

1 Improvement in quality of life and cognitive function in Post Covid
2 Syndrome after online occupational therapy: results from a
3 randomized controlled pilot study

4 Dominik Schröder, MPH^{1*}, Andrea Stölting^{2*}, Christina Müllenmeister, MSc OT¹, Prof. Dr. med.
5 Georg M.N. Behrens^{2,8}, Sandra Klawitter^{3,4}, Prof. Dr. Frank Klawonn^{3,4}, Aisha Cook⁵, Nadja
6 Wegner², PD. Dr. med. Martin Wetzke⁶, Dr. rer. med. Tim Schmachtenberg¹, M.A.¹, Prof. Dr. med.
7 Alexandra Dopfer-Jablonka ^{2,8,§}, PD Dr. med. Frank Müller, MSc^{1,8§}, Prof. Dr. med. Christine
8 Happle, PhD, MHBA^{3,7,9, §}

9

10 ¹Department of General Practice, University Medicine Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

11 ²Department of Rheumatology and Immunology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

12 ³Institute of Information Engineering, Ostfalia University of applied sciences, Wolfenbüttel, Germany

13 ⁴Biostatistical Research Group, Helmholtz-Center for Infection Research, Braunschweig, Germany

14 ⁵Tim-Cook Occupational Therapy, Hannover, Germany

15 ⁶Department of Pediatric Allergology, Pneumology, and Neonatology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover,
16 Germany

17 ⁷German Center for Infection Research, RESIST, Hannover-Braunschweig, Germany

18 ⁸Department of Family Medicine, College of Human Medicine, Michigan State University, Grand Rapids MI, USA

19 ⁹ German Center for Lung Research, DZL-BREATH, Hannover, Germany

20 [§]contributed equally

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 Word Count: 2129

28

29

30

31 **Key words:** occupational therapy, digital, Post Covid Syndrome, Long Covid, pilot
32 study, randomized controlled trial

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33 Abstract

34 **Background:** Post-COVID-Syndrome (PCS) poses enormous clinical challenges. Occupational
35 therapy (OT) is recommended in PCS, but structural validation of this concept is pending.

36 **Methods:** In an unblinded randomized pilot study (clinical trial # DRKS0026007), feasibility and
37 effects of online OT in PCS were tested. Probands received structured online OT over 12 weeks
38 either via interactive online treatment sessions (interactive group) or prerecorded videos (video
39 group). 50% of probands received no online OT (control group). At week 0, 12, and 24, we analyzed
40 study experience, health-related quality of life, and impairment in performance, participation, and
41 cognitive functions.

42 **Results:** N=158 probands (mean age 38 yrs., 86% female) were included into the analyses. 83.3%
43 of probands in the interactive versus 48.1% of probands in the video group described their study
44 experience as positive or very positive ($p=0.001$). After 12 weeks, all groups displayed significant
45 improvement in concentration, memory, and performance of daily tasks. After 24 weeks, significant
46 improvement in concentration and memory were observed in control- and video-probands, and
47 social participation had improved after video-OT. However, only probands that had received
48 interactive online OT showed improvement of all measured endpoints including concentration,
49 memory, quality of life, and social participation.

50 **Conclusion:** We show that online OT is feasible and that interactive online OT is a promising
51 treatment strategy for affected patients. We present exploratory data on its efficacy and
52 describe variables that can be employed for further investigations in confirmatory trials.

53

54 Introduction

55 Approximately 3-10% of people with an acute SARS-COV-2 infection develop Post COVID-
56 syndrome (PCS) with ongoing symptoms [1-3]. PCS affected people often experience severe
57 fatigue, trouble concentrating, and reduced quality of life and social participation [4-6]. Current
58 therapy guidelines for PCS mention occupational therapy (OT) as a treatment option [6], and case
59 reports describe success of OT in treating this novel condition [7]. However, clinical studies
60 confirming efficacy of OT in PCS are pending.

61 We sought to combine the concept of OT for PCS with the strategy of remote (digital) treatment
62 delivery. Remote treatment strategies via digital communication have become more accepted since
63 the COVID-19 pandemic [8]. As many PCS patients suffer from impaired mobility, digital treatment
64 appears to be particularly appealing for this patient group [9]. Given the high prevalence of PCS,
65 the scalability of digital therapy formats could enable efficient treatment for a high number of
66 affected people.

67 Here, we tested the feasibility and efficacy of structured online OT for PCS in a randomized
68 controlled, unpowered pilot study (German clinical trial registry #DRKS00026007 [10]). OT was
69 based on a detailed manual tailored to the needs of PCS patients and delivered online, either
70 by interactive sessions or as prerecorded videos. The aim of the intervention was to support
71 affected people in developing coping strategies against major PCS symptoms such as fatigue
72 and cognitive impairments and thus improve their quality of life and social participation.

