



Systematic Reviews

Journal of Hematology and Allied Sciences



Changes in hematological and other laboratory parameters in COVID-19 infection

Prakas Kumar Mandal¹, Rishu Vidhatri¹

¹Department of Hematology, Nil Ratan Sircar Medical College, Kolkata, West Bengal, India.

*Corresponding author:

Dr. Rishu Vidhatri, Department of Hematology, Nil Ratan Sircar Medical College, Kolkata, West Bengal, Kolkata, India.

rishuvidhatrib19@gmail.com

Received: 28 January 2022 Accepted: 08 March 2022 EPub Ahead of Print: 02 April 2022 Published: 19 April 2022

DOI

10.25259/JHAS_5_2022

Quick Response Code:



ABSTRACT

Severe acute respiratory syndrome-CoV-2 was declared as a pandemic by the World Health Organization in March 2020. The virus belongs to the family Coronaviridae and causes infection of varying severity ranging from mild respiratory tract infection to severe pneumonia or acute respiratory disease syndrome. Several laboratory parameters are deranged in COVID-19 infection. The gold standard of diagnosis of COVID-19 infection is polymerase chain reaction (PCR) from the nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swab. However, at remote places, where PCR reports are made available to patients after a time gap laboratory parameters may guide the treating physician regarding diagnosis, disease severity, and prognosis.

Keywords: COVID-19 infection, Laboratory parameters, Disease severity

INTRODUCTION

Coronavirus belongs to the family Coronaviridae. It has caused two major pandemics in the past 20 years, one in 2002 severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS-CoV) and the other in 2012 Middle East respiratory syndrome-CoV.^[1] This time the pandemic is caused by SARS-CoV-2 which is the seventh known coronavirus to infect humans. The novel virus infection was first reported in Wuhan, China, in December 2019 and then rapidly spread worldwide. SARS-CoV-2 was declared as an emergency on January 30, 2020, by the World Health Organization (WHO) and shortly on March 11 was declared a pandemic by the WHO.^[2] It has ravaged the whole world over the past 2 years and recently by new mutant more virulent strains. In India, the first case was detected on January 30, 2020, in a student who returned from Wuhan University to Thrissur, Kerala.^[3] Since then, millions of infected cases have been reported from India. The clinical manifestation of the disease varies from asymptomatic cases to severe cases with multiorgan dysfunction. The key to controlling the pandemic is early diagnosis, containment, disease stratification, and proper management.

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY

The SARS-CoV-2 virus is an enveloped single-stranded (ss) ribonucleic acid (RNA) virus and belongs to the family Coronaviridae.^[4] Bats are believed to be the animal reservoir of the virus.^[5] The virus is transmitted from person to person through a respiratory droplet. The coronavirus is made of four proteins, the spike proteins (S), membrane (M), envelop

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, transform, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms. ©2022 Published by Scientific Scholar on behalf of Journal of Hematology and Allied Sciences

(E), and nucleocapsid (N) proteins.^[6] These S proteins bind to the angiotensin-converting enzyme receptor 2 present on pulmonary epithelial cells of the host and multiple copies of ssRNAs are formed by enzyme RNAdependent RNA polymerase. The viral RNA integrates with the host ribosome and translates to form a complete virion which is released from the pneumocyte. The injured pneumocyte releases various inflammatory cytokines, leading to disease complications. The incubation period of COVID-19 is 5–6 days but can be up to 14 days. The virus can infect patients of any age, most seen in 40–70 years, and present with fever, body aches, breathlessness, dry cough, abdominal pain, vomiting, and loose stools. According to disease severity, it can be asymptomatic, mild, moderate, or severe disease.^[7,8]

CURRENT DIAGNOSTICS OF COVID-19

Confirmatory test for COVID-19 infection is molecular identification of SARS-CoV-2 using nucleic acid amplification tests such as the reverse transcriptasequantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or viral gene sequencing.^[9] Samples used are nasopharyngeal, oropharyngeal swab, sputum, or bronchoalveolar fluid. Rapid diagnosis of infection can also be done using rapid antigen test kits. However, in the developing countries, where laboratories are not well equipped and there is a lack of trained technicians to perform massive molecular tests in this pandemic which may lead to delay in results, during which clinical assessment is crucial for patient management. During this period, the patient history, hematological and biochemical laboratory parameters, and imaging in selected cases aid in the clinical confirmation of diagnosis. Chest X-ray is typically inconclusive in the early stages of the disease; as the infection progresses bilateral multifocal alveolar opacities are observed, which can even be associated with pleural effusion. High-resolution computed tomography is extremely sensitive even in the early phase of the disease and shows multifocal bilateral "ground-glass" areas associated with consolidation and patchy peripheral distribution, with greater involvement of the lower lobes.^[10]

HEMATOLOGICAL INDICES

Hematological indices vary in COVID-19 patients according to disease severity. In the developing countries with resource constraint settings where molecular reports may take several days to come, these parameters at least may give some clue to treating physicians toward diagnosis and disease severity. In the COVID-19 pandemic, the clinical and laboratory findings may help the treating physician to narrow down the differential diagnosis, facilitate early isolation of patients, and provide symptomatic treatment based on the laboratory parameters which are the treatment option available for this novel viral infection. Published literature has shown that there are leukopenia, lymphopenia, high neutrophilto-lymphocyte ratio, and thrombocytopenia.^[11-26] [Table 1] shows alteration in hematological parameters published in various studies. Thrombocytopenia with significant bleeding is unusual. Hemoglobin remains normal in most cases until there is a severe infection. Whether these alterations in hematological parameters are associated with morbidity and mortality in COVID-19 infection is not well established and there is conflicting evidence for the same.

In severe infection, Tang et al.^[26] found that thrombocytopenia negatively correlated with 28-day mortality. Our experience with this novel viral infection is new and published literature has shown that there is an increase in leukocyte, high neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, lymphocytopenia, and thrombocytopenia with the progression of the disease.^[17,18] Lymphocytopenia is a common abnormal laboratory parameter found in COVID-19 infection and may give a clue about disease prognosis in the initial phase of infection. Out of 1099 patients studied by Guan et al., [28] 83.2% of patients had lymphocytopenia, and leukocytosis was associated with severe disease. Qin et al.[17] studied 452 patients of which 286 had a severe infection and found a significant (P < 0.001) higher leukocytosis, neutrophilia, high neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, and lymphocytopenia in the severe group when compared to the non-severe group. Huang et al.^[14] and Wang et al.^[20] found a significant association between lymphopenia and intensive care unit (ICU) admission. Like the above-mentioned studies, Fan et al.[13] also found that on admission, low lymphocyte count was significantly (P < 0.001) associated with ICU admissions. While the above discussed published literature found an association between hematological parameters and disease severity or prognosis, other studies reveal conflicting results. Fan et al.^[13] showed that there was no association between thrombocytopenia at either admission or during hospitalization and ICU admission. Wu et al.[21] found a nonsignificant difference in platelet count between survivors and non-survivors complicated by acute respiratory distress syndrome. Young et al.[8] found that platelet count was not different in patients requiring oxygen support and those who did not, but the statistical comparison was not done. Wang et al.^[20] and Wu et al.^[21] also found that there was a nonsignificant difference in platelet count between hospitalized patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in ICU and non-ICU patients. Liu et al.^[15] found a non-significant difference in platelet, leukocyte, and lymphocyte count in patients with progressive and stable SARS-CoV2 infection.

