

1 **A comparison of critical speed and critical power in runners using Stryd running power**

2

3 van Rassel, C. R.¹, Sales, M. K.¹, Ajayi, O. O.¹, Nagai, K.¹, & MacInnis, M. J.^{1*}

4 ¹Faculty of Kinesiology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada T2N 1N4

5

6 *Corresponding Author: Martin MacInnis, PhD

7 **Abstract**

8 **Purpose:** Although running traditionally relies on critical speed (CS) as an indicator of critical
9 intensity, portable inertial measurement units (IMUs) offer a potential solution for estimating
10 running mechanical power to assess critical power (CP) in runners. The purpose of this study
11 was to determine whether CS and CP differ when assessed using the Stryd device, a portable
12 IMU, and if two running bouts are sufficient to determine CS and CP.

13 **Methods:** On an outdoor running track, ten trained runners ($\dot{V}O_{2max}$, 59.0 [4.2] ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹)
14 performed three running time-trials (TT) between 1200 and 4400m on separate days. CS and CP
15 were derived from two-parameter hyperbolic speed-time and power-time models, respectively,
16 using two (CS_{2TT} CP_{2TT}) and three (CS_{3TT} CP_{3TT}) time trials. Subsequently, runners performed
17 constant intensity running for 800m at their calculated CS_{3TT} and CP_{3TT}.

18 **Results:** Running at the calculated CS_{3TT} speed (3.88 [0.44] m·s⁻¹) elicited an average Stryd
19 running power (271 [28] W) not different from the calculated CP_{3TT} (270 [28]; p=0.940; d=0.02),
20 with excellent agreement between the two values (ICC=0.980). The CS_{2TT} (3.97 [0.42] m·s⁻¹)
21 was not significantly higher than CS_{3TT} (3.89 [0.44] m·s⁻¹; p=0.178; d=0.46); however, CP_{2TT}
22 (278 [29] W) was significantly greater than CP_{3TT} (p=0.041; d=0.75).

23 **Conclusion:** The running intensities at CS and CP were similar, supporting the use of running
24 power (Stryd) as a metric of aerobic fitness and exercise prescription, and two trials provided a
25 reasonable, albeit higher, estimate of CS and CP.

26

27 **Keywords:** Inertial measurement unit, running power, critical intensity, exercise training,
28 exercise performance

29

30 **Introduction**

31 Critical power (CP), the asymptote of the power-duration relationship, is a fundamental
32 concept in sport science and exercise physiology. As CP demarcates the boundary between
33 heavy and severe intensities of exercise, exercise below CP is characterized by a metabolic
34 steady state, whereas exercising above CP elicits continually increasing oxygen consumption
35 rates ($\dot{V}O_2$) and blood lactate concentrations as well as accelerated performance fatiguability.¹
36 Accordingly, CP is important for quantifying aerobic fitness and developing individualized
37 exercise training programs.

38 For cycling, power output (PO) is derived from the product of angular velocity and
39 torque measured at the pedal, crank, bottom bracket, or rear wheel, facilitating measures of CP;
40 however, technical issues have limited the adoption of CP to running. While the lack of a
41 dissipative external load makes it difficult to quantify running PO, a well-agreed upon approach
42 to evaluate mechanical running PO also does not exist.² Thus, speed has historically been used to
43 derive an intensity-duration relationship for running, with the asymptote of the speed-time
44 relationship termed critical speed (CS). Similar to cycling CP, the CS is derived from multiple
45 maximal bouts, with a fixed running distance or speed, selected to elicit task completion or
46 failure between 2 and 15 minutes.^{3,4} Consumer technologies that provide users with a running
47 power metric, including Stryd,⁵ could facilitate the derivation of a power-duration relationship
48 and identification of CP for running.

49 The Stryd running power device utilizes a portable inertial measurement unit (IMU) and
50 generates a running power metric. While there is a strong linear relationship between Stryd
51 running power and running speed,^{6,7} whether CS and CP represent equivalent intensities has not
52 been explored. Using the Stryd running power device, the purpose of this investigation was to
53 determine whether the running intensities associated with CS and CP differ and whether CS and
54 CP differ when measured with two, as opposed to three, time trials (TT).

55 **Methods**

56 Ten (7 male; 3 female) recreationally active or trained/developmental runners (mean
57 [SD]; age = 29 [7] years; body mass = 65.5 [9.4] kg; height = 170.7 [8.1] cm; $\dot{V}O_{2max}$, 59.0
58 [4.2] ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹) were recruited using convenience sampling. Written informed consent was
59 provided by the runners to participate in the experimental procedures, which were approved by
60 the University of Calgary Conjoint Health Research Ethics Board (REB20-1377). Participants
61 were free of medical conditions and injuries that could interfere with metabolic and
62 cardiorespiratory exercise responses. All participants provided their own lightweight running
63 shoes and wore the same shoes for all testing sessions.