73

74 Methods

75 Trial Design

76 This is a randomized controlled pilot study with two interventional groups receiving OT either
77 via (I) interactive digital sessions (interactive group) or (II) prerecorded videos (video group). A
78 control group (III) received no intervention (controls). Planned allocation ratio was 1:1:2 (I:II:III).
79 Patients were evaluated upon study start (T1), after the 12-week treatment phase (T2) and 24
80 weeks after study start (T3). More study details are outlined in a study protocol [10]. No changes
81 were made after trial commencement.

82

83 Participants and Recruitment

84 Following inclusion criteria were applied: [1] age \geq 16 years, [2] persistent or new PCS
85 symptoms \geq 4 weeks after SARS-CoV-2 infection (confirmed by PCR or rapid antigen testing),
86 [3] feeling of strong cognitive impairment and/or fatigue (concentration deficits and/or fatigue)
87 \geq 5/10 on a Likert scale, [4] access to a digital device, [5] consent to participate in the study.
88 Recruitment was performed through an online study platform for persons affected by PCS
89 (DEFEAT Corona, German study registry number DRKS00026007 [11]). Interested patients
90 were asked to complete an online screening survey. PCS people meeting the inclusion criteria
91 were invited to participate by email. Prior to enrollment, individual consent talks were conducted
92 which each interested eligible person and further study information was provided. Participants
93 declared written consent before enrollment.

94

95 Interventions

96 Participants in the interactive group received online OT by an experienced occupational
97 therapist twice weekly through interactive digital sessions. Proband in the video group were
98 provided with links for prerecorded OT videos for two weekly sessions. Outline and structure
99 of OT were based on a detailed manual tailored to the needs of PCS patients which was
100 identical in both interventional groups [10]. OT sessions consisted of guided exercises to

101 control typical PCS symptoms as well as customizable units to improve performance in
102 everyday occupations, social participation, and wellbeing. Participants in both groups also
103 received OT workbooks and were asked to apply contents into their everyday life
104 complementing the OT content of each therapy session regularly. Control participants received
105 no treatment.

106

107 Outcomes

108 Feasibility and acceptance of the treatment concept (primary endpoints) were analyzed by
109 Likert scaled items (online questionnaire) and assessment of drop out rates in the different
110 study phases. Secondary endpoints were cognitive function and problems in everyday
111 occupations assessed by Neuro-QoL™ v2.0 cognitive function short form [12], memory
112 function tested by the WIT-2 tool [13], and concentration deficits evaluated by the D2-R test
113 [14]. Health-related quality of life was analyzed by the EQ-5D-3L index and EQ VAS [15].
114 Social participation was evaluated by the Index for measuring participation restriction (IMET)
115 score [16], and occupational performance by the Canadian occupational performance measure
116 COPM based interviews [13].

117

118 Sample size

119 As pilot study, the sample size was conceived pragmatically considering feasibility with regard
120 to project funding

121 Randomization

122 Probands were randomized into the three groups employing an urn model (ratio
123 interactive/video/control group: 1/1/2) by a member of the study team not involved in the
124 treatment intervention. After randomization, patients were tested for occupational problems
125 using a structured interview according to the Canadian occupational performance measure
126 (COPM [13]), again by an independent team member not involved in the intervention.

127

128

129 Statistical analyses

130 Sample characteristics were characterized using descriptive and bivariate statistics. Within
131 groups, changes between two time points were assessed by Wilcoxon signed rank testing. To
132 analyze longitudinal changes between groups, covariance analyses with repeated
133 measurements were performed with baseline values, interventional arm, and time points as
134 covariables. Analyses of treatment effects were conducted according to the intention to treat
135 (ITT) principle [17], and missing values were imputed applying the last observation carried
136 forward (LOCF) strategy [18]. Adjusted differences between interventional versus control
137 groups at follow up visits are reported with confidence intervals (CI). P values were corrected
138 for multiple testing by Bonferroni Holm correction, and a p value $p < 0.05$ was considered
139 statistically significant. Calculations were performed employing R (V4.2.3) with the packages
140 afex, eq5d, and ggplot2 [10, 19, 20].

141

142 Research Ethics

143 The study protocol was approved by responsible research ethics boards of all participating centers
144 (Hannover Medical School #9948_BO_K_2021, University Medical Center Göttingen 15/8/22Ü).
145 The study was registered at the German Registry for Clinical Trials (trial number
146 DRKS00026007). Participants provided written informed consent prior to enrollment.
147 The project received funding through the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research
148 (Grant number 01EP2103C).


