

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

3
4 Natália Mendes Guardieiro^{1,2}, Gabriel Barreto¹, Felipe Miguel Marticorena¹, Tamires Nunes
5 Oliveira¹, Luana Farias de Oliveira¹, Ana Lucia de Sá Pinto^{2,3}, Danilo Marcelo Leite do
6 Prado¹, Bryan Saunders^{*1,4}, Bruno Gualano^{*1,3,5}

7 *both authors equally contributed to this study

8
9 1 – Applied Physiology and Nutrition Research Group, School of Physical Education and
10 Sport; Rheumatology Division; Faculdade de Medicina FMUSP, Universidade de São Paulo,
11 São Paulo, SP, BR, University of São Paulo, SP, Brazil.

12 2 – Hospital das Clínicas da Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo

13 3 - Laboratory of Assessment and Conditioning in Rheumatology (LACRE), Rheumatology
14 Division, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

15 4 – Institute of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Faculty of Medicine FMUSP, University of
16 São Paulo, Brazil.

17 5 – Food Research Center, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.

18
19 Correspondence:

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

22 Av. Dr. Arnaldo, 455 - Cerqueira César - CEP: 01246903 - University of São Paulo,

23 São Paulo, SP, Brazil. Phone: +55 11 3061-8789

24 E-mail: gualano@usp.br

25

26 **Abstract**

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

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

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

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

49

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

51 **What are the new findings?**

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

61

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

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

66 **Introduction**

67 The use of face masks is one of the most effective non-pharmacological strategy to prevent
68 SARS-CoV-2 infections [1, 2]. The recent resurgence of cases and deaths worldwide has led
69 to some decision-makers to re-issue mask orders to contain the disease, suggesting that this
70 safety tool will remain important as long as the pandemic is not fully mitigated [3], and
71 possibly after it is under control, as in several cultures employing facemasks as a routine
72 practice to protect against several health threats before COVID-19 outbreak [4]. Wearing a
73 facemask is recommended even during exercise, particularly at indoor fitness facilities and
74 gyms, where COVID-19 outbreaks have been reported [5]. Nevertheless, the physiological
75 impact of facemasks during exercise remains underexplored.

76

77 A facemask may reduce the ability to breathe comfortably during exercise, which has been
78 confirmed by some [6, 7], but not all [8] studies. It is possible to conjecture that the effects of
79 wearing a mask on cardiorespiratory responses may manifest during exhaustive high-intensity
80 exercise, but not (or less) during low- to moderate-intensity exercise. In fact, Driver et al. [6]
81 provide preliminary evidence that the effect of facemasks is dependent on exercise intensity,
82 with differences in oxygen saturation, ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) and dyspnoea
83 occurring at different stages of an incremental cardiopulmonary test as exercise intensity
84 increased. However, short-stage maximal incremental tests do not normalize the
85 physiological responses to exercise in relation to the gas exchange or blood acid-base profiles
86 [9 10], since %VO_{2max} at the ventilatory thresholds largely varies between individuals [9],
87 hampering accurate determination of exercise intensities and ultimately confounding data
88 interpretation [10, 11]. To overcome this limitation, constant-load tests based on the dynamic
89 behaviour of the pulmonary gas exchange and blood acid-base status have been
90 recommended to accurately determine exercise intensity domains (i.e., moderate, heavy,

91 severe, and extreme) [10]. This approach allows determination of whether facemasks affect
92 physiological and perceptual parameters at different, well-defined exercise intensities,
93 helping tailor exercise prescription for health that can minimize any negative effects of
94 wearing a mask on cardiorespiratory responses.

95

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

104

105 This study aimed to investigate whether wearing a cloth facemask could affect physiological
106 and perceptual responses to exercise at distinct exercise intensities in non-trained individuals.
107 A secondary aim was to test whether sex differences influenced these responses.

108 **Methods**

109 *Ethics statement*

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

112

113 *Study design and setting*

114 This was a crossover study (clinicaltrials.gov: NCT04887714) performed at an intrahospital,
115 exercise physiology laboratory in São Paulo, Brazil. Data collection took place between April
116 and November 2021.

