LETTER TO THE EDITOR



An updated meta-analysis on the association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality

Recently, Gao et al. published a paper entitled "Association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality: A rapid systematic review and meta-analysis" in the Journal of Medical Virology.¹ Their findings demonstrated that tuberculosis was not significantly associated with the increased risk for severity (odds ratio [OR] = 2.10, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.61–7.18) and mortality (OR = 1.40, 95% CI: 0.10–18.93) in a meta-analysis on the basis of six studies with 2765 COVID-19 patients.¹ This study was extremely interesting but had limited sample sizes. To our knowledge, a series of articles on this topic have been emerging since then. Therefore, we performed this updated meta-analysis to clarify the association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality based on the latest data.

This study followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines.² The electronic databases including PubMed, Web of Science, and EMBASE were systematically searched to identify the eligible studies published between January 1, 2020 and May 14, 2021. The keywords used were: "coronavirus disease 2019", "COVID-19". "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2". "SARS-CoV-2", "2019-nCoV", and "tuberculosis". The outcomes of interest were severity (severe, critical, intensive care unit [ICU] admission, invasive mechanical ventilation [IMV], intubation or death), and mortality. All peer-reviewed articles written in the English language reporting the association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality were eligibly included. Accordingly, repeated articles, case reports, review papers, comments, errata, and studies without sufficient data were excluded. The pooled OR and 95% CI were estimated using a random-effects meta-analysis model.³ Heterogeneity across studies was evaluated using the l^2 statistic.^{4,5} Egger's test and Begg's test were conducted to assess publication bias.⁶⁻⁸ Leaveone-out sensitivity analysis was performed to evaluate the stability of our results.⁹ The statistical analyses were performed by R software (Version 3.6.3). Statistical significance was defined as p < 0.05.

Thirty-six full-text articles with 60,103 COVID-19 patients were included in this study. Among them, 26 studies were from Asia (20 from China, three from Korea, and one each from Qatar, Turkey, and the Philippines), six studies were from Africa (two from Congo, two from South Africa, one from Ethiopia, and one from Nigeria), three studies came from Americas (two from Brazil and one from the United States) and one study was from multi-country. The baseline characteristics of the enrolled studies are summarized in Table 1.

Overall, we found that COVID-19 patients with tuberculosis tended to have an increased risk for the disease severity compared to those without tuberculosis (OR = 1.56, 95% CI: 1.13–2.16, Figure 1A). When we restricted the outcomes to mortality, the significant association was still present (OR = 1.94, 95% CI: 1.28–2.93, Figure 1B). Leave-one-out sensitivity analysis demonstrated that omitting each eligible study once had no obvious impacts on the overall results, which suggests that our results were robust and stable (Figure 1C for severity and 1D for mortality). There was no potential publication bias detected in Begg's test (p = 0.558) or Egger's test (p = 0.293).

There are several limitations in this current meta-analysis. First, the majority of the included studies are from Asia, especially from China. Thus, the findings of the present meta-analysis should be verified by future studies mainly from other regions. Second, the information on medications for tuberculosis is not available presently, thus we could not address the effects of medications on the association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality. Third, the association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality was estimated on the basis of crude OR. It is reported that age, gender, and several comorbidities had obvious effects on the clinical outcomes of COVID-19 patients,¹⁰⁻¹² therefore, a meta-analysis on this association based on risk factors adjusted-effect estimates should be performed to verify our findings in the future. Fourth, most of the included studies (n = 25) were retrospectively designed and only one study was prospectively designed. Therefore, well-designed studies with large sample-sized prospective articles are warranted to verify our findings in the future when more data are available.

In conclusion, our updated meta-analysis demonstrated that tuberculosis was significantly associated with an increased risk for severity and mortality among COVID-19 patients. Thus, several preventive measures should be taken to protect individuals with tuberculosis from SARS-CoV-2 infection and more clinical intervention and treatment also should be allocated to COVID-19 patients with tuberculosis to prevent disease progression. We hope that the updated data will contribute to the more accurate elaboration and substantiation of the findings reported by Gao et al.¹