149

150

151 Results

152
 153 Initially, n=163 PCS patients were recruited, but n=5 had to be excluded secondarily due to
 154 failing the inclusion criteria (Fig. 1). In total, n=158 PCS patients were included into the final
 155 analysis. 65.2% of participants completed the 12-week interventional or control period and
 156 were available for evaluation and timepoint T2. 32.5% of probands in the interactive, and
 157 53.8% of participants in the video group were lost to follow up at T2, as were 22.8% of control
 158 probands. An additional 2.5% of participants were lost to follow up at timepoint T3.

159 From cases in the interventional arms with follow up data, data on subjective treatment effects
 160 was available for 98.7% of probands, and 72.2% provided information on their personal OT
 161 experience. Psychological testing was performed in 98.1%, and COPM in 88% of probands
 162 with follow up evaluation. Participant numbers for each study arm and timepoint are illustrated
 163 in Fig. 1.



164
 165
 166 **Fig. 1: Flowchart illustrating study phases and proband numbers (PROM: patient reported outcome measures include**
 167 **NeuroQoL, EQ-5D, IMET)**

168

169 The median age of participants was 38 years (IQR 30–45, range 16–67), and probands in the
 170 interventional groups were significantly younger than those in the control group (Table 1). The
 171 majority of participants (86.1%) were female, with more women in the interventional as in
 172 control groups. PCS participants in the interactive group presented with better memory
 173 performance (WIT-2) than those in control and video arms. Other characteristics that did not
 174 differ between the study groups are displayed in Table 1. Further information on
 175 sociodemographic characteristics is provided in supplementary Table 1.

176

	Total (n=158)	Control (n=79)	Video (n=39)	Interactive (n=40)	p-value
Age (years) ^a	38.0 (30.0 – 45.0) <i>Range 16 – 67</i>	42.0 (31.5 – 47.0) <i>Range 16 – 61</i>	35.0 (26.5 – 41.0) <i>Range 18 – 53</i>	36.0 (29.0 – 44.0) <i>Range 16 – 67</i>	0.038 ¹
Female gender	136 (86.1)	51 (82.3)	24 (88.9)	17 (94.4)	0.025 ²
SARS-CoV-2 infection until study start (weeks, n=5 missing)	41.1 (26.8 – 63.9)	43.1 (28.1 – 60.9)	38.0.7 (20.9 – 51.2)	42.6 (28.9 – 98.3)	0.251 ¹
Fatigue ^a (Likert x/10)	8.0 (7.0 – 9.0)	8.0 (7.0 – 9.0)	9.0 (7.0 – 10.0)	8.0 (7.0 – 9.0)	0.650 ¹
Trouble concentrating (Likert x/10) ^a	8.0 (7.0 – 9.0)	8.0 (7.0 – 9.0)	8.0 (7.0 – 9.0)	7.0 (6.0 – 9.0)	0.757 ¹
d2-R ^a (n=3 missing)	-1.0 (-1.6 – 0.2)	-1.1 (-1.0 – 0.2)	-0.9 (-1.6 – -0.2)	-0.8 (-1.5 – 0.1)	0.394 ¹
WIT-2 ^a (n=3 missing)	0.1 (-0.6 – 0.5)	-0.1 (-0.5 – 0.3)	-0.1 (-1.0 – 0.3)	0.5 (-0.2 – 0.9)	0.007 ¹
EQ-5D-3L Index ^a (n=2 missing)	0.61 (0.39 – 0.75)	0.61 (0.39 – 0.75)	0.61 (0.38 – 0.75)	0.61 (0.484 – 0.75)	0.640 ¹
EQ VAS ^a (n=2 missing)	36.0 (30.0 – 51.0)	37.0 (30.0 – 50.0)	35.5 (30.3 – 49.0)	36.0 (31.0 – 56.0)	0.576 ¹
Neuro-QoL™ v2.0 Cognitive Function-Short Form ^a (n=3 missing)	33.0 (29.8 – 36.0)	34.0 (29.8 – 36.0)	33.0 (28.6 – 37.0)	32.0 (28.6 – 35.0)	0.833 ¹

