

26 **Abstract**

27 **Objectives:** To investigate whether wearing a cloth facemask could affect physiological and
28 perceptual responses to exercise at distinct exercise intensities in non-trained men and
29 women.

30 **Methods:** In a crossover design, participants (17 men and 18 women) underwent a
31 progressive square-wave test at four intensities (i. at 80% of the ventilatory anaerobic
32 threshold [80% VAT]; ii. at VAT; iii. at the respiratory compensation point [RCP]; iv. at
33 exercise peak [Peak] to exhaustion), with or without a triple-layered cloth mask (Mask or No-
34 Mask). Several physiological, metabolic and perceptual measures were analyzed.

35 **Results:** Mask reduced inspiratory capacity at all exercise intensities vs. No-Mask
36 ($p < 0.0001$), irrespective of sex. Mask reduced respiratory frequency vs. No-Mask ($p = 0.001$)
37 at Peak ($-8.3 \text{ breaths} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$; CI: $-5.8, -10.8$), RCP ($-6.9 \text{ breaths} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$; CI: $-4.6, -9.2$) and VAT
38 ($-6.5 \text{ breaths} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$; CI: $-4.1, -8.8$), but not at Baseline or at 80% VAT. Mask also reduced
39 tidal volume ($p < 0.0001$) at both RCP (-0.5 L ; CI: $-0.3, -0.6$) and Peak (-0.8 L ; CI: $-0.6, -0.9$),
40 but not at Baseline, 80% VAT or VAT. Shallow breathing index was increased with Mask at
41 Peak compared to No-Mask (11.3 ; CI: $7.5, 15.1$), but not at any other intensities. Mask did
42 not change heart rate, lactate, ratings of perceived exertion, blood pressure or oxygen
43 saturation.

44 **Conclusions:** Wearing a cloth facemask during exercise at moderate to heavy intensities is
45 unlikely to incur significant respiratory or cardiovascular changes, irrespective of sex. These
46 data can inform new exercise recommendations for health during the COVID-19 pandemic
47 and debunk unfounded allegations of harmful effects of masks during exercise.
48 ClinicalTrials.gov: NCT04887714

49

50 **Key-words:** physical activity; mask; COVID-19 pandemic; oxygen saturation; lactate.

51 **What are the new findings?**

- 52 ✓ Using a progressive square-wave test, we showed that wearing a cloth facemask
53 during exercise increased breathing difficulty, but this was dependent upon the
54 exercise intensity.
- 55 ✓ Respiratory variables (e.g., inspiratory capacity, respiratory frequency, shallow
56 breathing index) were affected at higher rather than lower intensities.
- 57 ✓ Mask wearing did not change heart rate, lactate, ratings of perceived exertion, blood
58 pressure or oxygen saturation at any exercise intensity.
- 59 ✓ There were no substantial sex differences on the effects of mask wearing during
60 exercise.

61

62 **How might it impact on clinical practice in the future?**

- 63 ✓ These data can debunk unfounded allegations on harmful effects of masks during
64 exercise, and help inform new exercise recommendations for health during the
65 COVID-19 pandemic, particularly where facemasks remain necessary.

66 **Introduction**

67 The use of face masks has been deemed as one of the most effective non-pharmacological
68 strategy to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infections [1, 2]. Owing to increasing vaccine coverage,
69 masks mandates have been eased by several governments; however, the resurgence of cases
70 and deaths in Europe and the US has led to some decision-makers to re-issue mask orders to
71 contain the disease, suggesting that this safety tool will remain important as long as the
72 pandemic is not fully mitigated [3]. Furthermore, several cultures employed facemasks as a
73 routine practice to protect against health threats prior to the COVID-19 pandemic [4], and
74 will likely to continue to do so long after it is under control. Wearing a face mask is
75 recommended even during exercise, particularly for indoor activities at fitness facilities and
76 gyms, where COVID-19 outbreaks have been reported [5]. Nevertheless, the physiological
77 impact of facemasks during exercise remains underexplored.

78

79 A facemask may reduce the ability to breathe comfortably during exercise, which has been
80 confirmed by a few [6, 7], but not all [8] studies. Specifically, Driver et al. [6] showed that
81 cloth facemasks decreased time-to-exhaustion and maximal oxygen uptake (VO_{2max}) in non-
82 trained individuals, a response attributed to perceived discomfort associated with the
83 facemask. However, it is possible to conjecture that the effects of wearing a mask on
84 cardiorespiratory responses may manifest during exhaustive high-intensity exercise, but not
85 (or less) during low- to moderate-intensity exercise. In fact, Driver et al. [6] provide
86 preliminary evidence that the effect of wearing a facemask is dependent on exercise intensity,
87 showing that differences in oxygen saturation (SpO_2), ratings of perceived exertion (RPE)
88 and dyspnoea occurred at different stages of an incremental cardiopulmonary test (Bruce
89 protocol) as exercise intensity increased. However, short-stage maximal incremental tests do
90 not normalize the physiological responses to exercise in relation to the gas exchange and

91 blood acid-base profiles [9 10], since %VO_{2max} at the ventilatory thresholds largely varies
92 between individuals [9], hampering the accurate determination of exercise intensities and
93 ultimately confounding data interpretation [10, 11]. To overcome this limitation, constant-
94 load tests (*i.e.*, square-wave protocols) based on the dynamic behaviour of the pulmonary gas
95 exchange and blood acid-base status have been recommended to accurately determine
96 exercise intensity domains (*i.e.*, moderate, heavy, severe, and extreme) [10]. This approach
97 has the potential to enable the investigation of whether facemasks affect physiological and
98 perceptual parameters at different, well-defined exercise intensities, helping tailor exercise
99 prescription for health that can minimize any negative effects of wearing a mask on
100 cardiorespiratory responses.

