QUALITY IN SPORT
eISSN 2450-3118 · Open Access · Peer-reviewed
apcz.umk.pl/QS Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

Cite as: KWIATKOWSKA, Maja, PALIAN, Jakub, HUZARSKA, Karolina, KURZYŃSKI, Szymon and BARANIECKA, Aleksandra. The Impact of Chronic Academic and Occupational Stress on Post-Exercise Recovery: a Narrative Review of the Medical Evidence. Quality in Sport. 2026;64:73747. https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2026.64.73747

ARTICLE TIMELINE
Received: 27.06.2026. Revised: 14.07.2026. Accepted: 14.07.2026. Published: 17.07.2026.

The journal has been awarded 20 points in the parametric evaluation by the Polish Ministry of Higher Education and Science (Annex to the announcement of 05.01.2024, No. 32553). Unique Journal Identifier: 201398. Scientific disciplines assigned: Economics and finance (Field of social sciences); Management and Quality Sciences (Field of social sciences).
Punkty Ministerialne z 2019 – aktualny rok 20 punktów. Załącznik do komunikatu Ministra Szkolnictwa Wyższego i Nauki z dnia 05.01.2024 Lp. 32553. Posiada Unikatowy Identyfikator Czasopisma: 201398. Przypisane dyscypliny naukowe: Ekonomia i finanse (Dziedzina nauk społecznych); Nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości (Dziedzina nauk społecznych).

The Impact of Chronic Academic and Occupational Stress on Post-Exercise Recovery: a Narrative Review of the Medical Evidence

Maja Kwiatkowska

Faculty of Medical Sciences, WSB Academy, Cieplaka 1C, 41-300 Dąbrowa Górnicza, Poland

maja.kwiatkowskaa@op.pl

https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1601-9433

Jakub Palian

The District Hospital in Zawiercie, Miodowa 14, 42-400 Zawiercie, Poland

palian.jj@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8573-3573

Karolina Huzarska

Independent Researcher khuzarska.staz@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1571-598X

Szymon Kurzyński

St. Barbara Provincial Specialist Hospital No. 5, Plac Medyków 1, 41-214 Sosnowiec, Poland

kurzynski.s41@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8181-7625

Aleksandra Baraniecka

Medical University of Warmia and Masuria, Faculty of Medicine, 10-719 Olsztyn, Poland

a.baraniecka280601@gmail.com

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1787-6882

Corresponding Author
Maja Kwiatkowska - maja.kwiatkowskaa@op.pl

ABSTRACT

Background: Recovery from exercise is an active, multisystem process. Chronic psychological stress from academic and occupational demands activates the same neuroendocrine, autonomic, immune and behavioural systems that mediate recovery, raising the possibility that non-training stressors impair the capacity to recover from physical effort.

Aim: To synthesise critically the medical evidence on how chronic academic and occupational stress affects post-exercise recovery, and to derive practical, mechanism-based implications for athletes, students, workers and clinicians.

Material and methods: Narrative review of experimental, observational and longitudinal human and animal studies, systematic reviews and meta-analyses addressing stress, the HPA axis, autonomic function, sleep, inflammation, overtraining and recovery.

Results: Chronic stress dysregulates the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis and the sympathoadrenal system, blunting hormonal reserve while sustaining catecholamine drive. Pre-clinical and human data show that stress prolongs exercise-induced muscle hyperalgesia and induces myostatin-dependent muscle atrophy. Stress also shortens sleep, shifts the Th1/Th2 cytokine balance, lowers heart-rate variability and raises the need for recovery — signatures that overlap with overreaching and overtraining, in which stress capacity, not training load alone, determines maladaptation. Academic stress, especially in student-athletes, coincides with reduced recovery, mental fatigue and higher injury risk. Conversely, well-dosed exercise buffers stress, yet stress reduces physical-activity engagement, producing a reciprocal relationship.

Conclusions: Chronic academic and occupational stress is a clinically meaningful, modifiable determinant of post-exercise recovery. Recovery should be monitored and managed

multidimensionally — sleep, load, autonomic and psychometric markers — rather than as a purely physical phenomenon.

Keywords: chronic stress; recovery; cortisol; HPA axis; heart rate variability; overtraining; academic stress; occupational stress; sleep; exercise

1. Introduction

Adaptation to exercise depends not on training itself but on the recovery that follows it. Performance is built when a training stimulus disturbs homeostasis and an interspersed period of rest allows the organism to restore, and then super-compensate beyond, its previous state; when recovery is inadequate the same stimulus erodes rather than enhances capacity [1,2]. Recovery is therefore not a passive interval but an active, energy-dependent and multisystem process, encompassing metabolic replenishment, neuromuscular repair, immune regulation, autonomic re-balancing and neuroendocrine normalisation [3,4]. Because these are precisely the systems through which the body also responds to psychological stress, the recovery that follows a hard session is in principle vulnerable to demands that have nothing to do with sport — the demands of study and of work.

That stress and recovery are intertwined is not a new idea, but it has usually been examined in one direction only: the overwhelming majority of research has treated exercise as an instrument for mitigating distress, rather than asking whether distress impairs the capacity to recover from exercise [5]. The reverse relationship is at least as important. Stress reactions are always followed by recovery processes, and these recovery processes are themselves compromised when stressors are severe, prolonged or unaccustomed [5]. The concept of allostatic load — the cumulative physiological cost of repeatedly adapting to stressors — captures this directly: when the adaptive capacity of the organism is exceeded, the wear and tear of constant adaptation accumulates and predisposes to disease and to impaired restoration [5,6]. Among athletes and physically active people, two of the most pervasive chronic stressors are academic pressure and occupational strain, both of which act over weeks to months rather than seconds, and both of which are now recognised to have measurable medical consequences [7,8].

Academic stress is a naturally occurring, recurrent and objectively datable stressor. Examination periods reliably raise perceived stress, cortisol and sympathetic activity, and they do so over a sufficiently long window to influence behaviour and physiology rather than merely provoke a transient reaction [9,10,11,12]. Occupational stress, conceptualised through models such as job strain and effort–reward imbalance, and operationalised in part through the construct of the "need for recovery" after work, is associated with a moderately but consistently elevated risk of cardiovascular disease and type 2 diabetes across hundreds of thousands of workers [7,8]. The student-athlete and the working exerciser therefore embody a collision of loads: the physical load of training must be recovered from at the very time that the cognitive and emotional load of study or employment is highest [13,14].

The purpose of this narrative review is to bring together the medical evidence on how chronic academic and occupational stress affects post-exercise recovery, and to do so critically rather than descriptively. We first define the key constructs — chronic stress, allostatic load and the

multidimensional nature of recovery. We then examine the shared neuroendocrine substrate, the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis and the sympathoadrenal system, through which both stress and recovery are regulated. We review the mechanisms by which chronic stress can impair physical recovery: delayed resolution of exercise-induced muscle pain, catabolic muscle wasting, sleep disruption, immune and inflammatory dysregulation, and autonomic imbalance. We show how these signatures converge on the syndromes of overreaching and overtraining, in which non-training stress is a recognised but under-measured contributor. We consider in detail the academic context and the student-athlete, the occupational context and the worker, and the reciprocal relationship in which movement is at once a stressor and a remedy. Finally, we appraise the strategies that may protect recovery under chronic stress, the methodological limitations of the evidence, and the practical implications. Throughout, the emphasis is comparative and the literature is treated as what it is: heterogeneous, frequently observational, and rich in plausible mechanisms that are not always matched by direct human proof.

Two clarifications frame the scope of this review. First, by chronic academic and occupational stress we mean the sustained psychosocial demand that arises from study and work over weeks to months, distinct from the acute physiological stress of a single exercise bout, although the two interact at the level of shared mediators [5,7,8]. Second, by post-exercise recovery we mean the multidimensional restoration of physiological and psychological systems that follows training, not merely the absence of fatigue, encompassing endocrine, autonomic, immune, neuromuscular, behavioural and psychological channels [6,15,16]. The review is deliberately mechanism-led: because direct experiments in which quantified academic or occupational stress is shown to impair a standardised recovery outcome are scarce, the argument is built by triangulating animal models, controlled human stress paradigms such as examinations, large occupational cohorts, the overtraining and burnout literatures, and the reciprocal exercise–stress evidence [2,3,5,7,17]. This triangulation is the method appropriate to the present state of knowledge, and its limitations are addressed explicitly in the methodological appraisal [6].

2. Defining chronic stress and post-exercise recovery

2.1 Chronic stress, the HPA axis and allostatic load

Stress lacks a single agreed definition, but for the purposes of this review it can be understood as a state of threatened homeostasis that is counteracted by adaptive affective, physiological, biochemical and cognitive–behavioural responses aimed at regaining equilibrium [5]. Stressors may be acute or chronic, mild or traumatic, and they are appraised: an individual perceives stress when a demand is judged both threatening and beyond their capacity to cope [5]. The physiological response is coordinated chiefly by two systems. The sympathoadrenal (sympathetic–adrenal-medullary) system responds within milliseconds, releasing catecholamines that mobilise the “fight-or-flight” reaction and subside rapidly when the stressor is withdrawn [18]. The HPA axis responds more slowly: physical and psychological stress stimulate hypothalamic corticotropin-releasing hormone, which drives pituitary adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) and, in turn, adrenal cortisol, a glucocorticoid that

mobilises energy, modulates immunity and, through negative feedback, terminates its own response over twenty to forty minutes [1,6,18].

Cortisol is essential, not inherently harmful. In the context of exercise its release is an adaptive component of the stress response, supporting glucose availability through gluconeogenesis, promoting lipolysis and modulating the transient inflammation of strenuous effort [1,6,19]. The paradox emphasised across this literature is that acute and basal elevations of cortisol in response to psychological stress are considered detrimental to health, whereas the elevations provoked by appropriately dosed exercise are considered beneficial and adaptive [1]. The difference lies not in the hormone but in the pattern: repeated or prolonged activation without adequate recovery shifts the axis from adaptive modulation toward functional dysregulation, the hallmark of high allostatic load [5,6]. In regularly training individuals, such dysregulation is reflected in altered basal cortisol, a flattened or exaggerated diurnal rhythm, and altered responsiveness to subsequent stressors, and it is best understood as a dynamic, partly reversible point on an adaptive–maladaptive continuum rather than as a fixed clinical pathology [6].

A particularly sensitive index of HPA regulation is the cortisol awakening response (CAR), the sharp rise in cortisol within the first thirty to forty-five minutes after waking that is superimposed on the diurnal rhythm and is thought to prepare the organism for the demands of the day [1,6]. The CAR has been related to burnout, chronic fatigue, depression and post-traumatic stress, and both exaggerated and blunted responses have been linked to dysfunctional health status, so that there is no single "healthy" value but rather an optimal regulatory range [1]. Because the CAR appears to integrate prior load and anticipated stress, it has been proposed as a marker of cumulative or global stress — exactly the quantity relevant to an athlete simultaneously carrying training, academic and occupational demands [1,6].

The detail of how chronic stress shifts the axis matters for recovery. Repeated episodes of acute stress can initiate a down-regulation of glucocorticoid receptors, producing relative glucocorticoid resistance in which cortisol increasingly fails to restrain inflammation despite adequate or even elevated circulating levels [12]. This decoupling of cortisol concentration from cortisol action is central to the present argument, because it means that a stressed exerciser may exhibit a normal or high cortisol value while the hormone's restorative, anti-inflammatory function is impaired — a state that a single basal measurement cannot detect [12,20]. The same principle underlies the overtraining literature's insistence that provoked, not resting, hormonal responses reveal maladaptation, and it cautions against the naive interpretation of any one cortisol reading in a person carrying combined training and life stress [6,20].

2.2 Academic stress as a controlled human model

Academic examination is, for the researcher, an almost ideal naturalistic stressor: it is objectively stressful, predictable, recurrent, and extends over a longer window than a discrete laboratory challenge, conferring greater ecological validity [5]. Real-time monitoring during university examinations shows the expected autonomic signature — higher heart rate, lower heart-rate variability (HRV) and a shift toward sympathetic dominance before and during the examination, with recovery of parasympathetic activity once it is over [9]. Longitudinal

sampling across a semester demonstrates progressive increases in cortisol from baseline through midterm to final examinations, accompanied by measurable changes in immune function [12]. Among medical students, stress measured objectively by HRV correlates with academic achievement in a manner consistent with an inverted-U relationship, in which appropriate stress can aid and excessive stress can impair performance, and females consistently report and exhibit greater stress reactivity than males [10]. Academic self-pressure in adolescents likewise lowers HRV and degrades working memory and cognitive performance, identifying autonomic regulation as a mediator between study demands and outcomes [21]. Academic stress is therefore not merely a convenient model; it is itself a prevalent chronic exposure with demonstrable neuroendocrine, autonomic and immune effects relevant to anyone who also trains.