IMET ^a (n=6 missing)	55.0 (41.3 – 66.0)	53.5 (41.0 – 66.0)	54.5 (44.8 – 66.0)	59.5 (37.8 – 66.0)	0.893 ¹
COPM – satisfaction (n=19 missing)	2.3 (1.5 – 3.0)	2.3 (1.5 – 3.0)	2.5 (1.3 – 3.0)	2.4 (1.5 – 3.3)	0.636 ¹
COPM – performance (n=19 missing)	3.0 (2.5 – 3.6)	3.0 (2.5 – 3.5)	3.0 (2.5 – 3.8)	3.0 (2.5 – 3.8)	0.816 ^a


177
178
179
180

Table 1: Proband characteristics at baseline

¹Kruskal-Wallis testing; ²Fisher-Freeman-Halton testing; ^amedian (IQR); ^bnumber (proportion); ^{*}comparison between control, video, and interactive group

181

182 To further analyze the acceptance of our concept, we asked PCS patients to rate their OT
183 experience during the 12-week intervention phase. In an online survey, they could rate their
184 therapy perception between 0 (very negative) and 5 (very positive). Participants in the
185 interactive group evaluated their OT experience with a mean of 4.2 points (range 2–5, n=30),
186 and 83.3% rated the treatment as positive or very positive (Fig. 2). By contrast, probands in
187 the video group rated their OT experience with an average of 3.3/5 points (range 1–5, n=27),
188 and only 48.1% described their experience as positive or very positive (Fig. 2, difference in
189 satisfaction p=0.001).



190

191 **Fig. 2: Rating of study experience by participants in the two intervention groups**

192

193 Next, we performed an exploratory analysis of the intervention’s efficacy in alleviating PCS
 194 symptoms. In all groups, a significant improvement of concentration and memory, as well as
 195 occupational performance was observed during the first 12 weeks of the study (Table 2).
 196 However, only in participants after interactive online OT, a significant improvement in health-
 197 related quality of life, social participation, and cognitive function as assessed by Neuro-QoL
 198 occurred (Table 2). In comparison to controls, participants in the interactive group presented
 199 with significantly stronger improvement in health-related quality of life (EQ-5D-3L index, mean
 200 difference 0.11, 95% CI [0.02-0.19], p=0.01) and cognitive function (Neuro-QoL, mean
 201 difference 2.36, 95% CI [0.27-4.46], p=0.022, Table 2).

202 24 weeks after the start of the study, all groups displayed significant improvement in
 203 concentration and memory performance, and participants in the control and interactive groups
 204 showed significant enhancement of social participation (Table 2). However, only PCS patients
 205 in the interactive group presented with significant improvement of all measured end points
 206 such as cognitive function, social participation, health-related quality of life, and occupational
 207 performance (Table 2).

	T1¹ (Baseline)	T2¹ (12-Weeks)	T3¹ (24-Weeks)	T1-T2² p	P T2-T3² p	P T1-T3² p
Control						
d2-R (n=77)	-1.10 (-1.90 – -0.20)	-0.50 (-1.50 – 0.30)	-0.30 (-1.20 – 0.30)	<0.001	0.002	<0.001
WIT-2 (n=77)	-0.10 (-0.50 – 0.30)	0.30 (-0.30 – 1.00)	1.00 (-0.10 – 1.60)	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
EQ-5D-3L Index (n=79)	0.613 (0.386 – 0.750)	0.613 (0.381 – 0.750)	0.649 (0.391 – 0.757)	0.912	0.092	0.419
EQ VAS (n=79)	37.00 (30.00 – 50.00)	36.00 (30.00 – 55.00)	35.00 (26.50 – 63.00)	0.590	0.590	0.590