101

102 Another remaining question is whether women and men respond differently to mask wearing
103 during exercise. Generally, women have smaller lungs and airways, which limits their ability
104 to generate expiratory flow [12, 13], which results in reduced ventilation during exercise
105 compared to men. Women also have lower oxygen (O₂) carrying capacity, maximum cardiac
106 output, and arteriovenous O₂ difference [14]. Considering the number of physiological and
107 morphological sex differences to exercise, one could speculate that any physiological
108 perturbations brought about wearing a mask during exercise could be greater in women, since
109 men have an overall higher cardiorespiratory reserve.

110

111 This study aimed to investigate whether wearing a cloth facemask could affect physiological
112 and perceptual responses to exercise at distinct exercise intensities in non-trained individuals.
113 A secondary aim was to test whether sex differences exist to the use of mask during exercise.

114

115

116 **Methods**

117 *Ethics statement*

118 The protocol was approved by the institutional ethics committee. Written informed consent
119 was obtained before participants' enrollment.

120

121 *Study design and setting*

122 This was crossover study (clinicaltrials.gov: NCT04887714) performed at an intrahospital,
123 exercise physiology laboratory in São Paulo, Brazil.

124

125 *Participants*

126 Men and women not engaged in competitive sports (*e.g.*, non-trained) were eligible for this
127 study. Exclusion criteria included any cardiac, pulmonary, and rheumatologic diseases,
128 musculoskeletal limitations, or a Body Mass Index (BMI) <18.5 or >30 kg/m². A total of 18
129 men and 20 women entered the study, although 3 dropped out for reasons unrelated to the
130 study. Thirty-five individuals (17 men and 18 women) completed all main sessions (age:
131 women: 28 ± 5 y, men: 30 ± 4 y; BMI: women: 22.9 ± 2.0 kg·m², men: 24.5 ± 2.6 kg·m²) and
132 were analyzed. According the short form of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire
133 (IPAQ) instrument [15], 31 participants were physically active, whereas 4 were inactive.

134

135 *Experimental design*

136 Participants attended the laboratory on three separate occasions, separated by a minimum of
137 48 h, at the same time of day to account for circadian variation [16]. The first visit consisted
138 of an incremental cardiopulmonary running test to exhaustion to determine maximal oxygen
139 uptake ($\dot{V}\square O_{2max}$) and ventilatory thresholds to determine the running speeds for the
140 subsequent sessions. The remaining two main visits consisted of a running progressive

141 square-wave test (PSWT), performed with or without the use of a triple-layered antiviral
142 cloth mask (Fashion Masks, São Paulo, Brazil). This type of mask was chosen because it is
143 widely accessible, recommended to the general public by the WHO and appropriate for
144 exercise, whereas surgical and N95 masks are not recommended to be worn during exercise
145 ([https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html)
146 [guidance.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html)). The outer layer was a waterproof polyester fabric, the middle layer was a
147 polypropylene filter, and the inner layer was absorbable cotton. The size of the mask was one
148 size fits all and was thus identical for all participants. Athletes were required to keep the
149 mask firmly in place over the nose, mouth, and chin during the entire session. All athletes
150 were habituated to wear a mask during their daily routines due to mandates, but not
151 specifically during exercise. Participants were requested to refrain from strenuous exercise,
152 caffeine and alcohol, and replicated their diet, in the 24 h prior to each visit.

153

154 *Cardiorespiratory Exercise Test*

155 Immediately prior to the cardiorespiratory exercise test, participants performed a pulmonary
156 function test according to the recommendations of the American Thoracic Society [17]. The
157 cardiorespiratory exercise test was performed without a cloth facemask on a motorized
158 treadmill (Centurion 300, Micromed, Brazil) using a ramp protocol. For men, the incremental
159 test started at 5 km·h⁻¹ and increased speed by 1 km·h⁻¹ every minute up to a maximum
160 velocity of 14 km·h⁻¹. For women, the incremental test started at 4 km·h⁻¹ and increased speed
161 by 1 km·h⁻¹ every minute up to a maximum velocity of 13 km·h⁻¹. For those participants who
162 reached these maximal speeds, there was a subsequent increase in inclination (2% each min)
163 until exhaustion. Once the test was terminated, participants performed three min of recovery,
164 namely one minute of active recovery at 5 km·h⁻¹ followed by 2 min of supervised passive
165 recovery. Ventilatory and gas exchange measurements were recorded continuously

166 throughout the test using a breath-by-breath system (MetaLyzer 3B, Cortex, Germany), as
167 was heart rate (HR; ergo PC elite, Micromed, Brazil). Verbal motivation was provided
168 throughout the test. The following criteria were used to define maximal effort: 1) subjective
169 evidence of exhaustion (RPE > 17); and either 2) peak HR \geq 90% age-predicted maximum
170 or 3) maximal respiratory exchange ratio (RER) \geq 1.10 [18]. Peak oxygen uptake ($\dot{V}O_{2peak}$)
171 was determined as the $\dot{V}O_2$ averaged over the final 30 s of the test.

