

Title: Impact of liver injury on the severity of COVID-19: Systematic Review with Meta-analysis

Authors: Javier Ampuero, Yolanda Sánchez-Torrijos, María del Rosario García Lozano, Douglas Maya, Manuel Romero-Gómez

DOI: 10.17235/reed.2020.7397/2020 Link: <u>PubMed (Epub ahead of print)</u>

Please cite this article as:

Ampuero Javier, Sánchez-Torrijos Yolanda, García Lozano María del Rosario, Maya Douglas, Romero-Gómez Manuel. Impact of liver injury on the severity of COVID-19: Systematic Review with Meta-analysis. Rev Esp Enferm Dig 2020. doi: 10.17235/reed.2020.7397/2020.



This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



REV 7397

Impact of liver injury on the severity of COVID-19: Systematic Review with Meta-analysis

Javier Ampuero^{1,2,3}*, Yolanda Sánchez^{1,2,3}, María Rosario García-Lozano^{2,3,4}, Douglas Maya^{1,2,3}, Manuel Romero Gómez^{1,2,3}

¹ Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío. Sevilla.

² SeLiver group. Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla.

³ CIBERehd. Spain.

⁴ Facultad de Farmacia. Universidad de Sevilla.

Correspondence:

Javier Ampuero MD, PhD

Digestive Disease Department and CIBERehd, Virgen del Rocio University Hospital,

Avenida Manuel Siurot s/n, 41013 Sevilla, Spain

E-mail: jampuero-ibis@us.es

ABSTRACT

Background and Aims

SARS-CoV-2 is mainly a respiratory virus that has relevant systemic effects. We assessed the impact of the baseline liver function (AST, ALT, and bilirubin) on COVID-19-related outcomes, including on mortality, intensive care unit admission, and non-fatal severe complications.

Methods

After a systematic review of the relevant studies, odds ratio, mean difference, sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative likelihood ratios, were calculated for the prediction of relevant COVID-19 outcomes by performing a meta-analysis using fixed and random effects models. A Fagan nomogram was used to assess the clinical utility. Heterogeneity was explored by sensitivity analysis and univariable meta-regression.



Results

Twenty-six studies were included (22 studies and 5271 patients for AST, 20 studies and 5440 subjects for ALT, and 9 studies and 3542 patients for bilirubin). The outcomes of the studies were: survival (n=8), intensive care unit admission (n=4), and non-fatal severe complications (n=16). AST>ULN (OR 3.10 (95 %CI 2.61-3.68)), ALT>ULN (OR 2.15 (95 %CI 1.43-3.23)), and bilirubin >ULN (OR 2.78 (95 %CI 1.88-4.13)) were associated with an increased prevalence of severe complications, with 78 %, 77 % and 94 % of specificity, respectively. The mean difference between mild and severe COVID-19 was 10.7 U/L (95 %CI 5.8-15.6) for AST, 8 U/L (95 %CI 1.0-15) for ALT, and 0.3 mg/dL (95 %CI 0.16-0.45) for bilirubin.

Conclusions

Patients showing liver injury had significantly higher risks of developing severe COVID-19 compared to those with normal liver function tests at admission. We should include the assessment of AST, ALT, and total bilirubin routinely in patients affected by SARS-CoV-2 in order to anticipate those at risk of developing COVID-19-related outcomes.

Keywords

COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, coronavirus, liver, AST, ALT, bilirubin.

Abbreviations

AHT: Arterial hypertension; CI: Confidence interval; CRP: C-reactive protein; DM: Diabetes mellitus; ICU: Intensive care unit; LR: Likelihood ratio; OR: Odds ratio; TB: Total bilirubin; ULN: Upper limit of normal.

INTRODUCTION

The pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 as cause of COVID-19 comprises from asymptomatic forms to acute distress respiratory syndrome and systemic inflammatory response secondary to a cytokine storm(1). However, despite the fact that SARS-CoV-2 is primarily a respiratory virus, it has important and devastating systemic effects(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)(7)(8), determining alterations in circulating lymphocytes and the immune system(9).

Inflammatory markers are usually elevated in COVID-19 patients, and they are being used as surrogate markers of severity (e.g., procalcitonin, ferritin, C-reactive protein, erythrocyte



sedimentation rate, D-dimer)(10)(11). However, they are unspecific for this disease because they can be increased in many other conditions. Routine laboratory markers reflecting an organ failure (additionally to systemic inflammation) could help to improve the prediction of COVID-19 severity. In this setting, liver function tests have been found altered in these patients at baseline, primarily elevated AST and ALT, and slightly increased bilirubin(12). Thus, the liver has been proposed as a target of COVID-19 but also could play an additional role in expanding the hyperinflammatory and prothrombotic status. Besides, the impact of pre-existing liver disease on the prognosis of COVID-19 remains unknown, although some etiologies may negatively influence, such as NAFLD(13).

The identification of surrogate markers of severe COVID-19 is of great importance and could help clinicians to manage it quickly and accurately. Given the urgency required in the decision making of the COVID-19 outbreak, we aimed to put together all the available data and conduct a meta-analysis to explore how the liver injury markers impact on the COVID-19 management and prognosis. Particularly, the primary aim was to assess the impact of the baseline liver function (AST, ALT, and TB) on COVID-19-related outcomes, particularly on mortality, ICU admission, and non-fatal severe complications (use of mechanical ventilation, septic shock, kidney failure, myocardial injury). The secondary aims were to: a) measure, quantitatively, the mean difference of AST, ALT, and TB between patients with and without COVID-19 complications; b) calculate the sensitivity and specificity of AST > ULN, ALT > ULN, and TB > ULN at the time of the infection to use them as surrogate markers of the use of health care resources; c) determine their usefulness in the current clinical scenario according to the virulence of SARS-CoV-2.

