ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Primary Care Relevant Risk Factors for Adverse Outcomes in Patients With COVID-19 Infection: A Systematic Review

Michelle Bentivegna, MPH, Cassie Hulme, MPH, and Mark H. Ebell, MD, MS

Background: **The aim of this systematic review is to summarize the best available evidence regarding individual risk factors, simple risk scores, and multivariate models that use patient characteristics, vital signs, comorbidities, and laboratory tests relevant to outpatient and primary care settings.**

Methods: **Medline, WHO COVID-19, and MedRxIV databases were searched; studies meeting inclusion criteria were reviewed in parallel, and variables describing study characteristics, study quality, and risk factor data were abstracted. Study quality was assessed using the Quality in Prognostic Studies tool. Random effects meta-analysis of relative risks (categorical variables) and unstandardized mean differences (continuous variables) was performed; multivariate models and clinical prediction rules were summarized qualitatively.**

Results: **A total of 551 studies were identified and 22 studies were included. The median or mean age ranged from 38 to 68 years. All studies included only inpatients, and mortality rates ranged from 3.2% to 50.5%. Individual risk factors most strongly associated with mortality included increased age, c-reactive protein (CRP), d-dimer, heart rate, respiratory rate, lactate dehydrogenase, and procalcitonin as well as decreased oxygen saturation, the presence of dyspnea, and comorbid coronary heart and chronic kidney disease. Independent predictors of adverse outcomes reported most frequently by multivariate models include increasing age, increased CRP, decreased lymphocyte count, increased lactate dehydrogenase, elevated temperature, and the presence of any comorbidity. Simple risk scores and multivariate models have been proposed but are often complex, and most have not been validated.**

Conclusions: **Our systematic review identifies several risk factors for adverse outcomes in COVID-19–infected inpatients that are often available in the outpatient and primary care settings: increasing age, increased CRP or procalcitonin, decreased lymphocyte count, decreased oxygen saturation, dyspnea on presentation, and the presence of comorbidities. Future research to develop clinical prediction models and rules should include these predictors as part of their core data set to develop and validate pragmatic outpatient risk scores. (J Am Board Fam Med 2021;34:S113–S126.)**

Keywords: **C-Reactive Protein, Clinical Prediction Rule, Comorbidity, COVID-19, Prognosis, Risk Factors, Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis**

Introduction

In December 2019, the first cases of novel coronavirus disease, later to become known as COVID-19, were reported.[1] Since this outbreak, the world has found itself facing a pandemic with total global cases exceeding 11 million as of October 21, 2020,[2] including more than 8 million confirmed cases in the United States.[3] Symptoms of COVID-19 include cough, fever, dyspnea, chills, myalgias, and loss of taste and smell. However, many individuals remain asymptomatic or have mild symptoms and do not seek testing, so the number of total cases is estimated to be approximately 10 times higher than the number of confirmed cases.[4,5] Currently the treatment is primarily supportive for patients with nonsevere

This article was externally peer reviewed.

Submitted 12 August 2020; revised 22 October 2020; accepted 28 October 2020.

From the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Georgia (MB, CH, MHE).

Funding: None.

Conflict of interest: None.

Contributions of authors: The study was conceived and designed by MHE; CH and MB performed the search and summarized the data, supervised by MHE; initial analysis and interpretation of the data were done by CH and MB, supervised by MHE; manuscript was drafted by MHE, critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content by MB and CH.

Corresponding author: Mark H. Ebell, MD, MS, 125 B. S. Miller Hall (Health Science Campus), Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602 (E-mail: ebell@uga.edu).

illness,[6] with respiratory support, remdesivir, and dexamethasone for more severely ill patients.[7,8]

COVID-19 has an infection mortality ratio estimated to be approximately 0.5–1.0%,[9] and an accurate prognosis is important to help clinicians decide on the most appropriate site of care (hospital vs home) and the intensity of follow-up and monitoring for both inpatients and outpatients. However, our understanding of clinical risk factors and biomarkers that increase the likelihood of serious illness or death remains incomplete and in some cases is contradictory. Previous studies have found that risk factors for severe illness or mortality include increasing age, male sex, and comorbidities such as diabetes, renal failure, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hypertension and cardiovascular disease.[10] A variety of biomarkers have also been reported to be associated with severe disease or mortality including c-reactive protein (CRP), lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), imaging findings, and the white blood cell count parameters.[11]

However, some of these biomarkers or imaging studies are not rapidly or widely available in outpatient settings, and physicians are increasingly having to make decisions via telehealth or in outpatient clinics. Whereas the availability of tests varies in different countries and in different outpatient settings (urgent care vs primary care vs telehealth vs emergency department), tests like the complete blood count, c-reactive protein (CRP), d-dimer, and procalcitonin are increasingly available.[12–15] The goal of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to summarize the best available evidence regarding individual risk factors, simple risk scores, and multivariate models that use patient characteristics, vital signs, comorbidities, and laboratory tests in inpatients, as a guide to testing their predictive utility in outpatient and primary care settings.

Methods

This systematic review was registered with the PROSPERO registry, registration number CRD42020193336. It was declared not human subjects research by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board.

Inclusion Criteria

Risk factors were limited to demographics, vital signs, oxygen saturation, comorbidities, and laboratory tests judged to be available in at least some outpatient settings (white blood cell count and differential, c-reactive protein, d-dimer and procalcitonin). Studies were included that reported the association between at least 1 of these risk factors and at least 1 marker of serious illness in cohorts of adults with a confirmed diagnosis of COVID-19. Adverse outcomes for all patients were defined as death, intensive care unit (ICU) stay, or need for mechanical ventilation. Included studies also had to report sufficient data for calculation of relative risk, including the number of patients with and without the risk factor for both good and bad outcomes.

Studies were excluded if they enrolled cohorts of only children. They were also excluded if the study focused on a specialized population such as pregnant women, individuals with cancer, HIV-positive individuals, or postoperative patients. Studies that included less than 50 patients were also excluded from the meta-analysis. There were no limitations set on the country or language of the publications. Studies from preprint servers were also included.

Search Strategy

A search of the Medline database was used with multiple terms for COVID-19 such as "betacoronavirus," "coronavirus," "COVID-19", and "SARS-CoV-2" as well as terms for prognostic studies such as "risk factor," "validation," "prediction rule," and "prognosis." All terms were linked by Boolean terms and the search is shown in Appendix A. The limits "has abstract" and "human" were applied to the search. In addition, the WHO COVID-19 Database and the MedRxIV preprint server were searched to identify additional published and preprint studies using similar keywords.

Data Abstraction

All abstracts were reviewed for inclusion by the lead author (MHE) and at least 1 other coauthor. For any abstract that was of interest, the full article was obtained and reviewed by the lead author and at least 1 other coauthor. Studies meeting inclusion criteria were reviewed in parallel and variables describing study characteristics, study quality, and risk factor data were abstracted. Risk factor data included the number of individuals with and without the risk factor and how many observed the outcome of interest. We included continuous and categorical data. All discrepancies were discussed and resolved by consensus. If a study reported a simple risk score, clinical

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of the search process.



prediction rule, or multivariate model, data regarding them was abstracted separately.