The examination model also exposes important individual differences and a notable absence of habituation. In a study of ninety students monitored continuously across a real four-hour examination, heart-rate variability was lowest before and during the examination and highest afterwards, marking the post-examination interval as a genuine relaxation–recovery period; yet students in successive undergraduate years did not differ in their stress response, indicating a lack of adaptation to repeated examination across the academic career [9]. Females consistently showed higher heart rate and lower variability than males before and after the examination, even though males exhibited greater sympathetic input, so that women appeared more prone to stress in real-life academic conditions [9]. This combination — no habituation across years, and greater female reactivity — implies that academic stress is a recurring, non-attenuating load that falls unequally, and that its capacity to erode recovery in a female student-athlete may be systematically greater than in a male peer, a pattern echoed across the recovery–stress literature [9,10,15].

2.3 Occupational stress and the need for recovery

Occupational stress has been studied principally through the job-strain model (high demands with low control) and the effort–reward imbalance model, and the evidence linking it to chronic disease is now substantial. A synthesis of more than 600,000 men and women from 27 cohort studies concluded that work stressors such as job strain and long working hours carry a moderately elevated risk of incident coronary heart disease and stroke, with an excess of roughly 10–40% in exposed individuals, and that the association is broadly consistent across sex, age and socioeconomic position [7]. The same body of work links job strain to type 2 diabetes but not to common cancers, indicating outcome specificity, and identifies plausible mediators including physical inactivity, disturbed sleep, adverse metabolic profiles and direct neuroendocrine activation [7]. The construct of the "need for recovery" after work — the short-term failure to unwind from a working day — captures the intermediate step between job stressors and disease, and a high need for recovery has itself been shown to be a strong, independent predictor of subsequent cardiovascular disease in a working population [8]. Crucially, a high need for recovery is associated with the same downstream phenomena that matter for athletic restoration: insomnia, fatigue, and impaired unwinding [8,22].

The strength of the occupational evidence lies partly in its scale and its attempts to exclude bias. The individual-participant meta-analyses of the IPD-Work consortium harmonised

exposure and outcome across hundreds of thousands of workers, used both published and unpublished data to gauge publication bias, and excluded early events to address reverse causation, concluding that the association between job strain and coronary heart disease is robust, modest and unlikely to be explained by confounding or chance [7]. Natural experiments add a temporal dimension: organisational downsizing, used as a proxy for work stress, was followed by a doubling of cardiovascular mortality among the employees who remained, concentrated in the years immediately after the event, consistent with major occupational stress acting as a trigger in vulnerable individuals [7]. The need-for-recovery cohort similarly found that the elevated cardiovascular risk associated with a high need for recovery was stable across thirty-two months and only marginally diminished after excluding early cases, supporting an intermediate rather than a reverse-causal role [8]. Together these designs make occupational stress one of the better-evidenced chronic exposures relevant to recovery, even though, like the academic literature, it rarely measures post-exercise recovery directly [7,8].

2.4 Post-exercise recovery as a multidimensional construct

If recovery is to be impaired by stress, it must first be defined. Contemporary consensus regards recovery as an inter- and intra-individual, multilevel process operating over timescales from minutes to days, encompassing the restoration of physiological systems and of psychological resources [15,16]. It is not reducible to a single biomarker. Physiologically it includes the normalisation of cortisol and catecholamines, the resolution of inflammation and oxidative stress, neuromuscular repair and glycogen replenishment [6,23]. Autonomically it is indexed by the return of cardiac vagal activity, most often quantified through the root mean square of successive differences (RMSSD) in heart-rate intervals [24,25]. Behaviourally and psychologically it depends on sleep and on the subjective sense of being recovered, captured by instruments such as the Recovery–Stress Questionnaire for Athletes (RESTQ-Sport) [15,16]. The biopsychosocial perspective embodied in the RESTQ-Sport explicitly treats stress and recovery as paired constructs and measures the extent to which an athlete is stressed and is able to mobilise individual recovery strategies [13,15]. This multidimensionality is essential to the argument that follows, because chronic academic and occupational stress acts not on one channel of recovery but on several simultaneously — endocrine, autonomic, immune, behavioural and psychological.

A practical advantage of the cortisol awakening response in this context is that it appears to integrate several inputs at once. Because it can reflect both the cumulative load already carried and the psychological anticipation of the day ahead, it has been proposed as a marker of global stress or allostatic load rather than of any single stressor [1]. For an individual simultaneously managing training, study and work, this is exactly the quantity of interest, and it can be sampled non-invasively from saliva at rest without the burden of repeated exercise testing [1]. The same property, however, is its interpretive difficulty: a given awakening response cannot be attributed to training, academic or occupational stress in isolation, and both exaggerated and blunted responses signal dysregulation, so the measure must be tracked longitudinally against a personal baseline and read alongside training load and sleep [1,6]. Used this way, the awakening response exemplifies the review's central methodological

stance — that markers of recovery are informative only when individualised and multidimensional [6,15].

The multidimensionality of recovery also explains why monitoring tools that capture only one channel can disagree. The Recovery–Stress Questionnaire spans general and sport-specific stress and recovery across many subscales, from emotional and social stress to physical recovery, sleep quality and being in shape, precisely because no single dimension represents the whole [15,16]. Physiological tools such as HRV capture the autonomic channel, salivary cortisol the endocrine channel, and inflammatory markers the immune channel, each of which can move independently of the others and of subjective report [1,12,26]. The consequence for the present argument is that chronic academic and occupational stress may impair recovery visibly on one channel while another appears intact, and that a judgement about whether recovery is adequate must therefore rest on convergence across channels rather than on any single favourable reading [15,26]. This is the conceptual foundation for the multimodal monitoring recommended later, and it follows directly from defining recovery as the restoration of multiple, partly independent systems [6,15].

3. The shared neuroendocrine substrate of stress and recovery

3.1 Cortisol dynamics, exercise and the awakening response

The cortisol response to exercise is intensity- and duration-dependent. In adults, an exercise intensity exceeding roughly 60% of maximal oxygen uptake is required to raise cortisol above resting levels, with a minimum duration of ten to fifteen minutes, and peak concentrations occurring twenty to thirty minutes after the bout [19]. Below this threshold the HPA axis is not meaningfully activated, which is why brief, low-intensity activity often produces no measurable change in cortisol or in the CAR [1,19]. After exhaustive exercise cortisol may exhibit a rebound, remaining depressed for twenty-four to forty-eight hours, and training itself modifies the axis by altering pituitary sensitivity to negative feedback or peripheral tissue sensitivity to cortisol [1]. These features matter for the present argument because they establish that the HPA axis is a finite, dynamically regulated resource: an axis already engaged by chronic academic or occupational stress has less reserve with which to mount, and then resolve, the cortisol response that a training session demands [6,20].

The systematic review of exercise and the CAR illustrates both the promise and the present limitations of using HPA markers to track recovery. Across thirty-two heterogeneous studies, the awakening response shifted variably with training: it appeared to increase as training load was first imposed and then to stabilise, before decreasing again if load became excessive, a non-linear pattern mirroring the chronic-fatigue and burnout literature in which the CAR may rise, fall or remain unchanged [1]. Some athletes who developed overtraining showed a declining, blunted CAR resembling that of burnout patients, whereas short intensive blocks could raise it [1]. The unavoidable conclusion is that the same biomarker can move in opposite directions depending on whether the load has exceeded the individual's adaptive capacity — which is itself partly determined by non-training stress [1,6]. This context-dependence is a recurring methodological theme: cortisol is informative only when interpreted longitudinally and alongside training load, sleep and psychological state [6].

The threshold nature of the cortisol response carries a counter-intuitive corollary that recurs through the recovery literature: not every exercise bout raises cortisol, and the relationship between exercise and cortisol is not uniformly positive. Brief, low-intensity activity may leave the awakening response unchanged, and some studies even report transiently lowered post-exercise cortisol, with the direction depending on intensity, duration, time of day and the population studied [19]. This sensitivity to methodological detail is precisely why the field has struggled to establish cortisol as a stand-alone recovery biomarker, and why apparently contradictory findings — increases, decreases and null results — can usually be reconciled by attending to dose and timing rather than by positing genuinely opposite physiology [1,19]. For the stressed exerciser the lesson is interpretive: a cortisol value is meaningful only against the background of the individual's habitual rhythm, recent training, sleep and concurrent academic or occupational load, and is best read as one channel within a multidimensional recovery profile [1,6].

3.2 Blunted hormonal reserve in overreaching and overtraining

The clearest endocrine evidence that recovery capacity can be exhausted comes from the overtraining literature. A systematic review of thirty-eight studies of the hormonal aspects of overtraining syndrome and functional and non-functional overreaching found that basal, resting hormone levels were mostly normal in affected athletes and were therefore poor predictors of the condition [20]. What distinguished maladapted athletes was their response to provocation: stimulation tests, typically maximal exercise or two-bout protocols, revealed blunted growth-hormone and ACTH responses, indicating a diminished capacity to mount an appropriate neuroendocrine reaction to an acute stressful demand [20]. This is a direct physiological analogue of the central thesis of this review: chronic overload depletes the reserve with which the axis can respond to, and recover from, further stress, and a static basal measurement misses it [6,20]. The testosterone-to-cortisol ratio, often promoted as an anabolic–catabolic index, showed altered values in only half of resting studies and is now understood to reflect the physiological strain of training rather than the athlete's maladaptation to it, a caution that applies equally to the uncritical use of single hormonal markers in stressed exercisers [20].

The diagnostic literature underlines how easily a single hormonal snapshot misleads. Across the overtraining studies, basal cortisol distinguished affected from healthy athletes in only a minority, resting cortisol after an overload programme was normal in three-quarters of studies, and only provoked responses — to maximal exercise, two-bout protocols or insulin tolerance testing — reliably exposed the blunted ACTH and growth-hormone reserve that marks maladaptation [20]. The earliest such study, using the insulin tolerance test, found blunted ACTH and cortisol responses in affected athletes, but no consistent cut-off for any hormone has since been validated, and several studies improperly diagnosed overtraining from hormone changes regardless of performance [20]. For the stressed exerciser the message is doubly cautionary: not only is a resting cortisol value an unreliable index of recovery capacity, but the temptation to over-interpret any single endocrine marker — including the testosterone-to-cortisol ratio, which reflects training strain rather than maladaptation — should be resisted in favour of provoked, longitudinal and multidimensional assessment [6,20].

3.3 The sympathoadrenal axis and catecholamines

Where the HPA axis governs the slower hormonal arm of the stress response, the sympathoadrenal axis governs the rapid one, and it too is implicated in impaired recovery. Catecholamine dynamics in overtraining are conflicting — endurance athletes tend to show reduced nocturnal catecholamine excretion as fatigue accumulates, whereas resistance-trained athletes may show increased catecholamines with down-regulated muscle beta-adrenergic receptors, supporting a distinction between parasympathetic-predominant and sympathetic-predominant forms of the syndrome [2,20]. More importantly for recovery, persistent sympathoadrenal activation is itself a mechanism by which psychological stress prolongs the physical consequences of exercise, as the pre-clinical work reviewed below demonstrates [3]. The autonomic imbalance produced by chronic stress — sympathetic dominance and withdrawal of cardiac vagal tone — is the same imbalance that HRV monitoring detects in overreached athletes, providing a unifying autonomic signature that links the psychological and the physical [24,25].

This dual nature of catecholamine signalling — protective in the acute fight-or-flight response yet damaging when chronically sustained — runs through the recovery literature. The acute sympathoadrenal surge increases attention, mobilises substrate and can transiently inhibit fatigue, which is adaptive during effort [27]. Sustained activation, however, maintains sympathetic dominance and vagal withdrawal between sessions, the autonomic state that HRV monitoring detects as impaired recovery and that pre-clinical work shows can prolong the physical consequences of exercise through peripheral beta-adrenergic receptors on nociceptors [3,25]. The same catecholamine excess enhances the release of pro-algesic and pro-inflammatory mediators from immune cells, linking the sympathoadrenal arm to the inflammatory dimension of impaired recovery [3]. Chronic academic or occupational stress, by keeping this arm engaged, therefore acts on recovery through two coordinated routes — neuroendocrine and autonomic — that are not independent but mutually reinforcing, and that together explain why a depressed RMSSD, a blunted hormonal reserve and delayed tissue recovery so often co-occur in the over-stressed exerciser [3,20,25].