117

118 *Participants*

119 Men and women not engaged in competitive sports (*i.e.*, non-trained) were eligible for this
120 study. Exclusion criteria included any cardiac, pulmonary, and rheumatologic diseases,
121 musculoskeletal limitations, and BMI <18.5 or >30 kg·m². A total of 18 men and 20 women
122 entered the study, although 3 dropped out for reasons unrelated to the study. Thirty-five
123 individuals (17 men and 18 women) completed all main sessions (age: women: 28±5 y, men:
124 30±4 y; BMI: women: 22.9±2.0 kg·m², men: 24.5±2.6 kg·m²) and were analyzed. According
125 to the short form of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) instrument [15],
126 31 participants were physically active, whereas 4 were inactive.

127

128 *Experimental design*

129 Participants attended the laboratory on three separate occasions, separated by a minimum of
130 48 h, at the same time of day to account for circadian variation [16]. The first visit consisted
131 of an incremental cardiopulmonary running test to exhaustion to determine peak oxygen
132 uptake ($\dot{V}\square O_{2peak}$) and ventilatory thresholds. The remaining two main visits consisted of a

133 running progressive square-wave test (PSWT), performed with or without the use of a triple-
134 layered cloth facemask (Fashion Masks, São Paulo, Brazil). This facemask was chosen
135 because it is widely accessible, recommended to the general public by the WHO and
136 appropriate for exercise ([https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html)
137 [sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html)). The outer layer was waterproof polyester fabric, the
138 middle layer a polypropylene filter, and the inner layer was absorbable cotton. The size was
139 “one size fits all” and was thus identical for all participants. Athletes were required to keep
140 the mask firmly in place over the nose, mouth, and chin during the entire session. The order
141 of sessions was determined by an individual not involved in data collection. Blocks of two
142 individuals were allocated to the two possible orders (Mask–No Mask; No Mask–Mask)
143 using a random number generator (<https://www.randomizer.org/>) to ensure the study was
144 counterbalanced. Since the investigators could see that the participants were wearing a cloth
145 facemask or not, the session order was provided directly to the research team. All participants
146 were habituated to wear a mask during their daily routines due to mandates, but not
147 specifically during exercise. Participants were requested to refrain from strenuous exercise,
148 caffeine and alcohol, and replicated their diet, in the 24 h prior to each visit.

149

150 *Cardiorespiratory Exercise Test*

151 Immediately prior to the cardiorespiratory exercise test, participants performed a pulmonary
152 function test according to recommendations [17]. The cardiorespiratory exercise test was
153 performed on a motorized treadmill (Centurion 300, Micromed, Brazil). For men, the test
154 started at 5 km·h⁻¹ and increased speed (1 km·h⁻¹·min⁻¹) up to a maximum velocity of 14
155 km·h⁻¹. For women, the test started at 4 km·h⁻¹ and increased speed (1 km·h⁻¹·min⁻¹) up to 13
156 km·h⁻¹. For those participants who reached these maximal speeds, there was a subsequent
157 increase in inclination (2%·min⁻¹) until exhaustion. Ventilatory and gas exchange

158 measurements were recorded continuously throughout the test using a breath-by-breath
159 system (MetaLyzer 3B, Cortex, Germany), as was heart rate (HR; ergo PC elite, Micromed,
160 Brazil). Maximal effort was determined according to published criteria [18] and individual
161 $\dot{V}\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ was determined as the $\dot{V}\text{O}_2$ averaged over the final 30 s.

162

163 *Progressive square-wave test (PSWT)*

164 Data from the cardiorespiratory exercise test was used to determine exercise workload for the
165 square wave treadmill test according to the ventilatory anaerobic threshold (VAT) and the
166 respiratory compensation point (RCP). All thresholds were determined by the same
167 respiratory physiologist with clinical experience in the area. The PSWT protocol was
168 performed on a motorized treadmill (Centurion, model 200, Micromed, Brazil) and consisted
169 of three 5-min stages at workloads equivalent to 1) 80%VAT, 2) VAT, and 3) RCP. These
170 stages represented moderate, heavy and severe domains [10] and corresponded to $41\pm 9\%$,
171 $53\pm 9\%$ and $81\pm 8\%$ of $\dot{V}\text{O}_{2\text{peak}}$ of the volunteers. Participants then completed a final stage to
172 exhaustion at a running speed equivalent to the maximum achieved during the
173 cardiorespiratory exercise test (Peak). Ventilatory and gas exchange measurements were
174 recorded continuously throughout, with the spirometer mask placed over the cloth facemask.

