosmia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.06 (95% confidence interval:-0.34-0.22).(*P*=0.67).

eFigure 12c. Bubble Plots (age) on Anosmia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.07 (95% confidence interval:-0.11—0.02).(*P*=0.003).

eFigure 12d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Anosmia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.018 (95% confidence interval:-0.05-0.01).(*P*=0.26).

eFigure 12e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Anosmia



Egger's *P* was 0.008, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 13a. Forest Plot on Anxiety



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 13b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Anxiety



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.16 (95% confidence interval:-0.17-0.50).(*P*=0.34).

eFigure 13c. Bubble Plots (age) on Anxiety



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.101 (95% confidence interval:-0.06--.26).(*P*=0.21).

eFigure 13d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Anxiety



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.004 (95% confidence interval:-0.007-0.009).(*P*=0.09).

eFigure 13e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Anxiety



Egger's *P* was 0.004, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 14a. Forest Plot on Chills



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates and bar correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

eFigure 14b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Chills



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.54 (95% confidence interval:0.07-1.00).(*P*=0.02).

eFigure 14c. Bubble Plots (age) on Chills



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.05 (95% confidence interval:-0.33-0.23).(*P*=0.73).

eFigure 14d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Chills



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.01-0.1).(*P*=0.13).

eFigure 14e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Chills



Egger's *P* was 0.005, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 15a. Forest Plot on Confusion



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 15b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Confusion



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.01 (95% confidence interval:-0.27-0.29).(*P*=0.94).

eFigure 15c. Bubble Plots (age) on Confusion



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.10 (95% confidence interval:-0.21-0.006).(*P*=0.05).

eFigure 15d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Confusion



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.02 (95% confidence interval:-0.03-0.06).(*P*=0.44).

eFigure 15e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Confusion



Egger's *P* was 0.12, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 16a. Forest Plot on Cough



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 16b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Cough



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.027 (95% confidence interval:-0.30-0.24).(*P*=0.84).

eFigure 16c. Bubble Plots (age) on Cough



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.028 (95% confidence interval:-0.07-0.01).(*P*=0.16).

eFigure 16d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Cough



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.03 (95% confidence interval:-0.06—0.006).(*P*=0.02).

eFigure 16e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Cough



Egger's *P* was 0.06, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 17a. Forest Plot on Depression



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 17b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Depression



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.26 (95% confidence interval:0.05-0.47).(*P*=0.015).

eFigure 17c. Bubble Plots (age) on Depression



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.11 (95% confidence interval:0.02-0.19).(*P*=0.02).

eFigure 17d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Depression



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.013 (95% confidence interval:-0.03-0.05).(*P*=0.53).

eFigure 17e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Depression



Egger's *P* was 0.01, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 18a. Forest Plot on Diarrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 18b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Diarrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.26 (95% confidence interval:-0.12-0.64).(*P*=0.18).

eFigure 18c. Bubble Plots (age) on Diarrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.05 (95% confidence interval:-0.17-0.07).(*P*=0.44).

eFigure 18d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Diarrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.006 (95% confidence interval:-0.04-0.03).(*P*=0.78).

eFigure 18e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Diarrhea



Egger's *P* was 0.02, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 19a. Forest Plot on Dyspnea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 19b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Dyspnea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.46 (95% confidence interval:0.17-0.76).(*P*=0.002).

eFigure 19c. Bubble Plots (age) on Dyspnea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.05-0.12).(*P*=0.38).

eFigure 19d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Dyspnea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.005 (95% confidence interval:-0.04-0.03).(*P*=0.80).

eFigure 19e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Dyspnea



Egger's *P* was 0.13, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 20a. Forest Plot on Fatigue



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 20b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Fatigue



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.46 (95% confidence interval:0.12-0.79).(*P*=0.007).

eFigure 20c. Bubble Plots (age) on Fatigue



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.0008 (95% confidence interval:-0.06-0.06).(*P*=0.98).

eFigure 20d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Fatigue



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.004 (95% confidence interval:-0.03-0.04).(*P*=0.80).

eFigure 20e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Fatigue



Egger's *P* was 0.006, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 21a. Forest Plot on Fever



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 21b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Fever



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.35-0.27).(*P*=0.83).

eFigure 21c. Bubble Plots (age) on Fever



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.17 (95% confidence interval:-0.27—0.07).(*P*=0.0009).

eFigure 21d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Fever



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.06 (95% confidence interval:-0.09—0.02).(*P*=0.0019).

eFigure 21e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Fever



Egger's *P* was 0.17, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 22a. Forest Plot on Insomnia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 22b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Insomnia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.53 (95% confidence interval:0.06-0.99).(*P*=0.03).

eFigure 22c. Bubble Plots (age) on Insomnia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.07 (95% confidence interval:-0.30-0.17).(*P*=0.58).

eFigure 22d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Insomnia



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.05 (95% confidence interval:0.01-0.09).(*P*=0.007).

eFigure 22e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Insomnia



Egger's *P* was 0.20, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 23a. Forest Plot on Memory impairment



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 23b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Memory impairment



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.43 (95% confidence interval:0.04-0.82).(*P*=0.03).

eFigure 23c. Bubble Plots (age) on Memory impairment



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.02 (95% confidence interval:-0.12-0.15).(*P*=0.81).

