

# Journal of Rehabilitation Sciences and Research

Journal Home Page: jrsr.sums.ac.ir

Original Article

# Effects of Regular Aerobic with Nasal Breathing Exercise Training on Olfactory Rehabilitation in Asthmatic Patients with Chronic Rhino Sinusitis

# Azam Zarneshan<sup>1\*</sup>, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Sport Science, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

### ARTICLE INFO

Article History: Received: 31/01/2020 Revised: 20/10/2020 Accepted: 07/11/2020

Keywords: Aerobic exercise Olfaction disorder Rehabilitation Sinusitis

Please cite this article as: Zarneshan A. Effects of Regular Aerobic with Nasal Breathing Exercise Training on Olfactory Rehabilitation in Asthmatic Patients with Chronic Rhino Sinusitis. JRSR. 2020;7(4):178-183.

### ABSTRACT

**Background:** Chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS) is the most common cause of smell loss and has a strong association with asthma. Breathing exercise training has been known to be an effective treatment for decreasing asthma symptoms. However, its effect on the olfactory disorder in asthmatic patients with CRS is unknown. This research aimed to investigate the effects of regular aerobic with nasal breathing exercise training on olfactory rehabilitation in asthmatic patients with CRS.

Methods: In this quasi-experimental study, thirty-five inactive asthmatic women with CRS and olfaction disorder (mean age=34.7±7.5 years) were selected and grouped into experimental (n=18) and control (n=17) groups. The experimental group participated in an aerobic and breathing exercise program (60 min/day, three days a week), and the control group refrained from participating in regular exercise for 12 weeks. Self-rated olfactory acuity and function questionnaires were used to assess changes in exercise-induced olfactory acuity and function. **Results:** After 12 weeks, the exercise group improved smell function (*P*=0.002) and exhibited significantly increased acuity in smelling the odor of gas (P=0.019) compared with the control group. Body mass index (BMI) decreased (P=0.019) and forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1) increased (P=0.002) significantly in the exercise group. There was a negative relationship between mean change in BMI and mean change in acuity in smelling the odor of gas (r=-0.381, P=0.024). Conclusion: According to the self-report olfactory acuity and function questionnaires, the improvement in the smell function of asthmatic patients with chronic sinusitis after 12 weeks of regular aerobic with nasal breathing

exercise was promising and should be studied further. 2020© The Authors. Published by JRSR. All rights reserved.

## Introduction

Olfactory dysfunction is prevalent (30% - 80%) in patients with chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS), a disease that affects 12.5% of the adult population [1]. CRS is the most common cause of smell loss [2] and has a strong association with asthma. The evidence indicates a high prevalence of CRS in asthmatic patients [3]. It further indicates that patients with CRS have lower forced expiratory volume in the first second (FEV1) compared with healthy people [4]. According to the results of a study by Caglar et al., odor threshold value, discrimination, and identification were lower in the patient group with FEV1<80% compared with the healthy control group [5].

Despite the fact that olfactory dysfunction has a significant impact on the quality of life of patients with CRS and asthma, it is often overlooked by patients and doctors and its clinical management and treatment are still limited [6]. The treatment of posttraumatic olfactory dysfunction with corticosteroids and regular, structured exposure to odors through olfactory training (OT) [7]

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: Azam Zarneshan, 35 Km Tabriz- Maragheh Road, P.O. Box: 53714-161. Tabriz, Iran. **Tel:** +98 9383560486 *Email:* zarneshan@azaruniv.ac.ir

