A Cloth Facemask Causes No Major Respiratory or Cardiovascular Perturbations during Moderate to Heavy Exercise

Natália Mendes Guardieiro[1,2], Gabriel Barreto[1], Felipe Miguel Marticorena[1], Tamires Nunes Oliveira[1], Luana Farias de Oliveira[1], Ana Lucia de Sá Pinto[2,3], Danilo Marcelo Leite do Prado[1], Bryan Saunders*[1,4], Bruno Gualano*[1,3,5]

*both authors equally contributed to this study

1 – Applied Physiology and Nutrition Research Group, School of Physical Education and Sport; Rheumatology Division; Faculdade de Medicina FMUSP, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, BR, University of São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

2 – Hospital das Clínicas da Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo

3 - Laboratory of Assessment and Conditioning in Rheumatology (LACRE), Rheumatology Division, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

4 – Institute of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Faculty of Medicine FMUSP, University of São Paulo, Brazil.

5 – Food Research Center, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.

Correspondence:

Dr Bruno Gualano - Applied Physiology & Nutrition Research Group, Rheumatology Division, Faculty of Medicine FMUSP

Av. Dr. Arnaldo, 455 - Cerqueira César - CEP: 01246903 - University of São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brazil. Phone: +55 11 3061-8789

E-mail: gualano@usp.br

Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

What are the new findings?

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

How might it impact on clinical practice in the future?

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Another remaining question is whether women and men respond differently to mask wearing during exercise. Generally, women have smaller lungs and airways, which limits their ability to generate expiratory flow [12, 13], which results in reduced ventilation during exercise compared to men. Women also have lower oxygen (O_2) carrying capacity, maximum cardiac output, and arteriovenous O_2 difference [14]. Considering the number of physiological and morphological sex differences to exercise, one could speculate that any physiological perturbations brought about wearing a mask during exercise could be greater in women, since men have an overall higher cardiorespiratory reserve.

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

Methods

Ethics statement

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

Study design and setting

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

Participants

Men and women not engaged in competitive sports (*e.g.*, non-trained) were eligible for this study. Exclusion criteria included any cardiac, pulmonary, and rheumatologic diseases, musculoskeletal limitations, or a Body Mass Index (BMI) <18.5 or >30 kg/m2. A total of 18 men and 20 women entered the study, although 3 dropped out for reasons unrelated to the study. Thirty-five individuals (17 men and 18 women) completed all main sessions (age: women: 28 ± 5 y, men: 30 ± 4 y; BMI: women: 22.9 ± 2.0 $kg \cdot m^2$, men: 24.5 ± 2.6 $kg \cdot m^2$) and were analyzed. According the short form of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) instrument [15], 31 participants were physically active, whereas 4 were inactive.

Experimental design

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

square-wave test (PSWT), performed with or without the use of a triple-layered antiviral cloth mask (Fashion Masks, São Paulo, Brazil). This type of mask was chosen because it is widely accessible, recommended to the general public by the WHO and appropriate for exercise, whereas surgical and N95 masks are not recommended to be worn during exercise (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 polypropylene filter, and the inner layer was absorbable cotton. The size of the mask was one size fits all and was thus identical for all participants. Athletes were required to keep the mask firmly in place over the nose, mouth, and chin during the entire session. All athletes were habituated to wear a mask during their daily routines due to mandates, but not specifically during exercise. Participants were requested to refrain from strenuous exercise, caffeine and alcohol, and replicated their diet, in the 24 h prior to each visit.

Cardiorespiratory Exercise Test

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

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

Progressive square-wave test (PSWT)

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

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

capacity was determined at rest and at the end of each exercise stage during the PSWT. Ventilatory constraint was evaluated as the difference between inspiratory capacity at rest and at each exercise workload [19]. Ventilatory efficiency was determined using the ventilatory equivalent for carbon dioxide ($\dot{V}_E/\dot{V}CO_2$) and end-tidal carbo dioxide pressure ($PetCO_2$) during each stage. Breathing pattern was evaluated during each stage using the breathing frequency to tidal volume ratio (BF/TV) ratio [20].

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

Subjective Perception of Discomfort Questionnaire

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

Statistical analyses

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

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

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

Patient and Public Involvement statement

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

Results

Cardiorespiratory Exercise Test

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

Table 1. Participants' characteristics and cardiorespiratory data from the cardiopulmonary exercise test. 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
80%VAT		
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
VO_2 absolute (L/min)	1.01 ± 0.19	1.43 ± 0.4
VO_2 relative (ml/kg/min)	16.2 ± 3.2	19.4 ± 6
VO_2 %peak (%)	42.1 ± 7.9	39.8 ± 10.5
VAT		
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
VO_2 absolute (L/min)	1.25 ± 0.21	1.83 ± 0.35
VO_2 relative (ml/kg/min)	20.7 ± 3.5	24.9 ± 5.5
VO_2 %peak (%)	53.6 ± 7.5	51.4 ± 9.8
RCP		
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
VO_2 absolute (L/min)	2 ± 0.24	2.75 ± 0.35
VO_2 relative (ml/kg/min)	33.1 ± 3.6	37.2 ± 4.9
VO_2 %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
VO_2 absolute (L/min)	2.33 ± 0.26	3.59 ± 0.45
VO_2 relative (ml/kg/min)	38.7 ± 4.6	48.6 ± 6.3

Progressive square-wave test (PSWT)

Inspiratory capacity (IC)

Mask reduced IC at all exercise intensities (interaction effect condition*timing: F= 8.6, $p < 0.0001$, Figure 1, Panel A) compared to No-Mask irrespective of sex (80%VAT: -0.4 L; CI: -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), except at Baseline (-0.2 L; CI: 0.0, -0.4).