4. Mechanisms by which chronic stress impairs physical recovery

4.1 Delayed recovery from exercise-induced muscle pain

The most mechanistically explicit evidence that stress impairs recovery from exercise comes from a controlled animal model with direct human parallels. In rats, eccentric exercise produces mechanical muscle hyperalgesia that resolves within about five days; prior exposure to unpredictable sound stress prolonged this hyperalgesia for up to twenty days, selectively impairing the recovery phase rather than the peak of the injury [3]. The effect was sympathoadrenal in origin: surgical removal of the adrenal medulla abolished the prolongation, administration of stress levels of epinephrine reproduced it, and knockdown of nociceptor beta-2 adrenergic receptors attenuated it [3]. The authors interpreted this as stress disrupting the capacity of nociceptors to sense recovery — to detect that the tissue has healed — so that the protective hyperalgesia fails to switch off [3]. Critically, the authors anchor their model in human observations: high levels of chronic stress before pain onset prolong muscle

pain after eccentric exercise in previously pain-free volunteers, and chronic psychological stress impairs recovery of muscular function and increases fatigue over a four-day period of strenuous resistance exercise [3]. This is, in effect, a worked physiological example of academic or occupational stress delaying the resolution of ordinary exercise-induced soreness, with an identified mediator and a clear therapeutic implication that stress is detrimental to exercise-based rehabilitation [3].

The human counterpart of this animal work strengthens rather than weakens the inference. The same research programme that delineated the sympathoadrenal mechanism cites controlled human observations in which high chronic stress before pain onset prolonged delayed-onset muscle soreness in previously pain-free volunteers, and in which chronic psychological stress impaired the recovery of muscular function and increased somatic fatigue over a ninety-six-hour period following strenuous resistance exercise [3]. These findings convert an abstract mechanism into a concrete prediction for the student or worker: the ordinary soreness and functional loss that follow a hard session, which would normally resolve within days, may persist measurably longer when the exerciser is also carrying a heavy load of academic or occupational stress [3]. The clinical recommendation that emerges from this literature — that stress is detrimental to the success of exercise-based therapy and that cognitive and behavioural treatments may be needed alongside it — applies directly to rehabilitation and to training conducted under chronic life stress [3].

It is worth dwelling on why this model is so persuasive for the present argument. The effect was specific to the recovery phase: the peak of hyperalgesia was barely altered, but its resolution was delayed for weeks, demonstrating that stress acts not on the magnitude of the initial insult but on the capacity to recover from it — the very definition of impaired recovery [3]. The identified mediator, adrenal-medullary epinephrine acting on nociceptor beta-2 adrenergic receptors, is the same sympathoadrenal pathway chronically engaged by academic and occupational stress, providing a continuous mechanistic thread from a psychosocial stressor to a delayed physical recovery [3]. Moreover, the authors situate their findings within a broader account in which descending pain-modulatory controls are also disrupted by repeated stress, so that the prolongation of muscle pain reflects both peripheral nociceptor sensitisation and impaired central inhibition [3]. Few findings in the recovery literature are as mechanistically complete, and although demonstrated in rodents, the convergence with human observations of stress-prolonged soreness gives it unusual weight as a model of how life stress delays the everyday recovery from training [3].

4.2 Catabolism and stress-induced muscle atrophy

Chronic stress does not merely delay the resolution of damage; it can actively promote catabolism. In mice, one hour of daily psychological stress — whether restraint or cage-switching — decreased body and skeletal-muscle mass and increased the expression of the atrophy-associated genes myostatin, atrogin-1, muscle ring-finger 1 and the phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase inhibitory subunit p85, with restraint stress producing the more robust effect [17]. The loss of muscle was substantial: tibialis anterior mass fell by roughly 8–10% after three days, comparable to that seen with traditional models of muscle unloading such as hindlimb suspension [17]. Decisively, the effect was myostatin-dependent: myostatin-

null mice were largely protected, losing little body mass and no muscle mass and showing attenuated atrogene induction [17]. Because food restriction alone reproduced neither the muscle loss nor most of the gene changes, the atrophy could not be explained by reduced intake and was attributed to glucocorticoid-driven, myostatin-mediated signalling [17]. For the exercising human, the implication is sobering: chronic stress creates a catabolic, glucocorticoid-dominant internal environment that opposes the hypertrophic adaptation that resistance training seeks, and may render muscle smaller, weaker and more vulnerable to strain — the opposite of recovery [5,17].

The molecular detail of the mouse model is instructive about the mechanism and its plausibility in humans. The atrophy-associated genes induced by stress — myostatin, atrogin-1, muscle ring-finger 1 and the PI 3-kinase inhibitory subunit p85 — are the same effectors that glucocorticoids and disuse engage, and their expression is directly regulated by glucocorticoids, linking the behavioural stressor to a familiar catabolic pathway through the HPA axis [17]. The decisive control was genetic: myostatin-null mice lost little body mass and no muscle mass and showed attenuated atrogene induction, and they even displayed a blunted corticosterone and hyperglycaemic response to stress, implicating myostatin as an intermediary between HPA activation and muscle wasting [17]. Although the absolute changes in gene expression were modest, the muscle loss was real and comparable in magnitude to hindlimb unloading, illustrating that small, sustained shifts in catabolic signalling can produce meaningful tissue loss over days [17]. Extrapolated to the chronically stressed human, this predicts a low-grade catabolic drag on the hypertrophic and reparative processes that resistance training depends upon, and offers a mechanistic account of why stressed individuals may build less muscle and recover more slowly from training than their adaptive capacity would otherwise allow [5,17].

4.3 Sleep disruption as a central mediator

Sleep is the single most important recovery behaviour, and it is acutely sensitive to chronic stress. Need for recovery after work is strongly associated with insomnia, and recovery from work relates to multiple insomnia symptoms — difficulty staying asleep, repeated waking and non-restorative sleep — that together degrade the restoration that sleep should provide [8,22]. Sleep loss in turn feeds directly into the physiological pathways of impaired recovery. Sleep deficiency increases HPA-axis activity, elevating cortisol and catecholamines, and raises oxidative stress and the inflammatory marker high-sensitivity C-reactive protein [23]. In a controlled study of university students, three nights of restricted sleep increased reactive oxygen metabolites and cortisol; importantly, the response to subsequent exercise was intensity-dependent, with low-intensity aerobic exercise lowering both oxidative stress and cortisol relative to the sleep-deprived state, while high-intensity exercise increased them [23]. This finding crystallises a central practical message: under conditions of accumulated stress and sleep debt, the recovery value of exercise depends on its dose, and a hard session may aggravate rather than relieve the underlying dysregulation [23]. Exercise timing and intensity also modulate circadian rhythm and sleep quality, so that the scheduling of training relative to the stress-disturbed sleep–wake cycle is itself a recovery variable [28]. Self-reported exercise and sleep interact in shaping next-day cortisol rhythms even in older adults, underscoring that the sleep–exercise–cortisol triad is a lifelong determinant of recovery [29].

The intensity-dependence of exercise under sleep debt has a circadian dimension that compounds the problem. Disrupted circadian rhythm and a sedentary lifestyle independently worsen sleep quality, and the systematic review of exercise timing and intensity concludes that both variables shape the physiological circadian rhythm and the quality of subsequent sleep, so that exercise can entrain and improve the sleep–wake cycle or, if poorly timed and excessively intense, further disturb it [28]. Chronic academic and occupational stress already perturbs circadian regulation through elevated evening cortisol and irregular schedules, and a late high-intensity session layered onto this disturbance risks delaying sleep onset and flattening the diurnal cortisol slope, the very pattern associated with residual physiological stress [28,29]. The convergent message of the sleep, circadian and cortisol literatures is that timing is not a minor detail of training prescription but a determinant of whether a session aids or undermines recovery in a stressed individual, and that the window for demanding exercise narrows as sleep and circadian regulation deteriorate under chronic load [23,28,29].

4.4 Immune and inflammatory dysregulation

Recovery from exercise requires a controlled inflammatory response that resolves; chronic stress disturbs this control. Academic examination stress shifts the balance of T-helper cytokines away from cellular (Th1) toward humoral (Th2) immunity. In medical and health-sciences students sampled across a semester, the final-examination period produced the highest cortisol release and a significant rise in the Th2 cytokines interleukin-4, interleukin-5 and interleukin-1ra, with a fall in the Th1/Th2 ratio, interpreted as cortisol-driven suppression of Th1-mediated cellular immunity and a corresponding increase in susceptibility to infection [12]. An exploratory randomised trial in university students exposed to progressively greater examination stress found that rising distress was associated with an increased proportion of B lymphocytes and with elevations of pro-inflammatory markers, although mindfulness training did not reliably buffer these immune changes [11]. The relevance to recovery is twofold: first, stress-induced glucocorticoid resistance and a pro-inflammatory tilt impair the orderly resolution of exercise-induced inflammation; second, the heightened infection risk that accompanies the Th2 shift mirrors the well-documented vulnerability of overtrained athletes to upper-respiratory infection, situating academic stress alongside training load as a contributor to immunosuppression [2,11,12].

The immunological account is mechanistically coherent and connects academic stress to the established immunosuppression of overtraining. Stress hormones act through receptors on immune cells to favour humoral over cellular immunity; cortisol suppresses Th1 cytokine production while permitting or enhancing Th2 cytokines, and the resulting fall in the interferon-γ/interleukin-4 ratio reflects a shift from cellular toward humoral immunity that reduces defence against viral infection [12]. This is the same Th2-favouring profile, with raised interleukin-6 and other markers, that has been described after prolonged or intensive exercise and that accompanies the increased upper-respiratory infection risk of overtrained athletes [2,12]. The convergence is important for the present thesis: academic and athletic stress are not merely analogous but appear to act through a shared neuroendocrine-immune pathway, so that their effects on the immune component of recovery may summate in a student-athlete sitting examinations during a heavy training block [2,11,12]. The caveat is that immune parameters in healthy individuals are tightly regulated and may need to surpass a

threshold before stress produces detectable change, which helps explain why some examination-stress studies find only modest or selective immune effects [11].

The mindfulness trial conducted within the same examination cohort tempers any easy optimism about countering this immune effect. Although mindfulness training reliably reduced self-reported distress, it did not buffer the stress-related immune changes: the proportion of B lymphocytes rose with distress regardless of trial arm, and there was no clear effect on cortisol, C-reactive protein or the cytokines measured [11]. The authors were careful about confounds — baseline and examination samples were taken in different seasons, and immune parameters in healthy people are tightly regulated — but the central message stands that a psychological intervention can improve perceived stress without normalising its physiological signature [11]. For recovery this is a crucial caution: interventions must be judged on the specific channel they move, and the assumption that reducing felt stress automatically restores immune or endocrine recovery is not supported [11]. It also reinforces that the immune dimension of recovery may be more resistant to behavioural intervention than the autonomic or psychological dimensions, and may instead depend chiefly on reducing the underlying load and protecting sleep [11,22,23].

4.5 Autonomic signatures: heart-rate variability

Heart-rate variability provides a non-invasive window onto the autonomic arm of recovery, and it responds to both training and non-training stress. A healthy, well-recovered organism shows high vagally mediated variability; physical exertion and systemic stress trigger vagal withdrawal and sympathetic activation, reducing variability and producing more rhythmic, less variable heartbeats [25]. During university examinations, HRV falls and the sympathovagal balance shifts before and during the examination, recovering afterwards, demonstrating that a cognitive stressor alone reproduces the autonomic pattern of physical strain [9]. In training contexts, the natural logarithm of RMSSD (lnRMSSD) and its coefficient of variation track the perturbation of homeostasis by load: during an intensified canoeing training camp, male athletes who perceived higher training loads showed a small reduction in lnRMSSD and a rise in total perceived stress, while females, who perceived lower loads, did not [24]. Systematic review supports RMSSD and the non-linear index DFA alpha-1 as sensitive markers of acute autonomic fatigue, while cautioning that HRV is a leading indicator of organismic stress that is itself lowered by poor sleep, hypoxia and high cognitive or emotional load, and that perceived stress scores are inversely correlated with RMSSD [25]. HRV thus cannot distinguish the source of a stressor, which is precisely why it is valuable here: it registers the summed autonomic burden of training, study and work, and a depressed RMSSD in a stressed student-athlete may reflect academic as much as physical load [25].

The coefficient of variation of lnRMSSD adds a complementary dimension, reflecting day-to-day fluctuation in cardiac parasympathetic activity; athletes with lower variability of this index tend to be more aerobically fit and to cope better with a given load, reporting less perceived fatigue [24]. In the canoeing camp, the absence of change in this coefficient between training periods was interpreted as evidence that the imposed load did not substantially perturb homeostasis, whereas the small decline in mean lnRMSSD in males

tracked their higher perceived load and stress [24]. This granularity matters because it shows that HRV can register not only the presence of strain but its adequacy relative to the individual's capacity — capacity that is itself reduced by concurrent academic or occupational stress [24,25]. It also reinforces the methodological warning that HRV must be individualised: a value that signals overload in one athlete may be normal in another, and only longitudinal, person-specific baselines, ideally measured nocturnally or in standardised morning conditions, yield reliable interpretation [25].