as well as olfactory rehabilitation after endoscopic sinus surgery in patients with chronic sinusitis and nasal polyps have been studied [8], but no research was found that used exercise therapy to improve olfactory function in patients with CRS. Having an active lifestyle or changing the respiratory pattern at maximal work may be an effective way to improve a patient's olfactory disorder. The pattern of nasal breathing reduces night-time episodes and the severity of exercise-induced asthma (EIA) provoked in asthmatic patients [9]. Repeated exercise with nose breathing during more training sessions may have other beneficial effects, such as improving the olfaction function in asthmatic patients with CRS. The results of previous studies have shown that regular exercise training retains the olfactory function in older adults [10] and in individuals with Parkinson's [11]. However, no study has examined the effect of regular aerobic and respiratory exercises on the olfactory function of CRS patients. Zhang et al. reported that various types of physical activity like tai chi and running prevent and delay olfactory deterioration in older adults [12]. Arshamian et al. indicated that nasal breathing affects odor function more than mouth breathing [13], and Morales et al. reported that the nasal airflow-inducing technique enables an essential recovery of olfaction and improvement of taste after total laryngectomy [14]. Considering the hypothesis that regular exercise and nasal breathing may be an effective, low cost, and available way to improve olfactory function lacking potential side effects, the present study aimed to investigate the effects of regular aerobic and breathing exercise training with nasal breathing on self-rated olfactory acuity and function in asthmatic patients with CRS.

### Methods

In this quasi-experimental research conducted between February 4 and October 11, 2016, asthmatic women with a diagnosis of CRS were introduced by the asthma specialists of Sahand Clinic in Urmia, Iran, and were assessed for eligibility. In total, thirty-five eligible patients participated in this study.

Eligibility criteria for inclusion were having an age between 20 and 40 years and a history of olfactory disorder for more than one year. Exclusion criteria were pregnancy, major cardiovascular illness, renal, metabolic, or other pulmonary problems, accident or sinus surgery, very bad nasal patency, malignant tumors, multiple sclerosis, smoking, regular diet or exercise programs for six months prior to the study, and changing the treatment during the study.

The demographic and clinical characteristics of patients such as age, asthma duration (yrs), and olfactory loss duration (yrs) were approved. All aspects of the use of human subjects in this study were approved by the Urmia University of Medical Sciences Ethics Committee (ir. umsu.rec.1395.81). Before the exercise, written consent was provided by patients.

Sample size was determined according to the article by Rosenfeldt et al. This published study considered the effect of an aerobic exercise intervention on olfaction function in 38 individuals. With the difference between mean changes of olfaction in the exercise and control groups (2.4) and its standard deviation (2.3) [11], using the following formula with 80% power using a cutoff for statistical significance of 0.05 [15], and considering approximately 20% of the drop, 17 participants were required in each group; a total of 35 participants were included in this study.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Standardized difference} &= \frac{\text{Target difference}}{\text{Standard deviation}} = d \\ n &= \frac{2}{d^2} \times C_{0.05,80\%} \qquad C_{0.05,80\%} = 7.9 \\ \frac{2.4}{2.3} &= 1.04 = d \\ n &= \frac{2}{1.04^2} \times 7.9 = 14.62 \end{aligned}$$

Samples were randomly divided into experimental (n=18: receiving specific exercise training) and control groups (n=17: normal daily activities).

### Aerobic Exercise Training

Exercise in the present study was designed by the researcher based on the American College Sports Medicine (ACSM) guidelines [16] and the results of previous studies [11-13].

The exercise group trained (three days/week/evening) for 12 weeks. Each training session began with 15 minutes of warm-up, continued with a 30-minute walk/run on a treadmill with 60-80% of  $HR_{max}$ , and a final 15 minutes of breathing exercises. Before the start of training, subjects were trained on how to work with treadmills and safety. Training began with 60% of maximum heart rate in the first two weeks and gradual increases in subsequent meetings (Table 1). Control of exercise intensity (based on heart rate) was performed by Polar heart rate monitors. In this program, the ACSM guidelines were used to limit any problems such as exercise-induced asthma (EIA). Patients were encouraged to warm up long-term, drink plenty of water before and after the exercise session, and inhale through the nose and exhale through the mouth as much as possible when exercising [9]. The control group refrained from participating in regular exercise for 12 weeks of the study protocol.