THROMBOTIC BIOMARKERS

Apart from hematological indices, thrombotic biomarkers are also frequently abnormal in SARS-CoV-2 infection.

$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	References	Sample size	Platelet	WBC	Hemoglobin
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ding et $al^{[11]}$		Thrombocytopenia		•
severe 57 (79,20)Non-severe - 14 (70-00)(P-0.09)Non-severe - 14 (P-0.10)Non-severe - 14 (P-0.51)Non-severe - 13 (P-0.51)Non-severe - 13 (P-	e ing er um				
57 (79, 2%) 10.5% lymphocyte ratio (P=0.02) was increased (P=0.10) (P=0.51) non-severe (P=0.108) Lymphocyte ratio (P=0.002) in severe patients study on RT+PCB Decrease in hemoglobin - 51% Single-center Thrombocytopenia Leukocytosis 24% Decrease in hemoglobin - 51% (n=90) -4% Lymphocyte moto (P=0.02) H5 slightly decrease in ICU patients. (n=01) #er67 Thrombocytopenia Leukopenia 32.9% (P=0.87) H5 slightly decrease in ICU patients. 9 - LCU Non-ICU - 1% Leukopenia 36.9% (P=0.002) H5 slightly decrease Non-ICU - 3% H5 slightly decrease Non-ICU - 3% 14uang et al. ^[14] m=41 LCU=13 Thrombocytopenia (P=0.67) Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.45) Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.45) Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.45) Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.45) Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.16) Interformant in ICU patients.				(P=0.09) – Leukocyte $(P=0.05)$. Neutrophil:	Non-severe – 14
non-sever(P=0.108)(P=0.102)					
					(1 0.01)
		non severe	(1-0.100)		
	hen <i>et al</i> [12]	Single-center	Thrombocytopenia		Decrease in
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c } & \mbox{crease} & \mbox{line} & line$	Shen et ut.	0	• -		
		'			
an et al. n=67 Thrombocytopenia Leukopenia 29.2% (P=0.87) Hb slightly decrease. 9 - ICU ICU - 21% Iymphopenia 36.9% (P=0.0002) in ICU patients. 9 - ICU Non-ICU - 11% Difference non-significant (P=0.67) Icu - 8% Hb slightly decrease. non-significant (P=0.67) Icu - 8% Non-ICU - 4% Point CU - 3% Icu - 8% Non-ICU - 28 Non-ICU - 1% Leukocytosis ICU - 54% (P=0.2) Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.4) Jumphopenia Icu - 8% Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.2) .iu et al. ^[15] n=78 Disease progression Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.04) Median absolute neutrophil count ICU - 10.6×10% (Pe0.04) Median absolute neutrophil count ICU - 10.6×10% (Pe0.04) Jia et al. ^[16] n=78 Disease progression Stabilization groups -5.18±1.63×109/L Progression Jia et al. ^[16] n=78 Disease progression Stabilization groups -5.18±1.63×109/L Progression Jia et al. ^[16] n=91 Severe -152 TLC Hb severe - 130 Progression					
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Fon et al [13]	· ,			Hb slightly decreased
9 - ICUNon-ICU - 11% (P=0.67)Difference non-significant (P=0.07)Huang et al. $n=41$ ICU=13Thrombocytopenia (V=0.67)Leucopenia ICU - 8% Non-ICU - 3%Hb slightly decreases in ICU patients. (P=0.2)Non-ICU - 28Non-ICU - 4% (P=0.45)Non-ICU - 54% Non-ICU - 54%(P=0.2)Jun et al. $n=78$ Disease progression - 11Disease progression - 143.9564.81× 109/L (P=0.16)Disease ICU - 44×10° (IQR 2.0-61) (P=0.00069) ICU - 44×10° (IQR 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) (IQR 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) tool -143.9564.81× (P=0.24)Hb severe - 130 (ISE 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) (ISE 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) (ISE 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) (ISE 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) (ISE 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) (ISE 2.0-61) (P=0.000069) 			• -		
Itang et al. $(P=0.67)$ non-significant $(P=0.07)$ Itang et al. $n=41$ ICU=13 Non-ICU=28Inrombocytopenia ICU - 8%Leucopenia ICU - 8% 				Lymphopenia 36.9% (P=0.0002)	÷
		9 – ICU			
Huang et al. ¹¹⁴¹ $n=41$ ICU=13 Non-ICU = 18 Non-ICU = 18 Non-ICU = 18% Leucopenia ICU = 8% Non-ICU = 33% Hb slightly decreased in ICU patients. Non-ICU = 19% Non-ICU = 19% $P=0.2$ Non-ICU = 48% Non-ICU = 19% $P=0.2$ (P=0.45) Non-ICU = 54% (P=0.2) Non-ICU = 55% Non-ICU = 55% Non-ICU = 54% Non-ICU = 44×10° ICU = 85% Non-ICU = 44×10° (IQR 2.0-61) (P=0.0069) ICI = 106×10°/L (IQR 5.0-11.8) non-ICU = 4.4×10° III disease progression = 6.08±2.56 x109/L Disease progression Stabilization groups = 5.18±1.63×109/L III = 109/L Disease progression Iosease trapersession Group (P=0.075) stabilized 67 IO9/L Group (P=0.075) III = 142) Non-sever (127-208)×10°/L Severe - 152 TLC Hb severe - 130 (127-208)×10°/L Severe - 152 (126-147) (P=0.27) Non-severe - 166 Non-severe - 9.9 (0.7-1.3)×10°/L III = 142) Non-sever Non-severe - 166 Non-severe - 9.9 (0.7-1.3)×10°/L III = 142) Non-sever Non-severe - 166 Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004) Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004) Severe - 2			(P=0.67)		-
Non-ICU=28 ICU = 8% Non-ICU - 33% in ICU patients. Non-ICU = 4% Leukocytosis ICU = 54% (P=0.2) Non-ICU = 19% Leukocytosis ICU = 54% (P=0.2) Jumphopenia ICU = 8% Non-ICU = 19% (P=0.04) (P=0.2) Jumphopenia ICU = 65% Non-ICU = 54% (P=0.04) (P=0.2) Jumphopenia ICU = 64% (P=0.04) Median absolute neutrophil count ICU = 106 (×10) ⁰ /L (IQR S-0-1.18) non-ICU = 4.4×10° Jum et al. ^[18] n=78 Disease progression Stabilization groups = 5.18±1.63×109/L (P=0.294).1ymphocytes are slightly lower in Juscase 109/L disease progression Group (P=0.075) (P=0.294).1ymphocytes are slightly lower in Jumprovement/ Disease stabilized Group (P=0.075) (118-142) Non-sever 109/L Qian et al. ^[16] n=91 Severe - 152 TLC Hb severe - 130 (118-142) Non-sever Qian et al. ^[16] n=452 Thrombocytopenia Severe - 0.9 (0.7-1.3)×10 ⁿ /L (P=0.27) Qian et al. ^[16] n=452 Thrombocytopenia Severe - 0.9 (0.7-1.3)×10 ⁿ /L (P=0.27)	T , T [14]		771 1		
$ 2 [19] \ \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } & Non-ICU - 4\% & [eukocytosis ICU - 54\% & (P=0.2) \\ & (P=0.45) & Non-ICU - 1\% (P=0.04) \\ & Jumphopenia \\ & ICU - 85\% & Non-ICU - 1\% (P=0.04) \\ & Median absolute neutrophil count ICU - 10.6\times10^{9}/L (1QR 5.0-11.8) \\ & non-ICU - 4.4\times10^{9} & (IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.0069) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.0001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.0001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.0001) \\ & IGR 2.0-6.0001 \\ & IGR 2.0-6$	iuang et al.[14]			1	
		Non-ICU=28			-
Lime et al.Isrue is a set of the second					(P=0.2)
$ \begin{array}{lllll} \begin{tabular}{lll} eq:linear_l$			(<i>P</i> =0.45)		
$ \begin{tabular}{ 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16$					
Jute tal.Median absolute neutrophil count ICU - 106×10^{17} (IQR 5.0-11.8) $(IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069)$ $(IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069)$ $(IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069)$ $(IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069)$ $(IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069)$ $(IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00069)$ $IQR 2.0-6.1) (P=0.00075)$ $IQR 2.0-7)$ $IQPL (P=0.075)$ $IQPL (P=0.075)$ $IQPL (P=0.075)$ 					
$ \begin{array}{llllll} \begin{tabular}{lllll} limits and limits a$					
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$				Median absolute neutrophil count ICU –	
Lin et al.ICIQR 2-0-6.1) (P=0.00069)Lin et al.n=78DiseaseTLC in disease progression - 6.08±2.56 x109/LDiseaseprogressionStabilization groups -5.18±1.63×109/Lprogression -11-143.9±64.81×(P=0.294). Lymphocytes are slightly lower inDisease109/Ldisease progressionimprovement/Disease stabilizedGroup (P=0.075)stabilized 67-173.2±55.37(IIE(P=0.116)109/L(IIE-102)Qian et al.n=91Severe - 152TLC(IIE-2008)×109/LSevere - 5.23 (4.74-6.8)×109/L(IIE-142) Non-sever(IIE-2008)×109/LSevere - 5.23 (4.74-6.8)×109/L-135 (126-147)(IIE-2008)×109/LNon-sever - 4.97 (4.02-5.65)×109/L (P=0.010)-135 (126-147)(IIE-2008)×109/LNon-sever - 4.97 (4.02-5.63)×109/L (P=0.027)-135 (126-147)(IIE-2008)×109/LSevere - 0.9 (0.7-1.3)×109/L(P=0.27)P=0.51Severe - 0.9 (0.7-1.3)×109/L(P=0.27)Non-sever - 1.8 (LIE-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)P=0.51Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)P=0.51Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)Non-sever - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)Non-sever - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)Non-sever - 1.4 (1.05-1.75)×107/L (P=0.027)-135 (126-147)Non-sever - 2.8 (3.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)Non-sever - 2.8 (3.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)Non-sever - 2.8 (1.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)-135 (126-147)					
