

1 **Effectiveness of a telerehabilitation program for COVID-19 survivors (TERECO) on exercise**
2 **capacity, pulmonary function, lower limb muscle strength, and quality of life: a randomized**
3 **controlled trial**

4
5 Jian'an Li^{1,2§}, Wenguang Xia^{3§}, Chao Zhan^{4§}, Shouguo Liu^{1,2}, Zhifei Yin^{1,2}, Jiayue Wang^{1,2}, Yufei
6 Chong³, Chanjuan Zheng³, Xiaoming Fang⁴, Wei Cheng⁴, Jan D. Reinhardt^{5,6,7,8*}

7
8 (1) Center of Rehabilitation Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, Jiangsu,
9 China; (2) School of Rehabilitation Medicine, Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China; (3) Department
10 of Rehabilitation Medicine, Hubei Province Hospital of integrated Chinese and Western Medicine, Wuhan, Hubei,
11 China; (4) Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Huangshi Traditional Chinese Medicine Hospital, Huangshi,
12 Hubei, China; (5) Institute for Disaster Management and Reconstruction of Sichuan University and Hong Kong
13 Polytechnic University, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China; (6) Swiss Paraplegic Research, Nottwil,
14 Switzerland; (7) Department of Health Sciences and Medicine, University of Lucerne, Lucerne, Switzerland; (8) XD
15 Group Hospital, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

16
17 [§]Drs. Li, Xia, and Zhan have contributed equally

18 *Correspondence to

19 Prof. Dr. Jan D. Reinhardt, Institute for Disaster Management and Reconstruction of Sichuan
20 University and Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Sichuan University, 122 Huang He Road (first
21 section, middle section), 610207 Chengdu, Sichuan, China, e-mail: reinhardt@scu.edu.cn

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Objectives**

26 To investigate superiority of a telerehabilitation program for Covid-19 (TERECO) over no
27 rehabilitation with regard to functional exercise capacity, lower-limb muscle strength (LMS),
28 pulmonary function, health-related quality of life (HRQOL), and perceived dyspnoea.

29 **Design**

30 Parallel-group randomised controlled-trial with 1:1 block-randomisation.

31 **Setting**

32 Three major hospitals from Jiangsu and Hubei provinces, China.

33 **Participants**

34 120 Covid-19 survivors with modified Medical Research Council (mMRC) dyspnoea score of 2-3
35 who had been discharged from hospital were randomised. 61 were allocated to the control group
36 and 59 to the TERECO group.

37 **Intervention**

38 The control group received educational instructions. The TERECO group participated in a
39 6-week home-based, pulmonary rehabilitation program delivered via smartphone and monitored
40 with chest-worn heart rate telemetry. Exercise types comprised breathing control and thoracic
41 expansion, aerobic exercise, and LMS exercise.

42 **Outcomes**

43 Primary outcome was 6-minute walking distance (6MWD) in metres. Secondary outcomes were

44 LMS measured as squat time in seconds; pulmonary function assessed by spirometry with
45 parameters being forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1), forced vital capacity (FVC),
46 FEV1/FVC, maximum voluntary ventilation (MVV), and peak expiratory flow; HRQOL measured
47 with SF-12 physical component score (PCS) and mental component score (MCS); and mMRC
48 dyspnoea, favourable outcome (no dyspnoea). Outcomes were assessed at 6 weeks
49 (post-treatment) and 28 weeks (follow-up).

50 **Results**

51 120 patients were randomised, 15 (12.5%) were lost to follow-up at study endpoint. No serious
52 adverse events occurred. 38 participants in the TEREKO group complied with the exercise
53 protocol (64.41% of randomized). The adjusted between-group difference in change in 6MWD
54 from baseline was 65.45 metres (95% CI 43.8-87.1, $p<0.001$) at post-treatment and 68.62
55 metres (95% CI 46.39-90.85, $p<0.001$) at follow-up. Treatment effects for LMS were 20.12
56 seconds (95% CI 12.34-27.9, $p<0.001$) post-treatment and 22.23 seconds (95% CI 14.24-30.21,
57 $p<0.001$) at follow-up. No group differences were found for lung function apart from
58 post-treatment MVV (10.57 litres/minute, 95% CI 0.26-17.88, $p=0.005$). Increase in SF-12 PCS
59 was greater in the TEREKO group with treatment effects estimated as 3.79 (95% CI 1.24-6.35,
60 $p=0.004$) at post-treatment and 2.69 (95% CI 0.06-5.32, $p=0.045$) at follow-up. No significant
61 between-group differences were found for improvements in SF-12 MCS. At post-treatment 90.4%
62 endorsed a favourable outcome for mMRC dyspnoea in the TEREKO group vs. 61.7% in control
63 (adjusted RR 1.46, 1.17-1.82, $p=0.001$).

64 **Conclusions**

65 This trial demonstrated superiority of TEREKO over no rehabilitation for 6MWD, LMS, and SF-12
66 PCS. We found no persistent effects on pulmonary function, SF-12 MCS, and perceived
67 dyspnoea.

68 **Trial registration:** Chinese Clinical Trial Registry: ChiCTR2000031834, 11 Apr 2020, URL:
69 <http://www.chictr.org.cn/showproj.aspx?proj=52216>

70

71 **Keywords:** COVID-19, rehabilitation, telehealth, randomized controlled trial, 6 minute walking
72 test, pulmonary function, muscle strength, quality of life, dyspnoea

73

74

75 **KEY POINTS**

76 **What is already known**

77 Many Covid-19 survivors discharged from hospital have reduced exercise capacity, impaired
78 pulmonary function, muscle weakness, and reduced quality of life, all of which might be
79 addressed with pulmonary rehabilitation.

80 However, evidence on effective pulmonary rehabilitation measures for this population is currently
81 lacking. As delivery of conventional rehabilitation services is furthermore limited due to pandemic
82 control measures, telerehabilitation programs represent a possible alternative.

83

84 **What the study adds**

85 We developed a telerehabilitation program for Covid-19 survivors (TERECO program) that is
86 delivered via smartphone and can be carried out at home.

87 Our study suggests that TERECO was safe and participants of the TERECO program had
88 improved exercise capacity, lower-limb muscle strength, and physical quality of life. No relevant
89 group differences were found for lung function, self-reported breathlessness, and mental quality
90 of life.

91 The TERECO program is inexpensive and could be implemented on a large scale to improve
92 physical health of Covid-19 survivors after discharge from hospital.

93

94 INTRODUCTION

95 After discharge from acute care, many survivors of coronavirus disease-2019 (Covid-19)
96 experience ongoing symptoms^{1 2}, impairment of pulmonary function²⁻⁴, decreased exercise
97 capacity^{2 4}, reduced muscle strength⁵, activity limitations^{6 7}, anxiety⁷, depression and
98 neurocognitive dysfunction⁸, and reduced quality of life². Problems may persist for at least six
99 months². This indicates the need for the provision of rehabilitation services that can decrease the
100 burden on patients and the health system⁹. Pulmonary rehabilitation measures with
101 demonstrated effectiveness in chronic obstructive lung disease (COPD)¹⁰ and, with low-certainty
102 evidence (one trial), severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)¹¹ are obvious candidates.
103 Evidence on the effectiveness of such programs in Covid-19 survivors is, however, lacking to
104 date¹². Moreover, delivery of conventional in- or outpatient rehabilitation is complicated through
105 diminished capacity in post-acute care as well as clinical and public health measures imposed to
106 reduce the risk of viral transmission¹³. Telerehabilitation programs provide a viable alternative
107 that could be superior to no rehabilitation (low-certainty evidence) and as effective as
108 conventional rehabilitation (moderate-certainty evidence)^{14 15}.

109 We investigated the possible superiority of a telerehabilitation program for Covid-19 (TERECO)
110 over a control group that did not receive rehabilitation with regard to functional exercise capacity,
111 lower-limb muscle strength, pulmonary function, perceived dyspnoea, and health-related quality
112 of life in COVID-19 survivors who had been discharged to their homes following acute inpatient
113 treatment. We further report on the occurrence of adverse events.

114 **METHODS**

115 **Study design**

116 This study is a multi-centre, parallel-group randomised controlled trial. It was registered at the
117 Chinese Clinical Trial Registry on 11 Apr 2020 (ChiCTR2000031834). Ethical approval was first
118 received from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing
119 Medical University/Jiangsu Province Hospital (2020-SR-171, 9 April 2020) and then
120 subsequently from the IRBs of Hubei Province Hospital of Integrated Chinese and Western
121 Medicine (2020016, 14 April 2020), and Huangshi Hospital of Chinese Medicine
122 (HSZYPJ-2020-026-01, 20 April 2020). The original protocol for this study is available from (URL:
123 <http://idmr.scu.edu.cn/info.htm?id=1841614474692833>).

124 **Recruitment**

125 Three centres from Jiangsu (The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University), Hubei
126 Wuhan (Hubei Province Hospital of Integrated Chinese and Western Medicine), and Hubei
127 Huangshi (Hubei Huangshi Hospital of Chinese Medicine) recruited patients recovering from
128 COVID-19. Contact details of possible candidates were extracted from hospital records. The first
129 contact was made by telephone. If the candidates expressed interest, an appointment for a
130 baseline visit was made and informed written consent was obtained from all study participants at
131 this baseline visit.

132 **Eligibility criteria**

133 Hospital records were pre-screened for eligibility and further assessment of eligibility of possible

134 candidates was performed at the baseline visit. Inclusion criteria were as follows: (i) laboratory
135 confirmed SARS-2 infection, clinically diagnosed with COVID-19, having received inpatient
136 treatment for it and having been discharged from one of the participating hospitals; (ii) aged
137 18-75 years; (iii) ownership of and ability to use a smartphone either independently or with
138 support from family members; (iv) modified British Medical Research Council (mMRC)
139 dyspnoea¹⁶ score of 2-3, indicating moderate dyspnoea symptoms. Participants were excluded
140 under the following conditions: (i) resting heart rate of over 100 bpm as measured at the baseline
141 visit; (ii) taking medication that can affect cardiopulmonary function and heart rate such as
142 trimetazidine, bronchodilators, or β -blockers; (iii) medical history of cerebrovascular or
143 cardiological condition within the past 12 months, severe kidney disease (\geq stage 3,
144 eGFR<60ml/min), other severe organic disease, uncontrolled hypertension (resting
145 BP \geq 160/100mmHg), uncontrolled diabetes (random blood glucose>16.7 mmol/l, HbA1C>7.0%);
146 (iv) received intra-articular drug injection or surgical treatment of lower extremities within the past
147 6 months; (v) unable to walk independently with assistive device; (vi) unable or unwilling to
148 collaborate with assessments; (vii) enrolled in or participated in other trials within the past 3
149 months; (viii) having severe cognitive or mental disorder or history of substance abuse; (ix)
150 enrolment in any other rehabilitation program.

