

The Relationship Between the Moderate–Heavy Boundary and Critical Speed in Running

Ben Hunter,¹ Samuel Meyler,² Ed Maunder,³ Tobias H. Cox,³ and Daniel Muniz-Pumares²

¹School of Human Sciences, London Metropolitan University, London, United Kingdom; ²School of Life and Medical Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, United Kingdom; ³Sports Performance Research Institute New Zealand, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

Purpose: Training characteristics such as duration, frequency, and intensity can be manipulated to optimize endurance performance, with an enduring interest in the role of training-intensity distribution to enhance training adaptations. Training intensity is typically separated into 3 zones, which align with the moderate-, heavy-, and severe-intensity domains. While estimates of the heavy- and severe-intensity boundary, that is, the critical speed (CS), can be derived from habitual training, determining the moderate–heavy boundary or first threshold (T1) requires testing, which can be costly and time-consuming. Therefore, the aim of this review was to examine the percentage at which T1 occurs relative to CS.

Results: A systematic literature search yielded 26 studies with 527 participants, grouped by mean CS into low (11.5 km·h⁻¹; 95% CI, 11.2–11.8), medium (13.4 km·h⁻¹; 95% CI, 11.2–11.8), and high (16.0 km·h⁻¹; 95% CI, 15.7–16.3) groups. Across all studies, T1 occurred at 82.3% of CS (95% CI, 81.1–83.6). In the medium- and high-CS groups, T1 occurred at a higher fraction of CS (83.2% CS, 95% CI, 81.3–85.1, and 84.2% CS, 95% CI, 82.3–86.1, respectively) relative to the low-CS group (80.6% CS, 95% CI, 78.0–83.2). **Conclusions:** The study highlights some uncertainty in the fraction of T1 relative to CS, influenced by inconsistent approaches in determining both boundaries. However, our findings serve as a foundation for remote analysis and prescription of exercise intensity, although testing is recommended for more precise applications.

Keywords: testing, monitoring, intensity domains, endurance training, exercise prescription

Training characteristics including duration, frequency, and intensity can be manipulated to maximize endurance performance.^{1,2} There is an enduring interest in the role of training intensity distribution across different intensity “zones” to elicit distinct training adaptations as well as helping to identify “best practice.”^{1,3,4} Several approaches have been proposed to delineate these zones, but most commonly they align with 3 distinct physiological domains: moderate, heavy, and severe.⁵ Moderate intensity is characterized by the rapid attainment of oxygen uptake (VO₂) steady state within 2 to 3 minutes, and blood [lactate] is not substantially elevated above resting levels.⁶ Heavy-intensity exercise is typified by delayed attainment of a VO₂ steady state, caused by the emergence of the slow component of VO₂ kinetics, as well as stable metabolite concentrations above resting values.⁷ The severe-intensity domain occurs above the heavy-severe boundary, where a steady state is not attainable in respiratory and metabolic responses, and given sufficient time eventually leads to the attainment of an individual’s maximum oxygen uptake (VO₂max) and task failure.⁷ These domains are separated by 2 distinct “thresholds,” although these may behave more like phase transitions.⁸

The transition between the moderate and heavy domains (T1) is typically quantified as either lactate threshold (LT),⁹ gas exchange threshold (GET),¹⁰ or the first ventilatory threshold


(VT1).¹¹ The demarcation of the heavy–severe boundary is typically represented by either critical speed (CS),¹² maximum lactate steady state,⁹ or respiratory compensation point.¹⁰ There is some conjecture as to the most accurate representation of the heavy-severe domain boundary.^{13–17} In essence, the heavy-severe boundary represents the greatest work rate at which a metabolic steady state can occur which is conjectured to be most appropriately captured by CS.¹⁶ Indeed, it has been proposed that the CS may be the most appropriate method of determining the heavy-severe boundary.^{16,18} Furthermore, estimates of the CS, and its analogy for cycling, critical power, can be derived from habitual training data or a set of time trials.^{19–21} Importantly, these approaches do not necessarily require costly and time-consuming laboratory-based testing, thus permitting remote determination which may be more accessible for amateur runners.¹⁹ The latter is an important distinction given that the determination of T1 as LT necessitates capillary blood sampling, whereas GET and VT1 require an online gas analyzer. If T1, without specific testing, can be expressed as a percentage of CS, this would enable more accessible exercise intensity prescription across all exercise intensity domains, or the remote monitoring of training intensity distribution.