4.6 A natural experiment: COVID-19 as a chronic stress–recovery model

The aftermath of COVID-19 provided an unplanned model of how a sustained systemic and psychological stressor degrades recovery in otherwise fit people. In a cohort of ninety-nine athletes studied after infection, perceived recovery measured by the RESTQ-Sport was persistently below reference values across multiple time points, and maximal aerobic power correlated negatively with the stress subscales — general, emotional and somatic stress, performance pressure, overtiredness and lack of energy — and positively with somatic and general recovery [30]. In other words, the athletes with the most disturbed perception of stress and recovery were those with the lowest physical performance, and the authors noted that the persistent symptoms of post-COVID syndrome, including fatigue, sleep disturbance and concentration problems, resemble the consequences of overtraining and may share altered immune and inflammatory mechanisms [30]. The deterioration of perceived sleep over seven months, and its established role in monitoring general recovery, again identified sleep as a pivotal channel [30]. While COVID-19 is a specific pathophysiological insult, the study is conceptually valuable here because it demonstrates, in a longitudinal athletic sample, the same coupling that this review proposes for academic and occupational stress: a chronic non-training stressor lowers perceived recovery and tracks reduced physical performance, and monitoring both psychological and physical parameters is necessary to manage the return to full function [15,30].

5. Convergence with overreaching and overtraining

5.1 Stress capacity, not load alone, determines maladaptation

The clinical syndromes of non-functional overreaching (NFO) and overtraining syndrome (OTS) are the point at which inadequate recovery becomes manifest, and the literature on them has increasingly recognised that non-training stress is integral to their development. Overreaching is an accumulation of training load that produces a transient performance decrement; followed by adequate rest it yields super-compensation (functional overreaching), but combined with an additional stressor and insufficient recovery it can progress to NFO and then to OTS, a multisystem disorder involving the HPA axis, the immune system and the autonomic nervous system, with depressed mood, central fatigue and neurohormonal change [2]. The practical guide to OTS is explicit that psychological and social stressors, alongside physiological stress, contribute to NFO and OTS, and that an individual's stress capacity helps determine whether overload becomes maladaptive [2]. The triggers it lists — increased load without recovery, monotony, excessive competition, sleep disturbance, and personal and occupational stressors — place academic and work strain squarely among the precipitants of

overtraining [2]. This reframes the syndromes as the predictable endpoint of an imbalance between total stress (training plus life) and total recovery, not merely between training and rest [2,6].

The pathophysiology proposed for overtraining further embeds non-training stress within the syndrome. The cytokine hypothesis frames OTS as a systemic inflammatory response initiated by an imbalance between training and recovery, in which repeated micro-trauma without adequate rest amplifies a local then systemic inflammatory reaction, with pro-inflammatory cytokines acting on the hypothalamus to produce the depressed mood, anorexia and central fatigue of "sickness behaviour" [2]. Because the same cytokine and glucocorticoid pathways are engaged by psychological stress, academic or occupational strain plausibly adds to the inflammatory load that tips an athlete from functional into non-functional overreaching [2,12]. Complementary hypotheses — glycogen depletion, altered central serotonin and the glutamine and oxidative-stress accounts — each capture part of the picture, but none alone explains all the features, and the practical guide concludes that OTS remains a clinical diagnosis of exclusion requiring a careful history that explicitly includes personal and occupational stressors [2]. This diagnostic emphasis on life stress, rather than training load alone, is the clearest statement in the sports-medicine literature that recovery is governed by total demand [2,6].

5.2 Hormonal and metabolic markers of exhausted reserve

The endocrine profile of overtraining, reviewed above, reinforces this reading. Because basal hormones are largely normal and only provoked responses reveal blunted ACTH and growth-hormone reserve, the syndrome is best understood as a depletion of the capacity to respond to stress rather than a simple deficiency state [20]. Conceptually this is the same exhaustion of adaptive reserve that high allostatic load describes, and it predicts that an athlete whose reserve is already partly consumed by chronic academic or occupational stress will reach the maladaptive threshold at a lower training load than an unstressed peer [6,20]. The HPA-axis review of regularly training individuals makes the bidirectional nature of the relationship explicit: chronic training stress shapes hormonal responsiveness, and hormonal dysregulation in turn limits tolerance to physical load, with disturbances that are time-dependent and at least partially reversible once load is reduced and recovery, sleep and nutrition are restored [6]. The reversibility is important, because it identifies the management of non-training stress as a legitimate lever for protecting recovery, not merely an unavoidable background [6].

5.3 Autonomic monitoring for early detection

Because overt OTS is diagnosed largely by exclusion and only after a prolonged performance decrement has already developed, attention has turned to daily, non-invasive monitoring that can detect the transition from functional to non-functional overreaching before it becomes entrenched [25]. Systematic review of HRV for this purpose concludes that RMSSD and DFA alpha-1 are sensitive leading indicators of autonomic maladaptation, that HRV-guided training (adjusting load when variability falls below an individual's smallest worthwhile change) can improve adaptation relative to fixed periodisation, and that high-end chest straps agree closely with electrocardiography whereas wrist optical sensors are prone to motion artefact [25]. The same review is careful to state that HRV should not stand alone as a diagnostic tool, because

OTS is multisystemic and HRV is confounded by sleep, hypoxia, substances and psychological load; it recommends integrating HRV with subjective wellness scales and performance metrics, using individualised seven-day rolling averages and gender-specific interpretation given the influence of the menstrual cycle on autonomic tone [25]. For the stressed exerciser, this multimodal philosophy is exactly right: a fall in RMSSD during examinations or a demanding work period should be read as a signal to reduce load, not as evidence of physical overtraining alone [9,25].

The operational guidance distilled from the HRV literature translates directly to the stressed exerciser. Practitioners are advised to establish an individualised baseline using a seven-day rolling average rather than one-off measurements, to implement HRV-guided training in which high-intensity sessions are replaced by recovery when variability falls below the individual's smallest worthwhile change, to standardise measurement conditions to minimise the confounding of caffeine, alcohol and circadian shifts, to adopt sex-specific interpretation given the menstrual-cycle influence on autonomic tone, and to incorporate non-linear indices such as DFA alpha-1 for high-intensity monitoring [25]. Critically, the same framework insists that HRV be cross-referenced with subjective wellness and performance before any conclusion is drawn, because a fall in variability may reflect academic or emotional load rather than physical overtraining [25]. This is precisely the multimodal, individualised approach that protects recovery in a person carrying combined loads, and it converts the abstract claim that life stress affects recovery into a concrete monitoring protocol [9,25].

5.4 Psychometric monitoring of the stress–recovery balance

Psychological instruments capture the dimension of recovery that biomarkers miss. The RESTQ-Sport, built explicitly on a stress–recovery balance, has been validated across languages and sports and is responsive to training load; in elite swimmers a short version tracked the dose–response relationship between training load and recovery–stress states and related to heart-rate recovery during tapering [15,16]. In Mexican youth athletes, the questionnaire revealed that individual-sport athletes and female athletes reported lower recovery and higher stress, identifying subgroups in whom the stress–recovery balance is more precarious and recommending closer monitoring and more effective coping strategies for them [15]. A prospective multilevel study of young table-tennis players found that recovery and coping, rather than stress itself, predicted burnout symptoms, supporting the view that the goal is not to eliminate the stress inherent in competitive sport but to balance it with adequate recovery resources [13]. The convergence of the psychometric and physiological literatures is striking: both conclude that monitoring the balance between total stress and total recovery, longitudinally and individually, is more informative than any single measurement, and both implicitly include non-training stress within the stress side of the ledger [13,15,16,25].

6. Academic stress and the student-athlete

6.1 When training load and study load collide

The student-athlete is the population in which the collision of physical and academic stress is most directly observable. A four-year monitoring study of 182 young elite university athletes

found that energy levels and sleep deteriorated toward examination periods, and that examination periods coincided with the highest stress levels and an increased likelihood of illness [14]. A logistic regression identified decreased mood, decreased sleep duration and increased academic stress as predictors of injury, and a sudden pre-season spike in training load was associated with elevated injury and illness — so that the two loads, athletic and academic, compounded one another [14]. This is the applied expression of every mechanism reviewed above: at the very moment when examination stress is raising cortisol, lowering HRV and shortening sleep, the athlete must still recover from training, and the margin for recovery narrows [9,12,14]. The study's recommendation — that coaches and support staff monitor and manage overall stress, recognising that examination time and pre-season are periods of heightened vulnerability — follows directly from treating recovery as a function of total rather than purely physical load [14].

Cross-cultural comparison reinforces that the academic environment shapes the stress–recovery balance. A study contrasting European and American student-athletes found significant differences in general, emotional, social and sport-specific stress, in fatigue and disturbed breaks, and in sleep quality and mood, attributing them to cultural and environmental factors and arguing for tailored psychological and recovery strategies [31]. The recurrent finding that female and individual-sport athletes carry a less favourable stress–recovery profile, observed independently in Mexican youth athletes and in the canoeing and student-athlete literatures, identifies subgroups in whom academic stress is most likely to erode recovery and who therefore warrant the closest monitoring [15,24,31]. Self-regulation skills appear protective: in athletes entering an elite sports school, the transition raised perceived stress and threat, and these correlated strongly and negatively with self-regulation and self-access, so that structured support to build self-competence may buffer the impact of the dual academic–athletic career on recovery and well-being [32].

The speed-skating data illustrate why the athlete's perception, shaped by total life stress, must inform load management rather than the coach's intention alone. Over a four-week preparatory period junior skaters executed fewer sessions and a lower total duration than their coaches intended, and the mismatch between intended and perceived training correlated, at a large magnitude, with changes in recovery-oriented scales — success, physical recovery, self-regulation and personal accomplishment [33]. Because the internal load that determines adaptation depends on the athlete's psychophysiological response rather than on the externally prescribed load, and because that response is conditioned by age, experience and perceived stressors, a coach who plans solely from external targets will misjudge recovery in an athlete burdened by academic or occupational stress [33]. Monitoring the gap between intended and perceived load thus becomes a practical proxy for the influence of life stress on training, and a prompt to individualise the plan [25,33].

The injury-prediction findings deserve emphasis because they translate the physiology into a hard clinical outcome. In the four-year university-athlete cohort, lower perceived mood, shorter sleep duration and higher academic stress each independently predicted injury, and examination periods carried the highest stress and the greatest likelihood of illness, while an abrupt pre-season rise in training load was associated with elevated injury and illness — so that academic and athletic loads compounded to raise risk [14]. This is the applied endpoint of

every mechanism reviewed: when examination stress raises cortisol, shifts the immune balance, lowers HRV and shortens sleep, the tissue that must also recover from training is left more vulnerable, and the clinical manifestation is injury and infection [9,12,14]. The recommendation that follows — to monitor and manage overall stress and to treat examination time and pre-season as periods of heightened vulnerability — is the logical consequence of treating recovery as a function of total rather than purely physical load, and it gives coaches and clinicians a concrete, datable target for protective action [2,14].

6.2 Mental fatigue: the cognitive cost of academic load on physical recovery

Academic work imposes not only emotional stress but cognitive load, and cognitive load produces mental fatigue — a psychobiological state of tiredness and reduced energy induced by prolonged demanding cognitive activity that measurably impairs subsequent physical performance [27,34]. In a randomised cross-over trial in adolescent endurance athletes, thirty minutes of a demanding Stroop task impaired both selective attention and aerobic performance, lowering estimated maximal oxygen uptake and the velocity at which it occurred, and raising perceived exertion during a subsequent shuttle-run test [35]. Controlled work shows that even ten to twenty minutes of a cognitive task — whether or not it requires response inhibition — induces mental fatigue, raises heart rate, lowers HRV and reduces subsequent handgrip endurance, establishing that the duration of cognitive load required to impair physical performance is short and lies between that reported for isometric and whole-body exercise [34]. Mechanistically, mental fatigue is thought to act through accumulation of brain adenosine and altered dopaminergic signalling that increase the perception of effort, a central rather than peripheral pathway consistent with the broader physiology of central fatigue [27,34]. The practical synthesis is that a day of intensive study can leave an athlete approaching training already mentally fatigued, with a higher perceived exertion and a blunted capacity to perform and, by extension, to recover [34,35].

Encouragingly, mental fatigue is modifiable. A systematic review of interventions to counteract mental fatigue in athletes found that autonomous self-control training, person–task fit, nature exposure, mindfulness and transcranial direct-current stimulation could attenuate mental fatigue and improve sport-specific performance across strength, speed, skill, stamina and perceptual-cognitive domains, with self-regulation and attentional resources as the proposed mechanisms [36]. These interventions target the same self-regulatory capacity that buffers academic stress, suggesting a shared psychological substrate linking the management of cognitive load to the protection of physical recovery [32,36]. The broader narrative review of central and peripheral fatigue situates these findings within an integrative governor model, in which psychological factors such as stress and sleep deprivation realign neural activation patterns, slow mental operations and amplify central fatigue, so that recovery from exercise is inseparable from the cognitive and emotional state of the recovering person [27].

