### 1 Title: EHR-based Case Identification of Pediatric Long COVID: A Report from the RECOVER

### 2 EHR Cohort

### 3 Authors:

- 4 Morgan Botdorf, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Kimberley Dickinson, BS<sup>1</sup>, Vitaly Lorman PhD<sup>1</sup>, Hanieh Razzaghi,
- 5 PhD<sup>1</sup>, Nicole Marchesani, MS<sup>1</sup>, Suchitra Rao, MBBS, MSCS<sup>2</sup>, Colin Rogerson, MD<sup>3</sup>, Miranda
- 6 Higginbotham, MHA<sup>1</sup>, Asuncion Mejias, MD, PhD, MsCS<sup>4</sup>, Daria Salyakina, PhD<sup>5</sup>, Deepika
- 7 Thacker, MD<sup>6</sup>, Dima Dandachi, MD, MPH<sup>7</sup>, Dimitri A Christakis MD MPH<sup>8</sup>, Emily Taylor,
- 8 M.A<sup>9</sup>, Hayden Schwenk, MD, MPH<sup>10</sup>, Hiroki Morizono, PhD<sup>11</sup>, Jonathan Cogen MD, MPH<sup>12</sup>,
- 9 Nate M Pajor MD, MS<sup>13</sup>, Ravi Jhaveri, MD<sup>14</sup>, Christopher B. Forrest, MD, PhD<sup>1</sup>, L. Charles
- 10 Bailey, MD, PhD<sup>1</sup>, on behalf of the RECOVER Consortium  $\Box$
- 11
- 12 Affiliations:
- 13 <sup>1</sup>Applied Clinical Research Center, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA
- <sup>2</sup>Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado School of Medicine and Children's Hospital
- 15 Colorado, Denver, CO
- <sup>3</sup> Division of Critical Care, Department of Pediatrics, Indiana University School of Medicine,
- 17 Indianapolis, IN
- <sup>4</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Pediatrics, Nationwide Children's Hospital and
- 19 The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
- 20 <sup>5</sup>Center for Precision Medicine, Nicklaus Children's Hospital, Miami, FL
- 21 <sup>6</sup>Nemours Cardiac Center, Alfred I. duPont Hospital for Children, Wilmington, DE.
- 22 <sup>7</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Missouri-Columbia,
- 23 Columbia, MO
- <sup>8</sup>Center for Child Health, Behavior and Development, Seattle Children's Research Institute,
- 25 Seattle, WA
- 26 <sup>9</sup>New York University Grossman School of Medicine Department of Medicine New York, NY
- 27 <sup>10</sup>Stanford School of Medicine, Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Stanford, CA
- 28 <sup>11</sup>Center for Genetic Medicine Research, Children's National Hospital, Washington, DC
- 29 <sup>12</sup>Division of Pulmonary and Sleep Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Seattle Children's
- 30 Hospital, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
- 31 <sup>13</sup>Division of Pulmonary Medicine, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center and University
- 32 of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati OH
- 33 <sup>14</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago,
- 34 Chicago, IL
- 35

## 36 Authorship Statement

- 37 Authorship has been determined according to ICMJE recommendations.
- 38
- **39 Corresponding Author:**
- 40 Name: Morgan Botdorf
- 41 Affiliation: Applied Clinical Research Center, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

### 42 Email: <u>botdorfm@chop.edu</u>

- 43 Abbreviated Title: Identifying Children with Long COVID
- 44 **Funding Source:** This research was funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH)
- 45 Agreement OTA OT2HL161847-01 as part of the Researching COVID to Enhance Recovery
- 46 (RECOVER) program of research.
- 47 **Disclaimer:** This content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily
- 48 represent the official views of the RECOVER Initiative, the NIH, or other funders.
- 49
- 50 Key Words: PEDSnet, Post-acute sequelae SARS-CoV-2 infection, Long COVID, Chronic
- 51 COVID-19 Syndrome, Late sequelae of COVID-19, Long haul COVID, Long-term COVID-19,
- 52 Post COVID syndrome, Post-acute COVID-19, Rule-based phenotyping, Electronic health
- 53 records, Electronic phenotyping, Chart review
- 54 Abbreviations: PASC—post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection; COVID-19—
- 55 coronavirus disease 2019; SARS-CoV-2—severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2;
- 56 PCR—polymerase chain reaction; EHR—electronic health record; MIS-C—multisystem
- 57 inflammatory syndrome in children; ICD-10—International Classification of Diseases, version

58 10.

### 60 Abstract

### 61 **Objective**

62 Long COVID, marked by persistent, recurring, or new symptoms post-COVID-19 infection,

63 impacts children's well-being yet lacks a unified clinical definition. This study evaluates the

64 performance of an empirically derived Long COVID case identification algorithm, or

65 computable phenotype, with manual chart review in a pediatric sample. This approach aims to

66 facilitate large-scale research efforts to understand this condition better.

#### 67 Methods

68 The algorithm, composed of diagnostic codes empirically associated with Long COVID, was

69 applied to a cohort of pediatric patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection in the RECOVER PCORnet

70 EHR database. The algorithm classified 31,781 patients with conclusive, probable, or possible

71 Long COVID and 307,686 patients without evidence of Long COVID. A chart review was

performed on a subset of patients (n=651) to determine the overlap between the two methods.