METHODS

Study identification and selection

The search strategy was in accordance with the recommendations of the meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology (MOOSE) group⁶⁰. One of the reviewers (JA) with experience in database searches designed the search strategy, which was subsequently revised by other three investigators (YS, MRGL, DM). They independently searched the MEDLINE (using PUBMED as the search engine), EMBASE, and Cochrane databases and collected all results separately. Disagreements between them were resolved by a third investigator (MRG) or by consensus. Databases were used to identify suitable studies that



were published up to 16 April 2020. MeSH terms and keywords were used, and the search terms were as follows: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, coronavirus, mortality, survival, death, ICU, severe disease, infection, and a combination of those MeSH terms by using the appropriate Boolean logic. The searches were limited to English-language publications with human subjects. A manual search was conducted by using the references listed in the original articles and review articles retrieved. Only fully published articles were considered, so oral presentations, abstracts, and posters were not considered. The inclusion criteria were: a) studies that reported dichotomized (upper limit of normal (ULN) or not) AST, ALT or total bilirubin (TB) (at least, one of them); b) studies that assessed one of the following endpoints: COVID-19-related non-fatal severe complications, intensive care unit (ICU) admission or mortality (at least, one of them); c) adults (>18 years old). The exclusion criteria were as follows: a) duplicate reports; b) case reports, comments and letters to the editors; and c) systematic reviews or meta-analyses. This study was performed according to the PRISMA statement(14).

Data extraction and quality assessment

The following data were extracted: author, country, year, population selection criteria, sample size, COVID-19-related endpoint, AST, ALT, total bilirubin, age, sex, liver disease, arterial hypertension (AHT), diabetes mellitus (DM), lymphocyte, LDH, C-reactive protein (CRP), d-dimer, ferritin, albumin, heart rate, respiratory rate, fever, X-ray, and oxygenation (SaO2). When the same population was published in several journals, we retained only the most informative article or the most complete study, to avoid duplication. We also asked the investigators for additional information, and if we received no answer, "unreported" items were treated as "unclear" or "not available". On the other hand, three investigators (SG, RM, MG) independently assessed the quality of the studies using the "Quality in Prognostic Studies (QUIPS)" tool(15).

Statistical analysis

We used STATA version 16 (Stata Corp; College Station, TX) with the commands "Midas", "Metan" and "Metaninf" All statistical tests were two-sided, with p-values ≤0.05 denoting statistical significance. Confidence intervals (CIs) of individual studies were determined from the available data.



The assumption of heterogeneity was tested for each planned analysis using the Cochran-Q heterogeneity and I2 statistics (significant heterogeneity according to I2 values >50 %)(16). The random-effects model was utilized in case of significant heterogeneity, and in the absence of it, the model of fixed effects was applied to pool results from studies. For the dichotomous variables (AST > ULN, ALT > ULN, TB > ULN, the effect denotes odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95 % CIs, while we used the difference in means to specifically provide measures of the absolute difference between the mean values of the explored variables (AST U/L, ALT U/L, TB mg/dL). We identify COVID-19-related mortality, ICU admission, and severe complications as relevant outcomes. On the other hand, a bivariate regression was performed to estimate the overall sensitivity and specificity. Additionally, we calculated positive and negative likelihood ratios (LR) in order to generate Fagan nomograms. They were performed to evaluate the clinical utility of AST > ULN, ALT > ULN, and TB > ULN for the use of health care resources, according to the current clinical scenario of the virulence of SARS-CoV-2 (pretest probability of 20 % for hospitalization), which shows the relationship between the prior probability, the likelihood ratio, and the posterior test probability. In case of heterogeneity, a sensitivity analysis was performed to determine if there was any

undue influence exerted by a single study on the results of the combined studies(17). Besides, potential heterogeneity was explored by univariable meta-regression and subgroup analyses(18).

The potential publication bias was assessed by Egger's test and graphically by a funnel plot. A p-value < 0.10 indicated statistical significance.

RESULTS

Eligible study characteristics and quality assessment

The flow-chart diagram details the article selection process for this meta-analysis (Figure 1). Finally, twenty-six studies were included (twenty-two, twenty, and nine evaluating AST, ALT, and total bilirubin, respectively). All the studies included in the meta-analysis were from China, probably because the COVID-19 outbreak started in this country. The outcomes of the studies were: survival (n=8), ICU admission (n=4), and non-fatal severe complications (n=16) (two of them assessed both survival and severe complications). Overall, 5271 patients were included in the group of studies on AST, 5440 subjects with an ALT assessment, and 3542 had a TB evaluation. The characteristics of the eligible studies are listed in Table 1. Seven of

REVISTA ESPAÑOLA DE ENFERMEDADES DIGESTIVAS The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology

the twenty-six studies showed a low risk of bias, while the rest of them showed a moderate risk according to the quality assessment by QUIPS.

Data analyses

The presence of increased or decreased AST classified correctly 71.5 % (764/1069) of deaths, 73.8 % (739/1002) of ICU admission, and 65.1 % (1495/2297) of severe complications correctly. We found that baseline AST > ULN was associated with death (OR 3.82 (95 %CI 2.55-5.73)), the need for ICU admission (OR 2.98 (95 %CI 2.00-4.45)), and the occurrence of non-fatal severe complications (OR 2.95 (95 %CI 2.38-3.67)), in comparison with patients showing decreased AST levels. Taking all the outcomes, AST > ULN showed an overall OR 3.10 (95 %CI 2.61-3.68) for COVID-19-related outcomes, with a moderate heterogeneity (Q=33.77; I²=46.7 %; p=0.01). (Figure 2a). Regarding the mean difference, we observed that AST values were higher in patients with adverse events (10.7 U/L (95 %CI 5.8-15.6)) (Figure 2b). AST > ULN showed a sensitivity of 0.48 (95 %CI 0.41-0.55) and a specificity of 0.79 (95 %CI 0.72-0.85), with a LR+ 2.3 (95 %CI 1.8-2.9) and LR- 0.66 (95 %CI 0.60-0.73), for the use of any health care resource (Figure 2c).

Elevated or decreased ALT determined correctly the 65.6 % (852/1299) of the population who died, the 73.4 % (694/945) of those requiring ICU admission, 58.9 % (1261/2141) of subjects suffering from any non-fatal severe complication. Regarding ALT > ULN, it was not associated with increased mortality (OR 1.54 (95 %CI 0.66-3.59)). However, the need for ICU admission (OR 2.85 (95 %CI 1.52-5.35)) and COVID-19-related severe complications (OR 2.39 (95 %CI 1.37-4.15)) were increased in patients with ALT > ULN. Taking all the outcomes, ALT > ULN showed an overall OR 2.15 (95 %CI 1.43-3.23) for COVID-19-related outcomes (Figure 3a). Besides, we found that ALT values were higher in patients with adverse events (8 U/L (95 %CI 1.0-15)) (Figure 3b). We found a high heterogeneity of the combined studies on ALT (Q=62; I²=77.8 %; p=0.0001). ALT > ULN showed a sensitivity of 0.38 (95 %CI 0.29-0.49) and a specificity of 0.77 (95 %CI 0.68-0.85), with a LR+ 1.7 (95 %CI 1.3-2.3) and LR- 0.79 (95 %CI 0.69-0.92), for the use of health care resources (Figure 3c).