172

173 *Progressive square-wave test (PSWT)*

174 Data from the cardiorespiratory exercise test was used to determine exercise workload for the
175 square wave treadmill test according to the ventilatory anaerobic threshold (VAT) and the
176 respiratory compensation point (RCP). All thresholds were determined by the same
177 respiratory physiologist with clinical experience in the area. The PSWT protocol was
178 performed on a motorized treadmill (Centurion, model 200, Micromed, Brazil) and consisted
179 of three 5-min stages at workloads equivalent to the exercise intensity at 1) 80% VAT, 2)
180 VAT, and 3) RCP. These stages were meant to represent moderate, heavy and severe
181 domains [10] and corresponded to $41 \pm 9\%$, $53 \pm 9\%$ and $81 \pm 8\%$ of $\dot{V}O_{2peak}$ of the
182 volunteers. Participants then completed a final stage to exhaustion at a running speed
183 equivalent to the maximum speed achieved during the cardiorespiratory exercise test (Peak).
184 Following the completion of each stage, a fingerprick blood samples was taken for
185 subsequent lactate analysis. Ventilatory and gas exchange measurements were recorded
186 continuously throughout the test using a breath-by-breath system (MetaLyzer 3B, Cortex,
187 Germany), with the spirometer mask placed over the cloth facemask.

188

189 To determine the effect of PSWT mask on pattern of change of in operating lung volumes we
190 evaluated end-expiratory volume to functional vital capacity ratio (EELV/FVC). Inspiratory

191 capacity was determined at rest and at the end of each exercise stage during the PSWT.
192 Ventilatory constraint was evaluated as the difference between inspiratory capacity at rest and
193 at each exercise workload [19]. Ventilatory efficiency was determined using the ventilatory
194 equivalent for carbon dioxide ($V_{E}/V_{T}CO_{2}$) and end-tidal carbon dioxide pressure ($P_{et}CO_{2}$)
195 during each stage. Breathing pattern was evaluated during each stage using the breathing
196 frequency to tidal volume ratio (BF/TV) ratio [20].

197

198 Ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) were assessed at the end of each stage by asking
199 participants to point to a numbered chart using the 6- to 20-point Borg scale [21]. Heart rate
200 was monitored continuously throughout (ergo PC elite, Micromed, Brazil). A fingertip blood
201 sample was collected at baseline, at the end of each stage and 4-min post-exhaustion for the
202 subsequent analysis of lactate. A small aliquot (20 μ L) of blood was taken and homogenized
203 in a microtube containing the same volume of an ice-cold 2% NaF solution. Samples were
204 centrifuged at 2000 g for 5 min to separate plasma from erythrocytes. Plasma was removed
205 and stored at $-20^{\circ}C$ until analysis. Plasma lactate was determined spectrophotometrically
206 using an enzymatic-colorimetric method as supplied by a commercially available kit (Katal,
207 Interteck, Brazil).

208

209 *Subjective Perception of Discomfort Questionnaire*

210 Participants completed a questionnaire [22] following the completion of the PSWT to rate
211 their perception of ten sensations of discomfort related to the facemask: humidity, heat,
212 breathing resistance, itchiness, tightness, saltiness, feeling unfit, odor and fatigue. They were
213 also required to rate their overall feeling of discomfort related to the facemask rated on a
214 scale from 0 to 10, with 0 to 3 representing “Comfortable”, >3 to 7 representing
215 “Uncomfortable” and >7 representing “Extremely uncomfortable”.

216 *Statistical analyses*

217 Lactate data from 2 individuals (1 male and 1 female) who did not complete the third stage
218 (RCP) were excluded from the RCP and Peak analyses. Furthermore, 2 individuals (1 male
219 and 1 female) reported extreme discomfort with the PSWT mask and stopped exercising
220 before volitional exhaustion; therefore, these were excluded from the Peak analysis for all
221 outcomes. The same 4 individuals were excluded from the TTE analysis. Due to the
222 characteristics of lactate dynamics during incremental exercise, lactate data were log₁₀
223 transformed before mixed model analysis, turning the model into an exponential data mixed
224 model. For any outlying data that were detected, sensitivity analyses were performed to
225 assess the impacts of these data points on the overall analysis. Since all results were
226 unchanged, data points were maintained in all analyses. Whenever outlying data points were
227 considered improbable (e.g., a value of 50 mmHg for systolic blood pressure), they were
228 considered measurement or transcription error and were excluded.

229

230 Repeated measures Mixed Model ANOVAs were performed with condition (Mask vs. No-
231 Mask), sex (females vs. males) and exercise intensity (Baseline [except for RPE], 80% VAT,
232 VAT, RCP, Peak) as fixed factors and individuals as random factors. Exceptions were
233 Spirometry, TTE and Questionnaire related outcomes, which were not repeated at several
234 time points and, therefore, timing was not included as a fixed factor. For TTE data, the model
235 was corrected by treatment order, since participants were not familiarized to the protocol.
236 When a significant main effect or interaction was detected (statistical significance was
237 accepted at $p \leq 0.05$), post-hoc pairwise comparisons were performed with Tukey's
238 adjustment. All analyses were performed with the RStudio software (Rstudio 1.4.11003,
239 PBC, Boston, MA). Mixed models were analyzed using the lmer function of the lmerTest
240 package. Estimated differences and standard errors were obtained from the models with the

241 emmeans function of the emmeans package. Standard errors were then transformed into 95%
242 confidence intervals (CI). All values are expressed as estimated differences and 95% CIs, and
243 data in figures are represented as mean \pm 1 standard deviation. Lactate log₁₀ transformed
244 values were back transformed through exponentiation for the final reporting of data.

245

246 *Patient and Public Involvement statement*

247 Participants were not involved in the design or in performing the study.

248 **Results**

249 Cardiorespiratory Exercise Test

250 Participants' characteristics and respiratory data at the ventilatory thresholds and calculated
251 stages are presented in Table 1.

252

253 **Table 1.** Participants' characteristics and cardiorespiratory data from the cardiopulmonary exercise test.

