

1 **Title page**

2

3 **Physiological Effects of Exercising at Different Intensities Wearing TNT or Double-layer Cotton**

4 **Facemasks Compared to Not Wearing a Mask**

5

6 Fabrício Braga^{1,2}; Gabriel Espinosa¹; Amanda Monteiro¹; Beatriz Marinho¹; Eduardo Drummond¹

7

8 **Affiliations**

9 ¹ Human Performance Laboratory; Rio de Janeiro; Brazil

10 ² Casa de Saúde São José; Rio de Janeiro; Brazil

11

12 **Corresponding author:** Fabrício Braga

13 Laboratório de Performance Humana, Largo do Ibam, n01 - 2º andar - Humaitá, Rio de Janeiro - RJ,

14 Brazil ZIP code: 22271-070

15 email: fabricao.braga@instutodoesporte.com

16 ORCID ID: Fabrício Braga: 0000-0002-7062-1705

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20 We compared the physiological differences between exercising wearing a TNT or a double-layer-cotton
21 (DLC) facemask (FM) and not wearing a mask (NM). Sixteen volunteers underwent 4 sets (S) of 2
22 sequential bouts (B). B1 and B2 corresponded to light and moderate intensity cycling, respectively. FMs
23 were used as follows: S1: NM; S2: TNT or DLC; S3: DLC or TNT; and S4: NM. Metabolic, pulmonary,
24 and perceptual variables were collected. The main results are expressed as effect sizes and confidence
25 intervals (ES [95% CI]) for TNT and DLC unless otherwise indicated. Compared to NM, FM increased
26 the duty cycle (B1=1.11[0.58-1.61] and 1.53[0.81-2.18]; B2=1.27[0.63-1.84] and 1.93[0.97-2.68]) and
27 decreased breath frequency (B1=0.59[0.23-0.94] and 1.43[0.79-2.07], B2=0.39[0.05-0.71] and 1.33[0.71-
28 1.94]). Only B1 tidal volume increased (0.33[0.09-0.56] and 0.62[0.18-1.05]) enough to avoid a
29 ventilation reduction with TNT but not with DLC (B1=0.52[0.23-0.79]; B2=0.84[0.44-1.22]). Both FMs
30 reduced oxygen saturation in B1 (0.56 [0.07-1.03] and 0.69 [0.09-1.28]) but only DLC did so in B2 (0.66
31 [0.11-1.13]). Both end tidal CO₂ (B1=0.23[0.05-0.4] and 0.71[0.38-1.02]; B2=0.56[0.2-0.9] and
32 1.20[0.65-1.68]) and mixed-expired-CO₂ (B1=0.74[0.38-1.08] 1.71[1.03-2.37], B2=0.94[0.45-1.38] and
33 1.78[0.97-2.42]) increased with FMs. Ventilatory adaptations imposed during FM exercising influenced
34 blood-lung gas exchange. Larger ESs were seen with DLC. No adverse changes to human health were
35 observed.

36

37

38 **Novelty Bullets**

- 39 • Facemasks affect the breathing pattern by changing the frequency and amplitude of pulmonary
40 ventilation.
- 41 • The augmented ventilatory work increases VO₂, VCO₂, and RPE and promotes non-concerning
42 drops in SpO₂ and CO₂ retention.
- 43 • Increased inspiratory and expiratory pressure can account for the reduction in pulmonary
44 physiological dead space.

45

46 **Keywords:** facemask, COVID-19, exercise, hypercapnia, hypoxemia

47

48

49 **Introduction**

50 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic triggered many events and circumstances that deeply affect everyday life,
51 demanding adaptations (Haleem et al. 2020). One of them is universal facemask (FM) use to decrease
52 environmental viral airborne community transmission (Setti et al. 2020; Esposito et al. 2020). These
53 recommendations include exercise practice, either outdoors or in indoor facilities. The efficacy of FM use
54 to reduce the odds of respiratory tract viral infection in high-risk situations has already been widely
55 demonstrated in the household set. However, its benefit in mitigating contagion is strongly dependent on
56 adherence and early use regarding symptom onset in the index case (Cowling et al. 2009; MacIntyre et al.
57 2015). Despite limited evidence, observational studies suggest a potential benefit of FM use in containing
58 virus spread (Cheng et al. 2020; Eikenberry et al. 2020). Some experts also endorse FM use (MacIntyre
59 and Chughtai 2015; Fodjo et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2020).

60 In this scenario, the safety of wearing a FM while exercising has been the subject of debate, and concerns
61 have been raised by the popular media. Nevertheless, the paucity of scientific research approaching this
62 problem so far has amplified the buzz and divided opinions (Chandrasekaran and Fernandes 2020). Those
63 who advocate against wearing FMs raise the possibility of dangerous CO₂ retention and O₂ desaturation.
64 Before the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, an investigation of the physiological effect of wearing a FM during
65 physical activity focused on personal protective equipment such as filtering air-purifying facepiece
66 respirators (Johnson et al. 1995; Johnson 2016). Those few studies have shown some increases in exhaled
67 CO₂ and the opposite effect on O₂, as well as a reduction in exercise performance. The proposed
68 mechanism was not an increase in pulmonary dead space but a reduction in alveolar ventilation caused by
69 the higher ventilation resistance. A similar effect was seen among healthcare workers using N95
70 respirators (Özdemir et al. 2020). However, most of the issues with acceptability of these FMs seems to
71 be related to the thermal sensation, rather than to any ventilatory disturbance they may cause (Nielsen et
72 al. 1987).

73 Suggested exercise FMs are non-woven fabric surgical masks (TNT) or double-layer cotton (DLC). Thus,
74 the physiological effect of their use during exercise is poorly understood.

