



Clinical features and cognitive sequelae in COVID-19: a retrospective study on $N=152$ patients

Marina Rita Manera¹ · Elena Fiabane² · Debora Pain³ · Edoardo Nicolò Aiello⁴  · Alice Radici³ · Marcella Ottonello² · Mariacristina Padovani¹ · Barbara Ann Wilson⁵ · Jessica Fish⁶ · Caterina Pistarini⁷

Received: 11 October 2021 / Accepted: 11 November 2021 / Published online: 15 November 2021
© Fondazione Società Italiana di Neurologia 2021, corrected publication 2021

Abstract

Background The novel human coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) shows neurotropism and systemically affects the central nervous system (CNS). Cognitive deficits have been indeed reported as both short- and long-term sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection. However, the association between these disturbances and background/disease-related clinical features remains elusive. This work aimed at exploring how post-infective cognitive status relates to clinical/treatment outcomes by controlling for premorbid/current risk factors for cognitive deficits.

Methods Cognitive measures (Mini-Mental State Examination, MMSE) of $N=152$ COVID-19 patient were retrospectively assessed in relation to disease severity, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, steroidal treatment, and occurrence of other viral/bacterial infections by controlling for remote/recent/COVID-19-related risk factors for cognitive deficits (at-risk vs. not-at-risk: Neuro+ vs. Neuro–).

Results Descriptively, impaired MMSE performances were highly prevalent in mild-to-moderate patients (26.3%). ICU-admitted patients made less errors ($p=.021$) on the MMSE than those not admitted when partialling out risk factors and age—the latter negatively influencing performances. When addressing Neuro– patients only, steroidal treatment appears to improve MMSE scores among those suffering from other infections ($p=.025$).

Discussion Cognitive sequelae of COVID-19 are likely to arise from a complex interplay between background/clinical premorbid features and disease-related/interventional procedures and outcomes. Mild-to-moderate patients requiring assistive ventilation who however are not admitted to an ICU are more likely to suffer from cognitive deficits—despite their etiology remaining elusive.

Keywords SARS-CoV-2 · COVID-19 · Neuropsychology · ICU · Steroid · Premorbid

Introduction

Central nervous system (CNS) involvement has been acknowledged in patients infected with the novel human coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2)—due to both its neurotropic/neuroinvasive properties and inflammatory processes/secondary systemic disorders [8, 24].

Cognitive deficits within have been indeed reported and postulated as both short- and long-term sequelae of the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) [7, 18, 19].

Most studies suggested deficits in memory, executive functioning, and attention [5, 13, 18, 22, 23]. Furthermore, results from previous pandemics of acute respiratory illness (e.g., middle-east respiratory syndrome) and existing knowledge of neurological outcomes in pulmonary disorders suggested that neuropsychological sequelae are to be expected in patients with COVID-19 [9]. Coronavirus infections are indeed believed to increase and thereby extending the risk of post-infection cognitive dysfunction and accelerating neurodegenerative processes [20].

Pistarini et al. [18] found a high prevalence of cognitive impairments in both COVID-19 and post-COVID-19 patients as assessed by a I-level, global cognition test

Marina Rita Manera, Elena Fiabane, and Debora Pain equally contributed to the paper.

✉ Edoardo Nicolò Aiello
e.aiello5@campus.unimib.it

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

(Montreal Cognitive Assessment). By contrast, a recent 4-month follow-up study [25] investigated cognitive impairments after SARS-CoV-2 infection in a group of mild–moderate post-COVID-19 patients and found no differences compared to non-COVID-19 cases.

It is thus currently debated whether cognitive impairment actually represents a SARS-CoV-2-specific complication or it is secondary to extra-CNS disorders—e.g., systemic inflammation [26].

Moreover, certain issues remain open as to the association between cognitive sequelae and both disease-related and background clinical variables. First, it is challenging to assess post-infective cognitive status by controlling for possibly intervening premorbid conditions/disease-related complications. Second, intensive care unit (ICU) admission has been reported to counterintuitively represent a protective factor toward cognitive outcomes [5]. Moreover, the relation between cognitive dysfunctions and possible iatrogenic effects of steroidal treatment is still poorly understood [12].