ETTER TO THE EDITOR JOURNAL OF MEDICAL VIROLOGY WILEY										5683												
OVID-19) patients	Non-severe (TB/ cases, %)	Survival (8/158, 5.1%)	General (0/70, 0%)	Non-ICU (8/381, 2%)	Recovery (57/ 359, 15.9%)	Non-severe (5/279, 1.8%)	Survived (0/36, 0%)	Non-severe (0/82, 0%)	Non-ICU (1/28, 3.6%)	Non-severe (18/ 719, 2.5%)	Mild (2/557, 0.5%)	Discharge (1/199, 0.5%)	Common (4/366, 1.1%)	Survivor (10/1033, 1.4%)	Mild (18/1196, 1.5%)	Not deceased (2015/ 21683, 9.3%)	Moderate (2/68, 2.9%)	Non-severe (15/ 575, 2.6%)	Mild (12/5345, 0.2%)	Survivor (1/138, 2.6%)	Non-severe (3/47, 6.4%)	(Continues)
General information of the included studies on the association between tuberculosis and severity and mortality among coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) patients	Severe (TB/cases, %)	Deceased (0/21, 0%)	Refractory (3/ 85, 3.5%)	ICU (0/35, 0%)	Died (25/71, 35.2%)	Severe (4/269, 1.5%)	Died (1/19, 5.3%)	Severe (2/58, 3.4%)	ICU (1/23, 4.3%)	Severe (2/242, 0.8%)	Severe (0/137, 0%)	Death (0/217, 0%)	Severe/Critical (9/ 535, 1.7%)	Non-survivor (5/ 157, 3.3%)	Severe (2/365, 0.5%)	Deceased (103/ 625, 16.5%)	Severe/Critical (0/ 36, 0%)	Severe (4/191, 2.1%)	Severe/Critical (1/ 117, 0.9%)	Non-survivor (1/ 7, 14.3%)	Severe (0/26, 0%)	
erity and mortality amon	Age	57.6 ± 13.7	54 (42-66)	46.58	NR	60 (48-69)	54 (20-91)	57 (25-87)	51.9 (17-78)	63 (49-70)	55.91	NR	60.0 (49.0-69.0)	57 (47-67)	62 (50-70)	NR	44 (33-55)	46 (34-58)	35.8 ± 1.2	43±16.0	51 ± 13	
uberculosis and seve	Male (%)	54.2	55.5	47.6	NR	50.9	53.2	50.7	49	52	30.5	NR	48.3	53.4	50	31.6	61.5	65.6	88.9	86.7	59	
iation between t	Sample sizes	179	155	416	430	548	55	140	51	961	694	416	901	1190	1561	22,308	104	766	5462	145	73	
ncluded studies on the assoc	Study design	Prospective study	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	Cohort study	Ambispective study	Case series	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	Cross-sectional study	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	Cohort study	Retrospective study	Cohort study	Case series	Retrospective study	Retrospective study	
ieneral information of the ir	Country	China	China	China	Philippines	China	China	China	Brazil	China	Korea	Brazil	China	China	China	South Africa	China	Congo	Qatar	Nigeria	China	
TABLE 1 G	Author	Du RH	Mo P	Zeng JH	Sy KTL	Li X	Chen T	Zhang JJ	Pierrotti LC	Song J	Lee JY	Miciel EL	Zhang J	Liu J	НН пХ	Boulle A	Yang C	Nachega JB	AI Kuwari HM	Ibrahim OR	Dai M	