175

176 To determine the effect of the mask on pattern of change in operating lung volumes we
177 evaluated end-expiratory volume to functional vital capacity ratio (EELV/FVC). Inspiratory
178 capacity was determined at rest and at the end of each exercise stage during the PSWT.
179 Ventilatory constraint was evaluated as the difference between inspiratory capacity at rest and
180 at each exercise workload [19]. Ventilatory efficiency was determined using the ventilatory
181 equivalent for carbon dioxide ($\dot{V}_E/\dot{V}\text{CO}_2$) and end-tidal carbon dioxide pressure (PetCO_2)

182 during each stage. Breathing pattern was evaluated during each stage using the breathing
183 frequency to tidal volume ratio (BF/TV) ratio [20].

184

185 RPE were assessed at the end of each stage with participants pointing to a chart using the 6-
186 to 20-point Borg scale [21]. Heart rate was monitored continuously throughout (ergo PC elite,
187 Micromed, Brazil). A fingertip blood sample (20 μ L) was collected at baseline, at the end of
188 each stage and 4-min post-exhaustion for the subsequent analysis of lactate. Blood was
189 homogenized in the same volume of 2% NaF, centrifuged at 2000 g for 5 min before plasma
190 was removed and stored at -20°C until analysis. Plasma lactate was determined
191 spectrophotometrically using an enzymatic-colorimetric method (Katal, Interteck, Brazil).

192

193 *Subjective Perception of Discomfort Questionnaire*

194 Participants completed a questionnaire [22] following the completion of the PSWT to rate
195 their perception of ten sensations of discomfort related to the facemask: humidity, heat,
196 breathing resistance, itchiness, tightness, saltiness, feeling unfit, odor and fatigue. They were
197 also required to rate their overall feeling of discomfort related to the facemask on a scale
198 from 0 to 10, with 0–3 representing “Comfortable”, >3–7 representing “Uncomfortable” and
199 >7 representing “Extremely uncomfortable”.

200

201 *Statistical analyses*

202 Lactate data from 2 individuals (1 male, 1 female) who did not complete the third stage were
203 excluded from the RCP and Peak analyses. Furthermore, 1 male and 1 female reported
204 extreme discomfort with the PSWT mask and stopped exercising before volitional
205 exhaustion; and were excluded from the Peak analysis for all outcomes. The same 4
206 individuals were excluded from the TTE analysis. Lactate data were log₁₀ transformed

207 before mixed model analysis, turning the model into an exponential data mixed model, and
208 back transformed through exponentiation for the final reporting of data. Whenever outlying
209 data points were considered improbable (e.g., a value of 50 mmHg for systolic blood
210 pressure), they were considered measurement or transcription error and were excluded.

211

212 Repeated measures Mixed Model ANOVAs were performed with condition (Mask, No-
213 Mask), sex and exercise intensity (Baseline [except RPE], 80%VAT, VAT, RCP, Peak) as
214 fixed factors and individuals as random factors. Exceptions were Spirometry, TTE and
215 Questionnaire related outcomes, which were not repeated measures and, therefore, timing
216 was not included as a fixed factor. For TTE, the model was corrected by treatment order,
217 since participants were not familiarized to the protocol. When a significant main effect or
218 interaction was detected (accepted at $p \leq 0.05$), post-hoc pairwise comparisons were performed
219 with Tukey's adjustment. All analyses were performed with the RStudio software (Rstudio
220 1.4.11003, PBC, MA) using the "lmer" function of the lmerTest package and "emmeans"
221 function of the emmeans package. Data are expressed as estimated differences and 95%
222 confidence intervals (CI), and data in figures are represented as mean \pm 1 standard deviation.