The present study thus aimed at investigating how cognitive outcomes relate to clinical/treatment features in COVID-19 patients by taking into account premorbid/disease-related clinical features possibly affecting cognition.

Methods

Materials

Data from $N=152$ post-infectious SARS-CoV-2 patients referred to either sub-acute or specialist rehabilitation units of Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri located in Northern Italy, between May 2020 and May 2021, were retrospectively collected (see Table 1). The study was approved by the local Ethical Committee (Approval Number: 2470, 8 September 2020).

All patients had been administered the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) [17]—the most commonly used tool for screening cognitive impairment and consists of a brief (5–10) 30-point scale. The presence of cognitive impairment was defined by a total score <23.80 adjusted for age and education in the Italian population [17].

Furthermore, information regarding neurological, psychiatric, and general medical history were retrieved, along with data regarding the clinical manifestations of COVID-19. A classification according to disease severity was performed: asymptomatic; mildly symptomatic; mild-to-moderate: requiring O_2 therapy but not ventilation; moderate-to-severe: requiring either non-invasive ventilation or admitted to an ICU.

Furthermore, patients were sub-divided into those who had either remote, recent, or COVID-19-related conditions possibly affecting cognitive functioning (Neuro+) and those

who did not (Neuro–). The Neuro+ group included patients with (a) neurological diseases (e.g., Parkinson's disease, stroke); (b) severe psychiatric disorders (e.g., depression, post-traumatic stress-disorder); (c) severe internal conditions (e.g., atrial fibrillation); and (d) at least 3 risk factors for NP impairment (e.g., type-II diabetes, arterial hypertension, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease). This group however did not encompass patients that suffered from acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)/respiratory insufficiency (requiring or not assistive ventilation) or were admitted to an ICU due to COVID-19. This expedient was implemented in order to rule out possible overlapping co-occurrences with the *ICU/Severity* factors. As to the inclusion criteria of Neuro–, they did not present with the aforementioned risk factors for cognitive decline.

Two independent authors performed this categorization blinded to both each other's decision and patients' psychometric outcomes; disagreements were solved by discussion with a third independent author. According to this grouping, 103 patients were classified as Neuro+ and 49 as Neuro–.

Statistical analyses

Normality checks were performed by assessing skewness and kurtosis values [16].

According to data distribution, either linear or generalized linear models [1] were implemented for assessing predictions of interest. Associations between continuous variables were tested via either Pearson's or Spearman's coefficient.

Group (Neuro+ vs. Neuro–) was partialled out in each model in order to control for premorbid/disease-related confounders. As Neuro+ and Neuro– patients were comparable for education ($t(150)=-.63$; $p=.366$) but not for age ($t(150)=-2.05$; $p=.042$; Neuro+: $M=68.5$, $SD=13.7$; Neuro–: $M=63.8$, $SD=11.5$), the latter was entered as a covariate within models including *Group*.

ICU (admitted vs. not admitted), *Steroids* (treated vs. not treated with steroids), *Infection* (occurrence vs. absence of a bacterial/viral infection during COVID-19), and *Severity* (mild, recoded by merging the first two original levels into one vs. mild-to-moderate vs. moderate-to-severe) effects were tested on both the MMSE and its sub-scores. Domain-specific scales were defined as follows: spatial and temporal orientation (0–10); immediate and delayed recall (0–6); attention (0–5); language (0–8); constructional praxis (0–1). Within each implemented model, interactions between target (e.g., *ICU*) and control (i.e., *Group* and *Age*) variables, as well as between control variables themselves, were not tested.

Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons was applied if appropriate.

Analyses were performed via SPSS 27 [14] and jamovi 1.6 [21].

