JKMS

Original Article Otorhinolaryngology

Check for updates

Regional and Chronological Variation of Chemosensory Dysfunction in COVID-19: a Meta-Analysis

Jeong-Whun Kim ^(b),¹ Seung Cheol Han ^(b),¹ Hyung Dong Jo ^(b),¹ Sung-Woo Cho ^(b),¹ and Jin Youp Kim ^(b),^{1,2}

¹Department of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seongnam, Korea ²Interdisciplinary Program of Medical Informatics, Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

OPEN ACCESS

Received: Dec 3, 2020 Accepted: Jan 11, 2021

Address for Correspondence: Jin Youp Kim, MD

Department of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, Seoul National University College of Medicine,82 Gumi-ro, 173-beon-gil, Bundang-gu, Seongnam 13620, Republic of Korea.

E-mail: kjyoup0622@gmail.com

© 2021 The Korean Academy of Medical Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ORCID iDs

Jeong-Whun Kim D https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4858-3316 Seung Cheol Han D https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1981-9334 Hyung Dong Jo D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1294-6018 Sung-Woo Cho D https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0827-4471 Jin Youp Kim D https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2687-6919

Disclosure

The authors have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

ABSTRACT

Background: Olfactory and gustatory dysfunction are frequently reported in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). However, the reported prevalence of olfactory and/or gustatory dysfunction varies widely, and the reason for the inter-study differences is unclear. Hence, in this meta-analysis, we performed subgroup analyses to investigate the factors that contribute to the inter-study variability in the prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction. Methods: Out of 943 citations, we included 55 eligible studies with 13,527 patients with COVID-19 for a meta-analysis. Calculating the data extracted from each study, the weighted summary prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction was estimated using a Freeman-Tukey transformation with models based on random-effects assumptions. A meta-analysis of variance compared the prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction according to regional, chronological, demographic, and methodologic factors, respectively. Results: The overall pooled prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were 51.4% and 47.5%, respectively, in the random-effect model. In subgroup analyses, the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were significantly different among four geographical regions (both P < 0.001, respectively). Although the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction did not significantly differ according to the time of enrollment, the subgroup analyses including only studies from the same geographical region (Europe) revealed a significant difference in olfactory dysfunction according to the time of enrollment. **Conclusion:** The regional and chronological differences in the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunctions partly explain the wide inter-study variability.

Keywords: Coronavirus; Smell; Taste; Meta-Analysis; Geographic Location

INTRODUCTION

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has spread rapidly worldwide since it was first identified in Wuhan, China in 2019. Although most COVID-19 patients have mild clinical manifestations, about 5% progress to critical status with respiratory failure and/or multi-organ failure.¹ A previous study suggested that the sinonasal tract may play a significant role in the infection, transmission, and pathogenesis of the SARS-CoV-2.² In addition, nasal swabs

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Kim JW, Kim JY. Data curation: Han SC, Jo HD, Kim JY. Formal analysis: Kim JY. Investigation: Han SC, Jo HD, Kim JY. Methodology: Kim JW, Kim JY. Project administration: Kim JW, Kim JY. Resources: Han SC, Jo HD, Kim JY. Software: Kim JY. Supervision: Kim JW, Cho SW. Validation: Kim JW. Visualization: Kim JY. Writing - original draft: Kim JY. Writing - review & editing: Kim JW, Cho SW, Kim JY. from symptomatic patients with COVID-19 had higher viral loads than throat swabs.³ As the olfactory sensory neurons directly contact the environment in the nasal cavity, these neurons may be vulnerable to the exposure of the high viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in the nasal cavity.

Olfactory and gustatory dysfunction are frequently reported in patients with COVID-19 and are noted as significant symptoms in COVID-19. The prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in previous studies varies from 5.1% to 98.3% and 5.6% to 92.7%, respectively⁴; however, the reason for the inter-study differences is unclear. In addition, a recent meta-analysis showed that the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were 52.7% and 54.9% in COVID-19 patients, respectively; however, a significant heterogeneity (I² = 98.9% for both, prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction) was detected.⁴ In contrast to Europe where the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction was found to be more than 50% in many studies, we noted that most studies conducted in Asia showed the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction to be less than 50%.⁵⁻⁹ Therefore, we hypothesized that the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction. In this meta-analysis, we performed subgroup analysis to investigate factors, such as geographical region and enrollment time, that contributed to the inter-study variability of the prevalence rate of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction.

METHODS

Search strategy

A comprehensive search of PubMed, Embase, and Scopus databases following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guideline was carried out up to July 9th, 2020.¹⁰ Two authors (S.C.H, J.Y.K) independently performed literature searches to identify candidate studies for the meta-analysis using the terms: ("olfact*" OR "smell" OR "anosmia" OR "hyposmia") AND COVID-19. Only studies published in English were selected.

Selection of studies

The two authors independently screened abstracts and titles of studies identified by the search strategy. Studies that did not satisfy eligibility criteria were discarded; then, eligibility was evaluated in the full-text format. The inclusion criteria of the present systematic review and meta-analysis were as follows: 1) the article reports on prevalence of olfactory or gustatory dysfunction in patients with COVID-19, 2) prevalence of olfactory or gustatory dysfunction are separately reported. The following types of studies were excluded: 1) multicenter studies, including different continents (e.g., Europe and Asia), 2) studies lacking full text (e.g., only abstracts).

Data extraction

Data from included studies were extracted into standardized forms and were independently confirmed by the two authors. For each article, the following information was collected: the name of the first author, year of publication, study design, country where the study was conducted, time patients were enrolled, age, sample size, number of patients with olfactory dysfunction, number of patients with gustatory dysfunction, evaluation method of olfactory dysfunction and/or gustatory function, and the characteristics of the population (general population, hospitalized population, non-hospitalized population, or healthcare workers population). The regions where the individual studies were conducted were categorized

into: East Asia, Europe, North America, Middle East, Latin America, and Africa. The evaluation method was classified into history taking, self-reported survey, validated survey, and validated instrument. The validated surveys were designated as surveys with structured questions about olfactory and/or gustatory dysfunction. The validated instrument included evaluation with psychophysical function tests such as Sniffin' Sticks, UPSIT, and taste test with four solutions (salted, sweet, sour, and bitter solutions).

Risk of bias assessment

Risk of bias was evaluated using a quality assessment checklist for prevalence studies based on nine domains: representation of the national population, representation of the target population, random selection, likelihood of nonresponse, directly collected data from the subject, case definition, validity of the instrument of measurement, similarity in mode of data collection for all subjects, and presence of numerators and denominators in the parameters of interest.¹¹ Each item was graded as 0 for low risk or 1 for high risk, and the summation of values rated to evaluate the risk of bias were 0–3, 4–6, and 7–9 for low, moderate, and high risk of bias, respectively.

Statistical analysis

Calculating the data extracted from each study, the weighted summary prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction was estimated using a Freeman-Tukey transformation with models based on random-effects assumptions.¹² Because prevalence would be influenced by the spectrum of populations and the evaluation method of olfactory or gustatory dysfunction in the individual studies, we expected a significant heterogeneity across the included studies. Therefore, we selected a random-effects model to give more conservative estimates. A meta-analysis of variance compared the prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction according to regional, chronological, demographic, and methodologic factors, respectively. Post-hoc analysis was carried out using Tukey's test for the results of analysis of variance (ANOVA). To assess heterogeneity across the included studies, the Cochran Q statistic test and the I² test were carried out. A funnel plot and Egger's test were used to evaluate potential publication bias. All analyses were conducted in R for Windows version 3.6.1 by using the "meta" and "metaphor" packages (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). A *P* value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Initially, of the 943 citations identified through the search strategy, we included 55 eligible studies for systematic review (**Fig. 1**).^{5-9,13-61}

Study characteristics

The characteristics of the included studies are summarized in **Table 1**. The total sample size of the 55 included studies was 13,527 patients with individual sample sizes ranging from 16–3,191 patients. All included studies reported the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction. All included studies were conducted in 2020, and they were performed across 19 countries. There were four regions with at least one study: East Asia (n = 7), Europe (n = 35), North America (n = 8), Middle East (n = 5). The region with the most individual studies was Europe (n = 35), including 16 studies conducted in Italy. Two multicenter studies conducted in Europe were included. Out of 55 included studies, 29 clarified when patients were enrolled. Considering



Fig. 1. Study selection diagram.

the characteristics of the population of individual studies, there were 29 studies of the general population, including both hospitalized and non-hospitalized patients, 15 studies of only hospitalized patients, eight studies of only non-hospitalized patients, and three studies of healthcare workers. Ten studies used history taking of olfactory and/or gustatory evaluation, 31 used self-reported surveys, six used validated surveys, and eight used validated instruments. Patients were diagnosed as COVID-19 by real-time polymerase chain reaction in most studies, except four^{6,23,49,51} that did not report the testing tool.

Quality assessment

Quality assessment of the individual studies is demonstrated in **Supplementary Table 1**. The mean overall score was 3.5, indicating overall low to moderate risk of procedure bias, and there were 29 and 26 studies with low and moderate risk of procedure bias, respectively. No study had a high risk of methodological bias because the prevalence of olfactory and/ or gustatory dysfunction was similarly evaluated in patients. However, the studies with hospitalized, non-hospitalized, or healthcare worker populations that did not represent the general population were commonly evaluated as studies with a moderate risk of bias. Most individual studies were cross-sectional, which contains an implicit risk of bias if the number of patients omitted was not recorded accurately.

The overall prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in COVID-19 patients

A total of 13,527 patients were identified for assessment of olfactory dysfunction in 55 studies. The prevalence of olfactory dysfunction in individual studies ranged from 5.1% to 99.0%, and the prevalence was 51.4% in the random-effects model with severe inter-study heterogeneity (95% confidence interval [CI], 43.7–59.1; I² = 98.6%; **Supplementary Fig. 1A**).