223

224 *Patient and Public Involvement statement*

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

226 **Results**

227 Cardiorespiratory Exercise Test

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

230

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

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

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

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

Peak

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

233

234 *Progressive square-wave test (PSWT)*

235 *Inspiratory capacity (IC)*

236 Mask reduced IC at all exercise intensities (interaction effect condition*timing: F=8.6,
237 p<0.0001, Figure 1, Panel A) compared to No-Mask irrespective of sex (80%VAT: -0.4 L;
238 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, -
239 1.2), except at Baseline (-0.2 L; CI: 0.0, -0.4).

240

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

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

244

245 *Respiratory Frequency (Rf)*

246 Mask reduced Rf vs. No-Mask (interaction effect of condition*timing: F=4.6, p=0.001,
247 Figure 1, Panel D) at Peak (-8.3 breaths·min⁻¹; CI: -5.8, -10.8), RCP (-6.9 breaths·min⁻¹; CI: -
248 4.6, -9.2) and VAT (-6.5 breaths·min⁻¹; CI: -4.1, -8.8), but not at Baseline or at 80%VAT

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

251

252 *Tidal Volume (VT)*

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

257

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

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

264

265 *PetCO₂*

266 Mask increased PetCO₂ at both RCP ($+4.0$ mmHg; CI: $2.8, 5.3$, Figure 1, Panel G) and Peak
267 ($+4.9$ mmHg; CI: $3.5, 6.3$) compared to No-Mask (interaction effect condition*intensity: $F =$
268 $6.8, p<0.0001$), but had no effect at Baseline, 80%VAT or VAT (all $p \geq 0.09$). The effect of
269 Mask on PetCO₂ increases was comparable in men ($+3.4$ mmHg; CI: $2.5, 4.2$) and women
270 ($+1.9$ mmHg; CI: $1.1, 2.7$).

271

272 *V_E/V_T CO₂*

273 Mask reduced VE/VCO₂ at the three highest intensities compared to No-Mask (interaction
274 effect of condition*intensity, F=3.7, p=0.006): VAT (-2.2; CI: -0.9, -3.5), RCP (-3.2; CI:
275 -1.9, -4.5), and Peak (-4.4; CI: -3.0, -5.8) (Figure 1, Panel H), irrespective of sex.

276

277 *Heart rate during exercise (HR)*

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

281

282 *Lactate*

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

285

286 *Ratings of Perceived Exertion (RPE)*

287 Mask did not influence RPE at any exercise intensity. However, Mask increased RPE for
288 men, but not women (interaction effect of condition*sex, F=6.2, p=0.01, men: +1.4; CI: 0.9,
289 2.0; women: +0.4; CI: -0.1, 1.0; Figure 2, Panel C).

290

291 *Blood pressure*

292 Mask did not affect both systolic or diastolic blood pressure at any exercise intensity (Figure
293 2, Panel D and E), regardless of sex.

294

295 *Oxygen saturation (SatO₂)*

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

297

298 *Time-to-exhaustion (TTE)*

299 Mask reduced TTE compared to No-Mask (-34.5 s; CI: -17.0, -52.1; main effect of condition:

300 $F=14.9$, $p=0.0007$, Figure 3), with no condition*sex interaction.

301

302 *Forced Vital Capacity at rest (FVC)*

303 Mask reduced FVC compared to No-Mask (-1.8L; CI: -1.1, -1.5; condition: $F=117.7$,

304 $p<0.0001$), with no condition*sex interaction (Table 2).

305

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

307 Mask reduced FEV1 compared to No-Mask (-1.2; CI: -1.0, -1.4; main effect of condition:

308 $F=156.2$, $p<0.0001$), with no condition*sex interaction (Table 2).

309

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

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

312

313 *Peak expiratory flow at rest (PEF)*

314 Mask reduced PEF compared to No-Mask (-3.4; CI: -2.8, -4.0, main effect of condition:

315 $F=122.1$, $p<0.0001$), independently of sex (Table 2).

