Technological advances in elite marathon performance

Jonathon W. Senefeld^{1§}, Michael H. Haischer^{2,3§}, Andrew M. Jones⁴, Chad C. Wiggins¹, Rachel Beilfuss^{2,3}, Michael J. Joyner^{1†}, and Sandra K. Hunter^{2,3*†}

¹Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN.

²Exercise Science Program, Department of Physical Therapy, and ³Athletic and Human Performance Research Center, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI.

⁴Sport and Health Sciences, College of Line and Environmental Sciences, St. Luke's Campus, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom

ORCID iD		
JWS	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8116-3538	
МНН	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9184-6591	
AMJ	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2082-1709	
CCW	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6458-0142	
MJJ	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7135-7643	
SKH	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8013-2051	

*Correspondence to:

Jonathon W. Senefeld, Ph.D., Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine Mayo Clinic | 200 First Street SW | Rochester, MN 55905

[§]JWS and MHH are co-first authors.

[†]MJJ and SKH have equal contributions and are co-senior authors.

1 ABSTRACT

There is scientific and legal controversy about recent technological advances in 2 3 performance running shoes that reduce the energetic cost of running and may provide a distinct competitive advantage. To better understand the potential 4 performance-enhancing effects of Nike's pioneering marathon racing shoes, we 5 examined the finishing times and racing shoes of the top 50 male and 50 female 6 runners from the World Marathon Major series in the 2010s — before and after 7 the introduction of new Nike shoe models (4%, NEXT%, Alphafly, and other 8 9 prototypes; herein referred to as *neoteric Nikes*). Data for racing shoes were available for 3,886 of the 3,900 performances recorded at the four annual 10 11 marathons in Boston, London, Chicago, and New York. In full cohort analyses, marathon finishing times were 2.0% or 2.8 min (138.5 \pm 8.1 min vs. 141.3 \pm 7.4 12 13 min, P<0.001) faster for male runners wearing neoteric Nikes compared to other 14 shoes. For females, marathon finishing times were 2.6% or 4.3 min (159.1 \pm 10.0 15 min vs. 163.4 ± 10.7 min, P<0.001) faster for runners wearing neoteric Nikes. In 16 a subset of within-runner changes in marathon performances (males, n = 138; 17 females, n = 101), marathon finishing times improved by 0.8% or 1.2 min for males wearing *neoteric Nikes* relative to the most recent marathon in which other 18 shoes were worn, and this performance-enhancing effect was greater among 19 20 females who demonstrated 1.6% or 3.7 min improvement (P=0.002). Our results demonstrate that marathon performances for world-class athletes are 21 substantially faster wearing *neoteric Nikes* than other market-leading shoes, 22 23 particularly among females.

24 INTRODUCTION

The sub-2-hour marathon performance by Eliud Kipchoge (1:59:40, 25 26 *hr:min:sec*) in late 2019 fascinated the public, athletes and scientists (7, 10, 12), not unlike the first sub-4-minute mile run by Sir Roger Bannister in 1954. This 27 28 interest in the physiology of fast marathons is exemplified by the associated Viewpoint in The Journal of Applied Physiology (11) and ~40 accompanying 29 commentaries (22). Just hours after Kipchoge's world best performance, the 16-30 year-old marathon world record for women was improved by 80 seconds by 31 Brigid Kosgei. Kipchoge and Kosgei had one important commonality — both 32 raced in a prototype in the latest line of marathon racing shoes from the Nike 33 34 Vaporfly series. In a laboratory setting, the Nike Vaporfly 4% reduced the energetic of running among males by ~4% relative to other contemporary racing 35 36 shoes (5), hence the shoe's moniker. These initial findings among males were supported and broadened to include females in independent laboratory testing 37 (1) and analysis of real-world performance data of recreational runners (19). The 38 39 Nike Vaporfly represented three deviations from "conventional" marathon performance shoes, each of which likely contributed synergistically to the 4% 40 reduction in the energetic cost of running: first, embedded carbon-fiber plate (6, 41 21); second, innovative midsole material (13); and third, appreciable midsole 42 thickness. This reduction in the energetic cost of running is predicted to improve 43 44 running velocity to a lesser extent ($\sim 2/3$ rds), thus, may improve marathon performance time by ~2.5 minutes (14). However, translation of these laboratory 45 findings to race performance among elite athletes has not been substantiated. 46