JKMS

Table 1. Summary of the included studies

Authors	Region	Country	Study design	The time of enrollment	Population	Age	Evaluating method	Sample size
Liang et al.7	East Asia	China	CS	03-16-2020 to 04- 12-2020	Hospitalized population	25.5 ^b	Self-reported survey	86
Mao et al. ⁸	East Asia	China	CS	01-16-2020 to 02-19- 2020	Hospitalized population	52.7ª	History taking	214
Chung et al. ⁵⁶	East Asia	China (Hongkong)	Retrospective case- control study	04-06-2020 to 04- 09-2020	Hospitalized population	Unknown	Validated survey	18
Kim et al. ⁵	East Asia	Korea	CS	03-12-2020 to 03-16- 2020	Non-hospitalized population	26 ^b	Self-reported survey	213
Lee et al. ⁶	East Asia	Korea	CS	03-08-2020 to 03- 31-2020	General population	44 ^a	History taking	3,191
Noh et al. ⁹	East Asia	Korea	CS	NA	Non-hospitalized population	38 ^a	History taking	199
Chua et al. ²⁰	East Asia	Singapore	CS	03-23-2020 to 04- 04-2020	General population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	31
Lechien et al. ³¹	Europe	Four European countries	CS	NA	General population	36.9ª	Validated survey	417
Lechien et al. ³²	Europe	Five European countries	CS	NA	General population	39.2ª	Self-reported survey	1,420
Iravani et al. ²⁶	Europe	France	Retrospective case series	03-01-2020 to 03- 17-2020	General population	47 ^a	Self-reported survey	114
Lechien et al. ³⁰	Europe	France	CS	NA	General population	41.7ª	Validated instrument	86
Renaud et al. ⁴³	Europe	France	CS	NA	General population	35 ^b	Self-reported survey	97
Zayet et al.54	Europe	France	Retrospective case- control study	NA	Non-hospitalized population	40 ^a	Self-reported survey	95
Zayet et al. ⁵⁵	Europe	France	Retrospective case- control study	02-26-2020 to 03- 14-2020	General population	57ª	Self-reported survey	70
Brandstetter et al. ¹⁸	Europe	Germany	CS	NA	Healthcare workers	Unknown	Self-reported survey	31
Hintschich et al.57	Europe	Germany	CS	NA	General population	Unknown	Validated instrument	41
Luers et al. ³⁶	Europe	Germany	CS	03-22-2020 to 03- 28-2020	Non-hospitalized population	38ª	Self-reported survey	72
Tsivgoulis et al. ⁴⁸	Europe	Greece	CS	03-19-2020 to 04- 08-2020	Hospitalized population	55ª	Validated instrument	22
De Maria et al.22	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	Non-hospitalized population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	92
Dell'Era et al. ²³	Europe	Italy	CS	03-10-2020 to 03- 30-2020	General population	50 ^b	Validated survey	355
Freni et al.24	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	General population	37.7 ^a	Validated survey	50
Gelardi et al. ²⁵	Europe	Italy	Retrospective case series	NA	General population	49.7ª	History taking	72
Karadaş et al. ²⁸	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	Hospitalized population	46.5ª	History taking	239
Lagi et al. ²⁹	Europe	Italy	CS	02-25-2020 to 03- 26-2020	Hospitalized population	62 ^b	History taking	68
Liguori et al. ³⁵	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	Hospitalized population	55ª	History taking	103
Meini et al.37	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	Hospitalized population	65ª	Self-reported survey	100
Mercante et al. ³⁸	Europe	Italy	CS	03-05-2020 to 03- 23-2020	General population	52.6ª	Self-reported survey	204
Paderno et al. ⁵⁹	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	General population	55ª	Self-reported survey	508
Paderno et al. ³⁹	Europe	Italy	CS	03-27-2020 to 04- 01-2020	Non-hospitalized population	45ª	Self-reported survey	151
Petrocelli et al. ⁴¹	Europe	Italy	CS	03-16-2020 to 05- 02-2020	General population	43.6ª	Validated instrument	300
Vacchiano et al.49	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	Hospitalized population	59 ^b	Self-reported survey	108
Vaira et al. ⁵⁰	Europe	Italy	CS	03-31-2020 to 04- 06-2020	General population	49.2ª	Validated instrument	72

(continued to the next page)



Table 1. ((Continued)) Summar	v of the	included	studies
10000 10 (continuou	ounnun	, 01 0110	motudou	Scaaroo

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							
Authors	Region	Country	Study design	The time of enrollment	Population	Age	Evaluating method	Sample size
Vaira et al. ⁵¹	Europe	Italy	Retrospective case series	NA	General population	48.5ª	Validated instrument	256
Vaira et al. ⁵²	Europe	Italy	CS	NA	Healthcare workers	47.2ª	Validated instrument	33
Tostmann et al.47	Europe	Netherland	Retrospective case- control study	03-10-2020 to 03- 23-2020	Healthcare workers	Unknown	Self-reported survey	79
Sierpiński et al.46	Europe	Poland	CS	NA	Non-hospitalized population	50 ^b	Self-reported survey	1,942
Abalo-Lojo et al. ¹³	Europe	spain	CS	NA	General population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	131
Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	Europe	Spain	CS	03-23-2020 to 03- 25-2020	Hospitalized population	61.6 ^a	Self-reported survey	79
Izquierdo-Domínguez et al. 27	Europe	Spain	CS	03-21-2020 to 04- 21-2020	General population	56.8ª	Validated survey	846
Speth et al. ²	Europe	Switzerland	CS	03-03-2020 to 04- 17-2020	General population	46.8ª	Self-reported survey	103
Altin et al.15	Europe	Turkey	CS	03-25-2020 to 04- 20-2020	Hospitalized population	54.2ª	History taking	81
Patel et al.40	Europe	UK	CS	03-01-2020 to 04- 01-2020	General population	45.6ª	Self-reported survey	141
Carignan et al. ¹⁹	North America	Canada	Retrospective case- control study	NA	General population	57.1 ^b	Self-reported survey	134
Lee et al. ³³	North America	Canada	CS	03-15-2020 to 04- 06-2020	General population	38 ^b	Self-reported survey	56
Aggarwal et al.14	North America	USA	CS	NA	Hospitalized population	67 ^b	History taking	16
Dawson et al. ²¹	North America	USA	CS	NA	General population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	42
Pinna et al. ⁴²	North America	USA	Retrospective case series	03-01-2020 to 04- 30-2020	Hospitalized population	59.6ª	History taking	50
Yan et al. ⁶⁰	North America	USA	CS	03-03-2020 to 03- 29-2020	General population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	59
Yan et al. ⁶¹	North America	USA	Retrospective case series	03-03-2020 to 04- 08-2020	General population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	128
Yan et al. ⁵³	North America	USA	CS	03-09-2020 to 04- 29-2020	General population	Unknown	Self-reported survey	46
Moein et al. ⁵⁸	Middle East	Iran	Retrospective case- control study	03-21-2020 to 04- 05-2020	Hospitalized population	46.6ª	Validated instrument	60
Biadsee et al.17	Middle East	Israel	CS	NA	Non-hospitalized population	36.3ª	Self-reported survey	128
Levinson et al. ³⁴	Middle East	Israel	CS	03-10-2020 to 03- 23-2020	Hospitalized population	34 ^b	Self-reported survey	42
Sakalli et al.44	Middle East	Turkey	CS	NA	General population	37.8ª	Self-reported survey	172
Sayin et al.45	Middle East	Turkey	Retrospective case- control study	NA	General population	37.8ª	Validated survey	64

CS = cross-sectional, NA = not available.

^aMean age; ^bMedian age.

Evaluation of gustatory dysfunction was identified in 46 included studies of 13,014 patients. The prevalence of gustatory dysfunction in individual studies ranged from 5.1% to 89.4%, and the random-effects model demonstrated a 47.5% prevalence with severe inter-study heterogeneity (95% CI, 39.7–55.3; I^2 = 98.6%; **Supplementary Fig. 1B**).

Subgroup analyses according to the region

The prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction of the four different regions were 25.3% and 19.4% in East Asia, 57.5% and 53.1% in Europe, 41.8% and 46.2% in North America, and 59.8% and 47.9% in the Middle East, respectively, with a significant difference among the regions (both P < 0.001; **Fig. 2A and B**). Post-hoc analysis revealed that the



Proportion 95% CI Weight

0 38 (0 28-0 49)

0.29 (0.23-0.35)

0.23 (0.17-0.29)

0.54(0.52-0.57)

0.40 (0.31-0.50)

0.35 (0.26-0.45)

0.65 (0.55-0.75)

0.44 (0.28-0.60)

0.69 (0.57-0.80)

0.23 (0.08-0.45)

0.65 (0.60-0.70)

0.70 (0.55-0.82)

0.72 (0.60-0.82)

0.07 (0.04-0.11)

0.38 (0.27-0.51)

0.47 (0.37-0.57)

0.41 (0.31-0.51)

0.55 (0.48-0.62)

0.63 (0.59-0.67)

0.89 (0.83-0.94)

0 61 (0 56-0 67)

0.61(0.51 - 0.70)

0.54 (0.42-0.66)

0.45 (0.39-0.51)

0.52 (0.34-0.69)

0.48 (0.45-0.50)

0.56 (0.48-0.65)

0.35 (0.25-0.47)

0.52 (0.49-0.56)

0.65 (0.55-0.74)

0.27 (0.18-0.38)

-

0.6 0.8

0.63 (0.55-0.71) 2.2%

0.53 (0.47-0.59) 65.5%

0.63 (0.55-0.72) 2.2%

0.71 (0.58-0.82) 2.1%

0.55 (0.46-0.64) 2.2%

0.46 (0.30-0.62) 14.7%

0.33 (0.25-0.42) 2.2%

0.36 (0.22-0.52) 2.1%

0.51 (0.43-0.59) 2.2%

0.72 (0.59-0.82) 2.1%

0.47 (0.40-0.55) 100%

0.48 (0.32-0.64)

0 46 (0 33-0 60)

0.19(0.04-0.46)

0.57 (0.41-0.72)

0.10 (0.03-0.22)

-

0.06 (0.03-0.10) 2.2%

0.11 (0.10–0.12) 2.3%

0.19 (0.10-0.30) 11.1%

0.82 (0.78-0.86) 2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.3%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.1%