64 ***Experimental Design***

65 Participants visited the University of Calgary for a total of five visits separated by at least
66 48 hours. Visit 1 consisted of a step-ramp-step treadmill running test to determine $\dot{V}O_{2max}$.⁸ All
67 subsequent visits were performed on a 400m outdoor athletic track with running power data
68 collected using the Stryd running power device (Model v.19, firmware v.2.1.16, software v.4;
69 Boulder, CO, USA).

70 For all visits on the outdoor running track, participants performed the same standardized
71 warm-up consisting of 800m of running at 2.4 m·s⁻¹ as well as any additional dynamic
72 movements deemed necessary to prepare for the TTs by each runner. Runners were instructed to
73 complete each TT as quickly as possible.

74 In a randomized order, visits 2 and 3 consisted of a 1200m (i.e., 3-lap) and 2400m (i.e., 6-
75 lap) TT, as recommended by Stryd.⁹ For each runner, the average running speed and power from

76 these TTs were used to construct 2-parameter hyperbolic speed-time and power-time models, with
77 asymptotes of CS (CS_{2TT}) and CP (CP_{2TT}), respectively. For visit 4, runners completed a third TT
78 for which the distance (i.e., 3600m, 4000m, or 4400m) was selected to require approximately 15
79 min based on the CS_{2TT} model. Using the average running speed and power from all three
80 running trials, speed-time and power-time relationships were constructed to again calculate each
81 runner's CS and CP (i.e., CS_{3TT} and CP_{3TT} , respectively).

82 Subsequently, for visit 5, participants were paced at their calculated CS_{3TT} for 800m, and
83 following a short familiarization period, participants self-paced an 800m run at their calculated
84 CP_{3TT} using a sport watch (Garmin; Olathe, KS, USA) connected to their Stryd running pod to
85 view real-time running power. The difference in average running speed for the 800m run at
86 CS_{3TT} (i.e., CS_{800}) and the calculated CS_{3TT} (Table 1; $0.00 [0.03] \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) was not statistically
87 significant ($p=0.790$, $d=0.09$), indicating that the runners were accurately paced; however, the
88 average running power during the 800m run at CP_{3TT} (i.e., CP_{800}) was significantly greater ($+4$
89 $[6] \text{ W}$; Table 1) than the calculated CP_{3TT} ($p=0.037$; $d=0.77$), indicating that self-pacing using
90 the sport watch was slightly too fast. Accordingly, only the CS_{800} trial was used for analysis.

91 **Statistical Analysis**

92 Paired Student's t tests were used to compare pairs of variables, with effect sizes
93 calculated using Cohen's d for paired variables.¹⁰ Agreement between pairs of variables was
94 assessed by Bland-Altman analyses (with 95% limits of agreement) and two-way mixed effects,
95 absolute agreement, single rater intraclass correlation models.

96 Data are presented as mean [standard deviation (SD)]. Statistical significance was set at
97 an α level of < 0.05 . Statistical analyses were performed using Statistical Package for the Social
98 Sciences (SPSS, version 26, IBM, Armonk, NY, USA), with data visualization performed using
99 Prism (version 9.5.1 for macOS, GraphPad Software, San Diego, California USA).

100 **Results**

101 The CS_{3TT} was not significantly different from the CS_{2TT} (Table 1; $p=0.178$; $d=0.46$),
102 with excellent reliability ($ICC=0.951$; 95% C.I.= $0.809-0.988$) and low bias ($-0.08 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$; LOA: $-$
103 0.43 to $0.27 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$; Figure 1) between variables. In contrast, the CP_{3TT} was significantly lower
104 than the CP_{2TT} (Table 1; $p=0.041$; $d=0.75$); however, there was still excellent reliability
105 ($ICC=0.954$; 95% C.I.= $0.741-0.990$) and low bias (-7 W ; LOA: -27 to 12 W ; Figure 1) between
106 variables.

107 The average running power measured during the CS_{800} trial was not significantly
108 different from the calculated CP_{3TT} (Table 1; $p=0.940$; $d=0.02$), and there was excellent
109 reliability ($ICC=0.980$; 95% C.I.= $0.918-0.995$) and low bias (0 W ; LOA: -16 to 16 W ; Figure 2)
110 between variables.