254 VE/MVV: minute ventilation/maximum voluntary ventilation ratio.

| | Women | Men |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD |
| Age (years) | 28 ± 5 | 30 ± 4 |
| Weight (kg) | 60.9 ± 9.0 | 73.96 ± 8.1 |
| Height (m) | 1.63 ± 0.07 | 1.74 ± 0.07 |
| <u>80% VAT</u> | | |
| Heart rate (bpm) | 115 ± 12 | 109 ± 20 |
| Respiratory exchange ratio | 0.79 ± 0.11 | 0.83 ± 0.07 |
| Minute ventilation (L/min) | 25.4 ± 5.5 | 34.4 ± 10.7 |
| VO₂ absolute (L/min) | 1.01 ± 0.19 | 1.43 ± 0.4 |
| VO₂ relative (ml/kg/min) | 16.2 ± 3.2 | 19.4 ± 6 |
| VO₂ %peak (%) | 42.1 ± 7.9 | 39.8 ± 10.5 |
| <u>VAT</u> | | |
| Heart rate (bpm) | 128 ± 13 | 122 ± 17 |
| Respiratory exchange ratio | 0.85 ± 0.09 | 0.89 ± 0.06 |
| Minute ventilation (L/min) | 32.6 ± 6.4 | 44.7 ± 10.2 |
| VO₂ absolute (L/min) | 1.25 ± 0.21 | 1.83 ± 0.35 |
| VO₂ relative (ml/kg/min) | 20.7 ± 3.5 | 24.9 ± 5.5 |
| VO₂ %peak (%) | 53.6 ± 7.5 | 51.4 ± 9.8 |
| <u>RCP</u> | | |
| Heart rate (bpm) | 168 ± 9 | 161 ± 10 |
| Respiratory exchange ratio | 1.02 ± 0.05 | 1.04 ± 0.05 |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Minute ventilation (L/min) | 64.3 ± 10.9 | 83.5 ± 14.8 |
| VO₂ absolute (L/min) | 2 ± 0.24 | 2.75 ± 0.35 |
| VO₂ relative (ml/kg/min) | 33.1 ± 3.6 | 37.2 ± 4.9 |
| VO₂ %peak (%) | 86.1 ± 8.4 | 77.0 ± 8.0 |

Peak

| | | |
|--|-------------|--------------|
| Heart rate (bpm) | 183 ± 6 | 183 ± 6 |
| Respiratory exchange ratio | 1.18 ± 0.06 | 1.22 ± 0.07 |
| Minute ventilation (L/min) | 95.3 ± 15.3 | 139.4 ± 25.1 |
| VE/MVV | 0.73 ± 0.13 | 0.77 ± 0.16 |
| VO₂ absolute (L/min) | 2.33 ± 0.26 | 3.59 ± 0.45 |
| VO₂ relative (ml/kg/min) | 38.7 ± 4.6 | 48.6 ± 6.3 |

255

256 Progressive square-wave test (PSWT)

257 *Inspiratory capacity (IC)*

258 Mask reduced IC at all exercise intensities (interaction effect condition*timing: F= 8.6, p <
259 0.0001, Figure 1, Panel A) compared to No-Mask irrespective of sex (80%VAT: -0.4 L; CI: -
260 0.2, -0.6; VAT: -0.5 L; CI: -0.4, -0.7; RCP: -0.7 L; CI: -0.5, -0.9; Peak: -1.0 L; CI: -0.8, -1.2),
261 except at Baseline (-0.2 L; CI: 0.0, -0.4).

262

263 *End expiratory lung volume (EELV) and EELV/Forced Vital capacity (EELV/FVC)*

264 Mask did not influence EELV or EELV/FVC, irrespective of exercise intensities and sex (all
265 p ≥ 0.1, Figure 1, Panel B and C).

266

267 *Respiratory Frequency (Rf)*

268 Mask reduced Rf vs. No-Mask (interaction effect of condition*timing: F = 4.6, p = 0.001,
269 Figure 1, Panel D) at Peak (-8.3 breaths·min⁻¹; CI: -5.8, -10.8), RCP (-6.9 breaths·min⁻¹; CI: -
270 4.6, -9.2) and VAT (-6.5 breaths·min⁻¹; CI: -4.1, -8.8), but not at Baseline or at 80%VAT

271 (both $p \geq 0.06$). Rf was reduced similarly in men (-7.5 breaths \cdot min $^{-1}$; CI: $-6.0, -9.0$) and
272 women (-3.4 breaths \cdot min $^{-1}$; CI: $-1.9, -4.9$) with Mask (Figure 1, Panel D).

273

274 *Tidal Volume (VT)*

275 Mask reduced VT (interaction effect of condition*intensity, $F = 18.3$, $p < 0.0001$, Figure 1,
276 Panel E) at both RCP (-0.5 L; CI: $-0.3, -0.6$) and Peak (-0.8 L; CI: $-0.6, -0.9$), but not at
277 Baseline, 80% VAT or VAT (all $p \geq 0.97$). Sex had no influence on the effects of Mask on
278 VT ($p = 0.053$).

279

280 *Tobin index (Rf/VT or shallow breathing index)*

281 Mask increased the Tobin index at Peak compared to No-Mask ($+11.3$; CI: $7.5, 15.1$), but not
282 at any other intensity (all $p \geq 0.4$, interaction effect of condition*intensity: $F = 7.3$, $p <$
283 0.0001). Rf/VT in men was not affected by Mask, whereas it was increased in Mask vs. No-
284 Mask for women (interaction effect of condition*sex: $F = 25.1$, $p < 0.0001$; men: $+1.1$; CI: $-$
285 $1.1, 3.3$; women: $+6.9$; CI: $4.7, 9.1$; Figure 1, Panel F).

