# 1 Reduced exercise capacity, chronotropic incompetence, and early systemic inflammation in

2 cardiopulmonary phenotype Long COVID

## 3 Durstenfeld et al. CPET Findings >1 year after COVID-19

- 4 Matthew S. Durstenfeld<sup>1,2,</sup>, Michael J. Peluso<sup>1,3</sup>, Punita Kaveti<sup>1,4</sup>, Christopher Hill<sup>5</sup>, Danny Li<sup>2</sup>,
- 5 Erica Sander<sup>4</sup>, Shreya Swaminathan<sup>2</sup>, Victor M. Arechiga<sup>2</sup>, Scott Lu<sup>3</sup>, Sarah A Goldberg<sup>6</sup>,
- 6 Rebecca Hoh<sup>2</sup>, Ahmed Chenna,<sup>7</sup> Brandon C. Yee,<sup>7</sup> John W. Winslow,<sup>7</sup> Christos J. Petropoulos,<sup>7</sup>
- J. Daniel Kelly<sup>6,8,9</sup>, David V. Glidden<sup>6</sup>, Timothy J. Henrich<sup>10</sup>, Jeffrey N. Martin<sup>6</sup>, Yoo Jin Lee<sup>11</sup>,
- 8 Mandar A. Aras<sup>1,4</sup>, Carlin S. Long<sup>1,4</sup>, Donald J. Grandis<sup>1,4</sup>, Steven G. Deeks<sup>1,3</sup>, Priscilla Y.
- 9  $Hsue^{1,2}$
- 10 1 Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA
- 11 2 Division of Cardiology, Zuckerberg San Francisco General, San Francisco, CA, USA
- 12 3 Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, Zuckerberg San Francisco General
- 13 Hospital, University of California, San Francisco, USA
- 14 4 Division of Cardiology, UCSF Health
- 15 5 School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, USA
- 16 6 Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, USA
- 17 7 LabCorp-Monogram Biosciences Inc, South San Francisco, CA USA
- 18 8 Institute of Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, USA
- 19 9 F.I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, USA
- 20 10 Division of Experimental Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, USA
- 21 11 Cardiac and Pulmonary Imaging, Department of Radiology, University of California, San
- 22 Francisco
- 23 Presented in part as a late breaking oral presentation at Conference on Retroviruses and
- 24 Opportunistic Infections, 2/2022, as an oral presentation at the Heart Rhythm Society in 5/2022,
- 25 and in full at the American Heart Association Scientific Sessions 11/2022.
- 26 <u>Keywords</u>: post-acute sequelae of COVID-19 (PASC); Long COVID; chronotropic
- 27 incompetence; cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET); inflammation
- 28 Word Count: 3736

# 29 **Corresponding author:**

- 30 Matthew S. Durstenfeld, MD MAS
- 31 Division of Cardiology, UCSF at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital
- 32 1001 Potrero Avenue, 5G8
- 33 San Francisco, CA 94110, USA
- 34 Tel: +1 628 206 5562; Fax: +1 628 206 5447
- 35 e-mail: matthew.durstenfeld@ucsf.edu
- 36 twitter: @durstenfeld
- 37 Key Points: Long COVID symptoms were associated with reduced exercise capacity on
- 38 cardiopulmonary exercise testing more than 1 year after SARS-CoV-2 infection. The most
- 39 common abnormal finding was chronotropic incompetence. Reduced exercise capacity was
- 40 associated with early elevations in inflammatory markers.

# 1 Abstract

- 2 **BACKGROUND** Mechanisms underlying persistent cardiopulmonary symptoms following
- SARS-CoV-2 infection (post-acute sequelae of COVID-19 "PASC" or "Long COVID") remain
   unclear. This study sought to elucidate mechanisms of cardiopulmonary symptoms and reduced
- 5 exercise capacity using advanced cardiac testing.
- 6 **METHODS** We performed cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET), cardiac magnetic
- 7 resonance imaging (CMR) and ambulatory rhythm monitoring among adults > 1 year after
- 8 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in Long-Term Impact of Infection with Novel Coronavirus
- 9 cohort (LIINC; substudy of NCT04362150). Adults who completed a research echocardiogram
- 10 (at a median 6 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection) without evidence of heart failure or
- 11 pulmonary hypertension were asked to complete additional cardiopulmonary testing
- approximately 1 year later. Although participants were recruited as a prospective cohort, to
- 13 account for selection bias, the primary analyses were as a case-control study comparing those
- 14 with and without persistent cardiopulmonary symptoms. We also correlated findings with
- 15 previously measured biomarkers. We used logistic regression and linear regression models to
- adjust for potential confounders including age, sex, body mass index, time since SARS-CoV-2
- 17 infection, and hospitalization for acute SARS-CoV-2 infection, with sensitivity analyses
- 18 adjusting for medical history.
- 19 **RESULTS** Sixty participants (unselected for symptoms, median age 53, 42% female, 87% non-
- 20 hospitalized) were studied at median 17.6 months following SARS-CoV-2 infection. On
- 21 maximal CPET, 18/37 (49%) with symptoms had reduced exercise capacity (peak VO<sub>2</sub><85%
- predicted) compared to 3/19 (16%) without symptoms (p=0.02). The adjusted peak VO<sub>2</sub> was 5.2
- 23 ml/kg/min (95%CI 2.1-8.3; p=0.001) or 16.9% lower actual compared to predicted (95%CI 4.3-
- 24 29.6; p=0.02) among those with symptoms compared to those without symptoms. Chronotropic
- incompetence was present among 12/21 (57%) with reduced VO<sub>2</sub> including 11/37 (30%) with
- symptoms and 1/19 (5%) without (p=0.04). Inflammatory markers (hsCRP, IL-6, TNF- $\alpha$ ) and
- 27 SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels measured early in PASC were negatively correlated with peak
- VO<sub>2</sub> more than 1 year later. Late-gadolinium enhancement on CMR and arrhythmias on
- ambulatory monitoring were not present.
- 30 **CONCLUSIONS** We found evidence of objectively reduced exercise capacity among those
- 31 with cardiopulmonary symptoms more than 1 year following COVID-19, which was associated
- 32 with elevated inflammatory markers early in PASC. Chronotropic incompetence may explain
- exercise intolerance among some with cardiopulmonary phenotype Long COVID.
- 34
- 35

#### **1** Graphical Abstract



Cardiopulmonary Exerc	ise Testing at	Median 18 Months
< 85% Predicted:	18/37 (49%)	3/19 (16%)
Peak VO <sub>2</sub> (ml/kg/min):	22.7 ± 8.1	29.6 ± 7.0



Most common abnormal exercise pattern: chronotropic incompetence, not ventilatory, cardiac, or deconditioning



#### Exercise capacity correlated with earlier inflammatory biomarkers



No evidence of myocarditis or arrhythmias

- 1 Abbreviations list: PASC=post-acute sequelae of COVID-19; hsCRP=high sensitivity c-
- 2 reactive protein; LIINC=Long-term Impact of Infection with Novel Coronavirus; LV=left
- 3 ventricle; RV=right ventricle; CPET=cardiopulmonary exercise testing; CMR=cardiac magnetic
- 4 resonance imaging; AHRR=adjusted heart rate reserve; POTS=postural orthostatic tachycardia
- 5 syndrome;
- 6

# 1 Background

2	Following acute SARS-CoV-2 infection, some individuals experience persistent symptoms of
3	"Long COVID" (LC), a type of post-acute sequelae of COVID-19 (PASC) [1]. By 3-6 months
4	after SARS-CoV-2 infection, cardiac function is generally normal on echocardiogram [2-4],
5	suggesting that other techniques are needed to identify physiologic correlates of symptoms.
6	Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging (CMR) has revealed changes in parametric mapping and
7	late gadolinium enhancement (LGE) suggestive of cardiac inflammation without consistent
8	associations with symptoms or differences from controls [5-9]. Cardiopulmonary exercise testing
9	(CPET) has demonstrated reduced exercise capacity 3-6 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection
10	without consistent patterns of limitations [10], and with limited data beyond 1 year after
11	infection.
12	We designed the Long-Term Impact of Infection with Novel Coronavirus (LIINC) study (NCT
13	04362150) to evaluate physical and mental health following SARS-COV-2 infection by
14	including individuals representing the spectrum of acute illness and post-acute-recovery [11].
15	The purpose of this substudy was to elucidate mechanisms underlying cardiopulmonary
16	symptoms >1 year following SARS-CoV-2 infection by comparing symptomatic and recovered
17	individuals using CMR, CPET, and ambulatory rhythm monitoring, and correlating findings with
18	blood-based markers.
19	Methods

As previously reported, LIINC is a San Francisco-based post-COVID cohort [11]. After our initial echocardiogram-based study did not reveal cardiac mechanisms of symptoms [2], we amended our protocol to conduct a second visit about 1 year later among participants who

completed an echocardiogram visit and were willing to undergo additional cardiopulmonary
 testing. In this subset, we performed cross-sectional cardiopulmonary testing including CPET,
 CMR, and ambulatory rhythm monitoring and correlated with already measured biomarkers from
 prior cohort visits (including at the time of the echocardiogram for troponin, NT-pro-BNP, and
 hsCRP).

### 6 *Participants*

We invited LIINC participants with PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection who completed an 7 8 echocardiogram study visit to participate in additional cardiopulmonary testing irrespective of symptom status. Those with pregnancy (due to expected changes during pregnancy), cardiac 9 disease (congenital heart disease, heart failure, myocardial infarction, coronary revascularization 10 11 with percutaneous coronary intervention or coronary artery bypass graft surgery, or other heart surgery), pulmonary disease requiring home oxygen or lung surgery, and musculoskeletal or 12 neurologic conditions that precluded participation in cycler ergometry were excluded. 13 Additionally, those with non-MRI compatible implants or claustrophobia were excluded from 14 CMR; those with eGFR <30 ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup> were excluded from gadolinium. 15 16 *Symptoms* Participants completed a structured interview about medical history, characteristics of acute 17

infection, cardiopulmonary diagnoses, and symptoms within the previous two weeks. We defined
cardiopulmonary symptoms as chest pain, dyspnea, or palpitations and symptoms as
cardiopulmonary symptoms or fatigue in the 2 weeks preceding the study visit. Consistent with
the WHO definition, all classified as symptomatic were >3 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection
with new symptoms without alternative cardiopulmonary explanations [12].