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

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

Respiratory Frequency (Rf)

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

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

Tidal Volume (VT)

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

Tobin index (Rf/VT or shallow breathing index)

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

$PetCO_2$

Mask increased $PetCO_2$ at both RCP (+4.0 mmHg; CI: 2.8, 5.3, Figure 1, Panel G) and Peak (+4.9 mmHg; CI: 3.5, 6.3) compared to No-Mask (interaction effect condition*intensity: $F = 6.8$, $p < 0.0001$), but had no effect at Baseline, 80%VAT or VAT (all $p \geq 0.09$). The effect of Mask on $PetCO_2$ increases was comparable in men (+3.4 mmHg; CI: 2.5, 4.2) and women (+1.9 mmHg; CI: 1.1, 2.7).

$\dot{V}_E/\dot{V}CO_2$

Mask reduced VE/VCO_2 at the three highest intensities compared to No-Mask (interaction effect of condition*intensity, F = 3.7, p = 0.006): VAT (-2.2; CI: -0.9, -3.5), RCP (-3.2; CI: -1.9, -4.5), and Peak (-4.4; CI: -3.0, -5.8) (Figure 1, Panel H), irrespective of sex.

Heart rate during exercise (HR)

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

Lactate

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

Ratings of Perceived Exertion (RPE)

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

Blood pressure

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

Oxygen saturation ($SatO_2$)

Mask did not affect $SatO_2$ at any exercise intensity (Figure 2, Panel F), regardless of sex.

Time-to-exhaustion (TTE)

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

Forced Vital Capacity at rest (FVC)

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

Forced expiratory volume in 1 second at rest (FEV1)

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

FVC/FEV1 at rest (FVC by FEV1 ratio)

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

Peak expiratory flow at rest (PEF)

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

Subjective perception questionnaire

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

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**
Spirometry				
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)[$!]	7.7 ± 1.8	4.4 ± 1.1	9.2 ± 1.9	5.7 ± 1.6
Questionnaire				
Tightness	3.4 ± 2.4	4.2 ± 3.4	2.5 ± 2.2	3.4 ± 2.5
Heat[$]	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

FEV1, forced expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC, forced vital capacity; FVCbyFEV1, forced vital capacity by FEV1 ratio; PEF, peak expiratory flow.

Significance labels: [$], main effect of condition; [!], main effect of sex; [&], interaction effect



Figure 1. Inspiratory capacity, end expiratory lung volume (EELV), EELV by forced vital capacity ratio (EELV/FVC), respiratory frequency, tidal volume, respiratory frequency by tidal volume, CO_2 partial pressure ($PetCO_2$) and ventilatory equivalent for carbon dioxide (V_E/VCO_2) data expressed as mean ± 1 standard deviation.

$^{\$}$ main effect of Mask; $^{!}$ main effect of intensity; $^{\&}$ main effect of sex; * condition*intensity interaction; ♂ condition*intensity interaction for men; ♀ condition*intensity interaction for women.



Figure 2. Heart rate, lactate, rating of perceived effort (RPE), systolic (SBP) and diastolic (DBP), and oxygen saturation ($SatO_2$) expressed as mean ± 1 standard deviation.

$^{\$}$ main effect of Mask; $^{!}$ main effect of intensity; $^{\&}$ main effect of sex; $^{♂}$ condition*intensity interaction for men.



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

$ main effect of Mask

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

cardiorespiratory reserve than men, owing to classically described morphological and physiological sex-differences (e.g., smaller lungs, lower O_2 carrying capacity and maximum cardiac output, etc). This hypothesis was not confirmed, as the effects of the cloth facemask on physiological measures were in general similar between women and men irrespective of exercise intensities. Furthermore, exercise capacity in the severe exercise domain was reduced by 23.9% in women and 17.8% in men when using a cloth facemask, with no differences between sexes. It is possible to conjecture that the stress imposed by wearing a mask does not constitute a greater physiological or metabolic burden to women vs. men, even at higher exercise intensities, despite the well-known sex-differences during exercise.

