

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**Changes in health promoting behavior during COVID-19 physical distancing: Utilizing WHOOP data to Examine Trends in Sleep, Activity, and Cardiovascular Health.**

Emily R Capodilupo<sup>1</sup> and Dean J Miller<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Whoop, Inc., Department of Data Science and Research, Boston, Massachusetts

<sup>2</sup> Central Queensland University, Appleton Institute for Behavioral Science, Adelaide, South Australia

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to:

Dean J. Miller, Appleton Institute for Behavioral Science, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.

Tel: +61 8378 4523. Email: [d.j.miller@cqu.edu.au](mailto:d.j.miller@cqu.edu.au)

## 22 **Abstract**

23 The COVID-19 pandemic incited global and unprecedented restrictions on the behavior of society.  
24 The aims of this study were to quantify changes to sleep/wake behavior and exercise patterns (e.g.,  
25 exercise frequency, modality, and intensity), and the subsequent impact on physiological markers  
26 of health (e.g., total sleep duration, social jet lag, resting heart rate, and heart rate variability) with  
27 the introduction of physical distancing mandates and recommendations. A retrospective analysis  
28 of 50,000 subscribers to the WHOOP platform (mean age =  $36.6 \pm 10.5$ ; 11,956 females, 38,044  
29 males) was conducted covering the period from January 1st, 2020 through May 15th, 2020. In  
30 order to make robust comparisons, this time period was separated into a 68 day baseline period  
31 and a 67 day physical distancing period – with a total of 6.3 million sleeps and 4.9 million exercise  
32 sessions analyzed. As compared to baseline, during physical distancing, all subjects analyzed in  
33 this study dedicated more time to sleep (+0.21 hours), fell asleep earlier (-0.43 hours), woke up  
34 earlier (-0.29 hours), obtained more sleep (+0.19 hours) and reduced social jet lag (-0.23 hours).  
35 Subjects also increased exercise frequency by an average of 1.1% and increased exercise intensity  
36 by spending an average of 1.8% more time in the three highest heart rate zones. These changes to  
37 sleep and exercise behavior may have contributed to the observed lowered resting heart rate (-0.9  
38 beats per minute) and increased heart rate variability (+1.3 milliseconds) during physical  
39 distancing. A potential explanation for these results is that decreases in business hours-based  
40 commitments during physical distancing may have resulted in increased opportunity to engage in  
41 exercise and prioritize sleep. Therefore, as the COVID-19 pandemic eases, maintenance of certain  
42 aspects of physical distancing (e.g., flexibility to work from home) may result in a healthier  
43 population.

## 44 **Introduction**

45 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the virus responsible for the  
46 COVID-19 pandemic [1], has caused significant social and economic disruptions and has altered  
47 the behavior of society. Millions of employees and business owners have stopped working or  
48 shifted to working from home rather than commuting into offices. Physical distancing protocols  
49 put in place to reduce disease transmission have also precluded previously common forms of group  
50 leisure and athletic activities. Exercise and sleep are two primary behaviors that may have been  
51 impacted by COVID-19 restrictions - with individuals confined to their homes and likely having  
52 increased opportunity to perform daily exercise and acquire more sleep.

53 Changes in sleep/wake behavior can have meaningful implications on health. Insufficient  
54 sleep duration has been shown to correlate with impairments to cognitive performance [2], insulin  
55 sensitivity [3] and diabetes [4], cardiovascular disease [5], impairments to mental health [6], and  
56 reduced physical performance [7]. Increasing sleep quantity has been shown to reverse many of  
57 these effects; for example, increases in sleep quantity have been shown to drive changes in  
58 attention [8] and stress hormone expression [9] even within already healthy populations. Changes  
59 in sleep timing and the consistency of bedtimes and wake times also have profound effects on  
60 wellbeing, with benefits seen when a consistent sleep schedule is maintained [10]. These benefits  
61 are understood to be related to the circadian rhythm; shifting sleep timing decouples the circadian  
62 rhythm from the sleep/wake rhythm [11, 12], causing adverse health outcomes such as higher rates  
63 of cardiovascular disease [13] and breast cancer [14].

64 Physical distancing mandates brought with them temporary closure of gyms, banning of  
65 team sports, and cancelations of competitive seasons, which in turn forced a shift in the way we  
66 exercise and the types of exercise we have access to. These sudden changes have a variety of

67 potential effects on fitness. For example, one study showed that women who participated in  
68 multiple exercise modalities had higher muscular endurance than women who participated in only  
69 one athletic activity [15]. Other studies suggest that rapid introduction of new exercise modalities,  
70 such as running, could lead to an increase in athletic injuries [16]. Sudden changes in the exercise  
71 modalities performed by individuals may also result in changes to exercise intensity (e.g.,  
72 transitioning from weight training to running). Therefore, if COVID-19 restrictions do provide  
73 more opportunity for exercise, increases in exercise frequency and intensity may result in  
74 beneficial cardiovascular adaptations [17]. Understanding how the distribution of time spent in  
75 each heart rate zone is perhaps as important as understanding how total exercise and exercise  
76 modality changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this context, wearable technology can  
77 be leveraged to provide a unique insight into health related behavior and subsequent health  
78 outcomes in large population cohorts.

79 The WHOOP strap (Whoop, Inc., Boston, MA, USA) is a commercially available wearable  
80 device that has been third-party validated to measure sleep, resting heart rate (RHR), heart rate  
81 variability (HRV), and respiratory rate [18]. Previous research has shown that metrics such as RHR  
82 [19] and HRV [20] are powerful indicators of physical health. Conditions brought forth by the  
83 pandemic create a natural testing ground in which to examine whether changes in cardiovascular  
84 health, as measured by decreases in RHR and increases in HRV, can occur due to changes in sleep  
85 and exercise behavior.

86 This study is the first to quantify the impact on health related behaviors – specifically sleep  
87 timing and duration and exercise frequency, intensity, and modality – of the COVID-19 pandemic  
88 and its associated physical distancing mandates. This study also explores the physical outcomes of

89 these changes in behavior by examining markers of physical health, including sleep duration,  
90 RHR, and HRV.

## 91 **Materials and Methods**

92 This study conducted a retrospective analysis of health-related behavior before and during  
93 COVID-19 physical distancing restrictions. 50,000 WHOOP members (mean age =  $36.6 \pm 10.5$ ;  
94 11,956 females, 38,044 males) meeting the study's inclusion criteria were randomly selected from  
95 the WHOOP subscriber-base. Inclusion criteria were (1) having recorded sleeps for at least 120 of  
96 the 135 (89%) days and (2) be between the ages of 18 and 80 on May 15th, 2020, when data was  
97 extracted for analysis. The study was approved by the Central Queensland University Human  
98 Research Ethics Committee.

