

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Full title:** Inhaled CO<sub>2</sub> concentration while wearing face masks: a pilot study using capnography.

**Short title:** Capnography assessment of carbon dioxide inhaled with face masks.

**Authors:** Cecilia Acuti Martellucci\* (1); Maria Elena Flacco\* (1); Mosè Martellucci (2); Francesco Saverio Violante (3), Lamberto Manzoli (4).

**Affiliations:** (1) Department of Environmental and Prevention Sciences, University of Ferrara, Italy; (2) Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Perugia, Italy; (3) Occupational Health Unit, Sant'Orsola Malpighi University Hospital, University of Bologna, Italy; (4) Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, Italy.

\* These authors contributed equally to the present work.

**Corresponding author:**

Dr. Cecilia Acuti Martellucci  
Department of Medical Sciences, University of Ferrara  
Via Fossato di Mortara 64/B - 44121 Ferrara, Italy  
E-mail: [cecilia.martellucci@unife.it](mailto:cecilia.martellucci@unife.it)

**Abstract word count:** 244

**Word count:** 2772

**Keywords**

Carbon dioxide, face masks, capnography

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 None of the available evaluations of the inhaled air carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) concentration, while wearing face  
3 masks, used professional, real-time capnography with water-removal tubing. We measured the end-tidal CO<sub>2</sub>  
4 using professional side-stream capnography, with water-removing tubing (Rad-97™ capnograph), at rest, (1)  
5 without masks, (2) wearing a surgical mask, and (3) wearing a FFP2 respirator, in 102 healthy volunteers aged  
6 10-90 years, from the general population of Ferrara province, Italy. The inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was then  
7 computed as:  $((\text{mask volume} \times \text{end-tidal CO}_2) + ((\text{tidal volume} - \text{mask volume}) \times \text{ambient air CO}_2)) / \text{tidal}$   
8  $\text{volume}$ ).

9 The mean CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was 4965±1047 ppm with surgical masks, and 9396±2254 ppm with FFP2  
10 respirators. The proportion of the sample showing a CO<sub>2</sub> concentration higher than the 5000 ppm acceptable  
11 exposure threshold recommended for workers was 40.2% while wearing surgical masks, 99.0% while wearing  
12 FFP2 respirators. The mean blood oxygen saturation remained >96%, and the mean end-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> <33 mmHg.  
13 Adjusting for age, gender, BMI, and smoking, the inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration significantly increased with  
14 increasing respiratory rate (with a mean of 10,143±2782 ppm among the participants taking 18 or more breaths  
15 per minute, while wearing FFP2 respirators), and was higher among the minors, who showed a mean CO<sub>2</sub>  
16 concentration of 12,847±2898 ppm, while wearing FFP2 respirators. If these results will be confirmed, the  
17 current guidelines on mask-wearing could be updated to integrate recommendations for slow breathing and a  
18 more targeted use when contagion risk is low.

19

20

21

22

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Most nations introduced the use of face masks in the community to contrast SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.(1, 2) Italy,  
3 one of the first countries to experience an epidemic wave,(3) required masks to be worn by all people older than  
4 five years, indoors and outdoors.(4)

5 While masks contribute to reducing the epidemic spread,(2) and might also decrease the incidence of other  
6 airborne infections,(5, 6) a prolonged mask use has been associated with adverse effects due to pathogens  
7 contamination and/or a substantial rise of the carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) concentration in inhaled air.(7, 8) However,  
8 only two studies directly assessed CO<sub>2</sub> in air inhaled while wearing masks in the general population.(9, 10)  
9 These studies had an overall sample of 12 adults, and used measurement tools which could not avoid the  
10 interference of water vapor,(9, 10) which is typically high in exhaled air,(11) and is known to substantially  
11 decrease accuracy.(12) Indeed, a third research was recently retracted because of methodological concerns  
12 including water vapor interference, instrument's latency, and the impossibility to correctly define inhaled and  
13 exhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> without the use of capnography.(13)

14 We used a professional real-time capnograph, with water-removal tubing, in order to assess the inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub>  
15 concentration in a sample of healthy individuals wearing different types of masks.

16

17

## 18 MATERIALS AND METHODS

19

### 20 Study population

21 The participants were healthy volunteers sequentially recruited by three general practitioners and one family  
22 pediatrician in the Province of Ferrara, Italy during April and May 2021. Inclusion criteria were: age between 10  
23 and 90 years, forehead temperature <37.5°C, being able to wear a mask without assistance, and providing  
24 written informed consent (for the minors, the consent was requested to the legally responsible individual).  
25 Exclusion criteria were: pregnancy, and cardiac or respiratory comorbidities.