2.2%

1.9%

2.2%

2 1%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.2%

2.0%

2.3%

2.2%

2.2%

2.3%

2.2%

2.2%

21%

1.9%

2.1%

2.1%

8.7%

Gustatory dysfunction

-

214

239

-

0.2

0.4

Α	0	lfacto	ry dysfunction			В	Gι	ustato
Study	Event	s Total	Prop	ortion 95% CI \	Neight	Study	Events	o Total
East Asia			.			East Asia		
Liang et al ⁷	34	86		0 40 (0 29_0 51)	1.8%	Liang et al ⁷	33	86
Mao et al. ⁸	11	214		0.05 (0.03-0.09)	1.9%	Mao et al. ⁸	12	214
Chung et al.56	12	18		0.67 (0.41-0.87)	1.6%	Kim et al.⁵	61	213
Kim et al.⁵	68	213		0.32 (0.26-0.39)	1.9%	Lee et al. ⁶	353	3,191
Lee et al. ⁶	389	3,191		0.12 (0.11–0.13)	1.9%	Noh et al. ⁹	45	199
Noh et al. ⁹	52	199		0.26 (0.20-0.33)	1.9%	Subgroup prevalence		3,903
Chua et al. ²⁰	7	31		0.23 (0.10-0.41)	1.7%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 =$	• 0.0193, <i>P</i>	< 0.010
Subgroup prevalence	0.0056	3,952	-	0.25 (0.15-0.37)	12.7%	Europe		
Heterogeneity. 1 - 90%, t -	0.0256, 1	0.010				Lechien et al. ³¹	342	417
Europe						Lechien et al. ³²	770	1,420
Lechien et al. ³¹	357	417		0.86 (0.82–0.89)	1.9%	Iravani et al. ²⁶	46	114
Lechien et al. ³²	997	1,420		0.70 (0.68–0.73)	1.9%	Renaud et al.43	34	97
Iravani et al.20	54	114		0.47 (0.38–0.57)	1.8%	Zayet et al.34	62	95
Lechien et al. ³⁰	53	86		0.62 (0.51-0.72)	1.8%	Hintschich et al."	18	41
Zavot of al 54	90	97		0.63 (0.53 0.73)	1.0%	Trivoculis et al. 48	50	22
Zayet et al ⁵⁵	37	70		0.53 (0.55–0.75)	1.8%	Dell'Fra et al. ²³	232	355
Brandstetter et al. ¹⁸	16	31		0.52 (0.33-0.70)	1.0%	Freni et al. ²⁴	35	50
Hintschich et al.57	25	41		0.61 (0.45–0.76)	1.8%	Gelardi et al. ²⁵	52	72
Luers et al. ³⁶	53	72		0.74 (0.62–0.83)	1.8%	Karadaş et al. ²⁸	16	239
Tsivgoulis et al.48	16	22		0.73 (0.50-0.89)	1.7%	Lagi et al. ²⁹	26	68
De Maria et al. 22	48	92		0.52 (0.42-0.63)	1.8%	Liguori et al. ³⁵	48	103
Dell'Era et al. ²³	237	355		0.67 (0.62-0.72)	1.9%	Meini et al.37	41	100
Freni et al. ²⁴	46	50		0.92 (0.81–0.98)	1.8%	Mercante et al. ³⁸	113	204
Gelardi et al. ²⁵	42	72	+	0.58 (0.46–0.70)	1.8%	Paderno et al.39	321	508
Karadaş et al. ²⁸	18	239		0.08 (0.05–0.12)	1.9%	Paderno et al. ⁵⁵	135	151
Lagi et al.29	17	68		0.25 (0.15–0.37)	1.8%	Vacchiano et al 49	66	108
Liguori et al.33	40	103		0.39 (0.29–0.49)	1.8%	Vaira et al ⁵⁰	39	72
Meini et al. ³⁷	29	100		0.29 (0.20-0.39)	1.8%	Vaira et al. ⁵¹	115	256
Mercante et al. ⁵⁰	202	204		0.42 (0.35-0.49)	1.9%	Vaira et al.52	17	33
Paderno et al 39	203	151		0.50 (0.51-0.60)	1.9%	Sierpiński et al.46	923	1,942
Petrocelli et al 41	120	300		0.63(0.77-0.69) 0.63(0.58-0.69)	1.9%	Abalo-Lojo et al.13	74	131
Vacchiano et al. ⁴⁹	40	108		0.37 (0.28–0.47)	1.8%	Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹	⁶ 28	79
Vaira et al. ⁵⁰	44	72		0.61 (0.49–0.72)	1.8%	Izquierdo-Domínguez et a	ıl.²7 442	846
Vaira et al.51	179	256		0.70 (0.64–0.75)	1.9%	Speth et al. ²	67	103
Vaira et al.52	17	33		0.52 (0.34-0.69)	1.7%	Altin et al. ¹⁵	22	81
Tostmann et al.47	37	79		0.47 (0.36-0.58)	1.8%	Patel et al. ⁴⁰	89	141
Sierpiński et al.46	956	1,942		0.49 (0.47-0.51)	1.9%	Subgroup prevalence	- 0 0050 5	8,220
Abalo-Lojo et al.13	77	131	+	0.59 (0.50-0.67)	1.8%	Helefogeneity. 1 - 90%, t -	· 0.0252, P	. 0.010
Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	25	79		0.32 (0.22-0.43)	1.8%	North America		
Izquierdo-Domínguez et al	.27 442	846		0.52 (0.49–0.56)	1.9%	Carignan et al. ¹⁹	85	134
Speth et al. ²	63	103		0.61 (0.51–0.71)	1.8%	Lee et al. ³³	26	56
Altin et al. ¹⁵	50	81		0.62 (0.50-0.72)	1.8%	Aggarwal et al. ¹⁴	3	16 -
Patel et al."	80	141	-	0.57 (0.48-0.65)	1.9%	Dawson et al. ²¹	24	42
Subgroup prevalence	0.0326.1	0,070		0.57 (0.51–0.04)	04.170	Pinna et al.**	5	50 -
Heterogeneity. 1 - 97%, t -	0.0336, /	- \ 0.010				Yan et al. ⁶⁰	42	129
North America						Yan et al. ⁹ Subgroup provalence	70	120
Carignan et al. ¹⁹	69	134		0.51 (0.43–0.60)	1.9%	Subgroup prevalence Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 91\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0405 0	400
Lee et al. ³³	23	56		0.41 (0.28–0.55)	1.8%	neccrogeneity. 1 5170, t	0.0403,1	0.010
Aggarwal et al. ¹⁴	3	16		0.19 (0.04–0.46)	1.6%	Middle East		
Dawson et al.21	18	42	+	0.43 (0.28-0.59)	1.8%	Biadsee et al. ¹⁷	42	128
Pinna et al. ⁴²	3	50	-	0.06(0.01-0.17)	1.0%	Levinson et al. ³⁴	15	42
Yan et al. ⁶⁰	40	128		0.66 (0.54-0.79)	1.0%	Sakalli et al.44	88	172
Yan et al. 53	23	46		0.59 (0.50-0.07)	1.8%	Sayin et al.45	46	64
Subgroup prevalence	20	531		0.42 (0.28-0.56)	14.2%	Subgroup prevalence		406
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 90\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0374.	P < 0.010		0.12 (0.20 0.00)		Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 =$	= 0.0773, P	e < 0.010
						Overall prevalence		13,014
Middle East						Heterogeneity: I ² = 90%, τ ² :	= 0.0245, F	P = 0.000
Moein et al.58	59	60	-	0.98 (0.91–1.00)	1.8%	Residual heterogeneity: I ² =	96%, P < C	0.010
Biadsee et al."	49	128		0.38 (0.30-0.47)	1.8%			
Levinson et al.34	14	42		0.33 (0.20-0.50)	1.8%			
Sakalli et al."	40	1/2		0.47 (0.39-0.55)	1.9%			
Subgroup prevalence	43	04 166		0.60 (0.35 0.92)	0.1%			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\% \tau^2 =$	0.0773	+00 0.010		0.00 (0.00-0.02)	3.1/0			
	, 1	0.010						
Overall prevalence		13,527	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.51 (0.44–0.59)	100%			
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0794,	P = 0.000	0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8					

Residual heterogeneity: I² = 96%, P < 0.010

Fig. 2. Subgroup analysis on region. (A) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction of four regions (East Asia, Europe, North America, and Middle East) showed 25.3%, 57.5%, 41.8%, and 59.8% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). (B) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction of four regions (East Asia, Europe, North America, and Middle East) showed 19.4%, 53.1%, 46.2%, and 47.9% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). The diamonds represent pooled prevalence rates with 95% CI, and the estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines. CI = confidence interval.

JKMS



Fig. 3. World map of the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in coronavirus disease 2019 patients. The colored regions indicate the geographically classified regions in this study (aqua blue: East Asia, yellow: Europe, red: North America, navy: Middle East). The prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction, number of included studies and patients, and number of studies according to the evaluation method are presented for each region.

prevalence of olfactory dysfunction in East Asia was significantly lower than that in Europe or the Middle East (P = 0.001 and P = 0.021, respectively), and prevalence of gustatory dysfunction in East Asia was significantly lower than that in Europe or North America (P = 0.001 and P = 0.048, respectively). Considering the possibility that olfactory or gustatory dysfunction was not accurately recorded when the history taking was used as the evaluation method, an ANOVA was performed without the studies conducted with history taking as the evaluation method, and the results also showed a significant difference among the regions (P = 0.005 and P < 0.001, respectively; **Supplementary Fig. 2A and B**). The regional prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction are shown in **Fig. 3**.

Subgroup analyses according to the time of enrollment

The time of enrollment was clarified in 29 out of 55 studies. The time of enrollment in the included studies ranged from January 16, 2020 to May 2, 2020. The beginning date of the time of enrollment in the included studies ranged from January 16, 2020 to April 6, 2020, and the end date ranged from February 9, 2020 to May 2, 2020. After calculating the median date (mid-date) between the beginning and end date of the time of enrollment, the individual studies were categorized into three groups: 1st period (mid-date February 2, 2020 to March 17, 2020), 2nd period (mid-date March 20, 2020 to March 29, 2020), and 3rd period (mid-date March 30, 2020 to April 9, 2020). The numbers of included studies of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in each period were n = 10 and n = 8 for the 1st period, n = 11 and n = 9 for the 2nd period, and n = 8 and n = 6 for the 3rd period, respectively. The prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction for the three periods were 39.5% and 40.9% for the 1st period, 57.7% and 51.2% for the 2nd period, and 49.0 and 40.5% for the 3rd period, respectively; however, no significant difference was found with regard to the time of enrollment (P =0.391 and P = 0.778; Fig. 4A and B). As the region can be a potential confounding factor, we performed ANOVA for the studies conducted in Europe (n = 16). The ANOVA of the studies from Europe demonstrated that there were significant differences in the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction among the three periods (P = 0.013; Fig. 4C); however, there was no



A Olfactory dysfunction						B Gustatory dysfunction						
Study	Event	s Total		Proportion 95% CI V	Veight	Study	Events	s Total		Pro	portion 95% C	I Weight
1st period			1			1st period						
Mao et al. ⁸	11	214		0.05 (0.03-0.09)	3.5%	Mao et al. ⁸	12	214			0.06 (0.03-0.4	10) 4.4%
Kim et al.⁵	68	213	-	0.32 (0.26-0.39)	3.5%	Kim et al.⁵	61	213			0.29 (0.23-0.3	35) 4.4%
Iravani et al. ²⁶	54	114	- i-	0.47 (0.38–0.57)	3.5%	Iravani et al. ²⁶	46	114		_	0.40 (0.31–0.5	50) 4.4%
Zayet et al.55	37	70		- 0.53 (0.41–0.65)	3.4%	Lagi et al. ²⁹	26	68		_	0.38 (0.27-0.5	51) 4.3%
Lagi et al. ²⁹	17	68		0.25 (0.15-0.37)	3.4%	Mercante et al. ³⁸	113	204			0.55 (0.48-0.6	32) 4.4%
Mercante et al. ³⁸	85	204		0.42 (0.35-0.49)	3.5%	Patel et al.40	89	141			0.63 (0.55-0.7	, 4.4%
Tostmann et al.47	37	79	— <u>ii</u> —	0.47 (0.36-0.58)	3.5%	Yan et al. ⁶⁰	42	59			0.71 (0.58–0.8	32) 4.3%
Patel et al.40	80	141	÷	- 0.57 (0.48–0.65)	3.5%	Levinson et al. ³⁴	15	42		_	0.36 (0.22-0.5	52) 4.2%
Yan et al. ⁶⁰	40	59	—	0.68 (0.54–0.79)	3.4%	Subgroup prevalence		1,055			0.41 (0.24-0.5	59) 34.8%
Levinson et al. ³⁴	14	42		0.33 (0.20-0.50)	3.4%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.0674, F	P < 0.010				
Subgroup prevalence		1,204		0.40 (0.26-0.54)	34.7%							
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 96\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0499,	P < 0.010				2nd period						
						Lee et al. ⁶	353	3,191			0.11 (0.10–0.1	12) 4.5%
2nd period						Luers et al. ³⁶	50	72			0.69 (0.57–0.8	30) 4.3%
Lee et al. ⁶	389	3,191		0.12 (0.11–0.13)	3.6%	Tsivgoulis et al.48	5	22 –			0.23 (0.08–0.4	45) 4.0%
Chua et al. ²⁰	7	31	-	0.23 (0.10-0.41)	3.3%	Dell'Era et al. ²³	232	355		-	0.65 (0.60–0.7	70) 4.4%
Luers et al. ³⁶	53	72		- 0.74 (0.62–0.83)	3.4%	Paderno et al. ³⁹	135	151		-	⊩ 0.89 (0.83–0.9	€4) 4.4%
Tsivgoulis et al.48	16	22		- 0.73 (0.50-0.89)	3.2%	Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	28	79		-	0.35 (0.25–0.4	47) 4.3%
Dell'Era et al. ²³	237	355		0.67 (0.62–0.72)	3.6%	Speth et al. ²	67	103			0.65 (0.55–0.7	74) 4.4%
Paderno et al. ³⁹	126	151		- 0.83 (0.77–0.89)	3.5%	Lee et al. ³³	26	56		-	0.46 (0.33–0.6	30) 4.3%
Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	⁶ 25	79		0.32 (0.22-0.43)	3.5%	Yan et al.61	70	128			0.55 (0.46–0.6	34) 4.4%
Speth et al. ²	63	103	-	- 0.61 (0.51-0.71)	3.5%	Subgroup prevalence		4,157			0.51 (0.25–0.7	77) 39.0%
Lee et al. ³³	23	56		0.41 (0.28–0.55)	3.4%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.1709, F	o < 0.010				
Yan et al.61	75	128	-	- 0.59 (0.50–0.67)	3.5%	and pariod						
Moein et al.58	59	60		- 0.98 (0.91-1.00)	3.4%	Liang at al 7	22	00	_		0.20 (0.20 0.0	40) 4.20/
Subgroup prevalence		4,248		0.58 (0.33–0.81)	37.9%	Liang et al.	33	200			0.36 (0.26-0.4	19) 4.3% 27) 4.40/
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.1734, F	° < 0.010				Veire et el 50	104	300			0.61 (0.56-0.6)) 4.4% () 4.20/
2nd maniad						Valla et al.	7 442	8/6	1		0.54 (0.42-0.0	50) 4.5% 56) 4.5%
Jiang at al 7	24	00	_	0.40.(0.20, 0.54)	2 50/	Altip et al 15	22	Q1	_		0.32 (0.49-0.0	20) 4.3%
Liang et al.	34	00		0.40 (0.29–0.51)	3.5%	Allin et al. ⁴⁹	22	50 =			0.27 (0.18-0.3	20) 4.370 22) 4.20/
Chung et al.	12	18			3.1%	Subgroup provolonce	5	1 4 2 5			0.10 (0.03-0.2	(2) 4.3%
Petrocelli et al."	190	300	1		3.5%	Hotorogonoity: $I^2 = 0.40\%$, $\sigma^2 = 0.00\%$	0000 1	1,400			0.41 (0.26–0.3	JJ) 20.270
Vaira et al.	44	12		- 0.61 (0.49-0.72)	3.4%	Heterogeneity. 1 – 94%, t – 0	.0222, r	.0.010				
Izquierdo-Dominguez et a	L ^{2'} 442	040		0.52 (0.49-0.56)	3.0%	Overall prevalence		6,647			0.45 (0.32-0.5	58) 100%
Altin et al. ¹⁰	50	50		- 0.62 (0.50-0.72)	3.5%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.0960,	P = 0.000	02 04	0.6 0.8		,
Pinna et al.	3	50 -		0.06 (0.01–0.17)	3.4%	Residual heterogeneity: I ² = 99	1%, P < (0.010	0.2 0.4	0.0 0.0		
Yan et al. ³⁵	23	40		- 0.50 (0.35-0.65)	3.4%	6 9						
Subgroup prevalence Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 92\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0210, <i>I</i>	1,499 < 0.010		0.49 (0.36–0.60)	27.4%							
Overall prevalence Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0931, <i>I</i>	6,951 P = 0.000	0.2 0.4 0.6	0.49 (0.38–0.60)	100%							

Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, P < 0.010

Fig. 4. Subgroup analysis on the time of enrollment. The time of enrollment was clarified in 29 out of 55 studies. After calculating the median date (mid-date) between beginning and end date of the time of enrollment, the individual studies were categorized into three groups: 1st period (mid-date February 2, 2020 to March 17, 2020), 2nd period (mid-date March 20, 2020 to March 29, 2020), and 3rd period (mid-date March 30, 2020 to April 9, 2020). (A) Forest plot metaanalysis of the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction of the three periods showed 39.5%, 57.7%, and 49.0% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the randomeffect model, respectively (P = 0.391 for subgroup difference). (B) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction of the three periods showed 40.9%, 51.2%, and 40.5% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.778 for subgroup difference). (C) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction only including studies conducted in Europe for the three periods showed 45.2%, 65.4%, and 59.0% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.013 for subgroup difference). (D) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction of the three periods showed 49.8%, 60.2%, and 49.3% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.538 for subgroup difference). The diamonds represent pooled prevalence rates with 95% CI, and the estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines. CI = confidence interval.

(continued to the next page)

significant difference in the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction (Fig. 4D). Post-hoc analysis revealed that the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction in the 2nd period was significantly higher than that in the 1st period (P = 0.046). Furthermore, the chronological difference among the studies from Europe was significant even when studies in which history taking was used as an evaluation method were omitted (P = 0.038, Supplementary Fig. 3). The chronological prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction are shown in Fig. 5.

Subgroup analyses according to evaluation method

The prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction according to the four different evaluation methods were 23.4% and 23.5% for history taking, 52.1% and 53.2% for selfreported surveys, 72.9 and 68.5% for validated surveys, and 69.2 and 48.4% for the validated



C Olfactory dysfunction					D Gustatory dysfunction							
Study	Events	s Total	Pro	portion 95% CI W	eight	Study	Events	Total		Pro	portion 95% CI	Weight
1st period						1st period						
Iravani et al. ²⁶	54	114		0.47 (0.38-0.57)	6.4%	Iravani et al. ²⁶	46	114			0.40 (0.31-0.50) 7.3%
Zayet et al.55	37	70		0.53 (0.41–0.65)	6.0%	Lagi et al. ²⁹	26	68			0.38 (0.27-0.51	,) 6.8%
Lagi et al. ²⁹	17	68		0.25 (0.15–0.37)	5.9%	Mercante et al. ³⁸	113	204	-	-	0.55 (0.48-0.62	2) 7.6%
Mercante et al. ³⁸	85	204		0.42 (0.35-0.49)	6.7%	Patel et al.40	89	141		-	0.63 (0.55-0.71) 7.4%
Tostmann et al.47	37	79	- -	0.47 (0.36-0.58)	6.1%	Subgroup prevalence		527	-	-	0.50 (0.39-0.61) 29.1%
Patel et al.40	80	141	-ij-	0.57 (0.48-0.65)	6.5%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 84\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.0108, P	< 0.010				
Subgroup prevalence		676	-	0.45 (0.37-0.53) 3	7.6%							
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 78\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0080, <i>I</i>	P < 0.010				2nd period						
						Luers et al. ³⁶	50	72		_	0.69 (0.57–0.80) 6.9%
2nd period						Tsivgoulis et al. ⁴⁸	5	22			0.23 (0.08–0.45	o) 5.2%
Luers et al. ³⁶	53	72		0.74 (0.62–0.83)	6.0%	Dell'Era et al. ²³	232	355		-	0.65 (0.60–0.70	J) 7.8%
Tsivgoulis et al.48	16	22		0.73 (0.50–0.89)	4.3%	Paderno et al. ³⁹	135	151		-	0.89 (0.83–0.94) 7.4%
Dell'Era et al. ²³	237	355		0.67 (0.62–0.72)	7.0%	Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	28	79			0.35 (0.25–0.47	') 7.0%
Paderno et al. ³⁹	126	151	-	0.83 (0.77–0.89)	6.6%	Speth et al. ²	67	103	ł		0.65 (0.55–0.74) 7.2%
Beltrán-Corbellini et al.16	25	79		0.32 (0.22–0.43)	6.1%	Subgroup prevalence		782			0.60 (0.43–0.76	i) 41.4%
Speth et al. ²	63	103		0.61 (0.51–0.71)	6.3%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.0409, F	e < 0.010				
Subgroup prevalence		782		0.65 (0.51-0.78) 3	6.2%	Qual as a size of						
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 92\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0270, F	o.010				3rd period	404			_		
Qued as entire d						Petrocelli et al.*	184	300	<u>i</u>		0.61 (0.56-0.67) 7.7%
3rd period	100			/	/	Vaira et al. ³⁰	39	72		-	0.54 (0.42-0.66	() 6.9%
Petrocelli et al.4	190	300		0.63 (0.58–0.69)	6.9%	Izquierdo-Dominguez et al.	442	846	7		0.52 (0.49–0.56) 7.9%
Vaira et al. ³⁰	44	72		0.61 (0.49–0.72)	6.0%	Altin et al. ¹³	22	81			0.27 (0.18–0.38	3) 7.0%
Izquierdo-Dominguez et al	.2/ 442	846		0.52 (0.49–0.56)	7.1%	Subgroup prevalence		1299	-	*	0.49 (0.38–0.60) 29.5%
Altin et al. ¹⁵	50	81		0.62 (0.50–0.72)	6.1%	Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 90\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.0106, P	< 0.010				
Subgroup prevalence		1,299	*	0.59 (0.52–0.66) 2	6.1%	Overall prevalence		2 608			0 54 (0 46-0 67	2) 100%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 77\%$, $\tau^2 =$	0.0038, F	P < 0.010				Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 92\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$	0907 P	2,000			0.54 (0.40-0.02	.) 100 %
Overall prevalence		2 757		0 56 (0 49-0 63) 4	100%	Residual heterogeneity: 1 ² – 02	0/207, P	010	0.2 0.4 (J.6 0.8		
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 910/2$ $\tau^2 - 1$	0 0162 P	< 0.010		0.00 (0.49-0.03)	100 /0	nesidual neterogeneity. 1 - 33	/0, / × U	.010				
1100010geneity. 1 - 31%, t -	0.0102, P	. 0.010	0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8									

Residual heterogeneity: I² = 87%, *P* < 0.010

Fig. 4. (Continued) Subgroup analysis on the time of enrollment. The time of enrollment was clarified in 29 out of 55 studies. After calculating the median date (mid-date) between beginning and end date of the time of enrollment, the individual studies were categorized into three groups: 1st period (mid-date February 2, 2020 to March 17, 2020), 2nd period (mid-date March 20, 2020 to March 29, 2020), and 3rd period (mid-date March 30, 2020 to April 9, 2020). (**A**) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction of the three periods showed 39.5%, 57.7%, and 49.0% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.391 for subgroup difference). (**B**) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction of the three periods showed 40.9%, 51.2%, and 40.5% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.778 for subgroup difference). (**C**) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction only including studies conducted in Europe for the three periods showed 45.2%, 65.4%, and 59.0% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.538 for subgroup difference). The diamonds represent pooled prevalence rates with 95% CI, and the estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines. CI = confidence interval.



Fig. 5. The pooled prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction was presented chronologically. The overall and European pooled prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction are shown, discriminated by color. The prevalence rates of both olfactory and gustatory tended to increase from the 1st to 2nd period but decreased from the 2nd to 3rd period.

instruments, respectively, and there was a significant difference among the regions (both P < 0.001, respectively; **Fig. 6A and B**). In a post-hoc analysis, the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction evaluated by history taking was lower than that evaluated by other methods (all P < 0.001, respectively), and the prevalence evaluated by the self-reported survey was lower than that evaluated by validated survey (P = 0.033). In addition, the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction by history taking was lower than that evaluated by the self-reported survey, validated survey, and validated instruments (P < 0.001, P < 0.001, and P = 0.004, respectively).

Subgroup analyses according to the characteristics of the population

The prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction according to the four population groups were 58.7% and 56.2% in the general population, 36.7% and 28.3% in hospitalized patients, 52.3% and 51.1% in non-hospitalized patients, and 48.9% and 51.5% in health care workers, respectively (**Fig. 7A and B**). Interestingly, a significant difference was found in the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction depending on the characteristics of the population (P = 0.013) but not in that of olfactory dysfunction (P = 0.173). Post-hoc analysis showed that the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction of the hospitalized patients was significantly lower than that of the general population (P = 0.030).

Assessment of publication bias

The funnel plot demonstrated potential publication bias in the analysis (**Supplementary Fig. 4A and B**). In Egger's test, there was a potential publication bias for the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction (P = 0.031, P = 0.028). However, asymmetry in the funnel plots may be attributed to the various factors that elicited different prevalence rates, such as region, time of enrollment, and evaluation method, rather than publication bias.