eFigure 23d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Memory impairment



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.04-0.11).(*P*=0.31).

eFigure 23e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Memory impairment



Egger's *P* was <0.0001, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 24a. Forest Plot on Nasal blockage



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 24b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Nasal blockage



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.38 (95% confidence interval:-0.73—0.04).(*P*=0.03).

eFigure 24c. Bubble Plots (age) on Nasal blockage



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.03 (95% confidence interval:-0.06-0.12).(*P*=0.52).

eFigure 24d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Nasal blockage



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.07 (95% confidence interval:-0.13—0.02).(*P*=0.0098).

eFigure 24e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Nasal blockage



Egger's *P* was 0.21, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 25a. Forest Plot on Nausea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 25b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Nausea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.54 (95% confidence interval:0.19-0.89).(*P*=0.003).

eFigure 25c. Bubble Plots (age) on Nausea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.08 (95% confidence interval:-0.24-0.08).(*P*=0.31).

eFigure 25d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Nausea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.01 (95% confidence interval:-0.05-0.08).(*P*=0.68).

eFigure 25e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Nausea



Egger's *P* was 0.018, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 26a. Forest Plot on Palpitation



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 26b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Palpitation



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.30 (95% confidence interval:-0.29-0.89).(*P*=0.32).

eFigure 26c. Bubble Plots (age) on Palpitation



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.08 (95% confidence interval:-0.02-0.28).(*P*=0.44).

eFigure 26d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Palpitation



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.007 (95% confidence interval:-0.06-0.08).(*P*=0.84).

eFigure 26e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Palpitation



Egger's *P* was 0.15, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 27a. Forest Plot on Rhinorrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 27b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Rhinorrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.10 (95% confidence interval:-0.27-0.47).(*P*=0.59).

eFigure 27c. Bubble Plots (age) on Rhinorrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.05 (95% confidence interval:-0.1-0.19).(*P*=0.50).

eFigure 27d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Rhinorrhea



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.007 (95% confidence interval:-0.06-0.05).(*P*=0.80).

eFigure 27e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Rhinorrhea



Egger's *P* was 0.02, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 28a. Forest Plot on Sneezing



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 28b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Sneezing



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.58 (95% confidence interval:-0.31-1.46).(*P*=0.20).

eFigure 28c. Bubble Plots (age) on Sneezing



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.40 (95% confidence interval:-1.03-0.24).(*P*=0.22).

eFigure 28d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Sneezing



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.02 (95% confidence interval:-0.13-0.09).(*P*=0.76).

eFigure 28e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Sneezing



Egger's *P* was 0.56, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 29a. Forest Plot on Sputum



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 29b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Sputum



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.22 (95% confidence interval:-0.46-0.01).(*P*=0.07).

eFigure 29c. Bubble Plots (age) on Sputum



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.01 (95% confidence interval:-0.07-0.10).(*P*=0.78).

eFigure 29d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Sputum



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.01 (95% confidence interval:-0.02-0.04).(*P*=0.49).

eFigure 29e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Sputum



Egger's *P* was 0.63, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 30a. Forest Plot on Vertigo (Dizziness)



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 30b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Vertigo (Dizziness)



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.35 (95% confidence interval:-0.17-0.87).(*P*=0.19).

eFigure 30c. Bubble Plots (age) on Vertigo (Dizziness)



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.03 (95% confidence interval:-0.13-0.18).(*P*=0.75).

eFigure 30d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Vertigo (Dizziness)



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.002 (95% confidence interval:-0.06-0.06).(*P*=0.96).

eFigure 30e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Vertigo (Dizziness)



Egger's *P* was 0.014, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 31a. Forest Plot on Vomiting



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 31b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Vomiting



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.36 (95% confidence interval:-0.15-0.88).(*P*=0.17).

eFigure 31c. Bubble Plots (age) on Vomiting



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.27-0.19).(*P*=0.72).

eFigure 31d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Vomiting



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.04 (95% confidence interval:-0.06-0.15).(*P*=0.42).

eFigure 31e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Vomiting



Egger's *P* was 0.002, indicating the presence of publication bias.

eFigure 32a. Forest Plot on Weakness



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 32b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Weakness



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.13 (95% confidence interval:-0.75-1.01).(*P*=0.76).

eFigure 32c. Bubble Plots (age) on Weakness



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.50 (95% confidence interval:-0.70—0.29).(*P*<0.001).

eFigure 32d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Weakness



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.009 (95% confidence interval:-0.09-0.07).(*P*=0.84).

eFigure 32e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Weakness



Egger's *P* was 0.46, indicating the absence of publication bias.

eFigure 33a. Forest Plot on Weight loss



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

eFigure 33b. Bubble Plots (follow-up period) on Weight loss



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was -0.96 (95% confidence interval:-2.80-0.88).(*P*=0.31).

eFigure 33c. Bubble Plots (age) on Weight loss



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.06 (95% confidence interval:-0.23-0.36).(*P*=0.66).

eFigure 33d. Bubble Plots (sex) on Weight loss



Point sizes are proportional to an inverse of the precision of the estimates.

The regression coefficient was 0.02 (95% confidence interval:-0.01-0.45).(*P*=0.21).

eFigure 33e. Funnel Plot of studies reporting on Weight loss



Egger's *P* was 0.13, indicating the absence of publication bias.