Despite considerable attention being directed toward CS, the relationship between T1 and CS during running has not been systematically studied. To address this limitation, the aim of this study was to conduct a systematic review and quasi meta-analysis to determine the percentage at which T1 occurs relative to CS. It has previously been observed that the heavy and severe domains become compressed in elite endurance athletes.²² Therefore, a further aim was to examine whether the percentage at which T1 occurs relative to CS differs between fitness levels.

Meyler  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0976-697X>

Maunder  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2329-959X>

Muniz-Pumares  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6748-9870>

Hunter (b.hunter@londonmet.ac.uk) is corresponding author,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4190-4543>

Methods

Search Strategy

A systematic search was conducted to identify relevant papers in 2 scientific databases: PubMed and Scopus. The focus of this review was on journal articles published in English that described measures of both CS and T1. Articles published up to February 28, 2023, were reviewed originally, with an updated search taking place on April 3, 2024. Title, abstract, and keyword search fields were searched using the following search strategy:

((“critical speed”) OR (“critical velocity”))
AND ((“run”) OR (“running”)).

Screening Procedure

The selection process consisted of 4 steps using Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines: (1) duplicates were removed after combining results from the 2 databases; (2) an initial title and abstract screen was performed by independent reviewers (Meyler and Cox), and (3) 2 independent reviewers (Meyler and Hunter) read the full texts based on the inclusion/exclusion criteria detailed below. References of all included studies were checked for additional studies that could be included. At all stages, conflicting decisions were adjudicated by a third reviewer (Hunter at stage 2 and Muniz-Pumares at stage 3). Studies were included if they met the following inclusion criteria: (1) CS was reported; (2) either GET, LT1, or VT1 was reported; (3) participants were 18+ years; and (4) written in the English language. Studies were excluded if they: (1) did not meet the inclusion criteria above; (2) were book chapters, review articles, case studies, letters, short communications, conference proceedings, or other nonpeer-reviewed literature; (3) reported on animal subjects; and (4) did not examine running.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted by Hunter, Meyler, Muniz-Pumares, and Maunder using a customized form to ensure standardization. Information from each article included: sample size, participant training level, age, sex, protocol used to determine CS, CS, protocol used to determine T1, and speed which elicited T1. Where studies divided participants into subgroups, the mean values from the subgroups were extracted separately for further analysis. Where T1 or CS was not reported, but the relative position of it relative to the CS or T1 was, this percentage was used to calculate the mean speed at either CS or T1 for the group. Where T1 or CS was reported in a figure, the authors were contacted to confirm the values required.

Statistical Analysis

Following data extraction, the mean percentage at which T1 occurred relative to CS was calculated. Prior to this, each study was checked for normality of data distribution. None of the included studies stated that either T1 or CS data were skewed or not normally distributed. The mean CS from each of the included articles was grouped into bins of equal size ($0.49 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$), which were then plotted against the cumulative frequency. The total number of participants (n) of the included articles was divided into 3 to form cut-offs (ie, $n/3$ and $2n/3$). If the cut-off coincided with a bin, then all articles up to and including the bin were included. These cut-offs were then applied to group studies into low ($\leq 12 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$), medium ($\leq 14 > 12 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$), and high CS ($> 14 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$) based on the cumulative frequency. Sample size weighted means and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated for CS in each group and overall. Furthermore, sample size weighted means and 95% CI were calculated for the overall percentage of CS at which T1 occurred, and for the percentage of CS at which T1 occurred in each group. Hedges g was used to calculate effect sizes between the percentage of CS at which T1




Figure 1 — Flow diagram of the search strategy. CS indicates critical speed; T1, first threshold.