TABLE 1 (Continued)	ed)							
Author	Country	Study design	Sample sizes	Male (%)	Age	Severe (TB/cases, %)	Non-severe (TB/ cases, %)	<u> </u>
Parker A	South Africa	Retrospective study	113	38.9	48.5	Death (6/28, 21.4%)	Survivor (7/85, 8.2%)	ΝI
Lee SG	Korea	Retrospective study	7339	40.1	47.1 ± 19.0	Deceased (4/ 227, 1.8%)	Survivor (24/7112, 0.3%)	LEY
Tahtasakal CA	Turkey	Retrospective study	534	56.4	59 (19-97)	Severe/Critical (1/ 136, 0.7%)	Mild/Moderate (1/ 398, 0.3%)	MED
Li S	China	Retrospective study	2924	50.6	61.9 (49.7–69.5)	Death (8/257, 3.1%)	Survival (44/2667, 1.6%)	ICAL VI
Wang W	China	Retrospective study	146	61.2	44 (33-50)	Severe (2/24, 8.3%)	Non-severe (1/122, 0.8%)	ROI
Yan B	China	Retrospective study	110	53.7	59.5 (14-86)	Critical (1/41, 2.4%)	Moderate (0/69, 0%)	OGV
Zheng B	China	Retrospective study	198	40.4	49.5	Severe (1/36, 2.8%)	Mild (0/162, 0%)	
Lu Y	China	Retrospective study	77	65	59 (54-63)	Non-survivor (1/ 40, 2.5%)	Survivor (0/37, 0%)	
Oh TK	Korea	Cohort study	7780	NR	NR	Mortality (OR = 1.65, 95% CI: 0.48 to 5.64)	.48 to 5.64)	
Bepouka Bl	Congo	Retrospective study	141	67.4	49.6 ± 16.5	Non-survivor (0/ 41, 0%)	Survivor (1/100, 1%)	
Yitao Z	China	Retrospective study	257	54	46±17	Deterioration (0/ 49, 0%)	Non-deterioration (3/ 208, 1.4%)	
Li G	Multi-country	NR	399	54	66 (58-74)	Non-survivor (3/ 157, 1.9%)	Survivor (3/242, 1.2%)	
Mollalo A	USA	NR	NR	NR	NR	Mortality (OR = 0.094, 95% CI: 0.012-0.761)	0.012-0.761)	
						Mortality (OR = 0.142, 95% CI: 0.026-0.784)	0.026-0.784)	
Zhang W	China	Retrospective study	500	53.6	40.6	Critical (1/300, 0.3%)	General (2/200, 1%)	
Abraha HE	Ethiopia	Retrospective study	2617	63.3	29 (24-38)	Severe (0/114, 0%)	Non-severe (8/ 2503, 0.3%)	
Meng M	China	Retrospective study	413	58.8	62.6 ± 13.5	Non-survivor (5/ 218, 2.29%)	Survivor (3/195, 1.54%)	
Note: The value of age ('years) was presented as	Note: The value of age (years) was presented as mean ± 5D or median with interquartile range (IQR)	erquartile range (IQR).					

Note: The value of age (years) was presented as mean ± SD or median with interquartile range (IQR). Abbreviations: Cl, confidence interval; ICU, intensive care unit; NR, not clearly reported; OR, odds ratio; TB, tuberculosis; USA, United States of America.