Data Preparation

Similar risk factors (eg, lymphocyte count < 0.8 and < 1.0) were grouped where it was felt to be clinically reasonable by the lead investigator, a physician. Outcomes were similarly grouped into 3 outcome categories: (1) death, (2) severe disease (intensive care unit admission, mechanical ventilation, or disease progression), and (3) severe disease or death. Where different units were reported, results were converted to a common set of units (eg, milligrams per liter for c-reactive protein). Original risk factors and outcome categories are available for the full data set and are available on request from the investigators.

In studies that did not report mean and standard deviation of continuous variables, these values were estimated using median and interquartile range. The mean was approximated by adding the lower (q_1) and upper bound (q_3) to the median (m) and dividing but the constant of 3. The standard deviation was estimated by subtracting q_1 from q_3 dividing by $\eta(n)$, which was determined using the sample size and Table 2 in the publication by Wan et al.[16] These values were calculated with the equation, $\eta(n) = 2E(Z_{(3Q+1)})$ for $Q \leq 50$, using the statistical software R. In cases in which the sample size was large and Q was ≥ 50, 1.35 was used as the $\eta(n)$.

Assessment of Study Quality

The Quality in Prognostic Studies (QUIPS)[17] tool was adapted and used to determine the quality of included studies. Definitions of low, moderate, and high risk of bias were prespecified for each domain. The full adapted tool is included in Appendix C. Quality was assessed in parallel by at least 2 researchers and all discrepancies were discussed and resolved by consensus.

Analytic Strategy

Data were imported into STATA (version 15.1; College Station, TX) and the metan procedure was used to perform the random effects meta-analysis of relative risks (categorical variables) and unstandardized mean differences (continuous variables). Forest plots were created for each risk factor, stratified by outcome (eg, death, severe disease). The number of studies and patients for each summary

Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies

Author, Year	Country	Patients Studied	Mean or median age	% Male	Definition of Bad Outcome	Mortality Rate, %
Yu, 2020[32]	China	Adults with COVID-19 from 27 hospitals in Jiangsu Province with a CT scan	48 (median)	53.0	Composite of ICU admission, acute respiratory failure occurrence, or shock during hospitalization	15.0
Wang, 2020[33]	China	Adults with COVID-19 who were discharged from 2 hospitals (Wuhan and Hubei Province)	51 (median)	53.3	Death	17.8
Chen, 2020[34]	China	Adults with COVID-19 classified as moderately, severely or critically ill in 1 hospital in Wuhan	68 (median)	62.4	Death	41.2
Zhou, 2020[35]	China	Adults with COVID-19 who had been discharged or died in 2 Wuhan hospitals	56 (median)	62.3	Death	28.0
Liu, 2020[36]	China	Adults with COVID-19 pneumonia in 3 tertiary hospitals in Wuhan	38 (median)	50	Clinical deterioration	14.1
Liang, 2020[19]	China	Adults with COVID-19 from 575 hospitals in 31 regions of China	48.9 (mean)	57.3	Composite of admission to ICU, invasive ventilation, death	3.2
Xie, 2020[37]	China	Adults with COVID-19 who had been discharged from or died in 2 hospitals in Wuhan	62 (median)	53.8	Death	50.5
Yan, 2020[38]	China	Adults with COVID-19 in 1 hospital in Wuhan	58.83 (mean)	58.7	Death	46.4
Cao, 2020[39]	China	Adults with COVID-19 in 1 hospital in Shanghai	50.1 (mean)	51	Admission to ICU	NR
Hu, 2020[40]	China	Adults with COVID-19 in 1 hospital in Wuhan	61 (median)	51.4	Death or progression	10.8
Luo, 2020[41]	China	Adults with COVID-19 with a clinical outcome in 1 hospital in Wuhan	57 (median)	50.3	Death	28.2
Petrilli, 2020[42]	United States	Adults with laboratory confirmed critical COVID-19 in 1 hospital in New York City	54 (median)	49.5	Composite of ICU, mechanical ventilation, discharge to hospice or death.	24.3
Wu, 2020[43]	China	Adults with COVID-19 pneumonia in 1 hospital in Wuhan	51 (median)	63.7	ARDS	21.9
Li, 2020[44]	China	Adults with laboratory confirmed severe COVID-19 infection	57 (median)	58	Death	14.7
Jang, 2020[45]	Korea	Adults with COVID-19 hospitalized at a tertiary hospital in Daegu, Korea	56.9 (mean)	43.6	Compositive of ARDS, ICU care, or death	7.3
Xu, 2020[46]	China	Adults with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 admitted to 16 tertiary hospitals from 8 provinces in China	46.1 (mean)	54	Composite of death, ICU, or requiring mechanical ventilation.	4.7
Zhou, 2020[47]	China	Adults with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 collected from 47 locations in Sichaun	43 (median)	56.6	Vasopressors or respiratory failure + 3 of: respiratory rate >30, $PaO_2/FIO_2 \leq 250$ mm Hg, infiltrates, confusion, BUN ≥20 mg/dL, leukopenia, hypothermia,	NR

Continued

Table 1. Continued

Author, Year	Country	Patients Studied	Mean or median age	% Male	Definition of Bad Outcome	Mortality Rate, %
					thrombocytopenia, or hypotension.	
Hou, 2020[48]	China	Adults with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 hospitalized at Beijing hospitals	50.9 (median)	43.6	Progression defined as having a clinically advanced type of COVID-19, ICU admission, or death during hospitalization	5.0
Zhang, 2020[49]	China	Adults with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 in 1 hospital in Wuhan, China	38.0 (median)	41.4	Disease deterioration including the transfer to ICU and death	13.5
Liu, 2020[50]	China	Adults with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 in 1 hospital in Wuhan, China	65.5 (median)	35.0	Severe disease defined as having shortness of breath, RR ≥30 bpm, O_2 sat ≤93%, $PaO_2/FIO_2 \leq 300$ mm Hg, and progression on imaging	NR
Zhu, 2020[51]	China	Adults with confirmed COVID-19 at 1 hospital in Zhejiang, China	50.9 (mean)	35.4	Severe disease defined as shortness of breath, RR ≥30 bpm, O_2 sat ≤93%, PaO_2/FIO_2 ≤300 mm Hg, or lesion progression	NR
Hu, 2020[52]	China	Adults with laboratory-confirmed critical COVID-19 in 1 hospital in Wuhan, China	60.8 (mean)	50.9	Death	18.0

COVID-19, coronavirus 2019; CT, computed tomography; RR, respiratory rate; O_2 sat, oxygen saturation; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; ICU, intensive care unit; ARDS, acute respiratory distress syndrome.

estimate were also noted. To perform random effects meta-analysis of continuous variables, median and interquartile ranges were converted to estimates of mean and standard deviation before calculation using the method of Wan et al.[16]

Results

A summary of our search process is outlined in Figure 1. Our initial search of PubMed was performed in May 2020, and a bridge search was performed on June 30, 2020. A total of 551 records were identified, and 56 full-text articles were screened for inclusion. Ultimately, 22 studies were included in the quantitative synthesis.

The characteristics of included studies are summarized in Table 1. One study was set in the United States, 1 in Korea, and the remainder were set in China. All studies included adult inpatients with previously confirmed COVID-19 and reported outcomes of death, severe disease, or both; there were no studies of outpatient prognosis. The median or mean age ranged from 38 to 68 years with the majority of the participants being male in 16 of 22 studies. Mortality rates ranged from 3.2% to 50.5%.