Neuro-QoL™ v2.0 cogn. function-short form (n=79)	34.00 (29.80 – 36.00)	32.00 (28.60 – 37.00)	35.00 (29.80 – 38.90)	0.145	<0.001	0.074
IMET (n=78)	53.50 (41.00 – 66.00)	53.00 (37.00 – 66.75)	52.00 (31.00 – 66.50)	0.125	0.125	0.021s
COPM performance (n=66)	3.00 (2.50 – 3.50)	3.50 (2.54 – 4.50)	–	<0.001	-	-
COPM satisfaction (n=66)	2.25 (1.50 – 3.00)	2.50 (1.54 – 3.50)	–	<0.001	-	-
Video						
d2-R (n=39)	-0.90 (-1.60 – -0.15)	-0.60 (-1.35 – 0.30)	-0.40 (-1.35 – 0.30)	0.003	0.061	0.002
WIT-2 (n=39)	-0.10 (-1.00 – 0.30)	0.10 (-0.30 – 1.15)	0.30 (-0.60 – 1.60)	0.002	0.495	0.001
EQ-5D-3L Index (n=38)	0.613 (0.38 – 0.75)	0.639 (0.381 – 0.750)	0.64 (0.39 – 0.77)	1.00	1.00	1.00
EQ VAS (n=38)	35.50 (30.25 – 49.00)	35.50 (26.75 – 50.00)	36.50 (26.75 – 51.25)	0.990	0.460	0.990
Neuro-QoL™ v2.0 cogn. function-short form (n=37)	33.00 (28.60 – 37.00)	33.00 (39.80 – 37.00)	35.00 (27.30 – 38.90)	1.00	0.200	1.00
IMET (n=36)	54.50 (44.75 – 66.00)	56.50 (44.75 – 64.25)	55.50 (39.75 – <64.25)	0.840	0.640	0.640
COPM performance (n=37)	3.00 (2.50 – 3.75)	3.50 (3.00 – 4.75)	–	0.001	-	-
COPM satisfaction (n=37)	2.50 (1.25 – 3.00)	2.75 (2.25 – 4.75)	–	<0.001		
Interactive						
d2-R (n=39)	-0.80 (-1.50 – -0.10)	-0.10 (-0.95 – 0.80)	-0.20 (-0.95 – 0.80)	<0.001	0.002	<0.001
WIT-2 (n=39)	0.50 (-0.20 – 0.85)	1.00 (0.10 – 1.60)	1.30 (0.30 – 1.90)	<0.001	0.028	<0.001
EQ-5D-3L Index	0.613	0.750	0.750	0.044	0.346	0.008

(n=38)	(0.484 – 0.754)	(0.5 – 0.79)	(0.57 – 0.79)			
EQ VAS	36.00	46.00	42.00	0.047	0.979	0.047
(n=38)	(31.00 – 56.00)	(34.00 – 65.00)	(32.50 – 65.00)			
Neuro-QoL™ v2.0 cogn. function-short form (n=37)	32.00	34.00	34.00	0.026	0.132	0.004
	(28.60 – 35.00)	(30.90 – 37.45)	(30.35 – 39.40)			
IMET	59.50	48.50	49.00	0.023	0.836	0.012
(n=36)	(37.75 – 66.00)	(36.75 – 64.00)	(36.00 – 66.00)			
COPM performance (n=36)	3.00	3.88	–	0.001	-	-
	(2.50 – 3.75)	(2.94 – 4.81)				
COPM satisfaction (n=36)	2.38	3.00	–	0.029	-	-
	(1.46 – 3.25)	(1.63 – 4.50)				

208
209
210
211
212

Table 2: Effects of the study intervention on cognitive performance, quality of life, and occupational performance

¹Median (Q25-Q75); ²Wilcoxon sign rank, Bonferroni Holm correction for multiple testing

213 Discussion

214 PCS is a growing global health problem which has been estimated to affect up to 11% of
215 patients after SARS-CoV-2 infection [3]. In spite of high patient numbers worldwide and strong
216 clinical need, effective treatment strategies are pending [21, 22].

217 Here, we present first results on the feasibility of online OT and explore the efficacy in PCS.
218 The delivered parameters and data can be employed in larger randomized controlled clinical
219 trials on novel PCS treatment strategies. Our data illustrates that online OT can be a valuable
220 treatment approach in helping PCS patients better coping with their symptoms and restraints.
221 We have shown that online delivered OT can significantly improve their cognitive function and
222 quality of life.

223 Online delivered OT has several advantages especially for people with PCS: It can easily be
224 scaled meeting the current demand for treatment and may also be especially suitable for PCS
225 people that struggle with impaired mobility or live in more remote places. In our study, online
226 provision of OT was used by participants of all ages, illustrating the wide range of PCS patients
227 that could be reached by such an approach. Around two thirds of PCS patients in the interactive
228 therapy group completed the 12-week treatment course in the interactive group as compared
229 to less than one half of those in the video group, and significantly more patients that were
230 treated interactively rated their OT experience as positive. This illustrates that personal
231 interaction significantly enhances acceptance of online treatment in PCS. Furthermore, PCS
232 patients after interactive OT displayed significant treatment benefits when compared to both
233 video and control group. Their cognitive function showed statistically significantly improvement
234 and their health-related quality of life had increased by 0.11 points, a value clearly above the
235 threshold of 0.03 previously described to be clinically relevant [23]. The fact that secondary
236 outcomes such as memory and concentration capacity also improved in the control group could
237 be explained by a natural amelioration of PCS symptoms over time, which has also been
238 observed by other researchers [24]. Importantly, only patients receiving interactive OT showed
239 significant improvement of all measured endpoints of cognitive function, occupational
240 problems, quality of life, and social participation.