On the other hand, total bilirubin determined correctly the 73.8 % (1509/2046) of the population who showed non-fatal severe complications. Thus, TB > ULN was associated with an increased prevalence of severe complications (OR 2.78 (95 %CI 1.88-4.13)) (Figure 4a). Besides, we found that TB values were higher in patients with adverse events (0.3 mg/dL



(95 %CI 0.16-0.45)) (Figure 4b). We did not find a significant heterogeneity of the combined studies on TB (Q=3.79; I^2 =31.8 %; p=0.580). Also, TB > ULN showed a sensitivity of 0.13 (95 %CI 0.09-0.20) and a specificity of 0.94 (95 %CI 0.91-0.96), with a LR+ 2.3 (95 %CI 1.6-3.4) and LR- 0.92 (95 %CI 0.87-0.97), for the use of any health care requirement (Figure 4c).

Fagan nomograms

In the current scenario of COVID-19 virulence (20% of likelihood of hospitalization), the results of Fagan nomograms showed a negative posterior probability of 14% and a positive posterior probability of 38% for AST > ULN. In comparison, they were 17% and 30% for ALT > ULN, and 19% and 37% for TB > ULN.

Sensitivity analysis and univariable meta-regression

In order to explore the causes of heterogeneity, we performed a sensitivity analysis and a univariable meta-regression. Leaving out one study at a time from the meta-analysis, we did not find any individual study assessing AST, ALT or bilirubin that influenced the overall meta-analysis summary estimate.

The univariable meta-regression aimed to incorporate the effect of covarying factors on summary measures of AST, ALT, and total bilirubin. Lymphopenia was a possible source of heterogeneity of the combined studies on AST, while liver disease and albumin were for studies on ALT. By contrast, we did not find any variable causing heterogeneity in the studies assessing TB.

Publication bias

The Egger's test failed to identify any publication bias for AST (p=0.712), ALT (p=0.108), or total bilirubin (p=0.804).

DISCUSSION

COVID-19 is characterized by a respiratory affectation that can result in death due to massive alveolar damage and progressive respiratory failure, achieving up to 25% of mortality in patients admitted to ICU(19). To date, COVID-19 has been related to other complications, such as myocardial infarction or neurological disorders(20)(21). However, the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 and the liver remains poorly understood. It has been



published that about 14-53 % of COVID-19 cases showed abnormal levels of ALT and AST, although a clinically significant liver injury was uncommon(22). Interestingly, patients with a severe infection have demonstrated to have higher rates of liver dysfunction(23). The following reasons can explain these findings: a) SARS-CoV2 could have a direct cytopathic effect on the liver because the virus bind to the ACE2 receptor, whose expression is enriched in cholangiocytes(24); b) immune-mediated damage due to the severe inflammatory response (e.g., cytokine storm)(25); c) hypoxic hepatitis, although the elevation of transaminases in COVID-19 is mild; d) a viral translocation to the portal system could not be excluded because the virus replicates actively on the enterocyte. Hepatotoxicity secondary to antiviral drugs or hepatic congestion (by increasing right atrial pressure secondary to mechanical ventilation) are relevant once the patients have been hospitalized(26).

Given that cohorts with low-to-moderate sample size are being published, we performed a meta-analysis including more than 5,000 patients from twenty-six studies that assessed liver function. We found that AST (mortality, ICU admission, and non-fatal severe complications), ALT (ICU admission and non-fatal severe complications), and total bilirubin (ICU admission and non-fatal severe complications) increased the risk of poor COVID-19-related outcomes significantly when they were upper than the normal limit. However, we should not expect shocking alterations in the liver profile, because we observed that AST (11 U/L), ALT (8 U/L) and total bilirubin (0.3 mg/dL) showed relatively slightly higher levels in patients developing COVID-19 complications. Thus, we must pay close attention to the markers of liver injury at the admission to anticipate the patients at risk of developing a poor prognosis.

The COVID-19 outbreak is collapsing many national health systems²⁷. Thus, having prognostic factors of patients who could require ICU admission or develop severe complications (beyond mortality) is essential to manage the situation adequately. Few studies have been carried out to achieve this goal, being poorly reported, with a high risk of bias, and not including any parameter of liver disease(27). In our meta-analysis, the markers of liver injury were associated with COVID-19-related adverse outcomes (ranging from mortality to non-fatal severe complications). For instance, individuals with AST > ULN at baseline showed 40 % of post-test probability of suffering COVID-19 complications in the current scenario of virulence (prevalence 20 %). Besides, AST, ALT, and notably bilirubin showed high specificity (and reduced sensitivity) for COVID-19 outcomes, which means in clinical practice that patients with normal liver values have a low likelihood of poor prognosis. This approach

REVISTA ESPAÑOLA DE ENFERMEDADES DIGESTIVAS The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology

could result particularly relevant in areas like the Emergency Department, where many patients are attended and, sometimes, the decision of the hospitalization is not clear. The incorporation of the liver profile to other inflammatory markers, such as ferritin or D-dimer, could improve the decision-making process. Therefore, we believe that a panel of liver injury markers (including AST, ALT, and total bilirubin) must be routinely performed at baseline in patients suffering from an infection for SARS-CoV-2.

Our findings should be cautiously interpreted. First, all the studies included in this metaanalysis were from China that could limit the generalization of the results to other populations. However, no articles from Europe or America have been published evaluating the role of the liver dysfunction on the prognosis of COVID-19, probably because the first wave of the infection started in Wuhan (China) months earlier(28). Second, some studies could not be included in this meta-analysis because the liver function was not adequately assessed. In other studies, transaminases were reported as median and interquartile range probably because they did not follow a normal distribution, precluding their inclusion in a meta-analysis. However, most of these studies showed high AST and ALT levels in patients with COVID-19-related outcomes(20)(21)(29)(30)(31)(32). Third, the information about preexisting liver diseases is suboptimal in the published studies. When this information was reported, the percentage of patients with liver disease was very low(33). This fact could influence the prediction of AST, ALT, or total bilirubin on the COVID-19 severity, probably modifying the cut-off of the upper limit of the normality. Finally, elevated levels of creatinine kinase or lactate dehydrogenase, together with transaminases elevation, have been reported and could support an additional extrahepatic origin of these alterations (beyond liver dysfunction)(34). However, the fact of observing similar findings about total bilirubin in our meta-analysis (and other studies demonstrating that albumin levels decrease(35)(36)) could represent, at least in part, the relevant role of the liver in the context of severe COVID-19.