286

287 *PetCO₂*

288 Mask increased PetCO₂ at both RCP ($+4.0$ mmHg; CI: $2.8, 5.3$, Figure 1, Panel G) and Peak
289 ($+4.9$ mmHg; CI: $3.5, 6.3$) compared to No-Mask (interaction effect condition*intensity: $F =$
290 6.8 , $p < 0.0001$), but had no effect at Baseline, 80% VAT or VAT (all $p \geq 0.09$). The effect of
291 Mask on PetCO₂ increases was comparable in men ($+3.4$ mmHg; CI: $2.5, 4.2$) and women
292 ($+1.9$ mmHg; CI: $1.1, 2.7$).

293

294 *V_E/V_T CO₂*

295 Mask reduced VE/VCO₂ at the three highest intensities compared to No-Mask (interaction
296 effect of condition*intensity, $F = 3.7$, $p = 0.006$): VAT (-2.2; CI: -0.9, -3.5), RCP (-3.2; CI:
297 -1.9, -4.5), and Peak (-4.4; CI: -3.0, -5.8) (Figure 1, Panel H), irrespective of sex.

298

299 *Heart rate during exercise (HR)*

300 No effects of Mask at any exercise intensity were seen for HR. Despite an interaction effect
301 of condition*sex for HR ($F = 4.6$, $p = 0.03$), post-hoc comparisons did not show any
302 significant differences (all $p \geq 0.4$). (Figure 2, Panel A).

303

304 *Lactate*

305 Mask did not affect lactate measures at any exercise intensities, irrespective of sex (Figure 2,
306 Panel B).

307

308 *Ratings of Perceived Exertion (RPE)*

309 Mask did not influence RPE at any exercise intensity. However, compared to No-Mask, Mask
310 increased RPE for men, but not women (interaction effect of condition*sex, $F = 6.2$, $p = 0.01$,
311 men: +1.4; CI: 0.9, 2.0; women: +0.4; CI: -0.1, 1.0; Figure 2, Panel C).

312

313 *Blood pressure*

314 Mask did not affect both systolic or diastolic blood pressure at any exercise intensity (Figure
315 2, Panel D and E), regardless of sex.

316

317 *Oxygen saturation (SatO₂)*

318 Mask did not affect SatO₂ at any exercise intensity (Figure 2, Panel F), regardless of sex.

319

320 *Time-to-exhaustion (TTE)*

321 Mask reduced TTE compared to No-Mask (-34.5 s; CI: -17.0, -52.1; main effect of condition:
322 F = 14.9, p = 0.0007, Figure 3), with no condition*sex interaction.

323

324 *Forced Vital Capacity at rest (FVC)*

325 Mask reduced FVC compared to No-Mask (-1.8L; CI: -1.1, -1.5; condition: F = 117.7, p <
326 0.0001), with no condition*sex interaction (Table 2).

327

328 *Forced expiratory volume in 1 second at rest (FEV1)*

329 Mask reduced FEV1 compared to No-Mask (-1.2; CI: -1.0, -1.4; main effect of condition: F =
330 156.2, p < 0.0001), with no condition*sex interaction (Table 2).

331

332 *FVC/FEV1 at rest (FVC by FEV1 ratio)*

333 Mask did not influence the FVC/FEV1 ratio, irrespective of sex (Table 2).

334

335 *Peak expiratory flow at rest (PEF)*

336 Mask reduced PEF compared to No-Mask (-3.4; CI: -2.8, -4.0, main effect of condition: F =
337 122.1, p < 0.0001), independently of sex (Table 2).

338

339 *Subjective perception questionnaire*

340 Mask increased the subjective feelings of Heat, Misfitting, Discomfort, Fatigue, Resistance,
341 Saltiness and Humidity (all p ≤ 0.01), but did not affect feelings of Saltiness, Tightness or
342 Itchiness (all p ≥ 0.1). No interaction between condition and sex was detected (Table 2).

343 **Table 2.** Spirometry at rest and subjective questionnaire outcomes.


| | Women | | Men | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Mask | No-Mask | Mask | No-Mask |
| | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD |
| <u>Spirometry</u> | | | | |
| FEV1 (L)^{\$!} | 3.4 ± 0.4 | 2.3 ± 0.5 | 4.5 ± 0.5 | 3.2 ± 0.6 |
| FVC (L)^{\$!} | 3.8 ± 0.6 | 2.6 ± 0.6 | 5 ± 0.7 | 3.7 ± 0.7 |
| FVC/FEV1(%) | 90.7 ± 7.7 | 90.5 ± 7.2 | 90.8 ± 6.7 | 87.3 ± 8.4 |
| PEF (L/s)^{\$!} | 7.7 ± 1.8 | 4.4 ± 1.1 | 9.2 ± 1.9 | 5.7 ± 1.6 |
| <u>Questionnaire</u> | | | | |
| Tightness | 3.4 ± 2.4 | 4.2 ± 3.4 | 2.5 ± 2.2 | 3.4 ± 2.5 |
| Heat^{\$} | 3.6 ± 2.1 | 6.2 ± 2.5 | 3.3 ± 2.2 | 5.9 ± 2.3 |
| Itchiness | 0.8 ± 1.1 | 1.1 ± 2.2 | 1.6 ± 2.7 | 2.8 ± 3.1 |
| Misfitting^{\$} | 1.8 ± 2.3 | 2.6 ± 2.5 | 1.6 ± 2.1 | 4.1 ± 2.7 |
| Discomfort^{\$} | 4.5 ± 1.4 | 7.9 ± 2.3 | 4.2 ± 2.9 | 7.1 ± 2.6 |
| Fatigue^{\$} | 5.2 ± 3.1 | 8.2 ± 1.8 | 5 ± 2.6 | 8.6 ± 2.4 |
| Odour | 1.2 ± 2.4 | 0.9 ± 1.8 | 0.9 ± 1.3 | 1.7 ± 2.4 |
| Resistance^{\$} | 3.4 ± 2.3 | 8.6 ± 1.2 | 4 ± 2.8 | 8.4 ± 1.3 |
| Saltiness^{\$!} | 0.3 ± 0.5 | 0.7 ± 1.6 | 1 ± 1.8 | 2.7 ± 3.5 |
| Humidity^{\$} | 3.7 ± 2.6 | 5.3 ± 2.3 | 4.1 ± 1.9 | 6.6 ± 2.4 |

344 FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC, forced vital capacity; FVCbyFEV1,

345 forced vital capacity by FEV1 ratio; PEF, peak expiratory flow.