241 Taken together, these findings advocate for high acceptance and therapeutic benefit of the
242 interactive, person to person online OT in PCS patients.

243 Our study has several limitations. Firstly, due to it's novelty, *a priori* power calculations could
244 not be performed and the number of enrolled participants may have been too low to detect
245 subtle treatment effects. Also, the inhomogeneity of groups upon study start with regard to age,
246 sex, and memory function may have impacted our results. The high rate of lost to follow up
247 participants needs to be addressed in future studies. Unfortunately, we were unable to
248 systematically assess reasons for study discontinuation in our cohort. The high proportion of
249 female study participants can be interpreted as another limitation of our work. It may be
250 explained by a higher rate of female PCS patients in general and the fact that women tend to
251 seek medical help earlier than men [25, 26]. Furthermore, central outcomes such as symptom
252 severity were self-reported. As this feasibility study was performed in unblinded fashion, this
253 could have biased self-assessment. Finally, some of our test instruments such as WIT-2 and
254 d2r are not validated for repeated measurements, which could have led to improvement of
255 scorings at the second test date.

256 In spite of these limitations, our study adds significant information to the field of PCS treatment.
257 We provide detailed data on relevant clinical variables that can be employed in larger studies
258 on PCS treatment in the future. Our exploratory analyses of treatment effects also support the
259 notion that online OT is feasible in PCS and that interactive online OT may be a promising
260 treatment strategy for affected patients.

261 As such we hope our data helps to pave the way for new, effective, and scalable treatment
262 options in PCS.

263

264

265 References

266

- 267 1. Venkatesan P. NICE guideline on long COVID - The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2022. doi:
268 doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00031-X.
- 269 2. Chen Chen M. Global Prevalence of Post COVID-19 Condition or Long COVID: A Meta-Analysis
270 and Systematic Review. 2022.
- 271 3. Kavanagh KT, Cormier LE, Pontus C, Bergman A, Webley W. Long COVID's Impact on Patients,
272 Workers, & Society: A review. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2024;103(12):e37502. Epub 2024/03/22. doi:
273 10.1097/MD.00000000000037502. PubMed PMID: 38518038; PubMed Central PMCID:
274 PMCPMC10957027.
- 275 4. Koczulla AR, Ankermann T, Behrends U, Berlit P, Böing S, Brinkmann F, et al. S1-Leitlinie Post-
276 COVID/Long-COVID. *Pneumologie*. 2021;75:869-900. doi: 10.1055/a-1551-9734.
- 277 5. Soriano JB, Murthy S, Marshall JC, Relan P, Diaz JV. A clinical case definition of post-COVID-19
278 condition by a Delphi consensus. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2021. doi: 10.1016/s1473-
279 3099(21)00703-9.
- 280 6. Koczulla AR, Ankermann T, Behrends U, Berlit P, Berner R, Boing S, et al. [German S1 Guideline
281 Long-/Post-COVID]. *Pneumologie*. 2022;76(12):855-907. Epub 2022/12/09. doi: 10.1055/a-1946-3230.
282 PubMed PMID: 36479679.
- 283 7. Wilcox J, jawilcox@usc.edu, Jamie Wilcox O, OTR/L, is Associate Professor, Clinical
284 Occupational Therapy, Keck Medical Center of USC, Chan Division of Occupational Science and
285 Occupational Therapy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Frank E, efrank@usa.edu, Emily
286 Frank O, MS, OTR, is Assistant Professor and Manager of Simulation Education and Innovation
287 Initiatives, University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences, Austin, TX. *Occupational Therapy for the*
288 *Long Haul of Post-COVID Syndrome: A Case Report. The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*.
289 2023;75(Supplement_1). doi: 10.5014/ajot.2021.049223.
- 290 8. Parry W, Fraser C, Crellin E, Hughes J, Vestesson E, Clarke GM. Continuity of care and
291 consultation mode in general practice: a cross-sectional and longitudinal study using patient-level and
292 practice-level data from before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in England. *BMJ Open*.
293 2023;13(11):e075152. Epub 2023/11/16. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-075152. PubMed PMID:
294 37968008; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10660661.
- 295 9. Dahmen A, Keller FM, Derksen C, Rinn R, Becker P, Lippke S. Screening and assessment for
296 post-acute COVID-19 syndrome (PACS), guidance by personal pilots and support with individual digital
297 trainings within intersectoral care: a study protocol of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Infect Dis*.
298 2022;22(1):693. Epub 2022/08/16. doi: 10.1186/s12879-022-07584-z. PubMed PMID: 35971066;
299 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9377288.
- 300 10. Singmann H BB, Westfall J, Aust F, Ben-Shachar M. `_afex: Analysis of Factorial Experiments_`. R
301 package version 1.3-0. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=afex>. 2023.
- 302 11. Mikuteit M, Heinemann S, Roder S, Niewolik J, Schroder D, Vahldiek K, et al. Long-term
303 Consequences of COVID-19 and the Pandemic: Protocol for a Web-Based, Longitudinal Observational
304 Study (DEFEAT). *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2022;11(10):e38718. Epub 2022/09/16. doi: 10.2196/38718.
305 PubMed PMID: 36108134; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9611102.
- 306 12. [healthmeasures.net. Neuro-QoL. https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-](https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/neuro-qol#:~:text=Neuro-QoL%20TM%20%28Quality%20of%20Life%20in%20Neurological%20Disorders%29,by%20adults%20and%20children%20living%20with%20neurological%20conditions.)
307 [systems/neuro-qol#:~:text=Neuro-](https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/neuro-qol#:~:text=Neuro-QoL%20TM%20%28Quality%20of%20Life%20in%20Neurological%20Disorders%29,by%20adults%20and%20children%20living%20with%20neurological%20conditions.)
308 [QoL%20TM%20%28Quality%20of%20Life%20in%20Neurological%20Disorders%29,by%20adults%20a](https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/neuro-qol#:~:text=Neuro-QoL%20TM%20%28Quality%20of%20Life%20in%20Neurological%20Disorders%29,by%20adults%20and%20children%20living%20with%20neurological%20conditions.)
309 [nd%20children%20living%20with%20neurological%20conditions. 2022.](https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/neuro-qol#:~:text=Neuro-QoL%20TM%20%28Quality%20of%20Life%20in%20Neurological%20Disorders%29,by%20adults%20and%20children%20living%20with%20neurological%20conditions.)
- 310 13. Martin Kersting KA, Adolf Otto Jäger. *Wilde-Intelligenz-Test 2. Hofgreve_1st_edition*. 2008.
- 311 14. Wollseiffen P, Ghadiri A, Scholz A, Struder HK, Herpers R, Peters T, et al. Short Bouts of
312 Intensive Exercise During the Workday Have a Positive Effect on Neuro-cognitive Performance. *Stress*
313 *Health*. 2016;32(5):514-23. Epub 2015/10/10. doi: 10.1002/smi.2654. PubMed PMID: 26449710.
- 314 15. Ozkeskin M, Ozden F, Karaman B, Ekmekci O, Yuceyar N. The comparison of fatigue, sleep
315 quality, physical activity, quality of life, and psychological status in multiple sclerosis patients with or