## Aerobic and Breathing Exercises Training

Exercises employed nasal breathing and sitting comfortably with good posture, which are described in Table 1 (exercises number 2 to 6) and are shown in Figure 1.

## Self-Reported Olfactory Acuity

Due to the limitation of olfactory test clinics and standard olfactory evaluation tests, we were compelled to use questionnaires to gain information about the patients' olfactory function and acuity.

The self-administered questionnaire on odor as an easy method of estimating olfaction has been used and approved by other studies [17, 18]. In the present study, the olfactory acuity questionnaire described by Santos et al. [17] was used (Table 2).

| Table 1: Aerobic and breathing exercises training in the experimental group        |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Exercise   | Performance  |  |  |  |  |
| Number 1:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30-minute walking/running on a treadmill, inhaling through the nose and            | First two weeks: 60% of HRmax                                    |  |  |  |  |
| exhaling through the mouth. Each session of training began with 15 minutes of      | Third to sixth week: 65% of HRmax                                |  |  |  |  |
| waiking on the treadmill for warm-up.  | Ninth and tenth weeks: 70% of HRmax                              |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fleventh to twelfth week: 80% of HRmax                           |  |  |  |  |
| Number 2:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eves closed, the left hand over the left knee, right nostril closed with the right | First three weeks: five repeats                                  |  |  |  |  |
| thumb, inhaling slowly through the left nostril, the remaining the fingers placed  | Second three weeks: eight repeats                                |  |  |  |  |
| on the forehead, exhaling slowly through the mouth (Figure 1, A).                  | Last weeks: ten repeats  |  |  |  |  |
| Number 3:  | First three weeks: five repeats                                  |  |  |  |  |
| Exercise 1 runs with the change of the hand's positions (Figure 1, A).             | Second three weeks: eight repeats                                |  |  |  |  |
|  | Last weeks: ten repeats  |  |  |  |  |
| Number 4:  | First three weeks: five repeats                                  |  |  |  |  |
| Hands on knees, inhaling slowly through the nose, exhaling slowly through the      | Second three weeks: eight repeats                                |  |  |  |  |
| Nowley 5.  | Last weeks: ten repeats  |  |  |  |  |
| Number 5:  | First three weeks: keep inhaling for three seconds               |  |  |  |  |
| mouth (Figure 1, B).   | Last weeks: keep inhaling for eight seconds                      |  |  |  |  |
| Number 6: While stretching or rotating the body inhaling slowly through the        | First three weeks: repeat two times for each side of the body    |  |  |  |  |
| nose, exhaling slowly through the mouth during body returns (Figure 1, C, D).      | Second three weeks: repeat three times for each side of the body |  |  |  |  |
|  | Last weeks: repeat four times for each side of the body          |  |  |  |  |



(A)

(B) (C) Figure 1: Breathing exercises training in the experimental group

| Table 2: Questionnaire about olfactory acuity   |   |                  |  |  |  |
|---|---|------------------|--|--|--|
| Question  | Responses   | Scores           |  |  |  |
| How do you consider your olfaction at this moment?  | Poor<br>Fair<br>Good<br>Very good   | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |
| How do you consider your taste at this moment?  | Poor<br>Fair<br>Good<br>Very good   | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |
| How often can you smell perfume?  | Never<br>Sometimes<br>Usually<br>Always   | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |
| How often can you smell food?   | Never<br>Sometimes<br>Usually<br>Always   | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |
| How often can you smell the odor of gas leaking?  | Never<br>Sometimes<br>Usually<br>Always   | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |
| How often can you smell smoke?  | Never<br>Sometimes<br>Usually<br>Always   | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |
| Do you have any difficulties in your daily life due to alterations in your perception of odors? | I have no difficulty.<br>I have few difficulties.<br>I have some difficulties.<br>I have many difficulties. | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 |  |  |  |