In summary, patients who showed markers of liver injury had significantly higher risk of developing severe COVID-19 compared to those with normal liver function tests at admission. Our findings make essential to include the assessment of AST, ALT, and total bilirubin routinely in all patients affected by SARS-CoV-2 in order to anticipate those at risk of developing COVID-19 complications.

REVISTA ESPAÑOLA DE ENFERMEDADES DIGESTIVAS The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology

EXTERNAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT

This project has been partially funded by the "Consejería de Salud de la Junta de Andalucía" (PI-0075-2014), the "Spanish Ministry of Economy, Innovation and Competition, *Instituto de Salud Carlos III"* (PI19/01404, PI16/01842, PI17/00535 and GLD19/00100).

*The funders have not had any role in the design, analysis, writing, or interpretation of this project.

AUTHOR STATEMENT

Guarantor of the article: JA, MRG

Study design: JA

Drafting the manuscript: JA, MRG

Statistical analyses and interpretation: JA

Data acquisition and critical review of the manuscript: JA, YS, MRGL, DM, MRG

All authors approved the final version of the article, including the authorship list.

REFERENCES

- 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China, 2019. N. Engl. J. Med. 2020;382:727–733.
- Crespo J, Iglesias-Garcia J, Hinojosa J, et al. COVID-19 and the Digestive System: Protection and Management During the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic. Rev. Esp. Enferm. Dig. 2020;112
- 3. Liu PP, Blet A, Smyth D, et al. The Science Underlying COVID-19: Implications for the Cardiovascular System. Circulation 2020;
- 4. Hussain A, Bhowmik B, Cristina do Vale Moreira N. COVID-19 and Diabetes: Knowledge in Progress. Diabetes Res. Clin. Pract. 2020;108142.
- 5. Wu P, Duan F, Luo C, et al. Characteristics of Ocular Findings of Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hubei Province, China. JAMA Ophthalmol. 2020;
- 6. Su C-J, Lee C-H. Viral exanthem in COVID-19, a clinical enigma with biological significance. J. Eur. Acad. Dermatol. Venereol. 2020;
- 7. Xiong M, Liang X, Wei Y. Changes in Blood Coagulation in Patients with Severe Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): a Meta-Analysis. Br. J. Haematol.

2020;bjh.16725.

- Cheung KS, Hung IF, Chan PP, et al. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples from the Hong Kong Cohort and Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Gastroenterology 2020;
- 9. Mehta P, McAuley DF, Brown M, et al. COVID-19: consider cytokine storm syndromes and immunosuppression. Lancet 2020;395:1033–1034.
- 10. Zhu J, Ji P, Pang J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 3,062 COVID-19 patients: a metaanalysis. J. Med. Virol. 2020;
- 11. Henry BM, Oliveira MHS de, Benoit S, et al. Hematologic, biochemical and immune biomarker abnormalities associated with severe illness and mortality in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): a meta-analysis. Clin. Chem. Lab. Med. 2020;
- 12. Cai Q, Huang D, Yu H, et al. Characteristics of Liver Tests in COVID-19 Patients. J. Hepatol. 2020;
- 13. Ji D, Qin E, Xu J, et al. Non-alcoholic fatty liver diseases in patients with COVID-19: A retrospective study. J. Hepatol. 2020;
- 14. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. Ann. Intern. Med. 2009;151:264–269.
- 15. Hayden JA, Côté P, Bombardier C. Evaluation of the quality of prognosis studies in systematic reviews. Ann. Intern. Med. 2006;144:427–437.
- Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses.
 Br. Med. J. 2003;327:557–560.
- Copas JB, Shi JQ. A sensitivity analysis for publication bias in systematic reviews. Stat. Methods Med. Res. 2001;10:251–265.
- Petitti DB. Approaches to heterogeneity in meta-analysis. Stat. Med. 2001;20:3625–33.
- 19. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al. Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes of 1591 Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 Admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. JAMA 2020;
- 20. Mao L, Jin H, Wang M, et al. Neurologic Manifestations of Hospitalized Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. JAMA Neurol. 2020;
- 21. Shi S, Qin M, Shen B, et al. Association of Cardiac Injury With Mortality in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. JAMA Cardiol. 2020;

- 22. Bangash MN, Patel J, Parekh D. COVID-19 and the liver: little cause for concern. Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2020;
- 23. Zhang C, Shi L, Wang FS. Liver injury in COVID-19: management and challenges. Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2020;5:428–430.
- 24. Chai X, Hu L, Zhang Y, et al. Specific ACE2 Expression in Cholangiocytes May Cause Liver Damage After 2019-nCoV Infection. bioRxiv 2020;2020.02.03.931766.
- 25. Feng G, Zheng KI, Yan Q-Q, et al. COVID-19 and Liver Dysfunction: Current Insights and Emergent Therapeutic Strategies. J. Clin. Transl. Hepatol. 2020;8:18–24.
- 26. Boeckmans J, Rodrigues RM, Demuyser T, et al. COVID-19 and drug-induced liver injury: a problem of plenty or a petty point? Arch. Toxicol. 2020;
- Wynants L, Calster B Van, Bonten MMJ, et al. Prediction models for diagnosis and prognosis of covid-19 infection: systematic review and critical appraisal. BMJ 2020;369:m1328.
- 28. Munster VJ, Koopmans M, Doremalen N van, et al. A novel coronavirus emerging in China - Key questions for impact assessment. N. Engl. J. Med. 2020;382:692–694.
- 29. Fan Z, Chen L, Li J, et al. Clinical Features of COVID-19-Related Liver Damage. Clin. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2020;
- 30. Xie H, Zhao J, Lian N, et al. Clinical characteristics of Non-ICU hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 and liver injury : A Retrospective study. Liver Int. 2020;
- 31. Sun D, Li H, Lu X-X, et al. Clinical features of severe pediatric patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan: a single center's observational study. World J. Pediatr. 2020;
- 32. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. Lancet 2020;395:507–513.
- Lippi G, Oliveira MHS de, Henry BM. Chronic liver disease is not associated with severity or mortality in Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Eur. J. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2020;1.
- 34. Fu L, Wang B, Yuan T, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J. Infect. 2020;
- Gong J, Ou J, Qiu X, et al. A Tool to Early Predict Severe Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) : A Multicenter Study using the Risk Nomogram in Wuhan and Guangdong, China. Clin. Infect. Dis. 2020;