Study quality was assessed for all included studies using the QUIPS tool. All 22 studies were considered to have moderate risk of bias for study participation because only inpatients were included, limiting generalizability to patients cared for outside the hospital. Eight studies included patients who were still hospitalized at the time of data collection and were therefore considered to have high risk of bias for study attrition and ascertainment of the final outcome. Three studies did not provide a multivariate analysis and were considered to have high risk of bias for study confounding. All results and analytic strategies seemed to be clearly reported and were not considered to be a source of bias. Detailed results of the quality assessment including the adapted QUIPS tool are shown in Appendix C.

Table 2 includes summary estimates of the relative risks and their corresponding confidence intervals for each categorical risk factor reported by at least 3 studies using the same cutoff for abnormality (full data are available in Appendix B). Risk factors

Table 2. Association between Categorical Variables and Mortality or Severe Disease in Patients with COVID-19

Variables	Studies	Total Patients	RR (95% CI)
Outcome = death			
Demographics and vital signs			
Oxygen saturation < 90% to 93%	3	718	6.07 (4.27–8.63)
Respiratory rate >20 to 30 breaths/min	4	841	3.80 (2.13–6.78)
Age ≥60 to 65 years	3	483	2.62 (1.91–3.58)
Male sex	9	2213	1.24 (1.08–1.43)
Comorbidities			
Coronary heart disease	9	2213	5.27 (2.89–9.58)
Chronic kidney disease	5	1562	5.11 (2.18–12.0)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	9	2213	3.79 (2.51–5.72)
Hypertension	9	2213	2.34 (1.80–3.05)
Diabetes mellitus	9	2213	2.15 (1.46–3.15)
Symptoms			
Dyspnea	3	1073	3.47 (1.67–7.18)
Fever	6	1530	1.10 (0.95–1.28)
Cough	5	1366	1.02 (0.93–1.13)
Laboratory tests			
Procalcitonin ≥0.25 to 0.5 ng/mL	4	728	9.59 (3.71–24.8)
Increased LDH	3	831	5.16 (0.72–37.09)
D-dimer ≥1.0 mg/L	4	718	2.56 (2.10–3.13)
D-dimer ≥0.5 mg/L	3	569	1.54 (1.32–1.80)
D-dimer 0.5-1.0 mg/L	4	718	0.45 (0.31–0.64)
D-dimer ≤0.5 mg/L	4	718	0.19 (0.12–0.30)
Lymphocyte count < 0.8 to 1.1 × 109/mL	4	841	2.07 (1.51–2.84)
WBC ≥4 × 109/mL	3	567	1.07 (0.81–1.41)
WBC < 3.5 - 4 × 109/mL	3	567	0.34 (0.20–0.56)
WBC 4 to 10 × 109/mL	3	567	0.65 (0.54–0.78)
Outcome = severe disease			
Male sex	11	4582	1.30 (1.11–1.53)
Comorbidities			
Coronary heart disease	9	4364	3.69 (1.75–7.77)
Chronic kidney disease	3	3516	3.02 (0.63–14.6)
Diabetes mellitus	11	4582	2.57 (1.59–4.17)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	7	1033	2.47 (1.34–4.52)
Hypertension	11	4582	2.29 (1.61–3.26)
Symptoms			
Dyspnea	7	1473	6.28 (3.10–12.7)
Fever	10	4504	1.13 (1.05–1.22)
Cough	9	1775	1.11 (0.87–1.42)
Laboratory tests			
Procalcitonin >0.05 ng/mL	3	448	4.06 (0.65–25.3)
C-reactive protein >5 to 0 mg/L	3	448	1.68 (1.47–1.93)

Variables reported by fewer than 3 studies are not included but can be found online.
RR, risk ratio; CI, confidence interval.

most strongly associated with mortality included increased procalcitonin, increased LDH, decreased oxygen saturation, the presence of dyspnea, comorbid coronary heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and chronic kidney disease, and increased respiratory rate. Risk factors reported by at least 3 studies and most strongly associated with the outcome severe disease included the presence of dyspnea, elevated procalcitonin, and comorbid chronic heart disease and chronic kidney disease.

Table 3. Weighted Mean Differences between Patients With and Without the Outcome

Risk Factor	Studies	Patients	WMD (95% CI)
Outcome = death			
CRP (mg/L)	4	1016	40.4 (27.4–53.3)
Age (years)	7	1418	18.5 (15.4–21.6)
D-dimer (mg/L)	4	870	7.8 (6.1–9.4)
Heart rate (beats/minute)	3	486	5.3 (1.7–8.9)
Neutrophil count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	3	679	4.3 (2.7–5.8)
WBC count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	6	1314	4.0 (3.4–4.6)
Respiratory rate	3	486	3.1 (1.5–4.7)
Procalcitonin (ng/mL)	3	763	0.34 (0.27–0.40)
Oxygen saturation (%)	4	823	−8.9 (−11.9 to −5.9)
Lymphocyte count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	6	1314	−0.41 (−0.50 to −0.32)
Outcome = severe disease			
CRP (mg/L)	4	731	34.2 (15.4–53.1)
Age (years)	8	2223	14.1 (10.9–17.6)
Neutrophil count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	5	752	0.94 (−0.42 to –2.3)
WBC count ($\times$ 10^9/mL)	5	954	0.73 (−0.63 to 2.1)
D-dimer (mg/L)	5	604	0.30 (0.06–0.55)
Lymphocyte count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	5	948	−0.44 (−0.52 to −0.36)
Outcome = severe disease or death			
CRP (mg/L)	4	4531	60.5 (47.9–73.2)
Age (years)	5	4641	15.9 (10.4–21.3)
Neutrophil count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	4	1912	2.6 (2.1–3.2)
WBC count ($\times 10^9$/mL)	3	322	2.0 (0.98–3.0)
Procalcitonin (ng/mL)	3	4420	0.13 (−0.30 to 0.56)
Oxygen saturation (%)	3	2940	−4.4 (−7.3 to −1.4)
Lymphocyte count	5	4641	−0.63 (−1.0 to −0.22)

Variables reported by fewer than 3 studies are not included but can be found in the online Appendix B.
WMD, weighted mean differences; WBC, white blood count; CRP, c-reactive protein.

Cough and fever were not significantly associated with any of our adverse outcomes with relative risks for all risk categories near the null. Increased white blood cell count and increased neutrophil count were most strongly associated with the outcome severe disease or death (data not shown; no risk factor for this outcome was reported by more than 2 studies).

Risk factors reported as continuous variables are summarized in Table 3, showing the unstandardized weighted mean difference between patients with and without the risk factor for each risk factor. For the outcome of death, risk factors with clinically and statistically significant differences between patients dying and survivors included higher CRP, age, d-dimer, and white blood cell parameters as well as lower oxygen saturation and lymphocyte count. Risk factors that that had significantly higher values in patients with the outcome of severe disease or death included CRP, age, neutrophil count, and white blood cell count; oxygen saturation and lymphocyte count were significantly lower. For the outcome of severe disease, CRP and age were significantly higher, whereas lymphocyte count was significantly lower. Whereas d-dimer was higher, the difference was small and not clinically important. Forest plots for categorical variables are summarized in online Appendix D, and for continuous variables in online Appendix E.

Table 4 summarizes risk factors identified as independent predictors of adverse outcomes by multivariate models reported in 17 studies. Risk factors most often included in multivariate models included increasing age, increased CRP, decreased lymphocyte count, increased LDH, elevated temperature, and the presence of any comorbidity.