Lin et al.n=78DiseaseTLC in disease progression - 6.08±2.56 x109/LDiseaseprogression - 11143.9±64.81×(P=0.294). Lymphocytes are slightly lower in DiseaseDisease109/L(Disease progression)improvement/Disease stabilizedGroup (P=0.075)stabilized 67-173.2±55.37× 109/LGroup (P=0.075)(P=0.116)(P=0.116)Qian et al.n=91Severe - 152TLCNon-severe - 198Non-severe - 4.97 (A02-5.65)×10°/L(118-142) Non-sever (P=0.27)Point et al.n=452Thrombocytopeni in severe infectionSevere - 0.9 (0.7-1.3)×10°/L Non-severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 1.4 (1.05-1.75)×10°/L (P=0.004)Qin et al.n=452Thrombocytopeni in severe infectionSevere cases had higher leukocyte (P=0.001)Qian et al.n=150Platelet count in severe infection(Ci 5.4.9.×10°)? PC.0001), eoutophils (0.0 vs. 0.2%; PC.0001), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2%; PC.0015)Quan et al.n=150Platelet count in non-survivorsLeukocytosi and lymphopenia were significantly lower					
Disease progression - 11progression -143.9 \pm 64.81× 109/L improvement/ stabilized 67Stabilization groups -5.18 \pm 1.63×109/L (P=0.294). Lymphocytes are slightly lower in disease progressionQian et al. [16]Disease stabilized (P=0.116)Group (P=0.075)Qian et al. [16]n=91Severe - 152 (127-208)×10°/L (P=0.116)TLC Severe - 5.23 (4.74-6.8)×10°/L (127-208)×10°/LHb severe - 130 (127-208)×10°/L (144-248)×10°/LQian et al. [16]n=91Severe - 198 (127-208)×10°/L (P=0.51)Non-severe - 4.97 (4.02-5.65)×10°/L (P=0.010) (P=0.27)-135 (126-147) (P=0.27)Qin et al. [17]n=452Thrombocytopenia in severe infection (P=0.001)Severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 3.32 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.004)(P=0.001)Qin et al. [17]n=452Thrombocytopenia in sever infection (P=0.001)Severe case had higher leukocyte (f=0.001)(P=0.001) ymphocytes count (0.8 vs. 1.0×10°, P<0.001), neutrophil Severe - 286Severe - 286 in sever infection in sever infection (P=0.001)Leukocytosis and lymphopenia were s3.2; P<0.001), lower percentages of monocytes (6.6 vs. 8.4%; P<0.001), cosinophils (0.0 vs. 0.2%; P<0.001), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2%; P=0.015)					
$ \begin{array}{lllll} \mbox{progression - 11} & -143.9\pm 64.81 \times & (P=0.294). Lymphocytes are slightly lower in \\ \mbox{Disease} & 109/L & disease progression \\ \mbox{improvement/} & Disease stabilized & Group (P=0.075) \\ \mbox{stabilized 67} & -173.2\pm 55.37 \times \\ \mbox{109/L} & (P=0.116) \\ \mbox{period} & P=0.116 \\ \mbox{period} & P=0.51 \\ \mbox{period} & P=0.001 \\ \mbox{prodd} & P=0.001 \\ \m$	Liu <i>et al</i> . ^[15]	<i>n</i> =78			
Disease improvement/ stabilized 67109/L Disease stabilized $-173.2\pm55.37\times$ $109/L(P=0.075)disease progressionGroup (P=0.075)Qian et al.n=91Severe -152(127-208)\times10^9/LTLCSevere -5.23 (4.74-6.8)\times10^9/L(118-142) Non-sever-135 (126-147)(144-248)\times10^9/LHb severe -130(144-248)\times10^9/L(144-248)\times10^9/LP=0.51Qin et al.n=452Non-severe -166Non-severe -166Thrombocytopeniamor significant(a_3 vs. 3.2\times10^9, P<0.001), neutrophil(a_3 vs. 3.2\times10^9, P<0.001), neutrophil(a_3 vs. 3.2\times10^9, P<0.001), neutrophil(a_3 vs. 3.2\times10^9, P<0.001), neutrophil(a_5 vs. 8.4\%; P<0.001), neutrophil(b_6 vs. 8.4\%; P<0.001), lowerP=0.001)Ruan et al.n=150Platelet countsignificantly lowersignificantly lowerLeukocytosi and lymphopenia weresignificantly nore in non-survivors$		Disease	progression		
$ \begin{array}{llllll} \mbox{improvement/} & Disease stabilized & Group ($P=0.075$) \\ \mbox{stabilized 67} & -173.2\pm55.37\times \\ 109/L \\ (P=0.116) & \\ \mbox{improvement/} & (P=0.016) & \\ \mbox{improvement/} & (P=0.016) & \\ \mbox{improvement/} & (P=0.16) & \\ \mbox{improvement/} & (P=0.16) & \\ \mbox{improvement/} & (P=0.16) & \\ \mbox{improvement/} & (P=0.27) & \\ improvement$		progression – 11	$-143.9\pm64.81 \times$	(<i>P</i> =0.294). Lymphocytes are slightly lower in	
stabilized 67 $-173.2\pm55.37\times$ 109/L (P=0.116)TLCHb severe - 130Qian et al.n=91Severe - 152TLC(118-142) Non-severe (127-208)×10%/L(118-142) Non-severe (127-208)×10%/LNon-severe - 198Non-severe - 4.97 (4.02-5.65)×10%/L (P=0.010)- 135 (126-147) (P=0.27)Non-severe - 198Non-severe - 4.97 (4.02-5.65)×10%/L (P=0.027) Neutrophil severe - 3.23 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 1.4 (1.05-1.75)×10%/L (P=0.027) Neutrophil severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)Qin et al.n=452ThrombocytopeniaSevere cases had higher leukocyte in severe infection (P=0.001)Qin et al.n=452ThrombocytopeniaSevere cases had higher leukocyte (4.3 vs. 3.2×10% P<0.001), neutrophil lymphocytes count (0.8 vs. 1.0×10%; P<0.001), higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (5.5 vs. 3.2; P<0.001), higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (5.5 vs. 3.2; P<0.001), not sourcytes (6.6 vs. 8.4%; P<0.001), neutrophils (0.0 vs. 0.2%; P<0.001), not sourcytes (6.6 vs. 8.4%; P<0.001), neutrophils (0.0 vs. 0.2%; P<0.001), not basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2%; P=0.015)		Disease	109/L	disease progression	
Qian et al.109/L $(P=0.116)$ Hb severe - 130Qian et al.n=91Severe - 152TLCHb severe - 130 $(127-208) \times 10^9/L$ Severe - 5.23 (4.74-6.8) $\times 10^9/L$ (118-142) Non-severeNon-severe - 198Non-severe - 4.97 (A02-5.65) $\times 10^9/L$ (P=0.010)-135 (126-147) $(144-248) \times 10^9/L$ Lymphocyte(P=0.27)P=0.51Severe - 0.9 (0.7-1.3) $\times 10^9/L$ (P=0.027)Non-severe - 1.4 (1.05-1.75) $\times 10^9/L$ (P=0.027)Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0014)Severe - 2.8 (P=0.0015)Severe - 2.8 (P=0.0014)Non-severe - 2.8 (P=0.0017)Severe - 2.8 (P=0.0014)Non-severe - 2.8 (P=0.0017)Severe - 2.8 (P=0.0017)Nigher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (5.5 vs. 3.2; P<0.0017), neutrophil		improvement/	Disease stabilized	Group (<i>P</i> =0.075)	
Qian et al. $(P=0.116)$ Hb severe - 130Qian et al.n=91Severe - 152TLCHb severe - 130 $(127-208)\times10^9/L$ Severe - 5.23 $(4.74-6.8)\times10^9/L$ $(118-142)$ Non-severeNon-severe - 198Non-severe - 4.97 $(4.02-5.65)\times10^9/L$ (P=0.010)- 135 $(126-147)$ $(144-248)\times10^9/L$ Lymphocyte(P=0.27)P=0.51Severe - 0.9 $(0.7-1.3)\times10^9/L$ (P=0.027)Non-severe - 2.8 $(2.18-3.49)$ (P=0.0004)Non-severe - 2.8 $(2.18-3.49)$ (P=0.0004)Non-severe - 2.8 $(2.18-3.49)$ (P=0.0004)Qin et al.n=452ThrombocytopeniaSevere cases had higher leukocyteNon-severe - 286more significant $(5.6 vs. 4.9\times10^9; P<0.001)$, neutrophilSevere - 286more significant $(6.6 vs. 8.4\%; P<0.001)$, neutrophil $(P=0.01)$ Hymphocytes count $(0.8 vs. 1.0\times10^9; P<0.001)$, higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio $(5.5 vs. 3.2; P<0.001)$, lower percentages of monocytesRuan et al.n=150Platelet countLeukocytosis and lymphopenia wereSurvivor - 82significantly lowersignificantly more in non-survivors		stabilized 67	-173.2±55.37×		
Qian et al.n=91Severe - 152TLCHb severe - 130 $(127-208)\times10^9/L$ Severe - 5.23 $(4.74-6.8)\times10^9/L$ $(118-142)$ Non-severeNon-severe - 198Non-severe - 4.97 $(4.02-5.65)\times10^9/L$ $(P=0.010)$ $-135 (126-147)$ $(144-248)\times10^9/L$ Lymphocyte $(P=0.27)$ P=0.51Severe - 0.9 $(0.7-1.3)\times10^9/L$ Non-severe - 1.4 $(1.05-1.75)\times10^9/L$ $(P=0.004)$ Qin et al.n=452ThrombocytopeniaNon-severe - 166more significant(5.6 vs. 4.9\times10^9; P<0.001), neutrophil			109/L		
$(127-208)\times10^9/L$ Severe $-5.23(4.74-6.8)\times10^9/L$ $(118-142)$ Non-severeNon-severe -198 Non-severe $-4.97(4.02-5.65)\times10^9/L$ ($P=0.010$) $-135(126-147)$ $(144-248)\times10^9/L$ Lymphocyte($P=0.27$) $P=0.51$ Severe $-0.9(0.7-1.3)\times10^9/L$ Non-severe $-1.4(1.05-1.75)\times10^9/L$ ($P=0.0004$)Qin et al. ^[17] $n=452$ ThrombocytopeniaNon-severe -166 more significant($5.6 \text{ vs. } 4.9\times10^9; P<0.001$), neutrophilSevere $-2.86(2.18-3.49)$ ($P=0.0004$)Severe $-2.86(2.18-3.49)$ ($P=0.0004$)Severe -2.86 in severe infection($4.3 \text{ vs. } 3.2\times10^9; P<0.001$), neutrophilNum-severe -286 in severe infection($4.3 \text{ vs. } 3.2\times10^9; P<0.001$), neutrophilNum et al. ^[18] $n=150$ Platelet countSurvivor -82 significantly lowersignificantly lowerNon-survivorin non-survivorssignificantly more in non-survivors			(P=0.116)		