- 36. Zhang J, Wang X, Jia X, et al. Risk factors for disease severity, unimprovement, and mortality of COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 2020;
- Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. Lancet Respir. Med. 2020;
- Li Y-K, Peng S, Li L-Q, et al. Clinical and Transmission Characteristics of Covid-19 A Retrospective Study of 25 Cases from a Single Thoracic Surgery Department. Curr. Med. Sci. 2020;
- 39. Chen T, Wu D, Chen H, et al. Clinical characteristics of 113 deceased patients with coronavirus disease 2019: retrospective study. BMJ 2020;368:m1091.
- 40. 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;
- 41. Cao J, Tu W-J, Cheng W, et al. Clinical Features and Short-term Outcomes of 102 Patients with Corona Virus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. Clin. Infect. Dis. 2020;
- 42. Guan W, Ni Z, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China.N. Engl. J. Med. 2020;
- 43. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet 2020;395:497–506.
- 44. Zhang G, Zhang J, Wang B, et al. Analysis of clinical characteristics and laboratory findings of 95 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: A retrospective analysis. Respir. Res. 2020;21
- 45. Du R-H, Liu L-M, Yin W, et al. Hospitalization and Critical Care of 109 Decedents with COVID-19 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. Ann. Am. Thorac. Soc. 2020;
- 46. Zhang Y, Zheng L, Liu L, et al. Liver impairment in COVID-19 patients: a retrospective analysis of 115 cases from a single center in Wuhan city, China. Liver Int. 2020;
- 47. Wan S, Xiang Y, Fang W, et al. Clinical features and treatment of COVID-19 patients in northeast Chongqing. J. Med. Virol. 2020;
- 48. Wang Z, Yang B, Li Q, et al. Clinical Features of 69 Cases with Coronavirus Disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. Clin. Infect. Dis. 2020;
- 49. Shi H, Han X, Jiang N, et al. Radiological findings from 81 patients with COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. Lancet Infect. Dis. 2020;20:425–434.
- 50. Cai Q, Huang D, Ou P, et al. COVID-19 in a Designated Infectious Diseases Hospital

Outside Hubei Province, China. Allergy 2020;

- 51. Zheng F, Tang W, Li H, et al. Clinical characteristics of 161 cases of corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Changsha. Eur. Rev. Med. Pharmacol. Sci. 2020;24:3404–3410.
- 52. Li L, Li S, Xu M, et al. Risk factors related to hepatic injury in patients with corona virus disease 2019. medRxiv 2020;
- 53. Li X, Xu S, Yu M, et al. Risk factors for severity and mortality in adult COVID-19 inpatients in Wuhan. J. Allergy Clin. Immunol. 2020;
- 54. Ruan Q, Yang K, Wang W, et al. Clinical predictors of mortality due to COVID-19 based on an analysis of data of 150 patients from Wuhan, China. Intensive Care Med. 2020;
- 55. Zhang X, Cai H, Hu J, et al. Epidemiological, clinical characteristics of cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection with abnormal imaging findings. Int. J. Infect. Dis. 2020;
- 56. Cheng Y, Luo R, Wang K, et al. Kidney disease is associated with in-hospital death of patients with COVID-19. Kidney Int. 2020;
- 57. Liu Y, Du X, Chen J, et al. Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio as an independent risk factor for mortality in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. J. Infect. 2020;
- 58. Meng H, Xiong R, He R, et al. CT imaging and clinical course of asymptomatic cases with COVID-19 pneumonia at admission in Wuhan, China. J. Infect. 2020;
- Zheng Y, Xu H, Yang M, et al. Epidemiological characteristics and clinical features of 32 critical and 67 noncritical cases of COVID-19 in Chengdu. J. Clin. Virol. 2020;127:104366.
- 60. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA. 2000;283(15):2008-2012.

Auth or	Ye ar	Coun try	Study design	Pati ents	Outcom e	Liver function		True positi	False positi	False negat	True negat
						assessment		ve	ve	ive	ive
Yang	20	Chin	Single-	52	Survival	AST:	Yes	6	9	14	23
X(37)	20	а	center,			(N/A)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			retrospe			ALT: No		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			ctive,			TB: No					
			observat								
			ional								
			study								
Li	20	Chin	Single-	25	Survival	AST:	Yes	2	10	3	10

Table 1. Characteristics of the included studies.



Y(38)	20	а	center, retrospe ctive,			(N/A) ALT: No TB: No	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
			observat ional study		COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Yes (N/A) ALT: No TB: No	5 N/A N/A	8 N/A N/A	4 N/A N/A	8 N/A N/A
Chen T(39)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	274	Survival	AST: Yes (40 U/L) ALT: Yes (41 U/L) TB: No	59 30 N/A	25 30 N/A	54 83 N/A	136 131 N/A
Zhou F(40)	20 20	Chin a	Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	189	Survival	AST: No ALT: Yes (40 U/L) TB: No	N/A 33 N/A	N/A 26 N/A	N/A 102 N/A	N/A 28 N/A
Cao J(41)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	118	Survival	AST: No ALT: Yes (40 U/L) TB: No	N/A 7 N/A	N/A 25 N/A	N/A 10 N/A	N/A 76 N/A
Zhan g J(36)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat	663	Survival	AST: Yes (N/A) ALT: Yes (N/A) TB: No	11 9 N/A	160 142 N/A	7 9 N/A	485 503 N/A
			ional study		COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Yes (N/A) ALT: Yes (N/A) TB: No	131 110 N/A	40 41 N/A	278 299 N/A	214 213 N/A
Guan W(42)	20 20	Chin a	Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	757	Survival / ICU Admissi on (compos ite endpoin t)	AST: Yes (40 U/L) ALT: Yes (40 U/L) TB: Yes (1 mg/dL)	26 20 10	142 138 66	26 29 38	563 554 608
Huan g C(43)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive,	41	ICU Admissi on	AST: Yes (40 U/L) ALT: No TB: No	8 N/A N/A	7 N/A N/A	5 N/A N/A	21 N/A N/A