Finally, Table 5 summarizes 11 clinical prediction rules reported in the literature to date. They used a variety of approaches, including risk scores, classification trees, full models in the form of online calculators, and nomograms. Only 4 of the clinical prediction rules have been externally validated,[18,19] and only 2 have been externally validated outside China (1 in the United Kingdom and 1 in France).[20,21]

Table 4. Summary of Variables Included in Multivariate Models to Predict an Adverse Prognosis for COVID-19

Variable	Zhang, 2020 (J Clin Virol)	Zhou, 2020 (PLOS One)	Xu, 2020 (Theranostics)	Liu, 2020 (J Clin Virol)	Jang, 2020 (JKMS)	Hou, 2020 (Infect Dis)	Yu et al, 2020 (Theranostics)	Wang, 2020 (Crit Care)	Zhou, 2020 (Lancet)	Liu, 2020 (Chin Med J)	Liang, 2020 (JAMA Intern Med)	Xie, 2020 (medRxIV)	Yan, 2020 (medRxiv)	Hu, 2020	Luo, 2020 (Clin Infect Dis)	Petrilli, 2020 (BMJ)	Li, 2020	Number of Models Including This Variable
Demographics																		
Age (increasing)			x			x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	11
Male sex	x							x										2
Vital signs																		
Temperature (elevated)		x			x					x								3
Oxygen saturation (decreased)					x							x						2
Comorbidities																		
Presence of comorbidities	x		x								x							3
Diabetes mellitus					x									x				2
Tobacco use										x				x				2
History of cancer											x					x		2
Hypertension		x																1
Cardiovascular disease		x																1
Heart failure																x		1
Chronic liver disease		x																1
Chronic kidney disease		x																1
Use of hypnotic														x				1
Symptoms																		
Dyspnea		x									x							2
Cough		x																1
Hemoptysis											x							1
Loss of consciousness											x							1

Continued

Table 4. Continued

Variable	Zhang, 2020 (J Clin Virol)	Zhou, 2020 (PLOS One)	Xu, 2020 (Theranostics)	Liu, 2020 (J Clin Virol)	Jang, 2020 (JKMS)	Hou, 2020 (Infect Dis)	Yu et al, 2020 (Theranostics)	Wang, 2020 (Crit Care)	Zhou, 2020 (Lancet)	Liu, 2020 (Chin Med J)	Liang, 2020 (JAMA Intern Med)	Xie, 2020 (medRxIV)	Yan, 2020 (medRxiv)	Hu, 2020	Luo, 2020 (Clin Infect Dis)	Petrilli, 2020 (BMJ)	Li, 2020	Number of Models Including This Variable
Laboratory results																		
C-reactive protein (elevated)	x			x		x				x			x		x	x		7
Lymphocyte count (decreased)	x		x			x						x	x			x		6
Lactate dehydrogenase (increased)											x	x	x				x	4
WBC count (increased)			x											x				2
Neutrophil count (increased)														x	x			2
Troponin (increased)														x		x		2
Procalcitonin (increased)				x												x		2
D-dimer (increased)									x							x		2
Interleukin-6 >32.1 pg/mL				x														1
CK-MB (elevated)					x													1
Albumin (decreased)										x								1
Neutrophil/ lymphocyte ratio											x							1
Direct bilirubin (increased)											x							1
Serum creatinine (increased)																x		1

WBC, white blood count; CK-MB, creatine kinase-MB.

Table 5. Proposed Clinical Prediction Rules in the Medical Literature

Study	Predictor Variables	Outcome Predicted	Validation (Country)	Type of CPR With Outcome
Lu, 2020*	Age, CRP	Death	Internal validation (China)	Classification tree: Low: 0% mortality Mod: 6% mortality High: 33% mortality
Xie, 2020	Age, LDH, lymphocytes, SpO2	Death	External validation in 1 hospital (China)	Probability assessment using full logistic model as nomogram
Yan, 2020	LDH, CRP, lymphocytes	Death	Internal validation (China)	Classification tree
Yu, 2020	Age, sex, diabetes mellitus, lymphocytes, procalcitonin	Death	Internal validation (China)	Risk score High risk (>3 points): 22.8% Low risk (≤3 points): 5.4%)
Shi, 2020	Age, sex, hypertension	Death or severe disease	Internal validation (China)	0 factors: 0% 1 factor: 6% 2 factors: 19% 3 factors: 40%
Galloway, 2020	Age, sex, race, oxygen saturation, chest radiograph, neutrophils, CRP, albumin, creatinine, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, chronic lung disease	Death or critical care	Internal validation (UK)	Risk score High risk (≥4 points): 40.7% Low risk (<4 points): 12.4%
Petrilli, 2020	Age, SpO_2, procalcitonin, troponin, CRP, hypertension	Severe disease	Internal validation (US)	Classification tree
Liang, 2020	Age, neutrophil/lymphocyte ratio, LDH, direct bilirubin, chest radiograph, hemoptysis, dyspnea, unconsciousness, comorbidities, cancer	Severe disease	External validation in 3 hospitals (China)	Logistic regression model requiring online calculator
Zhou, 2020	Temperature, cough, dyspnea, hypertension, chronic liver disease, chronic kidney disease, cardiovascular disease	Severe disease	Internal validation (China)	Nomogram
Kaeuffer, 2020[20]	Age, BMI, sex, dyspnea, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, CRP	Severe disease	External validation	Risk score: Low risk (≤6): 13% Moderate risk (6–14): NR High risk (>14): 66%
Knight, 2020[21]	Age, sex, number of comorbidities, respiratory rate, SpO_2, level of consciousness, urea level, CRP	Mortality	External validation	Risk score from 0 to 21 points Low risk (0–3): 1.2% Intermediate risk (4–8): 9.9% High risk (9–14): 31.4% Very high risk (≥15): 61.5%

*Study included some patients with suspected but not confirmed COVID-19. Preprint at MedRxIV: Lu J, et al. ACP risk grade: a simple mortality index for patients with confirmed or suspected severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 disease (COVID-19) during the early stage of outbreak in Wuhan (https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.20.20025510).
CPR, clinical prediction rule; CRP, c-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; BMI, body mass index.

Discussion

We have summarized the literature to date with regard to prognosis of inpatients with COVID-19, with a focus on clinical factors and tests that may be available in the outpatient or primary care setting during the initial evaluation of a patient with COVID-19. Thus, we did not abstract data regarding imaging studies or tests that are not widely available such as interleukin-6, LDH, or serum albumin. Our systematic review identified several risk factors that are consistently and strongly associated with adverse outcomes based on univariate and multivariate analyses: increasing age, increased CRP, LDH, or procalcitonin, decreased lymphocyte count, decreased oxygen saturation, dyspnea on presentation, and the presence of comorbidities. Fever and cough were not strongly associated with severe disease or mortality, perhaps because almost all hospitalized patients had these symptoms, making them less helpful for discrimination. Future research to study prognosis in the North America and Europe and develop prediction models and clinical prediction rules should include these predictors as part of their core data set. Whereas the data are limited in several ways as noted below, they represent the best evidence currently available. Greater availability of tests like CRP, d-dimer, and procalcitonin at the point of care is desired by physicians and would facilitate more efficient evaluation of patients for COVID-19 and other important conditions such as community-acquired pneumonia.[13,22,23] Similarly, providing inexpensive oxygen saturation monitors to outpatients at risk for deterioration should be encouraged based on our findings.