99 The period between January 1, 2020 and March 9th, 2020 was classified as a baseline  
100 period, while the period from March 10th, 2020 through May 15th, 2020 was classified as the  
101 physical distancing period. While no single date globally separates pre- and post-physical  
102 distancing, delineation of the data on March 9th is based on the rough timeline along which most  
103 users would have been subject to some level of physical distancing mandate or recommendation.  
104 During the week of March 9th, the World Health Organization officially classified COVID-19 as  
105 a pandemic [21] and US President, Donald Trump, declared a National State of Emergency [22].  
106 The May 15th physical distancing end date was chosen such that the physical distancing period  
107 analyzed would end before gradual easing physical distancing begins. Additionally, utilizing the  
108 chosen dates to represent physical distancing resulted in similar durations of baseline and physical  
109 distancing (68 and 67 days, respectively).

110

## 111 WHOOP

112 The WHOOP strap (CB Rank, Greater Boston, New England) is a wearable device that collects  
113 continuous heart rate, 3-axis accelerometer, temperature, and 3-axis gyroscope data. In  
114 combination with the WHOOP mobile device app and cloud-analysis platform, a series of  
115 algorithms developed by WHOOP are collectively able to evaluate duration and phases of sleep,  
116 RHR and HRV. Validation of sleep and cardiovascular measures gleaned from WHOOP against  
117 gold standard polysomnography support a low degree of bias and low precision errors [18].

118 The WHOOP strap is capable of automatically detecting exercise and can automatically  
119 identify and classify 54 different modalities. Additionally, users of the WHOOP platform have the  
120 ability to manually log exercise that don't meet the algorithm's criteria for automatic detection.

121 The following variables were obtained from the WHOOP platform:

- 122 ● Sleep opportunity duration: *total time dedicated to sleep each night. Measured primarily*  
123 *through automatic detection in the WHOOP app. Users are alerted each morning when*  
124 *their automatically detected sleep is ready for review and have the ability to edit the start*  
125 *and stop times should any errors occur.*
- 126 ● Social jet lag: *the difference between sleep opportunity onset on weekends (Saturday and*  
127 *Sunday) and weekdays (Monday through Friday) resulting from misalignment between*  
128 *social and internal clocks [23].*
- 129 ● Sleep opportunity onset: *the time that each sleep opportunity was initiated relative to local*  
130 *time zone.*
- 131 ● Sleep opportunity offset: *the time that each sleep opportunity ended relative to local time*  
132 *zone*

- 133       • Sleep duration (hours): *total amount of time spent asleep each night. Measured through*  
134           *automatic detection.*
- 135       • Exercise frequency: *daily proportion of active WHOOP-users recording an exercise*  
136           *session.*
- 137       • Exercise type - *the sport or exercise type chosen for each exercise session. Labeled*  
138           *automatically by the app via a machine learning algorithm or manually by the WHOOP-*  
139           *user.*
- 140       • Exercise intensity: *duration of each of six heart rate zones - Zone 1 = 0-50% heart rate*  
141           *reserve (HRR) ; zone 2 = 50-60% HRR, zone 3 = 60-70% HRR, zone 4 = 70-80% HRR,*  
142           *zone 5 = 80-90% HRR, zone 6 = 90-100% HRR. Measured automatically during the*  
143           *exercise session.*
- 144       • Resting heart rate (beats per minute; bpm) - *the mean value of heart beats per minute*  
145           *sampled during slow wave sleep. Automatically measured during slow wave sleep each*  
146           *night.*
- 147       • Heart rate variability (milliseconds; ms) - *the root-mean-square difference of successive*  
148           *heartbeat intervals sampled during slow wave sleep. Automatically measured during slow*  
149           *wave sleep each night.*

150       Throughout, dates are assigned to sleeps and exercise based on the local time zone's date in  
151       which they end, for example, a sleep beginning in the final hours of January 1st and ending on the  
152       morning of January 2nd is attributed to January 2nd.

## 153   **Data Analysis**

154       All analyses were conducted at the cohort-level with data grouped by age (i.e., 18-19, 20-29, 30-  
155       39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79 years old) and sex (i.e., male and female). Independent non-

156 parametric significance tests (Mann-Whitney U tests) were performed to examine differences in  
157 sleep and exercise variables between the baseline period and the physical distancing period. To  
158 assess the magnitude of the differences between these periods, effect sizes and 95% confidence  
159 limits were also calculated. Effect sizes were interpreted as:  $<0.20$  (trivial), 0.2 to 0.59 (small),  
160 0.60 to 1.19 (moderate), 1.20 to 1.99 (large), and  $>2.0$  (very large) [24]. All analyses were  
161 conducted using Python Language Software (version 3.6.2).

## 162 **Results**

### 163 **Sleep**

164 A summary of sleep/wake behavior for age and gender cohorts are presented in Table 1. For all  
165 subjects, average sleep opportunity duration was significantly longer during physical distancing  
166 when compared to baseline ( $P < 10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.27$ , *large*). When analyzed by cohort, average  
167 sleep opportunity duration was significantly longer during physical distancing when compared to  
168 baseline for 18-19 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-16}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.94$ , *large*), 20-29 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-14}$ ,  
169 Cohen's  $d = 1.92$ , *large*), 30-39 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-7}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.27$ , *large*), 40-49 year-olds  
170 ( $P < 10^{-5}$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.95$ , *moderate*), 50-59 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-5}$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.87$ , *moderate*), 60-  
171 69 year-olds ( $P = 0.0001$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.53$ , *small*), 70-79 year-olds ( $P = 0.16$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.32$ ,  
172 *small*), females ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.44$ , *large*), and males ( $P < 10^{-7}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.21$ , *large*)  
173 (Table 1).

174 For all subjects, average sleep opportunity onset was significantly earlier during physical  
175 distancing when compared to baseline ( $P < 10^{-21}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.61$ , *very large*). When analyzed  
176 by cohort, average sleep opportunity onset was significantly earlier during physical distancing  
177 when compared to baseline for 18-19 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.11$ , *moderate*), 20-29

178 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-15}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.91$ , *large*), 30-39 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-21}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.55$ , *very*  
179 *large*), 40-49 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-21}$ , Cohen's  $d = -3.22$ , *very large*), 50-59 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-21}$ ,  
180 Cohen's  $d = -3.83$ , *very large*), 60-69 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-21}$ , Cohen's  $d = -5.27$ , *very large*), 70-79  
181 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-22}$ , Cohen's  $d = -6.07$ , *very large*), females ( $P < 10^{-21}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.68$ , *very*  
182 *large*), and males ( $P < 10^{-21}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.61$ , *very large*) (Table 1).

183 For all subjects, average sleep opportunity offset was significantly earlier during physical  
184 distancing when compared to baseline ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.10$ , *moderate*). When analyzed by  
185 cohort, average sleep opportunity offset was similar for 18-19 year-olds during baseline and  
186 physical distancing ( $P = 0.016$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.00$ , *trivial*), and significantly earlier in physical  
187 distancing than in baseline for 20-29 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.80$ , *moderate*), 30-39 year-  
188 olds ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.14$ , *moderate*), 40-49 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.25$ , *large*),  
189 50-59 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-10}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.54$ , *large*), 60-69 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-19}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.36$ ,  
190 *very large*), 70-79 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-20}$ , Cohen's  $d = -3.33$ , *very large*), females ( $P < 10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d$   
191  $= -0.95$ , *moderate*), and males ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.14$ , *moderate*) (Table 1).


