

An Observational Study of the Effect of Nike Vaporfly Shoes on Marathon Performance

Joseph Guinness, Debasmita Bhattacharya, Jenny Chen, Max Chen, Angela Loh

Cornell University

Abstract

We collected marathon performance data from a systematic sample of elite and sub-elite athletes over the period 2015 to 2019, then searched the internet for publicly-available photographs of these performances, identifying whether the Nike Vaporfly shoes were worn or not in each performance. Controlling for athlete ability and race difficulty, we estimated the effect on marathon times of wearing the Vaporfly shoes. Assuming that the effect of Vaporfly shoes is additive, we estimate that the Vaporfly shoes improve men’s times between 2.0 and 3.9 minutes, while they improve women’s times between 0.8 and 3.5 minutes. Assuming that the effect of Vaporfly shoes is multiplicative, we estimate that they improve men’s times between 1.4 and 2.8 percent and women’s performances between 0.6 and 2.2 percent. The improvements are in comparison to the shoe the athlete was wearing before switching to Vaporfly shoes, and represents an expected improvement rather than a guaranteed improvement.

1 Introduction

There is a growing consensus that Nike Corporation’s new line of marathon racing shoes, which are commonly referred to as Vaporflys, provide a significant performance advantage to athletes who wear them. While several different versions of the shoes have appeared in races, including the Vaporfly 4%, the Vaporfly Next%, the Alphafly, and several prototype shoes, each iteration of the shoes has in common a carbon fiber plate stacked inside of a highly responsive foam sole.

Several research studies have investigated the magnitude of the Vaporfly performance benefit. Hoogkamer et al. (2018) and Barnes and Kilding (2019) tested highly trained distance runners in laboratory studies, measuring various biomechanical and physiological variables while subjects wore Vaporflys and several other shoes in trial runs on a treadmill. Although the measured benefits varied somewhat from athlete to athlete, both studies found a roughly 4% average reduction in energy expenditures while wearing Vaporflys, in comparison to other popular racing shoes such as the Adidas Adizero Adios Boost line of racing shoes, and Nike Zoom Matumbo track spikes.

The Upshot, a division of The New York Times, collected data from actual marathon performances recorded on Strava, a popular running log and GPS tracking website. Their study included hundreds of thousands of marathon performances, and dozens of different shoes. The Upshot found that the Vaporflys imparted a 4 to 5% advantage in finishing time over an

average shoe and a 1.5 to 2.5% advantage over the second-best shoe (Kealy and Katz, 2018, 2019). A study published by Wired Magazine found that a sample of runners in the 2017 New York City Marathon were more likely to run the second half of the race faster than the first if they were wearing Vaporflys (Thompson, 2017).

Our study is most similar to the Upshot study in that we analyze data from marathon performances and compare people’s performances with and without the Vaporflys. However, our study differs in a few ways. First, instead of relying on a convenient sample of athletes who upload their data to Strava, we take an exhaustive sample of athletes who met a minimum performance standard at one of 22 of the largest marathon venues in 2015 and 2016 in the US and Canada. Second, instead of relying on self-reported shoe data, we searched the internet for photos of races and visually identified the shoes that runners wore. Third, we focus only on athletes who performed at an elite level before the Vaporflys were released to the public. Thus, we are only considering accomplished runners with marathon experience who, most likely, settled on a suitable shoe before the Vaporflys were released. These runners are also those most likely to be affected by shoe regulations because many of them compete in national Olympic qualifying races subject to regulations.

2 Study Design

We selected athletes who recorded a sufficiently fast marathon time—men under 2:24 and women under 2:45—at a collection of 22 distinct marathon venues in 2015 or 2016, including the 2016 U.S. Olympic Marathon Trials, which were contested in Los Angeles in February of 2016. The list of marathons is included in the Appendix. This resulted in a sample of 270 distinct women and 308 distinct men after matching names and our best effort to correct alternate spellings of names. We recorded these athletes’ performances in the same 22 marathon venues over the period 2015 to 2019, and searched publicly available online photographs, manually identifying whether or not each athlete was wearing a Nike Vaporfly shoe by visual inspection. All marathon times were downloaded from the website www.marathonguide.com.