73 Instances of discordance were reviewed to understand the reasons for differences.

### 74 **Results**

The sample comprised 651 pediatric patients (339 females,  $M_{age} = 10.10$  years) across 16

76 hospital systems. Results showed moderate overlap between phenotype and chart review Long

77 COVID identification (accuracy = 0.62, PPV = 0.49, NPV = 0.75); however, there were also

numerous cases of disagreement. No notable differences were found when the analyses were

real stratified by age at infection or era of infection. Further examination of the discordant cases

80 revealed that the most common cause of disagreement was the clinician reviewers' tendency to

81 attribute Long COVID-like symptoms to prior medical conditions. The performance of the

82	phenotype improved when prior medical conditions were considered (accuracy = $0.71$ , PPV =
83	0.65, NPV = $0.74$ ).
84	Conclusions
85	Although there was moderate overlap between the two methods, the discrepancies between the
86	two sources are likely attributed to the lack of consensus on a Long COVID clinical definition. It
87	is essential to consider the strengths and limitations of each method when developing Long
88	COVID classification algorithms.
89	
90	
91	
92	
93	
94	
95	
96	
97	
98	
99	
100	
101	
102	
103	
104	

## 105 Introduction

106 Long COVID, also known as post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC), is a 107 significant health concern characterized by ongoing, relapsing, or new symptoms emerging four or more weeks after the acute infection phase<sup>1</sup>. While post-viral syndromes like chronic fatigue 108 109 syndrome following mononucleosis are well-documented in children<sup>2-3</sup>, understanding the 110 clinical manifestations of Long COVID in pediatric patients remains incomplete. The variability of symptoms in children compared to adults complicates diagnosis and treatment<sup>4-9</sup>. Symptoms 111 can range from fatigue and headache to loss of taste and smell and chest pain<sup>4-9</sup>. Although rare, 112 113 diagnosed conditions associated with Long COVID include myocarditis, myositis, postural 114 tachycardia syndrome (POTS), and myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS), among other conditions<sup>10</sup>. Despite certain symptoms and conditions clearly 115 116 attributable to a SARS-CoV-2 infection, like multisystem inflammatory syndrome (MIS-C), much remains to be understood about others $^{11-12}$ . These symptoms and conditions impose a 117 118 substantial burden on children and their families, leading to missed school and the need for service referrals<sup>13-14</sup>. This highlights the importance of improved detection and treatment 119 120 strategies.

121Identifying children who suffer from Long COVID in research studies is crucial to better122understand this disorder and ensuring timely detection and treatments in clinical settings.123However, this task is challenging due to the inconsistency and heterogeneity of associated124symptoms. To address this challenge, researchers have used large observational cohort studies125that use repositories of electronic health record (EHR) data to identify patients<sup>5, 8, 9, 15, 16</sup>. These126studies have primarily relied on EHR-based diagnosis codes<sup>15-16</sup>. The ICD-10-CM U09.9 code,127introduced in October 2021<sup>17-18</sup>, allows clinicians to assign a Long COVID diagnosis; however,

its utilization remains inconsistent and potentially biased across patients and healthcare settings
 <sup>16</sup>. Additionally, relying solely on this code may not adequately capture all patients due to the
 variety of symptoms associated with Long COVID. This poses a risk of misclassification if
 researchers exclusively use the U09.9 code for phenotyping.
 To improve identification of patients with Long COVID, computable phenotyping

133 techniques, which involve developing a set of rules to identify patients with a disorder, have been used in Long COVID studies. Long COVID phenotypes for adult<sup>19</sup> and pediatric<sup>20</sup> patients 134 135 have been developed using machine-learning approaches that leverage large numbers of clinical 136 features. For example, in a recent pediatric study, a machine learning algorithm demonstrated 137 high precision in classifying both general and MIS-C-specific forms of PASC, with recall rates of up to 70%<sup>20</sup>. Training these supervised learning models requires a labeled cohort of patients 138 139 who likely have Long COVID based on healthcare utilization or Long COVID diagnosis codes. 140 Since there is no gold-standard definition of Long COVID, it is difficult to produce an unbiased

labeled training set, which limits the generalizability of the models.

141

142 In this study, we aimed to 1) identify children with Long COVID by utilizing a rules-143 based computable phenotype approach and 2) assess the performance of this computable phenotype for Long COVID in a subset of children. This approach involves analyzing specific 144 145 diagnosis coding and symptoms that occur more frequently after a COVID-19 infection. By 146 doing so, we can more accurately identify a larger number of children with Long COVID. In 147 addition, we have included clinician reviews of patient charts to gain a comprehensive 148 understanding of patients' experience with Long COVID. This combined approach represents a 149 significant step in the automation of Long COVID clinical phenotypes using EHR data in the 150 absence of a consensus definition.

### 151 Methods

### 152 Data Source

153 This retrospective cohort study is part of the NIH Researching COVID to Enhance 154 Recovery (RECOVER) Initiative, which seeks to understand, treat, and prevent the post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>21</sup>. The RECOVER PCORnet EHR cohort includes clinical 155 156 data from patients in 40 hospital systems across the United States. Data were extracted from 157 version 6 of the pediatric RECOVER database, comprising more than 9 million children who 158 were tested for SARS-CoV-2, diagnosed with COVID-19, or received a COVID-19 vaccine 159 between 2019 and December 2022. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained 160 under Biomedical Research Alliance of New York (BRANY) protocol #21-08-508. BRANY 161 waived the need for consent and HIPAA authorization.

### 162 *Study Population*

163 Inclusion criteria for our pediatric sample were as follows: 1) SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed via clinical diagnosis or PCR, antigen, or qualifying serology test<sup>22</sup> between March 164 165 2020 and December 2022, 2) age less than 21 years at first COVID-19 infection, and 3) at least 166 two contacts with the healthcare system (at least one being in-person or telehealth) to ensure 167 adequate follow-up during the post-acute phase (28-179 days following infection). We defined 168 clinically meaningful time periods surrounding the initial COVID-19 infection as shown in 169 Figure 1. The acute phase spanned until the 27th day post-infection. The post-acute phase, which 170 was the primary focus of our analyses, spanned from day 28 through day 179 post-infection, 171 ensuring that symptoms were not directly related to the acute COVID-19 infection. For patients 172 with a specific COVID-19 diagnosis or viral test, the initial infection date was the date of 173 diagnosis or test. For patients with diagnoses indicating "history of" or "complication of"

174 COVID-19 or with a positive serology test, we used 28 days prior to the earliest diagnosis or test
175 evidence of COVID-19 as a proxy for initial infection date.