75 Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the physiological effects of wearing TNT and DLC
76 FMs during exercise at light and moderate intensities. The following physiological variables were
77 considered: oxygen uptake (VO₂), carbon dioxide output (VCO₂), respiratory exchange ratio (RER), heart
78 rate (H_R), tidal volume (V_T), breath frequency (B_f), minute ventilation (V_E), end tidal CO₂ pressure

79 ($E_T\text{CO}_2$), mixed-expired CO_2 (PECO_2), difference between $E_T\text{CO}_2$ and PECO_2 ($\Delta E_T\text{-PECO}_2$), oxygen
80 saturation (SpO_2), relationship between inspiratory time and total ventilatory time (duty cycle [T_i/T_{TOT}]),
81 rate of perceived effort (RPE), subjective thermal perception (STP) and FM microclimate temperature
82 (FMMT). We hypothesized that DLC but not TNT increases exhaled CO_2 compared with NM and that
83 neither affects SpO_2 .

84

85 **Materials and methods**

86 **Participants**

87 This research was conducted at the physiology laboratory, LPH, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Sixteen healthy
88 volunteers (7 women) were recruited among amateur cyclists screened in our sport medicine clinic within
89 the previous 12 months. The inclusion criteria were men or women aged ≥ 18 years old who had a normal
90 health screening within the last 12 months and no chronic comorbidities and were currently cycling at
91 least 3 times a week either for sport or recreationally. This sample size was determined based on the
92 calculation described in the statistical section. Participant characteristics are presented in the first section
93 of Table 1. After providing written informed consent, they submitted to the two-day protocol outlined.
94 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Hospital Federal de Bonsucesso under protocol
95 number 33487920.9.0000.5253. All the procedures in this study were in accord with the 1975 Helsinki
96 Declaration, updated in 2013.

97

98 **Procedures**

99 Volunteers were asked to refrain from exercising within 24 hours prior to each visit. At the first visit,
100 volunteers performed a cardiopulmonary exercise test (CPET) to exhaustion on an electromagnetic-
101 braked cycle ergometer (Lode Corival®, Groningen, The Netherlands) using an individualized ramp
102 protocol based on the Wasserman algorithm. Throughout the exercise, gas exchange and ventilatory
103 variables were continuously measured with a breath-by-breath analyser using a computerized metabolic
104 cart (Metalyzer 3B®; Cortex®, Leipzig, Germany). Before each test, the gas analysis system underwent a
105 two-point gas calibration using ambient air and a gas mixture containing 4% CO_2 and 16% O_2 . The flow
106 sensor was calibrated using a 3 L air syringe with a constant flow of 1 L/s. Both procedures were
107 followed as recommended by the manufacturer. All data were smoothed by the 15-point moving average
108 method, automatically calculated by analytic software (MetaSoft Studio®; Cortex®, Leipzig, Germany).

109 SpO₂ and H_R were recorded throughout the exercise using a finger probe Nonin 3150 WristOx-2 (Nonin
110 Medical Systems, Minnesota, US) and a Polar® H7 (Polar Electro Kempele, Finland) chest strap,
111 respectively.

112 The CPET protocol consisted of 2 minutes of rest and 3 minutes of unload pedalling followed by a ramp
113 phase until exhaustion. A fixed comfortable cadence between 65 and 85 rpm was requested, and when the
114 participant failed to sustain a minimum of 60 rpm for more than 5 seconds despite verbal encouragement,
115 the test was interrupted. A five-minute passive recovery period followed.

116 First and second ventilatory thresholds (VT1 and VT2, respectively) were estimated based on standard
117 methodologies previously described (Wasserman et al. 1994; Lucia et al. 2000). Peak values for
118 physiological variables were defined as the highest 30-s average value.

119 The second visit occurred 1 to 7 days after the first visit. Volunteers performed 4 sets of exercise with a
120 10-minute rest between them. Each set consisted of two six-minute bouts (B) of constant work exercise
121 (on the same CPET cycle ergometer) using 80% of the workload at VT1 for B1 and 80% of VT2 for B2.
122 S1 and S4 were performed with NM. For S2 and S3, a 10 x10 cm snippet of TNT (removed from a
123 surgical FM) or DLC (provided by a local mask manufacturer) was attached in front of the flow sensor
124 using a rubber band to cover it completely (figure 2-A, 2-B, 2-D and 2-E). For the first included
125 volunteer, DLC and TNT were used on S2 and S3, respectively. Thereafter, to reduce the effect of
126 exercise time on physiological response, this sequence was counterbalanced for the next volunteers. In
127 order to blind the volunteers from the mask they were using, a cloth frame was placed on the border of the
128 flow sensor (figure 2-C).

129 Throughout all sets of exercise, VO₂, VCO₂, V_T, B_f, V_E, H_R, SpO₂, and FMMT were continuously
130 measured using the same devices previously described. RPE and STP were obtained every minute during
131 exercise using the Borg CR10 and 9-item thermal sensation scales, respectively (Gagge et al. 1971). A
132 double sensor air thermometer (TM10, Agetherm®, São Paulo, Brazil) had one probe positioned inside
133 the examining mask, monitoring FMMT, and the other checking ambient air temperature. Thus, both
134 temperatures could be simultaneously measured by the same device.

135 Laboratory temperature and relative humidity were maintained at 20.4±3.0°C and 55.5±10.8%,
136 respectively, with no significant variation throughout the experimental conditions. For more detailed data,
137 see figure S1 and table S2 in the online supplementary material.

138

139

140 **Statistical analysis**

141 Sample size was calculated using G*power v.3.1 software (G*power®, Dusseldorf, Germany) based on
142 repeated measures ANOVA to achieve a power of 80% and a level of significance of 5% (two sided),
143 with an effect size (ES) of 0.4 and a correlation among measures of 0.6. Therefore, 15 volunteers were
144 needed.

145 Two last-minute average values from each B were used for analysis for all volunteers but one, who had a
146 drop in ventilation and oxygen uptake after the fourth minute of B2 wearing the DLC mask. In this case,
147 values between the second and fourth minutes were considered. NM values were considered as the
148 average of S1 and S4. To confirm the measure's stability regardless of time, we calculated the intraclass
149 correlation coefficient (ICC) and its 95% confidence interval (CI) for S1 and S4 based on the absolute
150 agreement of single measures in a two-way mixed-effects model between conditions (Table S1).