Our criteria for inclusion in the study were meant to satisfy certain objectives. First, we wanted to study elite and sub-elite athletes, since shoe regulations are motivated by performance advantages for athletes in this group. Second, we wanted to study athletes who had achieved success in the marathon before the Nike Vaporfly shoes had been released to the public. This ensures that inclusion in the study is unrelated to whether an athlete was wearing the shoes in the race where they qualified for inclusion in the study. This is important because, if any shoe effect exists, the magnitude of the effect may differ among different athletes. If we were to use performances potentially aided by the shoes to select the athletes, that might have biased our sample towards athletes who benefit most from the shoes.

To identify shoes worn by the runners, we used photos posted on public websites such as marathonfoto.com, marathon-photos.com, sportphoto.com, and flashframe.io. We also collected photographs from social media sites such as [facebook.com](https://www.facebook.com) and [instagram.com](https://www.instagram.com). We assumed that Vaporfly shoes were not worn in 2015 or 2016 by any runners except for a few




Figure 1: (Left) Each circle represents an individual race, with the area of the circle proportional to the number of runners from the race in our dataset, and the vertical position equal to the proportion of runners wearing Vaporfly shoes in the race. (Right) Each circle represents an athlete, with the horizontal position being the athlete’s average marathon time in non-Vaporfly shoes, and the vertical position being the athlete’s average time in Vaporfly shoes.

that were reported to have worn prototypes in the 2016 US Olympic Trials Marathon. Identification of shoes via photos is a manual process that is subject to error. We have made all of our shoe identifications publicly available at <https://github.com/joeguinness/vaporfly> and will update this paper with new data if we are made aware of any errors in shoe identification. We identified the shoes worn in 840 of 880 (95.5%) men’s performances in our dataset and in 778 of 810 (96.0%) women’s performances.

3 Data Exploration

In Figure 1, we plot some summaries of the data. The left plot contains the proportion of runners wearing Vaporflys in each race in our dataset, separated by sex. Aside from a few prototypes being used in 2016, adoption of the shoes began in early 2017 and rose to over 50% on average in races at the end of 2019. The right plot contains the average marathon time for each athlete in the dataset in Vaporfly vs. non-Vaporfly shoes. Most runners’ average time in Vaporfly shoes is faster than their average time in non-Vaporfly shoes. Specifically, 53 of 71 men (74.5%) who switched to Vaporflys ran faster in them, and 40 of 56 women (71.4%) who switched to Vaporflys ran faster in them.

The right plot does not tell the whole story because it might be the case that runners who switched to Vaporflys did so when they ran on faster marathon courses. Some courses, such as the Boston Marathon course, have hills or often have poor weather, while others are flat and fast. So it is important to use the data to attempt to account for the difficulty of each

course. To get a satisfactory estimate of the effect of Vaporfly shoes, we need to analyze all of the data holistically, controlling for the strength of each runner and the difficulty of each marathon course. In the next section, we describe a statistical model intended for that purpose.

4 Statistical Model

We seek to estimate the effect of Vaporfly shoes on marathon performance, controlling for runner ability and marathon course difficulty. This is achieved by fitting a statistical model with non-random effects for Vaporfly shoes and random effects for runner ability, overall course difficulty, and course difficulty specific to year. To allow for the possibility that men and women have different performance characteristics, we analyze data from the two sexes separately. We assign each performance a label between 1 and n ($n = 840$ for men, $n = 778$ for women). Each athlete is assigned a label between 1 and the number of athletes A ($A = 308$ men, $A = 270$ women). We assign each marathon course a label between 1 and the number of marathon courses C ($C = 22$), and we assign each individual race a label between 1 and the number of races R , ($R = 106$). We summarize our notation for the data here:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= \text{marathon time in minutes for performance } i \\ x_i &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if Vaporfly shoes worn in performance } i \\ 0 & \text{if Vaporfly shoes not worn in performance } i \end{cases} \\ j(i) &= \text{label for athlete who completed performance } i \\ k(i) &= \text{label for marathon course associated with performance } i \\ \ell(i) &= \text{label for individual marathon race associated with performance } i \end{aligned}$$