Table 1 Participant Characteristics of Included Studies

	Sample size	Sex	Description	Age	$\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$ (mL·kg ⁻¹ ·min ⁻¹)	CS (km·h ⁻¹)	T1 (km·h ⁻¹)
Ade et al ²³ (2014)	71	40 M, 31 F	Healthy adults	23 (5)	48.0 (7.9)	11.9 (2.2)	8.2 (1.6)
Balasekaran et al ²⁴ (2023)	12	NR	Endurance-trained	32 (7)	57.6 (5.4)	15.0 (1.4)	13.4 (1.6)
Balasekaran et al ²⁴ (2023)*	9	NR	Sprint-trained	27 (9)	51.1 (3.6)	11.5 (0.8)	10.5 (0.8)
Bosquet et al ²⁵ (2006)	17	M	Middle- and long-distance runners	23 (3)	66.5 (7.3)	16.1 (1.9)	13.6 (1.7)
Florence and Weir ²⁶ (1997)	12	6 M, 6 F	Marathon runners	29(4)	45.0–75.0	16.0 (1.7)	14.5 (1.7)
Follador et al ²⁷ (2021)	42	31 M, 11 F	Recreational runners	32 (6)	52.5 (6.6)	14.0 (2.0)	12.1 (2.0)
Fukuda et al ²⁸ (2011)	14	M	Collegiate hockey and rugby players	21 (2)	51.2 (2.8)	17.3 (1.1)	10.1 (1.5)
Galbraith et al ²⁹ (2014)	14	M	Highly trained endurance runners	28 (8)	69.8 (6.3)	17.7 (1.8)	15.7 (1.2)
Hogg et al ³⁰ (2018)*	12	8 M, 4 F	Recreationally active	30 (9)	54.0 (5.8)	12.5 (0.1)	10.0 (1.2)
Hogg et al ³⁰ (2018)*	12	8 M, 4 F	Recreationally active	30 (9)	54.0 (0.7)	12.5 (0.1)	9.7 (1.5)
Hunter et al ³¹ (2021)	10	M	Recreationally trained runners	29 (10)	53.0 (5.0)	14.2 (1.5)	11.5 (1.6)
Kalva-Filho et al ³² (2024)	14	NR	Futsal players	21 (2)	41.0 (8.9)	10.1 (1.1)	9.4 (0.7)
Kramer et al ³³ (2018)	15	M	Soccer players	23 (3)	50.5 (4.0)	14.3 (1.9)	11.3 (1.2)
Kramer et al ³⁴ (2019)	14	M	Field athletes	21 (2)	44.1 (4.3)	13.6 (2.0)	10.5 (1.3)
Kramer et al ³⁵ (2020)	43	NR	Athletic (soccer: n = 16; rugby: n = 14; hockey: n = 5; mixed martial arts: n = 4; track athletes: n = 4)	23 (4)	50.0 (8.6)	13.5 (1.8)	11.1 (1.3)
Kramer et al ³⁵ (2020)*	25	NR	Nonathletic (gym-based training: n = 14; recreational running: n = 8; recreational CrossFit: n = 3)	25 (3)	48.3 (7.6)	10.8 (2.0)	9.1 (2.1)
Kranenberg and Smith ³⁶ (1996)	9	M	Highly trained runners	26 (5)	67.7 (4.1)	17.4 (1.2)	16.6 (1.4)
Kuo et al ³⁷ (2017)	12	M	Sprinters	21 (2)	55.0 (1.0)	11.4 (0.5)	11.2 (0.3)
Myrkos et al ³⁸ (2023)	24	9 M, 15 F	Recreationally active	21 (3)	57.7 (7.6)	12.0 (1.5)	10.1 (1.2)
Nimmerichter et al ³⁹ (2017)	16	M	Trained endurance athletes	30 (7)	63.6 (6.9)	13.5 (1.3)	9.6 (0.9)
Nixon et al ¹⁸ (2021)	10	M	Well-trained competitive (runners n = 7, triathletes n = 3)	23 (5)	63.0 (4.0)	16.4 (1.3)	14.5 (1.2)
Perez et al ⁴⁰ (2024)	10	7 M, 3 F	Middle-distance runners	19,3 (1.7)	60.3 (5.1)	18.3 (1.1)	14.6 (0.7)
Pettitt et al ⁴¹ (2012)	14	F	Collegiate distance runners	19 (1)	54.8 (3.3)	15.9 (1.5)	14.0 (0.8)
Ruiz-Alias et al ⁴² (2022)	15	NR	Athletes	31 (10)	66.3 (7.2)	16.6 (1.6)	13.7 (1.3)
Schnitzler et al ⁴³ (2010)	29	M	Moderately trained athletes	25 (7)	NR	13.1 (0.7)	12.2 (0.5)
Silva et al ⁴⁴ (2005)	11	NR	Physically active adults	21 (2)	48.9 (5.8)	12.0 (1.8)	11.1 (1.7)
Smith et al ⁴⁵ (2001)	8	M	Recreationally active subjects	28 (5)	54.9 (3.2)	14.4 (1.1)	11.6 (0.9)
Sperlich et al ⁴⁶ (2014)	15	M	Well-trained runners	25 (5)	71.1 (11.6)	14.6 (1.6)	12.5 (1.3)
Thomas et al ⁴⁷ (2020)*	9	NR	Moderately active, nonathletic	23 (4)	46.2 (6.6)	10.1 (1.9)	8.9 (3.3)
Thomas et al ⁴⁷ (2020)*	9	NR	Moderately active, nonathletic	23 (3,79)	44.2 (5.4)	11.2 (1.7)	9.4 (2.5)