Limitations

The studies that we identified had a number of important limitations that should be addressed by future research. These limitations can inform design of future studies of prognosis and risk models in North America and Europe. First, studies had variable definitions of serious illness. Standardization would assist in future analyses, although there is inherent subjectivity and between country variability in decisions to move a patient to the intensive care unit. The World Health Organization has identified 6 clinical severity categories for patients with COVID-19: (1) not hospitalized; (2) hospitalized, not requiring supplemental oxygen; (3) hospitalized, requiring supplemental oxygen; (4) hospitalized requiring nasal high-flow oxygen, noninvasive mechanical ventilation, or both; (5) hospitalized, requiring invasive mechanical ventilation, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation or both; and (6) death.[24] For outpatients and patients being evaluated in primary care, the important clinical prediction is category 1 versus 2 or higher or possibly 1 or 2 versus 3 or higher. All the studies in our meta-analysis included only hospitalized patients, and in some cases excluded patients who had not yet died or been discharged. There was also a wide range in mortality rates, which likely reflects differences in health systems, hospital capacity, and the decision to admit as well as declining case fatality rates as treatments emerge. In addition, timing of data collection was not always clearly reported, and in 8 of 22 studies, outcome ascertainment was incomplete. Future studies should also include patients managed in the outpatient setting to identify risk factors for deterioration and later hospitalization as well as patients who are hospitalized. As the literature evolves, additional risk factors may also be identified such as red cell distribution width.[25]

Another limitation of the current literature is that many of the multivariate models and clinical prediction rules were quite complex, in some cases including 9–12 predictors including imaging.[19,26] They also often required laboratory tests such as LDH, interleukin-6, and serum albumin that are not readily or rapidly available in outpatient settings. This places a high data collection and computational burden for those hoping to apply these tools in practice. We encourage researchers to create simpler clinical prediction rules and to provide online calculators.[19] The most widely used clinical prediction rules in current clinical practice such as the Ottawa Ankle Rules,[27] the Strep Score,[28,29] the CURB-65 (Confusion, Urea nitrogen, Respiratory rate, Blood pressure, and 65 years),[30] and the CRB-65[31] require only 4 or 5 pieces of clinical information. This reduces the implementation burden and facilitates memorization. In addition, because many patients are initially evaluated in the outpatient or even telehealth settings, clinical prediction rules that require few or no laboratory tests are needed. Fourth, most of the clinical prediction rules have not been externally validated. Before implementation, clinical prediction rules require at a minimum internal validation using bootstrapping or split sample approaches, and ideally should be externally validated in a different population.

Finally, It is important that clinical prediction rules identify risk groups that are situated in the clinical context with an understanding of clinical decision making. For example, the risk score proposed by Galloway et al[26] identifies a low-risk group with 12.4% mortality and a high-risk group with 40.7% mortality. Most physicians and their patients would consider both groups to be above the risk threshold for hospitalization. Similarly, Yu et al[32] identify a low-risk group with 5.4% mortality and a high-risk group with 22.8% mortality. What would be more helpful was a clinical prediction rule that identified 3 or more risk groups, with the lowest-risk group clearly below the threshold for hospitalization, a moderate-risk group that might be followed closely as an outpatient with oxygen saturation monitoring or that might be hospitalized, and a high-risk group that would generally be hospitalized. More work is needed to determine these risk thresholds.

In conclusion, we have comprehensively reviewed the literature on risk factors for severe disease and mortality in COVID-19 and found it lacking. Whereas this represents the best available evidence, studies to date have been in hospitalized patients; prognostic studies are needed in the outpatient setting in which most patients are managed. Our research provides a starting point for outpatient studies, identifying several clinical variables and laboratory tests that are promising for predicting severe disease and mortality. There is a need for pragmatic clinical prediction rules with a low burden of data collection to identify patients who are at low, moderate, or high risk for severe disease or death to guide decision making in the outpatient and primary care settings. In addition, as more data are published in both inpatient and outpatient settings, it will also be important to update systematic reviews like this one. Because of their usefulness in determining prognosis, tests such as c-reactive protein, d-dimer, and procalcitonin should be made available and studied in outpatient settings, and home monitoring of oxygen saturation should be offered to identify patients at risk for a poor outcome.

To see this article online, please go to: http://jabfm.org/content/34/Supplement/S113.full.

References

1. Yi Y, Lagniton PNP, Ye S, Li E, Xu R-H. COVID-19: what has been learned and to be learned about the novel coronavirus disease. Int J Biol Sci 2020;16:1753–66.
2. World Health Organization. Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Situation Report-127. World Health Organization.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Cases in the U.S.|CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/cases-in-us.html.
4. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. Lancet 2020.
5. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim TW. Seroprevalence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in six sites in the United States, March 23–May 3, 2020. medRxiv.org 2020.
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim clinical guidance for management of patients with confirmed 2019-nCoV|CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-guidance-management-patients.html.
7. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson J. Effect of dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with COVID-19—preliminary report. medRxiv.org 2020.
8. Beigel JH, Tomashek KM, Dodd LE, et al. Remdesivir for the treatment of Covid-19—preliminary report. N Engl J Med 2020;383:1813–26.
9. Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.
10. Xie J, Tong Z, Guan X, Du B, Qiu H, Slutsky AS. Critical care crisis and some recommendations during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. Intensive Care Med 2020;46:837–40.
11. Moutchia J, Pokharel P, Kerri A, et al. Clinical laboratory parameters associated with severe or critical novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a systematic review and meta-analysis. medrxiv.org 2020.
12. Do NT, Ta NT, Tran NT, et al. Point-of-care C-reactive protein testing to reduce inappropriate use of antibiotics for non-severe acute respiratory infections in Vietnamese primary health care: a randomised controlled trial. Lancet Glob Heal 2016;4:e633-41–e641.
13. Howick J, Cals JWL, Jones C, et al. Current and future use of point-of-care tests in primary care: an international survey in Australia, Belgium, The Netherlands, the UK and the USA. BMJ Open 2014;4:e005611–e005611.
14. Huang DT, Yealy DM, Filbin MR, et al. Procalcitonin-guided use of antibiotics for lower respiratory tract infection. N Engl J Med 2018;379:236–49.
15. Waterfield T, Maney JA, Hanna M, Fairley D, Shields MD. Point-of-care testing for procalcitonin in identifying bacterial infections in young infants: a diagnostic accuracy study. BMC Pediatr 2018;18.