## 1 Blood-Based Markers

2	Participants had venous blood collected and processed for serum and plasma on the day of the
3	echocardiogram. Samples were batch processed for measurement of high-sensitivity troponin I,
4	N-terminal prohormone b-type natriuretic protein. A subset had antibodies and additional
5	markers measured at two earlier time points (<90 days and 90-150 days after infection) including
6	IL-6, IL-10, glial fibrillary acidic protein (GFAP), neurofilament light chain (NfL), monocyte
7	chemoattractant protein-1 (MCP-1), interferon gamma (IFN - $\gamma$ ), and tumor necrosis factor
8	(TNF), and SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain (RBD) immunoglobulin G (IgG). These
9	samples were assayed by Monogram Biosciences using the Quanterix Simoa® platform blinded
10	with respect to patient and clinical information, and assay performance was consistent with
11	manufacturers' specifications [13].
12	Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging
13	Multiparametric, sequence-standardized, blinded (technician and reader) cardiac magnetic
14	resonance imaging (CMR) was performed with a 3T system (Premier, General Electric),
15	including assessment of LV and RV size and function, parametric mapping, and late gadolinium

16 enhancement. Measurements were performed by a single reader at a dedicated workstation using

17 Medis (Leiden, Netherlands) and AI-assisted Arterys (San Francisco, CA) under supervision of a

18 senior cardiac imager, both blinded to clinical variables, and in accordance with Society for

19 Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance recommendations. The full protocol is described in

20 Supplemental Methods.

## 21 Cardiopulmonary Exercise Testing

1	Noninvasive CPETs were performed by an exercise physiologist and cardiology nurse
2	practitioner blinded to participant data according to standard protocol using a metabolic cart
3	(Medical Graphics Corporation Ultima CardiO <sub>2</sub> ) and cycle ergometer (Lode Corival CPET) with
4	continuous 12 lead ECG monitoring (GE CASE) and noninvasive blood pressure and pulse
5	oximetry measurement. After rest ECG, BP and spirometry measurements were taken,
6	participants exercised to symptom limited maximal exertional with work increased in 1-minute
7	steps targeting a 10-minute test. We determined the work increase per 1 minute step based on the
8	expected peak VO <sub>2</sub> from the maximum voluntary ventilation for a goal 10 minute test, rounded
9	to 5 Watts/min increments based on reported exercise (range 10-30 Watts/min) in accordance
10	with guidelines [14]. The full protocol is described in Supplemental Methods.
11	We evaluated measured peak VO <sub>2</sub> (in ml/kg/min), estimated percent predicted peak VO <sub>2</sub> using
12	the Wasserman equations [15], and classified peak $VO_2 < 85\%$ predicted as reduced. We defined
13	chronotropic incompetence as peak VO <sub>2</sub> <85% predicted, adjusted heart rate reserve (AHRR)
14	<80% [(HR <sub>peak</sub> -HR <sub>rest</sub> )/(220-age-HR <sub>rest</sub> )], and no alternative explanation for exercise limitation
15	[16]. CPETs were interpreted independently by two cardiologists with discrepancies resolved
16	through consensus.

## 17 Ambulatory Rhythm Monitoring

An ambulatory rhythm monitor (Carnation Ambulatory Monitor, BardyDx) was placed on
participants' chests. They were instructed wear it for 2 weeks, press the button for symptoms,
and record a symptom diary. Monitors were processed according to BardyDx standard
procedures, and reports were overread by a cardiologist.

22 Statistical Analysis

To compare participants with and without symptoms, we used logistic regression to estimate 1 adjusted odds ratios of parameters with symptoms and linear regression to estimate adjusted 2 mean differences. Adjusted models included age, sex, time since SARS-CoV-2 infection, 3 hospitalization, and body mass index. Non-normally distributed variables were log-transformed 4 and findings are reported per doubling or 10-fold change. For biomarker data we report 5 6 unadjusted Pearson's rho correlation coefficients and adjusted linear regression models. For 7 longitudinal data we used mixed effects models with random intercept per patient. We conducted 8 sensitivity analyses considering other symptom definitions and additionally adjusting for 9 potentially relevant medical history (hypertension, diabetes, asthma/COPD, and HIV) and echocardiographic (LV ejection fraction and LV diastolic function) and spirometry parameters 10 (forced vital capacity, forced expiratory volume in 1 second, and maximal voluntary ventilation. 11 12 REDCap was used for data entry. Statistical analyses were performed using STATA version 17.1. P values <0.05 were considered statistically significant and were not adjusted for multiple 13 14 testing. The first author (MSD) had full access to the data and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and analysis. The study was approved by the UCSF Institutional Review 15 Board (IRB 20-33000). All participants provided written informed consent prior to participation. 16 17

### 18 Results

19 *Participant Characteristics* 

60 participants were included. Median age was 53 (IQR 41-59.5), 25 (42%) were female, and 8
(13%) were hospitalized during acute infection (Table 1). Median infection was in June 2020
(IQR March 2020-November 2020), so most participants were infected with the ancestral strain.

Durstenfeld et al. CPET, CMR, & Rhythm Findings >1 year after COVID-19

1	Four participants were vaccinated pre-infection ("breakthrough" infections), and 57 (95%)
2	received at least one SARS-CoV-2 vaccine prior to advanced testing.
3	Symptoms Persist at 18 Months
4	At visit 1 (median 6 months after infection; echocardiogram visit), 40/60 (67%) reported
5	symptoms and 32/60 (53%) reported cardiopulmonary symptoms. At visit 2 (median 17.6
6	months; advanced cardiopulmonary testing visit), 38/60 (63%) reported symptoms and 31/60

7 (52%) reported cardiopulmonary symptoms. Trajectories of individual symptoms were similar

8 (Supplemental Table 1). Self-reported reduced exercise capacity was highly associated with

9 symptoms: 29/33 (88%) reporting reduced exercise capacity also reported other symptoms

versus 9/27 (33%) reporting preserved or improved exercise capacity (OR 14.5, 95%CI 3.9-54.1;

11 p<0.001).

## 12 CPETs were Maximal Tests

13 Out of 60 participants who attended a CPET visit, 59 completed CPET at a median 17.6 months

14 after infection (IQR 15.8-19.4); one participant was too hypertensive to undergo CPET. Out of

15 59 CPETs performed, one was excluded due to  $\beta$ -blocker use, two were excluded for

submaximal tests with respiratory exchange ratio (RER) <1.05, leaving 56 CPETs for analysis.

17 Three were stopped for hypertensive response (after reaching >100% predicted peak VO<sub>2</sub>); all

18 others were symptom-limited maximal tests. No included participants were taking chronotropic

19 medications or antianginals including  $\beta$ -blockers, non-dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers,

20 ivabradine, or long-acting nitrates at the time of CPET.

21 Exercise Capacity Lower than Predicted and Objectively Reduced Among those with Symptoms

1	Peak VO <sub>2</sub> was <85% predicted among 18/37 (49%) with symptoms compared to 3/19 (16%)
2	without symptoms (p=0.02). A 5 ml/kg/min decrease in peak VO <sub>2</sub> was associated with 2.75
3	times higher odds of symptoms (95%CI 1.39-5.44; p=0.004). Those with symptoms completed
4	less work despite higher perceived effort and similar respiratory exchange ratio (Table 2).
5	Despite reduced exercise capacity among those with symptoms, most CPET parameters were not
6	associated with symptoms (Table 2 and Supplemental Table 2 for additional parameters
7	including rest spirometry & echocardiographic parameters).
8	As shown in Figure 1 and Table 2, peak VO <sub>2</sub> was $22.7\pm8.1$ and $29.6\pm7.0$ ml/kg/min among those
9	with and without symptoms, respectively, a difference of 6.9 ml/kg/min (95%CI 2.5-11.3;
10	p=0.003) and 92% versus 107% percent predicted (difference 15% predicted, 95%CI; p=0.02).
11	The adjusted difference in peak VO <sub>2</sub> was 5.2 ml/kg/min (95%CI 2.1-8.3; p=0.001), 0.4 L/min
12	(95%CI 0.09 to 0.73; p=0.02), and 16.9% lower predicted (95%CI 4.3-29.6; p=0.02). Results
13	were unchanged in sensitivity analysis adding diabetes and hypertension; the adjusted difference
14	in peak VO <sub>2</sub> was 4.5 ml/kg/min (95%CI 1.40-7.50; p=0.005). Similarly, results were unchanged
15	in sensitivity analyses accounting for diabetes, hypertension, asthma/COPD, and HIV, resting
16	spirometry values, and echocardiographic parameters (adjusted difference 3.9 ml/kg/min, 95%CI
17	0.6-7.3; p=0.02), but did vary based on symptom classification used (Supplemental Table 3).
18	Classification of Reduced Exercise Capacity by Pattern of CPET Findings
19	Among 56 maximal CPETs, 21 (37%) had peak VO <sub>2</sub> <85% predicted; no participants had
20	ventilatory limitation, 3 had cardiac limitation, and one had a hypertensive response. Four had
21	findings most consistent with deconditioning/obesity, and one participant's peak VO2 was 84%
22	predicted with no other abnormalities (possibly deconditioning). Twelve (21% overall, 57% of
23	those with reduced exercise capacity) had chronotropic incompetence. Among those with

1 symptoms, 11/37 (30%) had chronotropic incompetence compared to 1/19 (5%) without

#### 2 symptoms (p=0.04).

- 4 chronotropic incompetence had 49 bpm lower peak heart rate (119 bpm vs 170; 95%CI 40-60;
- 5 p<0.0001; Figure 2). They completed 100 Watts less work (196 vs 96, 95%CI 49-152; p=0.0005)
- 6 and had 12.2 ml/kg/min lower peak VO<sub>2</sub> (95%CI 6.5-17.9; p=0.0001). Those with chronotropic
- 7 incompetence also had reduced HR recovery at 1 minute (7.9 bpm lower, 95%CI 1.3-14.6;

8 p=0.02). In absolute terms, those with chronotropic incompetence generated a mean peak oxygen

- 9 consumption of 1.59 L/min compared to 2.35 L/min among those with normal exercise capacity
- 10 (difference 0.76 L/min, 95%CI 0.23 to 1.28; p=0.007); a linear regression model with only rest
- 11 and peak heart rate explains 54% of the difference in relative oxygen consumption (ml/kg/min)

12 and 34% of the difference in absolute oxygen consumption (L/min).