26

27

## 1 Study design

2 In this observational, descriptive study, we measured the end-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> (ETCO<sub>2</sub>) in all participants (a) without  
3 masks; (b) wearing a surgical mask; (c) wearing a Filtering Face-Piece grade 2 (FFP2) respirator. Given that the  
4 masks constitute an added dead space of the airways, with different volumes depending on mask size and face  
5 shape,(14) the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> within this added dead space can be assessed measuring the ETCO<sub>2</sub>, which  
6 indicates how much CO<sub>2</sub> is exhaled in the final phase of the expiration.(15) The evaluations of ETCO<sub>2</sub> were  
7 performed after ten minutes of rest, with participants seated, silent, and breathing only through the nose. A  
8 trained physician (CAM) took measurements at minutes three, four, and five, and the final value used in the  
9 analyses was the average of the three measurements.

10 All masks were identical and were provided by the investigators, who monitored and eventually adjusted the  
11 fit.(16) The surgical mask was a 3-layer plane-shaped disposable face mask with ear loops (17.5x9.5 cm,  
12 conforming to UNI EN ISO 14683:2019 and AC:2019 regulations). The FFP2 was a 5-layer disposable  
13 respirator (15.0x10.0 cm, conforming to EN 149:2001 and A1:2009), equivalent to United States N95.

14 The measurement tool was a Rad-97™ capnograph with real-time side-stream gas measurement and water-  
15 removal tubing (Masimo Corp., Irvine, CA, USA). The sampling point (nasal cannulas) was positioned outside  
16 the exhaled air stream – below the lips of each subject – to ensure that the detected ETCO<sub>2</sub> was that of the  
17 volume of air within the masks. Photos of the measurement method may be obtained from the corresponding  
18 author. The capnography device measured CO<sub>2</sub> in mmHg, which was converted to ppm using a standardized  
19 conversion formula.(17)

20 The environmental CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (in ppm) was measured using an automatic Temtop mod. M2000C®  
21 sensor (Elitech Technology Inc., Milpitas, CA, USA). All measurements were made into a room that was  
22 constantly and amply ventilated with external air.

23 For each participant, information was also collected on blood oxygen saturation and respiratory rate (measured  
24 at the same time points as the ETCO<sub>2</sub>), age, gender, weight and height, and smoking (current - at least one  
25 cigarette per week - or former). Blood oxygen saturation was measured through a LTD800® digital finger pulse  
26 oximeter (Dimed Co. Ltd., Cavriglia, AR, Italy).

27

28

## 1 **Data analysis**

2 The primary outcome was the mean inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration when wearing masks. The secondary  
3 outcome was the proportion of individuals with inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration exceeding 5000 ppm, which is the  
4 long-term occupational exposure (eight hours) threshold recommended by both the United States Department of  
5 Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the European Agency for Safety and Health  
6 at Work (EU-OSHA).(18, 19)

7 CO<sub>2</sub> inhaled air concentration was computed as follows:  $((\text{mask volume} \times \text{end tidal CO}_2) + ((\text{tidal volume} -$   
8  $\text{mask volume}) \times \text{ambient air CO}_2)) / \text{tidal volume}.$ (20) The standard value of 7 ml per kilogram of weight was  
9 used for the tidal volume (the volume of air inhaled and exhaled with every respiration cycle).(21, 22) Similarly,  
10 masks volumes were the minimum average values reported by the literature: 50 ml for the surgical mask,(23)  
11 and 98 ml for the FFP2 respirator.(24)

12 The differences in the mean CO<sub>2</sub> concentration with and without masks were evaluated using Wilcoxon  
13 matched-pairs signed ranks test.(25) The analyses were repeated separately for children (aged 10 to 18 years),  
14 adults (19-64 years), and elderly (65-90 years), assessing potential differences between the groups through  
15 Kruskal-Wallis tests. Multiple linear regression was then performed to investigate potential independent  
16 predictors of higher CO<sub>2</sub> content wearing surgical (model 1) or FFP2 (model 2) masks. All covariates were  
17 included a priori in the models, the validity of which was assessed as follows: the assumption of constant error  
18 variance was checked graphically, plotting Pearson residuals against fitted values, and formally, using the  
19 Cook–Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity. High leverage observations were identified by computing Pearson,  
20 standardized and studentized residuals, and Cook’s D influence. We found five high-leverage observations in  
21 both models: as their exclusion did not substantially alter the results, the final models were based on the whole  
22 sample. A two-tailed p-value<0.05 was considered significant for all analyses, which were carried out using  
23 Stata 15.1 (Stata Corp., College Station, TX, 2017).

24 We decided to enroll a sample size of 100 subjects as it would allow 95% confidence interval to remain within  
25  $\pm 10\%$  of the sample mean value, assuming an average inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration of  $2000 \pm 1000$  ppm  
26 wearing surgical masks, and  $3000 \pm 1000$  ppm wearing FFP2 respirators.(10)

27

28

## 1 **RESULTS**

2

### 3 **Sample characteristics**

4 Participation was requested to 104 eligible subjects; 102 provided the consent and were thus included in the  
5 study (50% males; mean age 46.7±19.9 years). Ten participants were aged 10-18 years, 20 were aged 65-90  
6 years. The mean Body Mass Index (BMI) was 24.5±4.6, and current or former smokers were 22.6%. The  
7 average respiratory rate was 16.5±3.4 breaths per minute, with 33.3% breathing at or above 18 breaths per  
8 minute; the average blood oxygen saturation was 97.4±0.9%, with 98% of the sample at or above 96.0%  
9 saturation.