16. Wan X, Wang W, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. BMC Med Res Methodol 2014;14.
17. Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Côté P, Bombardier C. Assessing bias in studies of prognostic factors. Ann Intern Med 2013;158:280–6.
18. Xie J, Hungerford D, Chen H, et al. Development and external validation of a prognostic multivariable model on admission for hospitalized patients with COVID-19. SSRN Electron J 2020.
19. Liang W, Liang H, Ou L, et al. Development and Validation of a Clinical Risk Score to Predict the Occurrence of Critical Illness in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19. JAMA Intern Med 2020;180:1081.
20. Kaeuffer C, Ruch Y, et al. The BAS^{2}IC score: a useful tool to identify patients at high risk of early progression to severe COVID-19. Open Forum Infect Dis 2020.
21. Knight SR, Ho A, Pius R, ISARIC4C investigators, et al. Risk stratification of patients admitted to hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical Characterisation Protocol: development and validation of the 4C Mortality Score. BMJ 2020;370:m3339.
22. Cals JWL, Ebell MH. C-reactive protein: Guiding antibiotic prescribing decisions at the point of care. Br J Gen Pract 2018;68:112–3.
23. Hardy V, Thompson M, Keppel GA, et al. Qualitative study of primary care clinicians' views on point-of-care testing for C-reactive protein for acute respiratory tract infections in family medicine. BMJ Open 2017;7:e012503.
24. World Health Organization. R & D blueprint and COVID-19. World Health Organization—WHO Web Site. https://www.who.int/teams/blueprint/covid-19.
25. Foy BH, Carlson JCT, Reinertsen E, et al. Association of red blood cell distribution width with mortality risk in hospitalized adults with SARS-CoV-2 Infection. JAMA Netw open 2020;3:e2022058.
26. Galloway JB, Norton S, Barker RD, et al. A clinical risk score to identify patients with COVID-19 at high risk of critical care admission or death: an observational cohort study. J Infect 2020.
27. Stiell I. Ottawa ankle rules. Can Fam Physician 1996.
28. Ebell MH, Smith MA, Barry HC, Ives K, Carey M. The rational clinical examination. Does this patient have strep throat? JAMA 2000;284:2912–8. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11147989.
29. Centor RM, Witherspoon JM, Dalton HP, Brody CE, Link K. The diagnosis of strep throat in adults in the emergency room. Med Decis Making 1981;1:239–46.
30. British Thoracic S, Myint PK, Kamath AV, Vowler SL, Maisey DN, Harrison BD, British Thoracic Society. Severity assessment criteria recommended by the British Thoracic Society (BTS) for community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) and older patients. Should SOAR (systolic blood pressure, oxygenation, age and respiratory rate) criteria be used in older people? A compilation of two prospective cohorts. Age Ageing 2006;35:286–91.
31. Ebell MH, Walsh ME, Fahey T, Kearney M, Marchello C. Meta-analysis of calibration, discrimination, and stratum-specific likelihood ratios for the CRB-65 Score. J Gen Intern Med 2019;34:1304–13.
32. Yu Q, Wang Y, Huang S, et al. Multicenter cohort study demonstrates more consolidation in upper lungs on initial CT increases the risk of adverse clinical outcome in COVID-19 patients. Theranostics 2020;10:5641–8.
33. Wang D, Yin Y, Hu C, et al. Clinical course and outcome of 107 patients infected with the novel coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, discharged from two hospitals in Wuhan, China. Crit Care 2020;24.
34. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, et al. Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. BMJ 2020;368.
35. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020.
36. Liu W, Tao ZW, Wang L, et al. Analysis of factors associated with disease outcomes in hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus disease. Chin Med J (Engl) 2020;133:1032–8.
37. Xie J, Hungerford D, Chen H, et al. Development and external validation of a prognostic multivariable model on admission for hospitalized patients with COVID-19. medRxiv April 2020;2020.03.28.20045997.
38. Yan L, Zhang H-T, Xiao Y, et al. Prediction of criticality in patients with severe Covid-19 infection using three clinical features: a machine learning-based prognostic model with clinical data in Wuhan. medRxiv March 2020;2020.02.27.20028027.
39. Cao M, Zhang D, Wang Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) in Shanghai, China. medRxiv 2020;2020.03.04.20030395. March.
40. Hu L, Chen S, Fu Y, et al. Risk factors associated with clinical outcomes in 323 COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China. medRxiv March 2020;2020.03.25.20037721.
41. Luo X, Zhou W, Yan X, et al. Prognostic value of C-reactive protein in patients with COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis 2020.
42. Petrilli CM, Jones SA, Yang J, et al. Factors associated with hospital admission and critical illness

among 5279 people with coronavirus disease 2019 in New York City: Prospective cohort study. BMJ 2020.

43. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, et al. Risk factors associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome and death in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA Intern Med 2020;180:934.
44. Li K, Chen D, Chen S, et al. Radiographic findings and other predictors in adults with Covid-19. medRxiv 2020;2:2020.03.23.20041673.
45. Jang JG, Hur J, Choi EY, Hong KS, Lee W, Ahn JH. Prognostic factors for severe coronavirus disease 2019 in Daegu, Korea. J Korean Med Sci 2020;35:e209.
46. Xu PP, Tian RH, Luo S, et al. Risk factors for adverse clinical outcomes with COVID-19 in China: a multicenter, retrospective, observational study. Theranostics 2020;10:6372–83.
47. Zhou Y, He Y, Yang H, et al. Development and validation a nomogram for predicting the risk of severe COVID-19: a multi-center study in Sichuan, China. PLoS One 2020;15:e0233328.
48. Hou W, Zhang W, Jin R, Liang L, Xu B, Hu Z. Risk factors for disease progression in hospitalized patients with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study. Infect Dis (Auckl) 2020;52:498–505.
49. Zhang J, Yu M, Tong S, Liu LY, Tang LV. Predictive factors for disease progression in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. J Clin Virol 2020;127:104392.
50. Liu F, Li L, Xu MD, et al. Prognostic value of interleukin-6, C-reactive protein, and procalcitonin in patients with COVID-19. J Clin Virol 2020;127:104370.
51. Zhu Z, Cai T, Fan L, et al. Clinical value of immune-inflammatory parameters to assess the severity of coronavirus disease 2019. Int J Infect Dis 2020;95:332–9.
52. Hu H, Yao N, Qiu Y. Comparing rapid scoring systems in mortality prediction of critically ill patients with novel coronavirus disease. Burton JH, ed. Acad Emerg Med 2020;27:461–8.

Appendices

Appendix A: Search Strategy

("betacoronavirus"[mh] OR "coronavirus"[tiab] OR "corona-virus"[tiab] OR "COVID-19"[tiab] OR "COVID19"[tiab] OR "2019-nCoV"[tiab] OR "nCoV"[tiab] OR "SARS-CoV-2"[tiab] OR "SARSCOV2"[tiab] OR "2019-nCov"[tiab] OR "2019 coronavirus"[tiab] OR "novel coronavirus"[tiab]) AND ("risk factor"[tiab] OR "validation"[tiab] OR "prediction rule"[tiab] OR "clinical prediction"[tiab] OR "risk model"[tiab] OR "prediction model"[tiab] OR "prognosis"[tiab] OR "prognostic"[tiab] OR "Predictive value of tests"[mh] OR "prognosis"[mh] OR "prognosis"[mh])

Appendix B: Evaluation of Study Quality Using the Quality of Prognostic Studies Tool

Table 2. Study Quality Assessment Using the Quality of Prognostic Studies Tool

Authors	Study Participation	Study Attrition	Prognostic Factor Measurement	Outcome Measurement	Study Confounding	Statistical Analysis and Reporting
Yu et al, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Wang, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Chen, 2020	M	H	L	L	H	L
Zhou, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Liu, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Liang, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Xie, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Yan, 2020	M	H	L	L	L	L
Cao, 2020	M	L	L	L	H	L
Hu, 2020	M	H	L	L	L	L
Luo, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Petrilli, 2020	M	H	L	L	L	L
Wu, 2020	M	H	L	L	H	L
Li, 2020	M	H	L	L	L	L
Jang, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Xu, 2020	M	H	L	L	L	L
Zhou, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Hou, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Zhang, 2020	M	H	L	L	L	L
Liu, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Zhu, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L
Hu, 2020	M	L	L	L	L	L

L, low risk of bias; M, moderate risk of bias; H, high risk of bias.