The unconventional Nike shoe models (4%, NEXT%, Alphafly, and other 47 48 prototypes; herein referred to as *neoteric Nikes*) were originally developed in anticipation of the first widely-publicized attempt to break the 2-hour marathon 49 barrier (Breaking2) held on May 6, 2017 (8). Akin to the whole-body polyurethane 50 51 swimsuits used during the late 2000s to break over 100 world records, which were eventually banned from swimming competitions in 2010 (3), the neoteric 52 Nikes led to widespread improvements in world records of distance road racing 53 events and the introduction of new regulations for performance footwear in road 54 running (2, 4). To better understand the performance-enhancing effects of the 55 line of neoteric Nikes in real race settings, we examined elite marathon 56 57 performances by athletes running with and without the *neoteric Nikes* in the World Marathon Major series. 58

The physiological requirements for fast marathon performances, including 2-59 60 hour marathon pace (10), are well-known and include an optimal combination of exceptional VO_{2max} , 'lactate threshold', and running economy (11). Although 61 $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ and 'lactate threshold' have been optimized by impressive training loads 62 of elite athletes for many decades (11), improved running economy is thought to 63 be deterministic in the most elite runners and is now the target of technological 64 innovation to enhance human performance beyond current limits. Recent media 65 articles suggested that the *neoteric Nikes* could improve marathon performance 66 by ~4% in sub-elite athletes (18). However, there is substantial heterogeneity 67 68 between sub-elite marathon runners, and within-runner training may vary 69 considerably particularly after the purchase of costly, exclusive *neoteric Nikes*

70 with a perceived technological advantage. Thus, elite marathon runners are an 71 ideal model to determine the effect of *neoteric Nikes* on marathon performance. 72 Elite marathon runners are generally homogenous for consistent and intensive training across many years. Furthermore, among elite athletes, $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ and 73 74 running velocity at lactate threshold are generally stable across time and 75 improvements in performance are primarily dependent on improved running economy which is typically improved gradually over many years, as 76 demonstrated in a previous women's world record holder for the marathon, Paula 77 Radcliffe (9). 78 Accordingly, the objective of our study was to determine the relationship 79 80 between marathon finishing times and the racing shoes worn by elite male and female marathon runners. This retrospective, observational study used real-world 81 data (17) to test the hypothesis that marathon performances would be faster with 82 83 neoteric Nikes for both cross-sectional and longitudinal observations. To accomplish this objective, we analyzed finishing times and the racing shoes worn 84 by the top 50 males and females for four of the World Marathon Major races 85 (Boston, Chicago, London, New York City) across a decade (2010 – 2019). 86 Using the entire cohort, we compared marathon finishing times in elite runners 87 with and without the *neoteric Nikes*. In a subset of elite runners with available 88 repeat performances, including performances both with and without *neoteric* 89 *Nikes*, we compared *within runner* changes in marathon performance. By 90 91 focusing on elite performances, we also inherently controlled for any issues 92 related to biological talent.

93 MATERIALS AND METHODS

94	All procedures involved accessing public information and did not require
95	ethical review as determined by the Mayo Clinic Institutional Review Board in
96	accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, 45 CFR 46.102, and the
97	Declaration of Helsinki. Marathon finishing times and the associated racing
98	shoes worn by the top 50 male and female finishers of the World Marathon
99	Majors were collected.
100	The World Marathon Majors includes six of the largest and most renowned
101	marathons in the world hosted by major cities (Berlin, Boston, Chicago, London,
102	New York, and Tokyo). Tokyo and Berlin events were excluded due to the lack of
103	marathon shoe data available for these competitions. Marathon finishing times
104	were downloaded from Boston Athletic Association Archives
105	(http://registration.baa.org/cfm_Archive/iframe_ArchiveSearch.cfm), Marathon
106	Guide (London and TCS New York City Marathons;
107	http://www.marathonguide.com/ results/), and Bank of America Chicago
108	Marathon Race Results (https://chicago-history.r.mikatiming.com/2018/).
109	Finishing data from four races across 10 years of competition were collected and
110	analyzed for the top 50 male and top 50 female finishers (except the New York
111	City Marathon in 2012 which was not held due to the aftermath of Hurricane
112	Sandy). Thus, a total of 3,900 data points were available for analysis.
113	Two of three investigators (JWS, MHH and RB) independently identified
114	racing shoes as neoteric Nikes or other from available photographs posted on

publicly available websites (e.g. <u>https://www.marathonfoto.com/</u>) or on social
media webpages. Any disagreement was resolved by consensus of the three
investigators. Of the 3,900 potential data points, 3,886 marathon performances
(Male: 1,944; Female: 1,942) had identifiable shoes and were included in
analyses.