The integrative governor model of fatigue provides the theoretical scaffolding that unifies these cognitive and physical observations. In this framework central and peripheral fatigue are not separable mechanisms but unison constructs regulated by competition between homeostatic, physiological and psychological factors under negative-feedback control, so that fatigue is a whole-organism phenomenon with implications at multiple levels [27].

Psychological disturbances such as stress, and external factors such as sleep deprivation, realign neural activation patterns, slow simple mental operations and amplify central fatigue independently of metabolic state [27]. Within this model the perception of effort — shaped by adenosine, dopamine and the prefrontal and cingulate cortices — is the common currency through which mental and physical load summate, which is why a cognitively fatigued or chronically stressed athlete experiences a given physical task as harder and recovers from it as though the load had been greater [27,34]. The governor model thus formalises the central claim of this review: that recovery from exercise cannot be isolated from the cognitive and emotional state of the recovering person, and that academic and occupational stress enter the fatigue equation through the same central channels as training itself [27].

6.3 Training status, coping and the stress response

Not all student-athletes are equally vulnerable, and the difference is partly explained by training status and coping. In a large sample of Chinese college student-athletes, training status was strongly and negatively correlated with the stress response, and sport-performance strategies and coping styles together mediated more than half of this relationship, with coping style the dominant mediator [37]. Better-trained athletes thus experience smaller stress responses, in part because training equips them with strategies and coping resources that blunt reactivity — a finding that complements the physiological evidence that fitness attenuates cardiac and hormonal reactivity to stressors [5,37]. This positions regular training not only as a stressor to be recovered from but as a source of resilience that lowers the cost of academic stress, an instance of the reciprocal relationship developed in the next section [5,37].

The endurance-athlete data sharpen the practical reading of mental fatigue. In the adolescent cross-over trial, the thirty-minute Stroop task raised subjective mental fatigue and then impaired both concentration and estimated maximal oxygen uptake, with a higher rating of perceived exertion at the same workload — exactly the pattern that would follow a demanding day of study before training [35]. The handgrip experiment located the threshold precisely: mental fatigue was induced after ten minutes of cognitive work, whereas muscular endurance was impaired after twenty, and the effect appeared whether or not the task required response inhibition, indicating that sustained cognitive demand of the kind that fills an academic day is sufficient to compromise subsequent physical performance [34]. Because mental fatigue raises the perception of effort without necessarily altering peripheral muscle function, an athlete arriving at training already mentally fatigued will work at a higher perceived intensity for a given external load, accumulate strain faster and, plausibly, require longer to recover — a cognitive route by which academic stress feeds into the physical recovery balance [27,34,35]. The corollary for practice is that strenuous training is best not scheduled immediately after intensive cognitive work during high-stress periods [34,35].

The cross-cultural comparison adds that the psychosocial climate of the academic environment, not only the workload, conditions the stress–recovery balance. European student-athletes reported higher general, emotional, social and sport-specific stress and worse sleep and mood than their American counterparts, differences attributed to collectivist versus individualist cultural expectations and to divergent coping and recovery practices [31]. Fear of failure emerged as a major stressor that lowers motivation and self-perception, and both

adolescent and student athletes were found to experience stress at levels comparable to professionals [31]. The practical implication is that interventions to protect recovery must be culturally and contextually tailored rather than generic, and that the academic setting itself — its expectations, support structures and competitive climate — is a modifiable determinant of how heavily study stress weighs on recovery [31,32]. This mirrors the occupational finding that working conditions, not merely individual behaviour, shape physiological stress, and it locates part of the solution at the institutional level [7,26].

7. Occupational stress, need for recovery and cardiometabolic risk

The occupational parallel to academic stress is, if anything, better evidenced at the level of hard clinical outcomes. The synthesis of work-stress cohorts establishes that job strain, long working hours and job insecurity raise the risk of coronary heart disease and stroke by roughly 10–40%, that the effect is specific to cardiometabolic disease, and that it is mediated in part by behavioural pathways including physical inactivity and disturbed sleep [7]. The "need for recovery" construct connects this occupational-health literature directly to the recovery framework of sport: a high need for recovery after work predicts subsequent cardiovascular disease independently of job strain and is interpreted as an intermediate marker between workplace stressors and disease, reflecting the failure to unwind and restore between working days [8]. The cumulative logic is the same as for the overtrained athlete — chronic demand without adequate recovery exhausts adaptive capacity and converts a normal stress response into pathology [2,6,8].

The early-childhood education cohort merits closer attention because it isolates the recovery problem with objective measurement. Using accelerometry rather than self-report, the study showed that high occupational physical activity significantly predicted a greater need for recovery, and that the relationship between need for recovery and insomnia was strongest precisely in those with high physical activity during the working day [22]. Leisure-time physical activity, by contrast, did not enhance recovery in this group, contradicting the assumption that off-work exercise reliably compensates for on-work demand [22]. The authors reasoned that even light but prolonged occupational activity may be too wearing when physical condition is limited, and that the active engagement and responsibility of the work itself intensified the need for recuperation [22]. For the present thesis this is an important refinement: not all physical activity is restorative, the context and controllability of the activity matter, and obligatory occupational movement performed under time pressure can behave as a chronic stressor that deepens rather than relieves the recovery deficit [22,26]. The protective prescription is therefore specific — autonomously chosen, moderate leisure activity — rather than simply more movement [22,26].

Occupational stress also degrades the specific recovery behaviours that protect health. Among early-childhood education and care professionals, high occupational physical activity was associated with a greater need for recovery and, when combined with insomnia, with the most precarious recovery profile, demonstrating that physically demanding work can deplete rather than build recovery capacity and that leisure-time activity did not reliably compensate [22]. The relationship between work activity and recovery is therefore not interchangeable with the relationship between leisure exercise and recovery: occupational physical activity, performed

under time pressure and low control, can behave as a stressor rather than a restorative [22]. This distinction is sharpened in fitness professionals, who perform several hours of moderate-to-vigorous activity at work each day. In this group, non-occupational physical activity was associated with lower physiological stress and higher recovery measured by HRV, whereas self-reported burnout on a standard questionnaire did not coincide with the physiological stress response — indicating that subjective and physiological recovery are dissociable and that occupational activity alone does not confer the stress-buffering benefit usually attributed to exercise [26]. Better working conditions — manageable hours, salary satisfaction, security — were themselves associated with lower physiological stress, locating part of the recovery problem in the structure of work rather than in the individual [7,26].

Burnout is the clinical condition in which chronic occupational stress and failed recovery converge most completely. Defined as emotional and physical exhaustion with reduced accomplishment and a cynical devaluation of the activity, burnout is associated with HPA-axis dysregulation, elevated fatigue and reduced motivation, and it shares overlapping features with overtraining, including persistent fatigue, decreased performance and mood disturbance [38]. In athletes, burnout arises from the interaction of physiological strain, psychological processes and contextual pressures, with excessive load and insufficient recovery among its principal contributors, and it is linked to declining performance, deteriorating mental health and withdrawal from sport [38]. The shared causal structure of burnout and overtraining — chronic stress exceeding recovery — is the strongest evidence that occupational and athletic recovery are governed by the same underlying balance, and that a worker-athlete depleted by job strain is predisposed to the same exhaustion that excessive training produces [2,38].

The fitness-professional study deserves emphasis because it dissociates subjective from physiological recovery in a way directly relevant to the present argument. Greater non-occupational physical activity was associated with a lower percentage of time in physiological stress, a higher percentage of recovery and a more favourable stress–recovery ratio measured objectively by HRV, whereas a validated burnout questionnaire did not coincide with these physiological indices [26]. The implication is that self-report and physiology capture different facets of recovery and that occupational activity, however vigorous, does not by itself deliver the stress-buffering benefit usually ascribed to exercise — only autonomously chosen, non-occupational activity did [26]. Better working conditions, including manageable hours and salary satisfaction, were independently associated with lower physiological stress, locating part of the recovery deficit in the structure of work rather than the individual and echoing the cardiovascular evidence that the psychosocial environment, not merely personal behaviour, shapes physiological strain [7,26]. For the working exerciser this means that occupational physical demand cannot be counted toward recovery, and may have to be counted against it [22,26].

Burnout completes the occupational picture and ties it explicitly to the athletic syndromes. Athlete burnout develops through the interaction of physiological strain, psychological processes and contextual pressures; among its principal contributors are excessive training demands, insufficient recovery, ineffective coping and unsupportive coaching, and among its consequences are impaired performance, mental-health deterioration and withdrawal from sport [38]. Physiologically it is associated with HPA-axis dysregulation and altered fatigue-

related biomarkers, and it shares overlapping features with overtraining, including persistent fatigue, decreased performance and mood disturbance, so that the two conditions are best seen as related expressions of chronic stress exceeding recovery [38]. The prevention strategies the burnout literature recommends — load regulation, adequate recovery and sleep, psychological skills such as coping and resilience, and a supportive social environment — are the same measures that protect post-exercise recovery, reinforcing the unity of the underlying model [13,38]. That burnout can be precipitated by occupational, academic and athletic demands alike is the strongest argument that these stressors draw on a common pool of recovery capacity [2,38].

8. Movement as both stressor and remedy: the reciprocal relationship

The reciprocal character of the stress–exercise relationship is the pivot on which the practical message of this review turns, and it must be stated carefully because it cuts both ways. On the one hand, exercise is one of the most effective and accessible means of reducing chronic stress and building the physiological and psychological resilience that protects recovery; on the other, chronic stress reduces the very exercise that would help, and under sufficient load exercise itself becomes an additional stressor rather than a remedy [5,23]. Neither half of this relationship is universally true: the buffering effect depends on dose, timing, autonomy and the individual's habits, and the harmful effect depends on the same variables in reverse [5,23,26]. The resolution is not to abandon exercise under stress but to titrate it — to recognise that the question is never simply whether to exercise but at what intensity, when, and within what total load — and the remainder of this section develops each half of the relationship in turn before the strategies that follow translate it into prescription [23,39].

8.1 Exercise buffers stress and protects recovery

The relationship between stress and exercise is bidirectional, and the better-known direction is genuinely protective. Appropriately dosed physical activity is consistently associated with less perceived stress across populations from athletes to older adults, neutralises the cardiac reactivity provoked by psychological stressors, dampens stressor-evoked rises in stress hormones, and buffers the effects of stress on physical health [5]. In burnout patients, a twelve-week aerobic exercise programme reduced perceived stress and symptoms of burnout and depression with large effect sizes and shifted mood toward a favourable profile, providing preliminary evidence that exercise can interrupt the progression from chronic stress toward deeper psychopathology [40]. Among students, physical-activity breaks during home study improved functional stress and perceived study ability, while leisure-time physical activity improved stress load, recovery experience through psychological detachment, and academic performance-related parameters [4]. In adolescents, a movement-based intervention raised HRV, reduced perceived stress and improved working memory and academic achievement, demonstrating that physical activity can directly improve the autonomic regulation that chronic academic stress degrades [21]. At a mechanistic level, exercise promotes neuroplasticity and emotional regulation through neurotrophic and anti-inflammatory pathways that strengthen the prefrontal–amygdala and hippocampal–HPA circuits underlying stress resilience and recovery [41]. Exercise is, in this sense, both the activity to be recovered from and a means of building the capacity to recover.

The neurobiological account of how exercise builds stress resilience makes the buffering effect mechanistically credible rather than merely epidemiological. Exercise raises brain-derived neurotrophic factor and myokines such as irisin, suppresses neuroinflammation and oxidative stress, and thereby enhances synaptic plasticity and neurogenesis in the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex [41,42]. At the circuit level these adaptations strengthen prefrontal control over the amygdala, improve the hippocampal regulation of the HPA axis so that cortisol is more tightly restrained, and activate the dopaminergic reward system, collectively improving emotional stability and stress resilience [41]. Because chronic stress degrades exactly these circuits — flattening HPA feedback and impairing prefrontal–amygdala regulation — exercise can be understood as directly counteracting the neural substrate of stress-related recovery failure [41]. The same framework explains why moderate aerobic training reduces burnout and depressive symptoms in clinical samples and why movement-based interventions raise HRV and cognitive performance in stressed students: the autonomic and neuroendocrine systems through which stress harms recovery are the systems that regular exercise reconditions [21,40,41]. This is the optimistic obverse of the catabolic and autonomic harms described earlier, and it is dose-dependent in the same way [39,41].

8.2 But stress reduces exercise — behavioural inhibition

The less-studied and more troubling direction is that chronic stress reduces physical activity, undermining the very behaviour that would buffer it. A systematic review of 168 studies, including 55 prospective ones, found that the majority — roughly three-quarters of prospective studies — showed that psychological stress predicts less physical activity and more sedentary behaviour, with the inverse association strongest in older adults, in mixed-sex cohorts, in larger samples and in higher-quality studies [5]. Objective stressors were especially consistent: during examination periods students reduced exercise frequency and duration, and chronically stressed populations such as caregivers and parents of children with a cancer diagnosis were less active than matched controls [5]. A minority of studies found the opposite — that some individuals, particularly habitual exercisers, increase activity under stress as a coping strategy — indicating that stress differentially affects exercise adoption, maintenance and relapse depending on a person's existing habits and stage of behaviour change [5]. For recovery the implication is a vicious cycle: chronic academic or occupational stress both impairs physiological recovery and erodes the protective exercise behaviour that could mitigate it, so that the most stressed individuals may also be the least likely to engage in the activity that would help them recover [5].

