

Assessment of functional capacity with cardiopulmonary exercise testing in non-severe COVID-19 patients at three months follow-up

Piero Clavario, MD^{1*}, Vincenzo De Marzo, MD^{2,3*}, Roberta Lotti, MD^{2,3}, Cristina Barbara, MD¹, Annalisa Porcile, MD¹, Carmelo Russo, MD¹, Federica Beccaria, MD¹, Marco Bonavia¹, Luigi Carlo Bottaro¹, Marta Caltabellotta, MD¹, Flavia Chioni, MD¹, Monica Santangelo, MD¹, Arto J. Hautala, MD, PhD⁴, Pietro Ameri, MD, PhD^{2,3}, Marco Canepa, MD, PhD^{2,3}, Italo Porto, MD, PhD^{2,3}

1. Cardiac Rehabilitation Center of Genoa, Azienda Sanitaria Locale, ASL 3 Genovese, Genoa, Italy

2. Cardiology Unit, DICATOV - Cardiothoracic and Vascular Department, IRCCS San Martino Hospital, Genoa, Italy

3. Cardiovascular Diseases Unit, Department of Internal Medicine and Medical Specialties (DIMI), University of Genoa, Genoa Italy

4. Cardiovascular Research Group, Division of Cardiology, Oulu University Hospital, University of Oulu, Finland

*** These authors contributed equally to this work.**

Words count: 1790

Declaration of interests: none of the authors have conflict of interests for this work

Funding sources: none of the authors received funding for this work

Take-home messages: at 3-month cardiopulmonary exercise testing 38/110(34.5%) non-severe COVID-19 survivors had percent predicted peak oxygen uptake (%pVO₂) < 85% (indicating normality). Half of them had functional capacity limitation mainly explained by muscular impairment.

Address for correspondence

Prof. Italo Porto

University of Genoa, Cardiovascular Unit, Department of Internal Medicine and Specialties (DIMI)

Viale Benedetto XV, 10, 16132 Genoa (Italy)

Email: italo.porto@unige.it Tel: +39-010-5551

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Long-term effects of Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) and their sustainability in a large number of patients are of the utmost relevance. We aimed to determine: 1) functional capacity of non-severe COVID-19 survivors by cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET); 2) those characteristics associated with worse CPET performance.

Methods

We prospectively enrolled the first 150 consecutive subjects with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 infection discharged alive from March to April 2020 at Azienda Sanitaria Locale (ASL)3, Genoa, Italy. At 3-month from hospital discharge, complete clinical evaluation, trans-thoracic echocardiography, cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET), pulmonary function test (PFT), and dominant leg extension (DLE) maximal strength evaluation were performed.

Results

Excluding severe and incomplete/missing cases, 110 patients were analyzed. Median percent predicted peak oxygen uptake (%pVO₂) was 90.9(79.2-109.0)%. Thirty-eight(34.5%) patients had %pVO₂ below, whereas 72(65.5%) above the 85% predicted value (indicating normality). Median PFT parameters were within normal limits.

Eight(21.1%) patients had a mainly respiratory, 9(23.7%) a mainly cardiac, 3(7.9%) a mixed-cardiopulmonary, and 18(47.4%) a non-cardiopulmonary limitation of exercise. Eighty-one(73.6%) patients experimented at least one symptom, without relationship with %pVO₂ ($p>0.05$).

Multivariate linear regression analysis showed age ($\beta=0.46$, $p=0.020$), percent weight loss ($\beta=-0.77$, $p=0.029$), active smoke status ($\beta=-7.07$, $p=0.019$), length of hospital stay ($\beta=-0.20$, $p=0.042$), and DLE maximal strength ($\beta=1.65$, $p=0.039$) independently associated with %pVO₂.

Conclusions

Half of non-severe COVID-19 survivors show functional capacity limitation mainly explained by muscular impairment, albeit cardiopulmonary causes are possible. These findings call for future research to identify patients at higher risk of long-term effects, that may benefit from careful surveillance and targeted rehabilitation.