316

317 *Subjective perception questionnaire*

318 Mask increased the subjective feelings of Heat, Misfitting, Discomfort, Fatigue, Resistance,

319 Saltiness and Humidity (all $p\leq 0.01$), but did not affect feelings of Saltiness, Tightness or

320 Itchiness (all $p\geq 0.1$). No interaction between condition and sex was detected (Table 2).

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


	Women		Men	
	No-Mask	Mask	No-Mask	Mask
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD
<u>Spirometry</u>				
FEV1 (L)^{\$!}	3.4 ± 0.4	2.3 ± 0.5	4.5 ± 0.5	3.2 ± 0.6
FVC (L)^{\$!}	3.8 ± 0.6	2.6 ± 0.6	5 ± 0.7	3.7 ± 0.7
FVC/FEV1(%)	90.7 ± 7.7	90.5 ± 7.2	90.8 ± 6.7	87.3 ± 8.4
PEF (L/s)^{\$!}	7.7 ± 1.8	4.4 ± 1.1	9.2 ± 1.9	5.7 ± 1.6
<u>Questionnaire</u>				
Tightness	3.4 ± 2.4	4.2 ± 3.4	2.5 ± 2.2	3.4 ± 2.5
Heat^{\$}	3.6 ± 2.1	6.2 ± 2.5	3.3 ± 2.2	5.9 ± 2.3
Itchiness	0.8 ± 1.1	1.1 ± 2.2	1.6 ± 2.7	2.8 ± 3.1
Misfitting^{\$}	1.8 ± 2.3	2.6 ± 2.5	1.6 ± 2.1	4.1 ± 2.7
Discomfort^{\$}	4.5 ± 1.4	7.9 ± 2.3	4.2 ± 2.9	7.1 ± 2.6
Fatigue^{\$}	5.2 ± 3.1	8.2 ± 1.8	5.0 ± 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	4.0 ± 2.8	8.4 ± 1.3
Saltiness^{\$!}	0.3 ± 0.5	0.7 ± 1.6	1.0 ± 1.8	2.7 ± 3.5
Humidity^{\$}	3.7 ± 2.6	5.3 ± 2.3	4.1 ± 1.9	6.6 ± 2.4

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

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

324 Significance labels: \$, main effect of condition; !, main effect of sex; &, interaction effect

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




325

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

330 \$ main effect of Mask; ! main effect of intensity; & main effect of sex; * condition*intensity
 331 interaction; ♂ condition*intensity interaction for men; ♀ condition*intensity interaction for
 332 women.


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



333

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

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



338

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

341 \$ main effect of Mask

342 **Discussion**

343 This study showed that breathing difficulty with a cloth facemask is dependent upon the
344 exercise intensity, with lower distress at less severe intensities. Mask wearing did not
345 substantially affect physiological or metabolic variables during exercise, regardless of sex
346 and intensity. From a practical perspective, these data suggest that use of a cloth facemask for
347 protecting individuals from SARS-CoV-2 infections should not be a barrier to the
348 engagement in moderate-to-heavy physical activity.

349

350 The main novelty of the current study is that we assessed the influence of wearing a mask on
351 respiratory and cardiovascular variables across several exercise intensities, spanning
352 moderate to severe domains [10]. Wearing a mask did not modify most respiratory variables
353 in the moderate to heavy exercise domains, with only inspiratory capacity reduced at
354 80% VAT with the mask. Our findings suggest that reductions in inspiratory capacity early in
355 exercise are reflective of a decrease in contractile power of the inspiratory muscles. This
356 inspiratory distress may place a greater strain on the respiratory muscles to maintain
357 breathing requirements during exercise. This was not seen in the moderate to heavy domains
358 but was manifested in an inability to maintain the physiological increases in respiratory
359 frequency and tidal volume at the higher intensities. For example, during VAT, although
360 breathing frequency was reduced, this was likely compensated by increases in tidal volume as
361 evidenced by no differences between conditions, suggesting that the cloth facemask did not
362 negatively inhibit the ability of the respiratory system to work at moderate, heavy and severe
363 exercise intensities. Indeed, this might explain the reduced V_{E}/V_{CO_2} with a mask. At
364 higher intensities, however, both respiratory frequency and tidal volume were reduced with a
365 mask, which may have led to an inability to maintain respiratory homeostasis and affected
366 subsequent performance. Our data are in agreement with previous studies showing a reduced

367 exercise capacity with different facemasks [6 22], though others have shown no negative
368 impact [8, 23]. It is possible that different types of facemasks and respirators (e.g., FFP2/N95,
369 surgical, cloth facemasks) and participants' fitness level may have contributed to these
370 conflicting findings.