10

### 11 **Outcomes**

12 The mean inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> without masks was 458±21 ppm. While wearing the surgical mask, the mean CO<sub>2</sub>  
13 was 4965±1,047 ppm (95% confidence interval 4758 to 5171 ppm), and exceeded 5000 ppm in 40.2% (30.6% to  
14 50.4%) of the measurements (Table 1). While wearing the FFP2 respirator, the average CO<sub>2</sub> was 9396±2254  
15 ppm (8953 to 9839 ppm), and 99.0% (94.7% to 100%) of the participants showed values higher than 5000 ppm.  
16 Among the minors, the mean CO<sub>2</sub> concentration when wearing surgical masks was 6439±1366 ppm (5462 to  
17 7415 ppm), and was considerably higher than among the adults (4852±857 ppm; p<0.001), or the elderly  
18 (4638±948 ppm; p<0.01). A similar difference by age class was observed also for the FFP2 respirators (Table 2).  
19 The CO<sub>2</sub> concentration varied also by respiratory rate: wearing surgical masks, inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> was 4663±692  
20 ppm among the individuals with respiratory rate ≤14 breaths per minute, progressively rising to 5271±1291 ppm  
21 when 18 or more breaths per minute were taken. A similar trend was observed for FFP2 respirators (Table 1).  
22 Multivariate analyses substantially confirmed univariate results: a higher respiratory rate was significantly  
23 associated with higher inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> wearing both masks. Regression coefficients for ≥18 compared to ≤14  
24 breaths per minute were +546 and +1243, respectively, with surgical masks and FFP2 respirators (both p<0.01;  
25 Table 1).  
26  
27 Both respiratory rate and blood oxygen saturation did not differ substantially without or with the masks. Also,  
28 when wearing masks, the mean ETCO<sub>2</sub> remained within 33 mmHg.

1  
2 **Table 1.** Outcomes for the overall sample and results of the multiple linear regression predicting overall inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm (N = 102).  
3

	Without mask	Surgical mask	FFP2 respirator
<i>Mean CO<sub>2</sub> detected inside the mask in ppm</i> <sup>A</sup>			
Mean±SD (95% CI)	0±0 (--)	43 099±4284 (42 257 - 43 940) *	43 434±4426 (42 565 - 44 303) *
<i>Estimated inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm</i>			
Mean ± SD (95% CI)	458±21 (454 - 462) <sup>B</sup>	4965±1047 (4758 - 5171) *	9396±2254 (8953 - 9839) *
>5000 ppm, %	0.0	40.2	99.0
<i>Inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm by respiratory rate, mean±SD (95% CI)</i>			
- Slow (≤14 breaths per minute, n=25)	462±22 (453 - 471)	4663±692 (4378 - 4950)	8779±1471 (8171 - 9386)
- Moderate (15-17 breaths per minute, n=43)	457±19 (451 - 463)	4899±959 (4604 - 5194)	9165±2043 (8536 - 9793)
- High (≥18 breaths per minute, n=34)	458±22 (450 - 465)	5271±1291 (4820 - 5721)	10 143±2782 (9173 - 11 114)
<i>Coefficients for the linear regression</i>			
Respiratory rate, 1 breath per minute increase	--	33 (-10; 77)	99 (6; 192) <sup>†</sup>
- Low (≤14 breaths per minute, n=25)	--	0.00 (Ref. cat.)	0.00 (Ref. cat.)
- Moderate (15-17 breaths per minute, n=43)	--	261 (-116; 638)	431 (-368; 1231)
- High (≥18 breaths per minute, n=34)	--	546 (157; 935) <sup>‡</sup>	1243 (418; 2067) <sup>‡</sup>

4  
5 FFP2 = filtering face-piece grade 2 respirator. <sup>A</sup>End-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> detected inside the face masks. <sup>B</sup> Only ambient air CO<sub>2</sub>. \* P<0.001 (Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-rank test) of the  
6 comparison of CO<sub>2</sub> parameters between without and with surgical or FFP2 masks. <sup>†</sup> P<0.05 and <sup>‡</sup> P<0.01 from the Wald test for the linear regression adjusted by gender, age, Body  
7 Mass Index, and smoking status.  
8