Non-severe - 198 $(144-248) \times 10^9/L$ $P=0.51$ Non-severe - 4.97 $(4.02-5.65) \times 10^9/L$ $(P=0.010)$ $(P=0.27)$ Qin et al. ^[17] $n=452$ Thrombocytopenia more significant $(P=0.01)$ Severe - 0.9 $(0.7-1.3) \times 10^9/L$ Non-severe - 1.4 $(1.05-1.75) \times 10^9/L$ $(P=0.027)$ Neutrophil severe - 3.32 $(3-5.82)$ Non-severe - 2.8 $(2.18-3.49)$ $(P=0.0004)$ Qin et al. ^[17] $n=452$ Thrombocytopenia more significant $(P=0.01)$ Severe cases had higher leukocyte $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P<0.001)$, neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P<0.001)$ counts, lower $(P=0.001)$ Severe cases had higher leukocyte $(5.6 vs. 4.9 \times 10^9; P<0.001)$, neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P<0.001)$ counts, lower $(P=0.001)$ Ruan et al. ^[18] $n=150$ Platelet count significantly lower Non-survivorLeukocytosis and lymphopenia were significantly more in non-survivors	Qian <i>et al.</i> ^[16]	<i>n</i> =91	Severe – 152	TLC	Hb severe - 130
Qin et al. [17] $n=452$ ImplementationImplementat			(127-208)×10 ⁹ /L	Severe - 5.23 (4.74-6.8)×10 ⁹ /L	(118-142) Non-sever
Qin et al. [17] $n=452$ ImplementationImplementat			Non-severe - 198	Non-severe - 4.97 (4.02-5.65)×10 ⁹ /L (P=0.010)	- 135 (126-147)
P=0.51Severe $-0.9(0.7-1.3)\times10^9/L$ Non-severe $-1.4(1.05-1.75)\times10^9/L(P=0.027)$ Neutrophil severe $-3.32(3-5.82)$ Non-severe $-2.8(2.18-3.49)(P=0.0004)$ Qin et al. ^[17] $n=452$ Non-severe -166 Severe -286 Thrombocytopenia more significant in severe infection $(P=0.001)$ Severe cases had higher leukocyte $(4.3 vs. 3.2\times10^9; P<0.001)$, neutrophil lymphocytes count (0.8 vs. $1.0\times10^9; P<0.001)$, higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (5.5 vs. $3.2; P<0.001)$, lower percentages of monocytes $(6.6 vs. 8.4\%; P<0.001)$, eosinophils (0.0 vs. $0.2\%;$ $P<0.001), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2\%; P=0.015)Ruan et al.[18]n=150Survivor -82Non-survivorsPlatelet countsignificantly lowerin non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia weresignificantly more in non-survivors$			(144-248) ×10 ⁹ /L		
Qin et al.n=452Thrombocytopenia more significant in severe infection $(P=0.001)$ Non-severe - 1.4 $(1.05-1.75)\times10^{9}/L$ $(P=0.027)$ Neutrophil severe - 3.32 $(3-5.82)$ Non-severe - 2.8 $(2.18-3.49)$ $(P=0.0004)$ Qin et al.n=452Thrombocytopenia more significant in severe infection $(P=0.001)$ Severe cases had higher leukocyte $(5.6 vs. 4.9\times10^{9}; P<0.001),$ neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2\times10^{9}; P<0.001)$ counts, lower $(P=0.001)$ Implementation of the severe respective of the severe					
Qin et al.n=452Thrombocytopenia more significant in severe - 166 severe - 286Neutrophil severe - 3.32 (3-5.82) Non-severe - 2.8 (2.18-3.49) (P=0.0004)Qin et al.n=452Thrombocytopenia more significant in severe infection (P=0.001)Severe cases had higher leukocyte (5.6 vs. $4.9 \times 10^{\circ}$; $P<0.001$), neutrophil (4.3 vs. $3.2 \times 10^{\circ}$; $P<0.001$) counts, lower lymphocytes count (0.8 vs. $1.0 \times 10^{\circ}$; $P<0.001$), higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (5.5 vs. 3.2 ; $P<0.001$), lower percentages of monocytes (6.6 vs. 8.4% ; $P<0.001$), eosinophils (0.0 vs. 0.2% ; $P<0.001$), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2% ; $P=0.015$)Ruan et al.n=150Platelet count Survivor - 82 Non-survivorsPlatelet count significantly lower in non-survivors					
Qin et al. $n=452$ Thrombocytopenia more significant in severe – 286Non-severe – 2.8 (2.18–3.49) ($P=0.0004$)Non-severe – 166more significant in severe infection ($P=0.001$)Severe cases had higher leukocyte ($5.6 vs. 4.9 \times 10^9; P<0.001$), neutrophil ($4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P<0.001$) counts, lower lymphocytes count ($0.8 vs. 1.0 \times 10^9; P<0.001$), higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio ($5.5 vs.$ $3.2; P<0.001$), lower percentages of monocytes ($6.6 vs. 8.4\%; P<0.001$), eosinophils ($0.0 vs. 0.2\%;$ $P<0.001$), and basophils ($0.1 vs. 0.2\%; P=0.015$)Ruan et al. $n=150$ Platelet count significantly lower in non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia were significantly more in non-survivors					
Qin et al.n=452Thrombocytopenia more significantSevere cases had higher leukocyte $(5.6 vs. 4.9 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(5.6 vs. 4.9 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(6.6 vs. 4.9 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, neutrophil $(5.5 vs. 3.2; P < 0.001)$, lower percentages of monocytes $(6.6 vs. 8.4\%; P < 0.001)$, eosinophils $(0.0 vs. 0.2\%;$ $P < 0.001), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2\%; P = 0.015)Ruan et al.n=150Platelet countSurvivor - 82Non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia weresignificantly more in non-survivors$				•	
Non-severe - 166more significant in severe infection $(P=0.001)$ (5.6 vs. 4.9×10^9 ; $P<0.001$), neutrophil $(4.3 vs. 3.2 \times 10^9; P<0.001) counts, lowerlymphocytes count (0.8 vs. 1.0 \times 10^9; P<0.001),higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (5.5 vs.3.2; P<0.001), lower percentages of monocytes(6.6 vs. 8.4\%; P<0.001), eosinophils (0.0 vs. 0.2\%;P<0.001), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2\%; P=0.015)Ruan et al.[18]n=150Platelet countsignificantly lowerin non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia weresignificantly more in non-survivors$	Qin <i>et al.</i> ^[17]	<i>n</i> =452	Thrombocytopenia		
Severe - 286in severe infection $(P=0.001)$ $(4.3 \text{ vs. } 3.2 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$ counts, lower lymphocytes count $(0.8 \text{ vs. } 1.0 \times 10^9; P < 0.001)$, higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio $(5.5 \text{ vs.}$ $3.2; P < 0.001)$, lower percentages of monocytes $(6.6 \text{ vs. } 8.4\%; P < 0.001)$, eosinophils $(0.0 \text{ vs. } 0.2\%;$ $P < 0.001)$, and basophils $(0.1 \text{ vs. } 0.2\%; P = 0.015)$ Ruan et al. ^[18] $n=150$ Survivor - 82 Non-survivorPlatelet count significantly lower in non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia were significantly more in non-survivors	-		, ,		
$(P=0.001)$ lymphocytes count $(0.8 \text{ vs. } 1.0 \times 10^{\circ}; P<0.001)$, higher neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio $(5.5 \text{ vs.}$ $3.2; P<0.001)$, lower percentages of monocytes $(6.6 \text{ vs. } 8.4\%; P<0.001)$, eosinophils $(0.0 \text{ vs. } 0.2\%;$ $P<0.001)$, and basophils $(0.1 \text{ vs. } 0.2\%; P=0.015)$ Ruan et al. ^[18] $n=150$ Platelet count significantly lower in non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia were significantly more in non-survivors					
Ruan et al. [18] $n=150$ Platelet countLeukocytosis and lymphopenia wereSurvivor - 82significantly lowersignificantly lowerNon-survivorin non-survivorssignificantly more in non-survivors					
3.2; P<0.001), lower percentages of monocytes (6.6 vs. $8.4%; P<0.001$), eosinophils (0.0 vs. $0.2%;$ $P<0.001$), and basophils (0.1 vs. $0.2%; P=0.015$)Ruan et al. ^[18] $n=150$ Survivor - 82 Non-survivorPlatelet count significantly lower in non-survivorsLeukocytosis and lymphopenia were significantly more in non-survivors			· · · · · · - /		
Ruan et al. $n=150$ Platelet count(6.6 vs. 8.4%; $P < 0.001$), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2%; $P = 0.015$)Ruan et al. $n=150$ Platelet countLeukocytosis and lymphopenia wereSurvivor - 82significantly lowersignificantly more in non-survivorsNon-survivorin non-survivorssignificantly more in non-survivors					
Ruan et al. $n=150$ Platelet count $P<0.001$), and basophils (0.1 vs. 0.2%; $P=0.015$)Survivor - 82significantly lowersignificantly lowersignificantly more in non-survivorsNon-survivorin non-survivorssignificantly more in non-survivors					
Ruan et al.n=150Platelet countLeukocytosis and lymphopenia wereSurvivor - 82significantly lowersignificantly more in non-survivorsNon-survivorin non-survivors					
Survivor – 82significantly lowersignificantly more in non-survivorsNon-survivorin non-survivors	Quan et al [18]	<i>n</i> -150	Platelet count		
Non-survivor in non-survivors	Nudii ei ül.				
				significantly more in non-survivors	