371

372 Despite some changes in respiratory variables, no cardiovascular measure was affected using
373 a cloth facemask. Even during the highest exercise intensity domains, there were no changes
374 in heart rate, or systolic and diastolic blood pressure when wearing a cloth facemask.
375 Moreover, the slight overall reduction in blood oxygen saturation (not detected at individual
376 exercise intensities) was not clinically meaningful, supporting previous studies showing no
377 effect of wearing a facemask on oxygen saturation [24, 25]. These findings collectively can
378 counteract misinformation during the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly relating to the use of
379 masks during exercise and its supposed negative effects on cardiac overload, acid-base
380 balance, and oxygen saturation [28].

381

382 We had speculated that any potential physiological effects associated with wearing a mask
383 during exercise could be greater in women, who have an overall lower higher
384 cardiorespiratory reserve than men, owing to classically described morphological and
385 physiological sex-differences (e.g., smaller lungs, lower O₂ carrying capacity and maximum
386 cardiac output). This hypothesis was not confirmed, as the effects of the cloth facemask on
387 physiological measures were mostly similar between women and men irrespective of exercise
388 intensities. Exercise capacity was reduced by 23.9% in women and 17.8% in men when using
389 a cloth facemask, with no differences between sexes. This suggests that the stress imposed by
390 wearing a mask does not constitute a greater physiological or metabolic burden to women vs.
391 men, despite the well-known sex-differences during exercise.

392

393 This study has several limitations. Although the measurement of respiratory variables during
394 the PSWT provide novel information regarding the respiratory response during different
395 intensities, participants were required to wear a facemask for breath-by-breath measures over
396 the cloth facemask. This may have increased the discomfort felt by the participants and may
397 also have led to some inaccuracies in measurements due to air escaping. The current data
398 cannot be directly extrapolated to trained individuals; however, we felt it important to
399 investigate this matter among a non-trained population, as there has been intense debate on
400 the physiological repercussions and potential adverse effects of face masks in non-trained
401 individuals. Since sufficient levels of physical activity prevent morbidities and mortality [29-
402 31] and improve vaccine immunogenicity [32], it is important that mask mandates do not lead
403 to a reduction in physical activity. In this regard, the present data provide relevant
404 information that wearing a cloth facemask will not have a negative impact during exercise at
405 moderate-to-heavy intensities, which is associated with a plethora of health-related benefits
406 [33, 34]. Whether the negative perpetual feelings related to the use of masks may result in
407 less adherence to exercise remains to be examined. Furthermore, the influence of mask
408 wearing during exercise in clinical populations warrants investigation.

409

410 In conclusion, although wearing a cloth facemask may reduce maximal exercise capacity, it
411 did not impose significant respiratory or cardiovascular changes during exercise performed at
412 moderate-to-heavy intensities. These data have important practical implications as they can
413 debunk unfounded allegations of harmful effects of facemasks during exercise and help
414 inform new exercise recommendations for health during the COVID-19 pandemic.