A statistical model is a family of probability distributions that encodes the assumptions we make about the processes generating the data. Models generally include unknown parameters relevant to the questions posed in the study. The goal of the analysis is to use the data to make inferences about these parameters. We consider the following two models for the performances y_1, \dots, y_n :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Untransformed:} \quad & Y_i = b_0 + b_1 x_i + U_{j(i)} + V_{k(i)} + W_{\ell(i)} + Z_i \\ \text{Log Untransformed:} \quad & \log Y_i = b_0 + b_1 x_i + U_{j(i)} + V_{k(i)} + W_{\ell(i)} + Z_i \end{aligned}$$

with each of the individual terms defined in the following table

The primary parameter of interest is b_1 , which is the effect of the Vaporfly shoes. The model assumes that, all else held constant, switching to Vaporfly shoes changes the response by b_1 . We do not attempt to model Vaporfly effects that vary among individual runners. The interpretations of the parameters are different depending on whether we take a log transformation of the times or not. When modeling untransformed times, the effect of Vaporfly shoes is additive, meaning that we expect the time to change by adding b_1 , and when modeling log-transformed times, the effect is multiplicative, meaning that we expect the time to change by multiplying by $\exp(b_1)$.

Terms		Assumptions	Description
b_0, b_1		non-random parameters	b_1 = Vaporfly effect
U_1, \dots, U_A	$\overset{ind}{\sim}$	$N(0, \sigma_1^2)$	runner effects
V_1, \dots, V_C	$\overset{ind}{\sim}$	$N(0, \sigma_2^2)$	course effects
W_1, \dots, W_R	$\overset{ind}{\sim}$	$N(0, \sigma_3^2)$	individual race effects
Z_1, \dots, Z_n	$\overset{ind}{\sim}$	$N(0, \sigma_4^2)$	residual effects

Aside from b_0 and b_1x_i , the rest of the terms are independent normal random effects. Each of the A runners has its own offset term U_j to account for the fact that runners have differing abilities; each of the C marathon courses has its own offset term V_k to account for the fact that different marathon courses are slower or faster than others; each of the R individual races has its own offset term W_ℓ to account for the fact that race conditions vary from year to year, making some years slower or faster than others at the same course; and finally each of the n individual performances has a term Z_i to account for any other factors that affected the performance. We also considered including time-varying runner effects, to allow each runner’s fitness to improve or decline over time independently of the fitness of other runners, but we decided that this model placed too much weight on athletes who raced frequently. In the Appendix, we also include results from a combined model for men and women.

5 Estimated Parameters

To fit the models, we used the `lmer` function, which is part of the `lme4` package (Bates et al., 2015) in the R programming language (R Core Team, 2018). The `lme4` package is a well-established piece of statistical software for fitting random effects models of the type we seek to estimate in this research study. Code and data for reproducing our results are available online at <https://github.com/joeguinness/vaporfly>.

We fit separate models for men and women, and additionally, separate models for the untransformed and log-transformed marathon times. The estimated parameters are summarized in the table below:

	men minutes	women minutes	men log minutes	women log minutes
	estimate (s.e.)	estimate (s.e.)	estimate (s.e.)	estimate (s.e.)
b_0	139.69 (0.59)	159.83 (0.81)	4.94 (0.004)	5.070 (0.0050)
b_1	−2.95 (0.60)	−2.18 (0.81)	−0.0209 (0.0041)	−0.0135 (0.0049)
σ_1	4.175	6.40	0.030	0.041
σ_2	1.852	2.33	0.013	0.014
σ_3	1.874	2.43	0.013	0.015
σ_4	4.108	5.02	0.028	0.030

Table 1: Table of parameter estimates for the statistical models.