151 The data distribution for each variable was analysed using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Continuous variables
152 were expressed as the mean \pm SD or median (IQR) according to their distribution. Parametric variables
153 were compared by repeated measures ANOVA followed by the Bonferroni test for post hoc pairwise
154 analysis. Partial eta squared (η^2) was calculated as the corresponding ES. Nonparametric variables were
155 compared by Friedman's test followed by Dunn's post hoc analysis for within-group comparisons. ES
156 was calculated using Kendall's W. Categorical variables were expressed as percentages and compared
157 with the Chi-square or Fisher's exact test.

158 ESs were measured for pairwise comparison using Hedges' *g*. Nonparametric data were previously
159 normalized using natural logarithmic before computing ES. The qualitative assessment of the ES was
160 interpreted as follows (Sawilowsky 2003): <0.2: very small (VSES); 0.2 to 0.49: small (SES); 0.5 to 0.79:
161 medium (MES), 0.8 to 1.19: large (LES), 1.2 to 1.99 very large (VLES) and ≥ 2.0 huge (HES). Common
162 language ES (CLES) was also measured (McGraw and Wong 1992).

163 Statistical analysis was carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (IBM
164 SPSS for Windows, version 22.0, IBM Corp., Armonk, NY) and R Studio (RStudio® Team, 2020,
165 Vienna, Austria).

166

167 **Results**

168 Of the 16 selected volunteers, two failed to complete B2 on the DLC set. In both cases, shortness of
169 breath was the reason for stopping the exercise. Immediately after removing the FM, symptoms ceased,
170 and both were able to continue the study protocol. No other clinical event occurred during the experiment.
171 Therefore, for B2 comparisons, 14 volunteers were considered. The results (ES with 95%CI) for pairwise
172 comparisons between FM are reported in Table 2. CLES is presented in Table S3 in the online material.
173 Figure 3 shows the boxplot results for each variable. A detailed description follows below.

174

175 **Oxygen uptake and carbon dioxide output, respiratory exchange rate and heart rate.**

176 VO_2 was significantly different between FMs during B1 and B2 (figure 3-a), increasing 8.7 and 10.4%
177 during B1 and 6.8 and 6.3% during B2 for TNT and DLC, respectively (SES for all). No difference was
178 found between TNT and DLC during either bout. VCO_2 was also different between FMs (figure 3-b).
179 Compared to NM, VCO_2 increased 8.7 (SES) and 7.3% (SES) during B1 and 4.8 (VSES) and 1.9% (non-
180 significant ES) during B2 for TNT and DLC, respectively. RER (figure 3-c) was significantly different
181 between FMs but in the opposite direction observed for VO_2 and VCO_2 , showing a non-proportional
182 change between these variables. RER was 3.1 (LES) and 5.7% (VLES) lower during B1 and 1.9 (MES)
183 and 4.3% (VLES) lower during B2 for TNT and DLC, respectively, than for NM. TNT RER was 2.7%
184 (MES) lower than DLC during B1, and no difference was found between them during B2.
185 H_R (figure 3-d) did not differ between FMs during B1. However, during B2, despite the 2.2% H_R increase
186 with DLC compared to NM in the post hoc analysis, no significant difference was found for any
187 comparison.

188

189 **Tidal volume, breathing frequency, minute ventilation, duty cycle, and oxygen saturation.**

190 V_T (figure 3-e) was different between FMs during B1 but not B2. There was a 7.4 (SES) and 15.4%
191 (MES) increase in V_T for TNT and DLC, respectively, compared to NM. Both FMs significantly reduced
192 B_f (figure 3-f) during B1 and B2. During B1, B_f was 9.6 (MES) and 23.6% (VLES) lower with TNT and
193 DLC, respectively, than with NM. Moreover, TNT B_f was 15.5% (LES) lower than DLC B_f . During B2,
194 no difference was found between NM and TNT, but DLC promoted 20.2 (VLES) and 14.9% (LES)
195 reductions in B_f compared to NM and TNT, respectively. The net effect on V_E (a product of B_f and V_T -
196 figure 3-g) also showed significant differences between FM and NM exercise. However, V_E was not

197 different between NM and TNT during B1 or B2. Otherwise, DLC reduced V_E by 12.0 (MES) and 9.8%
198 (SES) during B1 and 17.9 (LES) and 14.2% (MES) during B2 compared to NM and TNT, respectively.
199 T_i/T_{TOT} (figure 3-h) was different among FMs during both B1 and B2. Post hoc analysis shows 6.1 (LES)
200 and 10.4% (VLES) lower values of T_i/T_{TOT} for NM than for TNT and DLC, and no differences between
201 TNT and DLC during B1. During B2, T_i/T_{TOT} with NM was 5.1 and 9.8% (VLES for both) lower than
202 that with TNT and DLC, respectively. This time, the TNT value was 4.5% (MES) lower than that of the
203 DLC. SpO_2 (figure 3-i) was different between FMs during B1 and B2, but post hoc analysis was unable to
204 show significant differences within FM comparisons. However, ES showed significant differences for
205 pairwise analysis. DLC and TNT showed an MES reduction in SpO_2 compared to NM during B1. An
206 MES was seen during B2 for DLC relative to TNT and NM. All other comparisons were not significant.

207

208 **Mixed-expired and end tidal CO_2 pressures.**

209 E_TCO_2 (figure 3-j) was different between FMs for both B1 and B2. All within-FM post hoc comparisons
210 were significant; 2.2 (SES), 7.8 (MES) and 4.8% (MES) larger values during B1, as well as 5.2 (MES),
211 12.8 (LES) and 7.3% (MES) during B2, for NM vs. TNT, NM vs. DLC and TNT vs. DLC, respectively.
212 $PECO_2$ (figure 3-k) showed behaviour similar to E_TCO_2 , except there was no difference between TNT and
213 DLC FM in B1 post hoc analysis. However, all ES were significant: 7.5 (MES), 17.7 (MES) and 9.5%
214 during B1, and 9.5 (MES), 22.2 (LES) and 11.7% (MES) for NM vs. TNT, NM vs. DLC and TNT vs.
215 DLC, respectively. The difference between E_TCO_2 and $PECO_2$ (ΔE_T-PECO_2 , figure 3-l) was markedly
216 reduced with both FMs at the two exercise intensities. A 16.6 (VLES) and 30.2% (HES) reduction in
217 ΔE_T-PECO_2 were observed for TNT and DLC, respectively, compared to NM at B1. Moreover, DLC
218 promoted a 16.3% (LES) increase in ΔE_T-PECO_2 compared to TNT.

