



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Mental Fatigue From Smartphone Use Reduces Volume-Load in Resistance Training: A Randomized, Single-Blinded Cross-Over Study

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Gantois, P., Lima-Junior, D.d., Fortes, L.d.S., Batista, G.R., Nakamura, F.Y., Fonseca, F.d.S. (2021). Mental Fatigue From Smartphone Use Reduces Volume-Load in Resistance Training: A Randomized, Single-Blinded Cross-Over Study. *PERCEPTUAL AND MOTOR SKILLS*, 128(4), 1640-1659 [10.1177/00315125211016233].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/945201> since: 2024-11-04

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1177/00315125211016233>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

Perceptual and Motor Skills

Mental Fatigue from Smartphone Use Reduces Volume-load in Resistance Training: A Randomized, Single-blinded Cross-over Study

Journal:	<i>Perceptual and Motor Skills</i>
Manuscript ID	PMS-20-0337.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Mental fatigue, Resistance exercise, Perceived Exertion, Concentric mean velocity, Volume-load
Abstract:	<p>We investigated the acute effects of mental fatigue induced by 30-minute use of smartphone social network apps on volume load in resistance training among recreationally trained adults. Sixteen (n= 16) adults of both sexes performed three sets of a half back-squat exercise to failure with 80% of 15RM, interspersed with 3-minutes of passive recovery between sets, before and after two different cognitive tasks: (a) use of smartphone social network apps; and (b) watching a documentary. We assessed mechanical variables and ratings of perceived exertion during the strength exercise. Relative to the documentary-viewing control condition, a 30-minute exposure to smartphone social network apps led to participants toward increased perception of mental fatigue ($p = 0.004$) and lower volume-load during the strength exercise ($p = 0.006$). There were no significant differences in perceived exertion between conditions ($p = 0.54$), participants' motivation ($p = 0.277$), intra-set mechanical variables ($p > 0.05$), or blood lactate concentrations ($p = 0.36$). Our findings of an isolated possible higher-than normal RPE without changes in physiological variables, accompanying the lower volume-load in the mentally-fatigued participants support psychological rather than physiological bases for mental fatigue affects.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Mental Fatigue from Smartphone Use Reduces Volume-load in Resistance**
4
5 **Training: A Randomized, Single-blinded Cross-over Study**
6
7

8 **Abstract**
9

10
11 We investigated the acute effects of mental fatigue induced by 30-minute use of
12 smartphone social network apps on volume load in resistance training among
13 recreationally trained adults. Sixteen ($n= 16$) adults of both sexes performed three sets
14 of a half back-squat exercise to failure with 80% of 15RM, interspersed with 3-minutes
15 of passive recovery between sets, before and after two different cognitive tasks: (a) use
16 of smartphone social network apps; and (b) watching a documentary. We assessed
17 mechanical variables and ratings of perceived exertion during the strength exercise.
18 Relative to the documentary-viewing control condition, a 30-minute exposure to
19 smartphone social network apps led to participants toward increased perception of
20 mental fatigue ($p = 0.004$) and lower volume-load during the strength exercise ($p =$
21 0.006). There were no significant differences in perceived exertion between conditions
22 ($p = 0.54$), participants' motivation ($p = 0.277$), intra-set mechanical variables ($p >$
23 0.05), or blood lactate concentrations ($p = 0.36$). Our findings of an isolated possible
24 higher-than normal RPE without changes in physiological variables, accompanying the
25 lower volume-load in the mentally-fatigued participants support psychological rather
26 than physiological bases for mental fatigue affects.
27
28
29

30 **Keywords:** Mental fatigue, resistance exercise, perceived exertion, concentric mean
31 velocity, volume-load.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Resistance training (RT) is one of the main modern conditioning programs for promoting strength, power, and muscle size gains (Marshall et al., 2021; Schoenfeld et al., 2021). To maximize gains in these programs, trainers may manipulate their prescriptions of certain variables (e.g., number of sets and repetitions, intensity, rest time, and movement velocity), as these parameters determine the magnitude of the trainees' physiological, mechanical, and psychological responses during an exercise program (American College of Sports Medicine, 2009). Among these RT prescription parameters, the number of repetitions performed for a given load intensity in a session (i.e., load) is known as the most important variable in RT, since volume-load plays the main role in muscle size gains (Schoenfeld, Ogborn & Krieger, 2017). To help individual trainees maintain a high volume-load during their RT sessions, it is necessary to investigate possible performance limiting factors.

The main factor that reduces performance during RT sessions is cumulative fatigue, due to an increased number of repetitions in consecutive sets of resistance exercises (Sánchez-Medina & González-Badillo, 2011; Gantois et al., 2021). Typically, the scientific literature in this area has been based on a mechanical fatigue model (i.e., decreased availability of muscle bioenergetics or force generation capacity) that reduces working capacity during a RT session (Gorostiaga et al., 2012; Costa et al., 2019). In this sense, it has been well-established that intra-set assessment of movement velocity provides reliable information about the exerciser's fatigue status (Sánchez-Medina & González-Badillo, 2011).

However, previous studies on whole-body endurance showed that an increased rating of perceived exertion (RPE) rather than changes in muscle energetic mechanisms was associated with reduced exercise tolerance in mentally fatigued individuals (Marcora et al., 2009; Pageaux et al., 2014; Pageaux et al., 2015). Data from those

1 studies highlighted the brain's role in underlying cognitive processes that
2 mediate human exercise performance. In contrast to studies on whole-body endurance,
3
4 it is still unknown whether mental fatigue (MF) affects performance during
5
6 multi-sets of resistance exercise. Considering the importance of intra-session
7
8 performance during RT in eliciting chronic adaptations, mental fatigue warrants further
9
10 study.
11
12
13
14

15 MF refers to a psychobiological state characterized by a sensation of
16
17 tiredness and lack of energy that an individual might experience after a
18
19 prolonged high-demanding mental or cognitive task (Marcora et al., 2009).
20
21 Previous studies demonstrated that MF negatively affects whole-body endurance
22
23 through a higher-than-normal RPE at the same submaximal exercise intensity
24
25 (MacMahon et al., 2014; Marcora et al., 2009; Pageaux et al., 2015). Those results are
26
27 consistent with a psycho-biological model of exercise performance based on
28
29 motivational intensity theory (Marcora, 2008). Briefly, the psycho-biological
30
31 model postulates that time-to-exhaustion on an endurance task is driven by two
32
33 cognitive components – RPE and motivational factors. Thus, when an individuals'
34
35 motivation level is unaffected during exercise, mentally fatigued persons disengage
36
37 from the task when maximum effort is achieved (Marcora, 2008).
38
39
40
41
42