For both men and women and for untransformed and log-transformed times, the Vaporfly effect is negative, indicating that the evidence supports the hypothesis that Vaporflies decrease,

or improve, marathon times. Our best estimates of the additive effects are -2.95 minutes for men and -2.18 minutes for women. Using log-transformed data, our best estimates of the multiplicative effects are $\exp(-0.0209) = 0.979$ for men, and $\exp(-0.0135) = 0.986$ for women, meaning that we expect men’s times to decrease by 2.06%, and women’s times to decrease by 1.34%, when wearing Vaporfly shoes, as compared to the shoes each athlete was wearing before switching to Vaporflys.

While our estimates suggest that the effect of Vaporfly shoes is greater for men, the estimates come with some uncertainty. In the following table, we include 90% confidence intervals for each of the Vaporfly effects, constructed using a normal approximation to the sampling distribution of the estimates.

men minutes	women minutes	men log minutes	women log minutes
$(-3.933, -1.959)$	$(-3.514, -0.847)$	$(-0.028, -0.014)$	$(-0.022, -0.006)$

Table 2: 90% confidence intervals for Vaporfly effects in each model.

None of the intervals contain zero, which indicates strong evidence for a non-zero Vaporfly effect. There is substantial overlap between the men’s and women’s confidence intervals, which leaves some uncertainty about which sex benefits most from Vaporfly shoes. In the Appendix, we include an analysis assessing the difference between the men’s and women’s Vaporfly effects; we find that we do not have sufficient evidence to conclude that the effects differ by sex.

In random effects models such as those we use here, the estimates of the fixed effects, b_0 and b_1 , are calculated using the generalized least squares criterion. Generalized least squares attempts to triangulate all of the dependencies in the data, for example the fact that there are several performances for each runner and for each race, to arrive at a statistically optimal estimate of the effects. The estimates are linear combinations of the responses, for example

$$\hat{b}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i y_i,$$

where c_1, \dots, c_n are coefficients calculated using the covariance matrix of the random effects model. These coefficients can sometimes have seemingly counter-intuitive values. In the spirit of attempting to make sense of the magic of generalized least squares, and to promote its utility for this type of problem, we plot the coefficients for the estimates of the Vaporfly effects in Figure 2.

To help make sense of why generalized least squares picks these coefficients, consider four performances

- y_1 = Time for Runner 1 at Boston Marathon 2016
- y_2 = Time for Runner 2 at Boston Marathon 2016
- y_3 = Time for Runner 1 at Chicago Marathon 2017
- y_4 = Time for Runner 2 at Chicago Marathon 2017




Figure 2: Coefficients for the generalized least squares estimate of the Vaporfly effect \hat{b}_1 for the untransformed data. Each point represents an individual performance y_i . The height of the point is the corresponding coefficient c_i .

The first runner (y_1 and y_3) did not wear Vaporflys, but the second runner (y_2 and y_4) switched to Vaporflys at Chicago in 2017. A reasonable estimate for the Vaporfly effect from these data might be the average of the Vaporfly performances minus the average of the non-Vaporfly performances,

$$y_4 - \frac{1}{3}(y_1 + y_2 + y_3),$$

which places a positive coefficient (1.0) on the Vaporfly performance and negative coefficients (-0.33) on the non-Vaporfly performances. However, a better estimate would consider how much the second athlete's advantage increased after switching to the Vaporflys,

$$(y_4 - y_3) - (y_2 - y_1).$$

The first difference ($y_4 - y_3$) measures how much better the second athlete did in Chicago (wearing Vaporflys), and the second difference is how much better the second athlete did in Boston (not wearing Vaporflys). This estimate places a positive coefficient on the second runner's Vaporfly performance in Chicago, a positive coefficient on the first runner's Boston performance, a negative coefficient on the second runner's Boston performance, and a negative coefficient on the first runner's Chicago performance.