151 **Random sequence generation and allocation concealment**

152 Permuted allocation sequences for 1:1 block randomisation (block size 10-14) stratified by
153 hospital were computer-generated by an independent statistician. Allocation was concealed by

154 central randomisation and only revealed after baseline assessment through a call to the study
155 centre.

156 **Blinding**

157 Participants and therapists could not be blinded. Assessors were blinded to group allocation by
158 the following procedure: baseline visits of each potential study participant involved one assessor
159 (rehabilitation doctor) and one independent allocator (therapist). Once a patient was deemed
160 eligible and had provided informed consent, assessors conducted the baseline measurements.
161 Assessors then left the study site and allocators contacted the study centre in the presence of
162 the patient to reveal allocation. Patients and therapists were requested to not disclose allocation
163 to the assessors at any time during the study.

164 **Interventions**

165 Control group

166 Participants in the control group received 10-minute standardized educational instructions from
167 physiotherapists and an information sheet containing these instructions in written form. They
168 were advised to maintain normal daily activities, avoid excessive bed rest and immobilisation,
169 take part in moderate physical activities such as housework, adhere to a healthy diet and get 6-8
170 hours of sleep per day. Patients also received advice on basic hand hygiene, physical distancing,
171 and the appropriate use of personal protective equipment such as facemasks.

172 Tereco group

173 In addition to the instructions and information sheets received by the control group, the Tereco

174 group took part in a 6-week remotely-monitored home exercise program delivered through a
175 telerehabilitation smartphone application called RehabApp (R PLUS HEALTH, Version 1.1.0,
176 Recovery Plus Inc., Chengdu, China). Participants received a heart rate (HR) telemetry device
177 (Recovery Plus H1, Empsun Medical Co., Chengdu, China) to be worn on the chest during
178 exercise. The HR telemetry device was connected to RehabApp through the internet.
179 Physiotherapists with at least 5 years experience in rehabilitation regularly reviewed data on
180 exercise duration and HR data. Patient feedback on the exercise program was also collected
181 through RehabApp. In addition, consultations via mobile phone or WeChat voice calls were
182 carried out every week. Issues raised by participants related to the exercise program were
183 discussed and the exercise program was adjusted if necessary.

184 The duration of the exercise program was 40-60 minutes per session, with 3-4 sessions per
185 week, for a total of 6 weeks. Initial exercise types and intensity were determined by the physical
186 therapists based on baseline assessment and in accordance with the American College of
187 Sports Medicine's guidelines for exercise preparticipation¹⁷.

188 The telerehabilitation exercise program included (i) breathing control and thoracic expansion
189 (BCTE), (ii) aerobic exercise, and (iii) lower-limb muscle strength (LMS) exercises specified in a
190 three-tiered exercise plan as shown in **Table 1**. If patients met the target criteria for a tier 1
191 exercise during a particular week and did not report any adverse events, they could advance to
192 tier 2 for this exercise type and so on. (i) BCTE included one diaphragmatic breathing exercise
193 and several exercises aimed at improving thoracic muscle strength and chest mobility. (ii)

194 Aerobic exercise was performed by brisk walking or running outside near the home or on a
195 treadmill at home (if available to the participant) with a 3-minute warm-up and 3-minute
196 stretching cool-down. The target heart rate (THR) for aerobic exercise was calculated with the
197 Karvonen formula¹⁸, with exercise intensity scheduled to increase from 30-40% of heart rate
198 reserve (HRR) at the beginning of the exercise program to 40-60% of HRR in the final two weeks
199 of the program. Apart from monitoring the actual heart rate, patients were asked to report their
200 rate of perceived exertion (RPE) after the aerobic exercises according to Borg's scale^{19 20}. When
201 this RPE was greater than 14, the current intensity was considered unsuitable and the THR for a
202 participant was lowered. When the reported RPE was below 11, participants were requested to
203 increase their aerobic exercise intensity. When the reported RPE ranged between 11 and 14,
204 participants repeated the exercise at the same intensity and moved to the next tier after 2 weeks.
205 (iii) LMS exercise comprised weight-bearing and resistance exercises²¹ and gradually moved
206 from exercises performed in a sitting position such as seated leg lifting to exercises executed in
207 standing position such as squats and side lunges.

208 Table 1: Parameters of three-tiered exercise program for telerehabilitation of Covid-19

Tier	Exercise type	Exercise names and description	Physiological/anatomical target	Target duration per session	Target intensity	Schedule	Criteria for moving to next tier
Tier 1	Breathing control and thoracic expansion	<p>1.1 Reclined seated diaphragmatic breathing: Step 1. The patient sits down on a chair and relaxes the upper chest and shoulders. Both hands are positioned on the abdomen. The patient should breathe slowly and deeply. Upon inhaling and exhaling, the hands should be felt to move out and in. Step 2. The patient breathes slowly and deeply from the diaphragm and upon inhaling maintains pressure with the hands to provide resistance on the abdomen.</p> <p>1.2 Open chest, thoracic spine extension (seated): The patient sits up straight and stretches the thoracic spine, keeping hands on the back of the neck and elbows out to the side, and inhales deeply.</p>	<p>1.1 Increase voluntary control of diaphragmatic breathing, strengthen diaphragm</p> <p>1.2 Increase respiratory muscle strength, mobility and flexibility of thoracic muscles and rib cage</p>	<p>Total: 10 min</p> <p>Effective: 6 min</p> <p>1.1 Effective: 4 min plus 1 min breaks between sets</p> <p>1.2 Effective: 2 min plus 1 min breaks between sets</p>	<p>1.1 Step 1. Two sets, 12 reps, 1 min/set. Step 2. Two sets, 12 reps, 1 min/set</p> <p>1.2. Two sets, 12 reps, 1 min/set</p>	<p>Scheduled for weeks 1-2 at 3-4 sessions per week</p> <p>Minimal criteria for compliance: total app time \geq 52 min/week & effective</p>	Complete the current exercise without difficulties in execution of movements and adverse effects
	Aerobic	2. Brisk walking or running outside near home or on a treadmill at home with warm up comprising walking at regular speed and cool down comprising seated muscle stretching exercises (2.1-2.3).	2. Increase lung volume, aerobic capacity, leg muscle strength and endurance	Total: 20 min. Effective: 14 min plus 3 min warm up and 3 min cool down	THR at 30-40% HRR	(aerobic) \geq 28 min/week	Complete within THR at targeted duration of effective exercise time and RPE 11-13.
	Lower limb strengthening	<p>3.1 Seated unilateral hip and shoulder abduction and adduction: Sitting on a chair, the patient extends the left leg at 45 degrees to the left side with a slight outward twist of the knee while the left arm is extended horizontally with palms facing up. Return to the initial sitting position. Repeat with the right leg and the right arm.</p> <p>3.2 Seated leg lifting and shoulder abduction: Sitting on a chair starting with knees bent at 90 degrees, the patient lifts</p>	<p>3.1 Increase abduction and adduction strength of hip (gluteus medius, gluteus minimus, and adductors of hip) and abduction strength of shoulder (deltoid, and supraspinatus)</p> <p>3.2 Increase hip flexion</p>	<p>Total: 9 min</p> <p>Effective: 6 min</p> <p>3.1-3.3 2 min each plus 1 min breaks between sets</p>	3.1-3.3. Two sets each, 12 reps, 1 min/set.		Complete the current exercise without difficulties in execution of movements and adverse effects

		<p>the left knee up and as close to the chest as possible without discomfort while both arms are to the sides with elbows bent at 90 degrees, hands up, and palms forward. Return to the initial sitting position. Repeat with the right leg.</p> <p>3.3 Seated forward toe tap with contralateral punch: The patient sits in a chair with hip and knees bent at 90 degrees. The patient extends the left leg with heel to the ground and toes in the air. Then]she taps the floor with the toe of the left foot and punches forward with the right fist at the same time. Return to the initial sitting position. Repeat with the right leg and the left hand.</p>	<p>strength (iliopsoas, rectus femoris) and shoulder abduction strength (deltoid and supraspinatus)</p> <p>3.3 Increase plantar flexion strength (gastrocnemius and soleus) and shoulder flexion strength (biceps brachii and deltoideus)/</p>				
Tier 2:	Breathing control and thoracic expansion	<p>1.1 Reclined seated diaphragmatic breathing: same as Tier 1.</p> <p>1.2 Open chest, thoracic spine extension (seated): same as Tier 1.</p>	Same as Tier 1	Same as Tier 1	Same as Tier 1	Scheduled for weeks 3-4 at 3-4 sessions per week	Complete the current exercise without difficulties in execution of movements and adverse effects
	Aerobic	2. Brisk walking or running outside near home or on a treadmill at home with warm up comprising walking at regular speed and cool down comprising seated and standing muscle stretching exercises (2.2 and 2.3).	Same as Tier 1	Total: 25 min Effective: 19 min plus 3 min warming up and 3 min cool down	THR at 40-50% HRR.		Minimal criteria for compliance: total app time ≥ 62
	Lower limb strengthening	<p>3.4 Knee to chest walk: The patient stands straight with weight on the right leg while lifting the left leg and bringing the knee to the chest by bending at the hip and bending the knee. This position is supported by holding the shin of the left leg with both hands. The patient then releases the shin and places the left foot slightly ahead on the floor and returns to standing position. Repeat with the right leg.</p> <p>3.5 Toe stand and hold: The patient stands straight while</p>	<p>3.4 Increase hip flexion strength (iliopsoas and rectus femoris)</p> <p>3.5 Increase plantar flexion strength (gastrocnemius and soleus)</p> <p>3.6 Increase hip and knee extension strength</p>	Total: 9 min Effective: 6 min 3.4 to 3.6 each 2 min plus 1 min breaks between sets	<p>3 set interval exercise with 12 repetition for one set</p> <p>3.4. Two sets, 12 reps, 1 min/set.</p> <p>3.5. Two sets, 12 reps, 1 min/set.</p>	min/week & effective (aerobic) ≥ 38 min/week	Complete the current exercise without difficulties in execution of movements and adverse effects