219

220 **Rate of perceived effort, subjective thermal perception, and facemask microclimate temperature**

221 RPE (figure 3-m) increased with FM during B1 and B2. TNT increased RPE by 19.6 (MES) and 15.3%
222 (MES) during B1 and B2, respectively, as DLC increased by 28.0% (MES) and 33.4% (LES) during B1
223 and B2, respectively, compared to NM. DLC also increased RPE over TNT during B1: 7.1% (MES).
224 ANOVA showed significant differences between FMs during B1 but not B2 for STP (figure 3-n).
225 However, no significant pairwise ES was observed during B1 or B2.

226 FMMT (figure 3-o) showed remarkably similar results during B1 and B2. Post hoc analysis showed 4.9
227 and 2.1% increases in FMMT with DLC compared to NM and TNT, respectively. ES showed
228 significance for all comparisons; lower MES, VLES and MES values were observed for NM vs. TNT,
229 NM vs., and TNT vs DLC, respectively. Likewise, during B2, DLC showed a 4.9 and 2.1% higher
230 FMMT than NM and TNT, respectively. ES was significant for all 3 comparisons: LES, MES and LES
231 for NM vs. TNT, TNT vs. DLC and NM vs. DLC, respectively.

232 **Discussion**

233 The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of wearing TNT and DLC FMs during exercise at light
234 and moderate intensities on physiological responses in order to identify potential reasons for reported
235 malaise and reduced exercise performance, as well as any reason for concern regarding harmful effects on
236 gas exchange. To our knowledge, this is the first study considering different individualized exercise
237 intensities.

238 With regard to metabolic variables, both VO_2 and VCO_2 exhibited small increases with FM at the two
239 tested exercise intensities. The effects on VO_2 were larger than those on VCO_2 , as illustrated by a
240 reduction in RER. The absence of excess CO_2 indicates an increase mainly in aerobic rather than
241 anaerobic muscle metabolism. DLC produced a MES negative effect on RER that was twofold higher
242 than the effect of TNT compared to NM. What is the reason for this increase in aerobic metabolism? As
243 this phenomenon could be observed at higher exercise intensity (80% of VT_2), it is unlikely that an
244 increase in energy demand on exercising muscles near the ventilatory compensation point did not
245 generate an excess of CO_2 . Therefore, we believe that another group of working muscles should have
246 accounted for the higher VO_2 fostered by FMs.

247 Among all physiological changes produced by FMs, ventilatory variables were the most affected. The
248 upper airway obstruction (UAO) imposed by FMs primarily changes the T_i/T_{TOT} as a mechanism to
249 increase inspiratory time and preserve V_E , as seen in other UAOs (Schneider et al. 2009). Usually, T_i/T_{TOT}
250 is constant throughout exercise intensities (Neder et al. 2003). To keep enough expiration time and avoid
251 dynamic hyperinflation, B_f was reduced significantly with both FMs, even at low exercise intensity. In an
252 incremental exercise model, a previous publication reported ventilatory changes with loaded breathing
253 after 65% peak VO_2 (D'Urzo et al. 1987). As DLC elicits a higher UAO than TNT, its ventilatory effects
254 were larger. Wider breathing amplitude to increase V_T was another mechanism adopted to maintain V_E ;
255 however, this response was observed only at lower intensity and not at higher intensity. This happened

256 because V_T augmentation is restricted by lung and chest wall compliance, so it is a limited manoeuvre to
257 offset B_T reduction. Thus, the net effect was a V_E reduction for DLC at both intensities over NM and TNT.
258 The TNT FM flow restriction was not enough to reduce V_E despite its impact on the frequency and time
259 components of ventilation.

260 There is a negative relationship between the duty cycle (T_i/T_{TOT}) and diaphragmatic blood flow (Buchler
261 et al. 1985) and probably also between muscle performance and oxygen uptake. As muscle activation was
262 not measured, we hypothesized that efforts to keep V_E should be attributed to accessory respiratory
263 muscles, which can also be an explanation for the increased VO_2 observed with FM. Another possible
264 contribution is active expiration as a result of the shorter expiratory time.

265 General concerns regarding the effects of FM use during exercise rely on their effect on gas exchange. In
266 this research, FM promoted some reduction over NM on SpO_2 at lower exercise intensity, but only DLC
267 maintained this effect at a higher intensity. Reduced V_E is the main reason for dropping SpO_2 . However,
268 no clinically significant value has been seen ($SpO_2 < 90\%$).

269 Both FMs raised $ETCO_2$ and $PECO_2$ values. The effect on $ETCO_2$ increased with exercise intensity and
270 was more pronounced with DLC than with TNT. DLC also induced higher values of $PECO_2$ compared
271 with TNT, but the effects of both mask types were remarkably similar at both exercise intensities.

272 Moreover, the effect sizes observed for $PECO_2$ were larger than those for $ETCO_2$. As a result, ΔE_T -
273 $PECO_2$ had a sharp decrease with FMs; this decrease was greater for DLC than for TNT and was larger at
274 lower exercise intensity. Two hypotheses have been proposed to explain the CO_2 exchange shift: CO_2
275 rebreathing and a reduction in alveolar dead space caused by a continuous positive airway pressure effect
276 (“CPAP-like effect”) (MacIntyre 2019).