1  
2  
3

**Table 2.** Sample characteristics and outcomes by age-class.

	Children (N=10)	Adults (N=72)	Elderly (N=20)
<i>Mean CO<sub>2</sub> detected inside the mask in ppm<sup>A</sup>, mean±SD (95% CI)</i>			
Without masks	0±0 (--)	0±0 (--)	0±0 (--)
With surgical mask	40 526±4288 (37 459 - 43 594)	43 604±4086 (42 644 - 44 564)	42 566±4662 (40 384 - 44 748)
With FFP2 respirator	42 632±3732 (39 962 - 45 301)	43 476±4775 (42 354 - 44 598)	43 684±3458 (42 066 - 45 302)
<i>Inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm, mean±SD (95% CI)</i>			
Without masks <sup>B</sup>	457±21 (443 - 472)	461±18 (457 - 465)	450±18 (437 - 463)
≥5000 ppm, %	0.0	0.0	0.0
Surgical mask	6439±1366 (5462 - 7415) <sup>*‡</sup>	4852±857 (4650 - 5053) <sup>†</sup>	4638±948 (4194 - 5081) <sup>†§</sup>
≥5000 ppm, %	90.0	37.5	25.0
FFP2 respirator	12 847±2898 (10 774 - 14 920) <sup>*‡</sup>	9056±1838 (8624 - 9488) <sup>†</sup>	8894±1854 (8027 - 9762) <sup>†‡</sup>
≥5000 ppm, %	100	98.6	100

4  
5 FFP2 = filtering face-piece grade 2 respirator. <sup>A</sup> End-tidal CO<sub>2</sub> detected inside the face masks. <sup>B</sup> Only ambient air CO<sub>2</sub>. \* P<0.01 and <sup>†</sup> P<0.001 (Wilcoxon matched pairs signed-rank test)  
6 for the comparisons between inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration with and without surgical or FFP2 masks. <sup>‡</sup> P<0.001 for the comparison between children and adults, and between children  
7 and the elderly only with FFP2 respirators, and <sup>§</sup> P<0.01 for the comparison between children and the elderly only with surgical masks (Kruskal-Wallis test).



1

## 2 **DISCUSSION**

3 In our sample of healthy individuals, at rest, after a few minutes of surgical masks use, the mean  
4 inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> approached the occupational exposure limit of 5000 ppm,(18) and this threshold was  
5 largely exceeded when wearing FFP2 respirators. Notably, the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration significantly  
6 increased with increasing respiratory rates, reaching around 5200 ppm in those breathing at 18 or  
7 more breaths per minute with surgical masks, and the minors showed substantially higher CO<sub>2</sub>  
8 concentrations than adults.

9

### 10 **Strengths and weaknesses of the study**

11 The chosen capnography device had water-removal tubing, and real-time monitoring, ensuring  
12 reliable and reproducible CO<sub>2</sub> measurements.(26) Indeed, relative humidity ranges 42-91% in exhaled  
13 air,(11) potentially altering CO<sub>2</sub> assessments,(12) which might explain the differences with the  
14 measurements of previous studies.(9, 10) Additionally, we examined the largest sample, so far, of  
15 healthy individuals of various ages, comparing both surgical masks and FFP2 respirators.(9, 10)

16 This study has also limitations that must be considered. First, although the sample size is the largest as  
17 yet, it is still relatively scarce, especially for the minors. Secondly, the volume of the dead space  
18 within the mask could not be assessed for each participant, and therefore we could not closely inspect  
19 the possible influence of face shape and individual added dead space on the inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub>. Thirdly,  
20 the instrument's precision of 1.5 mmHg (1974 ppm) widens the uncertainty around the measurements.

21 Importantly, however, when 1974 ppm are subtracted to the mean inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub>, the CO<sub>2</sub> in surgical  
22 masks decreases to about 3000 ppm, while it still exceeds the 5000 ppm threshold with FFP2  
23 respirators.(18) Lastly, the experimental conditions, with participants at complete rest and in a  
24 constantly ventilated room, were far from those experienced by workers and students during a typical  
25 day, normally spent in rooms shared with other people or doing some degree of physical activity.

26 Since it was observed that speech and even low level physical activity are associated with increases in  
27 CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, CO<sub>2</sub> values in real life are likely to be higher than those recorded in this study.(27,

28 28)

1

## 2 **Comparison with other studies and discussion of main findings**

3 High CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in masks worn by individuals at rest were previously reported by two  
4 studies,(9, 10) which however had very small sample sizes and used instruments that could not avoid  
5 the interference of water vapor.(11) The explanation of the observed high CO<sub>2</sub> values lies in the  
6 combination of tidal and mask volumes: even though the 500 ml tidal volume of the average adult  
7 man is predominantly filled with low environmental concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub>,(15) the portion  
8 represented by the mask dead space had a CO<sub>2</sub> content so high that the overall inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub>  
9 increased substantially.(29)