		facing a wall and lifts both heels as high as possible with both hands on the wall to keep the weight in front of the body to prevent falling or losing balance. Return to standing position. 3.6. Mini squat (with chair): The patient squats with hip and knee bent at approximately 50 degrees and then stands up with hands holding the back of an chair. The knees should not exceed the toes during the squat.	(quadriceps femoris, gluteus maximus and hamstring)		3.6. Two sets, 12 reps, 1min/set.		
Tier 3:	Breathing control and thoracic expansion	1.1 Reclined seated diaphragmic breathing: as Tier 1. 1.3 Open chest, thoracic spine extension (standing position): Standing up straight, the patient stretches the thoracic spine, keeping hands on the back of the neck and elbows out to the side, and inhales deeply. 1.4. Bend over rowing and arm extension (dumbbells): While standing, the torso bends forward and the back is stretched; the upper limbs circle by extending forward and backward with dumbbells to mimic a rowing motion.	Same as Tier 1	Total: 15 min Effective: 9 min 1.1, 1.3-1.4 Three min each plus 1 min breaks between sets	1.1, 1.3-1.4 Three sets, 12 reps, 1 min/set.	Scheduled for week 5-6 at 3-4 sessions per week Minimal criteria for compliance: total app time ≥ 84 min/week & effective (aerobic) ≥ 48 min/week	n.a.
	Aerobic	2. Brisk walking or running outside near home or on a treadmill at home with warm up comprising walking at regular speed and cool down comprising seated and standing muscle stretching exercises (2.2 and 2.3).	Same as Tier 1	Total: 30 min. Effective 24 min plus 3 minutes warming up and 3 minutes cool down	THR at 40-60% HRR.		n.a.
	Lower limb strength	3.7 Squat: From standing position, the patient squats with hips and knees bent at approximately 50 degrees and then stands up (3.7.1). The knees should not exceed the toes during the squat. The intensity increases slightly from set 1 to 3 by adding upper-limb movements including a shoulder press (3.7.2, mimicking pressing a barbell upward with both	3.7 Increase hip and knee extension strength (quadriceps femoris and gluteus maximus) and increase shoulder flexion strength (biceps brachii and	Total: 15 min Effective: 9 minutes. 3.7-3.9 Three min each plus 1 min breaks	3.7-3.9 Three sets each, 12 reps, 1 min/set.		n.a.

		<p>hands as the torso moves downward) or clapping the hands over the head (3.7.3).</p> <p>3.8 Alternating lunge and shoulder flexion: From standing position, the patient starts to stride forward with the left leg until the left knee is bent between 60 to 90 degrees and then shifts the weight of the upper body over the left leg while lifting hands over the head. Return to standing position. Repeat with the right leg.</p> <p>3.9. Sideward lunge: From standing position, the patient steps sideward to the left and shifts the weight of the upper body over the left leg with the knee bent at about 60 degrees and with hands on the hips. Return to standing position by moving the right foot in. Repeat with the right leg.</p>	<p>deltoid)</p> <p>3.8 Strengthen quadriceps femoris and hamstring and increase shoulder flexion strength (biceps brachii and deltoideus)</p> <p>3.9 Strengthen quadriceps femoris, hamstring and hip adductors</p>	<p>between sets.</p>			
--	--	---	---	----------------------	--	--	--

209 HRR = Heart rate reserve; n.a. = not applicable; RPE= Borg rate of perceived exertion; THR = Target heart rate

210 On each day with scheduled exercises, RehabApp reminded the patients to start the exercise
211 and guided them through the process. In the case of BCTE and LMS exercise this was done by
212 displaying videos demonstrating the relevant exercises. During aerobic exercise, information on
213 the patients' HR in relation to the THR was displayed on the smartphone screen. When the
214 monitored HR was within the THR range, RehabApp recorded the duration as effective exercise
215 and illuminated a green light at the bottom of the screen. When the monitored HR was below or
216 over the THR, a yellow or red light appeared, respectively. If the HR exceeded 110% of the
217 target heart rate, the patient received a message to slow down the exercise until the HR returned
218 to resting rate. RehabApp recorded the HR, the total duration of the exercise, the duration of the
219 effective exercise, self-reported RPE and any interruptions if they occurred.

220 Compliance with exercise protocol

221 Total exercise time for a given day was determined as the time from opening to closing
222 RehabApp. The time during aerobic exercise within which the monitored HR reached the THR or
223 above was counted as effective exercise time. Having reached at least two thirds (66.7%) of the
224 scheduled total and effective target time as given in Table 1 or modified by the therapist in any
225 given week for at least five of the six weeks according to RehabApp records was considered
226 compliant with the exercise protocol.

227 **Assessments**

228 Assessments were conducted between 26 April and 9 December 2020. For each patient home
229 visits were scheduled at baseline, at six weeks (post-treatment), and at 24 weeks (follow-up).

230 Additional assessments for perceived dyspnoea and adverse events were performed by
231 consultation via cell phone or WeChat voice call at two weeks and four weeks after baseline. Due
232 to a new policy of the National Health Commission of the PR China announced in the time period
233 between post-treatment and planned follow-up assessments, home visits of patients were no
234 longer permitted for health professionals. Instead, assessments could only be performed after
235 the patients provided negative results of serum antibody and nucleic acid tests for SARS CoV-2.
236 For the final assessment, participants were thus invited to return to the hospitals where they had
237 originally received treatment. Free of charge serum antibody and nucleic acid tests for SARS
238 CoV-2 were provided there. As new appointments for hospital visits had to be scheduled with the
239 patients, this adjustment led to a delay in the final assessment time point for about four weeks on
240 average.

241 Primary outcome

242 The primary outcome was functional exercise capacity at the post-treatment assessment (6
243 weeks) measured with the 6-minute walking test (6MWT) administered in accordance with
244 guidelines from the European Respiratory Society and American Thoracic Society²² and
245 recorded as 6-minute walking distance (6MWD) in metres. For the first two assessment points a
246 course was arranged outside, near the patients' home. For the final follow-up assessment a
247 course was arranged in the hospital ward or a hall at the hospital according to the same criteria.
248 If a patient could not complete the 6MWT, the distance walked until interruption was recorded.

249 Secondary outcomes

250 Secondary outcomes included 6MWD at follow-up, LMS, pulmonary function, health-related
251 quality of life (HRQOL), and perceived dyspnoea. LMS was measured with the squat test²³.
252 Participants were asked to perform a squat with their back against the wall starting from a
253 standing position, feet flat on the ground, and approximating a 90° angle at the hip and knees.
254 The time in seconds participants could remain in this position was recorded. Pulmonary function
255 was evaluated by spirometry according to guidelines of the American Thoracic Society (Grade C)
256 ²⁴. A portable pulmonary function device (MINATO, AS-507, Japan) was used. The following
257 parameters were recorded: forced expiratory volume in the first second (FEV1) in litres, forced
258 vital capacity (FVC) in litres, FEV1/FVC, maximum voluntary ventilation (MVV) in litres per
259 minute, and peak expiratory flow (PEF) in litres per second. For the report of baseline data, the
260 percent of predicted value for FEV1, FVC, and FEV1/FVC, and the percent below lower limit of
261 normal (LLN) were calculated with Global Lung Initiative (GLI-2012) equations for South-East
262 Asia²⁵. Percent of predicted PEF and MVV were calculated based on equations for mainland
263 China provided by Mu and Liu²⁶. HRQOL was evaluated with the Short Form Health Survey-12
264 (SF-12) ^{27 28}. Physical component score (PCS) and mental component score (MCS) are reported,
265 with higher score indicating better health. Due to the absence of reference equations for
266 mainland China scores were standardised according to US norms²⁸. Perceived dyspnoea was
267 assessed with the modified mMRC scale ²⁹. Having no symptoms of dyspnoea (mMRC score = 0)
268 was defined as a favourable outcome.

269 Adverse events

270 Participants could report adverse events including falls, injuries, pain, muscle soreness, fatigue,
271 and other uncomfortable symptoms at any time during the study via phone call or WeChat
272 message to the responsible therapist or researcher. Moreover, participants were asked for any
273 adverse events that had occurred in the previous time period during regular assessments
274 including interim assessments for mMRC dyspnoea at 2 and 4 weeks. Participants in the
275 Tereco group additionally received a prompt by RehabApp after each session asking for
276 adverse events and uncomfortable symptoms that had occurred during exercise. Moreover, they
277 were asked about adverse events in weekly consultations with therapists responsible for
278 monitoring and adapting the intervention. Death, cardiovascular events, other life-threatening
279 events, and re-hospitalisation for events related to the intervention or Covid-19 were defined as a
280 serious adverse event. All reported adverse events were rated by two doctors who had access to
281 the event history and medical history of each patient but were blinded with respect to group
282 allocation. These doctors were not otherwise involved in the study. Severity was rated on a
283 5-point Likert scale ranging from very mild to life threatening, relationship with the intervention
284 was rated on a 3-point Likert scale (unlikely, possible, likely). Disagreement on particular events
285 was resolved by discussion. If consensus could not be achieved a third reviewer was consulted
286 who had the casting vote.

287 **Sample size calculation**

288 While a minimal important difference (MID) of 30 metres is recommended for the 6MWT in
289 COPD and other chronic lung disease³⁰, an MID for Covid-19 has not yet been established.