111 **Discussion**

112 The results from this investigation indicated that the running critical intensity is not
113 different when measured in units of speed (i.e., CS) or running power (i.e., CP from Stryd), as
114 running at CS_{3TT} produced the running power associated with CP_{3TT} . Furthermore, two running
115 trials (i.e., 1200m and 2400m) provided measures of CS and CP that were similar (2.1% and
116 2.5% higher, respectively) to the CS and CP derived from three running trials (i.e., adding a third
117 trial between 3600-4400m), suggesting that a third trial may not be necessary to derive a
118 reasonable estimate of each parameter.

119 In support of our finding that CS and CP represent the same intensity of running on a flat
120 outdoor track, strong associations were observed between running speed and Stryd running
121 power^{6,7} and between Stryd assessments of CP and measures of running fitness.¹¹ In slight

122 contrast to our primary finding, CS_{3TT} was not different from CS_{2TT} , whereas CP_{3TT} was
123 significantly lower than CP_{2TT} . Although these results could suggest that running speed and
124 running power do not represent equivalent exercise intensities, the relative differences, bias, and
125 LOA between pairs of critical intensity measures were comparable (Figure 1). Thus, the lack of
126 difference between CS_{2TT} and CS_{3TT} may be the result of a type II error. Even if there are true
127 differences between running critical intensity measured with two or three TTs, the small
128 differences in units of speed (~ 0.3 km/h) and power (~ 7 W) suggest that the addition of a third
129 TT may not meaningfully impact applications of CS and CP for many individuals. Nevertheless,
130 we previously demonstrated that Stryd running power provided a more accurate model to
131 estimate the oxygen cost of treadmill running sessions compared to running speed,⁸ suggesting
132 that speed and Stryd power are not always interchangeable. Indeed, the relative oxygen cost of
133 running may vary in response to increasing or decreasing running speeds,¹² indicating that a
134 running power metric, like Stryd power, could more accurately represent the metabolic
135 requirements of running than running speed.

136 **Conclusion**

137 In conclusion, this study demonstrated that the intensity associated with CS_{3TT} is similar
138 to that of CP_{3TT} derived from Stryd and that two TTs (1200m and 2400m) are sufficient to
139 estimate the CS or CP. Future investigations evaluating Stryd CP measures should consider
140 evaluating the metric under conditions of varying gradient, wind speeds, and terrain, to assess the
141 potential value of this running metric to inform training strategies in variable conditions.

142 **Acknowledgments**

143 All authors declare substantial contribution to the manuscript and no conflicts of interest.
144 MJM has received several foot pods from Stryd for research purposes; however, Stryd were not
145 involved in the conduct, analysis, or reporting of this study, and MJM has no professional
146 relationship with Stryd. This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering
147 Research Council of Canada (NSERC; grant number RGPIN-2018-06424), start-up funding from
148 the Faculty of Kinesiology (University of Calgary), the NSERC CREATE Wearable Technology
149 and Collaboration (We-TRAC) Training Program, and Alberta Innovates.