176 Phenotype classification

177 Patients were identified as having conclusive, probable, or possible Long COVID 178 according to the algorithm described in Figure 2, which used criteria documented in the EHR in 179 the post-acute period. The algorithm accounts for diagnoses of Long COVID (ICD-10-CM code 180 U09.9), diagnoses of MIS-C (ICD-10-CM code M35.81), diagnoses of sequelae of specified 181 infectious and parasitic diseases (ICD-10-CM code B94.8), and 23 diagnosis clusters identified as probable indicators of Long COVID based on our prior work<sup>5,9</sup> (Supplemental File 1). The 182 183 diagnosis clusters were formed using a data mining approach that identified conditions more 184 common in U09.9-diagnosed patients than in non-U09.9 diagnosed COVID-19+ patients in the 185 post-acute period<sup>5</sup>. Clinicians then reviewed the diagnosis codes to create clusters of ICD-10-CM 186 codes. Clusters included abdominal pain, abnormal liver enzymes, acute kidney injury, acute 187 respiratory distress syndrome, arrythmias, autonomic dysfunction, cardiovascular 188 signs/symptoms, changes in taste/smell, chest pain, cognitive function, generalized pain, 189 fatigue/malaise, fever, fluid/electrolyte balance, headache, heart disease, myocarditis, 190 musculoskeletal symptoms, myositis, respiratory signs/symptoms, and 191 thrombophlebitis/thromboembolism. Any patient with two or more diagnoses within the same 192 cluster separated by at least 28 days during the post-acute period was labeled as having probable 193 Long COVID, regardless of whether the patient had a specific Long COVID or MIS-C diagnosis 194 code. Figure 2 depicts the steps applied to classify patients according to the certainty of them 195 having Long COVID. Any patient with conclusive, probable, or possible Long COVID detected

by the phenotype was labeled as "Long COVID Evidence" and all others were labelled as "NoLong COVID Evidence".

198 Chart Review Sampling

199 A manual chart review was performed on a subset of the study population at 16 200 institutions. We sampled 702 patients split between the Long COVID Evidence and No Long 201 COVID Evidence groups to ensure there was adequate representation across sites. The sampling 202 strategy is laid out in Figure 3. Approximately 22 Long COVID Evidence patients were 203 randomly sampled per institution. Each Long COVID Evidence sampled patient was matched 204 1:1 without replacement with a No Long COVID Evidence patient using exact matching on 205 institution, age at time of infection, calendar quarter of infection, and acute period hospitalization 206 (yes/no). Ninety percent of the No Long COVID Evidence sample had SARS-CoV-2 infection 207 while the remaining ten percent (35 patients) were patients with no evidence of SARS-CoV-2 but 208 with at least two diagnoses of cluster conditions separated by 28 to 150 days. The latter group 209 were additional patients included in the chart review to gather insight on the attribution of cluster 210 diagnoses to conditions other than SARS-CoV-2 infection. A total of 651 children were 211 ultimately included in analyses based on additional exclusions which will be discussed. The 212 sampling strategy is laid out in Figure 3.

213 Chart Review Procedure

214 Clinical research teams from each participating institution conducted chart reviews using 215 a REDCap<sup>23</sup> (Research Electronic Data Capture) instrument with questions including 216 information on COVID-19 diagnoses and testing, demographics, COVID-19 prevention and 217 treatment strategies, vaccines, functional outcomes, and conditions post COVID-19 captured in 218 the patient's medical record. Each site had between 1 and 5 reviewers for a total of 44 reviewers

across sites. Table 1 contains a summary of patient information extracted from chart review, andthe full case report form is included in Supplemental File 2.

221 A secondary review was completed by a clinician who reviewed information extracted by 222 the primary chart reviewer and answered questions regarding the level of confidence with which 223 Long COVID could be assigned to the patient. The clinician was first asked if the patient met criteria for Long COVID based on the NIH definition<sup>21</sup> which describes Long COVID as signs, 224 225 symptoms, and conditions that continue or develop after initial COVID-19 or SARS-CoV-2 226 infection, are present four weeks [28 days] or more after the initial phase of infection; may be 227 multisystemic; and may present with a relapsing-remitting pattern and progression or worsening 228 over time, with the possibility of severe and life-threatening events even months or years after 229 infection. They were then asked if the patient met criteria for Long COVID based on the 230 computable phenotype definition. The response to these questions (i.e., conclusive, probable, 231 possible, no evidence) was used to assess concordance with the computable phenotype. The first 232 question, which analyses focused on, asked the clinician to exercise clinical judgment, while the 233 second question was focused on assessing the validity of the structured EHR data.

234 For ease of assessing the performance of the computable phenotype compared with chart 235 review, patients were collapsed into four overlapping groups: computable phenotype-positive 236 (CP-positive), computable phenotype-negative (CP-negative), clinician review-positive (CR-237 positive), and clinician review-negative (CR-negative). Patients identified by the phenotype as 238 having conclusive or probable Long COVID were placed in the CP-positive group. Conversely, 239 patients found to have possible evidence or no evidence of Long COVID were placed in the CP-240 negative group. Patients with possible Long COVID were included in the CP-negative sample as 241 the study team concluded that having only one post-viral sequelae code without a positive PCR

242	test to confirm SARS-CoV-2 infection did not provide enough evidence to conclude that the
243	patient's post-viral sequelae was caused by Long COVID. On the other hand, when examining
244	the chart review, we determined that the reasons reviewers used to classify patients as possible
245	for Long COVID were more similar to a positive than a negative Long COVID classification.
246	Therefore, the CR-positive group consisted of patients labeled as conclusive, probable, or
247	possible for Long COVID by the clinician reviewer. In contrast, the CR-negative group consisted
248	of patients labeled as having no evidence of Long COVID by the clinician reviewer.
249	Performance Assessment
250	The performance of the computable phenotype was evaluated across various key metrics
251	including sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value
252	(NPV). Additionally, we examined the accuracy and F1 score of the phenotype. Accuracy
253	assesses the proportion of CR-positive patients who were also CP-positive. The F1 score
254	combines precision and recall providing insight into the overall effectiveness of the phenotype.
255	Next, we assessed whether concordance between the phenotype and clinician review
256	classification differed by age (i.e., under vs. over 12 years old), variant period (i.e., alpha, delta,
257	omicron), and number of symptom clusters through stratified analyses. Analyses were conducted
258	using R version 4.1.2 (2021-11-01; 24).
259	We conducted an assessment to identify discrepancies between the phenotype and chart

review identification of Long COVID. We reviewed cases where the phenotype identified Long COVID, but the chart review did not, and vice versa. To understand the reasons behind these discrepancies, we reviewed the chart review form for each discordant patient, along with the clinician reviewer's explanation for assigning or not assigning Long COVID. We then generated themes that accounted for the discrepancy and assigned those themes to the remaining cases. We

next aimed to modify our model based the most common themes and perform a sensitivity
analysis to assess whether the performance of our modified model was superior to our original
model.