192

193 Table 1. Sleep/wake behaviour for age and gender cohorts as a function of time period.

Variable	Time period		Outcomes	
	Baseline (M±SD)	Physical distancing (M±SD)	Difference (PD-BL)	Effect size (95% confidence limits)
<b>Sleep opportunity duration (h)</b>				
All subjects	7.64 ± 0.17	7.85 ± 0.16	0.21**	1.27 (0.209, 0.211)
18-19 year-olds	7.88 ± 0.16	8.2 ± 0.17	0.32**	1.94 (0.301, 0.339)
20-29 year-olds	7.71 ± 0.13	7.99 ± 0.16	0.28**	1.92 (0.277, 0.283)
30-39 year-olds	7.61 ± 0.17	7.82 ± 0.16	0.21**	1.27 (0.207, 0.213)
40-49 year-olds	7.56 ± 0.22	7.75 ± 0.18	0.19**	0.95 (0.185, 0.195)
50-59 year-olds	7.62 ± 0.21	7.79 ± 0.18	0.17**	0.87 (0.162, 0.178)
60-69 year-olds	7.8 ± 0.17	7.89 ± 0.17	0.09**	0.53 (0.076, 0.104)
70-79 year-olds	7.82 ± 0.17	7.88 ± 0.2	0.06**	0.32 (0.022, 0.098)
Females	7.79 ± 0.19	8.05 ± 0.17	0.26**	1.44 (0.255, 0.265)
Males	7.59 ± 0.17	7.79 ± 0.16	0.20**	1.21 (0.198, 0.202)
<b>Sleep opportunity onset time</b>				
All subjects	23:07 ± 0:20	22:24 ± 0:12	-0.43**	-2.61 (-0.719, -0.714)
18-19 year-olds	23:42 ± 0:22	23:22 ± 0:13	-0.20**	-1.11 (-0.369, -0.298)
20-29 year-olds	23:27 ± 0:25	22:47 ± 0:16	-0.40**	-1.91 (-0.675, -0.658)
30-39 year-olds	23:06 ± 0:20	22:23 ± 0:13	-0.43**	-2.55 (-0.722, -0.711)
40-49 year-olds	22:54 ± 0:16	22:11 ± 0:10	-0.43**	-3.22 (-0.723, -0.711)
50-59 year-olds	22:45 ± 0:15	21:59 ± 0:08	-0.46**	-3.83 (-0.775, -0.758)
60-69 year-olds	22:31 ± 0:12	21:41 ± 0:06	-0.50**	-5.27 (-0.846, -0.820)
70-79 year-olds	22:41 ± 0:10	21:53 ± 0:05	-0.48**	-6.07 (-0.827, -0.773)
Females	22:52 ± 0:18	22:12 ± 0:11	-0.40**	-2.68 (-0.673, -0.660)
Males	23:12 ± 0:20	22:28 ± 0:13	-0.44**	-2.61 (-0.737, -0.729)
<b>Sleep opportunity offset time</b>				
All subjects	6:48 ± 0:30	6:19 ± 0:22	-0.29*	-1.10 (-0.292, -0.288)
18-19 year-olds	7:37 ± 0:30	7:37 ± 0:21	0.00	0.00 (0.031, -0.031)
20-29 year-olds	7:13 ± 0:33	6:50 ± 0:24	-0.23**	-0.80 (-0.237, -0.223)
30-39 year-olds	6:46 ± 0:30	6:16 ± 0:22	-0.30**	-1.14 (-0.305, -0.295)
40-49 year-olds	6:30 ± 0:28	5:59 ± 0:21	-0.31**	-1.25 (-0.317, -0.303)
50-59 year-olds	6:25 ± 0:26	5:50 ± 0:19	-0.35**	-1.54 (-0.360, -0.340)
60-69 year-olds	6:21 ± 0:21	5:38 ± 0:15	-0.43**	-2.36 (-0.445, -0.415)
70-79 year-olds	6:35 ± 0:14	5:50 ± 0:13	-0.45**	-3.33 (-0.478, -0.422)
Females	6:42 ± 0:29	6:18 ± 0:21	-0.24**	-0.95 (-0.246, -0.234)
Males	6:50 ± 0:30	6:20 ± 0:22	-0.30**	-1.14 (-0.304, -0.296)

194 Notes: BL = baseline; PD = physical distancing; \* = p-value <0.05; \*\* = p-value <0.001.

196



197

198 **Fig 1.** Daily average sleep opportunity onset time and sleep opportunity offset time by age cohort.

199 Each cohort is plotted in a different color, indicated in the legend. Filled circles indicate Sundays;  
200 a gray vertical line separates baseline and physical distancing.

201

202 For all subjects, average sleep duration was significantly longer during physical distancing

203 when compared to baseline ( $P < 10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.31$ , moderate). When analyzed by cohort,

204 average sleep duration was longer during physical distancing when compared to baseline for 18-

205 19 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-16}$ , Cohen's  $d = 2.00$ , very large), 20-29 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-15}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.99$ ,

206 large), 30-39 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.24$ , large), 40-49 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-5}$ , Cohen's  $d =$

207 0.97, moderate), 50-59 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-5}$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.82$ , moderate), 60-69 year-olds

208 ( $P=0.0021$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.40$ , *small*), 70-79 year-olds ( $P=0.46$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.12$ , *trivial*), females  
209 ( $P<10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.37$ , *large*), and males ( $P<10^{-8}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.29$ , *large*) (Table 2).


210 For all subjects, average social jet lag was reduced during physical distancing when  
211 compared to baseline ( $P<10^{-18}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.93$ , *large*). When analyzed by cohort, average social  
212 jet lag was reduced during physical distancing when compared to baseline for 18-19 year-olds  
213 ( $P<10^{-17}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.23$ , *very large*), 20-29 year-olds ( $P<10^{-18}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.33$ , *very large*),  
214 30-39 year-olds ( $P<10^{-18}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.87$ , *very large*), 40-49 year-olds ( $P<10^{-18}$ , Cohen's  $d = -$   
215  $1.87$ , *large*), 50-59 year-olds ( $P<10^{-18}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.58$ , *large*), 60-69 year-olds ( $P<10^{-18}$ ,  
216 Cohen's  $d = -1.58$ , *large*), 70-79 year-olds ( $P<10^{-7}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.31$ , *large*), females ( $P<10^{-18}$ ,  
217 Cohen's  $d = -1.44$ , *large*), and males ( $P<10^{-18}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.95$ , *large*) (Table 2).