150 **References**

- 151 1. Poole DC, Burnley M, Vanhatalo A, Rossiter HB, Jones AM. Critical power: an
152 important fatigue threshold in exercise physiology. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016;48(11):2320.
153 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000939
- 154 2. Williams KR, Cavanagh PR. A model for the calculation of mechanical power during
155 distance running. *J Biomech.* 1983;16(2):115-128. doi:10.1016/0021-9290(83)90035-0
- 156 3. Kranenburg KJ, Smith DJ. Comparison of critical speed determined from track running
157 and treadmill tests in elite runners. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1996;28(5):614-618.
158 doi:10.1097/00005768-199605000-00013
- 159 4. Broxterman R, Ade C, Craig J, Wilcox S, Schlup S, Barstow T. The relationship between
160 critical speed and the respiratory compensation point: coincidence or equivalence. *Eur J Sport*
161 *Sci.* 2015;15(7):631-639. doi:10.1080/17461391.2014.966764
- 162 5. Jaén-Carrillo D, Roche-Seruendo LE, Cartón-Llorente A, Ramírez-Campillo R, García-
163 Pinillos F. Mechanical power in endurance running: a scoping review on sensors for power
164 output estimation during running. *Sensors.* 2020;20(22):6482. doi:10.3390/s20226482
- 165 6. García-Pinillos F, Latorre-Román PÁ, Roche-Seruendo LE, García-Ramos A. Prediction
166 of power output at different running velocities through the two-point method with the Stryd™
167 power meter. *Gait Posture.* 2019;68:238-243. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.11.037
- 168 7. Taboga P, Giovanelli N, Spinazzè E, et al. Running power: lab based vs. portable devices
169 measurements and its relationship with aerobic power. *Eur J Sport Sci.* 2022;22(10):1555-1568.
170 doi:10.1080/17461391.2021.1966104
- 171 8. van Rassel CR, Ajayi OO, Sales KM, Azevedo RA, Murias JM, MacInnis MJ. A " Step-
172 Ramp-Step" protocol to identify running speed and power associated with the maximal
173 metabolic steady state. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2023;55(3):534-547.
174 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003066
- 175 9. Stryd T. Running power: Training and racing with power. 2023. Accessed June 1st, 2023.
176 [https://storage.googleapis.com/stryd_static_assets/power-training-manual/power-training-](https://storage.googleapis.com/stryd_static_assets/power-training-manual/power-training-manual-v14.pdf)
177 [manual-v14.pdf](https://storage.googleapis.com/stryd_static_assets/power-training-manual/power-training-manual-v14.pdf)
- 178 10. Cohen J. Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychol Bull.*
179 1992;112:1155-1159.
- 180 11. Ruiz-Alias SA, Olaya-Cuartero J, Ñancupil-Andrade AA, García-Pinillos F. 9/3-minute
181 running critical power test: Mechanical threshold location With respect to ventilatory thresholds
182 and maximum oxygen uptake. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2022;1(aop):1-8.
183 doi:10.1123/ijsp.2022-0069
- 184 12. Batliner ME, Kipp S, Grabowski AM, Kram R, Byrnes WC. Does metabolic rate increase
185 linearly with running speed in all distance runners? *Sports Med Int Open.* 2018;2(01):E1-E8.
186 doi:10.1055/s-0043-122068
187

188 **Figure captions**

189

190 **Figure 1.** Relationships between the critical speed (CS) and critical power (CP) calculated from
191 two (2TT) and three time trials (3TT). Panels A (CS_{3TT} and CS_{2TT}) and B (CP_{3TT} and CP_{2TT})
192 depict Bland-Altman analysis, with lines indicating bias (solid line) and limits of agreement
193 (LOA, dashed line). Panels C (CS_{3TT} and CS_{2TT}) and D (CP_{3TT} and CP_{2TT}) depict the
194 relationships between values. $n=10$ for all panels.

195


196 **Figure 2.** Relationships between the three time trial critical power (CP_{3TT}) and the running
197 power at critical speed measured over 800 m (CS_{800}). Panel A depicts Bland-Altman analysis,
198 with lines indicating bias (solid line) and limits of agreement (LOA, dashed line). Panel B
199 depicts the relationships between values. $n=10$ for all panels.

Table 1. Calculated critical speed (CS) and critical power (CP) from two and three time-trials, and the measured running speed and power during 800m of running at CS_{3TT} (i.e., CS₈₀₀) and CP_{3TT} (i.e., CS₈₀₀).


Subject	$\dot{V}O_{2max}$ (mL·kg ⁻¹ ·min ⁻¹)	<i>Calculated</i>				<i>Measured</i>			
		CS _{3TT}	CS _{2TT}	CP _{3TT}	CP _{2TT}	Speed at CS ₈₀₀	Speed at CP ₈₀₀	Power at CS ₈₀₀	Power at CP ₈₀₀
		(m·s ⁻¹)	(m·s ⁻¹)	(W)	(W)	(m·s ⁻¹)	(m·s ⁻¹)	(W)	(W)
1	57.5	3.98	3.99	263	258	3.94	4.30	255	273
2	68.5	4.44	4.51	309	325	4.40	4.60	317	323
3	58.1	3.93	4.26	288	302	3.94	4.02	277	285
4	62.4	3.94	3.73	236	234	4.02	3.90	240	246
5	55.3	3.95	4.03	272	283	3.94	3.98	275	271
6	55.2	3.35	3.42	300	309	3.36	3.29	307	300
7	57.1	3.33	3.75	225	249	3.33	3.28	228	225
8	57.5	3.37	3.43	297	289	3.36	3.67	283	301
9	62.4	4.65	4.67	253	260	4.65	4.57	262	258
10	56.5	3.93	3.90	260	269	3.90	3.90	261	264
Average	59.0	3.89	3.97	270	278	3.88	3.95	271	275
SD	4.2	0.44	0.42	28	29	0.44	0.46	28	29

$\dot{V}O_{2max}$, maximal oxygen uptake; 2TT, two time trials; 3TT, three time trials.


A




B




C



D



A



B