346 Significance labels: ^{\$}, main effect of condition; [!], main effect of sex; [&], interaction effect

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




347

348 **Figure 1.** Inspiratory capacity, end expiratory lung volume (EELV), EELV by forced vital
 349 capacity ratio (EELV/FVC), respiratory frequency, tidal volume, respiratory frequency by
 350 tidal volume, CO₂ partial pressure (PetCO₂) and ventilatory equivalent for carbon dioxide
 351 (V_E/VCO₂) data expressed as mean ± 1 standard deviation.

352 \$ main effect of Mask; ! main effect of intensity; & main effect of sex; * condition*intensity
 353 interaction; ♂ condition*intensity interaction for men; ♀ condition*intensity interaction for
 354 women.


It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



355

356 **Figure 2.** Heart rate, lactate, rating of perceived effort (RPE), systolic (SBP) and diastolic
357 (DBP), and oxygen saturation (SatO₂) expressed as mean ± 1 standard deviation.

358 \$ main effect of Mask; ! main effect of intensity; & main effect of sex; ♂ condition*intensity
359 interaction for men.



360

361 **Figure 3.** Time-to-exhaustion during the final stage. Dashed lines connect individual
362 performance data between No-Mask and Mask condition.

363 \$ main effect of Mask

364 **Discussion**

365 The present study showed that breathing difficulty with a cloth facemask is dependent upon
366 the exercise intensity, with lower distress at less severe intensities. In addition, mask wearing
367 did not substantially affect physiological or metabolic variables during exercise, regardless of
368 sex and intensity. From a practical perspective, during periods of uncontrolled COVID-19
369 spread, these data suggest that use of a cloth facemask for protecting individuals from SARS-
370 CoV-2 infections should not be a barrier to the engagement in adequate levels of physical
371 activity.

372

373 The main novelty of the current study is that we assessed the influence of wearing a mask on
374 respiratory and cardiovascular variables across several exercise intensities, spanning
375 moderate to severe domains assessed according to an accurate exercise protocol (*i.e.*, PSWT)
376 [10]. Wearing a mask did not modify most respiratory variables in the moderate to heavy
377 exercise domains, with only inspiratory capacity being reduced at 80%VAT with the mask.
378 Our findings suggest that the observed reductions in inspiratory capacity early in exercise are
379 reflective of a decrease in contractile power of the inspiratory muscles. This inspiratory
380 distress may place a greater strain on the respiratory muscles to maintain breathing
381 requirements during exercise. This was not seen in the moderate to heavy domains but was
382 manifested in an inability to maintain the physiological increases in respiratory frequency and
383 tidal volume at the higher intensities. For example, during VAT, although breathing
384 frequency was reduced, this was likely compensated by increases in tidal volume as
385 evidenced by no differences between conditions, suggesting that the cloth facemask did not
386 negatively inhibit the ability of the respiratory system to work at moderate, heavy and severe
387 exercise intensities. At higher intensities, however, both respiratory frequency and tidal
388 volume were reduced with a mask, which may have led to an inability to maintain respiratory

389 homeostasis and affected subsequent performance. Indeed, this might explain the reduced
390 $V_{\dot{E}}/V_{\dot{I}}CO_2$ with a mask which was evident from VAT. These mechanisms combined could
391 explain the reduced TTE at Peak with a mask. Our data are in agreement with previous
392 studies showing a reduced exercise capacity with different facemasks [6 22], though other
393 studies have shown no negative impact [8, 23]. It is possible that different types of masks and
394 respirators (e.g., FFP2/N95, surgical, cloth facemasks) and participants' fitness level may
395 have contributed to these conflicting findings.

396

397 It is important to highlight that, despite changes in these respiratory variables, no
398 cardiovascular measure was affected using a cloth facemask. Even during the highest
399 exercise intensity domains, there were no changes in heart rate, or systolic and diastolic blood
400 pressure when wearing a cloth facemask. In addition, despite an overall slight reduction in
401 blood oxygen saturation, there were no differences at individual exercise intensities while
402 absolute differences were not clinically meaningful; thus, it is unlikely that this reduction
403 could lead to harmful events. Our results complement previous studies showing no effect of
404 wearing a facemask on oxygen saturation during exercises of varying intensities [24, 25]. In
405 particular, the current study employed a three-layer cloth facemask (as per WHO
406 recommendations) that is inexpensive and widely available to the general population, which
407 makes the current data of great applicability. Also, the findings can be used to counteract the
408 misinformation during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic [26, 27], particularly relating to the
409 use of masks during exercise and its supposed negative effects on cardiac overload, acid-base
410 balance, and oxygen saturation [28].