10 Concerning the risk of hypoxia, a research on 53 surgeons found that blood oxygen saturation  
11 decreased noticeably with a longer time wearing surgical masks.(29) In contrast, the present study  
12 was performed at rest and for a short time, during which the recorded levels of CO<sub>2</sub> did not  
13 substantially alter blood oxygen saturation, as in similar studies.(9, 10, 30) Nevertheless, the exposure  
14 to inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> values higher than 5000 ppm, for long periods, is considered unacceptable for the  
15 workers, and is forbidden in several countries,(18) because it frequently causes signs and symptoms  
16 such as headache, nausea, drowsiness, rhinitis, and reduced cognitive performance.(31, 32) Also,  
17 reports have been published about the negative impact of respirators on healthcare professionals, such  
18 as headache, reduced tolerance to light workload, and recommendations to take regular breaks from  
19 mask wearing have been proposed to ensure the wellbeing and productivity of the workers.(33, 34)

20 As regards the difference between mask types, of the above mentioned studies, one did not find  
21 differences in the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration between surgical and FFP2 (with valve) masks, but only subject  
22 was analyzed.(10) The other study did not include surgical masks in the evaluation.(9) In fact, given a  
23 similar ETCO<sub>2</sub> between the two mask types, the larger dead space inside FFP2 respirators is expected  
24 to determine a sharp difference in CO<sub>2</sub> content between surgical and FFP2 masks.(23, 24) This is  
25 consistent with three previous studies: one on patients whose ETCO<sub>2</sub> increased with increasing mask  
26 dead space,(35) and two on healthcare professionals (one of which using capnography) which found  
27 CO<sub>2</sub> retention within FFP2 masks, whether with or without valve.(28, 36)

1 In relation to the respiratory rate, no previous study specifically evaluated its association with CO<sub>2</sub>  
2 concentration in healthy individuals at rest. However, an increase of inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> was found during  
3 physical activity with masks,(25) and with higher respiratory rates in post-operative ventilated  
4 patients.(37) In addition, it is well known that, besides mask use, slow breathing is associated with  
5 significantly lower inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> concentration.(38)  
6 Finally, concerning the minors, no study so far directly compared them to adults, and only one  
7 relatively old research showed increased CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in young children wearing gas  
8 masks.(39) In fact, minors can be expected to be at a disadvantage also in this evaluation. Specifically,  
9 their small build corresponds to a small tidal volume, which therefore provides lesser dilution of the  
10 excess CO<sub>2</sub> compared to the greater tidal volume of adults.(21, 22) Nonetheless, given the limited  
11 number of the included minors, this finding inevitably requires validation.

12

### 13 **Implications of the study**

14 The mentioned OSHA and EU-OSHA 5000 ppm threshold is the long-term Permissible Exposure  
15 Limit (eight hours weighted average), while the Short Term Exposure Limit (15 minutes weighted  
16 average) is 40 000 ppm.(18, 19) This suggests that limiting mask use to short intervals, for instance  
17 when visiting shops, does not imply an immediate risk of inhaling excess CO<sub>2</sub>. Instead, if the CO<sub>2</sub>  
18 concentration measured in the present work is confirmed during more protracted mask-wearing, the  
19 use of masks could be targeted to the sites and hours in which SARS-CoV-2 transmission risk is  
20 moderate to high, and reduced as much as possible when the risk is low, especially in view of the  
21 rising SARS-CoV-2 vaccination coverage worldwide.(40) Indeed, given the recent evidence  
22 suggesting that, in crowded rooms, two air-changes per hour may lower aerosol build-up more  
23 efficiently than the best performing masks,(41) the choice of increased ventilation over mask-wearing  
24 could be taken into consideration when allowed by the environmental and epidemiological conditions,  
25 especially for the minors.

26 Moreover, the observed difference in inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> according to mask types suggests that, when the  
27 usage is protracted and/or physical activities are required, surgical masks should be used instead of

1 FFP2 respirators, as they reduce the possible negative effects of high CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, while still  
2 covering nose and mouth and therefore reducing the emission of droplets and aerosols.(42, 43)  
3 Finally, if the relationship between CO<sub>2</sub> levels and respiratory rate is verified, the current guidelines to  
4 control SARS-CoV-2 pandemic could be integrated with recommendations to reduce the respiratory  
5 rate during mask use.(38) This would be particularly important for blue-collar workers and the elderly,  
6 who are known to breathe faster,(44, 45) possibly more so when wearing masks,(7) and showed  
7 higher baseline CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.(46) Indeed, the average respiratory rate at rest has been estimated  
8 around 15 breaths per minute in healthy adults,(47) and, in the present assessment, three additional  
9 breaths per minute were enough to increase the mean CO<sub>2</sub> content over 5000 ppm when wearing  
10 surgical masks.

11

## 12 **Unanswered questions and future research**

13 Mask wearing is required in many countries throughout the working day, and during lectures in the  
14 case of students.(2) Therefore, capnography and pulse oxymeter monitoring of a general population  
15 sample should be extended to more than five minutes, possibly to hours of observation, and not only  
16 in conditions of rest, in order to verify whether the ET<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> detected within masks remains constant or  
17 has a tendency to increase with longer mask wearing and while performing habitual tasks. In addition,  
18 subjective symptoms such as headache and drowsiness should also be investigated.