			observat ional study								
Zhan g G(44)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	95	ICU Admissi on	AST: Yes (4 U/L) ALT: Yes (4 U/L) TB: No	40 40	19 21 N/A	26 31 N/A	6 4 N/A	44 39 N/A
Du R(45)	20 20	Chin a	Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	109	ICU Admissi on	AST: Yes (4 U/L) ALT: Yes (5 U/L) TB: No	40 50	25 10 N/A	25 8 N/A	26 41 N/A	33 50 N/A
Zhan g Y(46)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	115	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Yes (4 U/L) ALT: Yes (5 U/L) TB: Yes (1 mg/dL)	40 50 2	12 8 5	5 3 3	19 23 26	79 81 81
Wan S(47)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	135	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Yes (4 U/L) ALT: No TB: No	40	15 N/A N/A	15 N/A N/A	25 N/A N/A	80 N/A N/A
Wang Z(48)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	69	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Yes (4 U/L) ALT: Yes (3 U/L) TB: No	40 35	7 6 N/A	12 17 N/A	7 8 N/A	43 38 N/A
Shi H(49)	20 20	Chin a	Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	81	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Yes (4 U/L) ALT: No TB: No	40	39 N/A N/A	4 N/A N/A	27 N/A N/A	11 N/A N/A
Cai Q(50)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat	298	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: Ye (N/A) ALT: Ye (N/A) TB: Ye	es es es	14 20 14	11 19 16	44 38 44	229 221 224



			ional			(N/A)				
I:	20	Chin	study Multi	202	COVID		10	24	20	120
ון (13)	20	chin 2	Mulu-	202	19	AST: Tes (N/Δ)	10 19	24 82	29	139 81
D(15)	20	a	retrospe		complica	ALT: Yes (30	4	13	35	150
			ctive.		tions	U/L)	-	10		200
			observat			TB: Yes				
			ional			(N/A)				
			study					-		
Zhen	20	Chin	Single-	161	COVID-	AST: Yes (40	12	10	18	121
g	20	а	center,		19	U/L)	5	8	25	123
F(51)			retrospe		complica	ALT: Yes (40	3	6	27	125
			ctive,		tions	U/L)				
			observat			1B: Yes (1.2)				
			ionai			mg/aL)				
Li	20	Chin	Single-	85	COVID-	AST: No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
L(52)	20	a	center,		19	ALT: Yes	16	17	10	42
			retrospe		complica	(N/A)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
			ctive,		tions	TB: No		-	-	-
			observat							
			ional							
			study							
Li	20	Chin	Single-	548	COVID-	AST: Yes (40	115	64	150	211
X(53)	20	а	center,		19	U/L)	64 17	61 7	202	214
			retrospe		complica	ALI: Yes $(40$	1/	/	249	268
			cuve,	. h.	uons	0/1.)				
			ohservat			TR. Vec (1.2)				
			observat			TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL)				
			observat ional study			TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL)				
Auth	Ye	Coun	observat ional study Study	Pati	Outcom	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Auth or	Ye ar	Coun try	observat ional study Study design	Pati ents	Outcom e	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function	Mean Endp	SD Endp	Mean Contr	SD Contr
Auth or	Ye ar	Coun try	observat ional study Study design	Pati ents	Outcom e	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment	Mean Endp oint	SD Endp oint	Mean Contr ol	SD Contr ol
Auth or Yang	Ye ar 20	Coun try Chin	observat ional study Study design Single-	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No	Mean Endp oint N/A	SD Endp oint N/A	Mean Contr ol N/A	SD Contr ol N/A
Auth or Yang X(37)	Ye ar 20 20	Coun try Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center,	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Voc	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1 14	SD Endp oint N/A N/A	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25
Auth or Yang X(37)	Ye ar 20 20	Coun try Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14	SD Endp oint N/A N/A 0.67	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25
Auth or Yang X(37)	Ye ar 20 20	Coun try Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14	SD Endp oint N/A N/A 0.67	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25
Auth or Yang X(37)	Ye ar 20 20	Coun try Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14	SD Endp oint N/A N/A 0.67	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25
Auth or Yang X(37)	Ye ar 20 20	Coun try Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14	SD Endp oint N/A N/A 0.67	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan	Ye ar 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a Chin	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi-	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14	SD Endp oint N/A N/A 0.67	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center,	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No ALT: No	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A N/A	SD Endp oint N/A N/A 0.67 N/A N/A	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25 N/A N/A
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No ALT: No ALT: No TB: Yes	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67 N/A N/A 0.63	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A 0.25 N/A N/A 0.40
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive,	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67 N/A N/A 0.63	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A 0.25 N/A N/A 0.40
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67 N/A N/A 0.63	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A N/A 0.25 N/A N/A 0.40
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional	Pati ents 52	Outcom e Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A 0.25 N/A 0.40
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20	Coun try Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A 1.14 N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67 N/A 0.63	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77	SD Contr ol N/A 0.25 N/A N/A 0.40
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54) Zhan	Ye ar 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Chin a Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Single- center	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival Survival Survival	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No TB: Yes (mg/dL)	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67 N/A 0.63	Mean Contr ol N/A N/A 0.77 N/A 0.75	SD Contr ol N/A 0.25 N/A 0.40 9.8 12 7
Auth or Yang X(37) Ruan Q(54) Zhan g Y(46)	Ye ar 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	Chin a Chin a Chin a Chin a	observat ional study Study design Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study Single- center, retrospe	Pati ents 52 150	Outcom e Survival Survival Survival COVID- 19 complica	TB: Yes (1.2 mg/dL) Liver function assessment AST: No ALT: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: No TB: Yes (mg/dL) AST: Yes (U(L) ALT: Yes	Mean Endp oint N/A N/A 1.14 N/A 1.06	SD Endp oint N/A 0.67 N/A 0.63	Mean Contr ol N/A 0.77 N/A 0.75	SD Contr ol N/A 0.25 N/A 0.40 9.8 12.7 0.25