DISCUSSION

Olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were not recognized as typical symptoms of COVID-19 in the early phase of virus' spread. However, as olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were frequently found in patients with COVID-19, these symptoms became significant. Furthermore, as a previous study reported, 17% of COVID-19 patients with anosmia were otherwise asymptomatic, meaning that isolated olfactory or gustatory dysfunction could be used as potential early indicators of SARS-CoV-2 infection during the COVID-19 pandemic.⁶² Possible mechanisms of olfactory dysfunctions in COVID-19 patients are conductive anosmia, disruption of olfactory epithelium following local infection, and retrograde propagation to higher-order neurons in the olfactory pathway.⁶³ However, there is limited evidence to conclusively determine the mechanism of olfactory dysfunction in COVID-19.63 Considering gustatory dysfunction in COVID-19, it is unclear whether gustatory dysfunction is a distinct clinical feature of SARS-CoV-2 or occurs secondary to olfactory dysfunction. Although olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were noted frequently in COVID-19, the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were variable among previous studies. In this metaanalysis, subgroup analysis was performed to explain the variability of the prevalence rate of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction among patients with COVID-19.

In this meta-analysis, the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in COVID-19 patients were 51.4% and 47.5%, with severe inter-study heterogeneity (both I^2 = 98.6%, respectively), respectively. We performed subgroup analysis based on region, time of enrollment, demographics, and the evaluation method to explain the inter-study heterogeneity.



Proportion 95% CI Weight

Α	0	lfacto	ory dysfunction		В
Study	Events	s Total		Proportion 95% CI Weight	Study
History taking					History taking
Mao et al. ⁸	11	214	•	0.05 (0.03-0.09) 1.9%	Mao et al. ⁸
Lee et al. ⁶	389	3,191		0.12 (0.11–0.13) 1.9%	Lee et al. ⁶
Noh et al. ⁹	52	199		0.26 (0.20–0.33) 1.9%	Noh et al. ⁹
Gelardi et al. ²⁵	42	72		0.58 (0.46–0.70) 1.8%	Gelardi et al.25
Karadaş et al.~	18	239		0.08 (0.05–0.12) 1.9%	Karadaş et al.20
Lagret at	17	103		0.25 (0.15-0.37) 1.8%	Lagrer at al 35
Altin et al ¹⁵	50	81		0.62 (0.50-0.72) 1.8%	Altin et al. ¹⁵
Aggarwal et al. ¹⁴	3	16		0.19 (0.04–0.46) 1.6%	Aggarwal et al.14
Pinna et al.42	3	50	- i i	0.06 (0.01-0.17) 1.8%	Pinna et al.42
Subgroup prevalence Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$	D.0346, <i>I</i>	4,233 < 0.010	-	0.23 (0.14–0.35) 18.2%	Subgroup prevalence Heterogeneity: I ² = 97%
Self-reported survey					Self-reported surve
Liang et al. ⁷	34	86		0.40 (0.29-0.51) 1.8%	Liang et al. ⁷
Kim et al.⁵	68	213		0.32 (0.26-0.39) 1.9%	Kim et al.⁵
Chua et al.20	7	31		0.23 (0.10–0.41) 1.7%	Lechien et al. ³²
Lechien et al. ³²	997	1,420		0.70 (0.68–0.73) 1.9%	Iravani et al. ²⁶
Iravani et al. ²⁶	54	114		0.47 (0.38–0.57) 1.8%	Renaud et al.43
Renaud et al.43	96	97	_	0.99 (0.94–1.00) 1.8%	Zayet et al.54
Zayet et al.54	60	95		0.63 (0.53–0.73) 1.8%	Luers et al.30
Zayet et al. ³³	37	70		0.53 (0.41–0.65) 1.8%	Meini et al. ³⁷
Brandstetter et al."	16	31		0.52 (0.33–0.70) 1.7%	Mercante et al. ³⁰
Luers et al. ³⁰	53	72		- 0.74 (0.62-0.83) 1.8%	Paderno et al.39
De Maria et al	48	100		0.32 (0.42-0.63) 1.8%	Vacchiano et al 49
Mercapto et al 38	29	204		0.29 (0.20-0.39) 1.8%	Sierniński et al ⁴⁶
Paderno et al 59	283	508		0.56 (0.51-0.60) 1.9%	Abalo-Loio et al. ¹³
Paderno et al 39	126	151		- 0.83 (0.77-0.89) 1.9%	Beltrán-Corbellini et
Vacchiano et al. 49	40	108		0.37 (0.28–0.47) 1.8%	Speth et al. ²
Tostmann et al. 47	37	79		0.47 (0.36–0.58) 1.8%	Patel et al.40
Sierpiński et al.46	956	1.942		0.49 (0.47–0.51) 1.9%	Carignan et al. ¹⁹
Abalo-Loio et al. ¹³	77	131		0.59 (0.50–0.67) 1.8%	Lee et al. ³³
Beltrán-Corbellini et al.16	25	79		0.32 (0.22-0.43) 1.8%	Dawson et al. ²¹
Speth et al. ²	63	103		0.61 (0.51-0.71) 1.8%	Yan et al.60
Patel et al.40	80	141	÷	0.57 (0.48–0.65) 1.9%	Yan et al.61
Carignan et al. ¹⁹	69	134		0.51 (0.43–0.60) 1.9%	Biadsee et al. ¹⁷
Lee et al. ³³	23	56		0.41 (0.28–0.55) 1.8%	Levinson et al. ³⁴
Dawson et al. ²¹	18	42		0.43 (0.28–0.59) 1.8%	Sakalli et al.44
Yan et al.60	40	59		- 0.68 (0.54-0.79) 1.8%	Subgroup prevalence
Yan et al.	75	128	+ -	0.59 (0.50–0.67) 1.8%	Heterogeneity: 1 ² = 92%
Yan et al.33	23	46		0.50 (0.35-0.65) 1.8%	Validated survey
Bladsee et al."	49	128		0.33 (0.30-0.47) 1.8%	Lechien et al. ³¹
Sakalli ot al 44	81	42		0.47 (0.39-0.55) 1.8%	Dell'Era et al. ²³
Subgroup prevalence	01	6 674		0.52 (0.46-0.58) 56 7%	Freni et al. ²⁴
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$ $\tau^2 = 0$	1 0938 4	2 < 0.010		0.52 (0.40-0.50) 50.776	Izquierdo-Domínguez
Validated survey		. 0.010			Sayin et al. ⁴⁵
Chung et al 56	12	18		- 0.67 (0.41-0.87) 1.6%	Heterogeneity: I ² = 97%
Lechien et al.31	357	417		0.86 (0.82–0.89) 1.9%	
Dell'Era et al. ²³	237	355		0.67 (0.62–0.72) 1.9%	Validated instrume
Freni et al. ²⁴	46	50		- 0.92 (0.81-0.98) 1.8%	Hintschich et al.57
Izquierdo-Domínguez et al.	27 442	846	÷	0.52 (0.49-0.56) 1.9%	Tsivgoulis et al.48
Sayin et al.45	43	64		- 0.67 (0.54-0.78) 1.8%	Petrocelli et al.41
Subgroup prevalence		1,750	-	0.73 (0.57–0.86) 10.9%	Vaira et al.50
Heterogeneity: I 2 = 97%, τ^2 = 0	0.0370, <i>I</i>	o.010			Vaira et al. ⁵¹
Validated instrument					Vaira et al. ³² Subgroup prevalence
Lechien et al. ³⁰	53	86		0.62 (0.51-0.72) 1.8%	Heterogeneity: I ² = 80%
Hintschich et al.57	25	41		0.61 (0.45-0.76) 1.8%	
Tsivgoulis et al.48	16	22		- 0.73 (0.50-0.89) 1.7%	Overall prevalence
Petrocelli et al.41	190	300		0.63 (0.58-0.69) 1.9%	Heterogeneity: I ² = 99%
Vaira et al.50	44	72	÷	0.61 (0.49-0.72) 1.8%	Residual heterogeneity:
Vaira et al.51	179	256		0.70 (0.64–0.75) 1.9%	
Vaira et al.52	17	33		0.52 (0.34-0.69) 1.7%	
Moein et al.58	59	60		- 0.98 (0.91-1.00) 1.8%	
Subgroup prevalence		870	-	0.69 (0.59–0.79) 14.3%	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 88\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$	0.0196, <i>F</i>	P < 0.010			
Overall prevalence		13.527	_	0.51 (0.44-0.59) 100%	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 9.9\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0\%$	0.0794.	P = 0.00	0 0 2 0 4 0 6		

12 214 0.06 (0.03-0.10) 2.2% 353 3,191 0.11 (0.10-0.12) 2.3% 0.23 (0.17-0.29) 45 199 2.2% 52 0.72 (0.60-0.82) 72 2.2% 16 239 0.07 (0.04-0.11) 2.2% 26 68 0.38 (0.27-0.51) 2.2% 0.47 (0.37-0.57) 48 103 2.2% 22 0.27 (0.18-0.38) 2.2% 81 3 16 0.19 (0.04-0.46) 1.9% 5 50 0.10 (0.03-0.22) 2.1% 4,233 0.23 (0.14-0.35) 21.6% $\tau^2 = 0.0357, P < 0.010$ v 0.38 (0.28-0.49) 2.2% 33 86 61 213 0.29 (0.23-0.35) 2.2% 770 1.420 0.54 (0.52–0.57) 2.3% 46 114 0.40 (0.31-0.50) 2.2% 0.35 (0.26-0.45) 34 97 2.2% 0.65 (0.55-0.75) 62 95 2.2% 50 72 0.69 (0.57-0.80) 2.2% 41 100 0.41 (0.31-0.51) 2.2% 113 204 0.55 (0.48-0.62) 2.2% 321 508 0.63 (0.59-0.67) 2.2% 135 151 - 0.89 (0.83-0.94) 2.2% 66 108 0.61 (0.51-0.70) 2.2% 923 1,942 0.48 (0.45-0.50) 2.3% 74 0.56 (0.48–0.65) 131 2.2% al.16 28 79 0.35 (0.25-0.47) 2.2% 67 103 0.65 (0.55-0.74) 2.2% 89 141 0.63 (0.55-0.71) 2.2% 85 134 0.63 (0.55-0.72) 2.2% 26 56 0.46(0.33 - 0.60)2.1% 24 42 0.57 (0.41-0.72) 21% 42 59 0.71 (0.58-0.82) 2.1% 70 128 0.55 (0.46-0.64) 2.2% 42 128 0.33 (0.25–0.42) 2.2% 15 42 0.36 (0.22-0.52) 2.1% 88 172 0.51 (0.43-0.59) 2.2% 6,325 0.53 (0.48-0.58) 54.7% $\tau^2 = 0.0139, P < 0.010$ 417 0.82 (0.78-0.86) 2.2% 342 . 0.65 (0.60-0.70) 232 355 2.2% 0.70 (0.55-0.82) 35 50 2.1% et al.27 442 0.52 (0.49–0.56) 2.3% 846 46 64 0.72 (0.59-0.82) 2.1% 1.732 0.69 (0.54-0.81) 11.0% $\tau^2 = 0.0255, P < 0.010$ nt 0.44 (0.28-0.60) 2 1% 18 41 0.23 (0.08-0.45) 5 22 1.9% 0.61 (0.56-0.67) 184 300 2.2% 39 72 0.54 (0.42-0.66) 2.2% 115 256 0.45 (0.39-0.51) 2.2% 17 33 0.52 (0.34-0.69) 2.0% 0.48 (0.39-0.58) 12.7% 724 $\tau^2 = 0.0099, P < 0.010$ 0.47 (0.40-0.55) 100% 13,014

0.2

0.4 0.6

Gustatory dysfunction

Events Total

Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0689$, P = 0.000Residual heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, P < 0.010 0.47 (0.40–0.55) 10 0.8

Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, P < 0.010 0.2

Fig. 6. Subgroup analysis on the evaluation method. The evaluation method was classified into history taking, self-reported survey, validated survey, and validated instrument. (**A**) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction of the four evaluation methods showed 23.4%, 52.1%, 72.9%, and 69.2% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). (**B**) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence rates of sustatory dysfunction of the four evaluation methods showed 23.5%, 53.2%, 68.5%, and 48.4% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). The diamonds represent pooled prevalence rates with 95% CI, and the estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines. CI = confidence interval.