# Self-Reported Olfactory Function

The self-reported olfactory function questionnaire used to evaluate patients who reported their olfactory function at the end of the protocol was designed based on research by Rawal et al. [19]. The researcher asked patients to use a seven-point scale to rate their smell function at the time of the study (very poor to excellent), compared to before the exercise protocol, and to rate the flavor of food at

the time of the study compared to before the exercise protocol (extremely weaker to extremely stronger). The self-reported olfactory acuity and function questions used in the present study were translated into Persian by native translators. Difficulties of translation and the given average score by translators according to a 100-point Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) from zero (easy translation) to 100 (difficult translation) was below 30. The translated Persian text was reverse translated to English to compare the translations. In the qualitative review of the questionnaire, the researcher asked experts to provide the necessary feedback on the questionnaire. The translation quality (sentences are clear, simple and understandable words used, use of specialized and artificial terms avoided) was confirmed by two other translators and a group of experts. Professional otolaryngologists, pulmonologists, and exercise physiologists assessed the self-rated olfactory acuity and function survey for content validity, instrument construction, and appropriateness. To determine content validity, the content validity index (CVI) was calculated. Items with  $CVI \ge 0.8$  were considered to have good content validity. The reliability of the questionnaires was assessed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The Cronbach's alpha for the self-reported olfactory acuity test was 0.77, while the self-reported olfactory function test was 0.75.

### FEV1 Measurement

The FEV1 was evaluated using a spirometer (model ST-95 Fukuda, Sanjio, Spiroanalayzer, Japan) according to the standards published by the American Thoracic Society (ATS) [20].

### BMI Measurement

BMI was calculated using weight and height (Kg/m2). Body weight and height were measured with a scale and a stadiometer (Seca 755, Germany), respectively, before and after the exercise protocol.

### Statistical Analysis

The normal distribution was checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Accordingly, baseline characteristics such as age, asthma duration, olfactory loss duration, BMI, and FEV1 had a normal distribution. Thus, an unpaired t-test was used to compare the baseline characteristics between control and experimental groups, and ANCOVA, with the baseline value as a covariate, was used to compare the differences between the groups. Ordinal variables with Likert scoring did not have a normal distribution. The Mann-Whitney U test used to compare self-rated olfactory acuity and function differences between two groups. The relationship between mean change in BMI, FEV1, and mean change in smell function was measured with Spearman's correlation. Data is shown as mean±SD. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered significant. The SPSS statistical software program (version 23) was used for all analyses.

### Results

The characteristics of the study groups are shown in Table 3. There were no differences between the groups at baseline (P>0.05). After training, BMI levels decreased (F (1, 33)=6.070, P=0.019), and FEV1 increased (F (1, 33)=15.072, P=0.001) significantly in the experimental group compared to the control (P<0.05).

The results of the self-rated olfactory acuity questionnaire pre- and post-exercise training in the experimental and control group are shown in Table 4. The Mann-Whitney U test revealed a significant difference between olfaction and smelling the odor of gas between the experimental and control groups (P<0.05) (Table 4). Before exercise training, 8 (44%) and 10 (56%) of the experimental group participants considered their olfaction poor and fair,

Table 3: Clinical characteristics and Body mass index (BMI), forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1) changes after exercise training in patients

|                              | Experimental |           | Control   |           | P*    | P**     |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|
|                              | Pre-         | Post-     | Pre-      | Post-     |       |         |
|                              | (mean±SD)    | (mean±SD) | (mean±SD) | (mean±SD) |       |         |
| Age                          | 32.9±7.5     |           | 36.7±8.2  |           | 0.363 |         |
| Asthma duration(yrs)         | 8.9±4.5      |           | 9.4±5     |           | 0.819 |         |
| Olfactory loss duration(yrs) | 5.2±3.7      |           | 6.3±3.1   |           | 0.519 |         |
| BMI                          | 29.9±4.2     | 28.8±4.3  | 28.9±4.1  | 29.4±4.2  | 0.342 | 0.019** |
| FEV1                         | 75.5±10.1    | 84.4±11.6 | 71.4±14.3 | 69.2±15.1 | 0.330 | 0.001** |