277 Other authors have already reported an increase in exhaled CO_2 values provoked by rebreathing the air
278 retained by different types of FM either during exercising or resting conditions (Johnson et al. 1995;
279 Özdemir et al. 2020). However, we could not find any evidence showing that this phenomenon is related
280 to hypercapnia. In a recent publication about the effects of FM on exercise physiology, researchers
281 measured arterial gas during incremental exercise and did not report any difference in CO_2 arterial
282 pressure, even with masks with greater flow restriction, such as the FFP2/N95 (Fikenzer et al. 2020).

283 Unfortunately, the effect on expiratory CO_2 pressures was not mentioned.

284 ΔE_T - $PECO_2$ is a measure of pulmonary physiological dead space (anatomical plus alveolar) (Hansen et al.
285 2007). Although it has been reported that alveolar dead space is negligible in healthy adults (Intagliata

286 and Rizzo 2018), loaded respiratory training has been demonstrated to improve ventilatory efficiency
287 even in the athletic population. Therefore, a reduction in alveolar dead space is a putative mechanism
288 (Sun et al. 2002; Salazar-Martínez et al. 2018). Furthermore, higher pulmonary perfusion could be
289 elicited by lower (more negative) intrathoracic pressure generated by FM ventilation, enhancing CO₂
290 exchange and decreasing ΔE_T -PECO₂ (Skytjoti et al. 2018).

291 The flow chart presented in figure 4 illustrates the findings of this study and the hypothesized underlying
292 mechanisms. The scheme describes an integrative exercise physiology while masking during low and
293 high intensity.

294 Regarding safety, in addition to not assuming that increased exhaled CO₂ is a hallmark of hypercapnia,
295 values often observed on CPET were seen during FM exercise (Bussotti et al. 2008). Both FMs raised
296 RPE, probably reflecting a combination of ventilatory, VO₂ and H_R effects. Interestingly, STP, which was
297 previously reported as an important marker of discomfort caused by FMs related to exercise intensity,
298 was observed only at lower intensities in this research despite the large effect seen on FMMT. STP had a
299 large variance among individuals, and this study was probably underpowered to show any difference,
300 mainly at the higher intensities where two volunteers failed to complete the DLC exercise.

301 Some limitations should be pointed out. First, and in our opinion the most relevant, is external validation.
302 In real life, a non-negligible amount of the ventilatory flow, either with TNT or DLC, does not pass
303 through the FM and flows by their borders otherwise. Thus, our FM exercising model was more
304 obstructive, and changes should probably not be this large in practice. However, as physiological exercise
305 effects are volume and intensity dependent, we can consider that a similar effect can arise during longer
306 exercise with less restrictive FM. Second, our population was composed of healthy young people, so we
307 do not recommend extrapolating these results to older and unhealthy populations. Third, as two
308 volunteers failed to complete all sets of exercise, the research became underpowered for showing some
309 post hoc differences at the higher intensity exercise level.

310 Wearing a FM while exercising triggers several physiological adaptations, all of which are more
311 pronounced with DLC than with TNT. Frequency, amplitude and mostly the time domain of pulmonary
312 ventilation must suit higher upper airway resistance. This breakdown in the usual breathing pattern
313 increases VO₂, H_R and RPE and promotes a non-concerning drop in SpO₂. Nevertheless, CO₂ exchange
314 also adapts. Rebreathing and an increased gas exchange surface elicited by alveolar recruitment are
315 hypothesized.

316 By reducing heat dissipation, face temperature increased but did not contribute to an increased thermal
317 sensation, although there was not enough power to assure this lack of effect. Despite these alterations in
318 regular exercise physiology, no potential harmful effects were reported. Thus, based on local needs and
319 health authority guidelines, FM wear can be encouraged during exercise as a strategy to contain SARS-
320 CoV-2 spread.

321

322

323

324 **Acknowledgements:** We thank all volunteers who dedicated their time to collaborating in answering this
325 scientific question, all staff members of LPH, the Casa de Saúde São José Executive Board for support,
326 and Ms. Flavio Ricardo Barbosa for continuous efforts in manuscript development.

327

328

329 **Disclosure statement**

330 Conflict of interest: Nothing to declare.

331 Consent for publication: The Author hereby fully consents to publication of this paper in *APNM*.

332 Funding: This work was not supported by any funding.

333 Ethical standards: The Research Ethics Committee of the Hospital Federal de Bonsucesso (Expedient
334 number: 4.120.822, 29/06/2020) approved the study, which was registered at the National Council of
335 Research Ethics in accordance with the 1964 Helsinki declaration. Informed consent was obtained from
336 all participants included in the study.

337

338 **Data availability:** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding
339 author upon reasonable request.

340

341 **Abbreviations:**

342 B: Bout

343 B_f: Breathing frequency

344 CPET: Cardiopulmonary exercise test

345 CI: Confidence interval

346	DLC:	Double-layer cotton
347	$E_T\text{CO}_2$:	End tidal CO_2 pressure
348	ES:	Effect size.
349	$\Delta E_T\text{-PECO}_2$:	Difference between $E_T\text{CO}_2$ and PECO_2
350	FM:	Facemask
351	FMMT:	Facemask microclimate temperature
352	H_R :	Heart rate
353	IQR:	Interquartile range
354	NM:	No mask
355	PECO_2 :	Mixed-expired CO_2 pressure
356	RER:	Respiratory exchange ratio
357	RPE:	Rate of perceived effort
358	S:	Set
359	SD:	Standard deviation
360	SpO_2 :	Oxygen saturation
361	STP:	Subjective thermal perception
362	T_i/T_{TOT} :	Duty cycle
363	V_E :	Minute ventilation
364	VCO_2 :	Carbon dioxide output
365	VO_2 :	Oxygen uptake
366	V_T :	Tidal volume
367	VT:	Ventilatory threshold
368		
369		
370		