- 316 without COVID-19. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. 2021;55:103180. Epub 2021/08/06. doi:
317 10.1016/j.msard.2021.103180. PubMed PMID: 34352513; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8324500.
318 16. Schroder D, Mullenmeister C, Heinemann S, Hummers E, Klawonn F, Vahldiek K, et al. Social
319 participation during the COVID-19 pandemic in persons with a high risk for a severe course of COVID-
320 19 - results of a longitudinal, multi-center observational study in Germany. *Health Psychol Behav Med*.
321 2023;11(1):2249534. Epub 2023/08/30. doi: 10.1080/21642850.2023.2249534. PubMed PMID:
322 37645515; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC810461510.
- 323 17. T B. Intent-to-Treat Analysis Versus Per Protocol Analysis. *Clinical trials*. 2017:173-201.
324 18. Gupta SK. Intention-to-treat concept: A review. *Perspect Clin Res*. 2011;2(3):109-12. Epub
325 2011/09/08. doi: 10.4103/2229-3485.83221. PubMed PMID: 21897887; PubMed Central PMCID:
326 PMC3159210.
- 327 19. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. 2016;ISBN
328 978-3-319-24277-4.
- 329 20. Morton F NJ. `_eq5d: Methods for Analysing 'EQ-5D' Data and Calculating 'EQ-5D' Index`
330 `Scores_`. R package version 0.14.0. <https://CRANR-project.org/package=eq5d>. 2023.
- 331 21. Kirchberger I, Meisinger C, Warm TD, Hyhlik-Durr A, Linseisen J, Gossiau Y. Post-COVID-19
332 Syndrome in Non-Hospitalized Individuals: Healthcare Situation 2 Years after SARS-CoV-2 Infection.
333 *Viruses*. 2023;15(6). Epub 2023/06/28. doi: 10.3390/v15061326. PubMed PMID: 37376625; PubMed
334 Central PMCID: PMC10303962.
- 335 22. Schmachtenberg T, Konigs G, Dragaqina A, Roder S, Muller F, Mullenmeister C, et al. "There is
336 no one who helps you with it": experiences of people with long COVID regarding medical care,
337 therapeutic measures, and barriers in the German healthcare system: results of a qualitative study
338 with four focus groups. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2023;23(1):1160. Epub 2023/10/27. doi:
339 10.1186/s12913-023-10170-x. PubMed PMID: 37884993; PubMed Central PMCID:
340 PMC10601213.
- 341 23. Coretti S, Ruggeri M, McNamee P. The minimum clinically important difference for EQ-5D
342 index: a critical review. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*. 2014;14(2):221-33. Epub
343 2014/03/15. doi: 10.1586/14737167.2014.894462. PubMed PMID: 24625040.
- 344 24. Steinmetz A, Gross S, Lehnert K, Lucker P, Friedrich N, Nauck M, et al. Longitudinal Clinical
345 Features of Post-COVID-19 Patients-Symptoms, Fatigue and Physical Function at 3- and 6-Month
346 Follow-Up. *J Clin Med*. 2023;12(12). Epub 2023/06/28. doi: 10.3390/jcm12123966. PubMed PMID:
347 37373660; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC10299126.
- 348 25. Bai F, Tomasoni D, Falcinella C, Barbanotti D, Castoldi R, Mule G, et al. Female gender is
349 associated with long COVID syndrome: a prospective cohort study. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.
350 2022;28(4):611 e9- e16. Epub 2021/11/12. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.002. PubMed PMID: 34763058;
351 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8575536.
- 352 26. Sagar-Ouriaghli I, Godfrey E, Bridge L, Meade L, Brown JSL. Improving Mental Health Service
353 Utilization Among Men: A Systematic Review and Synthesis of Behavior Change Techniques Within
354 Interventions Targeting Help-Seeking. *Am J Mens Health*. 2019;13(3):1557988319857009. Epub
355 2019/06/12. doi: 10.1177/1557988319857009. PubMed PMID: 31184251; PubMed Central PMCID:
356 PMC6560805.