#### 13 Normal Cardiac Structure and Function on CMR

Forty-three participants completed CMR, including two without gadolinium (one eGFR<30 and one due to inability to place an IV). CMR demonstrated normal LV and RV volumes and ejection fraction, and only RV volumes were associated with symptoms with smaller RV size associated with higher odds of symptoms (Table 3). No participants had LGE suggestive of myocardial scar, and native T1 and T2 parametric mapping values and ECV were not associated with symptoms. Some participants (10/43, 23%) had trace or small pericardial effusions with no difference by symptoms (p=0.59).

21 Palpitations are Not Explained by Arrhythmias on Ambulatory Rhythm Monitoring

1	Of those included, 38 participants wore and returned an ambulatory rhythm monitor. Lower
2	maximum heart rate, age-predicted maximum heart rate, and adjusted heart rate reserve were all
3	associated with symptoms consistent with our CPET findings (Table 4). One symptomatic
4	individual had a single episode of non-sustained ventricular tachycardia without recorded
5	symptoms or button push; no other clinically significant arrhythmias including atrial fibrillation
6	or atrial flutter were present in either group (Supplemental Table 4). The burden of sinus
7	tachycardia and supraventricular tachycardias was not significantly increased among those with
8	symptoms. Premature ventricular contractions were associated with symptoms, and we could not
9	exclude an association between premature atrial contractions and symptoms (Table 4).
10	Symptomatic individuals pressed the button 3.2 times more often (95%CI 2.1-4.7; p<0.001).
11	Button pushes were mostly during sinus rhythm, sinus tachycardia, or supraventricular ectopy
12	(Supplemental Figure). Results were similar considering only those with palpitations.
13	Ambulatory Rhythm Monitoring Correlates of Chronotropic Incompetence on CPET
14	CPET peak HR correlated with maximum sinus HR during ambulatory monitoring (Pearson's
15	r=0.71; p<0.001), with ambulatory peak HR 29 bpm lower among those with chronotropic
16	incompetence (95%CI 13-45; p<0.001). Chronotropic incompetence was associated with 12.6
17	bpm higher minimum HR (95%CI 3-22; p=0.01) and 59ms lower HR variability by standard
18	deviation n-to-n (95%CI 24-95; p=0.002; Supplemental Table 4). PR intervals were not
19	significantly longer among those with chronotropic incompetence (171ms vs 168ms; p=0.72).
20	One symptomatic individual had 2 <sup>nd</sup> degree Mobitz type 1 (normal finding), and no participants
21	had 2 <sup>nd</sup> degree Mobitz type 2 or 3 <sup>rd</sup> degree heart block.

Markers of Inflammation Early in PASC are Associated with Exercise Capacity and Pericardial
 Effusions More than 1 Year Later

Durstenfeld et al. CPET, CMR, & Rhythm Findings >1 year after COVID-19

1	Markers of inflammation in the blood (hsCRP, IL-6, TNF) and SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG level,
2	but not hs-troponin or NT-pro-BNP measured at 3-9 months after infection are negatively
3	correlated with peak VO <sub>2</sub> more than one year after infection (Figure 3). After adjustment, peak
4	VO <sub>2</sub> was 6.2 ml/kg/min lower per doubling of TNF (95%CI 0.6-11.8; p=0.03) and 1.8 ml/kg/min
5	lower per doubling of hsCRP (95%CI 0.8-2.9; p=0.001).
6	Longitudinal serum biomarkers of inflammation, neurologic injury, and SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG
7	were measured at <90 days from SARS-CoV-2 acute infection (median 52 days) and between
8	90-150 days (median 124 days) in 36 participants who underwent CPET (Figure 4), all prior to
9	vaccination. SARS-CoV-2 IgG (2.99-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI 1.41-6.33; p=0.004) and
10	TNF (1.34-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI 1.11-1.61; p=0.002) were higher at <90 days among
11	those with reduced exercise capacity. At 90-150 days, only SARS-CoV-2 IgG (2.12-fold higher
12	mean ratio, 95%CI 1.02-4.43; p=0.04) remained statistically significant, although after
13	adjustment it was no longer statistically significant (1.1 ml/kg/min per doubling, 95%CI -0.3 to
14	2.4; p=0.11). We could not exclude an effect of IL-6 (1.34-fold higher mean ratio, 95%CI 0.92-
15	1.96; p=0.11; adjusted 2.1 ml/kg/min per doubling, 95%CI -0.5-4.6; p=0.11). Except for IL-6, all
16	other biomarkers decreased over time regardless of eventual exercise capacity.

## 17 Discussion

18 We demonstrate that clinically meaningful reductions in objective exercise capacity are

19 associated with LC symptoms more than 1 year after SARS-CoV-2 infection. Our findings

20 suggest that chronotropic incompetence contributes to exercise limitations in LC. We found

- 21 elevated inflammatory markers and SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels early in PASC are associated
- 22 with reduced exercise capacity more than a year later. We did not find evidence of myocarditis,
- 23 cardiac dysfunction, or clinically significant arrhythmias. Finally, our study validates that CPET

Durstenfeld et al. CPET, CMR, & Rhythm Findings >1 year after COVID-19

- 1 allows objective measurement of patient-reported exercise intolerance and therefore may be
- 2 useful for interventional trials of therapeutics for LC.

### 3 Connections between Inflammation, Reduced Exercise Capacity, and Autonomic Responses

Our study extends prior findings that inflammatory markers including hsCRP, IL-6, and TNF are 4 5 negatively correlated with peak VO<sub>2</sub> early after COVID-19 hospitalization [17] to >1 year after 6 infection and those not hospitalized. This correlation may reflect a common cause for inflammation and exercise limitations in PASC (i.e., viral persistence [18], immune activation 7 8 [19]), or these markers could be on the causal path from infection to symptoms and reduced exercise capacity. Endothelial and coronary microvascular dysfunction occur in PASC [20-23] 9 10 and are associated with chronotropic incompetence and inflammation [24, 25]. Inflammation 11 may alter autonomic function which could explain reduced exercise capacity and chronotropic

12 incompetence.

13 Data from animal models support the hypothesis that chronotropy may be related to

14 inflammatory signals and endothelial functions. Apart from COVID-19, IL-6 impairs

15 chronotropic responses to autonomic signaling in mice [26] and may regulate energy allocation

16 during exercise [27]. In addition, IL-6 and TNF impair endothelial function in animal models via

17 increasing oxidative stress and suppressing endothelial nitric oxide synthase pathways [28].

18 Ideally, clinical trials should evaluate whether anti-inflammatory strategies improve chronotropy

19 and endothelial function, as both impact exercise capacity and risk of cardiovascular disease.

20 Autonomic Function, Sinus Node Function, and Inflammation in PASC

21 Altered autonomic function is a possible unifying explanation for our and others' CPET findings

22 in PASC including altered peripheral oxygen extraction [29], preload failure [30-32], and

1	disordered breathing [30]. Orthostatic intolerance, an autonomic symptom, occurs in PASC [33],
2	and skin biopsies suggest small fiber neuropathy in LC-associated postural-orthostatic
3	tachycardia syndrome [34, 35]. Effects on brainstem regulatory regions or the amygdala [36]
4	could also modify autonomic responses to exercise.
5	An alternative hypothesis is that SARS-CoV-2 could alter sinus node function. Autopsy studied
6	have not specifically examined sinus node tissue for evidence of persistent viral infection of the
7	sinus node [37], but hamster models suggest that SARS-CoV-2 can infect hamster sinoatrial
8	node cells and in vitro sinoatrial-like pacemaker cells resulting in altered calcium handling,
9	activated inflammatory pathways, and induced ferroptosis [38]. Sinus node remodeling may
10	reduce sinus node reserve in heart failure [39]. Although we did not find evidence of cardiac
11	fibrosis or sinus node dysfunction, we cannot fully exclude that sinus node dysfunction may
12	contribute to CI. A combination of autopsy studies that specifically examine sinoatrial tissue and
13	clinical studies may be necessary to identify the relevant mechanisms.
14	Inflammation modifies autonomic and chronotropic responses. Young adults recovering from
15	SARS-CoV-2 have elevated sympathetic activation at rest [40]. Chronic inflammation in other
16	settings is associated with parasympathetic and sympathetic imbalance, chronotropic
17	incompetence and reduced exercise capacity [24, 41]. Thus, chronic inflammation could blunt
18	chronotropy in PASC even without autonomic nervous system or sinus node damage.
19	Other Studies of PASC using CPET
20	Our study is consistent with others that have reported lower peak VO <sub>2</sub> among those with PASC
21	compared to recovered individuals mostly at 3-6 months after severe COVID-19, which we

summarized in a systematic review and meta-analysis [10]. Our findings build upon earlier