Variables	Study Participation	Study Attrition	Prognostic Factor Measurement	Outcome Measurement	Study Confounding	Statistical Analysis and Reporting
High risk of bias	Specialized population (ie, pregnant, elderly) or subset of very ill patients only	Incomplete outcome ascertainment (some patients still hospitalized)	Unclear definition for prognostic factors	Outcome not defined	No multivariate analysis performed	Selective reporting of results, no clear analytic strategy
Moderate risk of bias	Only inpatients	Complete ascertainment but >10% loss to follow-up	Post hoc selection of cut points	Unclear definition		
Low risk of bias	Inpatient and outpatient	Complete ascertainment and <10% loss to follow-up	Typical cutoffs used, clearly defined	Clear and reproducible definition	Multivariate analysis reported	Full reporting, analytic strategy clearly described

Appendix C: Full Data Set

Association between categorical variables and mortality, severe disease, or both in patients with COVID-19

Risk Factor	Studies	Patients	RR (95% CI)
Outcome = Death			
Age <39 to 40 years	1	274	0.01 (0.00–0.21)
Age <45 years	1	107	0.21 (0.06–0.79)
Age >45 years	1	107	1.79 (1.38–2.32)
Age >75 years	1	107	10.42 (3.58–30.33)
Age ≥40 years	1	274	1.49 (1.33–1.66)
Age ≥60 to 65 years	3	483	2.62 (1.91–3.58)
Age 40–60 years	1	274	0.55 (0.34–0.89)
Age 45–59 years	1	107	0.19 (0.03–1.34)
Age 60–75 years	1	107	2.03 (0.97–4.23)
Any comorbidity	1	692	2.99 (2.37–3.77)
Chronic kidney disease	5	1562	5.11 (2.18–11.98)
COPD	9	2213	3.79 (2.51–5.72)
Coronary heart disease	9	2213	5.27 (2.89–9.58)
Cough	5	1366	1.02 (0.93–1.13)
CRP >100 mg/L	2	243	4.16 (2.71–6.37)
CRP ≥3 mg/L	1	102	1.19 (1.04–1.36)
CRP increased	1	581	1.42 (1.29–1.55)
D-dimer ≤0.5 mg/L	4	718	0.19 (0.12–0.30)
D-dimer >21 mg/L	1	247	17.53 (5.54–55.49)
D-dimer ≥0.5 mg/L	3	569	1.54 (1.32–1.80)
D-dimer ≥1.0 mg/L	4	718	2.56 (2.10–3.13)
D-dimer 0.5–1.0 mg/L	4	718	0.45 (0.31–0.64)
D-dimer increased	1	371	2.63 (1.91–3.63)
Diabetes mellitus	9	2213	2.15 (1.46–3.15)
Dyspnea	3	1073	3.47 (1.67–7.18)
Fever	6	1530	1.10 (0.95–1.28)
Heart rate >100	1	274	1.66 (1.23–2.25)

Continued

Continued

Risk Factor	Studies	Patients	RR (95% CI)
Heart rate ≥125	1	191	12.55 (0.61–257.13)
Hypertension	9	2213	2.34 (1.80–3.05)
LDH increased	3	831	5.16 (0.72–37.09)
Lymphocyte count <0.5	1	274	7.84 (3.84–16.00)
Lymphocyte count <0.8 to 1.1	4	841	2.07 (1.51–2.84)
Lymphocyte count ≥1	1	274	0.17 (0.09–0.31)
Lymphocyte count 0.5–0.8	1	274	1.53 (1.07–2.19)
Lymphocyte count 0.8–1	1	274	0.81 (0.46–1.43)
Lymphocytes decreased	1	547	2.10 (1.87–2.36)
Male sex	9	2213	1.24 (1.08–1.43)
Neutrophil count >6.3	1	274	6.29 (3.94–10.04)
Neutrophils increased	1	544	6.12 (3.86–9.70)
Oxygen saturation <90 to 93	3	718	6.07 (4.27–8.63)
Procalcitonin <0.05 ng/mL	1	236	0.02 (0.00–0.15)
Procalcitonin <0.1 ng/mL	1	164	0.44 (0.31–0.64)
Procalcitonin >0.05 ng/mL	1	102	1.79 (1.45–2.22)
Procalcitonin ≥0.1 to 0.25 ng/mL	1	164	2.53 (1.34–4.79)
Procalcitonin ≥0.25 to 0.5 ng/mL	4	728	9.59 (3.71–24.82)
Procalcitonin ≥2.0 ng/mL	1	236	24.71 (1.44–423.13)
Procalcitonin 0.05–0.5 ng/mL	1	236	1.31 (1.04–1.65)
Procalcitonin 0.5–2.0 ng/mL	1	236	13.13 (4.10–42.04)
Procalcitonin increased	1	455	1.48 (1.18–1.85)
Respiratory rate <24	1	274	0.48 (0.38–0.60)
Respiratory rate >20 to 30	4	841	3.80 (2.13–6.78)
Respiratory rate 24–30	1	274	3.02 (1.79–5.10)
SBP <90 mm Hg	2	274	5.70 (1.23–26.34)
SBP ≥140 mm Hg	1	274	2.16 (1.49–3.12)
SBP 90–140 mm Hg	1	274	0.62 (0.51–0.76)
Troponin >34.2	1	101	6.96 (2.61–17.17)
WBC < 3.5 to 4	3	567	0.34 (0.20–0.56)
WBC ≥4	3	567	1.07 (0.81–1.41)
WBC ≥9.5 to 10	3	567	5.73 (2.48–13.27)
WBC 4–10	3	567	0.65 (0.54–0.78)
WBC increased	1	630	16.08 (9.05–28.58)
Outcome = severe disease or death			
Age ≥40 years	1	323	1.13 (1.07–1.19)
Age ≥60 to 65 years	1	323	2.06 (1.56–2.74)
Chronic kidney disease	1	1590	4.45 (1.76–11.29)
COPD	2	1913	5.63 (1.07–29.69)
Coronary heart disease	1	1590	3.15 (1.75–5.57)
Cough	2	1821	1.06 (0.96–1.17)
CRP ≥3 mg/L	1	306	1.13 (1.07–1.19)
Diabetes mellitus	2	1913	3.24 (2.41–4.36)
Dyspnea	2	1717	3.09 (2.59–3.68)
Fever	2	1859	1.01 (0.96–1.07)
Hypertension	2	1913	2.00 (1.06–3.78)
LDH increased	1	87	3.32 (1.75–6.32)
Lymphocyte count <2.0	1	305	1.57 (1.33–1.84)
Male sex	2	1901	1.19 (1.06–1.33)