Proportion 95% CI Weight

Α	Olfa	acto	ry dysfunction			В
Study	Events T	otal	Proj	portion 95% CI W	eight	Study
General population						General population
Lee et al.6	389 3,	,191		0.12 (0.11–0.13)	1.9%	Lee et al. ⁶
Chua et al.20	7	31		0.23 (0.10–0.41)	1.7%	Lechien et al. ³¹
Lechien et al. ³¹	357	417		0.86 (0.82–0.89)	1.9%	Lechien et al. ³²
Lechien et al.32	997 1,	,420		0.70 (0.68–0.73)	1.9%	Iravani et al. ²⁶
Lochion of al 30	54 53	96		0.47 (0.38-0.57)	1.8%	Hintschich at al. 57
Renaud et al 43	96	97		0.02 (0.51-0.72)	1.0%	Dell'Era et al 23
Zavet et al. 55	37	70		0.53 (0.41-0.65)	1.8%	Freni et al. ²⁴
Hintschich et al.57	25	41		0.61 (0.45-0.76)	1.8%	Gelardi et al. ²⁵
Dell'Era et al. ²³	237	355		0.67 (0.62-0.72)	1.9%	Mercante et al. ³⁸
Freni et al. ²⁴	46	50	-	- 0.92 (0.81–0.98)	1.8%	Paderno et al.59
Gelardi et al. ²⁵	42	72	÷	0.58 (0.46-0.70)	1.8%	Petrocelli et al.41
Mercante et al. ³⁸	85	204		0.42 (0.35-0.49)	1.9%	Vaira et al. ⁵⁰
Paderno et al. ⁵⁹	283	508		0.56 (0.51–0.60)	1.9%	Vaira et al.51
Petrocelli et al.4	190	300		0.63 (0.58-0.69)	1.9%	Abalo-Lojo et al. ¹³
Vaira et al. ⁵⁰	44	72		0.01 (0.49–0.72)	1.8%	Spoth at al 2
Vaira et al. ⁵⁷	77	200		0.70 (0.04-0.73)	1.9%	Patel et al 40
Abaio-Lojo et al.	27 151	8/6		0.53 (0.30–0.07)	1.0%	Carignan et al. ¹⁹
Sneth et al 2	63	103	E -	0.61 (0.51-0.71)	1.8%	Lee et al. ³³
Patel et al.40	80	141	÷ -	0.57 (0.48-0.65)	1.9%	Dawson et al. ²¹
Carignan et al. ¹⁹	69	134		0.51 (0.43-0.60)	1.9%	Yan et al.60
Lee et al. ³³	23	56	- I	0.41 (0.28-0.55)	1.8%	Yan et al.61
Dawson et al. ²¹	18	42		0.43 (0.28-0.59)	1.8%	Sakalli et al.44
Yan et al.60	40	59		0.68 (0.54-0.79)	1.8%	Sayin et al.45
Yan et al.61	75	128	÷	0.59 (0.50-0.67)	1.8%	Subgroup prevalence
Yan et al. ⁵³	23	46		0.50 (0.35–0.65)	1.8%	Heterogeneity: I ² = 99%
Sakalli et al.44	81	172		0.47 (0.39–0.55)	1.9%	Hospitalized nation
Sayın et al.**	43	64		0.67 (0.54-0.78)	1.8%	Liang et al.7
Subgroup prevalence Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0.00/6$ $\tau^2 = 0.00/6$	9, 1001 P/(,206		0.59 (0.47-0.70) 5	3.2%	Mao et al. ⁸
Theterogeneity. 1 = 35%, t = 0	J.1001, F < C	5.010				Tsivgoulis et al.48
Hospitalized patients						Karadaş et al.28
Liang et al. ⁷	34	86	-	0.40 (0.29–0.51)	1.8%	Lagi et al. ²⁹
Mao et al. ⁸	11	214		0.05 (0.03–0.09)	1.9%	Liguori et al. ³⁵
Chung et al.56	12	18		0.67 (0.41–0.87)	1.6%	Meini et al. ³⁷
Tsivgoulis et al.**	16	22	_	0.73 (0.50-0.89)	1.7%	Vacchiano et al.49
Karadaş et al.~	18	239		0.08 (0.05-0.12)	1.9%	Beltran-Corbellini et
Lagi et al. ²⁰	17	102		0.25 (0.15-0.37)	1.8%	Altin et al. ¹³
Meini et al 37	20	100		0.39 (0.29–0.49)	1.0 %	Pinna at al 42
Vacchiano et al 49	40	100		0.37 (0.28-0.47)	1.8%	Levinson et al. 34
Beltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	25	79		0.32 (0.22-0.43)	1.8%	Subgroup prevalence
Altin et al. ¹⁵	50	81		0.62 (0.50-0.72)	1.8%	Heterogeneity: I ² = 95%
Aggarwal et al. ¹⁴	3	16	-	0.19 (0.04–0.46)	1.6%	
Pinna et al.42	3	50 ·	-	0.06 (0.01-0.17)	1.8%	Non-hospitalized pa
Moein et al.58	59	60		0.98 (0.91–1.00)	1.8%	Kim et al. ³
Levinson et al. ³⁴	14	42		0.33 (0.20-0.50)	1.8%	Non et al. ⁹
Subgroup prevalence	1,	,286		0.37 (0.22–0.53) 2	6.8%	Zayet et al. ³⁴
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 97\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$	0.0924, P <	0.010				Paderno et al 39
Non-hospitalized patient	ts					Sierpiński et al.46
Kim et al.⁵	68	213	-	0.32 (0.26-0.39)	1.9%	Biadsee et al. ¹⁷
Noh et al.9	52	199		0.26 (0.20-0.33)	1.9%	Subgroup prevalence
Zayet et al.54	60	95		0.63 (0.53-0.73)	1.8%	Heterogeneity: I ² = 98%
Luers et al. ³⁶	53	72		0.74 (0.62-0.83)	1.8%	Lleeltheeve werkere
De Maria et al. ²²	48	92		0.52 (0.42-0.63)	1.8%	Healthcare workers
Paderno et al. ³⁹	126	151	1	0.83 (0.77–0.89)	1.9%	Subgroup prevalence
Sierpiński et al.46	956 1,	,942		0.49 (0.47–0.51)	1.9%	Heterogeneity: not appl
Biadsee et al."	49	128		0.38 (0.30-0.47)	1.8%	inder og bindigt not uppt
Subgroup prevalence	2,	,892 0.010	-	0.52 (0.40–0.64) 1	4.8%	Overall prevalence
neterogeneity: I* = 96%, t² = (J.U293, P <	0.010				Heterogeneity: I ² = 99%
Healthcare workers						Residual heterogeneity:
Brandstetter et al. ¹⁸	16	31		0.52 (0.33-0.70)	1.7%	
Vaira et al.52	17	33		0.52 (0.34-0.69)	1.7%	
Tostmann et al.47	37	79	-	0.47 (0.36-0.58)	1.8%	
Subgroup prevalence		143	+	0.49 (0.41–0.57)	5.3%	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$	P = 0.860					
Overall prevalence	13,	,527	<u> </u>	0.51 (0.44–0.59) 1	00%	
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$	0.0794, <i>P</i> =	0.000	0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8			

seneral population					
.ee et al. ⁶	353	3,191		0.11 (0.10-0.12)	2.3%
echien et al. ³¹	342	417		0.82 (0.78-0.86)	2.2%
echien et al. ³²	770	1,420	i 🔳	0.54 (0.52-0.57)	2.3%
ravani et al. ²⁶	46	114		0.40 (0.31-0.50)	2.2%
Renaud et al.43	34	97		0.35 (0.26-0.45)	2.2%
Hintschich et al.57	18	41		0.44 (0.28-0.60)	2.1%
Dell'Fra et al. ²³	232	355		0.65 (0.60-0.70)	2.2%
Freni et al 24	35	50		0.70 (0.55-0.82)	2.1%
Selardi et al ²⁵	52	72		0.72 (0.60-0.82)	2.1%
Aercante et al 38	113	204		0.55 (0.48 0.62)	2.2%
Paderno et al ⁵⁹	321	508		0.55 (0.40-0.02)	2.2%
Petrocelli et al 41	18/	300		0.03(0.39-0.07)	2.2%
aira at al 50	30	72		0.01 (0.30-0.07)	2.2/0
ana et al.	115	256		0.54 (0.42-0.66)	2.2/0
dild et dt.	74	200		0.45 (0.39-0.51)	2.2/0
ADAIO-LOJO et al."	14	131		0.56 (0.48-0.65)	2.2%
zquierdo-Dominguez et al.2	442	846		0.52 (0.49-0.56)	2.3%
speth et al. ²	67	103		0.65 (0.55–0.74)	2.2%
Patel et al.40	89	141		0.63 (0.55–0.71)	2.2%
Carignan et al.19	85	134		0.63 (0.55–0.72)	2.2%
ee et al.33	26	56		0.46 (0.33-0.60)	2.1%
Dawson et al. ²¹	24	42		0.57 (0.41-0.72)	2.1%
′an et al. ⁶⁰	42	59		0.71 (0.58-0.82)	2.1%
′an et al.61	70	128	÷	0.55 (0.46-0.64)	2.2%
Sakalli et al.44	88	172		0.51 (0.43-0.59)	2.2%
Sayin et al.45	46	64		0.72 (0.59-0.82)	2.1%
Subgroup prevalence		8.973		0.56 (0.45-0.67)	54.8%
leterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$.	0845.	P < 0.010		,	
0 9					
lospitalized patients					
iang et al. ⁷	33	86		0.38 (0.28-0.49)	2.2%
Mao et al. ⁸	12	214		0.06 (0.03-0.10)	2.2%
sivgoulis et al.48	5	22		0.23 (0.08-0.45)	1.9%
(aradas et al. ²⁸	16	239		0.07 (0.04-0.11)	2.2%
agi et al.29	26	68		0.38 (0.27-0.51)	2.2%
iguori et al.35	48	103		0.47 (0.37-0.57)	2.2%
Meini et al. ³⁷	41	100	- +	0.41 (0.31-0.51)	2.2%
/acchiano et al.49	66	108		0.61 (0.51-0.70)	2.2%
Seltrán-Corbellini et al. ¹⁶	28	79		0.35 (0.25-0.47)	2.2%
Altin et al ¹⁵	22	81		0 27 (0 18-0 38)	2.2%
aggarwal et al ¹⁴	3	16		0.19 (0.04-0.46)	1.9%
Pinna et al ⁴²	5	50		0.10 (0.03-0.22)	2.1%
evinson et al 34	15	42		0.36 (0.22-0.52)	2.1%
Subgroup prevalence	10	1 208		0.28 (0.17_0.41)	27.7%
$f_{aterogeneity} = 12 - 95\% \tau^2 - 0.0$)557 Ø	2 0 010		0.20 (0.17=0.41)	21.170
leterogeneity: 1 = 55%, t = 0.	JJJJ7, F	0.010			
Non-hospitalized patients					
(im et al.⁵	61	213	-	0.29 (0.23-0.35)	2.2%
Noh et al. ⁹	45	199		0 23 (0 17-0 29)	2.2%
avet et al 54	62	95		0.65 (0.55-0.75)	2.2%
uers et al ³⁶	50	72		0.69 (0.57-0.80)	2.2%
Paderno et al ³⁹	135	151		0.80 (0.83_0.04)	2.2%
Ciorpiński ot al 46	023	1 0 4 2		0.09 (0.03-0.94)	2.2/0
Diadago at al 17	323 10	1,942	- I	0.40 (0.40-0.00)	2.3%
Plausee et al."	42	2 800		0.55 (0.25-0.42)	Z.Z%
laterogeneitur 12 - 090/a -2 - 0	2454	2,000		0.51 (0.35-0.67)	10.0%
recei ogeneicy: i* = 98%, t² = 0.	J454,	r < 0.010			
ealthcare workers					
/aira et al. ⁵²	17	33		0.52 (0.34-0.69)	2.0%
Subgroup prevalence		33		0.52 (0.34-0.69)	2.0%

Gustatory dysfunction

Events Total

rogeneity: not applicable 0.47 (0.40-0.55) 100% rall prevalence 13,014 rogeneity: I² = 99%, τ² = 0.0689, P = 0.000 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 dual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 94\%$, P < 0.010

Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, P < 0.010

Fig. 7. Subgroup analysis on the characteristics of population. The characteristics of population was classified into general population, hospitalized population, non-hospitalized population, and population of healthcare workers. (A) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction of the four demographics showed 58.7%, 36.7%, 52.3%, and 48.9% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in the random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). (B) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalences of gustatory dysfunction of the four demographics showed 56.2%, 28.3%, 51.1%, and 51.5% pooled subgroup prevalence rates in random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). The diamonds represent pooled prevalence rates with 95% CI, and the estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines. CI = confidence interval.