INTRODUCTION

To date, the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic accounts for more than 50 million confirmed cases and up to 1 million deaths worldwide[1]. Whereas handling the initial phase has been challenging for health systems, the sheer number of cases raises alarm about the sustainability of even minor sequelae after hospital discharge.

COVID-19 is a mainly respiratory disease, but cardiovascular (CV) alterations are also associated with worse prognosis[2]. For the chronic phase, the main concerns are the development of pulmonary interstitial disease and/or a lingering CV involvement, as hypothesized by a recent CV magnetic resonance study[3] and potentially explained by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Coronavirus type 2 (SARS-CoV2)-associated endothelitis[4]. How to intercept, assess, and treat this large number of patients with potential long-term consequences of COVID-19 remains uncertain, with the hypothesized rehabilitative effort mainly focused on the post-intensive care patients[5, 6]. It should be noted, however, that among the 20,000+ COVID-19 patients hospitalized in Italy and discharged alive, those classified as clinically severe or critical represent less than 20%[7].

Conversely, despite data from the 2003 SARS outbreak highlighting long-term exercise capacity reduction even in absence of cardiac or pulmonary abnormalities[8], data on long-term functional COVID-19 effects in less clinically complex patients are lacking.

Aims of our study were: 1) to evaluate pulmonary, cardiac, and functional capacity of non-severe COVID-19 survivors by performing cardio-pulmonary exercise testing (CPET); 2) to identify those baseline and clinical characteristics associated to worse performance at CPET.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study subjects

We included the first 150 consecutive subjects undergoing post-COVID-19 evaluation at the Outpatient Cardiac Rehabilitation center of Genoa, Italy. The local healthcare authority (Azienda Sanitaria Locale, ASL 3 Genovese) set up a structured follow-up program for all patients with a history of Reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)-confirmed Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection admitted to COVID-19 wards from 1st of March 2020 to date (recruitment is still ongoing).

For the purpose of the study, we included in analysis all non-severe patients, excluding those requiring mechanical ventilation and intensive care.

Study design

At 3 months from hospital discharge, all patients received complete clinical evaluation, transthoracic echocardiography (TTE), CPET, pulmonary function test (PFT), and dominant leg extension (DLE) maximal strength evaluation. All patients signed an informed consent.

Study protocol and informed consent conform to the Declaration of Helsinki and were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Liguria Region (n° 430/2020CER).

All procedures and protocols are described in detail in **online-only material**.

Analysis

Categorical variables are presented as frequencies and percentages and were compared by chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. Continuous variables are reported as mean and standard deviation (SD) or median and interquartile range (IQR) according to their distribution. Normally distributed variables were compared by means of unpaired Student's t test. Non-normally distributed variables were compared with the U Mann-Whitney non-parametric test.

The main outcome measure was percent predicted peak VO₂ (%pVO₂). Patients were categorized according to the value of %pVO₂ below or above 85%.

Multivariate linear regression model was used to estimate the beta coefficients with 95% confidence interval (CI) of %pVO₂. The model was adjusted for time from hospital discharge to CPET and all clinically meaningful covariates with p < 0.10 in univariate analysis.

All analyses were performed with R environment 3.6.3 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) and packages tableone, finalfit, and ggplot2.

RESULTS

Of the first 150 evaluated patients, we excluded 24 (16.0%) who had needed invasive ventilation, 7 (4.7%) for missing data, and 9 (6.0%) as they were unable to perform CPET. The final population included 110 patients. **Table 1** depicts the characteristics of the study patients.

Forty-five (40.9%) patients were female, median age was 61.7 (53.5-69.2) years, median body mass index (BMI) at CPET evaluation was 26.8 (23.9-30.5) kg/m², median weight at hospital admission was 82.0 (70.0-95.0) kg, whereas median weight at CPET evaluation was 77.0 (67.0-89.8) kg with median percent weight loss of 9.4 (6.0-12.9) %. Forty-five (40.9%) patients were active smokers.

Cardiopulmonary exercise testing

The reason for maximal CPET interruption was exhaustion/leg fatigue for 109 (94.5%), dyspnea for 4 (3.6%), and new arrhythmia for 2 (1.8%). Median %pVO₂ was 90.9 (79.2-109.0) %, median RER 1.1 (1.0-1.2). Thirty-eight (34.5%) patients had %pVO₂ below, whereas 72 (65.5%) above the 85% predicted value.