To describe the sample and investigate the impact of patients with complex medical histories on the performance of the phenotype, we used the Pediatric Medical Complexity Algorithm<sup>25</sup> (PMCA). We determined the chronic condition status of each patient by applying the more conservative version of the algorithm. This version requires that a patient have one diagnosis of a progressive or malignant condition or at least two diagnoses per body system for at least two body systems in the three years prior to the SARS-CoV-2 infection.

274 **Results** 

275 Among patients with a positive SARS-CoV-2 infection (1,007,867), the computable 276 phenotype detected Long COVID in 31,781 (3.2%) patients. Seven hundred and two patients 277 were included in the chart review sample; however, sixteen charts were not completed due to 278 limitations in the chart reviewers' access to records and were excluded from the sample. In 279 addition, the 35 patients with no evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection according to the computable 280 phenotype were not included in comparative analyses as a full chart review was not completed 281 on them. Thus, our final sample consisted of 651 patients. Sample demographics and descriptive 282 statistics are presented in Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics were similar among those 283 classified with and without Long COVID by the phenotype and by the clinician chart reviewer 284 (Supplemental Table S1).

# There was 73.33% agreement between the responses to the two questions the clinician chart reviewers answered. Table 2 presents statistics assessing the performance of the computable phenotype with chart review. The two methods had substantial but incomplete

overlap. Analyses assessing whether concordance differed by selected variables showed similar
results across age, era associated with infection, and number of symptom clusters (Supplemental
Tables S2-4).

### 291 Computable Phenotype-Only and Clinician Review-Only Long COVID Positive Review

292 A review was conducted to assess the reasons for disagreement between the two methods. 293 The initial focus was cases where the phenotype identified Long COVID, but the chart review 294 did not (CP+/CR- cases) as there were many of these cases. Results are presented in Figure 4. In 295 most CP+/CR- cases, the clinician reviewer agreed with the symptoms the computable 296 phenotype identified but attributed those symptoms to another viral infection or preexisting 297 disorder (Figure 4a). This was especially true for symptoms common to other respiratory 298 infections and symptoms with occurrences both pre and post COVID-19 infection. In other less 299 common cases, the reviewer did not see the diagnostic codes that the phenotype saw, or the 300 reviewer made a conclusion based on incomplete information.

301 An assessment of CR+/CP- cases showed that in many cases the reviewer considered 302 symptoms, visits, and time frames that differed from our phenotype (Figure 4b). For example, 303 clinician reviewers considered symptoms beyond 180 days post-infection (up to 11 months in 304 some cases) while the computable phenotype considered symptoms in the one month to 180 days 305 following infection. In addition, reviewers considered symptoms beyond those included in the 306 computable phenotype definition, such as mental health symptoms. For example, clinician 307 reviewers used clinical judgment and identified anxiety as a qualifying symptom, but it is not 308 included in the phenotype definition due to inconsistent recording in structured data.

309 Sensitivity Analysis

310 The review of CP+/CR- patients showed that comorbidities were a large factor 311 contributing to discordance between the two methods. Given the difficulty of distinguishing 312 symptoms due to preexisting conditions and symptoms due to Long COVID, we performed a 313 sensitivity analysis to assess concordance with a modified model in which preexisting conditions 314 and comorbidities were accounted for. First, we censored prior symptoms. In other words, we 315 assessed phenotype classification when non-incident diagnoses were excluded. Patients who met 316 criteria for the computable phenotype with only preexisting symptom clusters that persisted after 317 their COVID-19 diagnosis were labeled as having no evidence of Long COVID (n = 32 patients). 318 Second, given the high prevalence of symptoms reported in the setting of non-COVID-19 319 respiratory infections, we excluded respiratory or fever cluster diagnoses that occurred 2 weeks 320 prior to or after a diagnosis of a non-COVID-19 respiratory infection. This led to exclusion of 31 321 patients who did not otherwise meet the criteria for probable long COVID. Finally, it was 322 difficult to attribute post-acute symptoms to a COVID-19 diagnosis versus underlying medical 323 conditions in patients with multiple chronic medical conditions. Therefore, we identified patients with complex medical histories using the  $PMCA^{25}$ . We reclassified patients with a complex 324 325 chronic condition as having no evidence of Long COVID (n = 67 patients) as we believed that 326 our phenotype could not accurately identify these patients as having Long COVID. 327 Concordance was assessed again after incorporating these alterations into a modified 328 model, and results showed a higher positive predictive value and specificity but lower sensitivity 329 (Table 3). The negative predictive value remained high. Given the difficulty in adequately

attributing diagnoses to Long COVID in patients with complex medical histories, we also

331 completed a sensitivity analysis where these patients were removed from the sample, and

performance was reassessed (Table 3). Results showed similar performance to the modifiedmodel overall, but a higher F1 score.

334 Discussion

335 We conducted a study to assess the performance of a rules-based computable phenotype 336 for identifying pediatric patients with Long COVID in a large EHR database compared to 337 clinician chart review. Results showed moderate overlap between the two methods. Specifically, 338 the computable phenotype was moderately sensitive in detecting patients with Long COVID and 339 specific in detecting those without Long COVID, in comparison to chart review. However, there 340 were several cases where the methods disagreed, with some patients being classified as having 341 Long COVID by the phenotype but not by chart review, and vice versa. The main reason for 342 these discrepancies was due to underlying comorbidities and subsequent respiratory infections. 343 Patients with comorbidities posed a challenge for the computable phenotype and the 344 clinician reviewer. This was likely due to the lack of clinical guidelines for attribution and the 345 difficulty in discerning exacerbation of preexisting symptoms. Clinicians were more likely to 346 attribute post-COVID-19 symptoms to preexisting conditions when comorbidities were present, 347 which likely resulted in the misattribution of Long COVID symptoms and may have been 348 influenced by the provider involved in clinical care. However, the overlap between the two 349 methods increased when the CP accounted for preexisting medical conditions by focusing on 350 incident diagnoses and censoring existing conditions. Nevertheless, because our phenotype was 351 not initially designed to assess exacerbation of preexisting conditions, we caution against its use 352 to diagnose Long COVID in patients with medical complexity. Another source of disagreement 353 between the computable phenotype and chart review stemmed from subsequent non-COVID-19 354 respiratory infections, which are common in children. Although there may be an increased risk of