Continued

Continued

Risk Factor	Studies	Patients	RR (95% CI)
Neutrophil count >7.5	1	305	3.02 (2.28–3.99)
WBC ≥9.5 to 10	1	305	9.14 (3.94–21.24)
Outcome = severe disease			
Age <39 to 40 years	1	198	0.29 (0.08–1.11)
Age >75 years	1	2729	1.69 (1.49–1.93)
Age ≥40 years	1	198	1.39 (1.15–1.68)
Age ≥50 years	1	198	1.62 (1.23–2.14)
Age ≥60 to 65 years	2	564	2.53 (1.89–3.40)
Age ≥70 years	1	198	4.71 (2.33–9.53)
Age 40–49 years	1	198	0.67 (0.17–2.61)
Age 50–59 years	1	198	0.13 (0.01–2.11)
Age 60–69 years	1	198	1.74 (0.90–3.33)
Asthma or COPD	1	2729	1.05 (0.88–1.24)
Chronic kidney disease	3	3516	3.02 (0.63–14.60)
COPD	7	1033	2.47 (1.34–4.52)
Coronary heart disease	9	4364	3.69 (1.75–7.77)
Cough	9	1775	1.11 (0.87–1.42)
CRP >5 to 10 mg/L	3	448	1.68 (1.47–1.93)
D-dimer ≥0.5 mg/L	2	877	3.10 (1.45–6.64)
Diabetes mellitus	11	4582	2.57 (1.59–4.17)
spnea	7	1473	6.28 (3.10–12.74)
Fever	10	4504	1.13 (1.05–1.22)
Heart rate ≥90	1	366	0.88 (0.43–1.79)
Hypertension	11	4582	2.29 (1.61–3.26)
LDH increased	1	110	2.65 (1.93–3.63)
Lymphocyte count <0.8 to 1.1	2	308	27.36 (0.96–778.27)
Lymphocyte count >3.2	1	198	0.13 (0.02–0.90)
Male sex	11	4582	1.30 (1.11–1.53)
Neutrophil count <1.8	1	198	0.26 (0.02–4.12)
Neutrophil count >6.3	1	308	4.13 (2.31–7.37)
Oxygen saturation <88	1	2729	3.69 (3.06–4.46)
Oxygen saturation <96	1	366	1.39 (0.77–2.52)
Procalcitonin >0.05 ng/mL	3	448	4.06 (0.65–25.29)
Respiratory rate >20 to 30	2	477	2.11 (0.20–22.05)
SBP ≥110 mm Hg	1	366	1.07 (1.01–1.13)
WBC <3.5 to 4	1	198	0.67 (0.17–2.61)
WBC ≥9.5 to 10	2	308	5.52 (2.41–12.66)

COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; RR, risk ratio; CI, confidence interval; CRP, c-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; WBC, white blood count; SBP, systolic blood pressure.

Association between Continuous Variables and Mortality, Severe Disease, or Both in Patients with COVID-19: Full Data Set

Risk Factor	Studies	Patients	WMD (95% CI)
Outcome = death			
Age	7	1418	18.5 (15.4–21.6)
Systolic blood pressure	1	105	12.5 (0.64–24.3)
Mean arterial pressure	2	381	8.0 (4.3–11.8)
D-dimer (mg/L)	4	870	7.6 (6.1–9.4)
Heart rate	3	486	5.3 (1.7–8.9)
CRP (mg/L)	4	1016	40.4 (27.4–53.3)
Neutrophil count	3	679	4.3 (2.7–5.8)
WBC count	6	1314	4.0 (3.4–4.6)
Respiratory rate	3	486	3.1 (1.5–4.7)
Procalcitonin	3	763	0.34 (0.27–0.40)
Oxygen saturation	4	823	−8.9 (−11.9 to −5.9)
Lymphocyte count	6	1314	−0.4 (−0.5 to −0.3)
Outcome = severe disease or death			
CRP (mg/L)	4	4531	60.5 (47.9–73.2)
Age	5	4641	15.9 (10.4–21.3)
Systolic blood pressure	1	110	8.6 (0.07–17.1)
Neutrophil count	4	1912	2.6 (2.1–3.2)
WBC count	3	322	2.0 (0.98–3.0)
Respiratory rate	2	211	1.5 (0.02–3.3)
Heart rate	2	211	0.99 (−3.7, 5.5)
D-dimer (mg/L)	1	2729	0.31 (0.27–0.36)
Procalcitonin	3	4420	0.13 (−0.30 to 0.56)
Mean arterial pressure	1	101	−6.1 (−17.8 to 5.6)
Oxygen saturation	3	2940	−4.4 (−7.3 to −1.4)
Lymphocyte count	5	4641	−0.63 (−1.0 to −0.22)
Outcome = severe disease			
CRP (mg/L)	4	731	34.2 (15.4–53.1)
Age	8	2223	14.1 (10.9–17.6)
Oxygen saturation	1	78	12.3 (2.6–22.1)
Heart rate	1	78	7.3 (−21.4 to –36.0)
Neutrophil count	5	752	0.94 (−0.42 to 2.3)
WBC count	5	954	0.73 (−0.63 to 2.1)
D-dimer (mg/L)	5	604	0.30 (0.06–0.55)
Procalcitonin	2	276	0.05 (−0.08 to 0.19)
Respiratory rate	1	78	0.00 (−15.6 to 15.6)
Lymphocyte count	5	948	−0.44 (−0.52 to −0.36)

WMD, weighted mean differences; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CI, confidence interval; CRP, c-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; WBC, white blood count; SBP, systolic blood pressure.

Appendix D. Forest Plots (Full List) for Categorical Variables

Age 40–49 years



Age 40–60 years



Age 45–59 years



Age 50–59 years



Age 60–69 years



Age 60 to 75 years



Age ≥40 years



Age ≥50 years



Age ≥60 to 65 years



Age ≥70 years



Age >45 years



Age >75 years



Age <39 to 40 years



Age <45 years



Any comorbidity



Asthma or COPD



COPD



Cough



CRP ≥3



CRP ≥5 to 10



CRP ≥100



CRP increased



D-dimer 0.5–1.0



D-dimer ≥0.5



D-dimer ≥1.0



D-dimer >21



D-dimer increased



D-dimer ≤0.5



Diabetes



Dyspnea



Fever



Heart disease



Heart rate ≥90



Heart rate ≥125



Heart rate >100



Hypertension



Kidney disease



LDH increased



Lymphocyte 0.5–0.8



Lymphocyte 0.8–1.0



Lymphocyte ≥ 1.0



Lymphocyte >3.2



Lymphocyte <0.5



Lymphocyte <0.8 to 1.1



Lymphocyte <2.0



Lymphocytes decreased



Male sex



Neutrophil >6.3



Neutrophil >7.5



Neutrophil <1.8





Neutrophils increased



Oxygen saturation <88



Oxygen saturation <90 to 93



Oxygen saturation <96



Procalcitonin 0.05–0.5



Procalcitonin 0.5–2.0



Procalcitonin ≥0.1 to 0.25



Procalcitonin ≥0.25 to 0.5



Procalcitonin ≥2.0



Procalcitonin >0.05



Procalcitonin increased



Procalcitonin <0.1



Procalcitonin <0.05



Respiratory rate 24–30



Respiratory rate >20 to 30



Respiratory rate <24



SBP 90–140



SBP ≥110



SBP ≥140



SBP <90



Troponin >34.2



WBC 4–10



WBC ≥4



WBC ≥9.5 to 10



WBC increased



WBC <3.5 to 4.0







COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRP, c-reactive protein; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; WBC, white blood count; SBP, systolic blood pressure.

Appendix E. Forest Plots (Full List) for Continuous Variables

Age



CRP



D-dimer



Heart rate



Lymphocyte count



Mean arterial pressure



Oxygen saturation



Procalcitonin



Respiratory rate



Systolic blood pressure



WBC count



COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.