Table 1 Participants' background, clinical and psychometric measures

Domain	Outcome					
Background	<i>N</i>	152				
	Age (years)	67±13.2 (18–93)				
	Sex (male/female)	101/51				
	Education (years)	10.6±3.9 (2–19)				
	Clinical	Disease duration (days)	43.4±25.6 (2–129)			
		Time from onset (days)	84±65.6 (7–422)			
		Severity	Asymptomatic	8.6%		
			Mildly symptomatic	15.1%		
			Mild-to-moderate	25%		
			Moderate-to-severe	51.3%		
ICU		48.7%				
Steroids	38%					
Infection	31.1%					
Comorbidities			Remote	Recent		
					COVID-19-re-related	
	Neurological	30.6%	15.1%	28.9%		
	Psychiatric	33.3%	5.9%	3.3%		
	Cardiac	59.2%	3.3%	7.9%		
	Pulmonary	12.9%	2%	19.1%		
	Infective	5.4%	.7%	5.9%		
	Metabolic	23.1%	-	2%		
	Psychometric	MMSE	Total	27.3±3.1 (15–30)		
			Temporal orientation	4.5±.9 (1–5)		
Spatial orientation			4.6±.7 (2–5)			
Immediate recall			3±.2 (1–3)			
Attention			4.4±1.3 (0–5)			
Delayed recall			2.3±.9 (0–3)			
Language			7.8±.6 (4–9)			
Constructional praxis			.8±.4 (0–1)			

MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; ICU, intensive care unit; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019

Results

Overall prevalence of cognitive deficits as assessed via the MMSE was 12.5%. Table 2 displays prevalence estimates sub-divided according to target factors. Below-cutoff MMSE percentage was visibly higher in Neuro+ (16.5%) vs. Neuro– (4.1%) patients. Moreover, within severity degrees, impaired MMSE performances were notably more frequent for mild-to-moderate (26.3%). Finally, a trend toward a lower prevalence of defective MMSE scores was detected in ICU-admitted patients (19.2%)—when descriptively compared to those not admitted (5.4%).

When testing the association between MMSE scores and disease duration/time from onset to evaluation

separately for the four severity sub-groups, no significant coefficients arose at $\alpha_{\text{adjusted}}=.05/4=.013$.

Both MMSE total and sub-scores were heavily left-skewed and overdispersed. Therefore, predictions on the MMSE were initially run via negative binomial regressions, by addressing the number of errors (subtracting the score to its maximum achievable) as the outcome [1].

When individually testing target factors on MMSE total errors with *Group* and *Age* partialled out, a significant effect of *ICU* arose ($\chi^2(1)=5.3$; $p=.021$)—with ICU-admitted patients ($M=1.72$; $SE=.24$) making less errors than those not admitted ($M=2.73$; $SE=.38$); by contrast, neither *Severity* ($\chi^2(3)=2.07$; $p=.356$) nor *Steroids* ($\chi^2(1)=.49$; $p=.485$) nor *Infection* ($\chi^2(1)=.8$; $p=.372$) yielded significance. Notably, age negatively influenced the performance

Table 2 Below-cutoff scores on the MMSE according to disease-related variable

		<23.8†
Severity	Asymptomatic	7.7%
	Mildly symptomatic	13%
	Mild-to-moderate	26.3%
	Moderate-to-severe	6.4%
	Neuro+	16.5%
	Neuro–	4.1%
ICU	Admitted	5.4%
	Not admitted	19.2%
Steroids	Yes	13.2%
	No	12.9%
Infections	Yes	8.5%
	No	14.4%

MMSE, Mini-Mental State Examination; Neuro+/-, patients with/without remote/recent/disease-related comorbidities possibly affecting cognition. †Cutoff from Measso et al. [17]

in all the above models ($p \leq .002$), whereas *Group* never showed significance ($.052 \leq p \leq .28$). Consistent results were detected when building a model encompassing *ICU*, *Infection*, and *Steroids* along with their interactions: *ICU* and age were predictive per se ($\chi^2(1)=5.5$; $p=.019$ and $\chi^2(1)=4.7$; $p=.029$, respectively), whereas no other main ($.395 \leq p \leq .75$) or interactive ($.1 \leq p \leq .93$) terms were significant.