43 The underlying mechanisms of MF are not fully understood. Some proposed that
44
45 highly demanding cognitive tasks are related to high adenosine and low
46
47 dopamine levels in the brain's prefrontal cortex, especially the anterior cingulate
48
49 cortex (ACC) (Pageaux et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2018). This area of the prefrontal
50
51 cortex is associated with several executive functions, such as decision making
52
53 based on effort during exercise, allocation of attention focus, and processing of
54
55 information inherent to the environment (Lorist et al., 2005; Marcora et al., 2009).
56
57 Given residual fatigue following consecutive sets of a resistance exercise, mentally
58
59 fatigued individuals might experience
60

1
2 a higher-than-normal RPE, compromising their performance in the RT session.
3
4 However, this hypothesis relies on whole-body endurance studies (Marcora et al., 2009;
5 Pageaux et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2015); the effects of MF in typical RT performance
6
7 are still uncertain.
8
9

10
11 Prior MF studies have relied on cognitive tasks such as the Stroop Color Word
12 task and AX-Continuous Performance Test (AX-CPT) (Marcora et al., 2009; Pageaux et
13 al., 2014; Smith et al., 2015). Although these earlier investigations contributed to an
14 understanding of the effect of MF on human performance, these are laboratory tasks that
15 may be novel to participants; they may lack ecological validity. Inducing mental fatigue
16 with universally common tasks participants are apt to encounter in daily life has more
17 direct relevance. One such task might be smartphone use, as this is a common modern
18 tool among young adults, with 3.6 billion smartphone users worldwide (Statista, 2020).
19 Some researchers have reported that prolonged exposure time to smartphones negatively
20 affected cognitive functions (Wilmer et al., 2017; Fortes et al., 2019; Fortes et al.,
21 2020).
22
23

24
25 In a recent literature review, Wilmer et al. (2017) suggested that exposure time
26 to smartphones affects a wide range of cognitive functions, and recently, Fortes et al.
27 (2019) showed that 30- and 45-minute exposure times to smartphone networking apps
28 acutely reduced inhibition control and passing decision-making among professional
29 soccer players. More recently, Fortes et al. (2020) also found that 30-minutes of
30 continuous social media on smartphones induced mental fatigue in high-level swimmers
31 (e.g., impaired Stroop task response time and increase perceived mental fatigue). Taken
32 together, these data suggest that prolonged use of smartphones induces MF and impairs
33 exercise performance. This prior research motivated the current study; and, to the best
34 of the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the effects of MF caused
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 by prolonged exposure time to smartphone networking apps on performance
2
3 during multi-sets of resistance exercise in recreationally trained adults. Based on
4
5 whole-body endurance studies (Marcora et al., 2009; Pageaux et al., 2014; Smith et
6
7 al., 2015) and the negative effects of prolonged social media use on cognitive and
8
9 athletic performance (Fortes et al., 2017; Fortes et al., 2020), we hypothesized that (a) a
10
11 30-minute exposure to smartphone social network app use would reduce session
12
13 volume-load and lead to higher RPE during the session, but (b) there would be no
14
15 effect of this smartphone use exposure on the participants' intra-set mechanical
16
17 performance or a change in their metabolic demand (blood lactate). This pattern of
18
19 results would suggest that perceived effort changes, rather than biological changes,
20
21 determined the reduced performance in mental fatigue conditions.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Methods**

29 ***Participants***

30
31
32
33
34 Twenty young adults of both sexes aged 18-36 years old participated in
35
36 this study. After four individuals withdrew from the study for personal reasons, the
37
38 final sample was comprised of 16 participants (8 women, 8 men; M age = 24.8, SD
39
40 = 4.2 years old; M weight = 73.1, SD = 9.6 kg; M height = 1.69, SD = 0.12 meters; M
41
42 Weight lifted at 15 Repetition Maximum (15 RM) in back-squat exercise = 75.2. SD =
43
44 20.3 kg). All participants were recreationally strength-trained as defined by Rhea
45
46 (2004) (i.e., individuals consistently trained for 1-5 years at >3 times per week). The
47
48 volunteers had no history of any muscular or-joint injury and had abstained from
49
50 any ergogenic substance to increase strength and/or muscle mass gains in the last six
51
52 months. They had previous experience with training to muscle concentric failure
53
54 and with perceptual scales, and all of them were habituated to performing half back-
55
56 squat exercise in their
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 training routines. The study was approved by the local Ethics and Research Committee
4 following the ethical principles contained in the Declaration of Helsinki. All
5 participants signed an informed consent form.
6
7
8
9

10 11 ***Study design*** 12

13
14 This study employed a counter-balanced, single-blinded, and randomized cross-
15 over design involving two experimental conditions (e.g., smartphone [experimental] vs.
16 watching documentary [control]) with a one-week washout interval between conditions.
17
18 The order of the presentation of these conditions was randomized. To induce MF,
19 participants spent 30-minutes on social networks through smartphone apps (e.g.
20 Facebook[®], Twitter[®], Instagram[®]), whereas, in the control condition, they watched a
21 documentary for 30-minutes.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The study was conducted in four different sessions with two visits to the
31 laboratory in the first week (with a 48-hour interval in-between) and one visit per week
32 in the next two sessions (with a one-week wash-out period) (see Figure 1). During the
33 first two visits, we familiarized participants with the experimental procedures and
34 performed the test-retest reproducibility of the 15RM test in the half back-squat
35 exercise. During the final two visits, participants performed either an experimental
36 condition to induce MF or a control treatment.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Upon arrival for the experimental treatments, participants were asked to
47 complete a pre-test checklist, ensuring compliance with the provided instructions, as
48 well as a psychometric tool related to perceived recovery and MF status, and to
49 undertake resting heart rate variability (HRV) assessment. Following the HRV
50 assessment, the half back-squat exercise to muscle failure (three sets with 80% of
51 15RM) was performed over three sets to verify if the mechanical variables and the
52 number of repetitions during the multi-sets resistance exercise were similar to the non-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mentally fatigued state. Thereafter, the experimental conditions were administered in a
4
5 quiet room.
6