Of the 38 patients with reduced %pVO₂, 8 (21.1%) had mainly respiratory limitation of exercise (RLE, *see online-only material for definitions*), 9 (23.7%) mainly cardiac limitation of exercise (CLE), 3 (7.9%) RLE and CLE, and 18 (47.4%) had non-cardiopulmonary limitation of exercise.

Pulmonary function test

At PFT, median forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV₁), forced vital capacity (FVC), and diffusing capacity of lungs for carbon monoxide (DLCO) were within normal limits; however, 2 (1.8%) patients had mild and 2 (1.8%) moderate impairment of FEV₁, 1 moderate impairment of FEV₁, 5 (4.5%) mild and 2 (1.8%) impairment of FVC, and 9 (8.2%) mild, 6 (5.5%) moderate and 2 (1.8%) severe DLCO impairment.

3-month clinical evaluation

At 3-month clinical evaluation, 81 (73.6%) patients experienced at least one disabling symptom, 30/38 (78.9%) among those with %pVO₂ below and 51/72 (70.8%) among those above 85% ($p > 0.05$). Of note, 55/110 (50.0%) patients complained of dyspnea, of whom 18/110 (16.4%) were in NYHA class III/IV, 28/110 (25.5%) had chest pain, 54/110 (49.1%) had fatigue, and 25/110 (22.7%) complained of palpitations. Each symptom frequency did not differ between patients with %pVO₂ below and above 85% predicted value (all $p > 0.05$).

Predictors of percent predicted peak oxygen uptake (VO₂)

At multivariate linear regression analysis adjusted for time from hospital discharge to CPET, age ($\beta=0.46$, $p=0.020$), percent weight loss ($\beta=-0.77$, $p=0.029$), active smoke status ($\beta=-7.07$, $p=0.019$), length of hospital stay ($\beta=-0.20$, $p=0.042$), and DLE maximal strength ($\beta=1.65$, $p=0.039$) (**Figure 1**) were independently associated with %pVO₂ (**Table 2**).

DISCUSSION

Our study has the following main findings: 1) 1/3rd of non-severe COVID-19 survivors had a significant alteration both in exercise capacity and %pVO₂ at 3 months after hospital discharge; 2) in about half of patients with abnormal %pVO₂, this was due to abnormal peripheral oxygen extraction, most likely to some degree of muscle impairment, as DLE maximal strength was independently associated with peak oxygen consumption; 3) more than 2/3rd (74.3%) of patients experienced at least one disabling symptom at 3 months after hospital discharge, although there was no relationship between symptoms and worst %pVO₂.

To our knowledge, for the first time we assessed clinical status and exercise capacity of COVID-19 patients performing complete CPET evaluation after hospital discharge.

Regarding the first point, our results are reminiscent of Ong et al., who found a 41% prevalence in reduced %pVO₂ among 44 SARS 3-month survivors[8], albeit they also included 10/44 (22.7%) patients that had required invasive ventilation. The abnormal %pVO₂ was accompanied by an early anaerobic threshold, translating into a significant impairment in daily activities.

On note, abnormal physical function and performance in COVID-19 survivors have been preliminarily described by Belli et al.[9] using 1-min sit-to-stand test and Short Physical performance Battery, without the more objective CPET evaluation.

Due to the ongoing and accelerating COVID-19 worldwide pandemic, these observations raise important concerns for health systems, as we proved that a substantial number of non-severe COVID-19 patients still had objective exercise impairment several months after hospital discharge.

As for the second point, it is noteworthy that a cardiopulmonary cause determining the exercise capacity and %pVO₂ reduction could only be found in about half of patients.