371 **References**

- 372 Buchler B, Magder S, Roussos C (1985) Effects of contraction frequency and duty cycle on
373 diaphragmatic blood flow. *J Appl Physiol* 58:265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1985.58.1.265>
- 374 Bussotti M, Magrì D, Previtali E, et al (2008) End-tidal pressure of CO₂ and exercise performance in
375 healthy subjects. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 103:727–732. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-008-0773-z>
- 376 Chandrasekaran B, Fernandes S (2020) “Exercise with facemask; Are we handling a devil’s sword?” – A
377 physiological hypothesis. *Med Hypotheses* 144:110002.
378 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110002>
- 379 Cheng VCC, Wong SC, Chuang VWM, et al (2020) The role of community-wide wearing of face mask
380 for control of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic due to SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect.*
381 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.024>
- 382 Cowling BJ, Chan KH, Fang VJ, et al (2009) Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza
383 transmission in households: A cluster randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 151:437–446.
384 <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-151-7-200910060-00142>
- 385 D’Urzo AD, Chapman KR, Rebeck AS (1987) Effect of inspiratory resistive loading on control of
386 ventilation during progressive exercise. *J Appl Physiol* 62:134–140.
387 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1987.62.1.134>
- 388 Eikenberry SE, Mancuso M, Iboi E, et al (2020) To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face
389 mask use by the general public to curtail the COVID-19 pandemic. *Infect Dis Model* 5:293–308.
390 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2020.04.001>
- 391 Esposito S, Principi N, Leung CC, Migliori GB (2020) Universal use of face masks for success against
392 COVID-19: evidence and implications for prevention policies. *Eur. Respir. J.* 55
- 393 Fikenzer S, Uhe T, Lavall D, et al (2020) Effects of surgical and FFP2/N95 face masks on
394 cardiopulmonary exercise capacity. *Clin Res Cardiol* 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00392-020-01704-y>
- 395
- 396 Fodjo JNS, Pengpid S, Villela EF de M, et al (2020) Mass masking as a way to contain COVID-19 and
397 exit lockdown in low- and middle-income countries. *J Infect.*
398 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.07.015>
- 399 Gage AP, Stolwijk JAJ, Nishi Y (1971) An Effective Temperature Scale Based on a Simple Model of
400 Human Physiological Regulatory Response

- 401 Haleem A, Javaid M, Vaishya R (2020) Effects of COVID-19 pandemic in daily life. *Curr Med Res Pract*
402 10:78–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmrp.2020.03.011>
- 403 Hansen JE, Ulubay G, Chow BF, et al (2007) Mixed-expired and end-tidal CO₂ distinguish between
404 ventilation and perfusion defects during exercise testing in patients with lung and heart diseases.
405 *Chest* 132:977–983. <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.07-0619>
- 406 Intagliata S, Rizzo A (2018) *Physiology, Lung Dead Space*. StatPearls Publishing
- 407 Johnson AT (2016) Respirator masks protect health but impact performance: A review. *J Biol Eng* 10:1–
408 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13036-016-0025-4>
- 409 Johnson AT, Dooly CR, Dotson CO (1995) Respirator mask effects on exercise metabolic measures. *Am*
410 *Ind Hyg Assoc J* 56:467–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15428119591016881>
- 411 Lucia A, Hoyos J, Chicharro JL (2000) The slow component of V_{O₂} in professional cyclists. *Br J Sports*
412 *Med* 34:367–374. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjism.34.5.367>
- 413 MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA (2015) Facemasks for the prevention of infection in healthcare and
414 community settings. *BMJ* 350
- 415 MacIntyre CR, Seale H, Dung TC, et al (2015) A cluster randomised trial of cloth masks compared with
416 medical masks in healthcare workers. *BMJ Open* 5:. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006577>
- 417 MacIntyre NR (2019) Physiologic Effects of Noninvasive Ventilation. *Respir Care* 64:617 LP – 628.
418 <https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.06635>
- 419 McGraw KO, Wong SP (1992) A Common Language Effect Size Statistic. *Psychol Bull* 111:361–365.
420 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.2.361>
- 421 Neder JA, Dal Corso S, Malaguti C, et al (2003) The pattern and timing of breathing during incremental
422 exercise: A normative study. *Eur Respir J* 21:530–538.
423 <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.03.00045402>
- 424 Nielsen R, Gwosdow AR, Berglund LG, Dubois AB (1987) The Effect of Temperature and Humidity
425 Levels in a Protective Mask on User Acceptability During Exercise. *Am Ind Hyg Assoc J* 48:639–
426 645. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298668791385336>
- 427 Özdemir L, Azizoğlu M, Yapıcı D (2020) Respirators used by healthcare workers due to the COVID-19
428 outbreak increase end-tidal carbon dioxide and fractional inspired carbon dioxide pressure. *J. Clin.*
429 *Anesth.* 66:109901
- 430 Salazar-Martínez E, Matos TR de, Arrans P, et al (2018) Ventilatory efficiency response is unaffected by

431 fitness level, ergometer type, age or body mass index in male athletes. *Biol Sport* 35:393–398.
432 <https://doi.org/10.5114/biolsport.2018.78060>

433 Sawilowsky SS (2003) A Different Future For Social And Behavioral Science Research. *J Mod Appl Stat*
434 *Methods* 2:128–132

435 Schneider H, Krishnan V, Pichard LE, et al (2009) Inspiratory duty cycle responses to flow limitation
436 predict nocturnal hypoventilation. *Eur Respir J* 33:1068–1076.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00063008>

438 Setti L, Passarini F, De Gennaro G, et al (2020) Airborne transmission route of covid-19: Why 2 meters/6
439 feet of inter-personal distance could not be enough. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 17

440 Skytjoti M, Søvik S, Elstad M (2018) Respiratory pump maintains cardiac stroke volume during
441 hypovolemia in young, healthy volunteers. *J Appl Physiol* 124:1319–1325.
442 <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.01009.2017>

443 Sun XG, Hansen JE, Garatachea N, et al (2002) Ventilatory efficiency during exercise in healthy subjects.
444 *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 166:1443–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.2202033>

445 Wang J, Pan L, Tang S, et al (2020) Mask use during COVID-19: A risk adjusted strategy. *Environ.*
446 *Pollut.* 266:115099