secondary infections due to SARS-CoV- $2^{26-27}$ , the symptoms are caused by a different agent. 355 356 Therefore, we removed these circumstances as indicators of Long COVID in our phenotype. 357 An analysis of chart review-only positives (i.e., those the clinician reviewer classified as 358 having Long COVID that the phenotype did not) showed that differences in the computable 359 phenotype guidelines and the clinician's framework for identifying Long COVID were the main 360 reasons for discordance. While the computable phenotype only assessed symptoms up to 180 361 days post SARS-CoV-2 infection, clinicians may use a longer time window in practice. This 362 suggests an extended time frame for assessing post-acute symptoms may be necessary, but also 363 may increase the risk of later onset of symptoms not being clearly attributable to a SARS-CoV-2 364 infection. In addition, clinician reviewers identified conditions beyond those included in our 365 phenotype as providing evidence for Long COVID. For example, the computable phenotype did 366 not consider mental health conditions due to reporting inconsistency of these conditions using 367 diagnosis codes and the difficulty in distinguishing between biologic and social causes of mental 368 health conditions. However, clinicians tended to include them in their framework for identifying 369 Long COVID. Therefore, constructing computable phenotypes that incorporate subphenotypes of 370 interest (e.g., physiological vs psychological manifestations of Long COVID) may be useful in 371 accounting for different manifestations of Long COVID.

Many of the differences in identifying Long COVID are due to the lack of a clear and consistently used definition for Long COVID. The novelty of Long COVID in children, as well as the overlap of symptoms with other acute and chronic disorders such as headache and fatigue, contribute to these differences. Similar difficulties have been encountered when defining other post-viral syndromes. Although chart review is often viewed as the best method for detecting patients with a specific disorder, the lack of a consistent definition for Long COVID by

378 healthcare providers poses significant challenges. Moreover, the chart review and EHR research 379 are prone to errors such as biases, missed codes, misdiagnoses, incomplete information due to 380 fragmented care, and a lack of availability of a unique medical code for certain Long COVID-381 related conditions. For example, a unique ICD code for POTS did not exist until October  $2022^{28}$ , 382 and many clinicians remain unaware of its existence, making it difficult to pick up the presence 383 of POTS in the phenotype or chart review. Therefore, comparing our computable phenotype with 384 chart review provided insight into the clinician's view of a patient's status, but it did not allow us 385 to validate against a gold standard, as we cannot confidently conclude that either method 386 accurately detects Long COVID.

387 Our two-pronged approach to identifying Long COVID using clinician chart review and a 388 computable phenotype is a strength of the study as previous research that used diagnosis codes or machine learning algorithms did not incorporate a review of patient charts<sup>19-20</sup>. By incorporating 389 390 both methods, we were able to qualitatively review cases of discordance. In addition, we focused 391 on pediatric patients, in whom Long COVID is understudied. Research suggests that Long 392 COVID has a lower prevalence in children; however, the current diagnostic tools may not be 393 sensitive enough to detect all cases. Our study design is a strength as it uses data-driven 394 symptom clusters for identifying Long COVID and specific diagnosis codes. This approach 395 allowed us to capture patients who may not have a clear Long COVID presentation but have 396 Long COVID-like symptoms. Although it allowed for our phenotype to be more inclusive, it also 397 resulted in a computable phenotype that was less inclusive than a clinician may be when 398 subjectively assessing whether a patient has Long COVID. As more symptoms of Long COVID 399 are identified, it may be necessary to update the symptom clusters.

400 Our study has limitations, but it also brings attention to some significant areas for future 401 work to focus on. Due to the challenge of distinguishing the progression of a chronic condition 402 from symptom exacerbation due to COVID-19 using EHR data and chart review, we were 403 unable to evaluate the worsening of preexisting symptoms. Instead, we examined differences in 404 concordance after excluding pre-COVID-19 symptoms. This approach provided increased 405 certainty that symptoms were due to Long COVID but may have been too restrictive. Future 406 research should consider cluster-specific washout windows and develop reliable methods to 407 identify patients with Long COVID-related worsening of preexisting conditions. Additionally, 408 our sampling strategy focused on edge cases and rare occurrences to develop and refine the 409 phenotype. This approach was useful for identifying patients with a range of Long COVID-410 related symptoms and diagnoses, but limits generalizability and underestimates the performance 411 of the phenotype. Future iterations should use random sampling to obtain a more generalizable 412 patient sample. Finally, because our study was based on EHR data and we imposed a two-visit 413 requirement in the post-acute period, our sample may be biased towards patients who have the 414 means to obtain healthcare at the population level.

### 415 Conclusion

This study describes a computable phenotype approach to identify children with Long COVID in EHR data. Our study highlights the complexity of identifying and diagnosing Long COVID due to its heterogeneity and overlap with other conditions, which leads to substantial differences observed across methods. To address this challenge, future work could include additional data sources, such as unstructured data, and further refine algorithms with clinical expertise to develop a reliable definition of Long COVID. It is also essential to develop a revised phenotype that can identify Long COVID through the worsening of pre-existing conditions. The

423	development of a reliable CP for Long COVID in children allows for studying large data
424	networks, which has future applications for both observational studies and clinical trials. Further
425	research assessing the presentation of Long COVID in children and the interplay between Long
426	COVID and comorbidities is vital to continue to understand this emerging chronic illness and
427	evaluate interventions that can prevent or mitigate its effects.
428	
429	Acknowledgements:
430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437	This study is part of the NIH Researching COVID to Enhance Recovery (RECOVER) Initiative, which seeks to understand, treat, and prevent the post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC). For more information on RECOVER, visit <u>https://recovercovid.org/</u> We would like to thank the National Community Engagement Group (NCEG), all patient, caregiver, and community Representatives, and all the participants enrolled in the RECOVER Initiative.
438	Author Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr. Mejias reports funding from Janssen, Merck for
439	research support, and Janssen, Merck and Sanofi-Pasteur for Advisory Board participation; Dr.
440	Rao reports prior grant support from GSK and Biofire and is a consultant for Sequiris. Dr.
441	Jhaveri is a consultant for AstraZeneca, Seqirus and Dynavax, and receives an editorial stipend
442	from Elsevier. All other authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.
443	Role of funder/sponsor statement: The funder had no role in the design and conduct of the
444	study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or
445	approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.
446	
447	