7
8 After the experimental condition, participants completed a visual analog scale
9
10 (VAS) regarding perceived MF and motivation status. Participants then performed three
11
12 exercise sets with 80% of 15RM (~10-minutes after the experimental conditions)
13
14 preceded by a standardized warm-up (~5-minutes). During the back-squat exercise, we
15
16 monitored mechanical variables (i.e., power output and movement velocity) and RPE.
17
18 Blood lactate was only measured 2-minutes after the last repetition of the resistance
19
20 exercise session.
21
22

23
24
25 ****Figure 1 here****
26
27

28 29 ***Procedures***

30 31 *Experimental and control sessions*

32
33 Before each session, participants were instructed to attend all conditions in
34
35 a well-rested state (i.e., sleep for at least 8 hours and to abstain from any physical
36
37 exercise and alcohol ingestion in the 48-hours before the sessions). Additionally,
38
39 caffeine, nicotine, and smartphone use (e.g., social media) were to be avoided for at
40
41 least three hours before the sessions (Azevedo et al., 2016; Fortes et al., 2020). A
42
43 previous study showed that subjective mental fatigue recovered post-60 minutes of
44
45 mental fatigue induced by 45-minutes of the Stroop task and almost recovered after 45-
46
47 minutes of the AX-CPT task (Smith et al. 2019). Thus, we requested that participants
48
49 avoid cognitive tasks for at least three hours before each experimental condition
50
51 (e.g., social media). These data were self-reported before each condition. Sessions
52
53 were performed from 3:00 to 8:00 p.m., at the same time of day for each participant.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In experimental sessions, as noted above, we induced MF with 30-minutes of
4 continuous activity engaging in social media networks (e.g., Facebook[®], Instagram[®],
5 Twitter[®]) through smartphone apps. Participants were strongly encouraged to stay in
6 continuous activity on the smartphone (reading texts, writing messages, and posting
7 information on social networks). A research member not involved in any other study
8 procedure accompanied the participants during the experimental condition to ensure that
9 participants maintained their networking activities. Thus, the research members
10 involved in the strength exercise protocol were blinded to the participant's condition
11 (mental fatigue vs. control). This procedure was adopted to minimize possible biases
12 during the strength exercise protocol arising from the knowledge of the condition being
13 tested.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 During the control condition sessions, the participants watched 30-minutes of the
29 documentary “Secrets of NASA: 1^o Season- Eps 05” (Discovery Channel[®], Brazil) on a
30 full-HD screen 14” notebook (Positivo[®] 5650, Brazil). This documentary was selected
31 based on its similar content to a film adopted in a previous study that reported neutral
32 emotional demands (Smith et al., 2015).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *15RM test and resistance exercise protocol*

43
44 The 15RM test defined the exercise load (Haff & Triplett, 2015); it was
45 performed over two non-consecutive days with a 48-hour interval in-between (test-
46 retest). During each session, participants made two attempts with an interval of 10-
47 minutes between trials. The intraclass coefficient correlation (ICC) and the coefficient
48 of variation (CV) were: ICC = 0.98 (0.94 to 0.99); and CV = 2.0% (0.02 to 0.34).
49 Verbal encouragement was provided during the 15RM test but not during the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experimental conditions. The concentric phase of the movement was performed at the
4
5 maximum intended velocity.
6

7
8 The 15RM test and resistance exercise performed in the experimental conditions
9
10 were preceded by a standardized half back-squat warm-up, which included two sets of
11
12 15 repetitions of 50% and 80% 15RM load, respectively. The resistance exercise
13
14 included three sets of back-squat exercise to muscle failure with 80% of 15RM in a
15
16 Smith Machine (Righetto[®], Brazil), interspersed with 3-minutes of passive recovery
17
18 between sets. Failure was considered as voluntary exhaustion.
19

20
21 During the half back-squat exercise, participants' feet were slightly wider than
22
23 shoulder-width, and their toes were pointed forward or slightly outward. The bar was
24
25 placed in the upper portion of the trapezius muscle, slightly above the posterior portion
26
27 of the deltoid muscle. The participants squatted down until the thighs were parallel with
28
29 the floor (90°) and briefly stopped before the concentric phase. The bar displacement
30
31 was monitored for each participant by a Linear Encoder (Cefise[®], Brazil). Participants
32
33 evidenced no mean difference in their bar displacements between the two conditions
34
35 (Experimental = 32.1, SD = 6.1 cm; Control = 32.4, SD = 6.1 cm; paired t-test [p =
36
37 0.78]).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Mechanical measures*

46
47 The absolute peak and average power output and movement velocity ($\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$)
48
49 during the back-squat exercise were assessed using an Encoder Linear Peak Power
50
51 (CEFISE[®], Brazil). This equipment consists of a linear transducer that was attached to
52
53 the Smith-machine bar (Righetto[®], Brazil) to record the displacement of the bar (mm)
54
55 and convert it into a digital signal to transfer it to Peak Power 4.0 software (CEFISE[®],
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Brazil). To quantify the mean power produced during the back-squat exercise, the
4
5 velocity of the displacement (ms) of the bar and the load (kg) lifted were considered.
6
7

8 9 10 *Heart rate variability (HRV)*

11
12 The R-R intervals recordings were assessed while the participants were seated
13
14 for 10-minutes, using a portable heart rate monitor (H10, Polar Electro Oy®, Finland),
15
16 and they were downloaded via a validated smartphone app (Elite HRV app®) (Perrotta,
17
18 Jeklin, Hives, Meanwell, & Warburton, 2017). Data were analyzed during the last five
19
20 minutes after excluding the first five minutes, allowing for heart rate stabilization (Task
21
22 Force, 1996). In this study, we assessed the time domain HRV indices including the
23
24 square root of the mean squared differences of successive RR intervals (RMSSD) and
25
26 the standard deviation of the R-R intervals (SDNN). These HRV indices were evaluated
27
28 before participants engaged in any experimental conditions since it has been
29
30 consistently reported that low-HRV indices are related to fatigue status (Kassiano et al.,
31
32 2020; Nakamura et al., 2020).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Perceptual responses: VAS, total quality recovery (TQR), and RPE*

41
42 Subjective ratings of MF (referring to the treatment task) and motivation
43
44 (referring to the upcoming RT session) were assessed using the 100-mm VAS as
45
46 previously adopted (Smith et al., 2016). We used VAS as it is a sensitive and practical
47
48 tool to assess mental fatigue (Smith et al., 2019; Fortes et al., 2020). These scales have
49
50 two extremities anchored at “none at all” and “maximal,” respectively. No other
51
52 descriptor was presented in the VAS. Participants were instructed to perform a vertical
53
54 line along the 100-mm scale to indicate their current perceived status. To quantify the
55
56 values, we measured the millimeter distance from the “none at all” extremity toward the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 end of the line as indicated by the individual. In order to overcome the potential bias
4 related to uncertainty over the definition of 'mental fatigue,' a standardized definition of
5 mental fatigue was provided: "Reduced ability to perform cognitive and behavioral
6 tasks with subjective feelings of tiredness and lack of energy" (Boksem & Tops, 2008;
7
8
9
10
11
12 Marcora et al., 2009).