(A)			(C)		
Study	Odds Ratio	OR 95%-CI Weight		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Mollalo A Dai M		0.12 [0.03; 0.45] 4.0% 0.24 [0.01; 5.27] 1.0%		7, Random, 95% Cl 1.82 [1.40; 2.37]	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Miciel EL	<	- 0.30 [0.01; 8.22] 0.9%	Omitting Dai M	1.59 [1.15; 2.20]	<u> </u>
Song J		0.32 [0.07; 1.44] 3.3% 0.33 [0.03; 3.65] 1.6%		1.58 [1.14; 2.20] 1.66 [1.21; 2.28]	
Zhang W Yu HH	— ■	0.36 [0.08; 1.59] 3.4%	Omitting Zhang W	1.60 [1.16; 2.22]	— <u>€</u>
Yang C Du RH		0.36 [0.02; 7.11] 1.1% - 0.41 [0.02; 7.88] 1.1%		1.65 [1.20; 2.28] 1.59 [1.14; 2.20]	
Yitao Z	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- 0.41 [0.02; 7.88] 1.1% → 0.59 [0.03; 11.64] 1.1%	Omitting Du RH	1.58 [1.14; 2.20]	
Zeng JH	<	→ 0.62 [0.03; 11.84] 1.1%		1.58 [1.13; 2.19] 1.57 [1.13; 2.19]	
Nachega JB Bepouka Bl	<	0.80 [0.26; 2.45] 4.9% → 0.80 [0.03; 20.67] 0.9%	Omitting Nachega JB	1.62 [1.16; 2.25]	
Lee JY Li X	< <u>+</u> 	→ 0.81 [0.04; 16.66] 1.1% 0.83 [0.22; 3.12] 4.0%		1.57 [1.13; 2.18] 1.57 [1.13; 2.18]	
Pierrotti LC	· · · · ·	→ 1.23 [0.07; 21.18] 1.2%	Omitting Li X	1.60 [1.15; 2.23]	
Abraha HE Meng M	← <u></u>	→ 1.28 [0.07; 22.87] 1.1% 1.50 [0.35; 6.40] 3.5%		1.56 [1.12; 2.17] 1.56 [1.12; 2.17]	
Zhang J		1.55 [0.47; 5.09] 4.5%	Omitting Meng M	1.56 [1.11; 2.18]	
Li G Oh TK		 1.55 [0.31; 7.77] 3.0% 1.65 [0.48; 5.66] 4.3% 		1.55 [1.11; 2.18] 1.56 [1.11; 2.18]	
LiS		1.92 [0.89; 4.13] 7.0%	Omitting Oh TK	1.55 [1.11; 2.18]	
Boulle A Lu Y		1.93 [1.55; 2.40] 10.9% → 2.85 [0.11; 72.97] 0.9%		1.53 [1.08; 2.16] 1.50 [1.02; 2.20]	
Sy KTL		2.88 [1.64; 5.06] 8.5%		1.55 [1.11; 2.15]	
Tahtasakal CA Parker A		→ 2.94 [0.18; 47.68] 1.2% — 3.04 [0.93; 9.96] 4.5%		1.47 [1.04; 2.08] 1.54 [1.11; 2.15]	
Liu J		→ 3.37 [1.13; 10.01] 5.0%		1.51 [1.08; 2.11]	
Al Kuwari HM Yan B		→ 3.83 [0.49; 29.82] 2.1% → 5.15 [0.20; 130.97] 0.9%		1.50 [1.07; 2.09] 1.53 [1.10; 2.13]	
Lee SG		→ 5.30 [1.82; 15.42] 5.1%		1.54 [1.11; 2.14] 1.47 [1.06; 2.04]	
Chen T Mo P		→ 5.92 [0.23; 152.44] 0.9% → 5.98 [0.30; 118.49] 1.1%	Omitting Chen T	1.54 [1.11; 2.14]	
Zhang JJ		→ 7.30 [0.34; 155.84] 1.0%		1.54 [1.11; 2.13] 1.53 [1.11; 2.13]	
Wang W Zheng B		→ 11.00 [0.96; 126.31] 1.5% → 13.73 [0.55; 343.40] 0.9%	Omitting Wang W	1.52 [1.10; 2.10]	— <u> </u>
Ibrahim OR		→ 22.83 [1.27; 410.57] 1.1%		1.53 [1.10; 2.12] 1.52 [1.10; 2.10]	
Random effects mo		1.56 [1.13; 2.16] 100.0%	-	1.56 [1.13; 2.16]	
Heterogeneity: I ² = 38%		10			0.5 1 2
(B)			(D)		
Study	Odds Ratio	OR 95%-CI Weight			
otaaj	outo nuto	on controlgin		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Mollalo A	∉ :	0.12 [0.03; 0.45] 6.4%		Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Miciel EL	← • · · · · · · · · · ·	0.30 [0.01; 8.22] 1.4%	-	2.10 [1.76; 2.52]	
Du RH	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.41 [0.02; 7.88] 1.8%		1.99 [1.32; 3.02]	
Bepouka Bl	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	→ 0.80 [0.03; 20.67] 1.5%	Omitting Renouka Bl 1	1.99 [1.31; 3.02] 1.96 [1.29; 2.99]	
Meng M		1.50 [0.35; 6.40] 5.6%	Omitting Meng M	1.96 [1.27; 3.03]	<u>∓</u>
Li G		1.55 [0.31; 7.77] 4.8%	Omitting Li G	1.95 [1.27; 3.02]	<u>∓</u>
Oh TK		1.65 [0.48; 5.66] 7.0%	Omitting Oh TK 1	1.95 [1.25; 3.04]	<u>_</u>
Li S Doutto A		1.92 [0.89; 4.13] 11.4%		1.92 [1.21; 3.06]	
Boulle A		1.93 [1.55; 2.40] 17.7%	-	1.88 [1.09; 3.24]	<u></u>
Lu Y Sy KTL		→ 2.85 [0.11; 72.97] 1.5% 2.88 [1.64; 5.06] 13.8%	Omitting Lu Y 1	1.92 [1.26; 2.94]	
Parker A		2.88 [1.64; 5.06] 13.8% - 3.04 [0.93; 9.96] 7.3%		1.81 [1.12; 2.91]	
LiuJ		→ 3.37 [1.13; 10.01] 8.1%		1.86 [1.20; 2.89]	
Lee SG		→ 5.30 [1.82; 15.42] 8.3%	Omitting Liu J	1.84 [1.18; 2.86]	
Chen T		→ 5.92 [0.23; 152.44] 1.5%	Omitting Lee SG 1	1.78 [1.17; 2.71]	
Ibrahim OR		→ 22.83 [1.27; 410.57] 1.8%	Omitting Chen 1	1.90 [1.25; 2.90]	
		EE.00 [1.E1, 410.01] 1.07			
			-	1.86 [1.24; 2.79]	
Random effects mode		1.94 [1.28; 2.93] 100.0%	_		
Heterogeneity: / ² = 50%,	τ ² = 0.2382, p = 0.01	1.94 [1.28; 2.93] 100.0%	_	1.86 [1.24; 2.79] I .94 [1.28; 2.93]	
Heterogeneity: / ² = 50%,	$\mathbf{r}_{t}^{2} = 0.2382, p = 0.01$	1.94 [1.28; 2.93] 100.0%	_		0.5 1 2