Interestingly, DLE maximal strength was independently associated with peak oxygen consumption suggesting that muscle impairment should be responsible for the residual cases, probably due to bed rest and subsequently muscular deconditioning, but also with a potential role for corticosteroid myopathy[10, 11]. Our numbers are again similar to Ong et al. (about 40% had non-cardiopulmonary impairment in their post-SARS cohort), although steroids during acute illness was less frequently used in their sample (15% vs. 100%). The important role of muscular factors is compounded by the higher weight loss in patients with abnormal %pVO₂, probably representing a reduction in fat and lean mass occurring during the acute phase.

We also highlight the role of hospital stay, that appeared longer among patients with abnormal %pVO₂, probably for both the forced confinement during the acute phase and the need for aggressive medical care in COVID-19. Regarding this, our data can again only be compared with

Belli et al.[9], which found no association between physical performance and length of hospital stay, but without measuring objective CPET-derived parameters.

We believe that the most important of our findings is the relationship between %pVO₂ and maximal strength of the lower limb muscles, maintained even after accounting for cardiopulmonary variables, for length of hospitalization, and for percent weight loss. In our opinion this reduces the likelihood that bed rest, exercise deprivation and loss of muscle mass alone could cause this degree of impairment, raising the possibility of a direct effect of SARS-CoV2 at the muscle level. We only mention the possibility of mitochondrial dysfunction[12], as several ongoing research projects are exploring its role on the pathogenesis of COVID-19 acute phase[13-15].

As for the third point, we demonstrate that almost 3/4th of patients experienced at least one disabling symptom 3 months after hospital discharge, without any relationship with exercise capacity. Several studies have already investigated the residual symptoms burden of patients recovering from COVID-19, observing different rates between out-patients (about 35% in Tenforde et al.)[16] and patients who had needed hospitalization (87% in the study by Carfi et al.)[6]. We report relatively high rates of disabling symptoms (50% dyspnea, 49.1% fatigue). Halpin et al. describe a cohort of 68 non-ventilated patients, of whom 41/68 (60%) complained of fatigue and 21/68 (43.6%) of dyspnea. The need for use of oxygen supplementation (80% vs. 70% in Halpin et al.) was also similar [17].

In conclusion, it has been known for many years that most critically ill patients face long-lasting functional impairment after discharge[10]; what is mostly worrying about our data is that we found severe mid-term consequences of COVID-19 in a non-ICU population. This observation supports the need for targeted management of these patients also during the acute phase (e.g. applying appropriate nutrition and early mobilization plans). Moreover, as there was no relationship with %pVO₂, symptoms alone should not guide the post-acute management of COVID-19 patients: more objective techniques, such as CPET, should probably be used to rapidly intercept and assess the exercise impairment and, perhaps, to decide whether to start a physical rehabilitation program.

Limitations

Our study has important limitations. Firstly, all patients came from an area of the city of Genoa. Secondly, the functional capacity evaluation was conducted three months after hospital discharge, with the patients unsupervised in the meantime and no data available about the baseline condition prior to COVID-19. Moreover, no direct structural evaluation at the muscle level was performed.

ACNOWELDGEMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

1. Worldometer. <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>. [cited; Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>]
2. Madjid M, Safavi-Naeini P, Solomon SD, Vardeny O. Potential Effects of Coronaviruses on the Cardiovascular System: A Review. *JAMA Cardiol* 2020.
3. Puntmann VO, Carej ML, Wieters I, Fahim M, Arendt C, Hoffmann J, Shchendrygina A, Escher F, Vasa-Nicotera M, Zeiher AM, Vehreschild M, Nagel E. Outcomes of Cardiovascular Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Patients Recently Recovered From Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA Cardiol* 2020.
4. Varga Z, Flammer AJ, Steiger P, Haberecker M, Andermatt R, Zinkernagel AS, Mehra MR, Schuepbach RA, Ruschitzka F, Moch H. Endothelial cell infection and endotheliitis in COVID-19. *Lancet (London, England)* 2020: 395(10234): 1417-1418.
5. Polastri M, Nava S, Clini E, Vitacca M, Gosselink R. COVID-19 and pulmonary rehabilitation: preparing for phase three. *Eur Respir J* 2020: 55(6).
6. Carfi A, Bernabei R, Landi F, Group ftGAC-P-ACS. Persistent Symptoms in Patients After Acute COVID-19. *JAMA* 2020: 324(6): 603-605.
7. Epicentro-ISS. <https://www.epicentro.iss.it>. [cited; Available from: <https://www.epicentro.iss.it>]
8. Ong KC, Ng AW, Lee LS, Kaw G, Kwek SK, Leow MK, Earnest A. Pulmonary function and exercise capacity in survivors of severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Eur Respir J* 2004: 24(3): 436-442.
9. Belli S, Balbi B, Prince I, Cattaneo D, Masocco F, Zaccaria S, Bertalli L, Cattini F, Lomazzo A, Dal Negro F, Giardini M, Franssen FME, Janssen DJA, Spruit MA. Low physical functioning and impaired performance of activities of daily life in COVID-19 patients who survived hospitalisation. *Eur Respir J* 2020: 56(4).
10. Kress JP, Hall JB. ICU-acquired weakness and recovery from critical illness. *The New England journal of medicine* 2014: 371(3): 287-288.
11. Minetto MA, Lanfranco F, Motta G, Allasia S, Arvat E, D'Antona G. Steroid myopathy: some unresolved issues. *Journal of endocrinological investigation* 2011: 34(5): 370-375.
12. Supinski GS, Schroder EA, Callahan LA. Mitochondria and Critical Illness. *Chest* 2020: 157(2): 310-322.

13. Kloc M, Ghobrial RM, Kubiak JZ. The Role of Genetic Sex and Mitochondria in Response to COVID-19 Infection. *Int Arch Allergy Immunol* 2020; 181(8): 629-634.
14. Prasun P. COVID-19, Mitochondria, and Interferon. *J Interferon Cytokine Res* 2020.
15. Saleh J, Peyssonnaud C, Singh KK, Edeas M. Mitochondria and microbiota dysfunction in COVID-19 pathogenesis. *Mitochondrion* 2020; 54: 1-7.
16. Tenforde MW, Kim SS, Lindsell CJ, Billig Rose E, Shapiro NI, Files DC, Gibbs KW, Erickson HL, Steingrub JS, Smithline HA, Gong MN, Aboodi MS, Exline MC, Henning DJ, Wilson JG, Khan A, Qadir N, Brown SM, Peltan ID, Rice TW, Hager DN, Ginde AA, Stubblefield WB, Patel MM, Self WH, Feldstein LR, Investigators IVYN, Team CC-R, Investigators IVYN. Symptom Duration and Risk Factors for Delayed Return to Usual Health Among Outpatients with COVID-19 in a Multistate Health Care Systems Network - United States, March-June 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020; 69(30): 993-998.
17. Halpin SJ, McIvor C, Whyatt G, Adams A, Harvey O, McLean L, Walshaw C, Kemp S, Corrado J, Singh R, Collins T, O'Connor RJ, Sivan M. Postdischarge symptoms and rehabilitation needs in survivors of COVID-19 infection: A cross-sectional evaluation. *J Med Virol* 2020.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Percent predicted peak oxygen uptake (VO₂) per dominant leg extension strength.

TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of the study patients stratified according to percent predicted VO2 below/above 85%.