13
14 We used the TQR scale proposed by Kentta & Hassmen (1998) and adapted and
15 validated to the Brazilian Portuguese language by Osieck et al. (2015) before each
16 experimental condition in order to assess the level of perceived recovery. The TQR
17 scale ranged from six (nothing recovered) to 20 (fully recovered), with higher values
18 indicating increased recovery perception. We used this scale to ensure that participants
19 performed both visits in similar perceived recovery status.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 We monitored RPE during the back-squat exercise using a CR-10 scale (Foster
29 et al., 2001). Specifically, at every five repetitions performed during each set, the
30 participants were instructed to provide their RPE. Since we found within- and between-
31 subjects' differences in the number of repetitions and comparing RPE in an iso-work
32 (i.e., number of repetitions) was not feasible, we compared the mean RPE value in pre-
33 and post-experimental conditions.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Blood Lactate Concentration*

45
46 We assessed blood lactate concentration only 2-minutes after the last post-
47 experimental back-squat repetition. Blood lactate analysis was based on samples of ~15
48 µl of the blood collected from the participant's earlobe without hyperemia. These
49 samples were immediately dropped into a strip (BM lactate, Roche®, Brazil), and the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 blood lactate level was indicated after 1-minute with portable equipment (Accutrend
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Plus, Roche[®], Brazil). The CV of this device falls within 1.8-3.3% for low, medium,
4
5 and high blood lactate levels, respectively (Baldari et al., 2009).
6
7
8
9

10 **Statistical analysis**

11
12 Data are presented as means and standard deviations. Shapiro-Wilk test and the
13
14 standardized skewness and kurtoses were used to verify the shapes of the data
15
16 distributions. Levenes' test verified the homoscedasticity of variances. We used paired t-
17
18 tests to compare the TQR, HRV, motivation, and blood lactate concentration, and we
19
20 used repeated measures of analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Bonferroni post
21
22 hoc testing to verify the interaction (condition x time) effects for RPE, number of
23
24 repetitions, volume load, and mechanical variables. We used partial eta-squared (η^2)
25
26 and Cohen's *d* effect size (ES) to determine practical significance of findings. We
27
28 defined the threshold for the ES as small (0.2 to 0.5), medium (> 0.5 to 0.8), or large (>
29
30 0.8) (Cohen, 1988). Moreover, we conducted a post hoc power analysis for a two-way
31
32 (time x conditions) analysis of variance interaction effect on both the mechanical
33
34 variables and volume-load. We found that the final sample resulted in statistical power
35
36 ($1 - \beta$) greater than 84.5%. Analyses were performed in the SPSS 20.0 version (IBM[®]
37
38 Corporation, USA) and the statistical significance level was set at 5%.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Results**

49
50 HRV measures during the pre-experiment were not different across experimental
51
52 conditions ($p > 0.05$). Specifically, RMSSD values were $M = 54.94$, $SD = 32.68$ and M
53
54 $= 55.44$, $SD = 33.27$ during mental fatigue and control conditions ($p = 0.91$ and CI 95%
55
56 $= -8.71$ to 9.17), respectively. SDNN values were $M = 69.56$. $SD = 29.79$ and $M =$
57
58 68.44 , $SD = 2.72$ during mental fatigue and control conditions ($p = 0.84$ and CI 95% = -
59
60

1
2
3 12.54 to 10.29), respectively. No statistical difference was found for perceived recovery
4
5 scores during pre-experimental conditions (M mental fatigue = 16.94, SD = 2.57;
6
7 M control condition = 17.27. SD = 2.72 [$p = 0.62$ and CI 95% = -1.0 to
8
9 1.63]). Furthermore, blood lactate concentrations after resistance exercise were similar
10
11 between experimental conditions (M smartphone = 7.51. SD = 3.76 vs. M control =
12
13 7.64, SD = 3.62; $p = 0.36$).

14
15
16 Data for the number of repetitions and the total volume-load performed pre- and
17
18 post-experimental conditions are shown in Figure 2. There was a main effect for
19
20 time for the number of repetitions ($F_{(2,30)} = 34.3$; $p < 0.001$; $np^2 = 0.70$), with
21
22 participants in both conditions performing progressively fewer repetitions across
23
24 consecutive sets. An interaction effect was significant ($F_{(5,75)} = 3.0$; $p = 0.015$; np^2
25
26 = 0.17), and post hoc analyses revealed fewer repetitions in Sets 1 and 3 at the post-
27
28 experiment ($p < 0.05$) in the smartphone relative to the control condition. Between-
29
30 condition ES findings post-experiment were: Set 1 = 0.44 (small), Set 2 = 0.16
31
32 (trivial), and Set 3 = 0.49 (small); and volume-load = 0.25 (small).

33
34
35 The volume-load performed was higher at pre-test than at post-test for both
36
37 conditions ($F_{(1,15)} = 32.6$; $p < 0.001$; $np^2 = 0.68$), and there was a significant interaction
38
39 effect ($F_{(1,15)} = 10.1$; $p = 0.006$; $np^2 = 0.40$), such that the volume-load performed in
40
41 the smartphone condition was lower than in control condition ($\Delta = -29\%$ vs. -14.8%).

42
43
44
45
46
47
48 ****Figure 2 here****
49

50
51
52
53 The subjective scores for MF, RPE and motivation are presented in Figure
54
55 3. There was a significant interaction effect for perceived MF ($F_{(1,15)} = 11.83$; $p =$
56
57 0.004 ; $np^2 = 0.46$), with participants reporting increased MF after using the
58
59 smartphone
60

(experimental condition) compared to watching a documentary (control condition). There was no significant condition difference noted in motivation before the back-squat exercise ($t_{(15)} = 1.12$; $p = 0.277$). A main effect for time was observed for the RPE score ($F_{(1,15)} = 17.5$; $p = 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.54$), with higher RPE values at post-testing for both conditions, and there were no main or interaction effects between conditions found for RPE ($p > 0.05$).