This pattern can be observed in Figure 2; early performances—before the Vaporfly appeared on the market—have either positive or negative coefficients, whereas later performances generally have positive coefficients when the Vaporfly is worn and negative coefficients when not worn. There is some variation in the magnitude of these coefficients, which we expect is due to the differing number of performances from each runner and from each race.

Note that Figure 2 shows the coefficients in the generalized least squares estimate, not raw performances.

6 Discussion

By collecting data on marathon times and identifying shoes worn in a systematic sample of elite and sub-elite marathon runners, we studied how much a runner’s marathon time can be expected to improve after switching to Vaporfly shoes. For men, the improvement is most likely somewhere between 2.0 and 3.9 minutes, or between 1.4% and 2.8%. For women it is likely between 0.8 and 3.5 minutes, or between 0.6% and 2.2%. To put these numbers into perspective, elite marathon runners cover more than half a mile in 3 minutes.

We made several assumptions that we believe to be reasonable, but nevertheless are open for debate and could be refined. We assumed that the expected Vaporfly effect (b_1) is the same for every runner of the same sex. Including prototypes, there are several different versions of Vaporflys, and it is logical to expect that newer versions improve upon older versions. Moreover, depending on biomechanical factors, some runners may benefit from Vaporflys more than others, or could have been wearing shoes that were not optimal for them before switching to Vaporflys. The models assume that, conditional on the runner and race, the marathon time follows a normal distribution. This may not be entirely appropriate because we believe that a runner is more likely to run 5 minutes slower than expected rather than 5 minutes faster; when things go wrong in a marathon, they can go really wrong.

The study did not include data on runners that did not finish their races. This data is more difficult to obtain and more difficult to model. Based on the Wired study (Thompson, 2017), which found that people wearing Vaporflys generally ran better in the second half of the race, we believe that people wearing Vaporflys are less likely to drop out, so we are more likely to miss the very worst performances in non-Vaporfly shoes. Thus, we believe that including drop-outs would only strengthen our estimate of the Vaporfly effect.

The shoes were identified via a manual process of searching through photographs. We believe that this manual process for getting the shoe data is better (though labor intensive) than relying on self-reported shoes. Nonetheless, it is prone to error in misidentification of the person and the shoes. For example, Nike has an orange Vaporfly with a black Swoosh logo, and also a Zoom Fly with the same color scheme. Another example, some professional athletes ran in a neon yellow and pink prototype Vaporfly, which looks very similar to the neon yellow and pink Nike Zoom Streak 6. See Johnson (2020) for a more detailed analysis. Yet a further example, we identified one athlete who attempted to conceal the identity of his shoes by coloring in the white Swoosh on a blue pair of Vaporflys.

Some of the athletes may have competed in marathons not included in the 22 marathons that we sampled. Missing these performances shouldn’t bias our results, but our results could be strengthened if we are able to track down every performance from the athletes in the study.

It is possible that athletes are more likely to switch to Vaporfly shoes when they know they are ready to turn in a good marathon performance. Inversely, some athletes might not be

willing to pay \$250 for shoes when they are out of shape. The Upshot study investigated this possibility by controlling for training volume; they did not see substantially different results. Further, our sample consists of solely highly accomplished runners. We believe that these athletes are generally wearing the best shoes available to them whenever they run a marathon.

We were able to identify shoes in nearly all, but not all marathon performances. Athletes have the ability to suppress photographs of themselves, for example by untagging themselves in Facebook photos, or simply electing not to post pictures of themselves from their races. If athletes are more likely to suppress photos of poor performances in Vaporfly shoes, our estimated effect of Vaporfly shoes could be larger than it should be.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Richard Heffron and Melissa Hardesty for discussions and providing comments on an early draft of the manuscript, and Richard Cleary for comments on the first version of the paper. We thank two peer reviewers, Harry Crane and Ted Westling, for providing detailed assessments of the paper and suggestions for improvements. Their reviews, along with our responses, are included in the Appendix. Finally, we express gratitude for those who take photos of major marathons and post them to social media, especially Karen Mitchell, Clay Shaw, and Malrie Sonier.