The prospective evidence within the same review specifies when and in whom stress most reliably suppresses activity, and the pattern is recovery-relevant. Studies that compared objectively stressful periods with control periods — final examinations versus mid-semester, or stressed populations such as caregivers versus matched controls — were of higher quality and nearly unanimous, with six of seven finding a significant reduction in exercise or physical activity under stress [5]. A single acute interpersonal stressor was sufficient to reduce children's subsequent energy expenditure and exercise time by around a fifth, with the largest reductions in those with the greatest autonomic stress reactivity [5]. Life transitions and major events — entering university or full-time work, the birth of a child, serious illness — were repeatedly associated with declines in physical activity [5]. Each of these is a scenario in

which recovery need is unchanged or heightened while the protective behaviour collapses, deepening the deficit; and because higher-reactivity individuals reduce activity most, the people whose physiology recovers least well from a given stressor are also those most likely to abandon the exercise that would help [5]. The behavioural and physiological arms of the vicious cycle thus reinforce one another [5,14].

A particularly important qualifier is that the behavioural inhibition of activity by stress is moderated by habit and stage of behaviour change. Habitually active individuals tend to maintain or even increase exercise under stress, using it as a coping strategy, whereas those in the early stages of adopting an exercise routine reduce or abandon it, so that stress differentially undermines adoption, maintenance and relapse [5]. This moderation has a direct recovery implication: the protective, stress-buffering use of exercise is most available precisely to those who least need to be told to do it, while the inactive and the newly active — who would benefit most — are the most likely to be deflected by stress [5]. It also implies that the window in which a stressed beginner is establishing an exercise habit is fragile and that academic or occupational stress during that window can derail the very behaviour that would build long-term recovery capacity, an argument for protecting and scaffolding early exercise adoption during predictable high-stress periods [5,14].

8.3 The decisive role of exercise dose and timing

Whether movement aids or aggravates recovery under stress depends on its dose, and this is the practical crux of the reciprocal relationship. The sleep-deficiency study is the clearest demonstration: after three nights of sleep restriction, low-intensity aerobic exercise reduced oxidative stress and cortisol, whereas high-intensity exercise increased them, so that the same modality helped or harmed depending only on intensity [23]. The cortisol-threshold literature provides the explanatory mechanism, since only exercise above roughly 60% of maximal oxygen uptake meaningfully activates the HPA axis [19]. Exercise timing further modulates circadian rhythm and sleep quality, so that ill-timed high-intensity training can compound the sleep disruption that stress already causes [28,29]. The dose-dependence extends to central adaptation: aerobic exercise regulates neuroplasticity in a dose-dependent manner, with moderate-intensity programmes optimising neurotrophic and structural benefit while excessively high intensity can aggravate oxidative and metabolic imbalance and partially offset the gains [39]. The unifying principle is that under high allostatic load — a stressed, sleep-deprived student or worker — recovery is best served by moderate, well-timed activity, and a maximal session may add to rather than relieve the burden, exactly the scenario in which the protective and the harmful faces of exercise diverge [23,39].

9. Individual differences: sex, training status and resilience

The effect of chronic stress on recovery is not uniform, and three sources of variation recur across the literature. The first is sex. Women consistently report and exhibit greater stress reactivity: in academic settings females showed higher heart rate and lower variability than males before and after examinations and reported being stressed more often, and female medical students experienced greater academic stress than males while achieving comparable or better performance [9,10]. In athletic monitoring, female and individual-sport athletes

reported lower recovery and higher stress, and female athletes were repeatedly identified as warranting closer attention to prevent maladaptation [15,24]. The perception of fatigue is also greater in women, and women's biological framework — the menstrual cycle in particular — modulates autonomic tone and the cortisol response, so that recovery markers such as HRV must be interpreted with hormonal phase in mind and overtraining thresholds may need to be sex-specific to avoid false-positive fatigue signals [25,27]. Paradoxically, women may be less fatigable than men in certain muscular tasks owing to neuromuscular and metabolic differences, underscoring that sex differences in fatigue and recovery are task-dependent rather than uniform [27]. The practical conclusion is that a single recovery rubric applied identically to men and women will misjudge the impact of chronic stress, and that female student-athletes in particular merit individualised monitoring [15,25].

The second source of variation is training status, which appears protective. In college student-athletes, better training status predicted a smaller stress response, mediated substantially by coping styles and sport-performance strategies, indicating that training equips individuals with psychological resources that blunt reactivity in addition to any physiological conditioning [37]. This complements the broader evidence that physically active and aerobically fit people show attenuated cardiac and hormonal reactivity to stressors and better cardiovascular recovery, so that the trained exerciser not only has more recovery capacity but mounts a smaller stress response to a given academic or occupational demand [5,37]. Training status therefore sits on both sides of the ledger: it is a source of physical load to be recovered from, and a source of resilience that lowers the cost of life stress [5,37].

The third source of variation is psychological — coping, self-regulation and resilience. The prospective table-tennis data showed that recovery and coping, not stress per se, predicted burnout symptoms, and that the contextual, team-level use of coping mattered as much as the individual's, pointing to the social embedding of recovery resources [13]. Self-regulation skills buffered the impact of the demanding transition into an elite sports school, where rising perceived stress and threat correlated strongly and negatively with self-regulation and self-access, suggesting that structured development of self-competence can protect recovery during a dual academic–athletic career [32]. These findings reframe the management of chronic stress as partly a question of modifiable psychological skill: two athletes carrying identical academic and training loads may differ markedly in recovery according to their coping repertoire and self-regulatory capacity, which are themselves trainable [13,32,36]. Individual differences thus argue not for fatalism but for personalised, skill-based intervention [32,37].

10. Strategies to protect post-exercise recovery under chronic stress

10.1 Load management and integrated monitoring

The first strategy follows directly from the evidence that recovery reflects total rather than purely physical load: training must be planned around life stress, not in isolation from it. Monitoring should be multimodal, combining objective autonomic markers (RMSSD, DFA alpha-1), subjective wellness and stress–recovery questionnaires, and performance indicators, interpreted longitudinally and individually [25]. A mismatch between the load a coach intends

and the load an athlete perceives is itself meaningful: in junior speed skaters, deviations between intended and perceived training related to changes in recovery-oriented scales such as success, physical recovery and self-regulation, underscoring that the athlete's perception — coloured by life stress — must inform load decisions [33]. During predictable high-stress windows such as examination periods or intensified work, deliberate reduction of training intensity and volume is warranted, given the documented coincidence of these windows with depressed recovery, elevated illness and injury risk [14]. The principle is to treat academic and occupational stress as quantifiable inputs to the training plan rather than as noise [2,14,25].

Integrated monitoring also means choosing instruments that measure what they claim to and combining them. Autonomic indices such as RMSSD and DFA alpha-1 are sensitive to acute autonomic fatigue but are confounded by sleep, hypoxia, caffeine, alcohol and psychological load, so they require standardised measurement conditions and individualised baselines; psychometric instruments such as the RESTQ-Sport and the need-for-recovery scale capture the subjective and stress-related dimension that physiology misses; and performance metrics anchor both to the outcome that matters [8,15,25]. The dissociation between subjective burnout and physiological stress observed in fitness professionals, and between perceived recovery and aerobic power post-COVID, shows that no single instrument suffices and that convergence across instruments is more trustworthy than any one alone [26,30]. In practice this argues for a small, sustainable panel — a morning or nocturnal HRV trend, a brief weekly stress–recovery questionnaire, sleep duration and quality, and a simple performance check — interpreted together and longitudinally rather than as isolated readings [15,25].

10.2 Protecting and prioritising sleep

Because sleep is both the most powerful recovery behaviour and the one most readily damaged by stress, its protection is central. Sleep deficiency elevates cortisol, oxidative stress and inflammation and degrades next-day recovery, while restored sleep reverses these effects [23,29]. Exercise itself can improve sleep when appropriately dosed and timed, but ill-timed high-intensity training can worsen it, so scheduling matters [28]. The consistent association of insomnia with a high need for recovery in working populations identifies sleep as the lever through which occupational stress most directly impairs restoration, and therefore as a primary target for intervention [8,22]. Practical sleep hygiene, consistent timing, and the avoidance of late high-intensity sessions during stressful periods are low-cost measures with a strong mechanistic rationale [23,28].

10.3 Psychological and self-regulatory interventions

The case for psychological intervention rests on the repeated finding that recovery resources, not the mere presence of stress, determine outcome. A certain level of stress is intrinsic to competitive sport, to study and to work, so the realistic aim is not to abolish it but to balance it with recovery and to equip the individual to cope [2,13]. Coping and self-regulation are modifiable: disengagement- and task-oriented coping predicted burnout symptoms in young athletes, self-regulation buffered the stressful transition into elite schooling, and training status itself improved stress responses largely through coping [13,32,37]. This makes the cultivation of coping and self-regulatory skill a legitimate recovery intervention with a mechanistic rationale, complementing rather than replacing the physical measures [13,32].

Since coping and recovery, rather than stress itself, predict maladaptation, interventions that build psychological recovery resources are well founded. In young athletes, recovery and disengagement-oriented coping predicted burnout symptoms, supporting the cultivation of effective coping rather than the unrealistic goal of eliminating stress [13]. Self-regulation skills buffer the impact of the dual academic–athletic career and can be developed through structured support [32]. Aerobic exercise reduces burnout and depressive symptoms and improves mood, functioning as a psychological as well as physical intervention [40]. For the cognitive load of study specifically, interventions that counteract mental fatigue — self-control training, person–task fit, nature exposure, mindfulness and brain stimulation — improve subsequent performance and target the self-regulatory and attentional resources shared with stress management [36]. Mindfulness, however, illustrates the need for critical appraisal: although it reduces self-reported distress, a randomised trial found it did not reliably buffer the immune dysregulation of examination stress, a reminder that psychological benefit does not always translate into measurable physiological recovery [11]. Interventions should therefore be selected for the recovery dimension they actually move, not assumed to be globally restorative [11,36].

The sleep–exercise interaction is bidirectional and dose-sensitive, which sharpens the prescription. Systematic review indicates that moderate-to-vigorous combined training improves sleep efficiency and that exercise timing and intensity shape both the physiological circadian rhythm and sleep quality, so that the same training can aid or disturb sleep depending on when and how hard it is performed [28]. Self-reported exercise and sleep duration and quality interact in determining next-day cortisol rhythms even in older adults, with more exercise on the prior day flattening the diurnal slope when habitual sleep is long, illustrating that the exercise–sleep–cortisol relationship is conditional rather than uniformly beneficial [29]. Under chronic stress with accumulated sleep debt, the safest prescription is therefore to protect sleep first and to avoid late, high-intensity sessions that would further delay or fragment it, reserving demanding training for periods when sleep is adequate [23,28,29]. Because insomnia and a high need for recovery predict adverse cardiovascular outcomes in working populations, treating sleep as the primary recovery behaviour is justified on health as well as performance grounds [8,22].

The evidence that aerobic exercise can itself serve as a stress and recovery intervention is worth stating in concrete terms, because it shows what a well-dosed programme achieves. In men with high baseline burnout, a twelve-week aerobic programme meeting a modest weekly energy-expenditure target reduced perceived stress and symptoms of burnout and depression with large effect sizes, and single sessions shifted mood toward an iceberg profile of high vigour and low negative affect [40]. In students, leisure-time physical activity improved functional stress, psychological detachment and perceived study ability, while short activity breaks improved functional stress and study ability, indicating that both sustained and brief activity contribute, through partly different routes, to the recovery of stressed learners [4]. These intervention data convert the epidemiological buffering effect into a usable prescription: regular moderate aerobic exercise is a low-cost, evidence-supported means of reducing the chronic stress that impairs recovery, provided its dose is calibrated to the individual’s current

load and sleep [4,23,40]. It is, in effect, both the activity to be recovered from and one of the most reliable tools for building the capacity to recover [40,41].