For the subset analysis of elite runners with repeat performances, data were available for 1,505 performances (male, n = 799; female, n = 706). Of the 1,505 performances, 239 were completed in *neoteric Nike* shoes (male, n = 138; female, n = 101) and 1,266 were completed in other racing shoes (male, n = 661; female, n = 605).

Data were reported as means \pm standard deviation within the text, unless 125 noted otherwise. Changes in marathon finishing time between races for the case-126 control analysis were calculated as $(race_n - race_{n+1}) \cdot (race_n)^{-1} \cdot 100\%$, where 127 performances were arranged in chronological order and n = the first performance 128 129 listed. Separate mixed-model univariate analyses of variance were used to compare the dependent variables (marathon finishing time and change in 130 marathon finishing time) between the independent variables (sex, male vs. 131 female; shoe, *neoteric Nike* vs. other; performance year; marathon course, 132 Boston vs. Chicago vs. London vs. New York). Multiple comparisons tests were 133 performed using the Bonferroni method (16). Analyses were performed with the 134 use of IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 25 statistical package 135 (Armonk, NY, USA). Interpretation of findings was based on P < 0.05 or 95% 136

137 confidence intervals. Reported P values are two-sided and have been adjusted

138 for multiplicity using Bonferroni factor.

139 **RESULTS**

140 Full Cohort Analyses

Marathon finishing times were stable during the initial portion of the 141 observation period (2010 – 2018) for both males (mean, 141.4 minutes; 95% 142 confidence interval [CI], 141.0 to 141.7 minutes) and females (mean, 163.5; 95% 143 CI, 162.9 to 164.0 minutes). In 2019, however, marathon performances markedly 144 145 improved for both males (136.7 \pm 0.4 minutes, P < 0.001) and females (158.3 \pm 0.6 minutes, P < 0.001), Figure 1. Although this improvement in performance 146 may be a characteristic of an Olympic qualification year, in the immediately 147 preceding Olympic years (2015 and 2011), there was no change in performance 148 for males (P = 1.0 for both) or females (P = 1.0 for both) relative to 2010, Figure 149 1. Each year, the average marathon finishing time was greater than 140 minutes 150 for males and 160 minutes for females, except for 2019. The faster average 151 152 marathon performance in 2019 coincided with the greatest proportion of males (n 153 = 132 of 199 (1 missing observation); 66.3%) and females (n = 115 of 197 (3) missing observations); 58.4%) racing in *neoteric Nikes*. 154 155 On average, the marathon finishing times of males were ~22 min or ~13% 156 faster than the finishing times of females $(141 \pm 8 \text{ vs.} 163 \pm 11 \text{ min}, P < 0.001)$. 157 This finding was consistent with the marathon performances produced in other

racing shoes (n = 3,419; P < 0.001). However, among the marathon

performances in *neoteric Nike* shoes (n = 467), there were two primarydifferences.

First, marathon finishing times were faster among those runners wearing 161 neoteric Nike shoes compared to other marathon racing shoes for both males 162 $(138.5 \pm 8.1 \text{ min vs.} 141.3 \pm 7.4 \text{ min, P} = 0.001)$ and females $(159.1 \pm 10.0 \text{ min})$ 163 164 vs. 163.4 ± 10.7 min, P<0.001), representing ~2.0% faster performance among males and ~2.6% faster performance among females. Second, the faster 165 marathon performance in the runners wearing the *neoteric Nike* shoes compared 166 to other marathon racing shoes was greater for females than males (P = 0.014; 167 Figure 2). In the analytical model examining the modifying effect of sex and 168 performance shoes on marathon finishing time, the effect size of the interaction 169 of sex and shoe (P=0.014; η_p^2 =0.002) was lower than the effect size of sex *per* 170 se (P<0.001; $\eta_p^2 = 0.341$). 171

172 Case-Control Analyses of Repeated Performances

In a subset, case-control analysis of elite runners with repeat performances,
we determined the within-runner change in finishing time between successive
marathon performances wearing and not-wearing the *neoteric Nikes*. Consistent
with our hypothesis, the change in performance between marathons was strongly
moderated by racing shoe for both males (P<0.001) and females (P<0.001).