357

358

359 Supplement

360

	T2 difference (95% CI) ¹	T3 difference (95% CI) ¹	P T2 ²	P T3 ²
d2-R ³				
video vs. control	-0.07 (-0.42 – 0.28)	-0.14 (-0.57 – 0.30)	1.00	1.00
interactive vs. control	0.08 (-0.28 – 0.43)	0.15 (-0.28 – 0.59)	0.783	0.783
WIT-2 ³				
interactive vs. control	0.07 (-0.31 – 0.46)	-0.41 (-0.92 – 0.10)	1.00	1.00
video vs. control	0.10 (-0.28 – 0.49)	-0.18 (-0.70 – 0.32)	0.158	0.746
EQ-5D-3L index ³				
video vs. control	0.021 (-0.069 – 0.110)	0.006 (-0.108 – 0.095)	0.577	0.880
interactive vs. control	0.106 (0.020 – 0.193)	0.065 (-0.033 – 0.163)	0.011	0.332
EQ VAS ³				
video vs. control	-1.21 (-8.47 – 6.05)	-4.47 (-13.27 – 4.32)	0.685	0.655
interactive vs. control	4.09 (-3.89 – 12.07)	0.32 (-9.35 – 9.98)	0.449	0.936
Neuro-QoL™ v2.0 cognitive function short form ³				
video vs. control	0.48 (-1.63 – 2.58)	-1.25 (-4.26 – 1.77)	0.582	0.633
interactive vs. control	2.36 (0.27 – 4.46)	0.80 (-2.20 – 3.81)	0.022	0.633
IMET ⁴				
video vs. control	3.78 (-4.17 – 11.74)	3.63 (-5.67 – 12.93)	0.498	0.686
interactive vs. control	-3.40 (-11.54 – 4.74)	-2.31 (-11.82 – 7.21)	0.498	0.686
COPM performance				
video vs. control	0.13 (-0.50 – 0.75)	-	1.00	not assessed
interactive vs. control	0.20 (-0.46 – 0.85)	-	1.00	not assessed
COPM satisfaction				
video vs. control	0.30 (-0.45 – 1.05)	-	0.977	not assessed
interactive vs. control	0.10 (-0.74 – 0.94)	-	1.00	not assessed

361

362

363

364

Supplementary Table 1: Differences between study arms adjusted for baseline scores

¹differences and CI adjusted according to baseline values employing repeated measurement variance analyses, ²Bonferroni Holm adjusted for multiple testing, ³positive value: improvement, ⁴negative value: improvement.