\*Unpaired t-test to compare the baseline characteristics between groups; \*\* ANCOVA to compare the differences between the groups after protocol; Significance of change at the level of 0.05. BMI: Body mass index; FEV1: Forced expiratory volume in 1 second

| Table 4: Results of self-rated olfactory acuity questionnaire before and after | nasal breathing exercises in experimental a | and control groups |
|--|---|--------------------|
|--|---|--------------------|

| Mean score in consideration of  | Experimental   |                | Control        |                | Mann-Whitney | Р      |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------|
|   | Before         | After          | Before         | After          | U            |        |
| Olfaction   | 1.5±0.51       | 2.2±0.81       | $1.5\pm0.51$   | 1.6±0.49       | 91.50        | 0.030* |
| Taste   | 1.8±0.43       | $1.9\pm0.42$   | $1.8 \pm 0.75$ | $1.7{\pm}0.47$ | 119.0        | 0.168  |
| Smell of perfume  | 1.9±1.1        | $2.2 \pm 0.78$ | 1.8±0.43       | $1.8 \pm 0.52$ | 117.0        | 0.197  |
| Smell of food   | $1.8 \pm 0.67$ | 2.1±0.58       | 2.3±0.77       | $2.1 \pm 0.60$ | 152.0        | 1.000  |
| The smell of gas  | $1.9 \pm 1.1$  | 2.3±0.84       | $1.6\pm0.62$   | $1.7{\pm}0.58$ | 90.00        | 0.019* |
| The smell of smoke  | 2.1±1.3        | 2.7±1.1        | 2.3±0.49       | 2.4±0.51       | 128.5        | 0.403  |
| *Difficulties in daily life due to changes in the perception of odors | 3.6±0.50       | 3.0±0.54       | 3.4±0.61       | 3/5±0/74       | 97.50        | 0.042* |

Four-point scales: minimum score to poor sense=1 and maximum score to stronger sense=4; \* Have no difficulty=1, have many difficulties=4; Mann-Whitney U to compare the differences between the groups after the protocol

Table 5: Comparison of self-rated olfactory function mean scores in experimental and control groups after the protocol

| Mean score in consideration of  | Experimental | Control        | Mann-Whitney U | Р      |  |  |  |  |
|---|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Smell at time of study  | 4.17±1.3     | 3.3±1.1        | 93.0           | 0.042* |  |  |  |  |
| Smell at time of study compared to prior to the exercise protocol         | 4.6±0.69     | $3.7 \pm 0.66$ | 63.0           | 0.002* |  |  |  |  |
| Flavor of food at the time of study compared to the pre-exercise protocol | 4.0±0.77     | 3.6±0.86       | 119.0          | 0.226  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 6 1 41 1     | 1 60.05        |                |        |  |  |  |  |

Seven-point scale: very poor=1 to excellent=7; \*Mann-Whitney U, Significance of change at the level of 0.05

respectively. After exercise training, 5 (28%) patients reported improvement to a good level, 1 (5%) reported a very good level, 3 (170%) considered it poor, and 9 (50%) considered it fair. Only one patient reported her taste as good, and none of the experimental participants considered their taste as very good after exercise training. The ability to smell perfume, smoke, and food didn't change (P<0.05), but the ability to smell the odor of gas improved (P=0.019) and the difficulties in daily life due to changes in the perception of odors decrease in the experimental group after exercise training (P=0.042) (Table 4).

After 12 weeks of exercise training, based on the results of the self-reported olfactory function questionnaire, the score of self-rated smell was better in the exercise group than in the control (4.6 vs. 3.7, respectively) (P=0.002). Exercise training had a significant effect on the sense of smell in patients (P=0.042); however, sensitivity to food flavor was slightly and not significantly better in the exercise group (Table 5).

The results of other measurements indicated that the only negative correlation was between mean change in BMI and mean change in acuity in smelling the odor of gas (r=-0.381, P=0.024), and no significant relationship was observed between FEV1 and self-rated olfactory acuity or function (P>0.05).