References

- Barnes, K. R. and Kilding, A. E. (2019). A randomized crossover study investigating the running economy of highly-trained male and female distance runners in marathon racing shoes versus track spikes. *Sports Medicine*, 49(2):331–342.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1):1–48.
- Hoogkamer, W., Kipp, S., Frank, J. H., Farina, E. M., Luo, G., and Kram, R. (2018). A comparison of the energetic cost of running in marathon racing shoes. *Sports Medicine*, 48(4):1009–1019.
- Johnson, R. (2020). Mechanical doping in 2016 – will anything be done about it? <https://tinyurl.com/umvmy7t>.
- Kealy, K. and Katz, J. (2018). Nike says its \$250 running shoes will make you run much faster. what if that’s actually true? <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/07/18/upshot/nike-vaporfly-shoe-strava.html>.
- Kealy, K. and Katz, J. (2019). Nike’s fastest shoes may give runners an even bigger advantage than we thought. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/12/13/upshot/nike-vaporfly-next-percent-shoe-estimates.html>.
- R Core Team (2018). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Thompson, N. (2017). Do nike’s new marathon shoes actually make you run faster? <https://www.wired.com/story/do-nike-zoom-vaporfly-make-you-run-faster/>.

A Table of Marathons Used in Analysis

Boston Marathon
California International Marathon
Chicago Marathon
Columbus Marathon
Eugene Marathon
Grandma’s Marathon
Houston Marathon
Indianapolis Monumental Marathon
Los Angeles Marathon
Lakefront Marathon
Marine Corps Marathon
New York City Marathon
Olympic Trials Marathon
Ottawa Marathon
Philadelphia Marathon
Phoenix Marathon
Richmond Marathon
Toronto Waterfront Marathon
Twin Cities Marathon
Vancouver International Marathon
Vermont City Marathon
Wineglass Marathon

B Peer Review Comments and Responses

This section is divided into subsections, one for each reviewer that provided comments on the paper. The reviewers’ comments are italicized, and our responses and discussions are in normal text.

B.1 Harry Crane, Rutgers University

This is a very interesting analysis of runner performance with and without the Nike Vaporfly. I’d expect this to be of interest to the running and sports science community, and also the general public as it shows how new technologies can impact the outcome of competitive events. In a case such as this, the early adopters will gain a competitive advantage for however long the benefits of the new product remain unknown to the broader pool of competitors. I hope this analysis will reach the most relevant communities. I have a few questions and comments

below. Some of these might be worth commenting in the paper, but for the most part they are for my own curiosity.

1. The analysis notes a performance improvement for athletes who have switched from non-Vaporfly to Vaporfly. Are there any instances of runners going in the other direction, from Vaporfly to non-Vaporfly? If yes, do you find anything interesting in the first performance back without Vaporfly? If not, do the authors believe this is because there has not been sufficient time to observe such a switch or because the performance enhancement is noticeable enough to the athletes that they would not want to switch?

We identified 5 runners who switched to the Vaporfly and then switched to a different shoe. Looking closely at each of these cases, we found that one was a case of a misidentified shoe, bringing the total to 4 runners. One of them joined a racing team sponsored by another company (Brooks). One switched to what looks like a prototype of Brooks's new racing shoe. One is wearing a different Brooks shoe, and one is wearing a different Nike shoe.

This is too small a sample to draw any conclusions, but of these 4 runners, 3 ran faster after switching away from the Vaporflys, although 1 of the 3 who ran faster did so on a faster course than the previous marathon in Vaporflys.

It is worth noting that very few athletes switched away from Vaporflys after trying them.