As being the only significant target factor in previous models, *ICU* was further tested on MMSE Orientation, Attention, Memory and Language errors by controlling for *Group* and age. The same model was instead tested on constructional praxis via a logistic regression. *ICU* was not found to affect performances on any of the sub-scales ($.112 \leq p \leq .311$). However, *ICU* admission predicted ($\chi^2(1)=4.4$; $p=.036$) a higher probability ($M=.88$; $SE=.04$) of responding correctly to constructional praxis item—when compared to non-admission ($M=.72$; $SE=.06$).

Factors of interest were then further tested on Neuro– patients' MMSE scores only ($N=49$) by controlling for age and education. As both normality ($W=.957$; $p=.38$) and homoscedasticity ($F(7,16)=1.5$; $p=.435$) assumptions for residuals were met, a linear model was run—which encompassed all possible between-factor interactions. No significant terms arose with the exception of a two-way *Steroids*×*Infection* interaction ($F(1,14)=6.3$; $p=.025$; $\eta^2=.31$)—whose post hoc, Bonferroni-corrected decomposition revealed that, among patients suffering from infections, those treated with steroids performed significantly ($t(14)= -3.86$; $p=.01$) better ($M=29.1$; $SE=.64$) than those not treated with steroids ($M=25.5$; $SE=.67$).

Discussion

This work sheds further light on the association between cognitive sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection and premorbid/disease-related clinical variables [7].

With respect to the protective role of ICU admission on cognitive functions, the present results are in line with the report by [5]. It can thus be hypothesized that patients presenting with ARDS/respiratory insufficiency who underwent intensive cares might have suffered less from cerebral hypoxia than those treated with non-invasive ventilation [5]—despite these treatments being more aggressive.

Furthermore, ICU admission being shown to affect global cognition but not specific instrumental domains further supports the notion that COVID-19-related cognitive deficits are likely to reflect a decrease in general cognitive efficiency—which is typical of critical illnesses also affecting the CNS [15].

It is moreover worth mentioning that the trend toward a poorer cognitive outcome in mild-to-moderate patients when compared to both mild and moderate-to-severe ones also appears to mirror Alemanno et al.'s [5] findings.

The present work does not provide overall conclusive evidence regarding the association between cognitive outcomes and steroidal treatment in COVID-19 patients [12]. This might have been due to missing values as far as whether patients have been treated with steroids (information not available for $N=52$ patient).

However, when selectively assessing patients judged as not at risk for cognitive impairment, steroids appeared to improve cognitive outcomes when infections occurred during the disease course. Therefore, although steroidal interventions have been postulated as possibly iatrogenic on cerebral functions [12], they might be beneficial to cognitive outcomes when other inflammatory processes co-occur with COVID-19.

As for background outcomes, findings here reported strongly support the role of advanced age as a risk factor for a worse cognitive outcome in post-infective SARS-CoV-2 patients [6]. Moreover, although no strong inferential evidence emerged, a descriptive trend toward a higher prevalence of cognitive dysfunction in already-at-risk COVID-19-recovered patients could be noted [6].

A limitation of this report is represented by the fact that only the MMSE has been addressed as a cognitive measure, this possibly leading to an underestimation of the prevalence of COVID-19-related cognitive aftermaths. Indeed, it has been suggested that other screeners, such as the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) [3] and the Frontal Assessment Battery [2], may be more appropriate for detecting such dysfunctions—possibly due to the an higher sensitivity [4, 10].

In conclusion, cognitive sequelae of COVID-19 are likely to arise from a complex interplay between background/clinical premorbid features and disease-related/interventional procedures and outcomes. Mild-to-moderate patients requiring assistive ventilation who however are not admitted to an ICU are more likely to suffer from cognitive deficits—despite their etiology remaining elusive. Further investigations are thus needed, also focusing on the longitudinal interplay of cognition and clinical features [11].