- 1. Davis, H. E., Assaf, G. S., McCorkell, L., Wei, H., Low, R. J., Re'em, Y., Redfield, S.,
- 450 Austin, J. P., & Akrami, A. (2021). Characterizing long COVID in an international
- 451 cohort: 7 months of symptoms and their impact. *eClinicalMedicine*, *38*, 101019.
- 452 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101019</u>
- 453 2. Katz, B. Z., Shiraishi, Y., Mears, C. J., Binns, H. J., & Taylor, R. (2009). Chronic Fatigue
- 454 Syndrome After Infectious Mononucleosis in Adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 124(1), 189–193.
- 455 https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2008-1879
- 456 3. Sellers, S. A., Hagan, R. S., Hayden, F. G., & Fischer, W. A. (2017). The hidden burden of
- 457 influenza: A review of the extra pulmonary complications of influenza infection.
- 458 *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses*, 11(5), 372–393.
- 459 https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12470
- 460 4. Lopez-Leon, S., Wegman-Ostrosky, T., Ayuzo Del Valle, N. C., Perelman, C.,
- 461 Sepulveda, R., Rebolledo, P. A., Cuapio, A., & Villapol, S. (2022). Long-COVID in
- 462 children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analyses. *Scientific Reports*,
- 463 *12*(1), 9950. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-13495-5</u>
- 464 5. Lorman, V., Rao, S., Jhaveri, R., Case, A., Mejias, A., Pajor, N. M., Patel, P., Thacker,
- 465 D., Bose-Brill, S., Block, J., Hanley, P. C., Prahalad, P., Chen, Y., Forrest, C. B., Bailey,
- 466 L. C., Lee, G. M., & Razzaghi, H. (2023). Understanding pediatric long COVID using a
- 467 tree-based scan statistic approach: An EHR-based cohort study from the RECOVER
- 468 Program. JAMIA Open, 6(1), ooad016. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooad016</u>
- 469 6. Zheng, Y.-B., Zeng, N., Yuan, K., Tian, S.-S., Yang, Y.-B., Gao, N., Chen, X., Zhang,
- 470 A.-Y., Kondratiuk, A. L., Shi, P.-P., Zhang, F., Sun, J., Yue, J.-L., Lin, X., Shi, L.,

471		Lalvani, A., Shi, J., Bao, YP., & Lu, L. (2023). Prevalence and risk factor for long
472		COVID in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis and systematic review. Journal of
473		Infection and Public Health, 16(5), 660–672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2023.03.005
474	7.	Pellegrino, R., Chiappini, E., Licari, A., Galli, L., & Marseglia, G. L. (2022). Prevalence
475		and clinical presentation of long COVID in children: A systematic review. European
476		Journal of Pediatrics, 181(12), 3995–4009. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-022-04600-x</u>
477	8.	Reese J, Blau H, Bergquist T, Loomba JJ, Callahan T, Laraway B, et al. Generalizable
478		Long COVID Subtypes: Findings from the NIH N3C and RECOVER Program. MedRxiv
479		Prepr Serv Health Sci 2022:2022.05.24.22275398. https://doi.or
480		g/10.1101/2022.05.24.22275398 PMID: 35665012
481	9.	Rao, S., Lee, G. M., Razzaghi, H., Lorman, V., Mejias, A., Pajor, N. M., Thacker, D.,
482		Webb, R., Dickinson, K., Bailey, L. C., Jhaveri, R., Christakis, D. A., Bennett, T. D.,
483		Chen, Y., & Forrest, C. B. (2022). Clinical Features and Burden of Postacute Sequelae of
484		SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children and Adolescents. JAMA Pediatrics, 176(10), 1000.
485		https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2022.2800
486	10	. Rao, S., Gross, R. S., Mohandas, S., Stein, C. R., Case, A., Dreyer, B., Pajor, N. M.,
487		Bunnell, H. T., Warburton, D., Berg, E., Overdevest, J. B., Gorelik, M., Milner, J.,
488		Saxena, S., Jhaveri, R., Wood, J. C., Rhee, K. E., Letts, R., Maughan, C., Stockwell,
489		M. S. (2024). Postacute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 in Children. Pediatrics, 153(3),
490		e2023062570. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2023-062570
491	11	. Feldstein, L. R., Rose, E. B., Horwitz, S. M., Collins, J. P., Newhams, M. M., Son, M. B.
492		F., Newburger, J. W., Kleinman, L. C., Heidemann, S. M., Martin, A. A., Singh, A. R.,
493		Li, S., Tarquinio, K. M., Jaggi, P., Oster, M. E., Zackai, S. P., Gillen, J., Ratner, A. J.,

494	Walsh, R. F., Randolph, A. G. (2020). Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in U.S.
495	Children and Adolescents. New England Journal of Medicine, 383(4), 334–346.
496	https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021680
497	12. Wu, E. Y., & Campbell, M. J. (2021). Cardiac Manifestations of Multisystem
498	Inflammatory Syndrome in Children (MIS-C) Following COVID-19. Current Cardiology
499	Reports, 23(11), 168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11886-021-01602-3
500	13. Garai, R., Krivácsy, P., Herczeg, V., Kovács, F., Tél, B., Kelemen, J., Máthé, A., Zsáry,
501	E., Takács, J., Veres, D. S., & Szabó, A. J. (2023). Clinical assessment of children with
502	long COVID syndrome. Pediatric Research, 93(6), 1616–1625.
503	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-022-02378-0
504	14. Kikkenborg Berg, S., Palm, P., Nygaard, U., Bundgaard, H., Petersen, M. N. S.,
505	Rosenkilde, S., Thorsted, A. B., Ersbøll, A. K., Thygesen, L. C., Nielsen, S. D., &
506	Vinggaard Christensen, A. (2022). Long COVID symptoms in SARS-CoV-2-positive
507	children aged 0-14 years and matched controls in Denmark (LongCOVIDKidsDK): A
508	national, cross-sectional study. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health, 6(9), 614-623.
509	https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(22)00154-7
510	15. Fritsche, L. G., Jin, W., Admon, A. J., & Mukherjee, B. (2023). Characterizing and
511	Predicting Post-Acute Sequelae of SARS CoV-2 Infection (PASC) in a Large Academic
512	Medical Center in the US. Journal of Clinical Medicine, 12(4), 1328.
513	https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12041328
514	16. Pfaff, E. R., Madlock-Brown, C., Baratta, J. M., Bhatia, A., Davis, H., Girvin, A., Hill,
515	E., Kelly, E., Kostka, K., Loomba, J., McMurry, J. A., Wong, R., Bennett, T. D., Moffitt,