(Contd...)

References	Sample size	Platelet	WBC	Hemoglobin
Wang et al. ^[19]	69 cases SpO2>90% n=55 SpO2<90% n=14	Normal in both groups	Leukopenia severe –21% Non-severe – 62% (<i>P</i> =0.007) Leukocytosis Severe – 7% Non-severe Lymphocytopenia Severe – 79% Non-severe – 32% (<i>P</i> =0.002)	Normal
Wang et al. ^[20]	n=138 ICU – 36 Non-ICU – 102	Median platelet count was slightly lower in ICU patients than in non-ICU patients (<i>P</i> =0.78)	Higher TLC ICU $-6.6 (3.6-9.8) \times 10^{9}$ /L Non-ICU $- 4.3 (3.3-5.4) \times 10^{9}$ /L; $P=0.003$, higher neutrophil count in ICU patients than in non-ICU patients ($P<0.001$) Lymphocytopenia more in ICU patients difference (non-significant)	
Wu <i>et al</i> . ^[21]	n=201 84 (41.8%) developed ARDS	Thrombocytopenia 18.8%	Leukocytosis 23.4% Lymphopenia 64.0% Neutrophilia 34.5%	
Yang et al. ^[22]	52 Critically ill 20 Survivors 32 Non-survivors	Median platelet count was normal in survivors and non-survivors	Lymphocytopenia 85% No association between survivors and non-survivors	
Zachariah <i>et al.</i> ^[23]	n=50 Non-severe – 41 Severe – 9		Leukocytosis (<i>P</i> =0.003) Severe – 23.2% Non-severe – 4.9% Leukopenia (<i>P</i> =0.16) Severe – 16.1% Non-severe – 22% Lymphopenia 72% Non-significant between severe and non-severe (<i>P</i> =0.160)	
Zhang et al. ^[24]	<i>n</i> =140 Non-severe – 58 Severe – 82		Leukopenia – 19.6% (<i>P</i> =0.001) Lymphocytopenia –75.4% (<i>P</i> =0.001) Eosinophil lowered 51.9% (<i>P</i> =0.06) Significantly difference between severe and non-severe	
Zhou <i>et al</i> . ^[25]	n=191 Survivors – 137 Non-survivors – 54	Thrombocytopenia 7% More non-survivors showed thrombocytopenia than survivors. (<i>P</i> <0.0001)	Lymphocytopenia 40% Leukocytopenia 17% Significant difference between non-survivors and survivors (<i>P</i> <0.0001)	