415 **Acknowledgments**

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

421 **References**

- 422 1. Clase CM, Fu EL, Joseph M, et al. Cloth Masks May Prevent Transmission of COVID-19:
423 An Evidence-Based, Risk-Based Approach. *Annals of internal medicine*
424 2020;**173**(6):489-91 doi: 10.7326/M20-2567[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 425 2. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and
426 efficacy of face masks. *Nature medicine* 2020;**26**(5):676-80 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-
427 0843-2[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 428 3. Stephenson J. CDC Studies Underscore Continued Importance of Masks to Prevent
429 Coronavirus Spread. *JAMA Health Forum* 2021;**2**(2):e210207-e07 doi:
430 10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.0207[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 431 4. Burgess A, Horii M. Risk, ritual and health responsabilisation: Japan's 'safety blanket' of
432 surgical face mask-wearing. *Sociology of health & illness* 2012;**34**(8):1184-98 doi:
433 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2012.01466.x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 434 5. Groves LM, Usagawa L, Elm J, et al. Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 at Three
435 Fitness Facilities — Hawaii, June–July 2020. *MMWR and Morbidity and Mortality*
436 *Weekly Report* 2021;**70**:316-20
- 437 6. Driver S, Reynolds M, Brown K, et al. Effects of wearing a cloth face mask on
438 performance, physiological and perceptual responses during a graded treadmill
439 running exercise test. *Br J Sports Med* 2021 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-
440 103758[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 441 7. Fikenzer S, Uhe T, Lavall D, et al. Effects of surgical and FFP2/N95 face masks on
442 cardiopulmonary exercise capacity. *Clinical research in cardiology : official journal of*
443 *the German Cardiac Society* 2020;**109**(12):1522-30 doi: 10.1007/s00392-020-01704-
444 y[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 445 8. Shaw K, Butcher S, Ko J, et al. Wearing of Cloth or Disposable Surgical Face Masks has
446 no Effect on Vigorous Exercise Performance in Healthy Individuals. *Int J Environ*
447 *Res Public Health* 2020;**17**(21) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17218110[published Online First:
448 Epub Date]].
- 449 9. Coyle EF, Coggan AR, Hopper MK, et al. Determinants of endurance in well-trained
450 cyclists. *J Appl Physiol* (1985) 1988;**64**(6):2622-30 doi:
451 10.1152/jappl.1988.64.6.2622[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 452 10. Burnley M, Jones AM. Oxygen uptake kinetics as a determinant of sports performance.
453 *Eur J Sport Sci* 2007;**7**(2):63-79 doi: 10.1080/17461390701456148[published Online
454 First: Epub Date]].

- 455 11. Whipp BJ, Ward SA, Rossiter HB. Pulmonary O₂ uptake during exercise: conflating
456 muscular and cardiovascular responses. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2005;**37**(9):1574-85
457 doi: 10.1249/01.mss.0000177476.63356.22[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 458 12. Duke JW. Sex Hormones and Their Impact on the Ventilatory Responses to Exercise and
459 the Environment. In: Hackney AC, ed. *Sex Hormones, Exercise and Women: Scientific and Clinical Aspects*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017:19-34.
- 460 13. Freedson P, Katch VL, Sady S, et al. Cardiac output differences in males and females
461 during mild cycle ergometer exercise. *Medicine and science in sports* 1979;**11**(1):16-9
- 462 14. Lewis DA, Kamon E, Hodgson JL. Physiological differences between genders.
463 Implications for sports conditioning. *Sports Med* 1986;**3**(5):357-69 doi:
464 10.2165/00007256-198603050-00005[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 465 15. Hagstromer M, Oja P, Sjostrom M. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire
466 (IPAQ): a study of concurrent and construct validity. *Public health nutrition*
467 2006;**9**(6):755-62 doi: 10.1079/phn2005898[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 468 16. Atkinson G, Reilly T. Circadian variation in sports performance. *Sports Med*
469 1996;**21**(4):292-312 doi: 10.2165/00007256-199621040-00005[published Online
470 First: Epub Date]].
- 471 17. Graham BL, Steenbruggen I, Miller MR, et al. Standardization of Spirometry 2019
472 Update. An Official American Thoracic Society and European Respiratory Society
473 Technical Statement. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*
474 2019;**200**(8):e70-e88 doi: 10.1164/rccm.201908-1590ST[published Online First:
475 Epub Date]].
- 476 18. Howley ET, Bassett DR, Jr., Welch HG. Criteria for maximal oxygen uptake: review and
477 commentary. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1995;**27**(9):1292-301
- 478 19. Guenette JA, Chin RC, Cory JM, et al. Inspiratory Capacity during Exercise:
479 Measurement, Analysis, and Interpretation. *Pulmonary medicine* 2013;**2013**:956081
480 doi: 10.1155/2013/956081[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 481 20. Neder JA, Andreoni S, Lerario MC, et al. Reference values for lung function tests: II.
482 Maximal respiratory pressures and voluntary ventilation. *Brazilian Journal of Medical
483 and Biological Research [online]* 1999;**32**(6):719-27 doi: 10.1590/S0100-
484 879X1999000600007[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 485 21. Borg GA. Psychophysical bases of perceived exertion. *Medicine and science in sports and
486 exercise* 1982;**14**(5):377-81
487