### Discussion

In the present study, the effect of nasal breathing during aerobic exercise training on olfactory recovery was promising in asthmatic women with CRS. Exercise training was also able to induce a decrease in body mass index and an increase in FEV, (Table 3). These results are in line with previous findings that found a significant effect of breathing aerobic exercise training on decreases in BMI [21] and increases in FEV, [22] and suggest that breathing exercise training may be beneficial for asthmatic patients with CRS. The effect of aerobic nasal breathing exercises on olfactory dysfunction, however, has not been well studied. Some studies have shown the beneficial effects of nasal breathing exercises on reducing night-time episodes, asthma symptoms [9], and allergic rhinitis symptoms [23]. There is also convincing evidence of the effect of breathing exercises on psychological and general health and on reducing rescue medication usage [9], improvement of lung function (FEV.) [24], improved exercise capacity, and asthma clinical control in asthmatic patients [25]. The results also showed that regular exercise can preserve a sense of smell in older adults [10] and individuals with Parkinson's disease [11].

Although the mentioned studies have found an association between exercise and better olfaction, the cause-and-effect association between olfaction and exercise remains unknown. It is possible that exercise

182

affects either general health or brain function [10], obesity [21], nasal volume [26], and upper respiratory tract infection [27] and may facilitate neuroplasticity of the olfaction system [11]. The effect of exercise in the prevention of acute respiratory infection [28] and nasal inflammation [29] has been shown. Inflammatory changes within the olfactory mucosa may be the cause of olfactory deficits in patients with chronic sinusitis [30].

Studies have found an association between olfactory impairment and neurodegenerative disease [31]. Evidence also indicates a correlation between human olfactory function and nasal volumetric measurements [32]. Yon DK et al. reported an association between serum lipid levels and peripheral olfactory function, allergic rhinitis, and nasal symptoms [33].

Exercise enhances neurogenesis and cognitive function and lowers the risk of cognitive impairment [10]. Additionally, studies have shown that physical exercise increases nasal volume and has a vasoconstrictor effect over nasal mucosa, which may also affect olfaction [26]. The findings indicated that exercise increases the nasal airway patency by discharging the sympathetic nerve and can also decrease the thickness of the mucosa [34].

Therefore, nasal breathing exercise training may have a beneficial effect on olfactory improvement by changing in brain function, inflammation, blood lipids, or other conductive or sensorineural factors. It appears that in this study, twelve weeks of regular treadmill aerobic exercise with an intensity of 60% to 80% MHR improved the olfactory system by decreasing BMI. Meta-analyses suggest that higher BMI and weight are associated with olfactory dysfunction [35, 36]. In the current study, there was a significant decrease in patient BMI after exercise training. The results of previous studies have also shown the effect of a 20- to 30-minute aerobic treadmill-based training program with an intensity of 60-70% MHR [37] on weight loss in obese subjects.

T novel study is the first to investigate the effects of aerobic nasal breathing exercise training on olfaction disorders in asthmatic patients with CRS. This study also investigated changes in obesity and respiratory function (FEV1) after exercise and the relationship between such changes and self-rated olfactory function. Based on the results, it can be concluded that the training program of the present study can be a useful, simple, and low-cost treatment aid for asthmatic patients with CRS. In short, the increases in self-rated olfactory acuity and function scores in the experimental group compared with the control group illustrate the beneficial effects of the nasal breathing training on olfaction disorder.

The current study has some limitations. The sample size was small because of the limited availability of asthmatic women with CRS and olfactory disorder who were interested in an exercise program; because of inaccessibility to advanced tools and methods, olfactory evaluation was based on self-reports. Though the use of self-report questionnaires by past studies [17, 19] can be of value for the present study, the satisfaction of patients with the improvement in their sense of smell gives us hope and feedback that indicates aerobic nasal breathing exercise training is an effective factor in improving olfaction. Future more extensive studies are suggested for more robust results in this area.