19 As mentioned, the progressive rise in CO<sub>2</sub> with increasing breaths per minute, and the higher CO<sub>2</sub> in  
20 minors also requires validation from further studies with larger samples.

21

## 22 **CONCLUSIONS**

23 Shortly after wearing surgical masks, the inhaled air CO<sub>2</sub> approached the highest acceptable exposure  
24 threshold recommended for workers, while concerningly high concentrations were recorded in  
25 virtually all individuals when wearing FFP2 masks. The CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was significantly higher  
26 among minors and the subjects with high respiratory rate. If these findings are confirmed, the current  
27 guidelines on masks use could be updated to integrate recommendations for slow breathing and a  
28 more targeted use when contagion risk is low.

1 **Acknowledgements:** The authors thank Luisa Rogari and Francesca and Marta Rosini for their help  
2 in data collection.

3

4 **Ethical approval:** The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Emilia-Romagna  
5 Region "Area Vasta Emilia Centrale" on February 12<sup>th</sup> 2021 (code 78/2021/Oss/UniFe).

6

7 **Data availability:** The study data is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

8

9

## 10 **FOOTNOTES**

11

12 **Contributors:** CAM and LM: conceptualization and methodology. CAM, MEF, and MM:  
13 investigation. LM: funding acquisition and project administration. CAM and MEF: formal analysis.  
14 CAM, MEF, MM, FSV, and LM: data curation. LM and FSV: supervision and validation. CAM,  
15 MEF, and LM: writing - original draft. CAM, LM, and FSV: writing - review and editing. All authors  
16 critically revised the article for important intellectual content and gave final approval for the article.  
17 The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others  
18 meeting the criteria have been omitted.

19

20 **Funding:** The study was funded by a 2020 Grant by the National Special Integrative Fund for  
21 Research (FISR - Fondo Integrativo Speciale per la Ricerca) of the University of Ferrara. The funder  
22 had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the  
23 manuscript. All authors had full access to all of the data (including statistical reports and tables) in the  
24 study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

25

26 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

27

1

2 **REFERENCES**

3

- 4 1. Acuti Martellucci C, Flacco ME, Cappadona R, Bravi F, Mantovani L, Manzoli L. SARS-  
5 CoV-2 pandemic: An overview. *Advances in Biological Regulation*. 2020;77:100736.
- 6 2. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing,  
7 face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and  
8 COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10242):1973-87.
- 9 3. Flacco ME, Acuti Martellucci C, Bravi F, Parruti G, Mascitelli A, Mantovani L, et al. SARS-  
10 CoV-2 lethality did not change over time in two Italian Provinces. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*.  
11 2020.
- 12 4. Italian Government. Ulteriori disposizioni attuative del decreto-legge 25 marzo 2020, n.19,  
13 convertito, con modificazioni, dalla legge 25 maggio 2020, n. 35, recante «Misure urgenti per  
14 fronteggiare l'emergenza epidemiologica da COVID-19», e del decreto-legge 16 maggio 2020, n. 33,  
15 convertito, con modificazioni, dalla legge 14 luglio 2020, n. 74, recante «Ulteriori misure urgenti per  
16 fronteggiare l'emergenza epidemiologica da COVID-19», *Gazzetta Ufficiale Serie Generale n.275*  
17 2020 [Available from: <https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/id/2020/10/18/20A05727/sg>].
- 18 5. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan K-H, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. Respiratory  
19 virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*. 2020;26(5):676-80.
- 20 6. The Visual Journalism Team. Afghanistan: Where will refugees go after Taliban takeover?  
21 BBC News. 2021.
- 22 7. Kisielinski K, Giboni P, Prescher A, Klosterhalfen B, Graessel D, Funken S, et al. Is a Mask  
23 That Covers the Mouth and Nose Free from Undesirable Side Effects in Everyday Use and Free of  
24 Potential Hazards? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(8).
- 25 8. Johnson AT. Respirator masks protect health but impact performance: a review. *Journal of*  
26 *Biological Engineering*. 2016;10(1):4.