The analysis has been updated after correcting the misidentified shoe.

2. Your model includes a random effect for each marathon, which I suppose captures any factors associated with all runners in that race running faster or slower than usual, e.g., bad weather, wind, etc. Have you considered to include a course effect for any marathons in your dataset that were run over the same course in different years, e.g., Boston 2016 and Boston 2017. Would this possibly help tease out any additional variation in course-day variation?

This is a good suggestion for making the marathon effects more flexible, as you are right that certain courses are difficult every year, but the exact difficulty varies from year to year because of weather conditions and other factors.

We have updated our analysis to include an additional set of random effects that are specific to marathon courses, in addition to the original effects that were specific to course-year combinations.

Overall, the estimates of the Vaporfly effects decrease slightly in magnitude, but none of the findings of the paper change substantially. We think that the decrease in the Vaporfly effects is due to the added flexibility in the random effects terms.

3. Presumably athletes who switch to the new shoe would want to know whether the shoe is going to help their performance specifically, rather than just a positive association over the population of all runners who wear the shoe. Is it possible to draw a causal relationship from the results of this analysis? The authors mention some potential confounding factors, such as cost of the shoe and runners knowing whether they are training well for an upcoming race. If one were to attempt such a causal inference, what additional analyses should be carried out?

As we understand it, causal inference is an attempt to control for confounders in an observational study. In that sense, one can interpret the effect as causal if one believes that all the important confounding variables have been accounted for. We think we have controlled for the most important confounders (athlete and marathon) but can't rule out the possibility that other confounding factors exist, which is why we mentioned cost and fitness.

Judging by the widespread adoption of the Vaporfly shoes, runners seem to think that there is a causal effect. Some runners at the 2020 US Olympic Trials marathon even wore the new Nike Alphafly shoes after receiving them a day or two before the race. Conventional running wisdom states that you should never race in a brand new shoe that you haven't tried before. In our opinion, this break from conventional wisdom suggests that runners think the effects are causal.

4. *I'm curious whether any of the authors have actually worn the Vaporfly. Can the authors provide any anecdotal evidence about their experience with the shoe, particularly in comparison to their experience with other (apparently inferior) shoes.*

We haven't worn them yet, though several runners have provided us with anecdotal evidence that the shoes improve their performances.

B.2 Ted Westling, University of Massachusetts Amherst

This article presents a clear and well-written study of the association between wearing the Vaporfly running shoe and race time in the context of elite marathon runners. I have several comments.

1. *Why have separate models for women and men? Once you control for individual runner effects, doesn't this automatically include sex differences? I would expect that putting all the runners in a single model would improve power and also allow a formal assessment of the interaction of sex and Vaporfly effect via an interaction of the two.*

This is a good question and suggestion. Our main reason for fitting separate models is that we wanted to avoid assuming that the variances of the random effects terms were the same for men and women. Looking at the table of parameter estimates, in the untransformed model, the women's standard deviations are all higher than the men's standard deviations, which is not surprising because the women's times are overall larger than the men's. For the log transformed model, the standard deviations are much closer, with the exception of the runner standard deviations, which are about 25% larger for the women.

Thanks to your suggestion, we fit the interaction model and include the results in the table below, followed by the table of confidence intervals.

The model is parameterized so that b_1 is the men's Vaporfly effect, and $b_1 + b_3$ is the women's effect, giving men's effects of -3.35 and -0.0229 for the untransformed and log-transformed models, and women's effects of -2.63 and -0.0167 . These effects are all larger in magnitude than those from the sex-separated analyses. We do not find statistical evidence that the difference between the men's and women's effects, b_3 , is different from zero, as the standard error of the estimates are comparable to the estimates in both models. For the untransformed

	minutes	log minutes
	estimate (s.e.)	estimate (s.e.)
b_0	140.27 (0.66)	4.94 (0.0043)
b_1	-3.35 (0.64)	-0.0229 0.0041
b_2	19.89 (0.53)	0.1336 0.0035
b_3	0.72 (0.86)	0.0062 0.0055
σ_1	5.265	0.0350
σ_2	2.110	0.0137
σ_3	2.239	0.0144
σ_4	4.604	0.0292