### Conclusion

According to self-report olfactory acuity and function questionnaires, the improvement in the smell function of asthmatic patients with chronic sinusitis was promising and should be studied further. This is a new study that showed that nasal breathing during an intensive activity (80%MHR) in asthmatic patients with CRS who mainly breathe through their mouths can be useful in modulating olfactory performance.

### Acknowledgments

The researcher of the present study is grateful to all participants.

### Conflict of Interest: None declared.

### References

- Schlosser RJ, Mulligan JK, Hyer JM, Karnezis TT, Gudis DA, Soler ZM. Mucous cytokine levels in chronic rhinosinusitis– associated olfactory loss. JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2016;142(8):731-7.
- Hummel T, Landis BN, Rombaux P. Disrupted odor perception. Springer Handbook of Odor: Springer; 2017. p. 79-80.
- Huang C-C, Wang C-H, Fu C-H, Huang C-C, Chang P-H, Chen I-W, et al. The link between chronic rhinosinusitis and asthma: a questionnaire-based study. Medicine 2016;95(31):1-6.
- Yousof AM, Awada OG, Fattah MTA, Ahmada SF. Pulmonary function tests in patients with chronic rhinosinusitis and the effect of surgery. Egyptian Journal of Bronchology 2017;11(3):283.
- Caglar O, Mutlu P, Mirici A, Oymak S, Derekoy S. The evaluation of nose functions in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Ann Med Res 2019;26(9):1964-8.
- Rombaux P, Huart C, Levie P, Cingi C, Hummel T. Olfaction in chronic rhinosinusitis. Curr Allergy Asthma Rep 2016;16(5):41.
- Bratt M, Moen KG, Nordgård S, Helvik A-S, Skandsen T. Treatment of posttraumatic olfactory dysfunction with corticosteroids and olfactory training. Acta Oto-Laryngologica 2020:1-7.
- Ren J, Huangfu H. Analysis of olfactory rehabilitation after endoscopic sinus surgery in patients with chronic sinusitis and nasal polyps. Journal of Clinical Otorhinolaryngology, Head, and Neck Surgery 2016;30(2):106-10.
- 9. Thomas M, Bruton A. Breathing exercises for asthma. Breathe 2014;10(4):312-22.
- Schubert CR, Cruickshanks KJ, Nondahl DM, Klein BE, Klein R, Fischer ME. Association of exercise with lower long-term risk of olfactory impairment in older adults. JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 2013;139(10):1061-6.
- 11. Rosenfeldt AB, Dey T, Alberts JL. Aerobic exercise preserves olfaction function in individuals with Parkinson's disease. Parkinson's Disease 2016;2016.
- 12. Zhang C, Li D, Wang X. Role of physical exercise type in olfactory deterioration in ageing. Rhinology 2020;58(2):145-50.
- Arshamian A, Iravani B, Majid A, Lundström JN. Respiration modulates olfactory memory consolidation in humans. Journal of Neuroscience 2018;38(48):10286-94.
- 14. Morales-Puebla JM, Morales-Puebla ÁF, Jiménez-Antolín JA,

Muñoz-Platón E, Padilla-Parrado M, Chacón-Martínez J. Olfactory rehabilitation after total laringectomy. Acta Otorrinolaringologica (English Edition). 2010;61(2):128-34.