Shi H(49)	20 20	Chin a	ctive, observat ional study Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat	81	tions COVID- 19 complica tions	(U/L) TB: (mg/dL) AST: (U/L) ALT: (U/L) TB:	Yes Yes Yes Yes	43.2 49.7 0.75	18.5 31.5 0.24	30.2 30.8 0.54	8.7 8.9 0.04
71	20	Chita	ional study	645	COMP	(mg/dL)	V	20.1	20.4	25.7	
znan g X(55)	20 20	a	Multi- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	645	complica tions	AS1: (U/L) ALT: (U/L) TB: (mg/dL)	Yes Yes Yes	30.1 29.4 0.66	20.4 25.7 0.47	25.7 25.5 0.53	15.5 20 0.29
Chen g Y(56)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	701	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: (U/L) ALT: (U/L) TB: (mg/dL)	Yes Yes Yes	47 32 1.23	33 29 0.33	41 36 0.64	43 40 0.41
Liu Y(57)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	245	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: (U/L) ALT: (U/L) TB: No	Yes Yes	52.1 40.6 N/A	57.7 42.2 N/A	31.9 25.3 N/A	20.1 17.9 N/A
Meng H(58)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	58	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: (U/L) ALT: (U/L) TB: No	Yes Yes	28.4 21.1 N/A	14.6 18.1 N/A	23.1 23.7 N/A	11 21.7 N/A
Zhen g Y(59)	20 20	Chin a	Single- center, retrospe ctive, observat ional study	69	COVID- 19 complica tions	AST: (U/L) ALT: (U/L) TB: No	Yes Yes	51.2 42.4 N/A	88.7 48.9 N/A	26.5 31.7 N/A	12.7 27.8 N/A





Figure 1. Flow-chart summarizing the selection of eligible studies. * Individual studies, although some of them reported simultaneously dichotomous and continuous variables..



ENFERMEDADES DIGESTIVAS

The Spanish Journal of Gastroenterology

Figure 2	a
----------	---

Study	End AST>ULN	point AST <uln< th=""><th>Col AST>ULN</th><th>ntrol AST<uln< th=""><th></th><th>Odds Ratio with 95% CI</th><th>Weigh (%)</th></uln<></th></uln<>	Col AST>ULN	ntrol AST <uln< th=""><th></th><th>Odds Ratio with 95% CI</th><th>Weigh (%)</th></uln<>		Odds Ratio with 95% CI	Weigh (%)
Survival							10.00
Yang X	6	9	14	23		1.10 [0.32, 3.74]	3.30
LIY	2	10	3	10 -		0.67 [0.09, 4.89]	1.64
Chen T	59	25	54	136		5.94 [3.38, 10.45]	6.71
Chen T	14	18	5	18		2.80 [0.83, 9.41]	2.23
Zhang J	11	160	7	485	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4.76 [1.82, 12.49]	2.30
Heterogeneity: I ² = 58.9	$2\%, H^2 = 2.43$					3.82 [2.55, 5.73]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(4) = 9.7	74, p = 0.05						
ICU Admission							
Guan W	26	142	26	563		3.96 [2.23, 7.04]	6.65
Huang C	8	7	5	21		- 4.80 [1.18, 19.61]	1.16
Zhang G	19	26	6	44		- 5.36 [1.90, 15.13]	2.24
Du R	25	25	26	33		1.27 [0.60, 2.70]	8.13
Heterogeneity: I ² = 60.0	8%, H ² = 2.50				-	2.98 [2.00, 4.45]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(3) = 7.5	51, p = 0.06						
COVID-19 complication	ns						
LiY	5	8	4	8		1.25 [0.24, 6.44]	1.74
Zhang Y	12	5	19	79		9.98 [3.14, 31.74]	1.13
Wan S	15	15	25	80	I	3.20 [1.37, 7.45]	3.79
Wang Z	7	12	7	43		3.58 [1.05, 12.23]	1.66
Shi H	39	4	27	11		- 3.97 [1.14, 13.80]	1.82
Cai Q	14	11	44	229		- 6.62 [2.82, 15.55]	2.21
Ji D	10	24	29	139		2.00 [0.86, 4.62]	4.70
Zheng F	12	10	18	121		- 8.07 [3.04, 21.37]	1.52
Li X	115	64	150	211	-	2.53 [1.75, 3.66]	24.23
Zhang J	131	40	278	214		2.52 [1.70, 3.75]	22.86
Heterogeneity: I ² = 41.2	2%, H ² = 1.70				•	2.95 [2.38, 3.67]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(9) = 15	.31, p = 0.08						
Overall					•	3.10 [2.61, 3.68]	
Heterogeneity: I ² = 46.7	0%, $H^2 = 1.88$						
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(18) = 3	3.77, p = 0.01						
Test of group difference	s: Q _b (2) = 1.25, p	o = 0.54			125 0 5 1 2		
ixed-effects Mantel-Hae	nszel model			0			

Figure 2b

 $\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle$

		Endpoi	nt		Contro	d	Mean Diff.	Weight
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD	with 95% CI	(%)
Zhang Y	31	38.9	22.6	84	24.4	9.8	14.50 [8.59, 20.41]	18.79
Shi H	66	43.2	18.5	15	30.2	8.7	13.00 [3.37, 22.63]	13.00
Zhang X	573	30.1	20.4	72	25.7	15.5	4.40 [-0.48, 9.28]	20.56
Chen Y	101	47	33	600	41	43	6.00 [-2.79, 14.79]	14.16
Liu Y	82	52.1	57.7	163	31.9	20.1	20.20 [10.35, 30.05]	12.70
Meng H	13	28.4	14.6	45	23.1	11	5.30 [-2.02, 12.62]	16.43
Zheng Y	32	51.2	88.7	67	26.5	12.7	24.70 [3.13, 46.27]	4.35
Overall							10.68 [5.75, 15.62]	
Heteroge	neity:	$\tau^2 = 24$	63, I ²	= 60.9	3%, H ²	= 2.56		
Test of θ_i	= θ _j : C	Q(6) = 1	5.75,	o = 0.0	02			
Test of 0	= 0: z	= 4.24,	p = 0.	00				
							40 60	

Random-effects REML model





Figure 2. Forest plots of the studies assessing AST depending on the outcomes.

A) Odds ratio. B) Mean difference. C) Sensitivity and Specificity.