$\Lambda_{11}$ $\Lambda$
--

- 517 (2023). Coding long COVID: Characterizing a new disease through an ICD-10 lens.
- 518 *BMC Medicine*, 21(1), 58. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-023-02737-6</u>
- 519 17. International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10), World Health
- 520 Organization (WHO) 2019/2021. https://icd.who.int/browse11. Licensed under Creative
- 521 Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 3.0 IGO license (CC BY-ND 3.0 IGO).
- 522 18. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Post-covid conditions: Information for
- 523 healthcare providers. Accessed January 5, 2024. <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-</u>
- 524 <u>ncov/hcp/clinical-care/post-covid-conditions.html</u>
- 525 19. Pfaff, E. R., Girvin, A. T., Bennett, T. D., Bhatia, A., Brooks, I. M., Deer, R. R.,
- 526 Dekermanjian, J. P., Jolley, S. E., Kahn, M. G., Kostka, K., McMurry, J. A., Moffitt, R.,
- 527 Walden, A., Chute, C. G., Haendel, M. A., Bramante, C., Dorr, D., Morris, M., Parker, A.
- 528 M., ... Niehaus, E. (2022). Identifying who has long COVID in the USA: A machine
- 529 learning approach using N3C data. *The Lancet Digital Health*, 4(7), e532–e541.
- 530 https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(22)00048-6
- 531 20. Lorman, V., Razzaghi, H., Song, X., Morse, K., Utidjian, L., Allen, A. J., Rao, S.,
- 532 Rogerson, C., Bennett, T. D., Morizono, H., Eckrich, D., Jhaveri, R., Huang, Y., Ranade,
- 533 D., Pajor, N., Lee, G. M., Forrest, C. B., & Bailey, L. C. (2023). A machine learning-
- based phenotype for long COVID in children: An EHR-based study from the RECOVER
- 535 program. *PLOS ONE*, *18*(8), e0289774. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0289774</u>
- 536 21. RECOVER: Researching COVID to Enhance Recovery. RECOVER: Researching
- 537 COVID to Enhance Recovery. https://recovercovid.org. Accessed 4 Jan 2024.

538	22. Mejias A, Schuchard J, Rao S, Bennett TD, Jhaveri R, Thacker D, Bailey LC, Christakis
539	DA, Pajor NM, Razzaghi H, Forrest CB, Lee GM. Leveraging Serologic Testing to
540	Identify Children at Risk for Post-Acute Sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: An
541	Electronic Health Record-Based Cohort Study from the RECOVER Program. J Pediatr.
542	2023 Jun; 257:113358. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2023.02.005.
543	23. PA Harris, R Taylor, R Thielke, J Payne, N Gonzalez, JG. Conde, Research electronic
544	data capture (REDCap) - A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for
545	providing translational research informatics support, J Biomed Inform. 2009
546	<i>Apr;42(2):377-81.</i>
547	24. Posit team (2023). RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Posit Software,
548	PBC, Boston, MA. URL http://www.posit.co/.
549	25. Simon, T. D., Lawrence, M., Stanford, S., Lyons, D., Woodcox, P., Hood, M., & Chen,
550	A. Y. (2014). Pediatric Medical Complexity Algorithm: A New Method to Stratify
551	Children by Medical Complexity. Pediatrics, 133(6).
552	26. Wang, L., Davis, P. B., Berger, N., Kaelber, D. C., Volkow, N., & Xu, R. (2023).
553	Association of COVID-19 with respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) infections in children
554	aged 0-5 years in the USA in 2022: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. Family
555	medicine and community health, 11(4), e002456. https://doi.org/10.1136/fmch-2023-
556	002456
557	27. Xie Y, Choi T, Al-Aly Z. Long-term outcomes following hospital admission for COVID-
558	19 versus seasonal influenza: a cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2023 Dec 14: S1473-
559	3099(23)00684-9. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00684-9.

560	28. World Health Organization. (2019). 8D89.2 Postural orthostatic tachycardia syndrome.
561	In International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems (11th
562	ed.). https://icd.who.int/browse/2024-01/mms/en#1533647472
563	
564	
565	
566	
567	
568	
569	
570	
571	
572	
573	
574	
575	
576	
577	



- 578 \*CED = cohort entry date
- 579 **Figure 1.** *Study Timeline.*



581
582 Figure 2. Flow chart depicting attrition and algorithm used to identify patients with Long COVID.