411

412 In this study, we also speculated that any potential physiological effects associated with
413 wearing a mask during exercise could be greater in women, who have an overall lower higher

414 cardiorespiratory reserve than men, owing to classically described morphological and
415 physiological sex-differences (e.g., smaller lungs, lower O₂ carrying capacity and maximum
416 cardiac output, etc). This hypothesis was not confirmed, as the effects of the cloth facemask
417 on physiological measures were in general similar between women and men irrespective of
418 exercise intensities. Furthermore, exercise capacity in the severe exercise domain was
419 reduced by 23.9% in women and 17.8% in men when using a cloth facemask, with no
420 differences between sexes. It is possible to conjecture that the stress imposed by wearing a
421 mask does not constitute a greater physiological or metabolic burden to women vs. men, even
422 at higher exercise intensities, despite the well-known sex-differences during exercise.

423

424 There are several strengths and limitations with the current study. Although the measurement
425 of respiratory variables during the PSWT provided novel information regarding the
426 respiratory response during different intensities, this meant that participants were required to
427 wear a facemask for breath-by-breath measures over the cloth facemask. This may have
428 increased the discomfort felt by the participants and may also have led to some inaccuracies
429 in measurements due to air escaping. We ensured that the masks were fitted as comfortably
430 and tightly as possible to avoid these issues as best as possible, but it cannot be ruled out that
431 this contributed somewhat to the current results. The current data cannot be directly
432 extrapolated to trained individuals; however, we felt it important to investigate this matter
433 among a non-trained population, as there has been an intense debate on the physiological
434 repercussions and potential adverse effects of face masks in recreationally trained individuals.
435 Since sufficient levels of physical activity prevent morbidities and mortality [29-31] and
436 improve vaccine immunogenicity [32], it is important that mask mandates do not lead to a
437 reduction in physical activity. In this regard, the present data provide relevant information
438 that wearing a cloth facemask may have some impact at severe to extreme exercise

439 intensities, but it will not have a negative impact during exercise at moderate-to-heavy
440 intensities, which are associated with a plethora of health-related benefits [33, 34]. Whether
441 the negative perpetual feelings related to the use of masks may result in less adherence to
442 exercise remains to be examined. Furthermore, the influence of mask wearing during exercise
443 in clinical populations warrants investigation.

444

445 In conclusion, wearing a cloth facemask during exercise performed at moderate to heavy
446 exercise intensities is unlikely to incur significant respiratory or cardiovascular changes.
447 However, severe and extreme intensity exercise may be negatively influenced by a cloth
448 facemask and individuals should be aware that this may lead to a reduced exercise capacity.
449 These data have important practical implications as they can debunk unfounded allegations of
450 harmful effects of cloth facemasks during exercise, and help inform new exercise
451 recommendations for health during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly where facemasks
452 remain necessary.

453 **Acknowledgments**

454 The authors would like to thank all of the athletes for taking part in this research. The authors
455 received no specific funding for this work. B.G (2017/13552-2), G.B. (2020/12036-3),
456 T.N.O. (2020/04368-6) and B.S. (2016/50438-0) have been financially supported by
457 Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo. B.S. has also received a grant from
458 Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo (2020.1.362.5.2).

459 **References**

- 460 1. Clase CM, Fu EL, Joseph M, et al. Cloth Masks May Prevent Transmission of COVID-19:
461 An Evidence-Based, Risk-Based Approach. *Annals of internal medicine*
462 2020;**173**(6):489-91 doi: 10.7326/M20-2567[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 463 2. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and
464 efficacy of face masks. *Nature medicine* 2020;**26**(5):676-80 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-
465 0843-2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 466 3. Stephenson J. CDC Studies Underscore Continued Importance of Masks to Prevent
467 Coronavirus Spread. *JAMA Health Forum* 2021;**2**(2):e210207-e07 doi:
468 10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.0207[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 469 4. Burgess A, Horii M. Risk, ritual and health responsabilisation: Japan's 'safety blanket' of
470 surgical face mask-wearing. *Sociology of health & illness* 2012;**34**(8):1184-98 doi:
471 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2012.01466.x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 472 5. Groves LM, Usagawa L, Elm J, et al. Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 at Three
473 Fitness Facilities — Hawaii, June–July 2020. *MMWR and Morbidity and Mortality*
474 *Weekly Report* 2021;**70**:316-20
- 475 6. Driver S, Reynolds M, Brown K, et al. Effects of wearing a cloth face mask on
476 performance, physiological and perceptual responses during a graded treadmill
477 running exercise test. *Br J Sports Med* 2021 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-
478 103758[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 479 7. Fikenzer S, Uhe T, Lavall D, et al. Effects of surgical and FFP2/N95 face masks on
480 cardiopulmonary exercise capacity. *Clinical research in cardiology : official journal of*
481 *the German Cardiac Society* 2020;**109**(12):1522-30 doi: 10.1007/s00392-020-01704-
482 y[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 483 8. Shaw K, Butcher S, Ko J, et al. Wearing of Cloth or Disposable Surgical Face Masks has
484 no Effect on Vigorous Exercise Performance in Healthy Individuals. *Int J Environ*
485 *Res Public Health* 2020;**17**(21) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17218110[published Online First:
486 Epub Date]].
- 487 9. Coyle EF, Coggan AR, Hopper MK, et al. Determinants of endurance in well-trained
488 cyclists. *J Appl Physiol* (1985) 1988;**64**(6):2622-30 doi:
489 10.1152/jappl.1988.64.6.2622[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 490 10. Burnley M, Jones AM. Oxygen uptake kinetics as a determinant of sports performance.
491 *Eur J Sport Sci* 2007;**7**(2):63-79 doi: 10.1080/17461390701456148[published Online
492 First: Epub Date]].