Variable	Overall population (n=110)	% predicted VO2 below 85% (n=38)	% predicted VO2 above 85% (n=72)	p value
Baseline and clinical characteristics				
Age (years)	61.7 (53.5-69.2)	58.8 (51.4-67.7)	62.4 (54.6-70.0)	0.266
Sex (female)	45 (40.9)	14 (36.8)	31 (43.1)	0.670
Height (centimeters)	168.0 (163.0-174.8)	167.0 (163.0-173.0)	169.0 (163.0-176.0)	0.491
Absolute weight loss (kg)	7.5 (5.0-10.0)	7.5 (6.0-12.0)	7.5 (4.0-10.0)	0.316
Weight at CPET evaluation (kg)	77.0 (67.0-89.8)	72.5 (64.3-79.5)	78.5 (69.5-90.3)	0.010
Weight at hospital admission (kg)	82.0 (70.0-95.0)	80.0 (66.0-85.5)	83.0 (72.8-95.8)	0.049
Percent weight loss (%)	9.4 (6.0-12.9)	10.4 (7.6-15.6)	9.2 (5.3-12.2)	0.090
Body mass index (kg/m ²)	26.8 (23.9-30.5)	26.1 (23.1-29.2)	28.0 (25.1-31.9)	0.042
Hypertension	49 (44.5)	19 (50.0)	30 (41.7)	0.525
Diabetes	3 (2.7)	2 (5.3)	1 (1.4)	0.568
Active smoke	45 (40.9)	18 (47.4)	27 (37.5)	0.393
Dyslipidemia	49 (44.5)	13 (34.2)	36 (50.0)	0.167
CKD	3 (2.7)	2 (5.3)	1 (1.4)	0.568
Previous MI	5 (4.5)	3 (7.9)	2 (2.8)	0.457
COPD	6 (5.5)	2 (5.3)	4 (5.6)	1.000
Oxygen support				0.299
No/low flow	61 (55.5)	18 (47.4)	43 (59.7)	
High flow/NIV	49 (44.5)	20 (52.6)	29 (40.3)	
Steroid therapy	110 (100.0)	38 (100.0)	72 (100.0)	1.000
Time from hospital discharge to CPET (days)	85.0 (71.5-102.5)	81.0 (64.0-106.5)	89.0 (78.3-98.5)	0.463
Length of hospital stay (days)	18.0 (6.8-30.0)	26.5 (15.0-33.8)	15.5 (3.0-23.8)	0.013
3-month clinical evaluation				
6MWT (meters)	540.0 (480.0-600.0)	525.0 (480.0-567.5)	540.0 (480.0-600.0)	0.255
Ejection fraction	60.0 (60.0-60.0)	60.0 (60.0-60.0)	60.0 (60.0-60.0)	0.485
Dyspnea	55 (50.0)	19 (50.0)	36 (50.0)	1.000
NYHA class III/IV	18 (16.4)	8 (21.1)	10 (13.9)	
Chest pain	28 (25.5)	9 (23.7)	19 (26.4)	0.937
Angina pectoris	2 (1.8)	2 (5.3)	0 (0.0)	
Fatigue	54 (49.1)	21 (55.3)	33 (45.8)	0.459
Palpitations	25 (22.7)	8 (21.1)	17 (23.6)	0.948
Lipothymia/syncope	2 (1.8)	2 (5.3)	0 (0.0)	0.982