1	studies by (1) demonstrating reduced peak $VO_2$ and chronotropic incompetence much later after
2	infection (2) including evaluation of cardiac inflammation, structural heart disease and
3	arrhythmias, (3) adjusting for confounders, (4) including recovered persons as comparators, and
4	(5) demonstrating associations with longitudinal biomarkers.
5	Differences in classification of exercise limitations across CPET studies of PASC may arise from
6	selection bias, confounding, different CPET protocols, and different interpretation algorithms.
7	Deconditioning, which contributes to reduced exercise capacity after any illness, may be
8	misidentified from noninvasive CPET, and has been commonly reported 3-6 months after
9	hospitalization [10]. Although reductions in physical activity after COVID-19 [42] suggest
10	deconditioning contributes, our findings argue against deconditioning as the only explanation for
11	most individuals as deconditioning more commonly demonstrates an accelerated rather than a
12	blunted heart rate response.
13	Five other studies have also found that chronotropic incompetence contributes to exercise
14	limitations in PASC [32, 42-45]. Chronotropic incompetence may be underestimated in some
15	studies as sensitivity and specificity vary with exercise modality and protocol and including sub-
16	maximal tests or patients on beta-blockers reduces specificity. Diagnosing chronotropic
17	incompetence may have prognostic implications: it is associated with incident cardiovascular
18	disease, sudden death, and all-cause mortality among men without coronary artery disease [46-
19	48].
20	Impaired peripheral oxygen extraction, best assessed with invasive CPET, may also contribute to
21	
	exercise limitations in PASC [29], perhaps via changes in autonomic regulation of

23 VO<sub>2</sub>/work slope, a noninvasive correlate of measured oxygen extraction. Although not observed

Durstenfeld et al. CPET, CMR, & Rhythm Findings >1 year after COVID-19

among our participants, dysfunctional (rapid, erratic) breathing and exercise hyperventilation
may contribute to dyspnea in PASC [30, 51, 52].

3

## 4 CMR and Ambulatory Rhythm Monitoring Findings

CMR findings suggestive of myocarditis without cardiac dysfunction may be present in the early
post-acute period [5, 8, 53]. Consistent with studies at later time points [6, 7], we did not find
evidence of abnormal function or LGE, suggesting that myocarditis is unlikely to explain
symptoms in most with PASC.

9 Our findings are consistent with two studies that did not find arrhythmias in early PASC [54, 55].

10 In contrast to a study in early PASC [56], inappropriate sinus tachycardia was present only in

11 one individual (without symptoms). Therefore, arrhythmias and inappropriate sinus tachycardia

are unlikely to explain symptoms among most individuals with PASC.

# 13 *Implications for Therapy*

Investigation into mechanisms of PASC may benefit from proof-of-concept approaches to 14 15 identify potential therapies. Although vaccination reduces the risk of PASC [57, 58] and the newer circulating variants may be associated with lower risk of Long COVID [59], there is no 16 data regarding whether anti-viral, anti-inflammatory, or anti-coagulant strategies improve 17 exercise capacity in PASC. In chronotropic incompetence separate from COVID-19, chronic 18 supervised exercise is the only intervention demonstrated to improve exercise capacity and 19 surrogates of autonomic function [60-62]. Exercise is an effective treatment for postural 20 21 orthostatic tachycardia syndrome, which may also be related to post-viral alterations in autonomic responses to stress and occurs in PASC [63, 64]. Reports of post-exertional malaise or 22

symptom exacerbation (PEM/PESE) in PASC overlapping with ME/CFS [65-67] mean exercise based interventions should be considered with caution. A study of a six-week structured pacing
 intervention improved physical activity levels and reduced PESE [68], and another study found
 that supervised exercise may be helpful rather than harmful in PASC [69].

5 *Limitations* 

6 The main limitations of this observational study arise from the small sample size, non-

probabilistic sampling, and cross-sectional cardiac measures. Secondly, the difference in peak 7 8 VO<sub>2</sub> was sensitive to the case definition, but our definition is consistent with current consensus definitions [12]. Volunteer bias may result in overestimated prevalence and magnitude of 9 reduced exercise capacity but should not affect classification of limitations. We did not include 10 11 an uninfected comparator group and nearly all individuals were unvaccinated at the time of initial SARS-CoV-2 infection. Although we excluded those with cardiac disease, adjusted for 12 measured confounders, and conducted sensitivity analyses adjusting for additional confounders, 13 unmeasured residual confounders including pre-COVID fitness remain. Adjustment (in BMI, for 14 example) may not have fully accounted for confounding. Misclassification of exercise limitations 15 could occur since we did not perform invasive CPET, stress echocardiography, stress CMR, or 16 stress ventriculography. Lastly, we lacked contemporaneous biomarker data with CPETs to 17 ascertain whether a transient inflammatory process or ongoing inflammation is more likely. 18

19 *Conclusions* 

In conclusion, more than 1 year after pre-vaccine index SARS-CoV-2 infection, reduced exercise
 capacity on CPET is associated with LC symptoms, chronotropic incompetence, and higher
 inflammatory markers and antibody levels in the early post-acute period, but not evidence of

- 1 myocarditis or arrhythmias. Further investigation into mechanisms of cardiopulmonary PASC
- 2 should include evaluation of inflammatory pathways, chronotropic function, and the autonomic
- 3 nervous system to identify therapeutic targets.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the research participants and the members of the
 LIINC study team. We would like to thank Dr. Kara Lynch and Dr. Alan Wu for their assistance
 with measuring cardiac biomarkers and hsCRP. We would also like to acknowledge support
 from Jeremy Lambert from Quanterix (Billerica, MA) and Patrick Kaiser from BardyDx, a
 division of Hillrom (Bellevue, Washington). We acknowledge the contributions of the UCSF
 Clinical and Translational Science Unit.

7 This study was funded by philanthropic gifts from Charles W. Swanson and the Ed and Pearl 8 Fein Foundation, research grants from the NIH/NLBI including L30 HL159695 and K12 9 HL143961, and internal funds from the Division of Cardiology at Zuckerberg San Francisco General. This work was assisted in part by a CFAR-ARI Boost Award from the UCSF AIDS 10 Research Institute. MSD is supported by K12HL143961. MJP is supported by K23AI157875. 11 JDK is supported by NIH/NIAID K23AI135037. TJH is supported by NIH/NIAID 12 13 3R01A1141003-03S1. PYH is supported by NIH/NAID 2K24AI112393-06. This publication 14 was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of Health, through UCSF-CTSI Grant Number UL1TR001872. Its contents are solely the 15 responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. The 16 17 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or

18 preparation of the manuscript.

### **19** Author Contributions:

MSD designed the study, obtained IRB approval, acquired data, analyzed data, interpreted the findings, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. MJP assisted in study design, participant recruitment, data interpretation, and critical revision of the manuscript. PK and YJL conducted CMR measurements, drafted the MRI methods, and contributed to interpretation of the MRI

Durstenfeld et al. CPET, CMR, & Rhythm Findings >1 year after COVID-19

1	findings. CH led the ambulatory rhythm monitoring measurements and participated in
2	interpretation of the findings. DL and ES participated in the cardiopulmonary exercise testing
3	measurements, drafting of the CPET methods, CPET interpretation, and provided input on the
4	manuscript. SS and VMA participated in measurements, data management, and revisions of the
5	manuscript. DVG participated in statistical design, analysis and visualization. SL, SAG, and RH
6	participated in participant recruitment, measurement, and data management. AC, BCY, JWW,
7	and CJP participated in biomarker measurement and provided input on drafts of the manuscript.
8	JDK, TJH, and JNM participated in the study design, interpretation of results, and revision of the
9	manuscript. CSL and DJG provided funding and participated in designing the study, interpreting
10	results, and revising the manuscript. SGD and PYH provided funding, oversight, and mentorship
11	for the first two authors and participated in study design, interpretation of results, and critical
12	manuscript revision.
13	Competing Interests statement: AC, BCY, JWW, and CJP are employees of Monogram

Biosciences, Inc., a division of LabCorp. PYH has received modest honoraria from Gilead and
Merck and research grant from Novartis unrelated to the submitted work. All other authors report
no other competing interests.

# 1 Tables:

#### 2 Table 1: Baseline Characteristics (n=60)

		Symptoms (n=38)	No Symptoms (n=22)
Months since Infection, median (IQR)		17.7 (15.9, 19.4)	17.5 (15.8, 18.6)
Age (years), median (IQR)		50.5 (40, 57)	54.5 (42, 61)
Sex	Male	19 (50%)	16 (73%)
	Female	19 (50%)	6 (27%)
Race/ Ethnicity	Hispanic/Latino	10 (24%)	5 (22%)
	White	26 (63%)	15 (65%)
	Black/African American	2 (5%)	1 (4%)
	Asian	2 (9%)	3 (7%)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), mean±SD		30.2±7.5	28.1±5.0
Change in BMI from visit 1 to visit 2, mean±SD		$1.18{\pm}1.4$	1.32±2.1
BMI Category	24.9 or less	10 (26%)	7 (32%)
	25 to 29.9	11 (29%)	10 (45%)
	30 to 34.5	9 (24%)	4 (18%)
	35 or greater	8 (21%)	1 (5%)
Medical History	Hypertension	9 (24%)	5 (24%)
	Diabetes	6 (16%)	1 (5%)
	Asthma/COPD	10 (27%)	2 (10%)
	HIV	10 (26%)	6 (27%)
	Autoimmune Disease	3 (8%)	1 (5%)
	Cancer	1 (3%)	1 (5%)
	Kidney Disease	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
TT 1. 11 1	Former or Current Tobacco use	13 (34%)	3 (14%)
Hospitalized (including ICU)		6 (16%)	2 (9%)
ICU		2 (33% hospitalized)	0

**3** Table 1 Legend: Demographic information, past medical history, and severity of acute COVID-19 by

4 hospitalization/ICU status of the participants who underwent advanced cardiopulmonary testing. Abbreviations:

5 BMI=body mass index, ICU=intensive care unit, IQR=Interquartile Range

#### 1 Table 2: Selected Cardiopulmonary Exercise Testing Parameters by Symptom Status (n=56)

	Measure	Symptoms (n=37)	No Symptoms (n=19)	Adjusted OR (95%CI; p value)	Adjusted Difference (95%CI; p value)
Exercise Capacity	Peak VO2, ml/kg/min	<b>22.7 ± 8.1</b>	<b>29.6</b> ± <b>7.0</b>	2.75 per -5 ml/kg/min (1.39- 5.44; p=0.004)	-5.2 (-8.3to -2.1; p=0.001)
	Peak VO <sub>2</sub> , % predicted	92.0 ± 22.0	$107.3 \pm 22.0$	1.22 per -5% (1.04- 1.43; p=0.01)	-17 (-30 to -4.3; p=0.01)
	Peak VO2, L/min	1.9 ± 0.6	$2.4 \pm 0.7$	1.18 per -0.1/min (1.03-1.37; p=0.02)	-0.41 (-0.73 to -0.09; p=0.01)
	Proportion <85% predicted	18 (49%)	3 (16%)	7.97 (1.56 to 40.8; p=0.01)	
Ventila- tory	Peak Respiratory Rate	37.5 ± 8.7	$40.8 \pm 9.7$	0.95 (0.88-1.02; p=0.17)	-3.8 (-10.0 to 2.4; p=0.23)
	Breathing Reserve (MVV-V <sub>Emax</sub> )	44.5 (38.3, 59.0)	32.8 (24.0, 44.8)	1.04 (1.00-1.07; p=0.05)	14.8 (0.7 to 29; p=0.04)
	Vent. Efficiency (V <sub>E</sub> /VCO <sub>2</sub> slope) <sup>a</sup>	$27.5 \pm 3.7$	$25.8\pm3.7$	1.18 (0.98-1.44; p=0.09)	2.0 (-0.4 to 4.4; p=0.10)
Peripheral	VO <sub>2</sub> to Work slope	9.9±3.0	10.9±3.5	0.94 (0.76-1.17; p=0.60)	-0.5 (-2.6 to 1.5; p=0.60)
Cardiac	VO <sub>2</sub> pulse, ml/beat	13.1 ± 3.3	$15.4 \pm 4.5$	0.85 (0.69-1.03; p=0.11)	-1.6 (-3.8 to 0.5; p=0.13)
	SBP peak, mm Hg	$\begin{array}{c} 173.9 \pm \\ 31.7 \end{array}$	$189.2 \pm 23.3$	0.86 per 5 mm Hg (0.73-1.03; p=0.10)	-13.2 (-31.3 to 4.8; p=0.15)
Heart Rate	Rest, bpm	78.3 ± 14.5	$75.2 \pm 10.4$	1.01 (0.96-1.06; p=0.75)	0.9 (-6.9 to 8.7; p=0.83)
	Peak, bpm	147.2 ± 25.7	154.1 ± 21.7	0.97 (0.94-1.01; p = 0.10)	-9.3 (-21 to 2; p=0.11)
	Peak, % Age Predicted	86.2 ± 11.9	94.1 ± 9.3	0.92 (0.85-0.99; p=0.02)	-8.5 (-15.2 to -1.8; p=0.02)
	Adjusted HR Reserve Achieved, %	73.6 ± 22.0	84.9 ± 21.2	0.97 (0.94-1.00; p=0.05)	-12.1 (-24.6 to 0.5; p=0.06)
	HR Recovery at 1 min, bpm	14.4 ± 7.4	$14.0 \pm 10.0$	1.04 (0.95-1.14; p=0.39)	2.0 (-2.9 to 6.9; p=0.42)
Exertion	Work (Watts)	140.8 ± 60.6	196.2 ± 68.2	1.20 per -10 Watts (1.04 to 1.40; p=0.01)	-49.6 (-86.2 to -13.0; p=0.009)
	Perceived Exertion, Borg Scale 6-20 <sup>b</sup>	16.2 ± 1.8	14.9 ± 2.2	1.64 (1.05-2.57; p=0.03)	1.3 (0.1 to 2.6; p=0.03)
	Peak Respiratory Exchange Ratio (VCO <sub>2</sub> /VO <sub>2</sub> )	1.18 (1.12, 1.23)	1.20 (1.12, 1.30)	1.01 per -0.1 (0.48- 2.12; p=0.98)	0.03 (-0.09 to 0.02; p=0.23)

1 Table 2 Legend: We present both the odds ratios for the association between CPET parameters and symptoms 2 estimated using logistic regression with adjustment for age, sex, time since COVID, hospitalization for acute 3 COVID, BMI category and the estimated adjusted mean differences between those with and without symptoms 4 using linear regression adjusting for the same covariates. Sensitivity analysis incorporating history of hypertension, 5 diabetes, and lung disease had no substantive changes in effect sizes or confidence intervals. <sup>a</sup>VE/VCO<sub>2</sub> slope could 6 not be determined for one participant without symptoms. <sup>b</sup>Borg scale of perceived exertion was assessed every 2 7 minutes; these represent the last measurement prior to test stopping. Bold text represents p<0.05. Abbreviations: 8 AT=Anaerobic threshold; bpm=beats per minute; FVC=Forced Vital Capacity; HR=heart rate; DBP=diastolic blood 9 pressure; MVV=maximal voluntary ventilation; SBP=systolic blood pressure;  $V_D/V_T$ =Dead space ratio;  $V_E$  = minute 10 ventilation; VCO<sub>2</sub>=carbon dioxide production; pVO<sub>2</sub>=peak oxygen consumption (VO<sub>2</sub>); Vent=Ventilatory.

Meaning	Parameter	Symptoms (n=25)	No Symptoms	Adjusted OR (95%CI; p value)
Months since SARS-CoV-2		15.9±3.8	(n=18) 15.9±3.9	
Hematocrit, mean±SD		$43.0\pm3.5$	$44.5 \pm 4.1$	0.86 (0.67 to 1.09; p=0.21)
Body Surface Area, m <sup>2</sup>		$1.95\pm0.22$	$1.90\pm0.16$	$1.26 \text{ per } 0.1 \text{ m}^2 (0.74-2.17; \text{ p=}0.38)$
Left	LVEDi, ml/m <sup>2</sup>	$63.6\pm13.9$	69.3 ± 12.3	0.97 (0.91-1.03; p=0.27)
Ventricular	LVESi, ml/m <sup>2</sup>	$24.4\pm6.9$	$25.3 \pm 7.0$	1.00 (0.89-1.12; p=0.97)
Size and	LVEF, %	$61.8 \pm 5.9$	$63.3 \pm 5.8$	0.93 (0.82-1.05; p=0.26)
Function	LV Mass Index, gm/m <sup>2</sup>	47.6 ± 7.9	$51.6 \pm 7.6$	0.98 (0.90 to 1.06; p=0.60)
	Stroke Volume, mlª	77.2 ± 18.1	84.2 ± 18.1	0.97 (0.93-1.01; p=0.20)
Right	RVEDi, ml/m <sup>2</sup>	65.3 ± 13.5	75.6 ± 12.4	0.92 (0.86 to 0.99; p=0.02)
Ventricular	RVESi, ml/m <sup>2</sup>	$27.1 \pm 6.4$	$31.3 \pm 7.6$	0.86 (0.75=0.99; p=0.04)
Size and Function	RVEF, %	$58.9\pm5.0$	$58.4 \pm 5.0$	0.75 (0.86 to 1.14; p=0.93)
Markers of	T1 Native	1202 (1141,	1219 (1153,	1.00 (0.99-1.00; p=0.51)
Cardiac	Mapping, ms	1253)	1248)	
Inflammation	Post-Contrast T1 Mapping Time, ms	603 (507, 634)	624 (577, 655)	1.00 (0.99 to 1.01; p=0.64)
	Extracellular Volume, %	$26.7 \pm 6.3$	$24.2 \pm 5.3$	1.08 (0.92-1.26; p=0.35)
	T2 Native Mapping, ms	46.5 (44.4, 51.0)	48.0 (44.0, 51.4)	0.97 (0.83-1.13; p=0.70)
Cardiac Fibrosis	LGE	0	0	
Possible Pericardial Inflammation	Pericardial Effusion	6 (24%)	5 (22%)	0.47 (0.08-2.71; p=0.41)

#### 1 Table 3. Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging Parameters (n=41) by Symptom Status

2 Table 3 Legend: CMR parameters by cardiopulmonary symptoms given as mean±SD or median (intraquartile

3 range) for non-normally distributed variables. Logistic regression was used to estimated odds of having symptoms

4 for a given change in each parameter adjusted for age, sex, BMI category, hospitalization, and time since infection.

5 Only RV end diastolic and end systolic volume indices were associated with symptoms with larger RV size

6 associated with lower odds of symptoms. Bold text represents p<0.05. Abbreviations: LVEDi=Left ventricular end

7 diastolic volume indexed to body surface area; LVESi=Left ventricular end diastolic volume indexed to body

8 surface area; LVEF=left ventricular ejection fraction; RVEDi=Right ventricular end diastolic volume indexed to

9 body surface area; RVESi=Right ventricular end diastolic volume indexed to body surface area; RVEF=Right

10 ventricular Ejection Fraction. LGE=Late Gadolinium Enhancement. <sup>a</sup>LV stroke volumes are reported but there is a

11 high correlation between LV and RV stroke volumes (Pearson's r=0.96).