218

219 Table 2. Objective sleep outcomes for age and gender cohorts as a function of time period.

Variable	Time period		Outcomes	
	Baseline (M±SD)	Physical distancing (M±SD)	Difference (PD-BL)	Effect size (95% confidence limits)
<b>Sleep duration (hours)</b>				
All subjects	6.92 ± 0.15	7.11 ± 0.14	0.19	1.31 (0.189, 0.191)
18-19 year-olds	7.17 ± 0.14	7.47 ± 0.16	0.30**	2.00 (0.282, 0.318)
20-29 year-olds	7.04 ± 0.11	7.29 ± 0.14	0.25**	1.99 (0.247, 0.253)
30-39 year-olds	6.92 ± 0.15	7.1 ± 0.14	0.18**	1.24 (0.177, 0.183)
40-49 year-olds	6.82 ± 0.19	6.99 ± 0.16	0.17**	0.97 (0.165, 0.175)
50-59 year-olds	6.75 ± 0.18	6.89 ± 0.16	0.14**	0.82 (0.133, 0.147)
60-69 year-olds	6.73 ± 0.15	6.79 ± 0.15	0.06*	0.40 (0.048, 0.072)
70-79 year-olds	6.61 ± 0.16	6.63 ± 0.17	0.02	0.12 (-0.014, 0.054)
Females	7.11 ± 0.17	7.33 ± 0.15	0.22**	1.37 (0.216, 0.224)
Males	6.86 ± 0.14	7.04 ± 0.14	0.18**	1.29 (0.182, 0.178)
<b>Social jet lag (hours)</b>				
All subjects	0.66 ± 0.14	0.44 ± 0.08	-0.23	-1.93 (0.219, 0.221)
18-19 year-olds	0.74 ± 0.18	0.36 ± 0.16	-0.38**	-2.23 (0.360, 0.400)
20-29 year-olds	0.88 ± 0.16	0.56 ± 0.11	-0.32**	-2.33 (0.317, 0.323)
30-39 year-olds	0.68 ± 0.14	0.46 ± 0.09	-0.22**	-1.87 (0.218, 0.222)
40-49 year-olds	0.53 ± 0.13	0.36 ± 0.08	-0.17**	-1.58 (0.167, 0.173)
50-59 year-olds	0.45 ± 0.13	0.29 ± 0.06	-0.16**	-1.58 (0.156, 0.164)
60-69 year-olds	0.34 ± 0.12	0.22 ± 0.05	-0.12**	-1.31 (0.112, 0.128)
70-79 year-olds	0.19 ± 0.16	0.1 ± 0.09	-0.09**	-0.69 (0.063, 0.117)
Females	0.61 ± 0.13	0.4 ± 0.09	-0.21**	-1.88 (0.207, 0.213)
Males	0.68 ± 0.14	0.45 ± 0.09	-0.23**	-1.95 (0.228, 0.232)

220 Notes: BL = baseline; PD = physical distancing; \* = p-value <0.05; \*\* = p-value <0.001.



221  
222 **Fig 2.** Daily average sleep duration aggregated by age cohort. Each cohort is plotted in a different  
223 color, indicted in the legend. Filled circles indicate Sundays; a vertical gray line separates baseline  
224 and physical distancing.

## 226 Exercise

227 Summaries of exercise behavior for age and gender cohorts are presented in Table 3 and Fig 3. On  
228 average, exercise frequency across all cohorts did not increase significantly during physical  
229 distancing when compared to baseline ( $P=0.28$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.28$ , *small*). When analyzed by  
230 cohort, exercise frequency did not differ between baseline and physical distancing for 20-29 year-  
231 olds ( $P=0.31$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.02$ , *trivial*), 30-39 year-olds ( $P=0.09$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.25$ , *small*) and

232 males ( $P=0.19$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.15$ , *trivial*). Exercise frequency significantly increased during  
 233 physical distancing when compared to baseline for 18-19 year-olds ( $P=0.005$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.23$ ,  
 234 *small*), 40-49 year-olds ( $P=0.00009$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.60$ , *moderate*), 50-59 year-olds ( $P<10^{-6}$ ,  
 235 Cohen's  $d = 0.80$ , *moderate*), 60-69 year-olds ( $P<10^{-6}$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.87$ , *moderate*), 70-79 year-  
 236 olds ( $P=0.002$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.48$ , *small*), females ( $P=0.001$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.53$ , *small*) (Table 3).


237 Table 3. Exercise frequency for age and gender cohorts as a function of time period.

Cohort	Exercise frequency (%)		Outcomes	
	Baseline (M±SD)	Physical distancing (M±SD)	Difference (PD-BL)	Effect size (95% confidence limits)
All subjects	61.6 ± 4.3	62.7 ± 4.2	1.1	0.26 (1.063, 1.137)
<b>Age (years)</b>				
18-19 (%)	70.7 ± 8.8	68.9 ± 6.9	-1.8*	-0.23 (-2.733, -0.867)
20-29 (%)	63.6 ± 6.4	63.7 ± 5.2	0.1	0.02 (0.037, 0.237)
30-39 (%)	60.6 ± 4.6	61.7 ± 4.3	1.1	0.25 (1.012, 1.188)
40-49 (%)	60.4 ± 2.9	62.5 ± 4.0	2.1**	0.60 (2.006, 2.194)
50-59 (%)	60.7 ± 2.5	63.6 ± 4.5	2.9**	0.80 (2.742, 3.058)
60-69 (%)	60.7 ± 2.6	63.8 ± 4.3	3.1**	0.87 (2.809, 3.391)
70-79 (%)	59.3 ± 3.7	61.4 ± 4.9	2.1*	0.48 (1.200, 3.000)
<b>Sex</b>				
Females (%)	64.4 ± 5.3	67.1 ± 4.9	2.7*	0.53 (2.571, 2.829)
Males (%)	60.7 ± 3.9	61.3 ± 4.0	0.6	0.15 (0.544, 0.656)

238 Notes: BL = baseline; PD = physical distancing; \* = p-value <0.05; \*\* = p-value <0.001.

239

240 For exercise during physical distancing, individuals spent more time in HR zone 1  
 241 ( $P=0.018$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.57$ , *small*), HR zone 4 ( $P<10^{-7}$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.56$ , *small*), HR zone 5  
 242 ( $P<10^{-10}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.44$ , *large*), and HR zone 6 ( $P<10^{-6}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.26$ , *large*) when  
 243 compared to *baseline* and spent less time during physical distancing in HR zone 2 ( $P<10^{-10}$ ,  
 244 Cohen's  $d = -1.04$ , *moderate*) and HR zone 3 ( $P<10^{-14}$ , Cohen's  $d = -2.60$ , *large*) compared to  
 245 baseline (Table 4).