290 Given limited knowledge about the longer-term course of the disease including spontaneous
291 recovery as well as learning effects that may occur, a more conservative MID of 50 metres was
292 assumed here. To achieve 80% power with an alpha error of 5%, a minimal sample size of 96
293 participants (48 per group) was needed to detect a statistically significant signal for a
294 between-group difference in change in 6MWD (with SD 99 in control and SD 71 in the
295 intervention group as reported by Lau for a trial in a SARS population¹¹). Assuming 20% attrition
296 our recruitment target was 120 participants (60 per group).

297 **Statistical analysis**

298 All analyses were performed with STATA 14.0. All main analyses were conducted on
299 intention-to-treat (ITT) basis and without imputations. Statistical significance was set at alpha = 5%
300 with two-sided tests. No corrections for multiplicity were applied. The predefined statistical
301 analysis plan (SAP) is available in Appendix 1.

302 **Main analysis**

303 Data were assumed to be missing at random (MAR) with missing values depending on observed
304 model parameters³¹. This assumption was tested with sensitivity analysis as described below.

305 The primary outcome, change in 6MWD post-treatment, was evaluated with constrained
306 longitudinal data analysis (cLDA), that is a linear mixed effects model that imposed an equality
307 constraint on baseline means^{32 33}. Dependence of longitudinal observations within study
308 participants was modelled with a random intercept. The fixed part of the model included time
309 points and interactions between time points and treatment group (but no term for treatment group

310 at baseline), and a term for study centre. This model is equivalent to longitudinal analysis of
311 covariance (ANCOVA) if there are no missing data. However, in the presence of missing data,
312 cLDA also considers data from participants who only participated in the baseline assessment.
313 The parameters for the interaction terms between time and treatment represent the estimated
314 treatment effects at the two follow-up points and are reported with 95% confidence intervals (CIs).
315 In contrast to the SAP, treatment effects for post-treatment and follow-up assessment were
316 estimated simultaneously, within the same model. This was done because two participants who
317 had missed the post-treatment assessment returned for the follow-up assessment and using this
318 information for model estimation was considered important in light of the principles of ITT
319 analysis.

320 All secondary outcomes apart from mMRC dyspnoea were analysed analogously. Occurrence of
321 a favourable outcome in mMRC dyspnoea was analysed with a generalised linear model of the
322 Poisson family with a log link. This model used the natural logarithm of the number of observed
323 occasions until the respective data point as offset and was adjusted for centre (fixed effect).
324 Cluster robust standard errors (cluster variable: participant ID) were used for the estimation of 95%
325 CIs³⁴. Baseline was not modelled for mMRC dyspnoea since all participants did have dyspnoea
326 at baseline (see inclusion criteria). Aside from terms for post-treatment and follow-up
327 assessment, and their interaction with treatment group, two additional time points (for weeks 2
328 and 4) and their interactions with treatment were included. Treatment effects are presented as
329 rate ratios (RR) along with logistic 95% CIs. The Poisson model was chosen over a longitudinal

330 logistic model originally specified in the SAP due to ease of interpretation of rate ratios and
331 derivation of population-averaged probabilities. A graphical illustration of trajectories presents
332 marginal means and probabilities (mMRC dyspnoea) for the intervention group and time point as
333 estimated with the above models with 84% CIs serving as comparisons bars. 84% CIs allow for
334 visual inspection for approximate statistical significance of mean differences at $\alpha = 5\%$ by
335 looking at the overlap of CIs.³⁵

336 Sensitivity analysis

337 Pre-specified sensitivity analysis included estimation of the above models on the per protocol
338 sample, as well as on two types of multiply imputed datasets. Firstly, multiple imputation with
339 chained equations³⁶ was performed under an extended MAR assumption, i.e. that missing
340 values were also dependent on observed values of (auxiliary) variables not included in the
341 models used for primary analysis. These were gender, age, disease severity, time from first
342 hospital admission for Covid-19 to baseline assessment, presence of comorbidities, smoking
343 history, and body mass index. Models were estimated on 70 imputed data sets as the
344 originally-specified 50 data sets (see SAP) did not yield a satisfactory upper limit for the fraction
345 of missing information³⁷. Secondly, controlled multiple imputation (50 sets) was used for
346 simulating a non-MAR scenario where patients with missing assessments in the TEREKO group
347 followed the pattern of change in controls (copy increments in reference - CIR).³⁸

348 As the follow-up assessment could not take place at home as planned due to change in
349 administrative regulations pertaining to Covid-19 as previously noted, a delay in the planned

350 follow-up assessment occurred for several patients and unequal time periods between
351 post-treatment and follow-up assessment resulted. Moreover, there was considerable variation
352 in days from onset of symptoms to admission (mean 7.4, SD 9.8, range 0-70) which was
353 unexpected. For these reasons, additional post hoc sensitivity analysis was conducted; the
354 models outlined under main analysis were fitted with two additional terms for time since onset of
355 symptoms (TOS) and TOS squared.

356 Analysis of harms

357 Adverse events were descriptively analysed.

358 **Summary of protocol deviations**

359 (i) Follow-up assessments could not be conducted by home visit due to change in administrative
360 regulations regarding Covid-19, but had to be performed at the participating hospitals.
361 Consequently, follow-up assessments could not be completed at 24 weeks as planned but were
362 conducted at 28 weeks after baseline on average. (ii) The primary outcome 6MWD at
363 post-treatment assessment was analysed simultaneously with the secondary outcome 6MWD at
364 follow-up, i.e. a joint model was fit as opposed to two separate models. (iii) mMRC perceived
365 dyspnoea (favourable outcome) was analysed with log-linear Poisson regression with
366 cluster-robust standard errors instead of longitudinal logistic regression. (iv) Multiple imputations
367 for sensitivity analysis (extended MAR scenario) were performed on 70 data sets and not 50 sets.
368 Deviations from the SAP (ii-iv) had no effect on the statistical significance of estimates when
369 compared with analyses as originally planned.

370 **Patient involvement**

371 Patients were not systematically involved in the design of this study. However, conversations
372 with patients and their families concerning what goals they had after discharge and what kind of
373 exercise they could perform at home informed the design of the TEREKO program. Moreover,
374 extensive feedback from individual patients allocated to the TEREKO group was collected during
375 the intervention period through RehabApp and in weekly consultations with therapists to better
376 adapt individual exercises to patients' needs and reduce any discomfort during and after training
377 sessions. Results will be disseminated to patients in both study groups upon publication.

378 **RESULTS**

379 **Figure 1** illustrates the flow of patients through the study. After pre-screening of hospital records,
380 140 patients were contacted for further evaluation of eligibility between 22 April and May 28 2020.
381 Of those 20 were ineligible or refused consent. 120 patients were randomised with one person in
382 the TEREKO group and one in the control group not receiving the allocated intervention. One
383 patient was withdrawn from the TEREKO group before the start of the exercise program as a
384 premature beat was discovered. One patient in the control group had been randomised
385 mistakenly because the assessor forgot to inform the allocator about the patient's ineligibility due
386 to refusal to collaborate in the baseline 6MWT and pulmonary function assessment (see
387 exclusion criterion vi). Other data from this patient were not included in the analysis. Six patients
388 of the TEREKO group did not complete the post-treatment assessment. We lost contact with four
389 patients of which one had previously announced to discontinue the intervention for unspecified

390 reasons. Two patients who discontinued the intervention, one because of chest pain and one for
391 unspecified reasons, missed the post-treatment assessment but returned for the follow-up
392 assessment. We had lost contact with four additional patients in the TEREKO group and five
393 patients from the control group at the final follow-up point.

394 Baseline characteristics of the study participants by intervention group are provided in **Table 2**.

395 The overall mean age of the study population was 50.61 (SD 10.98), 53 (44.5%) were male, and
396 73 (61.3%) had at least one comorbidity. Length of hospital stay for acute treatment was 26.18
397 on average (SD 15.25) with a mean of 70 days (SD 16.85) from hospital discharge to baseline.
398 Fifty (43.5%) patients were below LLN for FEV1, 45 (39.1%) for FVC, and 26 (22.6%) for
399 FEV1/FVC.

400 Overall, 38 participants in the TEREKO group complied with the exercise protocol, 64.41% of
401 those randomized and 73.3% of those who remained in the program for the full six weeks.

402

403 Table 2: Participant characteristics and outcomes at baseline

Descriptor	Total (n=119 [§])	Control (n=60 [§])	Intervention (n=59 [§])
Demographics			
Age in years, mean(sd)	50.61 (10.98)	52.04 (11.10)	49.17 (10.75)
Gender, n(percent)			
male	53 (44.5)	26 (43.3)	27 (45.8)
female	66 (55.5)	34 (56.7)	32 (54.2)

Inhospital treatment modalities

Days from onset to admission, mean(sd)	7.47 (9.80)	7.05 (10.60)	7.90 (8.97)
Disease severity [‡] , n(percent)			
not severe	81 (68.1)	44 (73.3)	37 (62.7)
severe	38 (31.9)	16 (26.7)	22 (37.3)
Oxygen support or non-invasive ventilation, n(percent)			
yes	103 (86.6)	54 (90.0)	49 (83.1)
Treatment with corticosteroids, n(percent)			
yes	49 (41.2)	23 (38.33)	26 (44.1)
Length of inpatient stay, mean(sd)	26.18 (15.25)	23.73 (11.00)	28.66 (18.37)
Medical history (baseline)			
Comorbidity presence, n(percent)			
none	46 (38.7)	21 (35.0)	25 (42.4)
single	45 (37.8)	24 (40.0)	21 (35.6)
multi	28 (23.5)	15 (25.0)	13 (22.0)
Comorbidity types, n(percent)			
Heart disease	9 (7.6)	7 (11.7)	2 (3.4)
Hypertension	26 (21.9)	18 (30.0)	8 (13.6)
Diabetes	17 (14.3)	9 (15.0)	8 (13.6)
Obesity	17 (14.3)	8 (13.33)	9 (15.3)
Lung disease (including inactive TB)	7 (5.9)	3(5.0)	4 (6.8)
Other comorbidity	28 (23.5)	12 (20.0)	16 (27.1)
Smoking history, n(percent)			
yes	15 (12.6)	6 (10.0)	9 (15.3)
Trial information			
Days from hospital discharge to baseline, mean (sd)	70.07 (16.85)	71.15 (13.22)	68.97 (19.94)
Days from baseline to post-treatment assessment, mean (sd)*	42.86 (2.12)	43.02 (1.87)	42.67 (2.37)