- 488 22. Li Y, Tokura H, Guo YP, et al. Effects of wearing N95 and surgical facemasks on heart
489 rate, thermal stress and subjective sensations. *International archives of occupational
490 and environmental health* 2005;**78**(6):501-9 doi: 10.1007/s00420-004-0584-
491 4[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 492 23. Epstein D, Korytny A, Isenberg Y, et al. Return to training in the COVID-19 era: The
493 physiological effects of face masks during exercise. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*
494 2021;**31**(1):70-75 doi: 10.1111/sms.13832[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 495 24. Shaw KA, Zello GA, Butcher SJ, et al. The impact of face masks on performance and
496 physiological outcomes during exercise: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Appl
497 Physiol Nutr Metab* 2021:1-11 doi: 10.1139/apnm-2021-0143[published Online First:
498 Epub Date]].
- 499 25. Fukushi I, Nakamura M, Kuwana S-i. Effects of wearing facemasks on the sensation of
500 exertional dyspnea and exercise capacity in healthy subjects. *PloS one*
501 2021;**16**(9):e0258104 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0258104[published Online First:
502 Epub Date]].
- 503 26. Kouzy R, Abi Jaoude J, Kraitem A, et al. Coronavirus Goes Viral: Quantifying the
504 COVID-19 Misinformation Epidemic on Twitter. *Cureus* 2020;**12**(3):e7255 doi:
505 10.7759/cureus.7255[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 506 27. Roozenbeek J, Schneider CR. Susceptibility to misinformation about COVID-19 around
507 the world. 2020;**7**(10):201199 doi: 10.1098/rsos.201199[published Online First: Epub
508 Date]].
- 509 28. Chandrasekaran B, Fernandes S. “Exercise with facemask; Are we handling a devil's
510 sword?” – A physiological hypothesis. *Medical Hypotheses* 2020;**144**:110002 doi:
511 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110002>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 512 29. Lavie CJ, Ozemek C, Carbone S, et al. Sedentary Behavior, Exercise, and Cardiovascular
513 Health. *Circulation research* 2019;**124**(5):799-815 doi:
514 10.1161/circresaha.118.312669[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 515 30. Fiuza-Luces C, Garatachea N, Berger NA, et al. Exercise is the real polypill. *Physiology*
516 (Bethesda, Md) 2013;**28**(5):330-58 doi: 10.1152/physiol.00019.2013[published
517 Online First: Epub Date]].
- 518 31. Mok A, Khaw KT, Luben R, et al. Physical activity trajectories and mortality: population
519 based cohort study. 2019;**365**:l2323 doi: 10.1136/bmj.l2323[published Online First:
520 Epub Date]].

- 521 32. Gualano B, Lemes I, Silva R, et al. Physical activity associates with enhanced
522 immunogenicity of an inactivated virus vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in patients with
523 autoimmune rheumatic diseases: Research Square, 2021.
- 524 33. Gebel K, Ding D, Chey T, et al. Effect of Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity on All-
525 Cause Mortality in Middle-aged and Older Australians. *JAMA Internal Medicine*
526 2015;**175**(6):970-77 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0541[published Online First:
527 Epub Date]].
- 528 34. Hupin D, Roche F, Gremeaux V, et al. Even a low-dose of moderate-to-vigorous physical
529 activity reduces mortality by 22% in adults aged ≥ 60 years: a systematic review and
530 meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2015;**49**(19):1262-67 doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2014-
531 094306[published Online First: Epub Date]].

532