246  
247 **Fig 3.** Percentage of each cohort active on WHOOP that logged an exercise session, by date. Each  
248 cohort is shown in a different color, indicated in the legend. Filled circles indicate Sundays; a  
249 vertical gray line separates baseline from physical distancing.  
250  
251

252 Table 4. Distribution of exercise intensity as a function of time period.

HR Zone	Distribution of exercise intensity (%)		Outcomes	
	Baseline (M±SD)	Physical distancing (M±SD)	Difference (PD-BL)	Effect size (95% confidence limits)
Zone 1	12.3 ± 0.6	12.7 ± 0.8	0.4*	0.57 (0.399, 0.401)
Zone 2	21.2 ± 1.0	20.3 ± 0.7	-0.9**	-1.04 (-0.901, -0.899)
Zone 3	27.5 ± 0.5	26.2 ± 0.5	-1.3**	-2.60 (-1.301, -1.299)
Zone 4	23.8 ± 0.9	24.3 ± 0.9	0.5**	0.56 (0.499, 0.501)
Zone 5	13.5 ± 0.9	14.6 ± 0.6	1.1**	1.44 (1.099, 1.101)
Zone 6	1.8 ± 0.2	2.0 ± 0.1	0.2**	1.26 (0.200, 0.200)

253 Notes: BL = baseline; PD = physical distancing; \* = p-value <0.05; \*\* = p-value <0.001.



254  
 255 **Fig 4.** Distribution of proportion of total exercise time spent in each heart rate zone by date. Each  
 256 heart rate zone is shown in a different color, indicated by the legend. Filled circles indicate  
 257 Sundays; the vertical gray line delineates between baseline and physical distancing.

## 258 **Cardiovascular health**

259 A summary of cardiovascular outcomes for age and gender cohorts are presented in Table  
260 5. Average RHR was lower for all subjects during physical distancing when compared to baseline  
261 ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.28$ , *large*). When analyzed by cohort, average RHR was lower during  
262 physical distancing when compared to baseline for 18-19 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.29$ ,  
263 *large*), 20-29 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.14$ , *moderate*), 30-39 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-9}$ , Cohen's  
264  $d = 1.19$ , *large*), 40-49 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-10}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.32$ , *large*), 50-59 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-13}$ ,  
265 Cohen's  $d = 1.62$ , *large*), 60-69 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-14}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.82$ , *large*), 70-79 year-olds  
266 ( $P < 10^{-13}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.53$ , *large*), females ( $P < 10^{-12}$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.43$ , *large*), and males ( $P < 10^{-$   
267  $9$ , Cohen's  $d = 1.30$ , *large*) (Table 5).

268 Average HRV was higher for all subjects during physical distancing when compared to  
269 baseline ( $P = 0.0004$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.68$ , *moderate*). When analyzed by cohort, average HRV was  
270 higher during physical distancing when compared to baseline for 18-19 year-olds ( $P = 0.02$ ,  
271 Cohen's  $d = -0.27$ , *small*), 20-29 year-olds ( $P = 0.001$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.59$ , *small*), 30-39 year-olds  
272 ( $P = 0.0003$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.69$ , *moderate*), 40-49 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-6}$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.89$ , *moderate*),  
273 50-59 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-11}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.36$ , *large*), 60-69 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-16}$ , Cohen's  $d = -1.97$ ,  
274 *large*), 70-79 year-olds ( $P < 10^{-4}$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.76$ , *moderate*), females ( $P < 10^{-6}$ , Cohen's  $d = -$   
275  $0.96$ , *moderate*), and males ( $P = 0.001$ , Cohen's  $d = -0.60$ , *small*) (Table 5).

276


277 Table 5. Cardiovascular outcomes for age and gender cohorts as a function of time period.

Variable	Time period		Outcomes	
	Baseline (M±SD)	Physical distancing (M±SD)	Difference (PD-BL)	Effect size (95% confidence limits)
<b>Resting heart rate (bpm)</b>				
All subjects	55.3 ± 0.81	54.4 ± 0.63	-0.9	-1.24 (-0.906, -0.894)
18-19 year-olds	53.6 ± 0.82	52.7 ± 0.55	-0.9	-1.29 (-0.982, 0.818)
20-29 year-olds	54.2 ± 1.02	53.2 ± 0.71	-1.0	-1.14 (-1.021, -0.979)
30-39 year-olds	55.3 ± 0.85	54.4 ± 0.65	-0.9	-1.19 (-0.915, -0.885)
40-49 year-olds	56.3 ± 0.64	55.5 ± 0.57	-0.8	-1.32 (-0.816, -0.78,)
50-59 year-olds	56.5 ± 0.51	55.7 ± 0.48	-0.8	-1.62 (-0.821, -0.779)
60-69 year-olds	56.2 ± 0.38	55.5 ± 0.39	-0.7	-1.82 (-0.732, -0.668)
70-79 year-olds	54.9 ± 0.49	54.2 ± 0.42	-0.7	-1.53 (-0.795, -0.605)
Females	57.7 ± 0.69	56.8 ± 0.56	-0.9	-1.43 (-0.916, -0.884)
Males	54.6 ± 0.86	53.6 ± 0.66	-1.0	-1.30 (-1.011, -0.989)
<b>Heart rate variability (ms)</b>				
All subjects	66.8 ± 2.19	68.1 ± 1.6	1.3	0.68 (1.283, 1.317)
18-19 year-olds	95.0 ± 3.78	95.8 ± 1.88	0.8	0.27 (0.448, 1.152)
20-29 year-olds	82.9 ± 2.99	84.4 ± 2.0	1.5	0.59 (1.440, 1.560)
30-39 year-olds	67.4 ± 2.14	68.7 ± 1.59	1.3	0.69 (1.263, 1.337)
40-49 year-olds	53.2 ± 1.35	54.3 ± 1.1	1.1	0.89 (1.067, 1.133)
50-59 year-olds	46.0 ± 1.06	47.4 ± 1.0	1.4	1.36 (1.355, 1.445)
60-69 year-olds	48.0 ± 0.9	49.8 ± 0.93	1.8	1.97 (1.725, 1.875)
70-79 year-olds	59.0 ± 3.15	61.2 ± 2.62	2.2	0.76 (1.599, 2.801)
Females	66.3 ± 1.84	67.9 ± 1.46	1.6	0.96 (1.558, 1.642)
Males	67.0 ± 2.31	68.2 ± 1.67	1.2	0.60 (1.171, 1.229)

278 Notes: BL = baseline; PD = physical distancing; bpm = beats per minute; ms = milliseconds; \* =

279 p-value <0.05; \*\* = p-value <0.001.

280



281  
282 **Fig 5.** Changes in RHR (top) and HRV (bottom) by date and age cohort. Each cohort is shown  
283 with a differently colored line as indicated in the legends. bpm = beats per minute; ms =  
284 milliseconds. Filled circles indicate Sundays; a gray vertical line separates baseline from physical  
285 distancing.  
286

## 287 **Discussion**

288 The aim of this study was to detail changes in health related behavior and outcomes associated  
289 with the introduction of global physical distancing policies in response to the COVID-19  
290 pandemic. A retrospective analysis of sleep and activity patterns covering January 1, 2020 through  
291 May 15, 2020 including 50,000 randomly selected WHOOP members ranging from age 18 to 80.  
292 Findings were divided into sleep, activity, and cardiovascular health categories and are discussed  
293 below.