**Figure 3.** Sampling strategy for the chart review cohort. The numbers reported in parentheses

*represent sample sizes.* 

# **Table 1.** Demographics of children with and without Long COVID based on the computable

# 597 phenotype definition.

	CP-Detected Long COVID (N=318)	No CP-Detected Long COVID (N=333)	Overall (N=651)	
Approx. CED age (years)				
Mean (SD)	10.10 (6.32)	10.10 (6.28)	10.10 (6.30)	
Median [Min, Max]	11.0 [0, 21.0]	10.3 [0.1, 21.0]	10.9 [0, 21.0]	
CED Age Group (years)				
<1	24 (7.5%)	25 (7.5%)	49 (7.5%)	
1-4	70 (22.0%)	76 (22.8%)	146 (22.4%)	
5-9	52 (16.4%)	55 (16.5%)	107 (16.4%)	
10-15	98 (30.8%)	100 (30.0%)	198 (30.4%)	
16-20	74 (23.3%)	77 (23.1%)	151 (23.2%)	
Patient Sex				
Male	147 (46.2%)	167 (50.2%)	314 (48.2%)	
Female	171 (53.8%)	166 (49.8%)	337 (51.8%)	
Race				
Asian/Native				
Hawaiian/Pacific	12 (3.8%)	14 (4.2%)	26 (4.0%)	
Islander				
Black	57 (17.9%)	58 (17.4%)	115 (17.7%)	
White	175 (55.0%)	182 (54.7%)	357 (54.8%)	
Multiracial	12 (3.8%)	9 (2.7%)	21 (3.2%)	
Unknown	62 (19.5%)	70 (21.0%)	132 (20.3%)	
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	78 (24.5%)	99 (29.7%)	177 (27.2%)	
Non-Hispanic	214 (67.3%)	210 (63.1%)	424 (65.1%)	
Unknown	26 (8.2%)	24 (7.2%)	50 (7.7%)	
Payer*				
Private	139 (43.7%)	143 (42.9%)	282 (43.3%)	
Public	124 (39.0%)	134 (40.2%)	258 (39.6%)	
Other/Unknown	55 (17.3%)	56 (16.8%)	111 (17.1%)	

*Note. CP* = *computable phenotype.* \*=*at time of COVID-19 infection.* 

# 602 **Table 2.** Statistics comparing computable phenotype and clinician review identification of Long

# 603 COVID.

_		(	CR-Positive $(N = 239)$	CI	R-Negati N = 412	ve	
	<b>CP-Positive</b> (N = 318)		156	(	162		
	<b>CP-Negative</b> $(N = 333)$		83		250		
_		Perfo	rmance Stati	stics*			
_		Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	<b>F1</b>
		0.624	0.653	0.607	0.491	0.751	0.560
 5	Note. PPV = positive predict phenotype. CR = chart revie	tive value. I w.	NPV = negativ	ve predictive v	value. CP	= compu	ıtable
5	*Reported as CP relative to	CR.					
7							
8							
)							
)							
2							
3							
Ļ							

Category	%		Perpiratory symptoms	
Reviewer agreed conditions are present but attributed them to a condition other than Long COVID	73%		Musculoskeletal symptoms	
Reviewer error (e.g., reviewer did not see the codes that the phenotype saw)	17%		Fever/chills	
Insufficient EHR data for the reviewer to form a conclusion	9%		Symptoms were often attributed to comorbidities,	
Reviewer noted that the codes for Long COVID were misused by the	1%		including:	
provider		Preexisting conditions (e.g., asthma)		
			Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza)	
<ul> <li>chart review-only Long COVID+ cases (N = 83) were grouped into the categories:</li> </ul>	he follow	ving	Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza) Presence of complex medical conditions (e.g., chronic conditions affecting 2 body systems)	
<ul> <li>Chart review-only Long COVID+ cases (N = 83) were grouped into the case of th</li></ul>	he follow %	ving	Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza) Presence of complex medical conditions (e.g., chronic conditions affecting 2 body systems)	
<ul> <li>Chart review-only Long COVID+ cases (N = 83) were grouped into the categories:</li> <li>Category</li> <li>Symptoms/visits identified by reviewer did not meet CP definition</li> </ul>	he follow % 36%	ving	Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza) Presence of complex medical conditions (e.g., chronic conditions affecting 2 body systems)	
<ul> <li>Chart review-only Long COVID+ cases (N = 83) were grouped into the categories:</li> <li>Category</li> <li>Symptoms/visits identified by reviewer did not meet CP definition</li> <li>Reviewer considered a longer post-acute period</li> </ul>	he follow % 36% 33%	ving	Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza) Presence of complex medical conditions (e.g., chronic conditions affecting 2 body systems)	
<ul> <li>Chart review-only Long COVID+ cases (N = 83) were grouped into the categories:</li> <li>Category</li> <li>Symptoms/visits identified by reviewer did not meet CP definition</li> <li>Reviewer considered a longer post-acute period</li> <li>Potential for Long COVID but inadequate evidence for phenotype</li> </ul>	he follow % 36% 33% 16%	ving	Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza) Presence of complex medical conditions (e.g., chronic conditions affecting 2 body systems)	
<ul> <li>Chart review-only Long COVID+ cases (N = 83) were grouped into the categories:</li> <li>Category</li> <li>Symptoms/visits identified by reviewer did not meet CP definition</li> <li>Reviewer considered a longer post-acute period</li> <li>Potential for Long COVID but inadequate evidence for phenotype</li> <li>Reviewer relied on unstructured EHR data to make a judgment</li> </ul>	he follow % 36% 33% 16% 12%	ving	Co-occurring viral infections (e.g., influenza) Presence of complex medical conditions (e.g., chronic conditions affecting 2 body systems)	

# 

## **Figure 4.** *Qualitative review of a.*) *CP+/CR-* Long COVID *patients and b.*) *CR+/CP-* Long

## 617 COVID patients.

## 628 **Table 3.** Statistics comparing modified computable phenotype and clinician review identification

## 629 of Long COVID.

Modified								
CR-Positive         CR-Negative           (N = 239)         (N = 412)								
Modified CP-Positive (N=188)		123 6						
Modified CP-Negative (N=463)	Sied CP-Negative         116         347           (3)							
	No Medic	ally Complex	x Patients					
	0	CR-Positive $(N = 210)$	Cl	R-Negati N = 308)	ve )			
Modified CP-Positive (N = 188)	(N = 210)         (N = 508)           dified CP-Positive (N         123         65           88)         65         65		, 					
Modified-CP Negative (N = 330)	Modified-CP Negative         87         243           (N = 330)         243         243         243							
	Perfo	rmance Stati	stics*					
Accuracy Sensitivity Specificity PPV NPV F1								
Modified	0.722	0.515	0.842	0.654	0.749	0.576		
No Medically Complex Patients	0.707	0.586	0.789	0.654	0.736	0.618		

630 Note. PPV = positive predictive value. NPV = negative predictive value. CP = computable

631 phenotype. CR = chart review.

632 \*Reported as CP relative to CR