Days from baseline to follow up assessment, mean (sd)**	197.30 (8.41)	196.87 (8.26)	197.78 (8.62)
Outcomes (baseline)			
6MWD in meters, mean(sd)	507.18 (88.27)	499.98 (93.41)	514.52 (82.87)
Squat time in seconds, mean(sd)	36.66 (23.51)	38.60 (25.07)	34.68 (21.85)
Spirometry***			
FEV1 in litres, mean(sd)	2.19 (0.71)	2.14 (0.69)	2.24 (0.74)
FEV1 in percent of predicted, mean(sd)	78.53 (16.86)	77.95 (15.45)	79.10 (18.25)
FEV1 below LLN, n(percent)	50 (43.5)	24 (42.1)	26 (44.8)
FVC in litres, mean(sd)	2.77 (0.82)	2.69 (0.88)	2.84 (0.75)
FVC in percent of predicted, mean(sd)	82.04 (15.20)	80.43 (15.39)	83.62 (14.99)
FVC below LLN, n(percent)	45 (39.1)	22 (38.6)	23 (39.7)
FEV1/FVC	0.80 (0.13)	0.81 (0.12)	0.79 (0.14)
FEV1/FVC in percent of predicted, mean(sd)	96.43 (15.93)	97.86 (15.03)	95.03 (16.78)
FEV1/FVC below LLN, n(percent)	26 (22.6)	12 (21.1)	14 (24.1)
MVV in litres per minute	68.72 (28.90)	63.05 (26.12)	74.30 (30.60)
MVV in percent of predicted, mean(sd)	62.69 (22.13)	58.94 (20.86)	66.37 (22.88)
PEF in litres per second	3.93 (2.07)	3.66 (1.75)	4.21 (2.33)
PEF in percent of predicted, mean(sd)	48.94 (21.77)	46.41 (18.20)	51.42 (24.70)
SF-12 PCS, mean(sd)	39.42 (7.09)	39.69 (7.06)	39.16 (7.16)
SF-12 MCS, mean(sd)	44.40 (8.48)	44.13 (8.25)	44.67 (8.76)
mMRC dyspnoea, n(percent)			
2 "On level ground, walks slower than people of same age because of breathlessness or has to stop for breath when walking at own pace."	116 (97.5)	58 (96.7)	58 (98.3)
3 "Stops for breath after walking about 100 yards or after a few minutes on level ground."	3 (2.5)	2 (3.3)	1 (1.7)

404 § Unless otherwise stated. † Cases were defined as severe when patients met one of the following criteria at any time during
405 hospitalization: acute respiratory distress, respiratory rate ≥ 30 breath/min; pulse oxygen saturation (SpO₂) $\leq 93\%$ at rest; arterial blood
406 partial pressure of oxygen/fraction of inspired oxygen (PaO₂/FiO₂) ≤ 300 mmHg (1 mmHg = 0.133 kPa); respiratory failure requiring
407 mechanical ventilation; septic shock; failure of other organs requiring ICU treatment.³⁹

408 * n=112 (control=60, intervention=52). ** n=105 (control=55, intervention=50). *** For spirometry n=115 (control=57,
409 intervention=58); 1 baseline value missing, 3 invalid entries in case record form. FEV₁, FCV, FEV₁/FVC predictions and lower limits of
410 normal according to GLI 2012²⁵, MVV, PEF predictions according to Mu & Liu 1990²⁶.

411 sd = standard deviation; FEV₁ = Forced Expiratory Volume in 1 second. FVC = Forced Vital Capacity, MVV = Maximum Voluntary
412 Ventilation, PEF = Peak Expiratory Flow, SF-12 = Medical Outcomes Short Form-12, PCS = Physical Component Score, MCS =
413 Mental Component Score, mMRC = modified Medical Research Council.

414

415 **Primary outcome**

416 The mean 6MWD in the control group improved by 17.1 metres (SD 63.9) from baseline to
417 post-treatment assessment at 6 weeks, whereas 6MWD in the TEREKO group increased by
418 80.2 metres (SD 74.7). The adjusted between-group difference in change in 6MWD from
419 baseline (treatment effect) was 65.45 metres (95% CI 43.8-87.1, p<0.001).

420 **Secondary outcomes**

421 **Table 3** gives an overview of crude change and adjusted treatment effects for all outcomes.

422 **Figure 2** depicts marginal trajectories over time by study group with 84% CIs (comparison bars)

423 serving as a visual aid for inspecting the statistical significance of mean differences at the 5%

424 level (see Appendix 2 for detailed estimates).

425

426

427 Table 3: Crude change in outcomes from baseline at the different assessment points and estimated
 428 adjusted treatment effects with 95% confidence intervals (on intention to treat basis)

	Number of participants		Crude change from baseline [§]		Estimated treatment effect [‡] (95% CI)	P
	Control	TERECO	Control	TERECO		
Primary outcome						
6MWD in meters						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	60	52	17.09 ± 63.94	80.20 ± 74.66	65.45 (43.80-87.10)	< 0.001
- follow up (~28 weeks)	55	50	15.17 ± 70.02	84.81 ± 80.38	68.62 (46.39-90.85)	< 0.001
Secondary outcomes						
<i>Squat time in seconds</i>						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	60	52	7.98 ± 19.53	29.35 ± 27.22	20.12 (12.34-27.90)	< 0.001
- follow up (~28 weeks)	55	50	4.16 ± 19.62	28.12 ± 27.17	22.23 (14.24-30.21)	< 0.001
<i>Pulmonary function</i>						
FEV1 in litres						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	56	51	0.18 ± 0.53	0.28 ± 0.51	0.08 (-0.08-0.25)	0.327
- follow up (~28 weeks)	53	47	0.29 ± 0.43	0.29 ± 0.48	0.00 (-0.18-0.17)	0.969
FVC in litres						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	56	51	0.19 ± 0.40	0.21 ± 0.47	0.02 (-0.14-0.18)	0.818
- follow up (~28 weeks)	53	47	0.27 ± 0.43	0.30 ± 0.38	0.01 (-0.16-0.17)	0.95
FEV1/FVC						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	56	51	0.01 ± 0.16	0.04 ± 0.17	0.03 (-0.02-0.07)	0.224
- follow up (~28 weeks)	53	47	0.02 ± 0.15	0.02 ± 0.18	-0.01 (-0.05-0.03)	0.732
MVV in litres per minute						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	56	51	5.61 ± 17.31	14.49 ± 21.60	10.57 (3.26-17.88)	0.005

- follow up (~28 weeks)	53	47	13.81 ± 20.78	18.47 ± 22.31	5.20 (-2.33-12.73)	0.176
PEF in litres per second						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	56	51	0.66 ± 1.95	0.98 ± 1.90	0.38 (-0.24-1.00)	0.229
- follow up (~28 weeks)	53	47	0.97 ± 1.84	0.76 ± 1.92	-0.02 (-0.66-0.62)	0.954
<i>Quality of life</i>						
SF-12 PCS						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	60	52	3.84 ± 7.60	7.81 ± 7.02	3.79 (1.24-6.35)	0.004
- follow up (~28 weeks)	55	50	5.20 ± 9.13	8.2 ± 10.05	2.69 (0.06-5.32)	0.045
SF-12 MCS						
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	60	52	4.17 ± 8.79	6.15 ± 10.78	2.18 (-0.54-4.90)	0.116
- follow up (~28 weeks)	55	50	5.51 ± 7.79	6.92 ± 10.28	1.99 (-0.81-4.79)	0.164
<i>mMRC perceived dyspnoea, favourable outcome</i>						
- interim 2 weeks	60	54	45.0	57.4	1.27 (0.88-1.82)	0.197
- interim 4 weeks	60	54	61.7	66.7	1.08 (0.82-1.42)	0.605
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	60	52	61.7	90.4	1.46 (1.17-1.82)	0.001
- follow up (~28 weeks)	55	50	60.0	72.0	1.22 (0.92-1.61)	0.162

429 §Crude change from baseline is given as mean change ± standard deviation of this change for all outcomes apart from mMRC
 430 (favorable outcome); for the latter outcome percentages endorsing a score of zero (no dyspnea) at each time point are provided.

431 ‡Estimated treatment effects for all outcomes apart from mMRC dyspnoea (favorable outcome) are between-group mean differences
 432 in change from baseline derived from mixed effects regression with random intercept for study participant; models are constrained to
 433 a common baseline mean across groups and adjusted for centre. Estimation includes all available observations from participants
 434 randomized (number of participants with valid observations at baseline is 115 for pulmonary function parameters and 119 for all
 435 other outcomes). Estimated treatment effects for mMRC dyspnoea (favourable outcome) are risk ratios derived from generalized
 436 linear model from Poisson family with log link adjusted for centre and ln(number valid observations up to data point) as offset; 95%
 437 CIs are based on cluster robust standard errors (cluster variable: participant ID).

438 TEREKO = telerehabilitation intervention for Covid-19 survivors, CI = confidence interval, 6MWD = six minute walking distance,
 439 FEV1 = forced expiratory volume in 1 second, FVC = forced vital capacity, MVV = maximum voluntary ventilation, PEF = peak
 440 expiratory flow, SF-12 = Medical Outcomes Short Form-12, PCS = physical component score, MCS = mental component score,
 441 mMRC = modified Medical Research Council

442

443 With estimated 68.62 metres (95% CI 46.39-90.85, $p<0.001$) the treatment effect regarding
444 6MWD increased somewhat at follow-up. LMS improved to a larger degree in the TEREKO
445 group as compared to control with estimated treatment effects of 20.12 seconds in squat position
446 (95% CI 12.34-27.9, $p<0.001$) post-treatment, and 22.23 seconds (95% CI 14.24-30.21, $p<0.001$)
447 at follow-up. Lung function parameters improved in both group over time (Figure 2). No group
448 differences were found apart from an adjusted between-group difference in change from
449 baseline of 10.57 litres per minute (95% CI 3.26-17.88, $p=0.005$) in post-treatment MVV in favour
450 of the TEREKO group. This between-group difference was reduced to 5.2 litres per minute (95%
451 CI -2.33-12.73) at follow-up and was no longer statistically significant ($p=0.176$). SF-12 PCS
452 increased to a larger degree in the TEREKO group as compared to the control group with
453 treatment effects estimated as 3.79 points (95% CI 1.24-6.35, $p=0.004$) at the post-treatment
454 assessment and 2.69 (95% CI 0.06-5.32, $p=0.045$) at follow-up. The lower limit of the 95% CI of
455 the between-group difference was however close to zero at follow-up. Improvement in SF-12
456 MCS was somewhat greater in the TEREKO group but 95% CIs were also compatible with
457 greater improvement in the control group at both assessment points. With 90.4% endorsing a
458 favourable outcome for dyspnoea in the TEREKO group as opposed to 61.7 percent in the
459 control group (adjusted RR 1.46, 1.17-1.82, $p=0.001$), a treatment effect for perceived dyspnoea
460 was found immediately after the intervention period but not at the other time points.