447 Wasserman K, Stringer WW, Casaburi RH, et al (1994) Determination of the anaerobic threshold by gas
448 exchange: biochemical considerations, methodology and physiological effects. undefined

449

450

451

452 **Table 1 – Characteristics of the participant and CPET data.**

453

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Overall</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Demographics</i>																	
<i>Age (years)</i>	35.3±8.9	40-44	45-49	35-39	20-24	45-49	25-29	25-29	45-49	35-39	30-34	45-49	30-34	15-19	40-44	25-29	35-39
<i>Sex (% Male)</i>	56.25%	M	F	M	M	M	M	F	F	F	M	M	M	F	F	M	F
<i>Weight (kg)</i>	72.2±13.2	81	56.3	78.8	72.3	85	60.4	61.8	58.4	65.7	80	84.4	77	56.8	72.6	103.6	61
<i>Height (cm)</i>	171.6±8.5	178	163	178	171	180	168	156	158	177	173	185	177	170	172	179	161
<i>CPET</i>																	
<i>Peak</i>																	
<i>VO₂(L/min)</i>	3.04±0.76	2.93	1.94	3.68	3.98	3.36	3.51	2.47	2.68	2.17	3.31	4.46	3.24	2.84	3.08	3.82	1.67
<i>VO₂(ml/kg/min)</i>	42.6±8.4	36.14	34.39	46.76	55.11	39.57	58.04	39.96	45.92	33.04	41.34	52.79	42.1	50.08	42.45	36.87	27.37
<i>%VO₂ previewed</i>	125.8±22.1	108	126	126	127	107	131	134	176	115	112	154	102	121	163	113	97
<i>Workload (W)</i>	279.3±67.8	274	189	312	364	299	318	226	248	210	286	413	299	264	284	343	140
<i>H_R(bpm)</i>	177.8±12.4	161	179	177	175	159	170	187	169	193	177	174	199	187	195	183	159
<i>B_f(irpm)</i>	49.9±7.2	53	44	55	56	37	52	51	45	56	63	52	47	49	58	42	39
<i>V_T(L)</i>	2.4±0.5	2.51	1.76	3.32	2.86	3.06	2.15	1.87	2.46	2.02	2.27	3.24	2.76	2.18	1.99	3.04	1.68
<i>V_E(L/min)</i>	121.8±31.1	133.1	77.1	183.8	158.9	112.2	111	94.2	110.9	113.6	142.1	168.2	128.8	106.1	115.9	127	66
<i>ETCO₂(mmHg)</i>	34.5±4.2	33	33	29	37	38	41	37	32	26	32	36	34	32	38	42	32
<i>VT2</i>																	
<i>VO₂(L/min)</i>	2.6±0.72	2.6	1.67	2.83	3.44	3.18	3.13	2.11	1.94	1.86	2.54	3.77	2.64	2.58	2.79	3.26	1.2
<i>VO₂(ml/kg/min)</i>	35.8±8.3	28.41	29.66	35.93	47.62	37.42	51.84	34.1	33.26	28.38	31.78	44.65	34.25	45.47	38.37	31.46	19.64
<i>Workload (W)</i>	217.2±57.7	211	157	226	289	235	273	191	170	161	204	321	217	219	232	280	89
<i>H_R(bpm)</i>	159.4±16.9	145	171	140	158	145	159	174	135	182	160	164	169	180	180	162	127
<i>B_f(irpm)</i>	32±6.2	33	31	29	24	31	41	28	28	32	37	39	27	38	44	27	23
<i>V_T(L)</i>	2.4±0.6	2.08	1.78	3.14	3.27	2.98	2.07	2.04	2.18	1.97	2.2	2.93	2.84	2.11	1.84	2.95	1.41
<i>V_E(L/min)</i>	75±18.7	69.5	54.8	91.3	79.4	90.9	85.7	57.5	61.1	63.1	82.3	114.8	77.1	79.1	81.7	79.5	32.9
<i>VT1</i>																	
<i>VO₂(L/min)</i>	1.64±0.53	1.64	0.92	1.51	2.34	1.79	2.23	1.67	1.11	1.14	1.44	2.74	1.65	1.46	1.61	2.1	0.91
<i>VO₂(ml/kg/min)</i>	22.5±6.6	15.72	16.32	19.18	32.35	21.04	36.98	26.99	18.95	17.3	17.97	32.49	21.43	25.65	22.2	20.26	14.85
<i>Workload (W)</i>	115.1±45.5	95	64	89	175	100	180	150	79	76	86	203	115	104	110	165	51
<i>H_R(bpm)</i>	121.4±19.1	99	134	85	127	106	128	158	97	138	120	131	114	132	125	143	106
<i>B_f(irpm)</i>	23.9±4	22	19	17	22	21	26	22	23	26	28	31	21	32	25	23	25
<i>V_T(L)</i>	12.2±42.3	1.47	1.26	1.99	2.22	1.98	1.71	1.86	1.39	1.3	1.49	2.38	1.9	1.14	1.38	1.95	0.9
<i>V_E(L/min)</i>	39.1±11.6	31.8	23.6	34.7	49.6	42.1	44.4	40.4	32.4	34	41.9	72.9	39.1	36.2	35	44.3	22.8
<i>ETCO₂(mmHg)</i>	40.9±4.7	41	37	42	49	42	50	44	35	37	37	43	39	36	43	45	35
<i>Slopes</i>																	
<i>VE/VCO₂ slope</i>	26.9±3.6	23.8	30	30.8	21	28.2	25.4	25.3	29.9	31.3	30	29.6	26.4	30.5	24.7	20.3	23.4
<i>ΔVO₂/ΔPower (ml/W)</i>	8.7±0.8	9.2	7.8	8.9	9.9	8.6	9.5	9.2	8	8.3	8.5	8.3	9.2	9.6	9.1	8.4	7