- 178 In the reference or control group of performances in non-Nike shoes, there
- 179 was no observed between-race change in performance for males (median, -
- 180 0.0%; 95% confidence interval [CI], -11.7% to 12.4%) or females (median, 0.5%;

95% Cl, -15.0% to 13.9%). Among these observations in the reference group, the
probability of improvement in performance was 49.4% (327 events of 661
observations) for males and 59.2% for females (347 events of 605 observations).
These analyses therefore, indicate no change in performance between
successive marathon performances in the reference group (i.e. when wearing
other racing shoes). See Figure 3.

In the experimental or case group of performances in which neoteric Nike 187 shoes were worn, the average between-race change in performance was 0.8% 188 189 for males (median, 1.1%; 95% CI, -5.4% to 11.4%) and 1.6% for females (median, 1.8%; 95% CI, -6.9% to 13.8%). Among these observations in the 190 experimental group, the probability of improvement in performance was 60.1% 191 (84 events of 138 observations) for males and 70.3% for females (71 events of 192 101 observations). Thus, the relative risk of improvement in performance when 193 194 wearing *neoteric* Nike shoes was 1.23 for both males and females. Although the 195 relative change in performance (%) in *neoteric* Nikes was not different between the sexes (P = 0.158), the absolute change in finishing time (min) was greater for 196 197 females than males (P < 0.001). These analyses demonstrate a performanceenhancing effect of *neoteric* Nikes, which was greater among females. 198

199 Exploratory Analyses of Race course

Although the primary objective was to determine the association between marathon performance and the racing shoes worn, additional exploratory analyses were performed based on marathon race course. In support of other

203	findings, marathon performance times of males were ~10-13% faster than
204	females for each marathon race course (all $P < 0.001$) and among marathon
205	performances in other racing shoes (all $P < 0.001$). For each marathon race
206	course, both males and females demonstrated faster performances wearing
207	neoteric Nikes than other shoes (all P<0.001; Figure 4), with the exception of
208	Boston for males ($P=0.637$). The null difference between shoe types for males in
209	Boston likely reflects the difficult running conditions (heavy rain) during the 2018
210	Boston Marathon which slowed performances by six minutes on average. The
211	2018 Boston Marathon had high statistical leverage ($n = 26$; 45%) on the total
212	sample of <i>neoteric Nikes</i> for males at Boston ($n = 58$). For females, however, the
213	2018 Boston marathon did not have large statistical leverage ($n = 9$; 27%) on the
214	total sample of <i>neoteric Nikes</i> for females at Boston ($n = 33$), and thus did not
215	notably affect these findings.

216 **DISCUSSION**

This retrospective, observational study using real-world data demonstrates a 217 performance-enhancing effect of contemporary Nike marathon racing shoe 218 219 models (4%, NEXT%, Alphafly, and other prototypes; *neoteric Nikes*) — which is greater for females than males. Our primary finding of performance-enhancing 220 effects of *neoteric Nikes* compared other market-leading shoes, particularly 221 222 among females, was supported by three separate analyses. First, the average marathon finishing time for both males and females was markedly faster in 2019 223 compared to previous years, which coincided with the first performance year in 224 which the majority of runners wore *neoteric Nikes*. Second, marathon finishing 225