****Figure 3 here****

The mechanical variables during the back-squat exercise at pre- and post-experiment are displayed in Figure 4. A main effect for time was found for all mechanical variables analyzed ($p < 0.05$), showing a reduced performance across consecutive sets. No condition or interaction effects were observed for these variables ($p > 0.05$). Within-subjects ES showed a small to moderate decrement in power output and movement velocity for both conditions.

****Figure 4 here****

Discussion

The main finding of this study was that MF induced by prolonged (i.e., 30-minute) use of smartphone social network apps reduced participants' total volume-load during a multi-set session of resistance exercise when compared to a control condition of documentary viewing ($\Delta = -29\%$ vs. -14.8%). Moreover, participants reported similar RPE scores and mechanical performance (power output and movement velocity) during exercise, even though they performed fewer volume-load repetitions following the experimental versus the control condition. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is

1
2 the first study to investigate the effects of MF on muscular performance during multi-set
3
4 resistance exercise that adopted a natural or ecological approach to inducing MF (i.e.,
5
6 via smartphone apps).
7
8

9 Participants' higher perceived MF in the smartphone condition suggests that it is
10
11 experienced as a highly demanding cognitive task. As hypothesized, the use of
12
13 smartphone social network apps caused a MF state in which participants reported an
14
15 increased subjective feeling of mental tiredness. It has been proposed that smartphone
16
17 use negatively affects cognitive function (Wilmer et al., 2017). Fortes et al. (2019)
18
19 found an increase in response time and reduction in accuracy on an inhibitory control
20
21 task following smartphone use periods at least equal to 30 minutes among soccer
22
23 players, similar to a more controlled laboratory cognitive task such as the Stroop task
24
25 (Gantois et al., 2019). These data support the idea that using smartphone apps might
26
27 impair executive function. Fortes et al. (2020) showed that both performances in the
28
29 Stroop task and perceived mental fatigue (VAS) were compromised after 30 minutes of
30
31 social media on a smartphone in a group of high-level swimmers. This data highlights
32
33 the sensitivity of VAS as a simple and feasible tool to assess mental fatigue instead of
34
35 laboratory cognitive tasks (Smith et al., 2019).
36
37
38
39
40

41 Although the continuous prolonged use of social media on smartphones
42
43 increases subjective mental fatigue when compared to the control condition, it is unclear
44
45 whether their cumulative effect would impair physical performance during resistance
46
47 exercise. For instance, a previous study showed that team sports athletes reported that
48
49 mental fatigue is a largely cumulative phenomenon (Russel et al., 2019). However, this
50
51 statement needs to be experimentally addressed, and future studies are required in order
52
53 to assess the time course and cumulative effects on physical and cognitive performance
54
55 of using social media.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In accordance with the psychobiological model, mentally fatigued participants
4 performed a lower volume-load in the resistance exercise protocol when compared to
5 the control condition. Since during resistance exercise, RPE increases linearly with the
6 number of repetitions (Hackett et al., 2017), we might assume that the same participant
7 would perform a similar number of repetitions, at a given load at the same level of
8 perceived effort, but RPE differences from mentally fatigued participants ($\Delta = -29\%$)
9 did not differ from those of non-mentally fatigued participants ($\Delta = -14.8\%$) at a lower
10 volume-load. Although the RPE during resistance exercise was not significantly
11 different between our two conditions, participants performed a lower volume-load after
12 the MF condition. Their report of similar levels of perceived exertion while performing
13 less work may indicate higher-than-normal RPE in the MF condition (Smith et al.,
14 2015).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Given the lack of change in participants' motivation before the half back-squat exercise, a possible explanation for their reduced volume-load after experiencing MF is the higher-than-normal RPE during exercise. According to the psychobiological model, motivation and perception of effort determine performance, although the periphery (e.g., afferent feedback and heart rate) might present an influence as well (Pageaux, 2014). Mental fatigue seems to affect the perception of effort only in many studies in which motivation remained similar (Martin et al., 2016; Filipas et al., 2020). Thus, similar levels of motivation before exercise are desired to avoid bias.

While there have been few previous investigations on the effect of MF on muscle endurance during resistance exercise, our data are consistent with previous reports on whole-body endurance exercises (Marcora et al., 2009; MacMahon et al., 2014; Pageaux et al., 2014). These studies showed that MF impaired endurance performance (i.e., time trial, overall speed, and time to exhaustion) due to higher-than-

1
2
3 normal RPE for the same exercise intensity. Although the assessment of the underlying
4 mechanisms of social media use on MF is far beyond the scope of the current study, it
5 has been proposed that engagement in high-order cognitive tasks is related to the level
6 of adenosine and dopamine in brain areas (prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate
7 cortex). The neurotransmitters act directly in executive functions related to decision-
8 making based on effort during exercise (Lorist et al., 2005; Marcora et al., 2009; Smith
9 et al., 2015; 2018). Considering that mentally fatigued individuals might experience
10 higher-than-normal RPE for the same exercise intensity, it is likely that the reduction in
11 the number of repetitions over sets during resistance exercise after the use of
12 smartphones in our study occurred due to the greater perception of effort caused by MF.
13 Of note, however, the limited performance found before and in the current study
14 occurred without any change in metabolic responses to exercise (Marcora et al., 2009;
15 Pageaux et al., 2013). Therefore, our results expand current knowledge by
16 demonstrating that the adverse effects of MF on whole-body endurance exercise
17 induced by higher-than-normal RPE also explain the reduction in the number of
18 repetitions in sets until the muscular failure in resistance exercise.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Volume-load is one of the most effective variables of resistance training (RT) to promote strength and hypertrophy gains (Izquierdo et al., 2006; Martorelli et al., 2017). RT has a dose-response effect on power, strength, muscle hypertrophy, and health outcomes (Schoenfeld et al., 2017; Figueiredo, de Salles & Trajano, 2018). Therefore, RT practitioners should be encouraged to avoid the prolonged use of social networks on smartphones before training sessions in order to maintain a greater volume-load. However, it is still not known whether an acute decrement on volume-load during complete multi-set RT affects long-term adaptations; this requires further research.

1
2
3 Unlike with mental fatigue, there have been consistent reports in the literature
4 that muscle fatigue during resistance exercise is caused by both central and peripheral
5 physiological changes (Kent-Braun & Le Blanc, 1996; Boerio et al., 2005). In the
6 current study, our participants showed a similar muscle peak, mean power output, and
7 velocity achieved during the resistance exercise after both MF and control conditions
8 even though there was a lower volume-load performed in the MF versus the control
9 condition. These results are in line with previous studies showing that maximal strength,
10 power output, and anaerobic work were unaffected by MF (Pageaux et al., 2013;
11 Rozand et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2015). Moreover, Pageaux et al. (2015) demonstrated
12 that MF compromised the whole-body endurance exercise through higher-than-normal
13 RPE rather than alterations in the maximal voluntary contraction. One possible
14 explanation for those results is that MF has a limited effect on cortical areas involved
15 with maximal muscle activation (Pageaux et al., 2013; Pageaux et al., 2015).