10.4 Physical and pharmacological adjuncts: a critical appraisal

A range of adjuncts is marketed for recovery, and the stress-and-recovery framework allows them to be appraised on mechanism and evidence. Post-exercise heat exposure is double-edged: infrared sauna after exercise initially elevated next-morning cortisol and nocturnal heart rate in female athletes, behaving acutely as an additional stressor, but after six weeks of regular use these stress responses adapted, suggesting that heat is a hormetic stimulus whose net effect depends on accustomisation and dose rather than an unconditionally restorative therapy [18]. Nutritional adjuncts are similarly conditional. The adaptogen ashwagandha (Withania somnifera) has been reported in randomised trials to lower serum cortisol and perceived stress and to support testosterone, recovery and aerobic capacity, with effects that are dose-dependent and most evident over at least eight weeks, although heterogeneity in extract, dose and population and a scarcity of data in women and elite athletes temper the conclusions [43,44]. Polyphenol supplementation has been proposed to attenuate the oxidative stress and inflammation of high-intensity interval training and thereby aid recovery, but the evidence base is comparably preliminary [42]. The cross-cutting caution is that these adjuncts act on the same cortisol, oxidative and inflammatory pathways disturbed by chronic stress, so any benefit must be weighed against the possibility — as with high-intensity exercise and acute heat — of adding to the allostatic load they are meant to relieve, and none substitutes for the foundational measures of load management, sleep and stress reduction [18,23,42,43].

The structure of work and study is itself a recovery variable that institutions can modify. In fitness professionals, more favourable working conditions — manageable weekly hours, salary satisfaction and longer tenure — were associated with lower physiological stress and higher HRV, indicating that organisational factors influence physiological recovery independently of the individual's behaviour [26]. In working populations more broadly, the legal and policy mechanisms that limit excessive hours, and the workplace-wellness campaigns that promote recovery, are justified by the consistent link between work stressors and cardiovascular risk, even though definitive intervention trials are lacking [7]. For students, the evidence that academic self-pressure lowers HRV and that movement-based learning can raise it suggests that curricular design — building physical activity into the school day — is a feasible institutional lever for protecting the autonomic regulation that underlies recovery [21]. Recognising these structural determinants prevents the error of placing the entire burden of recovery on individual discipline, when part of the remedy lies in how study and work are organised [7,21,26].

10.5 Movement breaks and the structure of the day

Finally, the way physical activity is distributed through a stressful day matters as much as its total volume. Short physical-activity breaks during study improved functional stress and perceived study ability, and leisure-time activity improved psychological detachment and recovery, indicating that brief, low-intensity movement interspersed through cognitively demanding periods can interrupt the accumulation of stressors without imposing the HPA-axis activation of a hard session [4]. This aligns with the dose principle: under high stress, the

recovery dividend comes from moderate, frequent, restorative movement rather than from additional maximal training [4,23]. For the worker, the distinction between occupational and leisure activity is critical, since the former can deplete and the latter replenish recovery, so that the protective prescription is leisure-time, autonomously chosen, moderate activity rather than simply more movement of any kind [22,26].

The dose-dependence of central adaptation reinforces the prescription and guards against the assumption that more is better. A synthesis of randomised trials of aerobic exercise found that moderate-intensity programmes optimally raised brain-derived neurotrophic factor, increased hippocampal volume and improved executive function, whereas high-intensity exercise above roughly 80% of maximal heart rate could aggravate prefrontal metabolic imbalance through increased oxidative stress, partially offsetting the neuroprotective benefit [39]. The optimal risk–benefit ratio lay with moderate-intensity, longer-term interventions, and males showed greater central improvements than females, again signalling sex-specific responses [39]. Applied to the stressed exerciser, this dose–response curve aligns precisely with the peripheral evidence from the sleep-deficiency study, in which low-intensity exercise lowered oxidative stress and cortisol while high-intensity exercise raised them [23,39]. The convergence of central and peripheral data on the same conclusion — that moderate intensity is restorative and excessive intensity can be harmful under high allostatic load — is one of the more robust practical messages of this review, and it directly contradicts the intuition that pushing harder accelerates recovery [23,39].

11. Methodological appraisal and research priorities

The evidence assembled here is mechanistically coherent but methodologically uneven, and an honest appraisal is essential. Several limitations recur. First, much of the most direct mechanistic evidence — stress-prolonged muscle hyperalgesia, stress-induced myostatin-dependent atrophy — derives from animal models, and although both are anchored in human observations, the quantitative translation to the training human remains to be established [3,17]. Second, the human data are dominated by cross-sectional and short longitudinal designs that demonstrate association rather than causation; studies of academic stress, HRV and recovery establish that examinations coincide with autonomic and immune change, but cannot prove that this change degrades a specific subsequent training adaptation [9,10,12,14]. Third, the exposure itself is measured inconsistently: perceived stress scales, job-strain instruments, the need-for-recovery scale and the RESTQ-Sport tap overlapping but non-identical constructs, complicating comparison across the academic, occupational and athletic literatures [7,8,13]. Fourth, the outcome — recovery — is multidimensional and rarely measured in full, so that a study may capture cortisol but not sleep, or HRV but not muscle function, and the dissociation between subjective and physiological recovery seen in fitness professionals warns against equating them [15,26].

A further limitation is the heterogeneity of both the exposure and the populations studied. The evidence assembled here spans elite athletes, recreational exercisers, students, sedentary workers, older adults and clinical samples, and a mechanism demonstrated in one group cannot be assumed to operate identically in another; the myostatin and sympathoadrenal findings derive from rodents, the cytokine data from students, the need-for-recovery data from

workers, and the HRV data from athletes, so that the integrated picture is a synthesis across populations rather than a single coherent dataset [3,12,17,22]. The intervention literature is similarly uneven: some adjuncts, such as ashwagandha and polyphenols, rest on trials of varying quality with inconsistent extracts, doses and durations and little data in women or elite athletes, so their place in recovery remains provisional [42,43,44]. And publication and citation biases, documented directly in the occupational-stress field where higher-quality studies did not attract more citations and higher risk estimates were cited more often, plausibly affect the wider literature and counsel caution in weighting individual positive findings [7]. These caveats do not overturn the central argument, which rests on convergent evidence across many designs, but they bound the confidence with which any single claim can be made [7,43].

From these limitations a research agenda follows. Future work should test, in adequately powered prospective human designs, whether quantified academic or occupational stress predicts impaired recovery of objective performance and muscle function after standardised exercise, separating it from training load. It should adopt multidimensional recovery outcomes — autonomic, endocrine, immune, sleep and psychometric — measured concurrently, so that the channels through which stress acts can be disentangled [15,25]. It should standardise and report the stress exposure, ideally combining a validated perceived-stress measure with an objective marker such as HRV or the cortisol awakening response, interpreted longitudinally [1,9,25]. It should address sex differences directly, given the consistent finding of greater stress reactivity and a less favourable stress–recovery balance in females and the influence of the menstrual cycle on autonomic and hormonal markers [10,15,25]. And it should test, in randomised designs, whether interventions that reduce non-training stress — sleep protection, load periodisation around life events, coping and self-regulation training — measurably improve post-exercise recovery, moving the field from plausible mechanism to demonstrated benefit [13,32,36]. Only with such data can the conditional, mechanism-based recommendations offered here be placed on firm ground.

12. Practical implications

Several practical principles emerge for athletes, students, workers and the clinicians who advise them. The first is to treat recovery as a function of total load. Training, study and work draw on a shared pool of adaptive capacity, and a plan that ignores academic or occupational stress will systematically over-estimate the athlete's capacity to recover; load should therefore be reduced, deliberately and in advance, around examinations and intensified work periods, which are documented windows of depressed recovery and elevated illness and injury risk [2,14]. The second is to monitor recovery multidimensionally and individually, combining an autonomic marker such as a seven-day rolling average of RMSSD with a subjective stress–recovery questionnaire, sleep tracking and performance, rather than relying on any single biomarker, and reading a fall in any of them during a stressful life period as a signal to recover rather than to push [15,25]. The third is to protect sleep as the primary recovery behaviour, avoiding late high-intensity sessions during stressful periods and recognising insomnia and a high need for recovery as early markers of an unfavourable balance [8,22,23]. The fourth is to calibrate exercise dose to stress state: under high allostatic load, moderate,

well-timed, autonomously chosen activity and short movement breaks support recovery, whereas maximal sessions and physically demanding obligatory work can deepen the deficit [4,23,26]. The fifth is to build psychological recovery resources — coping and self-regulation skills, and where appropriate aerobic exercise as a mood and stress intervention — while appraising adjuncts such as heat and supplements critically and never allowing them to substitute for the foundational measures [13,18,32,40,43].

It may help to render these principles as a sequence. The clinician or coach should first establish the athlete's total stress burden, asking explicitly about academic and occupational demands, sleep and the subjective need for recovery, not training alone [2,8]. They should then quantify recovery longitudinally and individually, using autonomic, psychometric and sleep markers together [15,25]. They should periodise training load around the predictable peaks of life stress, reducing intensity and volume when academic or work demands are highest [14]. They should prioritise sleep and prescribe exercise dose appropriate to the stress state, favouring moderate, well-timed activity when allostatic load is high [23,28]. And they should support the psychological dimension of recovery through coping and self-regulation, monitoring whether each intervention actually moves the recovery dimension it targets [11,13,36]. This sequence operationalises the review's central message: post-exercise recovery is not a purely physical event but the visible outcome of the balance between all of an individual's stressors and all of their recovery resources.

Two further practical points deserve explicit statement. First, the adjuncts that dominate commercial recovery — heat exposure, adaptogens and antioxidants — should be positioned as conditional supplements to, never substitutes for, the foundational measures of load management, sleep and stress reduction. Each acts on the same cortisol, oxidative and inflammatory pathways disturbed by chronic stress, and each can, in the wrong dose or before accustomisation, add to the very burden it is meant to relieve, as the acute stress response to post-exercise sauna and the harm of high-intensity exercise under sleep debt both demonstrate [18,23,42,43]. Second, the institutional and structural determinants of recovery — working conditions, academic climate, and the design of the study or training day — are modifiable and belong in any serious recovery strategy, so that responsibility for recovery is shared between the individual and the systems within which they study, work and train [7,21,26,31]. A recovery plan that ignores these structural levers places an unfair and often ineffective burden on individual discipline alone [7,26].

13. Conclusions

Chronic academic and occupational stress is a clinically meaningful and modifiable determinant of post-exercise recovery. The two domains of stress act through the same neuroendocrine, autonomic, immune and behavioural systems that mediate recovery: they dysregulate the HPA axis and deplete its reserve, sustain sympathoadrenal and catecholamine drive, shorten and fragment sleep, shift the immune balance toward a pro-inflammatory and infection-prone state, and lower heart-rate variability [1,12,23,25]. Pre-clinical and human evidence shows that stress can prolong the resolution of exercise-induced muscle pain and promote myostatin-dependent muscle atrophy, providing concrete mechanisms by which non-training stress impairs physical restoration [3,17]. These signatures converge on the

syndromes of overreaching, overtraining and burnout, in which stress capacity, not training load alone, determines whether overload becomes maladaptive — placing academic and occupational stress squarely among the precipitants of failed recovery [2,20,38].

The relationship is reciprocal and dose-dependent. Appropriately dosed exercise buffers stress, protects autonomic regulation and builds resilience, yet chronic stress reduces the very physical activity that would mitigate it, and under high allostatic load a maximal or ill-timed session can add to rather than relieve the burden [5,23,39]. The practical corollaries are clear: recovery should be planned around total load, monitored multidimensionally and individually, anchored in protected sleep and stress-calibrated exercise dose, and supported by coping and self-regulation, with physical and nutritional adjuncts appraised critically rather than assumed to be restorative [15,18,25,43]. Two conclusions deserve emphasis because they cut across the academic, occupational and athletic literatures. First, recovery is a multidimensional balance, and any account that measures only one of its channels will mislead. Second, the stress that impairs it is not confined to the gym: the demands of study and work belong on the stress side of the ledger, and managing them is a legitimate and necessary part of optimising post-exercise recovery [6,8,13].

Taken together, the practical sequence reframes the familiar question of how to recover from training as the broader question of how to balance all of life's demands against all of one's recovery resources. For the student-athlete revising for examinations, for the worker training around a demanding job, and for the clinician advising either, the operative principles are the same: count academic and occupational stress as load, monitor recovery across several channels and over time, protect sleep, calibrate exercise intensity and timing to the current stress state, build coping and self-regulatory skill, and treat adjuncts and even hard training as potential additions to allostatic load rather than as guaranteed remedies [2,15,18,23,43]. None of these measures is novel in isolation; their value lies in being applied together and in being grounded in the recognition that post-exercise recovery is not a purely physical event but the visible expression of a whole-person stress balance [6,8,13].

A final structural observation concerns the direction of causation between recovery and the conditions that surround it. Throughout this review the relationships are bidirectional: stress lowers HRV and HRV indexes stress; poor sleep raises cortisol and high cortisol disturbs sleep; inflammation can both follow and provoke stress; and reduced activity both results from and deepens impaired recovery [5,23,30]. This circularity is not a weakness of the evidence but a property of the system, and it has a hopeful corollary: because the loops are mutually reinforcing, an intervention at any node — protecting sleep, reducing load, building coping skill, restoring moderate activity — can propagate through the network and improve recovery as a whole [22,36,41]. The clinician's task is therefore to identify the most accessible and impactful node for a given individual rather than to address every channel at once, and to monitor whether the intervention moves the targeted recovery dimension [15,25].