454

455

456

457 **Table 2- Effect size values with 95% CIs for pairwise comparisons between masking. VO₂: Oxygen**
 458 **uptake, VCO₂: Carbon dioxide output, H_R: Heart rate, V_T: Tidal volume, B_f: Breathing frequency,**
 459 **V_E: Minute ventilation, T_i/T_{TOT}: Duty cycle, E_TCO₂: End tidal CO₂ pressure, PECO₂: Mixed-expired**
 460 **CO₂ pressure, ΔE_T-PECO₂, Difference between E_TCO₂ and PECO₂, RPE: Rate of perceived effort,**
 461 **SpO₂: Oxygen saturation, STP: subjective thermal perception, FMTP: Facemask microclimate**
 462 **temperature**

Variables	NM vs. TNT	TNT vs. DLC	NM vs. DLC
B1			
VO ₂	0.28[0.16 - 0.4]	0.05[-0.08 - 0.19]	0.34[0.19 - 0.49]
VCO ₂	0.28[0.16 - 0.4]	0.04[-0.1 - 0.19]	0.24[0.12 - 0.36]
RER	0.83[0.46 - 1.2]	0.70[0.34 - 1.04]	1.60[0.98 - 2.21]
H _R	0.30[-0.08 - 0.66]	0.25[-0.12 - 0.6]	0.06[-0.18 - 0.29]
V _T	0.33[0.09 - 0.56]	0.33[-0.12 - 0.76]	0.62[0.18 - 1.05]
B _f	0.59[0.23 - 0.94]	0.87[0.32 - 1.4]	1.43[0.79 - 2.07]
V _E	0.10[-0.03 - 0.22]	0.43[0.15 - 0.71]	0.52[0.23 - 0.79]
T _i /T _{TOT}	1.11[0.58 - 1.61]	0.63[0.1 - 1.12]	1.53[0.81 - 2.18]
SpO ₂	0.56[0.07 - 1.03]	0.21[-0.41 - 0.81]	0.69[0.09 - 1.28]
E _T CO ₂	0.23[0.05 - 0.4]	0.50[0.2 - 0.79]	0.71[0.38 - 1.02]
PECO ₂	0.74[0.38 - 1.08]	0.97[0.46 - 1.46]	1.71[1.03 - 2.37]
ΔE _T -PECO ₂	1.21[0.72 - 1.69]	1.03[0.43 - 1.6]	2.44[1.48 - 3.38]
RPE	0.33[0.03 - 0.61]	0.12[-0.18 - 0.42]	0.45[0.07 - 0.81]
FMTP	0.66[0.19 - 1.09]	0.67[0.16 - 1.16]	1.16[0.45 - 1.84]
STP	0.17[-0.04 - 0.38]	0.03[-0.23 - 0.29]	0.20[-0.03 - 0.43]
B2			
VO ₂	0.26[0.15 - 0.37]	0.02[-0.11 - 0.16]	0.24[0.07 - 0.41]
VCO ₂	0.18[0.11 - 0.26]	0.11[-0.01 - 0.22]	0.07[-0.02 - 0.17]
RER	0.61[0.11 - 1.1]	0.80[0.2 - 1.37]	1.48[0.61 - 2.31]
H _R	0.15[0.03 - 0.28]	0.02[-0.11 - 0.16]	0.17[0.03 - 0.3]
V _T	0.11[-0.04 - 0.27]	0.07[-0.17 - 0.31]	0.17[-0.11 - 0.45]
B _f	0.39[0.05 - 0.71]	0.87[0.45 - 1.27]	1.33[0.71 - 1.94]
V _E	0.19[0 - 0.38]	0.68[0.3 - 1.05]	0.84[0.44 - 1.22]
T _i /T _{TOT}	1.27[0.63 - 1.84]	0.75[0.25 - 1.22]	1.93[0.97 - 2.68]
SpO ₂	0.11[-0.19 - 0.41]	0.58[0.06 - 1.03]	0.66[0.11 - 1.13]
E _T CO ₂	0.56[0.2 - 0.9]	0.67[0.3 - 1.01]	1.20[0.65 - 1.68]
PECO ₂	0.94[0.45 - 1.38]	0.92[0.46 - 1.34]	1.78[0.97 - 2.42]
ΔE _T -PECO ₂	0.77[0.32 - 1.19]	0.66[0.29 - 1]	1.45[0.69 - 2.12]
RPE	0.45[0.08 - 0.81]	0.46[0.14 - 0.77]	0.87[0.26 - 1.44]
FMTP	0.87[0.19 - 1.47]	0.61[0.02 - 1.14]	1.15[0.44 - 1.83]
STP	0.14[-0.04 - 0.3]	0.00[-0.17 - 0.17]	0.12[-0.03 - 0.27]

463

464

465

466 **Figure 1 – Experimental design**

467

468

469 **Figure 1- Masking preparation procedures**

470

471

472 **Figure 2 – Physiological parameter comparisons between facemasks. The boxplots represent the**
473 **minimum, maximum, median, first quartile and third quartile in the data set, and the horizontal**
474 **line reflects the mean of the respective group. Outliers are not represented. Star symbols represent**
475 **the p values for post-hoc pairwise comparisons: (*), (**) and (***) for $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.001$,**
476 **respectively. VO_2 : Oxygen uptake, VCO_2 : Carbon dioxide output, HR : Heart rate, VT : Tidal**
477 **volume, B_f : Breathing frequency, VE : Minute ventilation, Ti/TTOT : Duty cycle, ETCO_2 : End tidal**
478 **CO_2 pressure, PECO_2 : Mixed-expired CO_2 pressure, $\Delta\text{E}_\text{T}\text{-PECO}_2$, Difference between $\text{E}_\text{T}\text{CO}_2$ and**
479 **PECO_2 , RPE : Rate of perceived effort, SpO_2 : Oxygen saturation, STP : Subjective thermal**
480 **perception, FMTP : Facemask microclimate temperature.**


481

482

483 **Figure 4 – Integrative exercise physiology while masking, considering all changes detected and**
484 **hypothesized underlying mechanisms.**


485


Day₁




CPET first and second ventilatory threshold corresponding loads were used to determinate day 2 workout

Day₂





Low to moderate intensity



Moderate to high intensity