461 **Sensitivity analysis**

462 Estimates from sensitivity analysis are provided in **Table 4**. Per protocol analysis showed larger

463 effect estimates for 6MWD and LMS. For the per protocol sample the estimated between-group
464 difference in change from baseline for the primary outcome was 72.25 metres (95% CI
465 47.54-96.97, $p>0.001$). With the exception of 6MWD at follow-up, treatment effects were lowest
466 under the CIR scenario, followed by the extended MAR scenario. The lowest treatment effect for
467 the primary outcome was 57.18 metres (35.42-78.95, $p<0.001$) under the CIR scenario. The
468 extended MAR scenario showed the lowest adjusted treatment effect for 6MWD at follow-up with
469 61.99 metres (95% CI 39.22-84.76, $p<0.001$). A longer-term effect of TEREKO on SF-12 PCS
470 was unstable in all pre-planned sensitivity analyses. Estimates from post hoc sensitivity analysis
471 that added parameters for TOS to the models were almost identical with those from main
472 analysis.

473 Table 4: Results of sensitivity analysis

Outcome	Estimates of treatment effects from different scenarios with 95% CIs				
	ITT, primary analysis (n=119, n _{int} =59, n _{obs} = 336)	Per protocol* (n=91, n _{int} =36)	ITT, extended MAR multiple imputation [§] (n=119, n _{int} =59, 70 sets)	ITT, CIR multiple imputation [‡] (n=119, n _{int} =59, 50 sets)	ITT, model including time from symptoms onset ^{&} (n=119, n _{int} =59, n _{obs} = 336)
Primary outcome: 6MWD in meters					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	65.45 (43.80-87.10)	72.25 (47.54-96.97)	62.23 (40.07-84.39)	57.18 (35.42-78.95)	65.12 (44.50-85.74)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	68.62 (46.39-90.85)	75.92 (51.21-100.64)	61.99 (39.22-84.76)	63.07 (40.87-85.27)	67.99 (46.77-89.20)
Secondary outcomes					
<i>Squat time in seconds</i>					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	20.12 (12.34-27.90)	22.67 (13.91-31.43)	20.32 (11.72-28.91)	17.81 (10.01-25.61)	20.15 (12.44-27.86)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	22.23 (14.24-30.21)	25.94 (17.18-34.70)	21.48 (12.73-30.24)	20.07 (12.09-28.06)	22.38 (14.45-30.31)
<i>Pulmonary function</i>					
FEV1 in litres					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	0.08 (-0.08-0.25)	0.09 (-0.1-0.28)	0.07 (-0.11-0.25)	0.06 (-0.11-0.24)	0.08 (-0.08-0.25)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	0.00 (-0.18-0.17)	-0.03 (-0.22-0.16)	-0.05 (-0.23-0.13)	0.00 (-0.18-0.18)	0.00 (-0.18-0.17)
FVC in litres					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	0.02 (-0.14-0.18)	0.09 (-0.08-0.27)	-0.01 (-0.18-0.16)	0.03 (-0.13-0.20)	0.02 (-0.14-0.18)

- follow up (~28 weeks)	0.01 (-0.16-0.17)	0.07 (-0.11-0.25)	-0.06 (-0.23-0.12)	0.01 (-0.16-0.18)	0.01 (-0.15-0.17)
<i>FEV1/FVC</i>					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	0.03 (-0.02-0.07)	0.02 (-0.02-0.07)	0.02 (-0.02-0.06)	0.02 (-0.02-0.06)	0.02 (-0.02-0.06)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	-0.01 (-0.05-0.03)	-0.02 (-0.07-0.03)	-0.01 (-0.05-0.03)	0.00 (-0.04-0.04)	-0.01 (-0.05-0.03)
<i>MVV in litres per minute</i>					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	10.57 (3.26-17.88)	14.3 (6.1-22.5)	10.09 (2.11-18.07)	10.32 (2.91-17.73)	10.57 (3.3-17.85)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	5.20 (-2.33-12.73)	7.29 (-1.00-15.59)	3.04 (-5.38-11.46)	6.01 (-1.77-13.78)	5.25 (-2.27-12.76)
<i>PEF in litres per second</i>					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	0.38 (-0.24-1.00)	0.52 (-0.17-1.22)	0.35 (-0.29-0.99)	0.35 (-0.29-0.99)	0.38 (-0.24-1.00)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	-0.02 (-0.66-0.62)	-0.16 (-0.86-0.55)	-0.18 (-0.83-0.48)	0.03 (-0.62-0.67)	-0.03 (-0.67-0.61)
<i>Quality of life</i>					
<i>SF-12 PCS</i>					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	3.79 (1.24-6.35)	3.70 (0.76-6.63)	3.68 (1.13-6.24)	3.27 (0.69-5.86)	3.75 (1.22-6.27)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	2.69 (0.06-5.32)	2.37 (-0.57-5.30)	2.31 (-0.43-5.05)	2.44 (-0.28-5.16)	2.72 (0.12-5.33)
<i>SF-12 MCS</i>					
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	2.18 (-0.54-4.90)	1.92 (-1.14-4.97)	2.17 (-0.57-4.91)	1.65 (-1.07-4.38)	2.18 (-0.53-4.89)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	1.99 (-0.81-4.79)	1.48 (-1.58-4.54)	2.30 (-0.48-5.09)	1.82 (-0.96-4.61)	1.93 (-0.87-4.73)
<i>mMRC dyspnoea, favourable outcome</i>					
- interim 2 weeks	1.27 (0.88-1.82)	1.33 (0.90-1.98)	1.26 (0.87-1.81)	1.26 (0.88-1.82)	1.28 (0.89-1.85)

- interim 4 weeks	1.08 (0.82-1.42)	1.04 (0.76-1.42)	1.06 (0.80-1.4)	1.06 (0.80-1.40)	1.09 (0.82-1.43)
- post-treatment (6 weeks)	1.46 (1.17-1.82)	1.43 (1.14-1.80)	1.42 (1.13-1.79)	1.40 (1.11-1.77)	1.47 (1.17-1.84)
- follow up (~28 weeks)	1.22 (0.92-1.61)	1.15 (0.84-1.57)	1.21 (0.92-1.58)	1.23 (0.92-1.63)	1.23 (0.93-1.62)

474 Apart from estimates for mMRC perceived dyspnoea (favourable outcome), estimates are between-group differences in mean change from baseline derived from linear mixed effects
475 models adjusted for study centre (fixed effect) and with baseline means constrained to be equal across comparison groups. Estimates for mMRC perceived dyspnoea are rate ratios
476 derived from general linear mixed model of the Poisson family with log link adjusted for centre and ln(number valid observations up to data point) as offset. CIs are estimated with cluster
477 robust standard errors (cluster variable: participant ID).

478 * Based on per protocol sample, i.e. participants who completed all assessments and completed the intervention program at or above minimum intensity and duration required for
479 compliance as defined in the protocol (intervention group). [§] Based on multiple imputation using chained equations assuming data were missing at random. The imputation model
480 included all outcomes and the following auxiliary variables with complete baseline information: gender, age, smoking history (no vs. yes), presence of any comorbidity (no vs. yes),
481 Covid-19 severity (non-severe vs. severe), body mass index, time from admission to hospital to baseline assessment in days. * Used reference-based controlled multi-variate normal
482 imputation for each outcome assuming increments in both comparison groups followed the observed pattern of the control group where data points were not observed. Auxiliary
483 variables employed were as in the MAR model. After imputation adaptive rounding was used for imputed values of mMRC dyspnoea (favourable outcome). [§] Same as main analysis but
484 providing additional adjustment for time from onset of symptoms to measurement point in days and time from onset of symptoms to measurement point squared. Likelihood ratio test
485 confirmed superior fit of model including squared term in addition.

486 CI = confidence interval, ITT = intention to treat, MAR = missing at random, CIR = copy increments from reference, 6MWD = six minute walking distance, FEV1 = forced expiratory
487 volume in one second, FVC = forced vital capacity, MVV = maximum voluntary ventilation, PEF = peak expiratory flow, SF-12 = Medical Outcomes Short Form-12, PCS = physical
488 component score, MCS = mental component score, mMRC = modified Medical Research Council.

489

490

491 **Adverse events**

492 No serious adverse events occurred during the study period. Eight patients (5 from the TEREKO
493 group and 3 from the control group) were hospitalized, all for non-life-threatening reasons
494 unrelated to Covid-19 or the intervention and all in the follow-up period. In total 174 adverse
495 events occurred involving 73 (61.3%) patients (38 or 63.3 % in the control and 35 or 59.3% in the
496 TEREKO group). Of the events 78 were recorded in the control and 96 in the TEREKO group. 64
497 events occurred during the intervention period (19 in controls and 45 in the TEREKO group). All
498 but one of those events (stomach ulcers of one patient in the control group were rated as
499 moderately severe) were classified as very mild to moderate. These events mostly comprised
500 uncomfortable symptoms including chest tightness, feelings of weakness or reduced physical
501 strength, and cough. A detailed account of adverse events is provided in Appendix 3.