16
17 Although future studies are still necessary to understand the relationship
18 between MF and RPE, one possible explanation for similarly perceived exertion even
19 for a lower volume of repetitions performed following the experimental MF condition
20 in comparison to the control condition is that highly-demanding cognitive tasks affect
21 frontal brain ACC activity (Lorist et al., 2005; Martin et al., 2018). Lorist et al. (2005)
22 found that such cognitive tasks reduced the ERN/Ne (error-related negativity)
23 amplitude, an electrophysiological index that relies predominately on the ACC area
24 (Carter et al., 1998). As we did not measure brain activity during our experimental
25 conditions, we can only speculate that the lower volume-load in the smartphone
26 condition may have at least partly related to the negative effect of MF on this cortical
27 area, associated with effort-based decision making. Pageaux et al. (2014) proposed that
28 highly demanding cognitive tasks may increase the adenosine accumulation in the ACC,
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 leading to higher-than-normal RPE during subsequent endurance exercise. Azevedo et
4
5 al. (2016) showed that caffeine (an antagonist of adenosine) attenuates the negative
6
7 effects of MF (\downarrow RPE and \uparrow endurance performance), suggesting that adenosine limits
8
9 human performance during the MF state. More studies are needed to investigate the
10
11 ability of caffeine to counteract the negative effects of MF, especially during multi-sets
12
13 resistance exercise.
14
15

16 17 18 19 **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

20
21 Among the limitations of this study, although VAS is a sensitive tool and widely
22
23 used to detect MF, the lack of any objective and neurophysiological measures to verify
24
25 the degree the participants' reports of MF induced by the use of smartphone social
26
27 network apps limits the meaning of our findings. Future investigations should further
28
29 analyze MF induced by smartphone use by applying direct neurological measures of
30
31 cognitive demand, such as the amplitude of electroencephalogram (EEG) recorded brain
32
33 waves (alpha and theta). Also, our data assessed the impact of this means of inducing
34
35 MF on only one exercise, limiting our ability to generalize these results to a complete,
36
37 multi-exercise RT session and during other muscular training methods (e.g., maximal
38
39 strength, explosive strength, and hypertrophy training). To the best of our knowledge,
40
41 this is one of the first studies to induce MF using a protocol with high ecological
42
43 validity (exposure time to a smartphone), and more research is needed to confirm our
44
45 hypothesis that continuous exposure to smartphone app use is associated with MF.
46
47 Therefore, futures studies are required to investigate the effect of mental fatigue induced
48
49 by prolonged use of social media and laboratory-based cognitive tasks (e.g., Stroop and
50
51 AX-CPT tasks), to increase understanding of mental fatigue on resistance exercise
52
53 performance. Furthermore, it is crucial to consider that the RPE score was not matched
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 by the amount of work performed, and future studies should consider the analysis
2
3 of RPE repetition-by-repetition or use the level of effort (e.g., velocity loss percentage)
4
5 as an adjustment variable to report along with the RPE scores. Finally, it has
6
7 been suggested that the amount of cognitive load should be individualized to
8
9 ensure a comparable level of mental fatigue (Holgado et al., 2020).
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Conclusion**

16
17 Results from this study showed that prolonged exposure to smartphones
18
19 (about 30 minutes) induced participants' perceived MF and compromised (by
20
21 approximately 15%) their number of repetitions during resistance exercise when
22
23 compared with a control condition of simply viewing a documentary. Since
24
25 volume-load is the most important acute means of measuring muscular effort during
26
27 resistance training, the fact that smartphone exposure induced perceived MF and
28
29 acutely affected exercise performance has important practical implications.
30
31 Although smartphone technology is present in adults' daily lives, our findings
32
33 suggest that its prolonged use before resistance training sessions should be avoided
34
35 if the goal is to increase or maintain total volume-load in order to build muscle
36
37 strength. Finally, our findings broaden variables of interest when testing MF effects
38
39 on human performance, especially when studying MF from daily, ecologically valid
40
41 activities.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Declaration of conflict of interest: none**

51 **REFERENCES**

52
53
54 Azevedo, R., Silva-Cavalcante, M. D., Gualano, B., Lima-Silva, A. E., & Bertuzzi, R.
55
56 (2016). Effects of caffeine ingestion on endurance performance in mentally
57
58 fatigued individuals. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 116(11),
59
60 2293-2303. [https://doi: 10.1007/s00421-016-3483-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-016-3483-y)