As we hypothesized, the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction were different among the four geographical regions. The prevalence of olfactory dysfunction in East Asia was significantly lower than that in Europe or the Middle East and prevalence of gustatory dysfunction in East Asia was significantly lower than that in Europe and North America. In the subgroup analysis on the time of enrollment, there was no significant difference among the three periods. However, considering the spread of the virus occurred regionally and chronologically, the regional factor might be a potential confounding factor. In an ANOVA of the studies from Europe alone, there were significant differences in the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction among the three time period groups, indicating that a genetic mutation of virus in the same region may have affected the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction. The prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction of the 3rd period, soft of the 3rd period, and 49.0% for the 3rd period, which was a similar tendency compared to that of Europe: 45.2% for the 1st period, 65.4% for the 2nd period, and 59.0% for the 3rd period. Interestingly, olfactory dysfunction increased from the 1st to 2nd period but slightly decreased from the 2nd to 3rd period.

Because the included studies were performed with various evaluation methods and populations, we carried out further subgroup analyses on the evaluation methods and population group to explain the heterogeneity. In subgroup analysis on the evaluation methods, the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction evaluated by history taking were lower than those by other evaluation methods. In contrast to survey or objective test, simple history taking may have a risk of omitting questions about olfactory and gustatory dysfunction. The chemosensory function of these patients was often regarded as normal, leading to a low prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction. Therefore, we confirmed the results of the subgroup analysis on the geographical region and the time of enrollment by omitting studies in which history taking was used as the evaluation method, and we found that it still showed a statistical significance. In subgroup analysis on the population group, interestingly, a significant difference was found in the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction depending on population characteristics but not in that of olfactory dysfunction. In a post-hoc analysis, the prevalence of gustatory dysfunction of the hospitalized patients was lower than that of the general population, which may be attributed to the higher rate of the history taking as the evaluation method in hospitalized patients than that in the general population (46.7% vs. 6.9%, respectively).

There are some possible explanations for the regional and chronological differences in olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in COVID-19—first, the ethnic differences in the frequency variants of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2). As previous studies indicate, ACE2 is a possible host receptor of SARS-CoV-2.^{64,65} Variants of ACE2 may affect the course of infection, including susceptibility and symptoms depending on the expression level and pattern of ACE2 in different tissues.⁶⁶ In a previous study, presence of a difference in variants of ACE2 according to geographical and ethnic factors was demonstrated,⁶⁶ and it is assumed that the difference in variants of ACE2 expressed in olfactory epithelial cells according to populations from different geographical regions can influence the prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction. Second, phylogenetic mutation may contribute to regional and chronological differences. As the prevalence of olfactory dysfunction was significantly different according to time of enrollment in subgroup analysis with the studies from European countries, the ethnic differences may not be sufficient to explain the chronological differences in the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction. Recent studies reported that SARS-CoV-2 has rapidly attained mutations as a typical coronavirus, allowing

for tracking its spread.^{67,68} The prevalence of S type and L type of SARS-CoV-2 were 3.7% and 96.3% in viral isolates in Wuhan, respectively, yet viral isolates outside of Wuhan were 38.4% S type and 61.3% L type.⁶⁸ Furthermore, the mutation may cause regional differences in virus type. For instance, a previous study revealed that the B1 clade is dominant in the West Coast of the United States, while the A2a clade, which seems to have spread through Europe and Italy, is dominant in the East Coast of the United States.⁶⁹ In addition to the regional differences, the expanding phylogenetic diversity can induce a chronologic difference in the type of SARS-CoV-2. A previous study revealed the global transition of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein from the original D614 to the G614 variant.⁷⁰ To be specific, through March 1, 2020, the G614 variant was rare outside Europe; however, it increased in frequency worldwide by the end of March.⁷⁰ As the virus types and genetic mutations were different regionally and chronologically,68-70 the influence of SARS-CoV-2 on the olfactory epithelium may have differed according to virus type and genetic mutation. Lastly, heterogeneity in the study designs may have caused different prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction. The study populations and evaluation methods were variable in the individual studies. As shown in the results, evaluation method may lead to different prevalence. To reduce the confounding effect of the evaluation method, we performed a subgroup analysis without the studies in which history taking was used as an evaluation method. However, the other three methods may also have had differences, although statistical significance was not found. In addition, different characteristics of populations might affect the prevalence rate in individual studies.

In conclusion, olfactory and gustatory dysfunction are commonly reported in patients with COVID-19 and noted as significant symptoms; however, the prevalence rates are variable. This meta-analysis revealed that regional and chronological differences in the prevalence rates of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction explain the inter-study heterogeneity.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Table 1

Quality assessment for the included studies

Click here to view

Supplementary Fig. 1

Prevalence of chemosensory dysfunction in patients with COVID-19. (A) Forest plot metaanalysis of the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction in patients with COVID-19 showed a 52.7% (95% CI, 43.7–59.1) pooled prevalence in random-effect model, as represented by the diamond. (B) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence rates of gustatory dysfunction in patients with COVID-19 showed a 47.5% (95% CI, 39.7–55.3) pooled prevalence in randomeffect model, as represented by the diamond. The estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines.

Click here to view

Supplementary Fig. 2

Subgroup analysis on region, excluding studies in which history taking was used as the evaluation method. (A) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence rates of olfactory dysfunction of four regions (East Asia, Europe, North America, and Middle East) showed

37.3%, 61.0%, 52.7%, and 59.8% pooled subgroup prevalence in random-effect model, respectively (P = 0.005 for subgroup difference). (B) Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence rates of gustatory dysfunction of four regions (East Asia, Europe, North America, and Middle East) showed 32.6%, 56.7%, 58.9%, and 47.9% pooled subgroup prevalence in the random-effect model, respectively (P < 0.001 for subgroup difference). The diamonds represent pooled prevalence with 95% CI, and the estimates of individual studies are represented as squares, with 95% CIs represented as horizontal lines.

Click here to view

Supplementary Fig. 3

Subgroup analysis on the time of enrollment, only including studies in which evaluation method using surveys or validated instruments among the studies conducted in Europe. The time of enrollment was clarified in 29 out of 55 studies. After calculating the median date (mid-date) between beginning and end date of the time of enrollment, the individual studies were categorized into three groups: 1st period (mid-date February 2, 2020 to March 17, 2020), 2nd period (mid-date March 20, 2020 to March 29, 2020), and 3rd period (mid-date March 30, 2020 to April 9, 2020). Forest plot meta-analysis of the prevalence rates of olfactory showed 48.7%, 65.4%, and 58.4% pooled subgroup prevalence in the random-effect model, respectively (*P* = 0.038 for subgroup difference).

Click here to view

Supplementary Fig. 4

Funnel plot of the prevalence rates of (A) olfactory and (B) gustatory dysfunction.

Click here to view

REFERENCES

- Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72 314 cases from the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* 2020;323(13):1239-42.
- Gengler I, Wang JC, Speth MM, Sedaghat AR. Sinonasal pathophysiology of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review of the current evidence. *Laryngoscope Investig Otolaryngol* 2020;5(3):354-9.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in upper respiratory specimens of infected patients. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382(12):1177-9.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Tong JY, Wong A, Zhu D, Fastenberg JH, Tham T. The prevalence of olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in COVID-19 patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;163(1):3-11.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Kim GU, Kim MJ, Ra SH, Lee J, Bae S, Jung J, et al. Clinical characteristics of asymptomatic and symptomatic patients with mild COVID-19. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020;26(7):948.e1-3.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lee Y, Min P, Lee S, Kim SW. Prevalence and duration of acute loss of smell or taste in COVID-19 patients. *J Korean Med Sci* 2020;35(18):e174.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Liang Y, Xu J, Chu M, Mai J, Lai N, Tang W, et al. Neurosensory dysfunction: a diagnostic marker of early COVID-19. Int J Infect Dis 2020;98:347-52.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF

- Mao L, Jin H, Wang M, Hu Y, Chen S, He Q, et al. Neurologic manifestations of hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Neurol* 2020;77(6):683-90.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Noh JY, Yoon JG, Seong H, Choi WS, Sohn JW, Cheong HJ, et al. Asymptomatic infection and atypical manifestations of COVID-19: comparison of viral shedding duration. *J Infect* 2020;81(5):816-46.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009;62(10):e1-34.
- Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012;65(9):934-9.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Freeman MF, Tukey JW. Transformations related to the angular and the square root. Ann Math Stat 1950;21(4):607-11.
 CROSSREF
- Abalo-Lojo JM, Pouso-Diz JM, Gonzalez F. Taste and smell dysfunction in COVID-19 patients. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 2020;129(10):1041-2.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Aggarwal S, Garcia-Telles N, Aggarwal G, Lavie C, Lippi G, Henry BM. Clinical features, laboratory characteristics, and outcomes of patients hospitalized with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Early report from the United States. *Diagnosis (Berl)* 2020;7(2):91-6.
- Altin F, Cingi C, Uzun T, Bal C. Olfactory and gustatory abnormalities in COVID-19 cases. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2020;277(10):2775-81.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Beltrán-Corbellini Á, Chico-García JL, Martínez-Poles J, Rodríguez-Jorge F, Natera-Villalba E, Gómez-Corral J, et al. Acute-onset smell and taste disorders in the context of COVID-19: a pilot multicentre polymerase chain reaction based case-control study. *Eur J Neurol* 2020;27(9):1738-41.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Biadsee A, Biadsee A, Kassem F, Dagan O, Masarwa S, Ormianer Z. Olfactory and oral manifestations of COVID-19: sex-related symptoms-a potential pathway to early diagnosis. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;163(4):722-8.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Brandstetter S, Roth S, Harner S, Buntrock-Döpke H, Toncheva AA, Borchers N, et al. Symptoms and immunoglobulin development in hospital staff exposed to a SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. *Pediatr Allergy Immunol* 2020;31(7):841-7.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Carignan A, Valiquette L, Grenier C, Musonera JB, Nkengurutse D, Marcil-Héguy A, et al. Anosmia and dysgeusia associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection: an age-matched case-control study. *CMAJ* 2020;192(26):E702-7.
- Chua AJ, Charn TC, Chan EC, Loh J. Acute olfactory loss is specific for COVID-19 at the emergency department. *Ann Emerg Med* 2020;76(4):550-1.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Dawson P, Rabold EM, Laws RL, Conners EE, Gharpure R, Yin S, et al. Loss of taste and smell as distinguishing symptoms of COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020;ciaa799.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- De Maria A, Varese P, Dentone C, Barisione E, Bassetti M. High prevalence of olfactory and taste disorder during SARS-CoV-2 infection in outpatients. *J Med Virol* 2020;92(11):2310-1.
- Dell'Era V, Farri F, Garzaro G, Gatto M, Aluffi Valletti P, Garzaro M. Smell and taste disorders during COVID-19 outbreak: cross-sectional study on 355 patients. *Head Neck* 2020;42(7):1591-6.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Freni F, Meduri A, Gazia F, Nicastro V, Galletti C, Aragona P, et al. Symptomatology in head and neck district in coronavirus disease (COVID-19): a possible neuroinvasive action of SARS-CoV-2. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2020;41(5):102612.
- Gelardi M, Trecca E, Cassano M, Ciprandi G. Smell and taste dysfunction during the COVID-19 outbreak: a preliminary report. *Acta Biomed* 2020;91(2):230-1.