Hb: Hemoglobin, TLC: Total leukocyte count, ICU: Intensive care unit, ARDS: Acute respiratory distress syndrome, and RT-PCR: Reverse tran polymerase chain reaction

Coagulation parameters abnormalities found in COVID-19 infection published in the literature are summarized in Table 2. A D-dimer level may help in the prognostication of disease and available literature has shown an association with disease severity.^[14,19,21] Prothrombin time (PT) and activated partial thromboplastin time (a PTT) were more in severe SARS-CoV-2 infection; however, the difference was non-significant.^[14,22] Han *et al.*^[27] did a study to assess abnormalities of coagulation parameters in COVID-19 infection and found that D-dimer, fibrin/ fibrinogen degradation products (FDPs), and fibrinogen were increased in all patients, and D-dimer and FDP values were higher in patients with severe infections compared to those with mild infection. Tang *et al.*^[26]

Table 2: Changes in	coagulation profile in COVID-19 int	fection.	
Reference	PT (s)	aPTT (s)	D Dimer (mg/L)
Chen et al. ^[12]	Increased 5% Decreased 30%	Increased 6% Decreased 16%	Increased 36%
Huang et al. ^[14]	Median	Median	Median
	ICU – 12.2 s (IQR 11.2–13.4)	ICU – 26.2 s	ICU – 2.4 (0.6–14.4)
	Non-ICU – 10.7 (IQR 9.8–12.1)	(IQR 22.5-33.9)	Non-ICU – 0.5 (0.3–0.8) (P=0.0042)
	(P=0.012)	Non-ICU – 27.7 s	
		(IQR 24.8-34.1)	
		(P=0.57)	
Liu <i>et al.</i> ^[15]			D-dimer more in disease
			progression however difference non-significant (P =0.501)
Qian <i>et al</i> . ^[16]			Severe – 450 (160–485) ng/ml
			Non-severe – 300 (106–400) ng/ml (<i>P</i> =0.591)
Wang et al. ^[20]	Raised in both arms (non-significant)	Normal	Significant increase in ICU group (P<0.001)
Wu <i>et al.</i> ^[21]	Prolonged 2.1%	Prolonged 9.7%	Increased 23.3%
Zachariah et al. ^[23]			Non-severe – 0.2 (0.1–0.3) µg/mL
			Severe – 0.4 (0.2–2.4) µg/mL
			$(P \le 0.001)$
PT: Prothrombin time;	aPTT: activated partial thromboplastin t	ime, ICU: Intensive care	unit

found significantly increased D-dimer and FDP levels, and prolonged PT and aPTT in non-survivors compared to survivors. Zhou *et al.*^[25] found that D-dimer greater than 1 μ g/mL on admission was predictive of in-hospital mortality (*P* = 0.0033). Wang *et al.*^[20] found a significant difference between D-dimer values in ICU as compared to non-ICU patients while there was a non-significant increase in PT in COVID patients and a PTT was normal and there was no significant difference between ICU and non-ICU patients.

BIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS

COVID-19 infection causes activation of the immune system and release of various cytokines which cause injury to vital organs such as the lung, kidney, heart, and liver, resulting in derangement of many biochemical parameters. Biochemical parameters deranged in SARS-CoV-2 infection are enlisted in Table 3. Hypoalbuminemia was significantly more common in severe disease as reported in various studies.^[14,15,18,19] Increased lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) level was significantly associated with severe disease.^[19-21] Liver enzymes were increased in patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection although the rise was marginal.^[12,14,20,22] Many studies have reported aspartate transaminase to be significantly raised in severe cases compared to non-severe.^[19,21] Total bilirubin was marginally more in patients with severe disease.^[12,14,19,22]

Blood urea nitrogen and creatinine levels were increased more in severe infection.^[21,22]

IMMUNOLOGICAL PARAMETERS

The most common immunological abnormality in COVID-19 infection was interleukin 6 (IL-6), erythrocyte sedimentation rate, ferritin, and C-reactive protein (CRP). Immunological parameters deranged in COVID-19 infection are summarized in Table 4. Many studies have documented that CRP is significantly elevated in severe disease as compared to non-severe disease and is an important marker of disease progression and response to treatment.^[15,17-20] Ferritin was increased more in patients who were severely infected compared to those with nonsevere infection.^[17,18] Procalcitonin is not commonly increased in COVID-19 patients and is often raised in patients with a secondary bacterial infection. Huang et al.^[14] did a study on 41 patients and found that procalcitonin levels were raised in four patients and all four had a secondary bacterial infection. Qin et al.,[17] in a study on 452 patients, found that procalcitonin was significantly elevated in ICU admitted patients who were severely infected with COVID-19 infection than in non-ICU patients (0.1 vs. 0.05 ng/mL; P < 0.001), and many inflammatory cytokines were significantly raised in severe infection than the non-severe ones, including IL-2R, IL-6, IL-8, IL-10, and tumor necrosis factor-alpha. Immunoglobulins such as IgA, IgG, and IgM and complement proteins (C3 and C4) were not affected or they were within the normal range. T lymphocytes are significantly decreased in severe COVID-19 infection as compared to non-severe. Both helper T lymphocytes and suppressor T lymphocytes were below normal in all patients and helper T cells were

Reference	Albumin (gm/L)	ALT (IU/L)	AST (IU/L)	Bilirubin (mg/L)	BUN	Creatinine	LDH (IU/L)
Chen et al. ^[12] Fan et al. ^[13]	Decreased 98%	Increase d 98%	Increase d 35%	Increased 18%	Increased 6% Decrease d 17%	Increase d 3% Decreased 21%	Increased in 76% Increased in 43.6% ICU patients (P=0.005)
Huang et al. ^[14]	Median ICU – 27.9 (26.3–30.9) Non-ICU – 34.7 (30.2–36.5) (<i>P</i> =0.00066)	Median ICU - 49 (29-115) Non-ICU - 27 (19.5-40) (P=0.038)	<40 ICU – 38% Non-ICU – 75% (<i>P</i> =0.025)	ICU - 14.0 (11.9-32.9) Non-ICU - 10.8 (9.4-12.3) (P=0.011)			>245 ICU (92%) Non-ICU – 635 (P=0.03)
Liu et al. ^[15]	Progression group – 36.62±6.60 Stabilization group – 41.27±4.55 (<i>P</i> =0.006)	No significant difference (<i>P</i> =0.77)	No significant difference (<i>P</i> =0.78)				
Qian GQ16	Severe – 38.55 (36.33–39.25) g/l Non-severe – 40.2 (38–42.4) g/l (<i>P</i> =0.133)	Severe – 19.9 (14–26) U/l Non-severe – 18 (13–29) U/l (<i>P</i> =0.75)	Severe – 27 (23.75–27) U/l Non-severe – 21 (17–29) U/l (<i>P</i> =0.89)		Severe - 5.19 (4.66-6.14) mmol/L Non-severe - 3.83 (3.25-4.4) mmol/L (P=0.0001)	Severe – 81.5 (70.75–90.5) umol/l Non-severe – 66 (57–76) umol/l (<i>P</i> =0.03)	
Ruan et al. ^[18]	Significantly lower in non-survivors				Significantly high in non survivors		
Wan et al. ^[19]		Slightly more in the severe group (<i>P</i> =0.11)	More in the severe group (<i>P</i> <0.03)				Significantly higher in severe cases (<i>P</i> =0.001)
Wang et al. ^[20]		Normal	Increase in ICU (<i>P</i> <0.001)	Normal	Increased in ICU (<i>P</i> <0.001)	More in ICU patients (<i>P</i> =0.04)	Increase in ICU (P<0.001)
Wu et al. ^[21]	Decreased 98.5%	Increase d 21.7%	Increase d 29.8%	Increased 5.1%	Increased 4.5%	Increased 4.5%	Raised 68.2%

ALT: Alanine transaminase, AST: Aspartate transaminase, BUN: Blood urea creatinine, LDH: Lactate dehydrogenase; and ICU: Intensive care unit

Table 4: Changes in immunological parameters in COVID-19 infection.						
Reference	Procalcitoni n	IL-6	ESR	Ferritin	CRP (mg/L)	
Chen <i>et al</i> . ^[12] Huang <i>et al</i> . ^[14]	Increased 6% >0.5 ng/ml ICU-25% Non-ICU-Nil	Increased 52%	Increased 85%	Increased 63%	Increased 86%	
Liu <i>et al</i> . ^[15]	Non-significant difference between progressive and stable disease (<i>P</i> =0.195)		Non-significant difference between progressive and stable disease (P=0.794)		Progression group versus improvement/stabilization group (38.9 [14.3, 64.8] vs. 10.6 [1.9, 33.1] mg/L, U=1.315, <i>P</i> =0.024)	
Qian <i>et al</i> . ^[16]	Severe – 0 (0) Non-severe – 0.03 (0–0.04) ng/m (<i>P</i> =0.003)				Severe – 30.63 (12.5–103.4) mg/l Non-severe – 5.98 (1.4–11.3) mg/l (P≤0.0001)	

(Contd...)