- 15. Whitley E, Ball J. Statistics review 4: sample size calculations. Critical care 2002;6(4):335.
- Pescatello LS, Riebe D, Thompson PD. ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription. 9nd ed. ed: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2014. pp.331-5.
- dos Santos CG, Bergmann A, Coça KL, Garcia AA, de Oliveira Valente TC. Olfactory acuity and quality of life after total laryngectomy. Revista CEFAC 2015;17(6):1976-86.
- Takebayashi H, Tsuzuki K, Oka H, Fukazawa K, Daimon T, Sakagami M. Clinical availability of a self-administered odor questionnaire for patients with olfactory disorders. Auris Nasus Larynx 2011;38(1):65-72.
- Rawal S, Hoffman HJ, Chapo AK, Duffy VB. Sensitivity and specificity of self-reported olfactory function in a home-based study of independent-living, healthy older women. Chemosensory perception 2014;7(3-4):108-16.
- Gardner RmjAoim. Standardization of spirometry: a summary of recommendations from the American Thoracic Society: the 1987 update. 1988;108(2):217-20.
- Kwak Y-S, Kim Y-I. The effect of abdominal breathing exercise on weight and body fat, BMI, waist hip ratio in obese college student. Journal of Life Science 2010;20(12):1867-71.
- Liu W, Pan YL, Gao CX, Shang Z, Ning LJ, Liu XJE, et al. Breathing exercises improve post-operative pulmonary function and quality of life in patients with lung cancer: A meta-analysis. Experimental and therapeutic medicine 2013;5(4):1194-200.
- Nair S. Nasal breathing exercise and its effect on symptoms of allergic rhinitis. Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head & Neck Surgery 2012;64(2):172-6.
- Saxena T, Saxena M. The effect of various breathing exercises (pranayama) in patients with bronchial asthma of mild to moderate severity. Int J Yoga 2009;2(1):22.
- Evaristo KB, Saccomani MG, Cukier A, Stelmach R, Carvalho-Pinto R, Santaella DF, et al. Effects of aerobic and breathing exercises on clinical control and airway inflammation in persistent asthma. Eur Respiratory Soc; 2017.
- Fonseca MT, Machado JAvP, Pereira SA, Pinto KM, Voegels RL. Effects of physical exercise in nasal volume.Rev Bras Otorrinolaringol 2006;72(2):256-60.
- Nieman DC, Henson DA, Austin MD, Sha W. Upper respiratory tract infection is reduced in physically fit and active adults. Br J Sports Med 2011;45(12):987-92.
- Barrett B, Hayney MS, Muller D, Rakel D, Brown R, Zgierska AE, et al. Meditation or exercise for preventing acute respiratory infection (MEPARI-2): A randomized controlled trial. PloS one 2018;13(6):e0197778.
- Tongtako W, Klaewsongkram J, Mickleborough TD, Suksom DJAPjoa, immunology. Effects of aerobic exercise and vitamin C supplementation on rhinitis symptoms in allergic rhinitis patients. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol 2018;36(4):222.
- Kern RCJTL. Candidate's Thesis: Chronic Sinusitis and Anosmia: Pathologic Changes in the Olfactory Mucosa. Laryngoscope 2000;110(7):1071-7.
- Ross GW, Petrovitch H, Abbott RD, Tanner CM, Popper J, Masaki K, et al. Association of olfactory dysfunction with risk for future Parkinson's disease. Ann Neurol 2008;63(2):167-73.
- Zhao K, Scherer PW, Hajiloo SA, Dalton PJCs. Effect of anatomy on human nasal air flow and odorant transport patterns: implications for olfaction. Chemical senses 2004;29(5):365-79.
- 33. Yon DK, Lee SW, Ha EK, Lee KS, Jung YH, Jee HM, et al. Serum lipid levels are associated with allergic rhinitis, nasal symptoms, peripheral olfactory function, and nasal airway patency in children. Allergy 2018;73(9):1905-8.
- Baraniuk JN, Merck SJ. Nasal reflexes: implications for exercise, breathing, and sex. Curr Allergy Asthma Rep 2008;8(2):147-53.
- Patel Z, DelGaudio J, Wise S. Higher body mass index is associated with subjective olfactory dysfunction. Behavioural neurology 2015;2015.
- 36. Peng M, Coutts D, Wang T, Cakmak YO. Systematic review of olfactory shifts related to obesity. Obesity Reviews 2019;20(2):325-38.
- Al Saif A, Alsenany S. Aerobic and anaerobic exercise training in obese adults. J Phys Ther Sci 2015;27(6):1697-700.