Cardiopulmonary exercise testing				
Reason for CPET interruption				0.654
exhaustion/leg fatigue	104 (94.5)	34 (89.5)	70 (97.2)	
dyspnea	4 (3.6)	2 (7.9)	2 (2.8)	
new arrhythmia	2 (1.8)	2 (5.3)	0 (0.0)	
Peak VO ₂ (ml O ₂ /min)	1552.0 (1240.3-2068.0)	1303.0 (1139.3-1542.3)	1772.5 (1393.3-2259.8)	<0.001
Percent predicted peak VO ₂ (%)	90.9 (79.2-109.0)	75.6 (64.8-79.2)	99.2 (91.1-114.1)	<0.001
Peak VO ₂ /kg (mL O ₂ /min /kg)	20.6 (17.8-25.4)	18.7 (15.2-20.5)	22.9 (19.1-27.9)	<0.001
Peak W (Watt)	119.5 (92.0-167.5)	101.5 (77.0-118.3)	138.5 (104.0-187.8)	<0.001
Percent predicted peak W (%)	97.7 (70.7-113.6)	61.2 (46.9-73.3)	105.9 (95.5-120.2)	<0.001
Peak HR (beat/min)	149.5 (133.5-159.8)	142.0 (115.5-158.8)	150.0 (139.8-160.0)	0.074
Percent predicted HR (%)	92.6 (84.7-98.1)	88.7 (72.5-96.6)	93.5 (88.8-98.8)	0.012
OUES	93.5 (78.6-105.8)	73.5 (65.7-80.1)	99.4 (90.1-112.8)	<0.001
RER	1.1 (1.0-1.2)	1.1 (1.0-1.2)	1.1 (1.0-1.2)	0.823
VE (L/min)	67.0 (54.9-88.3)	62.8 (47.2-71.9)	75.2 (60.5-96.6)	<0.001
VT (mL)	1754.0 (1457.3-2311.3)	1596.5 (1391.8-1916.0)	1940.0 (1535.8-2497.0)	0.007
BR (breath/min)	39.0 (35.2-43.0)	35.9 (32.1-41.9)	39.4 (35.7-43.3)	0.071
BrR	47.8 (28.1-67.4)	60.9 (44.0-80.5)	39.9 (21.8-52.5)	0.002
VE/VCO ₂ slope	31.7 (27.8-34.7)	33.2 (28.6-38.0)	30.6 (27.7-33.3)	0.041
Maximal work rate (Watt)	64.5 (44.0-95.5)	54.0 (35.3-68.5)	76.0 (50.8-103.5)	0.001
AT VO ₂ (mL O ₂ /min)	1054.5 (844.8-1382.5)	883.5 (770.5-1111.5)	1180.5 (962.0-1450.0)	<0.001
AT HR (beat/min)	112.0 (101.0-121.8)	112.0 (93.3-121.0)	111.5 (103.0-122.3)	0.517
AT VE/VCO ₂	33.6 (30.7-38.2)	35.1 (31.0-41.1)	33.3 (30.7-35.5)	0.040
VO ₂ /HR (ml/beat)	11.0 (9.1-14.2)	10.0 (7.5-12.7)	12.1 (9.8-15.5)	0.001
VO ₂ /W slope	9.1 (8.1-9.9)	8.1 (7.0-8.9)	9.5 (8.5-10.2)	<0.001
Pulmonary function testing				
FEV ₁ (L)	3.0 (2.5-3.8)	3.0 (2.6-3.5)	3.0 (2.4-3.9)	0.909
Percent predicted FEV ₁ (%)	104.0 (90.0-116.0)	98.5 (87.0-109.8)	108.0 (93.5-116.5)	0.022
FVC (L)	3.6 (2.9-4.4)	3.6 (3.2-4.1)	3.6 (2.8-4.6)	0.841
Percent predicted FVC (%)	100.0 (87.0-111.0)	97.5 (85.3-104.5)	102.0 (89.0-112.0)	0.053
Percentage of FEV ₁ /FVC (%)	106.0 (100.0-114.0)	106.5 (98.8-110.0)	106.0 (100.5-114.0)	0.470
MVV (L/min)	120.0 (98.0-153.6)	122.0 (104.8-140.7)	118.4 (96.2-157.8)	0.717
PEF (L/s)	7.3 (5.5-9.8)	7.6 (5.3-9.2)	7.0 (5.7-10.2)	0.307
Percent predicted PEF (%)	82.0 (42.7-107.3)	62.0 (40.0-103.8)	87.0 (56.0-107.8)	0.240
FEF _{25-75%} (L/s)	3.1 (2.4-4.1)	2.9 (2.5-3.9)	3.1 (2.4-4.3)	0.434
MEF _{75%} (L/s)	6.3 (4.7-8.2)	5.5 (4.6-7.5)	6.5 (4.8-8.9)	0.115
MEF _{50%} (L/s)	4.0 (2.9-5.0)	3.8 (2.8-4.6)	4.0 (3.0-5.1)	0.373
MEF _{25%} (L/s)	1.4 (1.0-1.9)	1.3 (1.0-1.8)	1.43 (1.0-2.0)	0.432

Percent predicted DLCO (%)	76.0 (65.5-95.3)	70.0 (58.0-82.5)	83.0 (69.0-103.0)	0.063
Strength evaluation				
DLE maximal strength (kg)	19.0 (12.0-29.3)	17.0 (10.8-30.0)	20.0 (12.4-27.0)	0.201
DLE maximal strength per BW	0.3 (0.2-0.8)	0.3 (0.2-0.4)	0.2 (0.2-0.3)	0.380