Parameter	Symptoms (n=24)	No Symptoms (n=14)	Adjusted OR for symptoms (95%CI; p value)	Adjusted OR for palpitations (95%CI; p value)
Monitoring Time, days	4 (3, 13)	8 (3, 13)		
Average Heart Rate, bpm	77.5 ± 11.4	74.4 ± 4.5	1.04 (0.96 to 1.14; p=0.34)	1.11 (0.98-1.28; p=0.11)
Minimum HR, bpm	50.2 ± 12.5	44.9 ± 2.8	1.13 (0.96-1.33; p=0.13)	1.38 (1.04-1.82; p=0.02)
Maximum HR, bpm	$\begin{array}{c} 142.2 \pm \\ 19.0 \end{array}$	157.4 ± 21.4	1.77 per -10 (1.03 to 3.03; p=0.04)	2.60 (1.07-6.34; p=0.04)
Maximum HR, % predicted	85.1 ± 9.1	94.9 ± 11.3	3.39 per -10 (1.09 to 10.6; p=0.04)	9.15 (1.14-72.9; p=0.04)
Adjusted HRR achieved, %	70.7 ± 19.7	89.9 ± 20.1	1.77 per -10 (1.09 to 2.89; p=0.02)	4.20 (1.34-13.2; p=0.01)
Heart Rate Variability, SDNN	143.5 (113.3, 185.5)	155.7 (137.0, 177.0)	1.00 per -10 (0.87 to 1.16; p=0.97)	1.91 (1.08-3.60; p=0.03)
PAC, % burden	0.02 (0.01, 0.10)	0.01 (0.01, 0.04)	1.36 per 10-fold increase (0.58 to 3.20; p=0.48)	1.05 (0.36-3.05; p=0.93)
PVC, % burden	0.01 (0.01, 0.15)	0.01 (0, 0.01)	2.74 per 10-fold increase (1.14 to 6.53; p=0.02)	2.20 (0.92-5.31; p=0.08)
Sinus tachycardia, % burden	7 (3, 13)	4 (3, 6)	1.15 (0.97 to 1.37; p=0.12)	1.20 (1.00-1.43; p =0.05)
Episodes of SVT* per week	1.2 (0, 3.5)	0 (0, 3)	1.08 (0.91 to 1.28; p =0.39)	1.15 (0.91-1.46; p=0.25)
Episodes of Nonsustained VT	0	1		
Button Pushes	2.5 (0.5,7)	1 (0, 2)	1.33 (1.00-1.76; p=0.05)	1.13 (0.93-1.36; p=0.22)

#### 1 Table 4: Ambulatory Rhythm Monitoring Findings by Symptoms (n=38)

2 Table 4 Legend. Values are reported as mean±SD or median (interquartile range) for non-normally distributed

variables assessed by histogram. Those with self-reported symptoms pressed the symptom button on the monitor
 more 3.2 times more often (95%CI 2.1-4.7; p<0.001). Bolded results are p<0.05.</li>

5

## 1 Figures:



## 2 Figure 1. Exercise Capacity by Symptoms and HR Response to Exercise (n=56)

3

Figure 1 Legend: Box and whisker plots of peak VO<sub>2</sub> (ml/kg/min in Panel A and percent 4 predicted in Panel B) among those without (blue) and with symptoms (pink) 17.6 months after 5 6 SARS-CoV-2 infection (top). In Panel C peak VO<sub>2</sub> in ml/kg/min is plotted by adjusted heart rate reserve (AHRR) to demonstrate the cluster of symptomatic individuals with low peak VO<sub>2</sub> and 7 chronotropic incompetence in the bottom left. Panel D demonstrates CPET patterns among those 8 with Long COVID symptoms: half achieved greater than 85% predicted peak VO<sub>2</sub>, and 9 10 chronotropic incompetence was the most common pattern among those with reduced exercise capacity. 11

## 1 Figure 2. Heart Rate during Exercise by Chronotropic Response to Exercise









#### 1 Figure 3. Correlations between Peak VO<sub>2</sub> and Previously Measured Biomarkers

2

Figure 3 Legend. Scatterplots and linear trend lines of peak VO<sub>2</sub> (measured at ~18 months) by natural log of previously measured biomarker levels with unadjusted Pearson's rho correlations and p-values listed (top row, median 6 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection; bottom two rows median 3.5 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection). Prior hsCRP, IL-6, TNF and SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain antibody levels were correlated with subsequent peak VO<sub>2</sub>. All antibody levels were measured prior to vaccination.

9

### 1 Figure 4. Change in Biomarkers Early Post-Infection by Eventual Exercise Capacity at 18

### 2 months (n=35)







# 1 <u>References</u>

2 Ballering AV, van Zon SKR, Olde Hartman TC, Rosmalen JGM. Persistence of somatic symptoms 1. 3 after COVID-19 in the Netherlands: an observational cohort study. Lancet. 2022;400(10350):452-61. 4 Epub 2022/08/08. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(22)01214-4. PubMed PMID: 35934007; PubMed Central 5 PMCID: PMCPMC9352274. 6 2. Durstenfeld MS, Peluso MJ, Kelly JD, Win S, Swaminathan S, Li D, et al. Role of antibodies, 7 inflammatory markers, and echocardiographic findings in postacute cardiopulmonary symptoms after 8 SARS-CoV-2 infection. JCl Insight. 2022;7(10). Epub 2022/04/08. doi: 10.1172/jci.insight.157053. 9 PubMed PMID: 35389890; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9220849. 10 3. Fayol A, Livrozet M, Boutouyrie P, Khettab H, Betton M, Tea V, et al. Cardiac performance in 11 patients hospitalized with COVID-19: a 6 month follow-up study. ESC Heart Fail. 2021;8(3):2232-9. Epub 12 2021/03/28. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.13315. PubMed PMID: 33773099; PubMed Central PMCID: 13 PMCPMC8120370. 14 Tangen J, Aukrust P, Barratt-Due A, Skulstad H, Edvardsen T. Reduced Cardiac Function by 4. 15 Echocardiography in a Minority of COVID-19 Patients >3 Months after Hospitalization. Journal of the 16 American Society of Echocardiography. 2022;35(2):243-4. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2021.10.014. 17 Puntmann VO, Carerj ML, Wieters I, Fahim M, Arendt C, Hoffmann J, et al. Outcomes of 5. Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Patients Recently Recovered From Coronavirus Disease 18 19 2019 (COVID-19). JAMA Cardiology. 2020. doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2020.3557. 20 6. Joy G, Artico J, Kurdi H, Seraphim A, Lau C, Thornton GD, et al. Prospective Case-Control Study of 21 Cardiovascular Abnormalities 6 Months Following Mild COVID-19 in Healthcare Workers. JACC: 22 Cardiovascular Imaging. 2021;14(11):2155-66. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2021.04.011. 23 7. Cassar MP, Tunnicliffe EM, Petousi N, Lewandowski AJ, Xie C, Mahmod M, et al. Symptom 24 Persistence Despite Improvement in Cardiopulmonary Health - Insights from longitudinal CMR, CPET and 25 lung function testing post-COVID-19. EClinicalMedicine. 2021;41:101159. Epub 2021/10/26. doi: 26 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101159. PubMed PMID: 34693230; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8527025. 27 8. Kotecha T, Knight DS, Razvi Y, Kumar K, Vimalesvaran K, Thornton G, et al. Patterns of 28 myocardial injury in recovered troponin-positive COVID-19 patients assessed by cardiovascular magnetic 29 resonance. Eur Heart J. 2021;42(19):1866-78. Epub 2021/02/18. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehab075. 30 PubMed PMID: 33596594; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7928984. 31 9. Puntmann VO, Martin S, Shchendrygina A, Hoffmann J, Ka MM, Giokoglu E, et al. Long-term 32 cardiac pathology in individuals with mild initial COVID-19 illness. Nat Med. 2022;28(10):2117-23. Epub 33 2022/09/06. doi: 10.1038/s41591-022-02000-0. PubMed PMID: 36064600; PubMed Central PMCID: 34 PMCPMC9556300. 35 Durstenfeld MS, Sun K, Tahir P, Peluso MJ, Deeks SG, Aras MA, et al. Use of Cardiopulmonary 10. Exercise Testing to Evaluate Long COVID-19 Symptoms in Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-36 37 analysis. JAMA Netw Open. 2022;5(10):e2236057. Epub 2022/10/13. doi: 38 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.36057. PubMed PMID: 36223120. 39 11. Peluso MJ, Kelly JD, Lu S, Goldberg SA, Davidson MC, Mathur S, et al. Persistence, Magnitude, 40 and Patterns of Postacute Symptoms and Quality of Life Following Onset of SARS-CoV-2 Infection: 41 Cohort Description and Approaches for Measurement. Open Forum Infectious Diseases. 2021;9(2). doi: 42 10.1093/ofid/ofab640. 43 Soriano JM, J; Diaz, JV; Murthy, S;; Relan, P. A clinical case definition of post COVID-19 condition 12. 44 by a Delphi consensus. In: Organization WH, editor. 2021.1 ed: ; 2021. 45 13. Peluso MJ, Lu S, Tang AF, Durstenfeld MS, Ho HE, Goldberg SA, et al. Markers of Immune 46 Activation and Inflammation in Individuals With Postacute Sequelae of Severe Acute Respiratory

Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Infection. J Infect Dis. 2021;224(11):1839-48. Epub 2021/10/23. doi: 1 2 10.1093/infdis/jiab490. PubMed PMID: 34677601; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8643408. 3 Balady GJ, Arena R, Sietsema K, Myers J, Coke L, Fletcher GF, et al. Clinician's Guide to 14. 4 cardiopulmonary exercise testing in adults: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. 5 Circulation. 2010;122(2):191-225. Epub 2010/06/30. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181e52e69. PubMed 6 PMID: 20585013. 7 Wasserman K HJ, Sue DY, Stringer W, Whipp BJ. Principles of Exercise Testing and Interpretation. 15. 8 4th ed. Philadelpha: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2005. 9 Brubaker PH, Kitzman DW. Chronotropic incompetence: causes, consequences, and 16. 10 management. Circulation. 2011;123(9):1010-20. Epub 2011/03/09. doi: 11 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.110.940577. PubMed PMID: 21382903; PubMed Central PMCID: 12 PMCPMC3065291. 13 Ribeiro Baptista B, d'Humieres T, Schlemmer F, Bendib I, Justeau G, Al-Assaad L, et al. 17. 14 Identification of factors impairing exercise capacity after severe COVID-19 pulmonary infection: a 3-15 month follow-up of prospective COVulnerability cohort. Respir Res. 2022;23(1):68. Epub 2022/03/24. 16 doi: 10.1186/s12931-022-01977-z. PubMed PMID: 35317815; PubMed Central PMCID: 17 PMCPMC8938727. 18 18. Swank Z, Senussi Y, Manickas-Hill Z, Yu XG, Li JZ, Alter G, et al. Persistent circulating SARS-CoV-2 19 spike is associated with post-acute COVID-19 sequelae. Clin Infect Dis. 2022. Epub 2022/09/03. doi: 20 10.1093/cid/ciac722. PubMed PMID: 36052466. 21 19. Littlefield KM, Watson RO, Schneider JM, Neff CP, Yamada E, Zhang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific 22 T cells associate with inflammation and reduced lung function in pulmonary post-acute segualae of 23 SARS-CoV-2. PLoS Pathog. 2022;18(5):e1010359. Epub 2022/05/27. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1010359. 24 PubMed PMID: 35617421. 25 20. Paneroni M, Pasini E, Vitacca M, Scalvini S, Comini L, Pedrinolla A, et al. Altered Vascular 26 Endothelium-Dependent Responsiveness in Frail Elderly Patients Recovering from COVID-19 Pneumonia: 27 Preliminary Evidence. J Clin Med. 2021;10(12). Epub 2021/07/03. doi: 10.3390/jcm10122558. PubMed 28 PMID: 34207876; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8228458. Mejia-Renteria H, Travieso A, Sagir A, Martínez-Gómez E, Carrascosa-Granada A, Toya T, et al. 29 21. 30 In-vivo evidence of systemic endothelial vascular dysfunction in COVID-19. International Journal of 31 Cardiology. 2021;345:153-5. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2021.10.140. 32 22. Drakos S, Chatzantonis G, Bietenbeck M, Evers G, Schulze AB, Mohr M, et al. A cardiovascular 33 magnetic resonance imaging-based pilot study to assess coronary microvascular disease in COVID-19 34 patients. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):15667. Epub 2021/08/04. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-95277-z. PubMed 35 PMID: 34341436; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8329060. 36 23. Ahmed AI, Saad JM, Han YS, Malahfji M, Nabi F, Mahmarian JJ, et al. Coronary Microvascular 37 Health in Patients with Prior Covid-19 Infection: Implications for Long-Covid Syndrome. Journal of the 38 American College of Cardiology. 2022;79(9):1822-. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2022.07.006. PubMed PMID: 39 WOS:000781026602023. 40 Huang PH, Leu HB, Chen JW, Wu TC, Lu TM, Ding YA, et al. Comparison of endothelial vasodilator 24. 41 function, inflammatory markers, and N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide in patients with or without 42 chronotropic incompetence to exercise test. Heart. 2006;92(5):609-14. Epub 2005/09/15. doi: 43 10.1136/hrt.2005.064147. PubMed PMID: 16159987; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1860951. 44 Bechsgaard DF, Hove JD, Suhrs HE, Bové KB, Shahriari P, Gustafsson I, et al. Women with 25. 45 coronary microvascular dysfunction and no obstructive coronary artery disease have reduced exercise 46 capacity. International Journal of Cardiology. 2019;293:1-9. doi: 47 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.07.048.

Hajiasgharzadeh K, Mirnajafi-Zadeh J, Mani AR. Interleukin-6 impairs chronotropic 1 26. 2 responsiveness to cholinergic stimulation and decreases heart rate variability in mice. Eur J Pharmacol. 3 2011;673(1-3):70-7. Epub 2011/11/03. doi: 10.1016/j.ejphar.2011.10.013. PubMed PMID: 22044916. 4 27. Kistner TM, Pedersen BK, Lieberman DE. Interleukin 6 as an energy allocator in muscle tissue. 5 Nat Metab. 2022;4(2):170-9. Epub 2022/02/26. doi: 10.1038/s42255-022-00538-4. PubMed PMID: 6 35210610. 7 Lee J, Lee S, Zhang H, Hill MA, Zhang C, Park Y. Interaction of IL-6 and TNF- $\alpha$  contributes to 28. 8 endothelial dysfunction in type 2 diabetic mouse hearts. PLoS One. 2017;12(11):e0187189. Epub 2017/11/03. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0187189. PubMed PMID: 29095915; PubMed Central PMCID: 9 10 PMCPMC5667841. 11 29. Singh I, Joseph P, Heerdt PM, Cullinan M, Lutchmansingh DD, Gulati M, et al. Persistent 12 Exertional Intolerance After COVID-19: Insights From Invasive Cardiopulmonary Exercise Testing. Chest. 2022;161(1):54-63. Epub 2021/08/15. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2021.08.010. PubMed PMID: 34389297; 13 14 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8354807. 15 30. Mancini DM, Brunjes DL, Lala A, Trivieri MG, Contreras JP, Natelson BH. Use of Cardiopulmonary 16 Stress Testing for Patients With Unexplained Dyspnea Post-Coronavirus Disease. JACC Heart Fail. 17 2021;9(12):927-37. Epub 2021/12/04. doi: 10.1016/j.jchf.2021.10.002. PubMed PMID: 34857177; 18 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8629098. 19 31. Brown JT, Saigal A, Karia N, Patel RK, Razvi Y, Constantinou N, et al. Ongoing Exercise Intolerance 20 Following COVID-19: A Magnetic Resonance-Augmented Cardiopulmonary Exercise Test Study. J Am 21 Heart Assoc. 2022;11(9):e024207. Epub 2022/04/27. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.121.024207. PubMed PMID: 22 35470679. 23 Szekely Y, Lichter Y, Sadon S, Lupu L, Taieb P, Banai A, et al. Cardiorespiratory Abnormalities in 32. 24 Patients Recovering from Coronavirus Disease 2019. J Am Soc Echocardiogr. 2021;34(12):1273-84.e9. 25 Epub 2021/09/12. doi: 10.1016/j.echo.2021.08.022. PubMed PMID: 34508837; PubMed Central PMCID: 26 PMCPMC8425293. 27 33. Jamal SM, Landers DB, Hollenberg SM, Turi ZG, Glotzer TV, Tancredi J, et al. Prospective 28 Evaluation of Autonomic Dysfunction in Post-Acute Seguela of COVID-19. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2022;79(23):2325-30. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2022.03.357. 29 30 34. Novak P, Mukerji SS, Alabsi HS, Systrom D, Marciano SP, Felsenstein D, et al. Multisystem 31 Involvement in Post-Acute Seguelae of Coronavirus Disease 19. Ann Neurol. 2022;91(3):367-79. Epub 32 2021/12/26. doi: 10.1002/ana.26286. PubMed PMID: 34952975. 33 Oaklander AL, Mills AJ, Kelley M, Toran LS, Smith B, Dalakas MC, et al. Peripheral Neuropathy 35. 34 Evaluations of Patients With Prolonged Long COVID. Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm. 2022;9(3). 35 Epub 2022/03/03. doi: 10.1212/nxi.000000000001146. PubMed PMID: 35232750; PubMed Central 36 PMCID: PMCPMC8889896. 37 36. Douaud G, Lee S, Alfaro-Almagro F, Arthofer C, Wang C, McCarthy P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 is 38 associated with changes in brain structure in UK Biobank. Nature. 2022;604(7907):697-707. Epub 39 2022/03/08. doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-04569-5. PubMed PMID: 35255491; PubMed Central PMCID: 40 PMCPMC9046077. 41 37. Stein SR, Ramelli SC, Grazioli A, Chung JY, Singh M, Yinda CK, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection and 42 persistence in the human body and brain at autopsy. Nature. 2022;612(7941):758-63. Epub 2022/12/15. 43 doi: 10.1038/s41586-022-05542-y. PubMed PMID: 36517603; PubMed Central PMCID: 44 PMCPMC9749650. 45 38. Han Y, Zhu J, Yang L, Nilsson-Payant BE, Hurtado R, Lacko LA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection Induces 46 Ferroptosis of Sinoatrial Node Pacemaker Cells. Circ Res. 2022;130(7):963-77. Epub 2022/03/09. doi: 47 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.121.320518. PubMed PMID: 35255712; PubMed Central PMCID: 48 PMCPMC8963443.