Figure 3a

	End	point	Co	ntrol		Odds Ratio	Weight
Study	ALT>ULN	ALT <uln< th=""><th>ALT>ULN</th><th>ALT<uln< th=""><th>N</th><th>with 95% CI</th><th>(%)</th></uln<></th></uln<>	ALT>ULN	ALT <uln< th=""><th>N</th><th>with 95% CI</th><th>(%)</th></uln<>	N	with 95% CI	(%)
Survival							
Zhou F	33	26	102	28		0.35 [0.18, 0.68]	7.18
Cao J	7	25	10	76		2.13 [0.73, 6.18]	5.51
Chen T	30	30	83	131	+	1.58 [0.89, 2.81]	7.53
Chen T	14	18	5	18	-	- 2.80 [0.83, 9.41]	4.96
Zhang J	9	142	9	503		- 3.54 [1.38, 9.09]	6.01
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.73$,	l ² = 80.43%, H	= 5.11				1.54 [0.66, 3.59]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(4) = 22.2	e6, p = 0.00						
ICU Admission					Î.		
Guan W	20	138	29	554		2.77 [1.52, 5.04]	7.44
Zhang G	21	31	4	39		6.60 [2.05, 21.25]	5.12
Du R	10	8	41	50		1.52 [0.55, 4.22]	5.70
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.11$,	² = 33.62%, H	2 = 1.51			-	2.85 [1.52, 5.35]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(2) = 3.45	, p = 0.18						
COVID-19 complications	5				1		
Zhang Y	8	3	23	81		9.39 [2.30, 38.29]	4.31
Wang Z	6	17	8	38		1.68 [0.50, 5.58]	4.99
LiL	16	17	10	42		- 3.95 [1.50, 10.43]	5.89
Cai Q	20	19	38	221	_	6.12 [2.99, 12.53]	6.96
Ji D	19	82	20	81	_	0.94 [0.47, 1.89]	7.03
Zheng F	5	8	25	123	-	- 3.08 [0.93, 10.18]	5.01
Li X	64	61	202	214		1.11 [0.75, 1.66]	8.17
Zhang J	110	41	299	213		1.91 [1.28, 2.85]	8.17
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.44$,	l ² = 78.42%, H	² = 4.63			-	2.39 [1.37, 4.15]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(7) = 28.8	1, p = 0.00						
Overall						2.15 [1.43, 3.23]	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.48$,	1 ² = 77.87%, H	= 4.52					
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(15) = 62.	03, p = 0.00				1		
Test of group differences:	Q _b (2) = 1.33,	p = 0.51					
Random-effects REML mo	del				0.25 1 4	16	

Figure 3b

		Endpoir	nt		Contro	d	Mean Diff.	Weight
Study	N	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD	with 95% CI	(%)
Zhang Y	31	37.9	32.2	84	21.2	12.7] 16.27
Shi H	66	49.7	31.5	15	30.8	8.9	18.90 [2.74, 35.06	9.87
Zhang X	573	29.4	25.7	72	25.5	20	3.90 [-2.26, 10.06] 18.00
Chen Y	101	32	29	600	36	40	-4.00 [-12.14, 4.14] 16.30
Liu Y	82	40.6	42.2	163	25.3	17.9	15.30 [7.76, 22.84] 16.83
Meng H	13	21.1	18.1	45	23.7	21.7	-2.60 [-15.55, 10.35] 12.17
Zheng Y	32	42.4	48.9	67	31.7	27.8	10.70 [-4.43, 25.83] 10.56
Overall							8.02 [1.04, 15.00]
Heteroge	neity:	$\tau^2 = 60$	57, I ²	= 73.3	32%, H ²	= 3.75		
Test of θ _i	= θ _j : 0	2(6) = 2	2.38,	p = 0.0	00			
Test of 0	= 0: z	= 2.25,	p = 0.	.02				
							-20 0 20 40	

Random-effects REML model



Figure 3. Forest plots of the studies assessing ALT depending on the outcomes. A) Odds ratio. B) Mean difference. C) Sensitivity and Specificity.

Figure 4a

	End	point	Cor	ntrol							0	dds Ra	atio	Weight
Study	TB>ULN	TB <uln< td=""><td>TB>ULN</td><td>TB<uln< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>wi</td><td>th 95%</td><td>CI</td><td>(%)</td></uln<></td></uln<>	TB>ULN	TB <uln< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>wi</td><td>th 95%</td><td>CI</td><td>(%)</td></uln<>							wi	th 95%	CI	(%)
Guan W	10	66	38	608		-	-	_			2.42 [1.15,	5.09]	26.73
Zhang Y	5	3	26	81		-					- 5.19 [1.16,	23.22]	5.22
Cai Q	14	16	44	224		i	_	-			4.45 [2.03,	9.78]	18.18
Ji D	4	13	35	150		+	_	_			1.32 [0.41,	4.29]	17.33
Zheng F	3	6	27	125	-	+	-		_		2.31 [0.54,	9.84]	7.74
Li X	17	7	249	268		i—	-	-	-		2.61 [1.07,	6.41]	24.79
Overall						ł	-				2.78 [1.88,	4.13]	
Heteroger	heity: $I^2 = 3$	1.81%, H ²	= 0.76			i i								
Test of θ_i	= θ _j : Q(5) =	3.79, p = 0	0.58			1								
Test of θ :	= 0: z = 5.0	9, p = 0.00				ł								
					1/2	1	2	4	8	16				

Fixed-effects Mantel-Haenszel model

Figure 4b

		Endpoir	nt		Contro							Mean Diff.		Weight
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD						with 95% CI		(%)
Ruan Q	68	1.058	.625	82	.748	.397						0.31 [0.15, 0.	47]	16.16
Yang X	32	1.14	.678	20	.765	.251			_			- 0.38 [0.06, 0.	69]	10.49
Shi H	66	.748	.239	15	.537	.035	i i					0.21 [0.09, 0.	33]	17.88
Zhang Y	31	.824	.374	84	.602	.251		-	-			0.22 [0.10, 0.	34]	17.99
Zhang X	573	.66	.467	72	.532	.286	-	-	-			0.13 [0.02, 0.	24]	18.30
Cheng Y	101	1.227	.333	600	.643	.409	į.					- 0.58 [0.50, 0.	67]	19.17
Overall								-				0.30 [0.16, 0.	45]	
Heteroge	neity:	$\tau^2 = 0.03$	3, I ² =	86.47	%, H ² =	7.39								
Test of θ _i	= θ _j : C	Q(5) = 54	4.74, p	o = 0.0	00									
Test of θ	= 0: z	= 4.12,	p = 0.	00										
							0	-	,	1	6			

Random-effects REML model

Figure 4.- Forest plots of the studies assessing total bilirubin. A) Odds ratio. B) Mean difference. C) Sensitivity and Specificity.