

Meta-analysis of coagulation disbalances in COVID-19: 41 studies and 17601 patients

Polina Len¹, Gaukhar Iskakova^{1,#}, Zarina Sautbayeva^{1,#}, Aigul Kussanova^{1,2,#}, Ainur T. Tauekelova³, Madina M. Sugralimova³, Anar S. Dautbaeva³, Meruert M. Abdieva³, Eugene D. Ponomarev⁴, Alexander Tikhonov¹, Makhabbat S. Bekbossynova^{3,*}, Natasha S. Barteneva^{1,5,6*}

¹School of Sciences and Humanities, Nazarbayev University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

²Core Facilities, Nazarbayev University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

³National Research Center for Cardiac Surgery, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

⁴School of Biomedical Sciences, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong

⁵National Laboratory Astana, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

⁶Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA

[#]These authors made an equal contribution in the study

^{*}Joint senior authors

Supplementary Material 1

Supplementary File 1. Criteria for clinical severity of COVID-19 used by the National Research Center for Cardiac Surgery.

- mild - fever $<39^{\circ}\text{C}$, $\text{SpO}_2 > 95\%$ on room air, no dyspnea, respiratory rate < 20 breaths/min, no imaging findings of pneumonia;
- moderate - fever $>38^{\circ}\text{C}$, SpO_2 94- 95% on room air, dyspnea on exertion, respiratory rate < 20 -22 breaths/min, CT extent of lung damage $<50\%$;
- severe – any fever, SpO_2 90-93%, dyspnea at less-than-ordinary activity or rest, respiratory rate 23-30 breaths/min, CT extent of lung damage $>50\%$;
- critical - any fever, $\text{SpO}_2 <90\%$, dyspnea at rest, respiratory rate >30 breaths/min, CT extent of lung damage 75-100%;

Supplementary Table 1. Results of the NIH Quality Assessment.

	1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations?	5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome?	9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	Score
Liao et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	✗	7
Shang et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	✗	7
Rauch et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	NA	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✗	8
Gerotziafas et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✗	9
Cen et al.	✓	✓	NR	✓	✗	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✗	8
P. Wang et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✗	8
Di Micco et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	NA	NA	NA	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	✗	6
Bauer et al.	✓	✓	CD	✓	✗	NA	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✗	7
J. Zhang et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	NA	NA	NA	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	✗	6

Lopez-Castaneda et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	NA	NA	NA	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Yue et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	NA	NA	NA	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	6
White et al.	✓	✓	NR	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Noh et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	NA	NA	✓	9
Bergantini et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	NA	NA	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	5
Jie Liu et al.	✓	✓	NR	NR	×	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	8
Jiac Liu et al.	✓	✓	NR	NR	×	NA	✓	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	✓	7
J. Zhao et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	✓	8
Karakoyun et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	×	9
X. Zheng et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	10
Y. Zhao et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Bastug et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	×	7
W Liu et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	9
Fu et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	6
H. Zhang et al.	✓	✓	NR	NR	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	✓	6
Aloisio et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	NA	×	7
Mikami et al.	✓	✓	NA	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Young et al.	✓	✓	✓	NR	×	NA	NA	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	7
Higuera-de-la-Tijera et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	8

Cugno et al.	✓	✓	CD	✓	✓	NA	NA	CD	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	6
N Chen et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	×	✓	NA	NA	✓	8
Wang et al.	✓	✓	×	NR	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	5
Long et al.	✓	✓	CD	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Yu et al.	✓	✓	✓	NR	CD	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	✓	7
Suleyman et al.	✓	✓	CD	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	✓	7
Z. Chen et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	✓	8
Ding et al.	✓	✓	✓	NR	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Q. Chen et al.	✓	✓	✓	×	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	6
G. Zhang et al.	✓	✓	✓	NR	×	NA	NA	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	×	6
Jiao Liu et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	NA	✓	CD	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	9
Zhou et al.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	NR	✓	NA	NA	✓	10

Supplementary Table 2. Results of the Egger's test with Pustejovsky's corrected standard error

Parameter	Intercept	Confidence Interval	t	p-value
PLT	-1.306	[-2.47, -0.14]	-2.195	0.0355
DD	3.228	[1.24, 5.21]	3.184	0.0030
FIB	2.142	[0.1, 4.18]	2.061	0.0526
APTT	0.717	[-1.46, 2.89]	0.647	0.5255
PT	-0.506	[-2.59, 1.58]	-0.476	0.6389