6MWT: 6 minutes walking test; AT: anaerobic threshold; BR: breathing rate; BrR: breathing reserve; CKD: chronic kidney disease; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CPET: cardiopulmonary exercise testing; DLCO: diffusing capacity of lungs for carbon monoxide; DLE: dominant leg extension; FEF25-75%: forced expiratory flow at 25-75% of FVC; FEV1: forced expiratory volume in one second; FVC: forced vital capacity. HR: heart rate; MEF: maximal expiratory flow; MI: myocardial infarction; MVV: maximal voluntary ventilation; OUES: oxygen uptake efficiency slope; Peak VO₂: peak oxygen uptake; PEF: peak expiratory flow; RER: respiratory exchange ratio; VCO₂: volume of exhaled carbon dioxide; VE: minute ventilation; VT: tidal volume; W: work level.

Table 2. Univariate and multivariate linear regression for percent predicted oxygen uptake (VO₂) adjusted for time from hospital discharge to cardiopulmonary exercise testing.

Variable	Univariate			Multivariate		
	β coefficient	95%confidence interval	p value	β coefficient	95%confidence interval	p value
Baseline and clinical characteristics						
Age (years)	0.58	0.16 to 1.00	0.007	0.46	0.07 to 0.85	0.020
Sex (female)	-4.28	-14.94 to 6.39	0.426			
Height (centimeters)	0.08	-0.46 to 0.63	0.758			
Absolute weight loss (kg)	-1.33	-2.37 to -0.29	0.013			
Weight at CPET evaluation (kg)	0.37	0.03 to 0.71	0.035			
Weight at hospital admission (kg)	0.16	-0.15 to 0.47	0.297			
Percent weight loss (%)	-1.33	-2.29 to -0.37	0.007	-0.77	-1.58 to -0.44	0.029
Body mass index (kg/m ²)	0.81	-0.07 to 1.70	0.071	0.66	-0.27 to 1.59	0.158
Hypertension	4.43	-6.53 to 15.38	0.423			
Diabetes	-27.74	-58.66 to 3.19	0.178			
Active smoke	-9.17	-14.04 to -3.69	0.037	-7.07	-16.75 to -2.60	0.019
Dyslipidemia	-1.33	-12.14 to 9.49	0.807			
CKD	-47.08	-90.00 to 4.16	0.102			
Previous MI	-4.50	-24.97 to 15.97	0.662			
COPD	-6.03	-28.72 to 16.67	0.598			
Oxygen support (high flow/NIV)	-9.71	-20.22 to 0.79	0.169			
Length of hospital stay (days)	-0.34	-0.64 to -0.03	0.031	-0.20	-0.73 to -0.03	0.042
3-month clinical evaluation						
6MWT (meters)	0.02	-0.05 to 0.06	0.893			
Ejection fraction	1.03	0.05 to 2.01	0.039	0.22	-0.69 to 1.14	0.630
Dyspnea (NYHA class III/IV)	-4.51	-15.19 to 6.18	0.403			
Chest pain	-2.84	-43.21 to 33.21	0.642			
Weakness	-11.48	-21.83 to -1.14	0.030			
Palpitations	-7.77	-19.75 to 4.20	0.199			
Lipothymia/syncope	-3.11	-47.56 to 41.33	0.889			
Pulmonary function test						
Percent predicted FEV1 (%)	0.33	0.09 to 0.58	0.007	0.21	-0.01 to 0.44	0.066
Percent predicted FVC (%)	0.29	0.03 to 0.56	0.029			
Percentage of FEV1/FVC (%)	0.46	-0.03 to 0.94	0.066			
Percent predicted PEF (%)	0.01	-0.13 to 0.15	0.839			
Percent predicted DLCO (%)	0.22	-0.08 to 0.51	0.144			
Strength evaluation						
DLE maximal strength (kg)	1.99	1.10 to 2.87	0.030	1.65	1.16 to 1.87	0.039

6MWT: 6 minutes walking test; BW: body weight; CKD: chronic kidney disease; COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; DLCO: diffusing capacity of lungs for carbon monoxide; DLE: dominant leg extension; FEF25-75%: forced expiratory flow at 25-75% of FVC; FEV1: forced expiratory volume in one second; FVC: forced vital capacity. MI: myocardial infarction; PEF: peak expiratory flow.