- 1
2
3 Baldari, C., Bonavolonta, V., Emerenziani, G. P., Gallotta, M. C., Silva, A. J., &
4 Guidetti, L. (2009). Accuracy, reliability, linearity of Accutrend and Lactate Pro versus
5 EBIO plus analyzer. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 107(1),
6 105-111. <https://doi:10.1007/s00421-009-1107-5>
7
8 Boerio, D., Jubeau, M., Zory, R., & Maffiuletti, N. A. (2005). Central and peripheral
9 fatigue after electrostimulation-induced resistance exercise. *Medicine & Science
10 in Sports & Exercise*, 37(6), 973-978.
11 Boksem, M. A., & Tops, M. (2008). Mental fatigue: costs and benefits. *Brain Research
12 Reviews*, 59(1), 125-139. <https://doi:10.1016/j.brainresrev.2008.07.001>
13
14 Carter, C. S., Braver, T. S., Barch, D. M., Botvinick, M. M., Noll, D., & Cohen, J. D.
15 (1998). Anterior cingulate cortex, error detection, and the online monitoring of
16 performance. *Science*, 280(5364), 747-749.
17 <https://doi:10.1126/science.280.5364.747>
18 Cohen, J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge, 1988.
19 Figueiredo, V. C., de Salles, B. F., & Trajano, G. S. (2018). Volume for muscle
20 hypertrophy and health outcomes: the most effective variable in
21 resistance training. *Sports Medicine*, 48(3), 499-505. [https://doi:10.1007/
22 s40279-017-0793-0](https://doi:10.1007/s40279-017-0793-0)
23
24 Filipas, L., Martin, K., Northey, J. M., La Torre, A., Keegan, R., & Rattray, B. (2020).
25 A 4-week endurance training program improves tolerance to mental exertion
26 in untrained individuals. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 23(12),
27 1215-1219. <https://doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2020.04.020>
28
29 Fortes, L. S., Lima-Junior, D., Nascimento-Júnior, J. R. A., Costa, E. C., Matta, M. O.,
30 & Ferreira, M. E. C. (2019). Effect of exposure time to smartphone apps
31 on passing decision-making in male soccer athletes. *Psychology of
32 Sport and Exercise*, 44, 35-41. <https://doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.05.001>
33
34 Fortes, L. S., Lima-Júnior, D. D., Gantois, P., Nascimento-Júnior, J. R., & Fonseca, F.
35 S. (2021). Smartphone use among high level swimmers is associated with
36 mental fatigue and slower 100-and 200-but not 50-meter freestyle
37 racing. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 128(1), 390-408. [https://doi:
38 10.1177/0031512520952915](https://doi:10.1177/0031512520952915)
39
40 Foster, C., Florhaug, J. A., Franklin, J., Gottschall, L., Hrovatin, L. A., Parker, S.,
41 Dodge, C. (2001). A new approach to monitoring exercise training. *The
42 Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 15(1), 109-115.
43
44 Gantois, P., de Souza Fonseca, F., de Lima-Júnior, D., da Cunha Costa, M., de
45 Vasconcelos Costa, B. D., Cyrino, E. S., & de Sousa Fortes, L. (2020). Acute
46 effects of muscle failure and training system (traditional vs. rest-pause) in
47 resistance exercise on countermovement jump performance in trained
48 adults. *Isokinetics and Exercise Science*, 1-9. <https://doi:10.3233/IES-202123>
49
50 Gantois, P., Caputo Ferreira, M. E., Lima-Junior, D. D., Nakamura, F. Y., Batista, G.
51 R., Fonseca, F. S., & Fortes, L. D. S. (2020). Effects of mental fatigue on
52 passing decision-making performance in professional soccer athletes.
53 *European Journal of Sport Science*, 20(4), 534-543.
54 <https://doi:10.1080/17461391.2019.1656781>
55
56 Hackett, D. A., Cobby, S. P., Davies, T. B., Michael, S. W., & Halaki, M. (2017).
57 Accuracy in estimating repetitions to failure during resistance exercise.
58 *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 31(8),
59 2162-2168. <https://doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000001683>
60
61 Haff, G. G., & Triplett, T. N. (2015). *Essentials of strength training and conditioning 4th
62 edition: Human Kinetics.*

- Holgado, D., Troya, E., Perales, J. C., Vadillo, M. A., & Sanabria, D. (2020). Does mental fatigue impair physical performance? A replication study. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 30, 1-9. [https://doi: 10.1080/17461391.2020.1781265](https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2020.1781265)
- Izquierdo, M., Ibanez, J., Gonzalez-Badillo, J. J., Hakkinen, K., Ratamess, N. A., Kraemer, W. J., Gorostiaga, E. M. (2006). Differential effects of strength training leading to failure versus not to failure on hormonal responses, strength, and muscle power gains. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 100(5), 1647-1656. [https://doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.01400.2005](https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.01400.2005)
- Kassiano, W., de Vasconcelos Costa, B. D., Lima-Júnior, D., Gantois, P., de Souza Fonseca, F., da Cunha Costa, M., & de Sousa Fortes, L. (2021). Parasympathetic nervous activity responses to different resistance training systems. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 42(01), 82-89. [https://doi: 10.1055/a-1219-7750](https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1219-7750)
- Kent-Braun, J. A., & Le Blanc, R. (1996). Quantitation of central activation failure during maximal voluntary contractions in humans. *Muscle Nerve*, 19(7), 861-869. <https://doi.org/drc2nr>
- Kentta, G., & Hassmen, P. (1998). Overtraining and recovery. A conceptual model. *Sports Medicine*, 26(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/d4s5wt>
- Lorist, M. M., Boksem, M. A., & Ridderinkhof, K. R. (2005). Impaired cognitive control and reduced cingulate activity during mental fatigue. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 24(2), 199-205. [https://doi:10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.01.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.01.018)
- MacMahon, C., Schucker, L., Hagemann, N., & Strauss, B. (2014). Cognitive fatigue effects on physical performance during running. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36(4), 375-381. [https://doi:10.1123/jsep.2013-0249](https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0249)
- Marcora, S. M. (2008). Do we really need a central governor to explain brain regulation of exercise performance? *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 104(5), 929-931; author reply 933-925. [https://doi:10.1007/s00421-008-0818-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-008-0818-3)
- Marcora, S. M., Staiano, W., & Manning, V. (2009). Mental fatigue impairs physical performance in humans. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 106(3), 857-864. [https://doi:10.1152/jappphysiol.91324.2008](https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.91324.2008)
- Marshall, J., Bishop, C., Turner, A. N., & Haff, G. (in press). Optimal training sequences to develop lower body force, velocity, power, and jump height: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine*. [https://doi: 10.1007/s40279-021-01430-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-021-01430-z)
- Martin, K., Meeusen, R., Thompson, K. G., Keegan, R., & Rattray, B. (2018). Mental fatigue impairs endurance performance: a physiological explanation. *Sports Medicine*, 48(9), 2041-2051. [https://doi:10.1007/s40279-018-0946-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0946-9)
- Martin, K., Thompson, K. G., Keegan, R., Ball, N., & Rattray, B. (2015). Mental fatigue does not affect maximal anaerobic exercise performance. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 115(4), 715-725. [https://doi:10.1007/s00421-014-3052-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-014-3052-1)
- Martin, K., Staiano, W., Menaspà, P., Hennessey, T., Marcora, S., Keegan, R., & Rattray, B. (2016). Superior inhibitory control and resistance to mental fatigue in professional road cyclists. *PloS One*, 11(7), e0159907. [https://doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0159907](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159907)
- Martorelli, S., Cadore, E. L., Izquierdo, M., Celes, R., Martorelli, A., Cleto, V. A., Bottaro, M. (2017). Strength training with repetitions to failure does not provide additional strength and muscle hypertrophy gains in young women. *European Journal of Translational Myology*, 27(2), 6339. [https://doi:10.4081/ejtm.2017.6339](https://doi.org/10.4081/ejtm.2017.6339)