- 1 9. Rhee MSM, Lindquist CD, Silvestrini MT, Chan AC, Ong JJY, Sharma VK. Carbon dioxide  
2 increases with face masks but remains below short-term NIOSH limits. *BMC Infect Dis.*  
3 2021;21(1):354.
- 4 10. Geiss O. Effect of Wearing Face Masks on the Carbon Dioxide Concentration in the  
5 Breathing Zone. *Aerosol and Air Quality Research.* 2021;21(2):200403.
- 6 11. Mansour E, Vishinkin R, Rihet S, Saliba W, Fish F, Sarfati P, et al. Measurement of  
7 temperature and relative humidity in exhaled breath. *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical.*  
8 2020;304:127371.
- 9 12. Bhavani SK. Physics of Capnography - Factors affecting IR Spectrography. 2021 [Available  
10 from: <https://www.capnography.com/chemical-method-of-co2-measurement?id=61>.
- 11 13. Walach H, Weikl R, Prentice J, Diemer A, Traindl H, Kappes A, et al. Experimental  
12 Assessment of Carbon Dioxide Content in Inhaled Air With or Without Face Masks in Healthy  
13 Children: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Pediatrics.* 2021.
- 14 14. Birgersson E, Tang EH, Lee WLJ, Sak KJ. Reduction of Carbon Dioxide in Filtering  
15 Facepiece Respirators with an Active-Venting System: A Computational Study. *PLOS ONE.*  
16 2015;10(6):e0130306.
- 17 15. Hall J. Guyton and hall textbook of medical physiology (13th ed.). ed2015.
- 18 16. Zhuang Z, Bergman M, Brochu E, Palmiero A, Niezgodka G, He X, et al. Temporal changes in  
19 filtering-facepiece respirator fit. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* 2016;13(4):265-74.
- 20 17. Breyse P, Lees P. Gases and vapors. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.  
21 2006. p. <http://ocw.jhsph.edu/courses/PrinciplesIndustrialHygiene/PDFs/Lecture5.pdf>.
- 22 18. United States Department of Labor. Occupational Safety and Health Administration  
23 Occupational Chemical Database - Carbon Dioxide 2021 [Available from:  
24 <https://www.osha.gov/chemicaldata/183>.
- 25 19. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA). Directive 2019/1831 -  
26 indicative occupational exposure limit values 2021 [updated April 8 2021. Available from:  
27 [https://osha.europa.eu/en/legislation/directive/directive20191831-indicative-occupational-exposure-](https://osha.europa.eu/en/legislation/directive/directive20191831-indicative-occupational-exposure-limit-values)  
28 [limit-values](https://osha.europa.eu/en/legislation/directive/directive20191831-indicative-occupational-exposure-limit-values).

- 1 20. Toklu AS, Kayserlioğlu A, Ünal M, Özer Ş, Aktaş Ş. Ventilatory and Metabolic Response to  
2 Rebreathing the Expired Air in the Snorkel. *Int J Sports Med.* 2003;24(03):162-5.
- 3 21. Hutchinson J. On the capacity of the lungs, and on the respiratory functions, with a view of  
4 establishing a precise and easy method of detecting disease by the spirometer. *Medico-chirurgical*  
5 *transactions.* 1846;29:137-252.
- 6 22. Needham CD, Rogan MC, McDonald I. Normal standards for lung volumes, intrapulmonary  
7 gas-mixing, and maximum breathing capacity. *Thorax.* 1954;9(4):313-25.
- 8 23. Hopkins SR, Dominelli PB, Davis CK, Guenette JA, Luks AM, Molgat-Seon Y, et al. Face  
9 Masks and the Cardiorespiratory Response to Physical Activity in Health and Disease. *Annals of the*  
10 *American Thoracic Society.* 2021;18(3):399-407.
- 11 24. Xu M, Lei Z, Yang J. Estimating the Dead Space Volume Between a Headform and N95  
12 Filtering Facepiece Respirator Using Microsoft Kinect. *J Occup Environ Hyg.* 2015;12(8):538-46.
- 13 25. Epstein D, Korytny A, Isenberg Y, Marcusohn E, Zukermann R, Bishop B, et al. Return to  
14 training in the COVID-19 era: The physiological effects of face masks during exercise. *Scand J Med*  
15 *Sci Sports.* 2021;31(1):70-5.
- 16 26. Masimo. Rad-97 with NomoLine Capnography - Product Information 2021 [Available from:  
17 [https://www.masimo.com/siteassets/us/documents/pdf/plm-10050b\\_product\\_information\\_rad-](https://www.masimo.com/siteassets/us/documents/pdf/plm-10050b_product_information_rad-97_nomoline_capnography_us.pdf)  
18 [97\\_nomoline\\_capnography\\_us.pdf](https://www.masimo.com/siteassets/us/documents/pdf/plm-10050b_product_information_rad-97_nomoline_capnography_us.pdf).
- 19 27. Smith CL, Whitelaw JL, Davies B. Carbon dioxide rebreathing in respiratory protective  
20 devices: influence of speech and work rate in full-face masks. *Ergonomics.* 2013;56(5):781-90.
- 21 28. Roberge RJ, Coca A, Williams WJ, Powell JB, Palmiero AJ. Physiological Impact of the N95  
22 Filtering Facepiece Respirator on Healthcare Workers. *Respiratory Care.* 2010;55(5):569-77.
- 23 29. Beder A, Büyükkoçak U, Sabuncuoğlu H, Keskil ZA, Keskil S. Preliminary report on surgical  
24 mask induced deoxygenation during major surgery. *Neurocirugia (Astur).* 2008;19(2):121-6.
- 25 30. Shaw K, Zello GA, Butcher S, Ko J, Bertrand L, Chilibeck PD. The Impact of Face Masks on  
26 Performance and Physiological Outcomes during Exercise: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.  
27 *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.* 2021.