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to all participants. The authors would like to thank Dr. Sharon Brambilla for her precious help to data collection.

Declarations

This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Conflict of interest None

Ethical approval Patients provided their informed consent. This study received ethical approval.

References

- Aiello EN, Depaoli EG, Gallucci M (2020) Usability of the negative binomial model for analyzing ceiling and highly-inter-individually-variable cognitive data. *Neurol Sci* 41:S273–S274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10072-020-04753-3>
- Aiello EN, Esposito A, Gramegna C, Gazzaniga V, Zago S, Difonzo T, ... & Bolognini N (2021a). The Frontal Assessment Battery (FAB) and its sub-scales: validation and updated normative data in an Italian population sample. *Neurol Sci*, 1-6
- Aiello EN, Fiabane E, Manera MR, Radici A, Grossi F, Ottonello M, Pain D, Pistarini C (2021b) Screening for cognitive sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a comparison between the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) and the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA). *Neurol Sci*:1–4
- Aiello EN, Gramegna C, Esposito A, Gazzaniga V, Zago S, Difonzo T, ... & Bolognini N (2021c) The Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA): updated norms and psychometric insights into adaptive testing from healthy individuals in Northern Italy. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, 1-8
- Alemanno F, Houdayer E, Parma A, Spina A, Del Forno A, Scatolini A, Angelone S, Brugliera L, Tettamanti A, Beretta L, Iannaccone S (2021) COVID-19 cognitive deficits after respiratory assistance in the subacute phase: a COVID-rehabilitation unit experience. *PLoS One* 16:e0246590
- Almeria M, Cejudo JC, Sotoca J, Deus J, Krupinski J (2020) Cognitive profile following COVID-19 infection: clinical predictors leading to neuropsychological impairment. *Brain, Behavior, & Immunity-Health* 9:100163
- Alnefeesi Y, Siegel A, Lui LM, Teopiz KM, Ho R, Lee Y, Nasri F, Gill H, Lin K, Cao B, Rosenblat JD (2021) Impact of SARS-CoV-2 infection on cognitive function: a systematic review. *Front Psych* 11:1629
- Baig AM, Khaleeq A, Ali U, Syeda H (2020) Evidence of the COVID-19 virus targeting the CNS: tissue distribution, host–virus interaction, and proposed neurotropic mechanisms. *ACS Chem Neurosci* 11:995–998
- Bailey EK, Steward KA, VandenBussche Jantz AB, Kamper JE, Mahoney EJ, Duchnick JJ (2021) Neuropsychology of COVID-19: anticipated cognitive and mental health outcomes. *Neuropsychology* 35:335
- Beaud V, Crottaz-Herbette S, Dunet V, Vaucher J, Bernard-Valnet R, Du Pasquier R, Clarke S (2021) Pattern of cognitive deficits in severe COVID-19. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 92:567–568
- Blazhenets G, Schröter N, Bormann T, Thurow J, Wagner D, Frings L et al (2021) Slow but evident recovery from neocortical dysfunction and cognitive impairment in a series of chronic COVID-19 patients. *J Nucl Med*
- Ghasemiyeh P, Borhani-Haghighi A, Karimzadeh I, Mohammadi-Samani S, Vazin A, Safari A, Qureshi AI (2020) Major neurologic adverse drug reactions, potential drug–drug interactions and pharmacokinetic aspects of drugs used in COVID-19 patients with stroke: a narrative review. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 16:595
- Helms J, Kremer S, Merdji H, Clere-Jehl R, Schenck M, Kummerlen C et al (2020) 415 Neurologic features in severe SARS-CoV-2 infection. *N Engl J Med* 382:2268–2270
- IBM Corp (2020) IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 27.0. IBM Corp, Armonk, NY
- Jaywant A., Vanderlind, W. M., Alexopoulos, G. S., Fridman, C. B., Perlis, R. H., Gunning, F. M. (2021). Frequency and profile of objective cognitive deficits in hospitalized patients recovering from COVID-19. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 1-6.
- Kim HY (2013) Statistical notes for clinical researchers: assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics* 38:52–54
- Measso G, Cavazzeran F, Zappala G, Lebowitz BD, Crook TH, Pirozzolo FJ, Amaducci LA, Massari D, Grigoletto F (1993) The Mini-Mental State Examination: normative study of an Italian random sample. *Dev Neuropsychol* 9:77–85
- Pistarini, C., Fiabane, E., Houdayer, E., Vassallo, C., Manera, M.R., Alemanno, F. (2021) Cognitive and emotional disturbances due to COVID-19: an exploratory study in the rehabilitation setting. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 12, 643-646.
- Rabinovitz B, Jaywant A, Fridman CB (2020) Neuropsychological functioning in severe acute respiratory disorders caused by the coronavirus: implications for the current COVID-19 pandemic. *Clin Neuropsychol* 34:1453–1479
- Ritchie K, Chan D, Watermeyer T (2020) The cognitive consequences of the COVID-19 epidemic: collateral damage? *Brain Commun.* 2:fcaa069. <https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcaa069>
- The jamovi project (2021). jamovi. (Version 1.6) [Computer Software]. Retrieved from <https://www.jamovi.org>.
- Wilson BA, Betteridge S, Fish J (2020) Neuropsychological consequences of COVID-19. *Neuropsychol Rehab* 30:1625–1628
- Zhou H, Lu S, Chen J, Wei N, Wang D, Lyu H et al (2020) The landscape of cognitive function in recovered COVID-19 patients. *J Psychiatr Res* 129:98–102
- Zubair AS, McAlpine LS, Gardin T, Farhadian S, Kuruvilla DE, Spudich S (2020) Neuropathogenesis and neurologic manifestations of the coronaviruses in the age of coronavirus disease 2019: a review. *JAMA Neurology* 77:1018–1027
- Mattioli F, Stampatori C, Righetti F, Sala E, Tomasi C, De Palma G (2021) Neurological and cognitive sequelae of Covid-19: a four month follow-up. *J Neurol* 268:4433–4428
- Stracciari A, Bottini G, Guarino M, Magni E, Pantoni L (2021) Cognitive and behavioral manifestations in SARS-CoV-2 infection: not specific or distinctive features?. *Neurol Sci* 1–9