502

503 **DISCUSSION**

504 In this trial, the TEREKO program was superior to the control group regarding improvement of
505 functional exercise capacity (6MWD), LMS (squat time), and the physical component of HRQOL
506 (SF-12 PCS). All these effects could be sustained over a 7-months period. Pronounced
507 differences in exercise capacity and lower-limb muscle strength remained between intervention
508 and control group. For physical HRQOL, the difference between TEREKO and the control group
509 decreased at the final follow-up due to improvements in the control group. We also found a
510 short-term effect of TEREKO on MVV and mMRC perceived dyspnoea. Both effects, however,

511 decreased at follow-up with differences from the control group no longer being statistically
512 significant. No effects of Tereco on the four other pulmonary function parameters and
513 statistically uncertain effects on the mental component of HRQOL were found in this study.
514 Adherence to the intervention program was satisfactory and no serious adverse events occurred.
515 All seven moderately-severe events that needed in-hospital treatment were unrelated to the
516 intervention.

517 This study evaluated a relatively inexpensive, patient-centred, adaptable telerehabilitation
518 intervention with a wide range of parameters of relevance to function and HRQOL of Covid-19
519 survivors including a comprehensive report on adverse events. With a few exceptions, this trial
520 was executed according to the original protocol and the attrition rate was low (about 12%).
521 Extensive sensitivity analysis was carried out that demonstrated the stability of most results
522 under different scenarios including per protocol analysis as well as an extended MAR and a
523 non-MAR scenario.

524 Limitations of this research include participant characteristics: only Covid-19 survivors with
525 moderate dyspnoea symptoms who had previously been hospitalized for treatment were
526 included. The results are thus not generalizable to persons with no, mild or severe dyspnoea, nor
527 to people who contracted SARS CoV-2 but were not hospitalised for it. Another important
528 weakness is the unexpected change of the location and resulting delay of the final follow-up
529 assessment because regulations pertinent to the protection of health professionals from infection
530 no longer permitted assessment visits. While conditions remained the same between

531 intervention and control group, it is unclear how this may have affected patient-reported
532 assessments and pulmonary function testing. Low-certainty evidence (one randomised
533 crossover trial) suggests that 6MWT performed outdoors yields comparable results to
534 centre-based testing.⁴⁰ Emerging evidence suggest that most profound impairment of lung
535 function in Covid-19 occurs in diffusion capacity^{2,41} usually measured as the diffusion capacity of
536 the lung for carbon monoxide (CO) or the transfer capacity for CO. This was unclear at the time
537 of study design and the required measurement procedures are difficult to perform in the home
538 setting. Comparability of the occurrence of adverse events across groups during the intervention
539 period was also limited by additional prompts in the intervention group issued in weekly
540 consultations with therapists and through RehabApp. Recollection bias in the control group is
541 possible, for instance, rather mild events that happened several days ago might not have been
542 remembered during two-weekly phone interviews. Finally, this trial was not powered for
543 subgroup analysis and effect sizes in specific subpopulations hence remain unclear.

544 At the time of writing, there are no other randomised-controlled studies on rehabilitation
545 effectiveness for Covid-19. Demonstrating clinically meaningful and sustainable effects of the
546 Tereco program on 6MWD and LMS, this study also adds to previous low-certainty evidence
547 on the effectiveness of telerehabilitation in respiratory disease.¹⁵ The effect size for 6MWD in the
548 present study at six weeks is comparable to results from a randomized-controlled trial from Hong
549 Kong by Lau and associates¹¹ who evaluated a 6-week outpatient exercise program for SARS
550 survivors with baseline and post-treatment assessment. In contrast to our findings, the latter

551 study did not detect any effects of the program on quality of life (SF-36) or lower-limb strength
552 (measured as gluteus maximum and anterior deltoid strength with dynamometer). While a recent
553 systematic review and meta-analysis reported superior effects of breathing exercise on lung
554 function parameters (FEV1 and FEV1/FVC) as compared to control for COPD⁴², no such effects
555 were found in the present study. In contrast to COPD, Covid-19 does not necessarily involve
556 permanent impairment of structures of the lung and patients in our study from both groups seem
557 to have naturally improved regarding lung function parameters. Another possible explanation is
558 that the BCTE exercises included in the TEREKO program were not sufficiently targeted.
559 Moreover, compliance with this exercise type is difficult to measure remotely. Similar to the
560 HRQOL physical component, mental aspects of quality of life also improved in both groups but
561 no statistically significant between-group differences in increments were detected at any point,
562 although the SF-12 MCS score of the TEREKO group remained at about 2 points above control
563 at follow-up. This result is difficult to interpret due to the unavailability of an MID for SF-12 in the
564 target population. It is possible that our study was simply underpowered to detect a clinically
565 relevant difference. In contrast to HRQOL, the proportion of patients free of subjective dyspnoea
566 clearly decreased in the TEREKO group between a peak at post-treatment and follow-up,
567 returning to about the value at four weeks and suggesting that effects on perceived dyspnoea
568 could not be sustained.

569 The TEREKO program is targeted at improving physical fitness including physical aspects of
570 subjective HRQOL and should be applied in populations with respective deficits. Effects of the

571 program on pulmonary function are unlikely while those on mental well-being remain unclear.
572 Components better targeting these outcomes could be added in future evaluations of similar
573 programs. For example, low- to moderate-quality evidence for the effectiveness of Tai-Chi in
574 improving lung function in persons with COPD exists.⁴³ The TEREKO program appears to be
575 safe but more mild adverse events occurred in the TEREKO group in the first 6 weeks. The
576 occurrence of uncomfortable symptoms during and after exercise can possibly be reduced by
577 adding more resting periods and warm up elements. Potential benefits of the latter should,
578 however, be weighed against an increased amount of time needed for exercising. The TEREKO
579 program is inexpensive and suitable for large scale implementation dependent on smartphone
580 coverage and the availability of therapists for remote supervision and consultations. The need for
581 home visits or hospital attendance for program evaluation could be further reduced by the
582 application of remote testing methods⁴⁰.

583

584 **CONCLUSIONS**

585 The TEREKO program was superior over no rehabilitation with regard to functional exercise
586 capacity, LMS, and the physical component of HRQOL. Only short-term effects were found for
587 self-reported dyspnoea and MVV. Effects of the intervention on pulmonary function are otherwise
588 unlikely and effects on mental aspects of quality of life are small at best.

589

590

591 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:**

592 JL, WX, CZha, SL, and JDR designed the study with support from ZY, JW, YC, and CZhe; JL led the
593 overall investigation and WX, CZha, SL, and YZ led the investigations at the respective centres; JL
594 acquired the primary funding; WX, CZha, SL, JW, ZY, YC, CZhe, XF, and WC acquired and curated
595 the data with JDR responsible for data checks and preparing the data for statistical analysis; JDR
596 planned and performed the statistical analysis with support from SL and JW; JDR created all figures
597 and tables for this article with support from JW; JDR wrote the original draft with support from SL and
598 JW; all other authors revised the draft for critical content; JL and JDR supervised the study. All
599 authors have read and agreed with the submitted version of the manuscript. JL and JDR act as
600 guarantors for this work and accept full responsibility for the work and the conduct of the study, they
601 had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish.

602

603 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

604 We sincerely appreciate the work of all our colleagues from The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing
605 Medical University, Hubei Province Hospital of Integrated Chinese and Western Medicine, and Hubei
606 Huangshi Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine who were involved in the conduct of this trial.
607 Special thanks go to Dr. Yongqiang Li, Puyang Zhang, Wei Zhang, and Wenzhong Zou. We cordially
608 thank all study participants and our other patients with Covid-19 for their feedback and ideas on how
609 to design and improve the TEREKO program. We thank Jiayi Zhang for cross-checking the English
610 translation of the Chinese protocol. We like to thank our friend and linguistics expert Dr. Michael

611 Herrera for his help with describing the different exercises. We are grateful to our friend Dr. Andrew
612 'Randy' Pennycott for review of style and language. JDR would like to thank Lili and Binhua Reinhardt
613 for their patience and continuous support and Dietrich Reinhardt for excellent discussions about the
614 lung function parameters and other aspects of data interpretation.

615

616 **DECLARATIONS AND STATEMENTS**

617 **Ethical approval**

618 This study was registered at the Chinese Clinical Trial Registry on 11 Apr 2020
619 (ChiCTR2000031834). Ethical approval was first received from the Institutional Review Board
620 (IRB) of the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University/Jiangsu Province Hospital
621 (2020-SR-171, 9 April 2020) and then subsequently from the IRBs of Hubei Province Hospital of
622 Integrated Chinese and Western Medicine (2020016, 14 April 2020), and Huangshi Hospital of
623 Chinese Medicine (HSZYPJ-2020-026-01, 20 April 2020).

624 **Declaration of interest**

625 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
626 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: no support from any organisation for the
627 submitted work. JL reports a research grant from Jiangsu CF PharmTech, Inc. JDR reports
628 research grants from Xi'an Bureau of Technology, China; from the Fundamental Research
629 Funds for the Central Universities, China; and from Sichuan Bureau of Science and Technology,
630 China during the conduct of the study. No other relationships or activities exist that could appear

631 to have influenced the submitted work.

632 **Funding**

633 This research was funded by Jiangsu CF PharmTech, Inc (to JL); Department of Science and
634 Technology of Sichuan Province (21ZDYF1918, to JDR), the Fundamental Research Funds of
635 Central Universities in China (20827041D4161, to JDR), Xi'an Science and Technology Bureau
636 (XA2020-HWYZ-0043, to JDR).

637 **Details of the role of the study sponsors**

638 CF PharmTech, Inc provided technical and financial support for the conduct of the study.
639 Department of Science and Technology of Sichuan Province, the Fundamental Research Funds
640 of Central Universities in China, and Xi'an Science and Technology Bureau provided financial
641 support for the conduct of the study.

642 **Statement of independence of researchers from funders**

643 The funders did not have any influence on the design, conduct, analysis, data interpretation, and
644 conclusions of his study.

645 **Data sharing statement**

646 Anonymised patient-level data on which the analysis, results, and conclusions reported in this
647 paper are based will be shared on a public digital repository upon publication of the paper.