FIGURE 1 Forest plot indicated that there was a significant association between tuberculosis and the increased risk for severity (A) and mortality (B) among patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19); Leave-one-out sensitivity analysis demonstrated that our results were stable and robust ((C) for severity and (D) for mortality). For Mollalo et al.'s study, the combined odds ratio was used

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Ying Wang, Li Shi, Wenwei Xiao, Xuan Liang, Jian Wu, Peihua Zhang, and Yang Li (All are from the Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Zhengzhou University) for their kind help in searching articles and collecting data, and valuable suggestions for data analysis. This study was supported by grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant number 81973105), Key Scientific Research Project of Henan Institution of Higher Education (grant number 21A330008) and Joint Construction Project of Henan Medical Science and Technology Research Plan (grant number LHGJ20190679). The funders have no role in the data collection, data analysis, preparation of the manuscript, and decision to submit. LEY-MEDICAL VIROLOGY

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Yadong Wang, Haiyan Yang, and Huifen Feng designed the study. Yadong Wang, Ruo Feng, Jie Xu, and Hongjie Hou searched articles and extracted the data. Jie Xu, Huifen Feng, and Haiyan Yang analyzed the data. Yadong Wang and Ruo Feng wrote and reviewed the manuscript. All the authors approved the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interests.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data relevant to this study are included in this article.

Yadong Wang¹ Ruo Feng² Jie Xu³ Hongjie Hou³ Huifen Feng⁴ Haiyan Yang³

¹Department of Toxicology,

Henan Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Zhengzhou, China ²Department of Histology and Embryology, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China ³Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China ⁴Department of Infectious Diseases, The Fifth Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China

Correspondence

Huifen Feng, Department of Infectious Diseases, The Fifth Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University, No. 3 of Kangfuqian St, Erqi District, 450052 Zhengzhou, China. Email: huifen.feng@163.com

Yadong Wang and Ruo Feng contributed equally to this study.

ORCID

Yadong Wang b http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3919-1759 Hongjie Hou b http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4793-8974 Haiyan Yang b http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1797-304X

REFERENCES

- Gao Y, Liu M, Chen Y, Sahi S, Geng J, Tian J. Association between tuberculosis and COVID-19 severity and mortality: a rapid systematic review and meta-analysis. J Med Virol. 2021;93(1): 194-196.
- 2. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151(4):264-269.
- DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. Contemp Clin Trials. 2015;45(Pt A):139-145.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ. 2003;327(7414):557-560.
- Yang H, Xu J, Shi L, Duan G, Wang Y. Correspondence on 'Prevalence and clinical outcomes of COVID-19 in patients with autoimmune diseases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2021. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-219821
- Balduzzi S, Rucker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health.* 2019;22(4): 153-160.
- Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in metaanalysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109): 629-634.
- Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics*. 1994;50(4): 1088-1101.
- Kang X, Dong L, Yang T, Wang Z, Huang G, Chen X. Clinical and radiographic outcomes of upper thoracic versus lower thoracic upper instrumented vertebrae for adult scoliosis: a meta-analysis. *Brazilian J Med Biol Res [Revista Brasileira De Pesquisas Medicas E Biologicas].* 2018;51(4):e6651.
- Li J, Huang DQ, Zou B, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical characteristics, risk factors, and outcomes. J Med Virol. 2021;93(3):1449-1458.
- Xu J, Xiao W, Liang X, et al. The association of cerebrovascular disease with adverse outcomes in COVID-19 patients: a metaanalysis based on adjusted effect estimates. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Diseases. 2020;29(11):105283.
- Liang X, Shi L, Wang Y, et al. The association of hypertension with the severity and mortality of COVID-19 patients: evidence based on adjusted effect estimates. J Infect. 2020;81(3):e44-e47.