226 times were faster among runners wearing *neoteric Nikes* compared to other 227 shoes for both males (2.8 min or 2.0%) and females (4.3 min or 2.6%). Third, and 228 perhaps most convincing, in a subset of elite runners with repeat performances, 229 marathon finishing times improved for runners who switched to wearing *neoteric*. 230 *Nikes* relative to their most recent marathon wearing other shoes— for both males (0.8% or 1.2 min) and more so for females (1.6% or 3.7 min). Notably, 231 there was no such change in marathon performance for males or females 232 wearing other marathon racing shoes in repeated performances. These findings 233 largely remained unchanged between different race courses in Boston, Chicago, 234 235 London and New York. These findings suggest that technological advances in 236 footwear contributed to the recent improvements in marathon performance times among elite runners and record-setting marathon performances. 237 The Nike Vaporfly 4% first became available to the public in late 2017. Since 238

239 then, Nike has produced several iterations of the shoe with more refined characteristics of the innovative technology, i.e. embedded carbon fiber plate and 240 thick midsole with novel foam material. Subsequently, this line of neoteric Nikes 241 was worn by athletes to break world records in the marathon as well as other 242 road races (100-km, half marathon, and 15-km distance) and has become almost 243 omnipresent among eligible elite runners at marathons, including ~70% of the top 244 50 males and females in the final World Marathon major race of the 2010s (New 245 York Marathon held on November 3, 2019). The implementation of technology to 246 247 improve the economy of movement has impacted nearly all modern-day sports (3, 4). Examples include introduction of carbon fiber and aerodynamic 248

handlebars in cycling, clap skates in speed skating, 'U' grooves of club heads in 249 250 golfing, fiber glass poles in pole vaulting, and 'spaghetti strung' rackets in tennis 251 (3, 4). New technology introduced to sport elicits reconsideration and 252 redevelopment of criteria to define the reasonable bounds of technological 253 enhancement. In the case of long distance running, the neoteric Nikes motivated, in part, new regulations for performance footwear in road running (2, 4) after 254 laboratory testing demonstrated a potential performance-enhancing effect (1, 5) 255 and several world records were broken. Our findings support the notion that 256 neoteric Nikes contributed to improvements in marathon finishing time in recent 257 258 years for both males and females. Interestingly, the magnitude of improvements 259 in performance are remarkably similar to the ~2% faster performance predicted using models based on metabolic savings in running (14). 260

261 Although the relative (%) improvement in marathon performance was not 262 different between the sexes, because males have faster performance times, the 263 absolute improvement in performance wearing *neoteric* Nikes was numerically greater for females. This greater improvement in absolute running times of the 264 265 females compared with the males was observed in the full-cohort analyses and also in the case-control data analyses of repeated marathon performances. 266 Because marathon performances are determined in the time domain, as opposed 267 to a relative performance, the greater benefit for females is noteworthy. Although 268 the mass of the athlete and other biomechanical properties likely influence the 269 performance benefit of the neoteric Nike shoes, there is limited empirical data 270 evaluating the mechanisms contributing to potential sex-related differences in the 271

272 performance benefit of the *neoteric Nike* shoes. Although most relevant 273 performance prediction models do not directly account for the biological sex of 274 the runner, analytical models predict that females would have a greater performance benefit due to slower performance times (14). The contributing 275 276 mechanisms to the performance benefit of the neoteric Nike shoes, and particularly the potential sex-related differences, warrant further investigation. 277 278 Our findings are consistent with laboratory assessments of the *neoteric Nikes* (1, 5), analyses of real-world data from recreational marathon runners (19, 20), 279 280 and analyses of elite athletes published in the lay literature (15). In the context of elite athletic performance, the observed ~1.5% improvement in performance is 281 substantial and highly meaningful for the elite-level athlete. For example, in the 282 283 most recent Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro in 2016, the top 10 men all finished the 42.2 km race within four minutes of one another. This improvement 284 285 in performance is likely due to the elastic properties of the *neoteric Nikes* which conserves energy expenditure at marathon racing speeds (1, 5). Laboratory 286 testing demonstrated that the *neoteric Nikes* could return 7.5 J of mechanical 287 energy per step which is approximately double the energy return of other widely-288 used marathon performance shoes (3.5 J per step). 289 We conclude that the ingenious Nike performance running shoes with 290 embedded carbon fiber plate and thick midsole with innovative material provide a 291 distinct competitive advantage (~1.5%) for both male and female elite marathon 292

runners. Our findings indicate that the ~4% reduced energetic cost of running

- observed in laboratory settings (1, 5) translates to real, but lesser, improvements
- in real world racing conditions among elite male and female marathon runners.