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

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

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

Acknowledgments

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

References

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

11. Whipp BJ, Ward SA, Rossiter HB. Pulmonary O2 uptake during exercise: conflating muscular and cardiovascular responses. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2005;**37**(9):1574-85 doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000177476.63356.22[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

12. Duke JW. Sex Hormones and Their Impact on the Ventilatory Responses to Exercise and the Environment. In: Hackney AC, ed. Sex Hormones, Exercise and Women: Scientific and Clinical Aspects. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017:19-34.

13. Freedson P, Katch VL, Sady S, et al. Cardiac output differences in males and females during mild cycle ergometer exercise. Medicine and science in sports 1979;**11**(1):16-9

14. Lewis DA, Kamon E, Hodgson JL. Physiological differences between genders. Implications for sports conditioning. Sports Med 1986;**3**(5):357-69 doi: 10.2165/00007256-198603050-00005[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

15. Hagstromer M, Oja P, Sjostrom M. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ): a study of concurrent and construct validity. Public health nutrition 2006;**9**(6):755-62 doi: 10.1079/phn2005898[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

16. Atkinson G, Reilly T. Circadian variation in sports performance. Sports Med 1996;**21**(4):292-312 doi: 10.2165/00007256-199621040-00005[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

17. Graham BL, Steenbruggen I, Miller MR, et al. Standardization of Spirometry 2019 Update. An Official American Thoracic Society and European Respiratory Society Technical Statement. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine 2019;**200**(8):e70-e88 doi: 10.1164/rccm.201908-1590ST[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

18. Howley ET, Bassett DR, Jr., Welch HG. Criteria for maximal oxygen uptake: review and commentary. Med Sci Sports Exerc 1995;**27**(9):1292-301

19. Guenette JA, Chin RC, Cory JM, et al. Inspiratory Capacity during Exercise: Measurement, Analysis, and Interpretation. Pulmonary medicine 2013;**2013**:956081 doi: 10.1155/2013/956081[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

20. Neder JA, Andreoni S, Lerario MC, et al. Reference values for lung function tests: II. Maximal respiratory pressures and voluntary ventilation. Brazilian Journal of Medical and Biological Research [online] 1999;**32**(6):719-27 doi: 10.1590/S0100-879X1999000600007[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

21. Borg GA. Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. Medicine and science in sports and exercise 1982;**14**(5):377-81

22. Li Y, Tokura H, Guo YP, et al. Effects of wearing N95 and surgical facemasks on heart rate, thermal stress and subjective sensations. International archives of occupational and environmental health 2005;**78**(6):501-9 doi: 10.1007/s00420-004-0584-4[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

23. Epstein D, Korytny A, Isenberg Y, et al. Return to training in the COVID-19 era: The physiological effects of face masks during exercise. Scand J Med Sci Sports 2021;**31**(1):70-75 doi: 10.1111/sms.13832[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

24. Shaw KA, Zello GA, Butcher SJ, et al. The impact of face masks on performance and physiological outcomes during exercise: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab 2021:1-11 doi: 10.1139/apnm-2021-0143[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

25. Fukushi I, Nakamura M, Kuwana S-i. Effects of wearing facemasks on the sensation of exertional dyspnea and exercise capacity in healthy subjects. PloS one 2021;**16**(9):e0258104 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0258104[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

26. Kouzy R, Abi Jaoude J, Kraitem A, et al. Coronavirus Goes Viral: Quantifying the COVID-19 Misinformation Epidemic on Twitter. Cureus 2020;**12**(3):e7255 doi: 10.7759/cureus.7255[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

27. Roozenbeek J, Schneider CR. Susceptibility to misinformation about COVID-19 around the world. 2020;**7**(10):201199 doi: 10.1098/rsos.201199[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

28. Chandrasekaran B, Fernandes S. “Exercise with facemask; Are we handling a devil's sword?” – A physiological hypothesis. Medical Hypotheses 2020;**144**:110002 doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110002[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

29. Lavie CJ, Ozemek C, Carbone S, et al. Sedentary Behavior, Exercise, and Cardiovascular Health. Circulation research 2019;**124**(5):799-815 doi: 10.1161/circresaha.118.312669[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

30. Fiuza-Luces C, Garatachea N, Berger NA, et al. Exercise is the real polypill. Physiology (Bethesda, Md) 2013;**28**(5):330-58 doi: 10.1152/physiol.00019.2013[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

31. Mok A, Khaw KT, Luben R, et al. Physical activity trajectories and mortality: population based cohort study. 2019;**365**:l2323 doi: 10.1136/bmj.l2323[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

32. Gualano B, Lemes I, Silva R, et al. Physical activity associates with enhanced immunogenicity of an inactivated virus vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in patients with autoimmune rheumatic diseases: Research Square, 2021.

33. Gebel K, Ding D, Chey T, et al. Effect of Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity on All-Cause Mortality in Middle-aged and Older Australians. JAMA Internal Medicine 2015;**175**(6):970-77 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0541[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

34. Hupin D, Roche F, Gremeaux V, et al. Even a low-dose of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity reduces mortality by 22% in adults aged ≥60 years: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Sports Med 2015;**49**(19):1262-67 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-094306[published Online First: Epub Date]|.