### 294 **Sleep**

295 The primary sleep related findings were (1) sleep opportunity duration increased as a result of  
296 sleep opportunity onset shifting earlier during physical distancing (2) average sleep duration  
297 increased in all cohorts during physical distancing and (3) social jet lag – i.e., weekday-to-weekend  
298 variability of sleep opportunity onset and offset – decreased for all cohorts during physical  
299 distancing.

300 There was a large shift in all cohorts towards earlier sleep opportunity onset times during  
301 physical distancing when compared with baseline, but not to an equal extent. Older cohorts  
302 experienced progressively larger shifts in sleep opportunity onset times during physical distancing  
303 relative to baseline (Table 1). The oldest cohort, 70-79 year-olds, exhibited a shift 2.4 times greater  
304 than that exhibited by the youngest cohort, 18 and 19 year-olds. For the younger cohorts, 18-19  
305 year-olds exhibited a similar sleep opportunity onset to the 20-29 year-olds during baseline, but  
306 during physical distancing, 20-29 year-olds observed a larger shift towards an earlier sleep  
307 opportunity onset (Table 1; Fig 1). This finding reflects the established differences in chronotype  
308 across age cohorts - younger individuals tend to have a late chronotype while older individuals  
309 skew towards early chronotypes [25].

310 In addition to exhibiting differences in the magnitude of average sleep onset shifts, Fig 1  
311 highlights a change in the differences between weekend and weekday sleep opportunity onset (i.e.,  
312 social jet lag) across all age groups. All age cohorts reduced social jet lag, with more extreme  
313 reductions seen in younger cohorts than in older ones (Table 2). The age group with the largest  
314 reduction was 18-19 year-olds. During baseline, this cohort averaged a 0.74 hour (i.e., 44 minutes)  
315 later sleep onset on weekends than on weekdays which was reduced during physical distancing to  
316 only 0.36 hours (i.e., 22 minutes). The smallest change, -0.08 hours (i.e., -5 minutes), was seen in  
317 the oldest cohort, 70-79 year-olds, who also had the least social jet lag in baseline – 0.19 hours  
318 (i.e., 11 minutes) (Fig 1).

319 Average nightly sleep duration was significantly higher during physical distancing than  
320 during baseline for all age cohorts (Fig 1). Younger cohorts obtained more sleep than older cohorts  
321 during baseline and increased their sleep by a greater percentage during physical distancing (Table  
322 2; Fig 2). The 18-19 year-old cohort averaged 0.56 hours (i.e., 34 minutes) more sleep per night  
323 than the 70-79 year-olds during baseline but averaged 0.84 hours (i.e., 50 minutes) more sleep  
324 during physical distancing. Among gender cohorts, females slept an average of 0.25 hours (i.e.,  
325 15.0 minutes) more per night than males during baseline and increased their sleep during physical  
326 distancing by more than males (+13 minutes and +11 minutes, respectively; Table 2).

327 With larger shifts observed in sleep opportunity onset compared to sleep opportunity offset,  
328 it is reasonable to suggest that the extension of sleep opportunities and sleep were primarily  
329 achieved by going to bed earlier and not by sleeping in later. These findings suggest that physical  
330 distancing may have alleviated societal factors (e.g., work or academic commitments, commuting)  
331 that restrict sleep opportunity, allowing individuals to revert towards biological sleep/wake  
332 preferences. Practical applications can be made across all cohorts; however, the data highlight


333 important changes in behavior amongst the 18-19 year-old cohort. As mentioned above,  
334 individuals from this cohort typically have late chronotypes (i.e., their circadian drive for sleep  
335 initiates later in the night). However, they are often expected to fulfil academic or sport related  
336 commitments early in the morning - decreasing opportunity for sleep. Prior literature has  
337 demonstrated subjective and objective benefits associated with even minor extension to average  
338 sleep duration when sustained over time; a 2018 study by Lo et al. [26] showed that 10 minutes of  
339 extended sleep duration in secondary school students correlated with improved alertness and  
340 mental health. These findings show that despite their typically late chronotype, 18-19 year-olds  
341 will shift their sleep onset opportunity earlier if given the opportunity. In addition to improvements  
342 in cognition, sleep extensions have been shown to correspond with statistically significant  
343 reductions in systolic blood pressure [27].

344

## 345 **Exercise**

346 The primary exercise findings were that physical distancing restrictions resulted in (1) significant  
347 changes to the types of athletic activities performed, (2) significant increases in frequency of  
348 exercise across all cohorts, and (3) increases in exercise intensity across all cohorts. The changes  
349 in activities observed are consistent with adherence to bans on gatherings of more than 10 people  
350 and closures of athletic facilities such as fitness clubs and gyms. Coincidentally, athletic activities  
351 that are compliant to physical distancing appear to be those that also require high cardiovascular  
352 load (i.e., running, cycling). This is supported by our data highlighting a decrease in weightlifting,  
353 and increases in activities like running (Fig 6). This increase is likely due to the minimal equipment  
354 needs (e.g., pair of sneakers for running), and that individuals are likely to prioritize outdoor  
355 activities whilst confined to their homes for the majority of each day. Previous studies suggest

356 that engagement in new exercise modalities may reduce injury rates [28], improve athletic  
357 performance and improve cardiovascular health [29, 30]. Therefore, alterations to training stimulus  
358 (i.e., exercise modality), and the associated physiological adaptations, may be an unexpected side  
359 effect of physical distancing restrictions.



360  
361 **Fig 6.** Percentage of change from average for the six most popular exercise modalities. Each  
362 modality is shown with a differently colored line as indicated in the legends. Filled circles indicate  
363 Sundays; a gray vertical line separates baseline from physical distancing.

364  
365 In addition to changes in exercise modalities performed, our data show that individuals  
366 exercised more frequently during physical distancing (Fig 3). All age cohorts except for the 18 and  
367 19 year-olds increased their frequency of exercise during physical distancing as compared to

368 baseline. Again, this is likely due to increased flexibility during physical distancing to perform  
369 physical activity. In isolation of the impact of physical distancing on exercise frequency, a novel  
370 cyclical pattern with a 7-day period in exercise frequency is observed in most age cohorts in Fig  
371 3. The cycle with highest amplitude is in 18 and 19 year-olds, the youngest cohort, with both the  
372 highest rates of exercise during the weekdays and the lowest rates of exercise on weekends. Again,  
373 this finding emphasizes the impact of professional and academic weekday commitments on  
374 exercise behavior.