296 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

- 297 None.
- 298 **GRANTS**
- None.

300 DISCLOSURES

No conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, are declared by the authors

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

- JWS, MJJ, and SKH conceived and designed the study. JWS, MHH, CCW, and
- RB collected the data. JWS, MHH, and CCW analyzed the data and prepared the
- figures. All authors contributed to interpretation of results, drafting and revising
- the manuscript, and all authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Barnes KR, and Kilding AE. A Randomized Crossover Study

Investigating the Running Economy of Highly-Trained Male and Female Distance Runners in Marathon Racing Shoes versus Track Spikes. *Sports Med* 49: 331-342, 2019.

2. Burns GT, and Tam N. Is it the shoes? A simple proposal for regulating footwear in road running. *Br J Sports Med* 54: 439-440, 2020.

3. Dyer B. The controversy of sports technology: a systematic review. *Springerplus* 4: 524, 2015.

4. Dyer B. A Pragmatic Approach to Resolving Technological Unfairness: the Case of Nike's Vaporfly and Alphafly Running Footwear. *Sports Med Open* 6: 21, 2020.

5. Hoogkamer W, Kipp S, Frank JH, Farina EM, Luo G, and Kram R. A Comparison of the Energetic Cost of Running in Marathon Racing Shoes. *Sports Med* 48: 1009-1019, 2018.

6. Hoogkamer W, Kipp S, and Kram R. The Biomechanics of Competitive Male Runners in Three Marathon Racing Shoes: A Randomized Crossover Study. *Sports Med* 49: 133-143, 2019.

7. Hoogkamer W, Kram R, and Arellano CJ. How Biomechanical Improvements in Running Economy Could Break the 2-hour Marathon Barrier. Sports Med 47: 1739-1750, 2017.

8. Hutchinson A. A Tale of Two Marathon Records and Nike's Magic Shoes. In: *Outside*. Santa Fe, NM: Outside Integrated Media, 2019.

9. Jones AM. The Physiology of the World Record Holder for the Women's Marathon. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching* 1: 101-116, 2006.

10. Jones AM, Kirby BS, Clark IE, Rice HM, Fulkerson E, Wylie LJ, Wilkerson DP, Vanhatalo A, and Wilkins BW. Physiological demands of running at 2-hour marathon race pace. *J Appl Physiol (1985)* 2020.

11. Joyner MJ, Hunter SK, Lucia A, and Jones AM. Physiology and fast marathons. *J Appl Physiol (1985)* 128: 1065-1068, 2020.

12. Joyner MJ, Ruiz JR, and Lucia A. The two-hour marathon: who and when? *J Appl Physiol (1985)* 110: 275-277, 2011.

13. Kerdok AE, Biewener AA, McMahon TA, Weyand PG, and Herr HM. Energetics and mechanics of human running on surfaces of different stiffnesses. *J Appl Physiol (1985)* 92: 469-478, 2002.

14. Kipp S, Kram R, and Hoogkamer W. Extrapolating Metabolic Savings in Running: Implications for Performance Predictions. *Front Physiol* 10: 79, 2019.
15. Langley J. The impact of Nike Vaporflys on Elite Marathon Performance.

WordPress.com: 2019.

16. Lee S, and Lee DK. What is the proper way to apply the multiple comparison test? *Korean J Anesthesiol* 71: 353-360, 2018.

17. Makady A, de Boer A, Hillege H, Klungel O, and Goettsch W. What Is Real-World Data? A Review of Definitions Based on Literature and Stakeholder Interviews. *Value Health* 20: 858-865, 2017.

18. Quealy K, and Katz J. Nike Says Its \$250 Running Shoes Will Make You Run Much Faster. What if That's Actually True? In: *The New York Times*. New York City: The New York Times Company, 2018.

19. Quealy K, and Katz J. Nike Says Its \$250 Running Shoes Will Make You Run Much Faster. What if That's Actually True? In: *The New York Times*. New York City: A.G. Sulzberger, 2018.

20. Quealy K, and Katz J. Nike's Fastest Shoes May Give Runners an Even Bigger Advantage Than We Thought. In: *The New York Times*. New York City: A.G. Sulzberger, 2019.