Table 3: Table of parameter estimates for the interaction models

men minutes	women minutes	men log minutes	women log minutes
$(-4.410, -2.298)$	$(-3.786, -1.478)$	$(-0.030, -0.016)$	$(-0.024, -0.009)$

Table 4: 90% confidence intervals for Vaporfly effects in each model.

model, the women’s confidence intervals get a little narrower and the men’s a little wider, which we suppose is not surprising because the women’s variances were larger in the non-interaction model. For the log transformed data, the widths of the confidence intervals do not change much.

2. As Harry Crane pointed out, controlling for marathon effects doesn’t account for variation in marathon conditions that vary year-to-year. I would expect this to substantively impact the conclusions only if marathon conditions are also associated with the choice to wear Vaporflys. I would be interested to know whether the authors expect this to be the case. Relatedly, as part of the data exploration it would also be interesting to see a plot of the proportion of runners wearing Vaporflys in each marathon over time.

This is probably a miscommunication on our part. We do control for variation from year to year in the same marathon. In the revised version, we have added effects for each individual course, which do not vary from year to year. Hopefully, now that we have both types of effects and describe them separately, the description of the effects is more clear.

Thank you for the suggestion for the plot. We have replaced our original plot with one that contains the proportion of runners wearing Vaporflys in each race as a function of race date.

3. Regarding the data collection/sampling strategy for the study: were elite runners first identified, and subsequently all marathon performances for these runners recorded? Or were marathons first identified, and only the performances meeting the stated time criteria included in the study? In the second strategy, a runner could theoretically be in the data for one marathon, but excluded for another due to their time not qualifying. In this case, I’d also be curious about whether and how the truncation in the sampling strategy might impact the results.

We first selected a sample of marathons consisting of 22 of the most competitive marathons in the United States and Canada. Then from those marathons, we selected runners who

achieved a minimum performance standard in 2015 or 2016 in at least one of the 22 selected marathons. Then we selected ALL performances from those runners, regardless of the time, in those 22 marathons over the period 2015 to 2019.

It would probably be better to first create a dataset from all marathons in 2015 and 2016, and then find runners that met the minimum performance standard in any marathon in 2015 and 2016. There is some manual work to be done to get such a dataset, because one needs to know the url on marathonguide.com for every marathon. We selected the 22 marathons to include those where runners had qualified for the U.S. Olympic trials, and marathons that had many Boston Marathon Qualifiers, so we think our method misses very few elite runners.

4. The authors refrain from using causal language in the article, probably because the study is observational rather than experimental in nature, and making causal conclusions from observational data is difficult and controversial. However, I don't think there is any doubt that the most relevant scientific question is a causal one: for instance, individual runners might want to know what their time would be wearing Vaporflys (treatment) versus wearing their usual race shoes (control). Such an individual-level causal question is challenging to answer even in the context of randomized trials, but we can and do strive to answer population-average version of such causal questions using observational data. The most common approach is to attempt to adjust for all confounding variables that impact both receipt of treatment (wearing of Vaporflys) and the outcome (marathon time). It would be nice if the authors could comment on what variables might be confounders in this setting.

We are not experts in causal inference techniques, so we appreciate your expert opinion on the matter. We list a few possible confounders in the discussion, namely fitness and price. Since Nike Vaporflys are expensive relative to other racing shoes, a runner who is in poor fitness may be unwilling to pay for them to wear in a marathon, but once a runner gets into good shape, they might be more willing to pay for the shoes and race in them. Also, some runners might try the shoes in training and decide that they do not want to race in them because they do not get a benefit from them. A runner's personal objections to the fairness of the shoes might also influence self-assignment of the shoes.