375 In regard to the intensity of exercise, the highest three heart rate zones (collectively, 70-  
376 100% HRR) occupy a larger proportion of total exercise time during physical distancing than they  
377 did during baseline (Table 4). Distributions in relative time spent in heart rate zones 2 through 5  
378 show a cyclical pattern with a 7-day period that is more pronounced during baseline than physical  
379 distancing; relatively more time is spent in zones 4, 5, and 6 on weekends, while more time is spent  
380 in zones 2 and 3 on weekdays. The differentiation between weekend and weekday heart rate zone  
381 distributions is less pronounced in all heart rate zones during physical distancing than it was during  
382 baseline. An increase in time spent in these higher heart rate zones may mean an increase in  
383 anaerobic training, which has been previously demonstrated to reduce RHR and improve  
384 endurance [31].

385 The present study highlights changes in exercise modality and increases in exercise  
386 frequency during physical distancing restrictions. Irrespective of societal influences, it is  
387 physiologically accurate to suggest that such changes to exercise behavior may improve health  
388 outcomes [32].

## 389 **Cardiovascular Health**

390 A major finding of this study was that average RHR decreased and HRV increased during physical  
391 distancing when compared to baseline for all age and gender cohorts (**Fig 3**). Both of these  
392 outcomes represent an improvement in cardiovascular health, which suggests that improved sleep  
393 and exercise behaviors may be conferring positive benefits on the WHOOP members analyzed.

394 Recent research has also demonstrated a relationship between social jet lag and HRV in  
395 which higher levels of social jet lag were associated with lower HRV [33]. These findings are  
396 consistent with the present study in which all cohorts experienced a reduction in social jet lag and  
397 increase in HRV during physical distancing.

398 Analysis of the baseline period shows expected moderate differences across age cohorts in  
399 which younger cohorts show signs of greater cardiovascular fitness than older cohorts. While it is  
400 well documented that HRV declines with age [34, 35], previous studies have demonstrated no age-  
401 related increase in RHR. For example, Kostis et al [36] found no relationship between age and  
402 RHR; this apparent discrepancy may be related to the small effect size and the relatively small  
403 datasets of previous studies. The demonstration here by analysis of 50,000 individuals that a  
404 statistically and practically significant increase in RHR with age occurs is a novel finding of this  
405 paper.

406

## 407 **Conclusions**

408 This is the first study to report on the sleep and exercise behavioral changes associated with  
409 COVID-19 related physical distancing mandates. By leveraging wearable technology, a unique  
410 analysis of large population cohorts both prior to and throughout the early stages of the COVID-  
411 19 pandemic were conducted. The findings suggest that meaningful changes have occurred to sleep  
412 and exercise patterns, which may have long-term consequences on the health and wellbeing of the  
413 population. While improved sleep and exercise patterns appear to be the mechanism for improved  
414 health outcomes during physical distancing, it is unclear which specific barriers were limiting these  
415 activities prior to physical distancing. It is reasonable to assume that decreases in business hours-  
416 based commitments (e.g., commuting) has previously limited the time devoted to exercise and  
417 sleep. Therefore, in the context of a post-pandemic society, increased flexibility in how business,  
418 academia and other professional endeavors are conducted (i.e., ability to work from home) may  
419 result in a healthier general population. The findings of this study should be interpreted with the  
420 sample demographic in mind – WHOOP subscribers may not demographically match the general  
421 population. It is reasonable to suggest that members of the WHOOP platform are more likely to  
422 be health-conscious and fitness-oriented than average. However, these data can be applied to a  
423 large population cohort that are seeking to engage more health-enhancing behavior despite  
424 professional commitments. Future research will be required as countries begin to reopen to  
425 investigate which behaviors are maintained, how these behaviors impact mental health, and if  
426 cohorts return to their previous behaviors.

427

428

429 **References**

- 430 1. Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. The species  
431 *Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus*: classifying 2019-nCoV and naming it  
432 SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Microbiol.* 2020;5(4):536-44. doi: 10.1038/s41564-020-0695-z. PMID: 32123347.
- 433 2. Banks S, Dinges DF. Behavioral and physiological consequences of sleep restriction. *J Clin Sleep*  
434 *Med.* 2007;3(5):519-28. PMID: 17803017.
- 435 3. Buxton OM, Pavlova M, Reid EW, Wang W, Simonson DC, Adler GK. Sleep restriction for 1 week  
436 reduces insulin sensitivity in healthy men. *Diabetes.* 2010;59(9):2126-33. doi: 10.2337/db09-  
437 0699. PMID: 20585000.
- 438 4. Hsieh SD, Muto T, Murase T, Tsuji H, Arase Y. Association of short sleep duration with obesity,  
439 diabetes, fatty liver and behavioral factors in Japanese men. *Intern Med.* 2011;50(21):2499-502.  
440 doi: 10.2169/internalmedicine.50.5844. PMID: 22041348.
- 441 5. Cappuccio FP, Cooper D, D'Elia L, Strazzullo P, Miller MA. Sleep duration predicts cardiovascular  
442 outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Eur Heart J.*  
443 2011;32(12):1484-92. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehr007. PMID: 21300732.
- 444 6. Zhang J, Paksarian D, Lamers F, Hickie IB, He J, Merikangas KR. Sleep Patterns and Mental Health  
445 Correlates in US Adolescents. *J Pediatr.* 2017;182:137-43. doi: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.11.007.  
446 PMID: 27939122.
- 447 7. Kirschen GW, Jones JJ, Hale L. The Impact of Sleep Duration on Performance Among Competitive  
448 Athletes: A Systematic Literature Review. *Clin J Sport Med.* 2018. doi:  
449 10.1097/JSM.0000000000000622. PMID: 29944513.

- 450 8. Arnal PJ, Sauvet F, Leger D, van Beers P, Bayon V, Bougard C, et al. Benefits of Sleep Extension on  
451 Sustained Attention and Sleep Pressure Before and During Total Sleep Deprivation and Recovery.  
452 Sleep. 2015;38(12):1935-43. doi: 10.5665/sleep.5244. PMID: 26194565.
- 453 9. Swinbourne R, Miller J, Smart D, Dulson DK, Gill N. The Effects of Sleep Extension on Sleep,  
454 Performance, Immunity and Physical Stress in Rugby Players. Sports (Basel). 2018;6(2). doi:  
455 10.3390/sports6020042. PMID: 29910346.
- 456 10. Phillips AJK, Clerx WM, O'Brien CS, Sano A, Barger LK, Picard RW, et al. Irregular sleep/wake  
457 patterns are associated with poorer academic performance and delayed circadian and sleep/wake  
458 timing. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):3216. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-03171-4. PMID: 28607474.
- 459 11. Czeisler CA. Duration, timing and quality of sleep are each vital for health, performance and safety.  
460 Sleep Health. 2015;1(1):5-8. doi: 10.1016/j.sleh.2014.12.008. PMID: 29073414.
- 461 12. Wright KP, Jr., Hull JT, Hughes RJ, Ronda JM, Czeisler CA. Sleep and wakefulness out of phase with  
462 internal biological time impairs learning in humans. J Cogn Neurosci. 2006;18(4):508-21. doi:  
463 10.1162/jocn.2006.18.4.508. PMID: 16768357.
- 464 13. Vetter C, Devore EE, Wegrzyn LR, Massa J, Speizer FE, Kawachi I, et al. Association Between  
465 Rotating Night Shift Work and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease Among Women. JAMA.  
466 2016;315(16):1726-34. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.4454. PMID: 27115377.
- 467 14. Schernhammer ES, Laden F, Speizer FE, Willett WC, Hunter DJ, Kawachi I, et al. Rotating night  
468 shifts and risk of breast cancer in women participating in the nurses' health study. J Natl Cancer  
469 Inst. 2001;93(20):1563-8. doi: 10.1093/jnci/93.20.1563. PMID: 11604480.
- 470 15. Grier T, Canham-Chervak M, Anderson MK, Bushman TT, Jones BH. The effects of cross-training  
471 on fitness and injury in women. US Army Med Dep J. 2015:33-41. PMID: 26101904.
- 472 16. Nielsen RO, Parner ET, Nohr EA, Sorensen H, Lind M, Rasmussen S. Excessive progression in weekly  
473 running distance and risk of running-related injuries: an association which varies according to type