Table 1. Mechanisms by which chronic stress impairs post-exercise recovery.

Channel	Effect of chronic academic/occupational stress	Key sources
HPA axis / cortisol	Dysregulated diurnal rhythm and cortisol awakening response; depleted reserve with blunted ACTH/GH	Anderson [1]; Cadegiani [20];

	responses to provocation	Gluzicka [6]
Sympathoadrenal axis	Sustained catecholamine drive; epinephrine via beta-2 receptors prolongs exercise muscle hyperalgesia	Alvarez [3]; Kreher [2]
Skeletal muscle	Glucocorticoid-driven, myostatin-dependent atrophy and atrogene induction; delayed resolution of soreness	Allen [17]; Alvarez [3]
Sleep	Insomnia and fragmentation; raised cortisol, oxidative stress and CRP; recovery value of exercise becomes dose-dependent	Park [23]; Karihtala [22]; Kim [28]
Immune / inflammation	Th1→Th2 cytokine shift; raised B cells and pro-inflammatory markers; infection susceptibility	Assaf [12]; Turner [11]
Autonomic (HRV)	Vagal withdrawal, lower RMSSD/DFA alpha-1; mirrors overreaching and confounds training monitoring	Hammoud [9]; Jaklik [25]; Coelho [24]
Behaviour	Reduced physical activity and increased sedentariness; vicious cycle of impaired recovery	Stults-Kolehmainen [5]

Table 2. Monitoring tools and recovery-protective strategies under chronic stress.

Domain	Tool or strategy	Key sources
Autonomic monitoring	7-day rolling RMSSD / DFA alpha-1; HRV-guided training; chest strap > wrist sensor	Jaklik [25]; Coelho [24]
Psychometric monitoring	RESTQ-Sport stress–recovery balance; need-for-recovery scale; individualised, longitudinal	Reynoso-Sánchez [15]; Nicolas [16]; van Amelsvoort [8]
Load management	Periodise around exams / intensified work; align intended and perceived load	Hamlin [14]; Otter [33]; Kreher [2]
Sleep	Protect sleep; avoid late high-intensity sessions; consistent timing	Park [23]; Kim [28]; Fein [29]
Exercise dose	Moderate, well-timed activity and movement breaks under high stress	Teuber [4]; Park [23]; You [39]
Psychological	Coping and self-regulation training; aerobic exercise for burnout; appraise mindfulness	Martinent [13]; Gerber [40]; Sun [36]; Schröder [32]; Turner [11]
Adjuncts (critical)	Heat/sauna and supplements act on stress pathways; hormetic, dose- and time-dependent	Ahokas [18]; Ossowska [43]; Fałczyńska [42]

DISCLOSURE:

Conceptualization: Jakub Palian**,** Maja Kwiatkowska

Methodology: Jakub Palian**,** Maja Kwiatkowska

Investigation: Jakub Palian, Karolina Huzarska, Aleksandra Baraniecka, Szymon Krzurzyński, Maja Kwiatkowska,

Writing-rough preparation: Jakub Palian, Szymon Krzurzyński

Writing-review and editing: Karolina Huzarska, Maja Kwiatkowska, Aleksandra Baraniecka, Szymon Krzurzyński, Jakub Palian

Supervision: Jakub Palian

Project administration: Maja Kwiatkowska

Funding statement:

This study received no external funding.

Informed consent statement:

Not applicable.

Institutional Review Board Statement:

Not applicable.

Conflict of interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Anderson T, Wideman L. Exercise and the cortisol awakening response: a systematic review. Sports Med Open. 2017;3(1):37.
2. Kreher JB, Schwartz JB. Overtraining syndrome: a practical guide. Sports Health. 2012;4(2):128–138.
3. Alvarez P, Green PG, Levine JD. Unpredictable stress delays recovery from exercise-induced muscle pain: contribution of the sympathoadrenal axis. Pain Rep. 2019;4(5):e782.
4. Teuber M, Leyhr D, Sudeck G. Physical activity improves stress load, recovery, and academic performance-related parameters among university students: a longitudinal study on daily level. BMC Public Health. 2024;24(1):598.
5. Stults-Kolehmainen MA, Sinha R. The effects of stress on physical activity and exercise. Sports Med. 2014;44(1):81–121.
6. Gluzicka A, Palacz B, Teper MM, Perz W, Polus A, Wrona JA, et al. Hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis dysregulation and its impact on exercise capacity and recovery in regularly training individuals. Quality in Sport. 2026;51:68663.
7. Kivimäki M, Kawachi I. Work stress as a risk factor for cardiovascular disease. Curr Cardiol Rep. 2015;17(9):74.
8. van Amelsvoort LGPM, Kant IJ, Bültmann U, Swaen GMH. Need for recovery after work and the subsequent risk of cardiovascular disease in a working population. Occup Environ Med. 2003;60(Suppl 1):i83–i87.

9. Hammoud S, Karam R, Mourad R, Saad I, Kurdi M. Stress and heart rate variability during university final examination among Lebanese students. Behav Sci (Basel). 2019;9(1):3.
10. Yoo HH, Yune SJ, Im SJ, Kam BS, Lee SY. Heart rate variability-measured stress and academic achievement in medical students. Med Princ Pract. 2021;30(2):193–200.
11. Turner L, Galante J, Vainre M, Stochl J, Dufour G, Jones PB. Immune dysregulation among students exposed to exam stress and its mitigation by mindfulness training: findings from an exploratory randomised trial. Sci Rep. 2020;10(1):5812.
12. Assaf AM, Al-Abbassi R, Al-Binni M. Academic stress-induced changes in Th1- and Th2-cytokine response. Saudi Pharm J. 2017;25(8):1237–1247.
13. Martinent G, Cece V, Guillet-Descas E. The impact of stress, recovery and coping on burnout symptoms of young elite table-tennis players: a prospective multilevel study. Front Psychol. 2022;13:1007697.
14. Hamlin MJ, Wilkes D, Elliot CA, Lizamore CA, Kathiravel Y. Monitoring training loads and perceived stress in young elite university athletes. Front Physiol. 2019;10:34.
15. Reynoso-Sánchez LF, Pérez-Verduzco G, Celestino-Sánchez MÁ, López-Walle JM, Zamarripa J, Rangel-Colmenero BR, et al. Competitive recovery–stress and mood states in Mexican youth athletes. Front Psychol. 2021;11:627828.
16. Nicolas M, Vacher P, Martinent G, Mourot L. Monitoring stress and recovery states: structural and external stages of the short version of the RESTQ sport in elite swimmers before championships. J Sport Health Sci. 2019;8(1):77–88.
17. Allen DL, McCall GE, Loh AS, Madden MC, Mehan RS. Acute daily psychological stress causes increased atrophic gene expression and myostatin-dependent muscle atrophy. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2010;299(3):R889–R898.
18. Ahokas EK, Kyröläinen H, Ihalainen JK, Hanstock HG. Salivary cortisol response to post-exercise infrared sauna declines over time. Temperature (Austin). 2025;12(3):281–295.
19. Budde H, Machado S, Ribeiro P, Wegner M. The cortisol response to exercise in young adults. Front Behav Neurosci. 2015;9:13.
20. Cadegiani FA, Kater CE. Hormonal aspects of overtraining syndrome: a systematic review. BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil. 2017;9:14.
21. Latino F, Tafuri D, Tafuri F. Academic self-pressure and physiological responses in adolescents: a pilot experimental study on the moderating role of an escape room-based physical activity intervention on cognitive and academic outcomes. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2025;22(6):948.
22. Karihtala T, Puttonen S, Valtonen AM, Kautiainen H, Hopsu L, Heinonen A. Role of physical activity in the relationship between recovery from work and insomnia among early childhood education and care professionals: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2024;14(3):e079746.
23. Park JS, Murlasits Z, Kim S. The effect of aerobic exercise on variation of oxidative stress, hs-CRP and cortisol induced by sleep deficiency. Healthcare (Basel). 2023;11(8):1201.
24. Coelho AB, Nakamura FY, Morgado MC, Holmes CJ, Di Baldassarre A, Esco MR, et al. Heart rate variability and stress recovery responses during a training camp in elite young canoe sprint athletes. Sports (Basel). 2019;7(5):126.
25. Jaklik D, Cholewa D, Guzik N, Starzyk R, Śmiałek S, Florek J, et al. Heart rate variability (HRV) as a marker for overtraining syndrome prevention in endurance athletes: a systematic review. Quality in Sport. 2026;52:69422.

26. Marín-Farrona MJ, León-Jiménez M, García-Unanue J, Gallardo L, Liguori G, López-Fernández J. Influence of non-occupational physical activity on burnout syndrome, job satisfaction, stress and recovery in fitness professionals. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(18):9489.
27. Tornero-Aguilera JF, Jimenez-Morcillo J, Rubio-Zarapuz A, Clemente-Suárez VJ. Central and peripheral fatigue in physical exercise explained: a narrative review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(7):3909.
28. Kim N, Ka S, Park J. Effects of exercise timing and intensity on physiological circadian rhythm and sleep quality: a systematic review. Phys Act Nutr. 2023;27(3):52–63.
29. Fein T, Buxton O, Lee S. The influence of self-reported exercise and sleep duration and quality on next-day cortisol rhythms in older adults. Innov Aging. 2025;9(Suppl 2):1151.
30. Zorn J, Vollrath S, Matits L, Schönfelder M, Schulz SVW, Jerg A, et al. Relationship between physical performance and perception of stress and recovery in daily life post COVID-19—an explorative study. PLoS One. 2023;18(5):e0285845.
31. Keriven H, Sánchez-Sierra A, de-la-Plaza-San-Frutos M, García-Pérez-de-Sevilla G, Clemente-Suarez V, Garcia-Laredo E, et al. Psychological wellbeing of student-athletes: a comparative study between European and American athletes. Front Psychol. 2025;16:1604783.
32. Schröder S, Frenkel J. Self-regulation skills and stress management during early sportschool-career. Pedagogy Psychol Sport. 2025;28:67572.
33. Otter RTA, Bakker AC, van der Zwaard S, Toering T, Goudsmit JFA, Stoter IK, et al. Perceived training of junior speed skaters versus the coach's intention: does a mismatch relate to perceived stress and recovery? Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(18):11221.
34. Dallaway N, Lucas SJE, Ring C. Cognitive tasks elicit mental fatigue and impair subsequent physical task endurance: effects of task duration and type. Psychophysiology. 2022;59(10):e14126.
35. Slimani M, Znazen H, Bragazzi NL, Zguira MS, Tod D. The effect of mental fatigue on cognitive and aerobic performance in adolescent active endurance athletes: insights from a randomized counterbalanced, cross-over trial. J Clin Med. 2018;7(12):510.
36. Sun H, Soh KG, Mohammadi A, Toumi Z, Zhang L, Ding C, et al. Counteracting mental fatigue for athletes: a systematic review of the interventions. BMC Psychol. 2024;12(1):67.
37. Gao J, Xiang J, Hou Z, Liu H. Relationship between training status and stress response in Chinese college student-athletes: chain mediation between sport performance strategies and coping styles. Front Psychol. 2025;16:1597539.
38. Włodarczyk F, Zapalska M, Kulig L, Wiercioch E, Krupska BI, Włodarczyk S, et al. Burnout syndrome in athletes: mechanisms, risk factors and prevention – a narrative review. Quality in Sport. 2026;54:70737.
39. You R, Huang W, Luo J. The dose-response effect of aerobic exercise on neuroplasticity: an analysis of the mechanism of drug relapse intervention based on RCTs. Pedagogy Psychol Sport. 2025;26:66394.
40. Gerber M, Brand S, Elliot C, Holsboer-Trachsler E, Pühse U, Beck J. Aerobic exercise training and burnout: a pilot study with male participants suffering from burnout. BMC Res Notes. 2013;6:78.
41. Yan H, Du R, Luo J. The mechanistic pathways linking exercise to neuroprotection and mental health: construction and elaboration of an integrative theoretical model. Pedagogy Psychol Sport. 2025;28:67244.

42. Fałczyńska A, Wawrzyniak M, Linke J, Szamałek K, Kozłowska D, Boral W, et al. The effect of polyphenol supplementation on recovery following high-intensity interval training. J Educ Health Sport. 2026;87:67848.

43. Ossowska W, Czarnota M, Ösztreicher W. Ashwagandha and its role in stress reduction, hormonal balance, and athletic recovery: an evidence-based review. J Educ Health Sport. 2025;83:61874.

44. Sikorski P, Malinowski P, Kopczyńska U, Kopczyński C, Gurdak K, Dydyk M, et al. Unlocking strength: the powerful impact of ashwagandha (Withania somnifera) supplementation on resistance training. J Educ Health Sport. 2024;68:50452.