21. Roy JP, and Stefanyshyn DJ. Shoe midsole longitudinal bending stiffness and running economy, joint energy, and EMG. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 38: 562-569, 2006.

22. Santos-Concejero J, Gonzalez-Mohino F, Gonzalez-Rave JM, Perrey S, Dewolf AH, Yates BA, Usaj A, Debevec T, Gonzalez-Rayas JM, Rayas-Gomez AL, Gonzalez-Yanez JM, Lepers R, Stapley P, Louis J, Proessl F, Nikolaidis PT, Knechtle B, Muniz-Pumares D, Hunter B, Bottoms L, Bontemps B, Valenzuela PL, Boullosa D, Del Coso J, Blagrove RC, Hayes PR, Millet GP, Malatesta D, de Almeida Costa Campos Y, Pereira Guimaraes M. Macedo Vianna J. Fernandes da Silva S. Silva Margues de Azevedo PH. Paris HL, Leist MA, Lige MT, Malysa W, Oumsang AS, Sinai EC, Hansen RK, Secher NH, Volianitis S, Hottenrott L, Hottenrott K, Gronwald T, Senefeld JW, Fernandes RJ, Vilas-Boas JP, Riveros-Rivera A, Boning D, Craighead DH, Kipp S, Kram R, Zinner C, Sperlich B, Holmberg HC, Muniz-Pardos B, Sutehall S, Angeloudis K, Guppy FM, Bosch A, Pitsiladis Y, Andrade DC, Del Rio R, Ramirez-Campillo R, Lopes TR, Silva BM, Ives SJ, Weyand PG, Brietzke C, Franco-Alvarenga PE, Meireles dos Santos T, Pires FO, Layec G, Hoogkamer W, Balestrini CS, Goss CS, Gabler MC, Escalera A, Bielko SA, and Chapman RF. Commentaries on Viewpoint: Physiology and fast marathons. J Appl Physiol (1985) 128: 1069-1085, 2020.



Figure 1. Finishing times of elite runners during the World Marathon Major races of the 2010s. The chronological dot plot represents the estimated marginal mean marathon performances times of males (**filled circles**) and females (**open circles**) who placed in the top 50 in a subset of World Marathon Major races (Boston, Chicago, London, or New York City) in the 2010s. The vertical error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals. For both males and females, the mean finishing time was faster in 2019 than all other performance years (P<0.001).



Figure 2. Finishing times in major marathons of elite athletes wearing *neoteric Nikes* or other running shoes. Violin plots represent the distributions of marathon finishing times of male and female athletes who placed in the top 50 in a subset of World Marathon Major races (Boston, Chicago, London, or New York City) in the 2010s. The middle vertical lines of each violin plot indicate the median, the left and right lines denote the 25th and 75th percentiles, and individual data points are indicated with open circles. Numerical values represent the mean finishing time of each distribution. For both males and females, marathon finishing times were faster among athletes wearing neoteric Nikes than athletes wearing other shoes; *, *P*<0.001.



Figure 3. Within-runner successive marathon performances changes among elite athletes wearing *neoteric Nikes* or other running shoes. Distributions of race-to-race change in performance for males (left panel) and females (right panel) wearing non-*neoteric Nike* shoes (Other) or *neoteric Nike* shoes for the first time (after switch from other marathon racing shoe). Violin plots represent the distributions of marathon finishing times of male and female athletes who placed in the top 50 in a subset of World Marathon Major races (Boston, Chicago, London, or New York City) in the 2010s. The middle vertical lines of each violin plot indicate the median, the left and right lines denote the 25^{th} and 75^{th} percentiles, and individual data points are indicated with open circles. Numerical values represent the mean finishing time of each distribution. For both males and females, the change in marathon finishing times were improved among athletes wearing neoteric Nikes; *, *P*<0.001. However, marathon finishing times remain unchanged among athletes wearing other running shoes.



Figure 4. Race course specific marathon finishing times of elite athletes wearing *neoteric Nikes* or other running shoes. Distributions of marathon finishing times for males (left panels, blue symbols) and females (right panels, red symbols) for *neoteric Nike* shoes (unfilled symbols) and other shoes (filled symbols). The horizontal line in the middle of each distribution denotes the median of the sample.