Table 4: (Conti	inued).				
Reference	Procalcitoni n	IL-6	ESR	Ferritin	CRP (mg/L)
Qian <i>et al</i> . ^[16]	Increased in severe infection (0.1 vs. 0.05 ng/mL; <i>P</i> <0.001)	IL-6, 8, and 10 Significantly more in severe cases	Non-significant difference between severe and non-severe	Increased in severe (800.4 vs. 523.7 ng/ml; <i>P</i> <0.001)	
Ruan et al. ^[18]		Significantly higher in non-survivors		Significantly higher in non-survivors	Significantly higher in non-survivors
Wang et al. ^[19]	Increased in severe cases (<i>P</i> =0.78)				Significantly higher in severe infection (<i>P</i> =0.001)
Wang et al. ^[20]	Procalcitonin ≥ 0.05 ng/ml severe – 75% non-severe – 21.6% ($P \leq 0.001$)				
Wu et al. ^[21]	Raised in 85.6%	Raised in 48.8%	Raised in 93.8%	Raised in 78.5%	Raised in 85.6%
Zachariah	Severe – 0.1 (0.06–0.3)				Severe – 47.6
<i>et al.</i> ^[23]	ng/mL				(20.6–87.1) mg/l
	Non-severe-0.05				Non-severe – 28.7
	(0.03–0.1) ng/mL				(9.5–52.1) mg/l
					P=0.001

IL-6: Interleukin 6, ESR: Erythrocyte sedimentation rate, CRP: C-reactive protein, and ICU: Intensive care unit

significantly decreased in the severe group. Naïve helper T cells were increased in severe infection, and the number of memory helper T cells decreased in severe cases.^[17]

CONCLUSION

Several laboratory parameters are affected in COVID-19 infection. Total leukocyte count, lymphocytopenia, thrombocytopenia, CRP, D-dimer, albumin, and LDH have been shown in published literature to have prognostic implications. The above-mentioned studies highlight the necessity and importance of laboratory tests to be done in COVID-19 infection. The gold standard diagnostic test for COVID-19 is RT-PCR.

Test for COVID-19 is RT-PCR, however, in resource constraint countries, where molecular test results are made available after a few days, these laboratory parameters may at least give a minimum diagnostic and prognostic clue to treating physicians.

Declaration of patient consent

Patient's consent not required as patients identity is not disclosed or compromised.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- 1. Zhu Z, Lian X, Su X, Wu W, Marraro G, Zeng Y. From SARS and MERS to COVID-19: A brief summary and comparison of severe acute respiratory infections caused by three highly pathogenic human coronaviruses. Respir Res 2020;21:224.
- Sohrabi C, Alsafi Z, O'Neill N, Khan M, Kerwan A, Al-Jabir A, et al. World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). Int J Surg 2020;76:71-6.
- 3. Khandelwal A, Agrawal A, Kumar A. An outbreak of coronavirus (COVID-19) epidemic in India: Challenges and preventions. J Infect Dis Ther 2020;8:421.
- 4. Coleman C, Frieman M. Coronaviruses: Important emerging human pathogens. J Virol 2014;88:5209-12.
- 5. Banerjee A, Kulcsar K, Misra V, Frieman M, Mossman K. Bats, and Coronaviruses. Viruses 2019;11:41.
- 6. Parasher A. COVID-19: Current understanding of its pathophysiology, clinical presentation, and treatment. Postgrad Med J 2021;97:312-20.
- 7. Donnelly C, Ghani A, Leung G, Hedley AJ, Fraser C, Riley S, *et al.* Epidemiological determinants of spread of causal agent of severe acute respiratory syndrome in Hong Kong. Lancet 2003;361:1761-6.
- 8. Young BE, Ong SW, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, *et al.* Epidemiologic features, and clinical course of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. JAMA 2020;323:1488-94.
- 9. Loeffelholz M, Tang Y. Laboratory diagnosis of emerging human coronavirus infections the state of the art. Emerg Microbes Infect 2020;9:747-56.
- Li Y, Xia L. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Role of chest CT in diagnosis and management. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2020;214:1280-6.

- 11. Ding X, Yu Y, Lu B, Huo J, Chen M, Kang Y, *et al.* Dynamic profile and clinical implications of hematological parameters in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019. Clin Chem Lab Med 2020;58:1365-71.
- 12. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, *et al.* Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: A descriptive study. Lancet 2020;395:507-13.
- Fan B, Chong V, Chan S, Lim GH, Lim KG, Tan GB, *et al.* Hematologic parameters in patients with COVID-19 infection. Am J Hematol. 2020;95:E131-4.
- 14. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, *et al.* Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet 2020;395:497-506.
- Liu W, Tao Z, Wang L, Yuan ML, Liu K, Zhou L, *et al.* Analysis of factors associated with disease outcomes in hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus disease. Chin Med J (Engl) 2020;133:1032-8.
- Qian G, Yang N, Ding F, Ma AH, Wang ZY, Shen YF, *et al.* Epidemiologic and clinical characteristics of 91 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Zhejiang, China: A retrospective, multicenter case series. QJM 2020;113:474-81.
- 17. Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, Zhang S, Yang S, Tao Y, *et al.* Dysregulation of immune response in patients with coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China. Clin Infects Dis. 2020;71:762-8.
- Ruan Q, Yang K, Wang W, Jiang L, Song J. Clinical predictors of mortality due to COVID-19 based on an analysis of data of 150 patients from Wuhan, China. Intensive Care Med 2020;46:846-8.
- Wang Z, Yang B, Li Q, Wen L, Zhang R. Clinical features of 69 cases with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. Clin Infect Dis 2020;71:769-77.
- 20. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalized patients with 2019 novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA

2020;323:1061-9.

- 21. Wu C, Chen X, Cai Y, Xia J, Zhou X, Xu S, *et al.* Risk factors associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome and death in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA Intern Med 2020;180:934-43.
- 22. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, *et al.* Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: A single-centered, retrospective, observational study. Lancet Respir Med 2020;8:475-81.
- 23. Zachariah P, Johnson CL, Halabi KC, Ahn D, Sen AI, Fischer A, *et al.* Epidemiology, clinical features, and disease severity in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in a children's hospital in New York City, New York. JAMA Pediatr 2020;174:e202430.
- Zhang JJ, Dong X, Cao YY, Yuan YD, Yang YB, Yan YQ, et al. Clinical characteristics of 140 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China. Allergy 2020;75:1730-41.
- 25. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, Fan G, Liu Y, Liu Z, *et al.* Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: A retrospective cohort study. Lancet 2020;395:1054-62.
- 26. Tang N, Bai H, Chen X, Gong J, Li D, Sun Z. Anticoagulant treatment is associated with decreased mortality in severe coronavirus disease 2019 patients with coagulopathy. J Thromb Haemost 2020;18:1094-9.
- Han H, Yang L, Liu R, Liu F, Wu KL, Li J, *et al.* Prominent changes in blood coagulation of patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Clin Chem Lab Med 2020;58:1116-20.
- Guan W, Ni Z, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of coronavirus disease 2019 in China. N Engl J Med 2020;382:1708-20.

How to cite this article: Mandal PK, Vidhatri R. Changes in hematological and other laboratory parameters in COVID-19 infection. J Hematol Allied Sci 2021;1:99-106.