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Authors and Affiliations

Marina Rita Manera¹ · Elena Fiabane² · Debora Pain³ · Edoardo Nicolò Aiello⁴  · Alice Radici³ · Marcella Ottonello² · Mariacristina Padovani¹ · Barbara Ann Wilson⁵ · Jessica Fish⁶ · Caterina Pistarini⁷

Marina Rita Manera
marina.manera@icsmaugeri.it

Elena Fiabane
elenamaria.fiabane@icsmaugeri.it

Debora Pain
debora.pain@icsmaugeri.it

Alice Radici
alice.radici@icsmaugeri.it

Marcella Ottonello
marcella.ottonello@icsmaugeri.it

Mariacristina Padovani
mariacristina.padovani@icsmaugeri.it

Barbara Ann Wilson
barbara.wilson00@gmail.com

Jessica Fish
Jessica.Fish@glasgow.ac.uk

Caterina Pistarini
caterina.pistarini@icsmaugeri.it

¹ Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri, IRCCS, Psychology Unit of Pavia Institute, Pavia, Italy

² Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri, Department of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine of Genova Nervi Institute, Genoa, Italy

³ Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri, IRCCS, Neurorehabilitation Department of Milano Institute, Milan, Italy

⁴ PhD Program in Neuroscience, School of Medicine and Surgery, University of Milano-Bicocca, Monza, Italy

⁵ Department of Clinical Neuropsychology & Clinical Health Psychology, St George's University, London, UK

⁶ Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University Of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

⁷ Istituti Clinici Scientifici Maugeri, IRCCS, Department of Neurorehabilitation of Pavia Institute, Pavia, Italy