- 493 11. Whipp BJ, Ward SA, Rossiter HB. Pulmonary O₂ uptake during exercise: conflating
494 muscular and cardiovascular responses. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;**37**(9):1574-85
495 doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000177476.63356.22[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 496 12. Duke JW. Sex Hormones and Their Impact on the Ventilatory Responses to Exercise and
497 the Environment. In: Hackney AC, ed. *Sex Hormones, Exercise and Women: Scientific and Clinical Aspects*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017:19-34.
- 498 13. Freedson P, Katch VL, Sady S, et al. Cardiac output differences in males and females
499 during mild cycle ergometer exercise. *Medicine and science in sports* 1979;**11**(1):16-9
- 500 14. Lewis DA, Kamon E, Hodgson JL. Physiological differences between genders.
501 Implications for sports conditioning. *Sports Med* 1986;**3**(5):357-69 doi:
502 10.2165/00007256-198603050-00005[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 503 15. Hagstromer M, Oja P, Sjostrom M. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire
504 (IPAQ): a study of concurrent and construct validity. *Public health nutrition*
505 2006;**9**(6):755-62 doi: 10.1079/phn2005898[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 506 16. Atkinson G, Reilly T. Circadian variation in sports performance. *Sports Med*
507 1996;**21**(4):292-312 doi: 10.2165/00007256-199621040-00005[published Online
508 First: Epub Date]].
- 509 17. Graham BL, Steenbruggen I, Miller MR, et al. Standardization of Spirometry 2019
510 Update. An Official American Thoracic Society and European Respiratory Society
511 Technical Statement. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*
512 2019;**200**(8):e70-e88 doi: 10.1164/rccm.201908-1590ST[published Online First:
513 Epub Date]].
- 514 18. Howley ET, Bassett DR, Jr., Welch HG. Criteria for maximal oxygen uptake: review and
515 commentary. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1995;**27**(9):1292-301
- 516 19. Guenette JA, Chin RC, Cory JM, et al. Inspiratory Capacity during Exercise:
517 Measurement, Analysis, and Interpretation. *Pulmonary medicine* 2013;**2013**:956081
518 doi: 10.1155/2013/956081[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 519 20. Neder JA, Andreoni S, Lerario MC, et al. Reference values for lung function tests: II.
520 Maximal respiratory pressures and voluntary ventilation. *Brazilian Journal of Medical
521 and Biological Research [online]* 1999;**32**(6):719-27 doi: 10.1590/S0100-
522 879X1999000600007[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 523 21. Borg GA. Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. *Medicine and science in sports and
524 exercise* 1982;**14**(5):377-81
525

- 526 22. Li Y, Tokura H, Guo YP, et al. Effects of wearing N95 and surgical facemasks on heart
527 rate, thermal stress and subjective sensations. *International archives of occupational*
528 *and environmental health* 2005;**78**(6):501-9 doi: 10.1007/s00420-004-0584-
529 4[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 530 23. Epstein D, Korytny A, Isenberg Y, et al. Return to training in the COVID-19 era: The
531 physiological effects of face masks during exercise. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*
532 2021;**31**(1):70-75 doi: 10.1111/sms.13832[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 533 24. Shaw KA, Zello GA, Butcher SJ, et al. The impact of face masks on performance and
534 physiological outcomes during exercise: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Appl*
535 *Physiol Nutr Metab* 2021:1-11 doi: 10.1139/apnm-2021-0143[published Online First:
536 Epub Date]].
- 537 25. Fukushi I, Nakamura M, Kuwana S-i. Effects of wearing facemasks on the sensation of
538 exertional dyspnea and exercise capacity in healthy subjects. *PloS one*
539 2021;**16**(9):e0258104 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0258104[published Online First:
540 Epub Date]].
- 541 26. Kouzy R, Abi Jaoude J, Kraitem A, et al. Coronavirus Goes Viral: Quantifying the
542 COVID-19 Misinformation Epidemic on Twitter. *Cureus* 2020;**12**(3):e7255 doi:
543 10.7759/cureus.7255[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 544 27. Roozenbeek J, Schneider CR. Susceptibility to misinformation about COVID-19 around
545 the world. 2020;**7**(10):201199 doi: 10.1098/rsos.201199[published Online First: Epub
546 Date]].
- 547 28. Chandrasekaran B, Fernandes S. “Exercise with facemask; Are we handling a devil's
548 sword?” – A physiological hypothesis. *Medical Hypotheses* 2020;**144**:110002 doi:
549 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110002>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 550 29. Lavie CJ, Ozemek C, Carbone S, et al. Sedentary Behavior, Exercise, and Cardiovascular
551 Health. *Circulation research* 2019;**124**(5):799-815 doi:
552 10.1161/circresaha.118.312669[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 553 30. Fiuza-Luces C, Garatachea N, Berger NA, et al. Exercise is the real polypill. *Physiology*
554 (Bethesda, Md) 2013;**28**(5):330-58 doi: 10.1152/physiol.00019.2013[published
555 Online First: Epub Date]].
- 556 31. Mok A, Khaw KT, Luben R, et al. Physical activity trajectories and mortality: population
557 based cohort study. 2019;**365**:l2323 doi: 10.1136/bmj.l2323[published Online First:
558 Epub Date]].

- 559 32. Gualano B, Lemes I, Silva R, et al. Physical activity associates with enhanced
560 immunogenicity of an inactivated virus vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in patients with
561 autoimmune rheumatic diseases: Research Square, 2021.
- 562 33. Gebel K, Ding D, Chey T, et al. Effect of Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity on All-
563 Cause Mortality in Middle-aged and Older Australians. *JAMA Internal Medicine*
564 2015;**175**(6):970-77 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0541[published Online First:
565 Epub Date]].
- 566 34. Hupin D, Roche F, Gremeaux V, et al. Even a low-dose of moderate-to-vigorous physical
567 activity reduces mortality by 22% in adults aged ≥ 60 years: a systematic review and
568 meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;**49**(19):1262-67 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-
569 094306[published Online First: Epub Date]].

570