- 474 of injury. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2014;44(10):739-47. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2014.5164. PMID:  
475 25155475.
- 476 17. Patel H, Alkhawam H, Madanieh R, Shah N, Kosmas CE, Vittorio TJ. Aerobic vs anaerobic exercise  
477 training effects on the cardiovascular system. *World J Cardiol.* 2017;9(2):134-8. doi:  
478 10.4330/wjc.v9.i2.134. PMID: 28289526.
- 479 18. Berryhill S, Morton CJ, Dean A, Berryhill A, Provencio-Dean N, Patel SI, et al. Effect of Wearables  
480 on Sleep in Healthy Individuals: A Randomized Cross-Over Trial and Validation Study.  
481 *0(0):jcs.8356.* doi: doi:10.5664/jcs.8356.
- 482 19. Aune D, Sen A, o'Hartaigh B, Janszky I, Romundstad PR, Tonstad S, et al. Resting heart rate and  
483 the risk of cardiovascular disease, total cancer, and all-cause mortality - A systematic review and  
484 dose-response meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis.* 2017;27(6):504-  
485 17. doi: 10.1016/j.numecd.2017.04.004. PMID: 28552551.
- 486 20. Thayer JF, Yamamoto SS, Brosschot JF. The relationship of autonomic imbalance, heart rate  
487 variability and cardiovascular disease risk factors. *Int J Cardiol.* 2010;141(2):122-31. doi:  
488 10.1016/j.ijcard.2009.09.543. PMID: 19910061.
- 489 21. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed.* 2020;91(1):157-60.  
490 doi: 10.23750/abm.v91i1.9397. PMID: 32191675.
- 491 22. Executive Office of the President. Proclamation 9994: Declaring a National Emergency Concerning  
492 the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Outbreak. March 13, 2020.
- 493 23. Roenneberg T, Wirz-Justice A, Mero M. Life between clocks: daily temporal patterns of human  
494 chronotypes. *J Biol Rhythm.* 2003;18(1):80-90.
- 495 24. Hopkins WG, Marshall SW, Batterham AM, Hanin J. Progressive statistics for studies in sports  
496 medicine and exercise science. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2009;41(1):3-13. doi:  
497 10.1249/MSS.0b013e31818cb278. PMID: 19092709.

- 498 25. Fischer D, Lombardi DA, Marucci-Wellman H, Roenneberg T. Chronotypes in the US - Influence of  
499 age and sex. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(6):e0178782. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0178782. PMID:  
500 28636610.
- 501 26. Lo JC, Lee SM, Lee XK, Sasmita K, Chee N, Tandj J, et al. Sustained benefits of delaying school start  
502 time on adolescent sleep and well-being. *Sleep*. 2018;41(6). doi: 10.1093/sleep/zsy052. PMID:  
503 29648616.
- 504 27. Stock AA, Lee S, Nahmod NG, Chang AM. Effects of sleep extension on sleep duration, sleepiness,  
505 and blood pressure in college students. *Sleep Health*. 2020;6(1):32-9. doi:  
506 10.1016/j.sleh.2019.10.003. PMID: 31753739.
- 507 28. Godfrey RJ. Cross-training. *Sports Exercise and Injury*. 1998;(4):50-5.
- 508 29. Tanaka H. Effects of cross-training. Transfer of training effects on VO<sub>2</sub>max between cycling,  
509 running and swimming. *Sports Med*. 1994;18(5):330-9. doi: 10.2165/00007256-199418050-  
510 00005. PMID: 7871294.
- 511 30. Tanaka H, Swensen T. Impact of resistance training on endurance performance. A new form of  
512 cross-training? *Sports Med*. 1998;25(3):191-200. doi: 10.2165/00007256-199825030-00005.  
513 PMID: 9554029.
- 514 31. Hunter GR, McCarthy JP. Pressor Response Associated With High-Intensity Anaerobic Training.  
515 *The Physician and Sportsmedicine*. 1983;11(4):150-62. doi: 10.1080/00913847.1983.11708515.
- 516 32. Cornelissen VA, Verheyden B, Aubert AE, Fagard RH. Effects of aerobic training intensity on  
517 resting, exercise and post-exercise blood pressure, heart rate and heart-rate variability. *J Hum*  
518 *Hypertens*. 2010;24(3):175-82. Epub 2009/06/26. doi: 10.1038/jhh.2009.51. PubMed PMID:  
519 19554028.

- 520 33. Sudy AR, Ella K, Bodizs R, Kaldi K. Association of Social Jetlag With Sleep Quality and Autonomic  
521 Cardiac Control During Sleep in Young Healthy Men. *Front Neurosci.* 2019;13:950. doi:  
522 10.3389/fnins.2019.00950. PMID: 31555086.
- 523 34. Schwartz JB, Gibb WJ, Tran T. Aging effects on heart rate variation. *J Gerontol.* 1991;46(3):M99-  
524 106. doi: 10.1093/geronj/46.3.m99. PMID: 2030273.
- 525 35. Jensen-Urstad K, Storck N, Bouvier F, Ericson M, Lindblad LE, Jensen-Urstad M. Heart rate  
526 variability in healthy subjects is related to age and gender. *Acta Physiol Scand.* 1997;160(3):235-  
527 41. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-201X.1997.00142.x. PMID: 9246386.
- 528 36. Kostis JB, Moreyra AE, Amendo MT, Di Pietro J, Cosgrove N, Kuo PT. The effect of age on heart  
529 rate in subjects free of heart disease. Studies by ambulatory electrocardiography and maximal  
530 exercise stress test. *Circulation.* 1982;65(1):141-5. doi: 10.1161/01.cir.65.1.141. PMID: 7198013.