- 1
2
3 Nakamura, F. Y., Torres, V. B. C., da Silva, L. S., Gantois, P., Andrade, A. D., Ribeiro,
4 A. L. B., & Batista, G. R. (in press). Monitoring heart rate variability and
5 perceived well-being in brazilian elite beach volleyball players: A single-
6 tournament pilot study. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*. doi:
7 [https://10.1519/JSC.00000000000003654](https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.00000000000003654)
8
- 9 Osiecki, R., Rubio, T. B. G., Coelho, R. L., Novack, L. F., Conde, J. H. S., Alves, C. G.,
10 & Malfatti, C. R. M. (2015). The total quality recovery scale (TQR) as a proxy
11 for determining athletes' recovery state after a professional soccer
12 match. *Journal of Exercise Physiology*, 18(3), 6.
13
- 14 Pageaux, B., Marcora, S. M., & Lepers, R. (2013). Prolonged mental exertion does not
15 alter neuromuscular function of the knee extensors. *Medicine & Science
16 in Sports & Exercise*, 45(12),
17 2254-2264. [https://doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e31829b504a](https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31829b504a)
18
- 19 Pageaux, B. (2014). The psychobiological model of endurance performance: an effort-
20 based decision-making theory to explain self-paced
21 endurance performance. *Sports Medicine*, 44(9), 1319. [https://doi: 10.1007/
22 s40279-014-0198-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-014-0198-2)
- 23 Pageaux, B., Lepers, R., Dietz, K. C., & Marcora, S. M. (2014). Response inhibition
24 impairs subsequent self-paced endurance performance. *European Journal of
25 Applied Physiology*, 114(5), 1095-1105. [https://doi:10.1007/s00421-014-2838-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-014-2838-5)
26
- 27 Pageaux, B., Marcora, S. M., Rozand, V., & Lepers, R. (2015). Mental fatigue induced
28 by prolonged self-regulation does not exacerbate central fatigue
29 during subsequent whole-body endurance exercise. *Frontiers in Human
30 Neuroscience*, 9, 67. [https://doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00067](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00067)
31
- 32 Perrotta, A. S., Jeklin, A. T., Hives, B. A., Meanwell, L. E., & Warburton, D. E. R.
33 (2017). Validity of the elite HRV smartphone application for examining heart
34 rate variability in a field-based setting *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning
35 Research*, 31(8), 2296-2302. [https://doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000001841](https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001841)
36
- 37 Rozand, V., Pageaux, B., Marcora, S. M., Papaxanthis, C., & Lepers, R. (2014). Does
38 mental exertion alter maximal muscle activation? *Frontiers in Human
39 Neuroscience*, 8, 755. [https://doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00755](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00755)
40
- 41 Russell, S., Jenkins, D., Rynne, S., Halson, S. L., & Kelly, V. (2019). What is mental
42 fatigue in elite sport? Perceptions from athletes and staff. *European Journal of
43 Sport Science*, 19(10), 1367-1376. [https://doi: 10.1080/17461391.2019.1618397](https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2019.1618397)
44
- 45 Schoenfeld, B. J., Ogborn, D., & Krieger, J. W. (2017). Dose-response relationship
46 between weekly resistance training volume and increases in muscle mass:
47 A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 35(11),
48 1073-1082. [https://doi:10.1080/02640414.2016.1210197](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2016.1210197)
49
- 50 Schoenfeld, B. J., Grgic, J., Van Every, D. W., & Plotkin, D. L. (2021). Loading
51 recommendations for muscle strength, hypertrophy, and local endurance: A re-
52 examination of the repetition continuum. *Sports*, 9(2), 32. [https://doi:
53 10.3390/sports9020032](https://doi.org/10.3390/sports9020032)
54
- 55 Smith, M. R., Marcora, S. M., & Coutts, A. J. (2015). Mental fatigue impairs
56 intermittent running performance. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*,
57 47(8), 1682-1690. [https://doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000592](https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000592)
58
- 59 Smith, M. R., Coutts, A. J., Merlini, M., Deprez, D., Lenoir, M., & Marcora, S. M.
60 (2016). Mental fatigue impairs soccer-specific physical and
technical performance. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 48(2),
267-276. [https://doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000762](https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000762)

- 1
2
3 Smith, M. R., Thompson, C., Marcora, S. M., Skorski, S., Meyer, T., & Coutts, A. J.
4 (2018). Mental fatigue and soccer: current knowledge and future directions. *Sports*
5 *Medicine*, 48(7), 1525-1532. <https://doi:10.1007/s40279-018-0908-2>
6
7 Smith, M. R., Chai, R., Nguyen, H. T., Marcora, S. M., & Coutts, A. J. (2019).
8 Comparing the effects of three cognitive tasks on indicators of
9 mental fatigue. *The Journal of Psychology*, 153(8), 759-783.
10 [https://doi: 10.1080/00223980.2019.1611530](https://doi:10.1080/00223980.2019.1611530)
11
12 Statista. (2020). Number of smartphone users worldwide from 2016 to 2023 (in
13 billions). [https://www.statista.com/statistics/330695/number-of-smartphone-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/330695/number-of-smartphone-users-worldwide/)
14 [users-worldwide/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/330695/number-of-smartphone-users-worldwide/)
15
16 Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology. The North American Society of
17 Pacing Electrophysiology. Heart rate variability. Standards of
18 measurement, physiological interpretation, and clinical use. *European Heart*
19 *Journal*, 17, 354–81, 1996.
20
21 Wilmer, H. H., Sherman, L. E., & Chein, J. M. (2017). Smartphones and cognition: a
22 review of research exploring the links between mobile technology habits
23 and cognitive functioning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8,
24 605. <https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00605>
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Experimental setup

Note: TQR = total quality recovery; HRV = heart rate variability; VAS = visual analogue scale; MF = mental fatigue; MOT = motivation; RPE = rating of perceived exertion.




Figure 2. The number of repetitions and the total volume-load at the pre- and post-experimental conditions.

Note: ES = effect size; * = statistically different from set 1 ($p < 0.05$); † = statistically different from control in the same time ($p < 0.05$); § = statistically different from pre-experiment ($p < 0.05$).




Figure 3. Subjective measures of mental fatigue and RPE score pre- and post-experimental conditions and motivation before resistance exercise trial.

Note: ES = effect size; * = statistically different from pre-experiment ($p < 0.05$); † = interaction (condition x time) effect ($p < 0.05$).




Figure 4. Peak and average power output and movement velocity during the back-squat sets at pre- and post-experiment according experimental conditions.

Note: ES = effect size; * = Simple main time effect ($p < 0.05$).