- 1 31. Jacobson TA, Kler JS, Hernke MT, Braun RK, Meyer KC, Funk WE. Direct human health  
2 risks of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Nature Sustainability*. 2019;2(8):691-701.
- 3 32. Azuma K, Kagi N, Yanagi U, Osawa H. Effects of low-level inhalation exposure to carbon  
4 dioxide in indoor environments: A short review on human health and psychomotor performance.  
5 *Environment International*. 2018;121:51-6.
- 6 33. Bharatendu C, Ong JJY, Goh Y, Tan BYQ, Chan ACY, Tang JZY, et al. Powered Air  
7 Purifying Respirator (PAPR) restores the N95 face mask induced cerebral hemodynamic alterations  
8 among Healthcare Workers during COVID-19 Outbreak. *J Neurol Sci*. 2020;417:117078.
- 9 34. Williams J, Krah Cichowicz J, Hornbeck A, Pollard J, Snyder J. NIOSH Science Blog  
10 [Internet]. Prevention CfDca, editor2020. [September 14, 2021]. Available from:  
11 <https://blogs.cdc.gov/niosh-science-blog/2020/06/10/ppe-burden/>.
- 12 35. Casati A, Fanelli G, Torri G. Physiological dead space/tidal volume ratio during face mask,  
13 laryngeal mask, and cuffed oropharyngeal airway spontaneous ventilation. *Journal of Clinical*  
14 *Anesthesia*. 1998;10(8):652-5.
- 15 36. Fletcher SJ, Clark M, Stanley PJ. Carbon dioxide re-breathing with close fitting face  
16 respirator masks. *Anaesthesia*. 2006;61(9):910.
- 17 37. Kurhekar P, Prasad TK, Rajarathinam B, Raghuraman MS. Capnographic Analysis of  
18 Minimum Mandatory Flow Rate for Hudson Face Mask: A Randomized Double-blind Study. *Anesth*  
19 *Essays Res*. 2017;11(2):463-6.
- 20 38. Russo MA, Santarelli DM, O'Rourke D. The physiological effects of slow breathing in the  
21 healthy human. *Breathe (Sheffield, England)*. 2017;13(4):298-309.
- 22 39. Arad M, Epstein Y, Royburt M, Berkenstadt H, Alpert G, Shemer J. Physiological assessment  
23 of the passive children's hood. *Isr J Med Sci*. 1991;27(11-12):643-7.
- 24 40. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard 2021 [Available  
25 from: <https://covid19.who.int/>].
- 26 41. Shah Y, Kurelek JW, Peterson SD, Yarusevych S. Experimental investigation of indoor  
27 aerosol dispersion and accumulation in the context of COVID-19: Effects of masks and ventilation.  
28 *Physics of Fluids*. 2021;33(7):073315.

- 1 42. Bandiera L, Pavar G, Pisetta G, Otomo S, Mangano E, Seckl JR, et al. Face coverings and  
2 respiratory tract droplet dispersion. *Royal Society Open Science*. 2020;7(12):201663.
- 3 43. Lindsley WG, Blachere FM, Law BF, Beezhold DH, Noti JD. Efficacy of face masks, neck  
4 gaiters and face shields for reducing the expulsion of simulated cough-generated aerosols. *Aerosol*  
5 *Science and Technology*. 2021;55(4):449-57.
- 6 44. Fleming S, Thompson M, Stevens R, Heneghan C, Plüddemann A, Maconochie I, et al.  
7 Normal ranges of heart rate and respiratory rate in children from birth to 18 years of age: a systematic  
8 review of observational studies. *The Lancet*. 2011;377(9770):1011-8.
- 9 45. Rodríguez-Molinero A, Narvaiza L, Ruiz J, Gálvez-Barrón C. Normal Respiratory Rate and  
10 Peripheral Blood Oxygen Saturation in the Elderly Population. *Journal of the American Geriatrics*  
11 *Society*. 2013;61(12):2238-40.
- 12 46. Ofir D, Yanir Y, Eynan M, Aviner B, Biram A, Mullokandov M, et al. The Effect of Aging  
13 on the Ventilatory Response to Wearing a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Hood  
14 Respirator at Rest and During Mild Exercise. *Mil Med*. 2017;182(1):e1536-e40.
- 15 47. Bergese SD, Mestek ML, Kelley SD, McIntyre RJ, Uribe AA, Sethi R, et al. Multicenter  
16 Study Validating Accuracy of a Continuous Respiratory Rate Measurement Derived From Pulse  
17 Oximetry: A Comparison With Capnography. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 2017;124(4):1153-9.
- 18
- 19