648 **Transparency declaration**

649 JL and JDR affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the
650 study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any

651 discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

652 **Dissemination declaration**

653 We have reported whether we plan to disseminate the results to study participants and or patient
654 organisations or stated that dissemination to these groups is not possible/applicable.

655

656 **References**

657 1. Lopez-Leon S, Wegman-Ostrosky T, Perelman C, Sepulveda R, Rebolledo PA, Cuapio A, et
658 al. More than 50 Long-term effects of COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis
659 *medRxiv (preprint)* 2021;Jan 30; 2021.

660 2. Huang C, Huang L, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Gu X, et al. 6-month consequences of COVID-19 in
661 patients discharged from hospital: a cohort study. *Lancet (London, England)*
662 2021;397(10270):220-32.

663 3. Mo X, Jian W, Su Z, Chen M, Peng H, Peng P, et al. Abnormal pulmonary function in
664 COVID-19 patients at time of hospital discharge. *The European respiratory journal*
665 2020;55(6).

666 4. Huang Y, Tan C, Wu J, Chen M, Wang Z, Luo L, et al. Impact of coronavirus disease 2019 on
667 pulmonary function in early convalescence phase. *Respiratory research* 2020;21(1):163.

668 5. Paneroni M, Simonelli C, Saleri M, Bertacchini L, Venturelli M, Troosters T, et al. Muscle
669 Strength and Physical Performance in Patients Without Previous Disabilities Recovering
670 From COVID-19 Pneumonia. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation*

- 671 2021;100(2):105-09.
- 672 6. Belli S, Balbi B, Prince I, Cattaneo D, Masocco F, Zaccaria S, et al. Low physical functioning
673 and impaired performance of activities of daily life in COVID-19 patients who survived
674 hospitalisation. *The European respiratory journal* 2020;56(4).
- 675 7. Zhu S, Gao Q, Yang L, Yang Y, Xia W, Cai X, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of disability
676 and anxiety in a retrospective cohort of 432 survivors of Coronavirus Disease-2019
677 (Covid-19) from China. *PloS one* 2020;15(12):e0243883.
- 678 8. Gennaro MM, Mariagrazia P, De Lorenzo R, Cristiano M, Sara P, Roberto F, et al. Persistent
679 psychopathology and neurocognitive impairment in COVID-19 survivors: effect of
680 inflammatory biomarkers at three-month follow-up. *Brain, behavior, and immunity* 2021.
- 681 9. Li Z, Zheng C, Duan C, Zhang Y, Li Q, Dou Z, et al. Rehabilitation needs of the first cohort of
682 post-acute COVID-19 patients in Hubei, China. *European journal of physical and*
683 *rehabilitation medicine* 2020;56(3):339-44.
- 684 10. McCarthy B, Casey D, Devane D, Murphy K, Murphy E, Lacasse Y. Pulmonary rehabilitation
685 for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*
686 2015(2):CD003793.
- 687 11. Lau HM, Ng GY, Jones AY, Lee EW, Siu EH, Hui DS. A randomised controlled trial of the
688 effectiveness of an exercise training program in patients recovering from severe acute
689 respiratory syndrome. *The Australian journal of physiotherapy* 2005;51(4):213-9.
- 690 12. Negrini F, de Sire A, Andrenelli E, Lazzarini SG, Patrini M, Ceravolo MG. Rehabilitation and

- 691 COVID-19: a rapid living systematic review 2020 by Cochrane Rehabilitation Field.
692 Update as of October 31st, 2020. *European journal of physical and rehabilitation*
693 *medicine* 2021;57(1):166-70.
- 694 13. Grabowski DC, Joynt Maddox KE. Postacute Care Preparedness for COVID-19: Thinking
695 Ahead. *Jama* 2020;323(20):2007-08.
- 696 14. Suso-Marti L, La Touche R, Herranz-Gomez A, Angulo-Diaz-Parreno S, Paris-Aleman A,
697 Cuenca-Martinez F. Effectiveness of Telerehabilitation in Physical Therapist Practice: An
698 Umbrella and Mapping Review with Meta-Meta-Analysis. *Physical therapy* 2021.
- 699 15. Cox NS, Dal Corso S, Hansen H, McDonald CF, Hill CJ, Zanaboni P, et al. Telerehabilitation
700 for chronic respiratory disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*
701 2021;1:CD013040.
- 702 16. Fletcher CM, Elmes PC, Fairbairn AS, Wood CH. The significance of respiratory symptoms
703 and the diagnosis of chronic bronchitis in a working population. *British medical journal*
704 1959;2(5147):257-66.
- 705 17. American College of Sports Medicine. *ACSM's Guidelines for Exercise Testing and*
706 *Prescription* 9th ed. Philadelphia, 2013.
- 707 18. Karvonen MJ, Kentala E, Mustala O. The effects of training on heart rate; a longitudinal study.
708 *Annales medicinae experimentalis et biologiae Fenniae* 1957;35(3):307-15.
- 709 19. Borg G. Perceived exertion as an indicator of somatic stress. *Scandinavian journal of*
710 *rehabilitation medicine* 1970;2(2):92-8.

- 711 20. Borg GA. Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. *Medicine and science in sports and*
712 *exercise* 1982;14(5):377-81.
- 713 21. Eckardt N. Lower-extremity resistance training on unstable surfaces improves proxies of
714 muscle strength, power and balance in healthy older adults: a randomised control trial.
715 *BMC geriatrics* 2016;16(1):191.
- 716 22. Holland AE, Spruit MA, Troosters T, Puhan MA, Pepin V, Saey D, et al. An official European
717 Respiratory Society/American Thoracic Society technical standard: field walking tests in
718 chronic respiratory disease. *The European respiratory journal* 2014;44(6):1428-46.
- 719 23. Cho M. The effects of modified wall squat exercises on average adults' deep abdominal
720 muscle thickness and lumbar stability. *Journal of physical therapy science*
721 2013;25(6):689-92.
- 722 24. Culver BH, Graham BL, Coates AL, Wanger J, Berry CE, Clarke PK, et al. Recommendations
723 for a Standardized Pulmonary Function Report. An Official American Thoracic Society
724 Technical Statement. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017;196(11):1463-72.
- 725 25. Quanjer PH, Stanojevic S, Cole TJ, Baur X, Hall GL, Culver BH, et al. Multi-ethnic reference
726 values for spirometry for the 3-95-yr age range: the global lung function 2012 equations.
727 *The European respiratory journal* 2012;40(6):1324-43.
- 728 26. Mu K, Liu S. *National compilation of reference values of pulmonary function*. Beijing, China:
729 the Associated Press of Beijing Medical University and Chinese Academy of Medical
730 Sciences, 1990.

- 731 27. Lins L, Carvalho FM. SF-36 total score as a single measure of health-related quality of life:
732 Scoping review. *SAGE open medicine* 2016;4:2050312116671725.
- 733 28. Ware J, Jr., Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of
734 scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Medical care* 1996;34(3):220-33.
- 735 29. Papisir SA, Daniil ZD, Malagari K, Kapotsis GE, Sotiropoulou C, Milic-Emili J, et al. The
736 Medical Research Council dyspnea scale in the estimation of disease severity in
737 idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis. *Respiratory medicine* 2005;99(6):755-61.
- 738 30. Singh SJ, Puhan MA, Andrianopoulos V, Hernandez NA, Mitchell KE, Hill CJ, et al. An official
739 systematic review of the European Respiratory Society/American Thoracic Society:
740 measurement properties of field walking tests in chronic respiratory disease. *The*
741 *European respiratory journal* 2014;44(6):1447-78.
- 742 31. Little RJA, Rubin DB. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2002.
- 743 32. Coffman CJ, Edelman D, Woolson RF. To condition or not condition? Analysing 'change' in
744 longitudinal randomised controlled trials. *BMJ open* 2016;6(12):e013096.
- 745 33. Twisk J, Bosman L, Hoekstra T, Rijnhart J, Welten M, Heymans M. Different ways to
746 estimate treatment effects in randomised controlled trials. *Contemporary clinical trials*
747 *communications* 2018;10:80-85.
- 748 34. Zou GY, Donner A. Extension of the modified Poisson regression model to prospective
749 studies with correlated binary data. *Statistical methods in medical research*
750 2013;22(6):661-70.

- 751 35. Goldstein H, Healy MJR. The graphical presentation of a collection of means. *Journal of the*
752 *Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)* 1995;158(1):175-77.
- 753 36. White I, Royston P, Wood A. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and
754 guidance for practice. *Statistics in medicine* 2011;30:377-99.
- 755 37. von Hippel PT. How Many Imputations Do You Need? A Two-stage Calculation Using a
756 Quadratic Rule *Sociological Methods and Research* 2020;49(3):699-718.
- 757 38. Cro S, Morris TP, Kenward MG, Carpenter JR. Sensitivity analysis for clinical trials with
758 missing continuous outcome data using controlled multiple imputation: A practical guide.
759 *Statistics in medicine* 2020;39(21):2815-42.
- 760 39. National Health Commission of the PR China [国家卫生健康委员会]. Diagnostic criteria of the
761 Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Diagnosis and Treatment Program (Trial Version 7) [in
762 Chinese; 关于印发新型冠状病毒肺炎诊疗方案（试行第七版）的通知], 2020.
- 763 40. Holland AE, Malaguti C, Hoffman M, Lahham A, Burge AT, Dowman L, et al. Home-based or
764 remote exercise testing in chronic respiratory disease, during the COVID-19 pandemic
765 and beyond: A rapid review. *Chronic respiratory disease* 2020;17:1479973120952418.
- 766 41. Torres-Castro R, Vasconcello-Castillo L, Alsina-Restoy X, Solis-Navarro L, Burgos F, Puppo
767 H, et al. Respiratory function in patients post-infection by COVID-19: a systematic review
768 and meta-analysis. *Pulmonology* 2020.
- 769 42. Lu Y, Li P, Li N, Wang Z, Li J, Liu X, et al. Effects of Home-Based Breathing Exercises in
770 Subjects With COPD. *Respiratory care* 2020;65(3):377-87.

771 43. Ngai SP, Jones AY, Tam WW. Tai Chi for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).

772 *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2016(6):CD009953.

773

774

Recruitment