39. Sanders P, Kistler PM, Morton JB, Spence SJ, Kalman JM. Remodeling of sinus node function in 1 2 patients with congestive heart failure: reduction in sinus node reserve. Circulation. 2004;110(8):897-3 903. Epub 2004/08/11. doi: 10.1161/01.CIR.0000139336.69955.AB. PubMed PMID: 15302799. 4 40. Stute NL, Stickford JL, Province VM, Augenreich MA, Ratchford SM, Stickford ASL. COVID-19 is 5 getting on our nerves: sympathetic neural activity and haemodynamics in young adults recovering from 6 SARS-CoV-2. J Physiol. 2021;599(18):4269-85. Epub 2021/06/27. doi: 10.1113/JP281888. PubMed PMID: 7 34174086; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8447023. 8 Franssen WMA, Keytsman C, Marinus N, Verboven K, Eijnde BO, van Ryckeghem L, et al. 41. 9 Chronotropic incompetence is more frequent in obese adolescents and relates to systemic inflammation 10 and exercise intolerance. J Sport Health Sci. 2021. Epub 2021/02/03. doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2021.01.010. 11 PubMed PMID: 33529767. 12 Margalit I, Yelin D, Sagi M, Rahat MM, Sheena L, Mizrahi N, et al. Risk factors and 42. 13 multidimensional assessment of long COVID fatigue: a nested case-control study. Clin Infect Dis. 2022. 14 Epub 2022/04/12. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciac283. PubMed PMID: 35403679. 15 Jimeno-Almazán A, Pallarés JG, Buendía-Romero Á, Martínez-Cava A, Courel-Ibáñez J. 43. 16 Chronotropic Incompetence in Non-Hospitalized Patients with Post-COVID-19 Syndrome. Journal of 17 Clinical Medicine. 2021;10(22):5434. PubMed PMID: doi:10.3390/jcm10225434. 18 44. Abdallah SJ, Voduc N, Corrales-Medina VF, McGuinty M, Pratt A, Chopra A, et al. Symptoms, 19 Pulmonary Function, and Functional Capacity Four Months after COVID-19. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 20 2021;18(11):1912-7. Epub 2021/04/20. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202012-1489RL. PubMed PMID: 21 33872135; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8641826. 22 Ladlow P, O'Sullivan O, Houston A, Barker-Davies R, May S, Mills D, et al. Dysautonomia 45. 23 following COVID-19 is not associated with subjective limitations or symptoms but is associated with 24 objective functional limitations. Heart Rhythm. 2022;19(4):613-20. doi: 25 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2021.12.005. 26 46. Jouven X, Empana JP, Schwartz PJ, Desnos M, Courbon D, Ducimetiere P. Heart-rate profile 27 during exercise as a predictor of sudden death. N Engl J Med. 2005;352(19):1951-8. Epub 2005/05/13. 28 doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa043012. PubMed PMID: 15888695. 29 Savonen KP, Lakka TA, Laukkanen JA, Halonen PM, Rauramaa TH, Salonen JT, et al. Heart rate 47. 30 response during exercise test and cardiovascular mortality in middle-aged men. European Heart Journal. 31 2006;27(5):582-8. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehi708. 32 48. Lauer MS, Francis GS, Okin PM, Pashkow FJ, Snader CE, Marwick TH. Impaired Chronotropic 33 Response to Exercise Stress Testing as a Predictor of Mortality. JAMA. 1999;281(6):524-9. doi: 34 10.1001/jama.281.6.524. 35 49. Joseph P, Arevalo C, Oliveira RKF, Faria-Urbina M, Felsenstein D, Oaklander AL, et al. Insights 36 From Invasive Cardiopulmonary Exercise Testing of Patients With Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic 37 Fatigue Syndrome. Chest. 2021;160(2):642-51. Epub 2021/02/13. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2021.01.082. 38 PubMed PMID: 33577778; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8727854. 39 de Boer E, Petrache I, Goldstein NM, Olin JT, Keith RC, Modena B, et al. Decreased Fatty Acid 50. 40 Oxidation and Altered Lactate Production during Exercise in Patients with Post-acute COVID-19 41 Syndrome. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2022;205(1):126-9. Epub 2021/10/20. doi: 10.1164/rccm.202108-42 1903LE. PubMed PMID: 34665688; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8865580. 43 51. Fresard I, Genecand L, Altarelli M, Gex G, Vremaroiu P, Vremaroiu-Coman A, et al. Dysfunctional 44 breathing diagnosed by cardiopulmonary exercise testing in 'long COVID' patients with persistent 45 dyspnoea. BMJ Open Respir Res. 2022;9(1):e001126. Epub 2022/04/01. doi: 10.1136/bmjresp-2021-46 001126. PubMed PMID: 35354589; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8968537. 47 52. Motiejunaite J, Balagny P, Arnoult F, Mangin L, Bancal C, Vidal-Petiot E, et al. Hyperventilation as 48 one of the mechanisms of persistent dyspnoea in SARS-CoV-2 survivors. Eur Respir J.

2021;58(2):2101578. Epub 2021/08/14. doi: 10.1183/13993003.01578-2021. PubMed PMID: 34385265; 1 2 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8361302 support from Servier, outside the submitted work. A. Cohen-3 Solal has received grants or honoraria from Novartis, Servier, Daiichi Sankyo, Vifor, Menarini and 4 Cardiorentis, outside of the submitted work. J. Frija-Masson reports non-financial support from Vitalaire, 5 Boehringer Ingelheim, Oxyvie and LVL Medical, outside the submitted work. All other authors declare 6 that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could 7 be construed as a potential conflict of interest. 8 53. Morrow AJ, Sykes R, McIntosh A, Kamdar A, Bagot C, Bayes HK, et al. A multisystem, cardio-renal 9 investigation of post-COVID-19 illness. Nat Med. 2022. Epub 2022/05/24. doi: 10.1038/s41591-022-10 01837-9. PubMed PMID: 35606551. 11 54. Ingul CB, Grimsmo J, Mecinaj A, Trebinjac D, Berger Nossen M, Andrup S, et al. Cardiac 12 Dvsfunction and Arrhythmias 3 Months After Hospitalization for COVID-19. J Am Heart Assoc. 13 2022;11(3):e023473. Epub 2022/01/21. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.121.023473. PubMed PMID: 35048715. 14 Dewland TA, Whitman IR, Win S, Sanchez JM, Olgin JE, Pletcher MJ, et al. Prospective arrhythmia 55. 15 surveillance after a COVID-19 diagnosis. Open Heart. 2022;9(1). Epub 2022/01/22. doi: 16 10.1136/openhrt-2021-001758. PubMed PMID: 35058344; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8783964. 17 Aranyó J, Bazan V, Lladós G, Dominguez MJ, Bisbal F, Massanella M, et al. Inappropriate sinus 56. 18 tachycardia in post-COVID-19 syndrome. Scientific Reports. 2022;12(1):298. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-19 03831-6. 20 Al-Aly Z, Bowe B, Xie Y. Long COVID after breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nature Medicine. 57. 21 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41591-022-01840-0. 22 Hastie CE, Lowe DJ, McAuley A, Winter AJ, Mills NL, Black C, et al. Outcomes among confirmed 58. 23 cases and a matched comparison group in the Long-COVID in Scotland study. Nat Commun. 24 2022;13(1):5663. Epub 2022/10/13. doi: 10.1038/s41467-022-33415-5. PubMed PMID: 36224173; 25 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9556711. Durstenfeld MS, Peluso MJ, Peyser ND, Lin F, Knight SJ, Djibo A, et al. Factors Associated With 26 59. 27 Long COVID Symptoms in an Online Cohort Study. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2023;10(2):ofad047. Epub 28 2023/02/28. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofad047. PubMed PMID: 36846611; PubMed Central PMCID: 29 PMCPMC9945931. 30 60. Keteyian SJ, Brawner CA, Schairer JR, Levine TB, Levine AB, Rogers FJ, et al. Effects of exercise 31 training on chronotropic incompetence in patients with heart failure. Am Heart J. 1999;138(2 Pt 1):233-32 40. Epub 1999/07/30. doi: 10.1016/s0002-8703(99)70106-7. PubMed PMID: 10426833. 33 Kiilavuori K, Toivonen L, Näveri H, Leinonen H. Reversal of autonomic derangements by physical 61. 34 training in chronic heart failure assessed by heart rate variability. Eur Heart J. 1995;16(4):490-5. Epub 35 1995/04/01. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.eurheartj.a060941. PubMed PMID: 7671894. 36 62. Myers J, Hadley D, Oswald U, Bruner K, Kottman W, Hsu L, et al. Effects of exercise training on 37 heart rate recovery in patients with chronic heart failure. Am Heart J. 2007;153(6):1056-63. Epub 2007/06/02. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2007.02.038. PubMed PMID: 17540210. 38 39 Fu Q, Levine BD. Exercise and non-pharmacological treatment of POTS. Auton Neurosci. 63. 40 2018;215:20-7. Epub 2018/07/14. doi: 10.1016/j.autneu.2018.07.001. PubMed PMID: 30001836; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6289756. 41 42 64. George SA, Bivens TB, Howden EJ, Saleem Y, Galbreath MM, Hendrickson D, et al. The 43 international POTS registry: Evaluating the efficacy of an exercise training intervention in a community 44 setting. Heart Rhythm. 2016;13(4):943-50. Epub 2015/12/23. doi: 10.1016/j.hrthm.2015.12.012. 45 PubMed PMID: 26690066. 46 Bonilla H, Quach TC, Tiwari A, Bonilla AE, Miglis M, Yang PC, et al. Myalgic 65. 47 Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome is common in post-acute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection (PASC): Results from a post-COVID-19 multidisciplinary clinic. Front Neurol. 2023;14:1090747. Epub 48

2023/03/14. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2023.1090747. PubMed PMID: 36908615; PubMed Central PMCID:
 PMCPMC9998690.

3 66. Jason LA, Dorri JA. ME/CFS and Post-Exertional Malaise among Patients with Long COVID. Neurol

4 Int. 2022;15(1):1-11. Epub 2023/01/18. doi: 10.3390/neurolint15010001. PubMed PMID: 36648965;

5 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9844405.

- 6 67. Vernon SD, Hartle M, Sullivan K, Bell J, Abbaszadeh S, Unutmaz D, et al. Post-exertional malaise
- 7 among people with long COVID compared to myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome

8 (ME/CFS). Work. 2023. Epub 2023/03/14. doi: 10.3233/wor-220581. PubMed PMID: 36911963.

- 9 68. Parker M, Sawant HB, Flannery T, Tarrant R, Shardha J, Bannister R, et al. Effect of using a
- 10 structured pacing protocol on post-exertional symptom exacerbation and health status in a longitudinal
- 11 cohort with the post-COVID-19 syndrome. J Med Virol. 2023;95(1):e28373. Epub 2022/12/04. doi:
- 12 10.1002/jmv.28373. PubMed PMID: 36461167; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9878088.
- 13 69. Jimeno-Almazán A, Buendía-Romero Á, Martínez-Cava A, Franco-López F, Sánchez-Alcaraz BJ,
- 14 Courel-Ibáñez J, et al. Effects of a concurrent training, respiratory muscle exercise, and self-management
- 15 recommendations on recovery from post-COVID-19 conditions: the RECOVE trial. Journal of Applied
- 16 Physiology. 2023;134(1):95-104. doi: 10.1152/japplphysiol.00489.2022. PubMed PMID: 36476156.