- 26. Iravani B, Arshamian A, Ravia A, Mishor E, Snitz K, Shushan S, et al. Relationship between odor intensity estimates and COVID-19 prevalence prediction in a Swedish population. *Chem Senses*. Forthcoming 2020. DOI: 10.1093/chemse/bjaa034.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Izquierdo-Domínguez A, Rojas-Lechuga M, Chiesa-Estomba C, Calvo-Henríquez C, Ninchritz-Becerra E, Soriano-Reixach M, et al. Smell and taste dysfunctions in COVID-19 are associated with younger age in ambulatory settings-a multicenter cross-sectional study. *J Investig Allergol Clin Immunol* 2020;30(5):346-57.
 CROSSREF
- Karadaş Ö, Öztürk B, Sonkaya AR. A prospective clinical study of detailed neurological manifestations in patients with COVID-19. *Neurol Sci* 2020;41(8):1991-5.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lagi F, Piccica M, Graziani L, Vellere I, Botta A, Tilli M, et al. Early experience of an infectious and tropical diseases unit during the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, Florence, Italy, February to March 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25(17):2000556.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lechien JR, Cabaraux P, Chiesa-Estomba CM, Khalife M, Hans S, Calvo-Henriquez C, et al. Objective olfactory evaluation of self-reported loss of smell in a case series of 86 COVID-19 patients. *Head Neck* 2020;42(7):1583-90.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, De Siati DR, Horoi M, Le Bon SD, Rodriguez A, et al. Olfactory and gustatory dysfunctions as a clinical presentation of mild-to-moderate forms of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19): a multicenter European study. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2020;277(8):2251-61.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lechien JR, Chiesa-Estomba CM, Place S, Van Laethem Y, Cabaraux P, Mat Q, et al. Clinical and epidemiological characteristics of 1420 European patients with mild-to-moderate coronavirus disease 2019. *J Intern Med* 2020;288(3):335-44.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Lee DJ, Lockwood J, Das P, Wang R, Grinspun E, Lee JM. Self-reported anosmia and dysgeusia as key symptoms of COVID-19. *CJEM* 2020;22(5):595-602.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Levinson R, Elbaz M, Ben-Ami R, Shasha D, Levinson T, Choshen G, et al. Time course of anosmia and dysgeusia in patients with mild SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Infect Dis (Lond)* 2020;52(8):600-2.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Liguori C, Pierantozzi M, Spanetta M, Sarmati L, Cesta N, Iannetta M, et al. Subjective neurological symptoms frequently occur in patients with SARS-CoV2 infection. *Brain Behav Immun* 2020;88:11-6.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Luers JC, Rokohl AC, Loreck N, Wawer Matos PA, Augustin M, Dewald F, et al. Olfactory and gustatory dysfunction in coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis* 2020;71(16):2262-4.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Meini S, Suardi LR, Busoni M, Roberts AT, Fortini A. Olfactory and gustatory dysfunctions in 100 patients hospitalized for COVID-19: sex differences and recovery time in real-life. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2020;277(12):3519-23.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Mercante G, Ferreli F, De Virgilio A, Gaino F, Di Bari M, Colombo G, et al. Prevalence of taste and smell dysfunction in coronavirus disease 2019. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;146(8):723.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Paderno A, Mattavelli D, Rampinelli V, Grammatica A, Raffetti E, Tomasoni M, et al. Olfactory and gustatory outcomes in COVID-19: a prospective evaluation in nonhospitalized subjects. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;163(6):1144-9.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 40. Patel A, Charani E, Ariyanayagam D, Abdulaal A, Denny SJ, Mughal N, et al. New-onset anosmia and ageusia in adult patients diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020;26(9):1236-41. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Petrocelli M, Ruggiero F, Baietti AM, Pandolfi P, Salzano G, Salzano FA, et al. Remote psychophysical evaluation of olfactory and gustatory functions in early-stage coronavirus disease 2019 patients: the Bologna experience of 300 cases. *J Laryngol Otol* 2020;134(7):571-6.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Pinna P, Grewal P, Hall JP, Tavarez T, Dafer RM, Garg R, et al. Neurological manifestations and COVID-19: experiences from a tertiary care center at the frontline. *J Neurol Sci* 2020;415:116969.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF

- Renaud M, Leon A, Trau G, Fath L, Ciftci S, Bensimon Y, et al. Acute smell and taste loss in outpatients: all infected with SARS-CoV-2? *Rhinology* 2020;58(4):406-9.
- 44. Sakalli E, Temirbekov D, Bayri E, Alis EE, Erdurak SC, Bayraktaroglu M. Ear nose throat-related symptoms with a focus on loss of smell and/or taste in COVID-19 patients. *Am J Otolaryngol* 2020;41(6):102622.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Sayin İ, Yaşar KK, Yazici ZM. Taste and smell impairment in COVID-19: an AAO-HNS anosmia reporting tool-based comparative study. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2020;163(3):473-9.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 46. Sierpiński R, Pinkas J, Jankowski M, Zgliczyński W, Wierzba W, Gujski M, et al. Sex differences in the frequency of gastrointestinal symptoms and olfactory or taste disorders in 1942 nonhospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Pol Arch Intern Med* 2020;130(6):501-5.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Tostmann A, Bradley J, Bousema T, Yiek WK, Holwerda M, Bleeker-Rovers C, et al. Strong associations and moderate predictive value of early symptoms for SARS-CoV-2 test positivity among healthcare workers, the Netherlands, March 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25(16):2000508.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Tsivgoulis G, Fragkou PC, Delides A, Karofylakis E, Dimopoulou D, Sfikakis PP, et al. Quantitative evaluation of olfactory dysfunction in hospitalized patients with coronavirus [2] (COVID-19). *J Neurol* 2020;267(8):2193-5.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Vacchiano V, Riguzzi P, Volpi L, Tappatà M, Avoni P, Rizzo G, et al. Early neurological manifestations of hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *Neurol Sci* 2020;41(8):2029-31.
- Vaira LA, Deiana G, Fois AG, Pirina P, Madeddu G, De Vito A, et al. Objective evaluation of anosmia and ageusia in COVID-19 patients: single-center experience on 72 cases. *Head Neck* 2020;42(6):1252-8.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Vaira LA, Hopkins C, Salzano G, Petrocelli M, Melis A, Cucurullo M, et al. Olfactory and gustatory function impairment in COVID-19 patients: Italian objective multicenter-study. *Head Neck* 2020;42(7):1560-9.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Vaira LA, Salzano G, Petrocelli M, Deiana G, Salzano FA, De Riu G. Validation of a self-administered olfactory and gustatory test for the remotely evaluation of COVID-19 patients in home quarantine. *Head Neck* 2020;42(7):1570-6.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Yan CH, Prajapati DP, Ritter ML, DeConde AS. Persistent smell loss following undetectable SARS-CoV-2. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2020;163(5):923-5.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Zayet S, Klopfenstein T, Mercier J, Kadiane-Oussou NJ, Lan Cheong Wah L, Royer PY, et al. Contribution of anosmia and dysgeusia for diagnostic of COVID-19 in outpatients. *Infection*. Forthcoming 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s15010-020-01442-3.

PUBMED | CROSSREF

- Zayet S, Kadiane-Oussou NJ, Lepiller Q, Zahra H, Royer PY, Toko L, et al. Clinical features of COVID-19 and influenza: a comparative study on Nord Franche-Comte cluster. *Microbes Infect* 2020;22(9):481-8.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Chung TW, Sridhar S, Zhang AJ, Chan KH, Li HL, Wong FK, et al. Olfactory dysfunction in coronavirus disease 2019 patients: observational cohort study and systematic review. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2020;7(6):a199.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 57. Hintschich CA, Wenzel JJ, Hummel T, Hankir MK, Kühnel T, Vielsmeier V, et al. Psychophysical tests reveal impaired olfaction but preserved gustation in COVID-19 patients. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol* 2020;10(9):1105-7.

PUBMED | CROSSREF

- Moein ST, Hashemian SM, Mansourafshar B, Khorram-Tousi A, Tabarsi P, Doty RL. Smell dysfunction: a biomarker for COVID-19. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol* 2020;10(8):944-50.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Paderno A, Schreiber A, Grammatica A, Raffetti E, Tomasoni M, Gualtieri T, et al. Smell and taste alterations in COVID-19: a cross-sectional analysis of different cohorts. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol* 2020;10(8):955-62.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF

- Yan CH, Faraji F, Prajapati DP, Boone CE, DeConde AS. Association of chemosensory dysfunction and COVID-19 in patients presenting with influenza-like symptoms. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol* 2020;10(7):806-13.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Yan CH, Faraji F, Prajapati DP, Ostrander BT, DeConde AS. Self-reported olfactory loss associates with outpatient clinical course in COVID-19. *Int Forum Allergy Rhinol* 2020;10(7):821-31.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Hopkins C, Surda P, Kumar N. Presentation of new onset anosmia during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Rhinology* 2020;58(3):295-8.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Han AY, Mukdad L, Long JL, Lopez IA. Anosmia in COVID-19: mechanisms and significance. *Chem Senses*. Forthcoming 2020. DOI: 10.1093/chemse/bjaa040.

 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 64. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, Niu P, Yang B, Wu H, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet* 2020;395(10224):565-74. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature* 2020;579(7798):270-3.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 66. Cao Y, Li L, Feng Z, Wan S, Huang P, Sun X, et al. Comparative genetic analysis of the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV/SARS-CoV-2) receptor ACE2 in different populations. *Cell Discov* 2020;6(1):11. PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Hadfield J, Megill C, Bell SM, Huddleston J, Potter B, Callender C, et al. Nextstrain: real-time tracking of pathogen evolution. *Bioinformatics* 2018;34(23):4121-3.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- Tang X, Wu C, Li X, Song Y, Yao X, Wu X, et al. On the origin and continuing evolution of SARS-CoV-2. Natl Sci Rev 2020;7(6):1012-23.
 CROSSREF
- Brufsky A. Distinct viral clades of SARS-CoV-2: implications for modeling of viral spread. J Med Virol 2020;92(9):1386-90.
 PUBMED | CROSSREF
- 70. Korber B, Fischer WM, Gnanakaran S, Yoon H, Theiler J, Abfalterer W, et al. Tracking changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike: evidence that D614G increases infectivity of the COVID-19 virus. *Cell* 2020;182(4):812-827.e19. PUBMED | CROSSREF