Abbreviation: CS, critical speed; NR, not reported; T1, first threshold; $\dot{V}O_2\text{max}$, maximum oxygen uptake. Note: Duplicate study titles with asterisks represent subgroups within studies.

Table 2 Methodological Characteristics of Included Studies

	Ramp protocol of T1 (start speed, increments)	Determination of T1	CS protocol	Surface
Ade et al ²³ (2014)	IND, 1 min stages, 0.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	Four T _{lim} trials at 90%–120% sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Balasekaran et al ²⁴ (2023)	40%–60% V̇O ₂ max, 4 min stages, 4%–5% V̇O ₂ max increments	LT1	Minimum of 2-to-3 T _{lim} trials at 110%–140% sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Bosquet et al ²⁵ (2006)	10 km·h ⁻¹ , 2 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	Four T _{lim} trials at 95%, 100%, 105%, 110%, and 120% of sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Florence et al ²⁶ (1997)	7.9 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 0.7 km·h ⁻¹ increments	VT1	Four T _{lim} trials at velocities from 13.0 to 21.6 km·h ⁻¹	Treadmill
Follador et al ²⁷ (2021)	8 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 1.1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	Three TTs for 1200, 2400, and 3600 m	GXT treadmill TT track
Fukuda et al ²⁸ (2011)	10 km·h ⁻¹ , 2 min stages, 2 km·h ⁻¹ increments until 16 km·h ⁻¹ then, 1 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments until 18 km·h ⁻¹ then, 1 min stages 2% gradient increments	VT1	Intermittent critical velocity test	Treadmill
Galbraith et al ²⁹ (2014)	IND, 4 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Three TTs for 1200, 2400, and 3600 m	GXT treadmill TT track
Hogg et al ³⁰ (2018)	IND, 4 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Three TTs for 1200, 2400, and 3600 m	GXT treadmill TTs track
Hunter et al ³¹ (2021)	8 km·h ⁻¹ , 0.5 min stages, 0.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	Four T _{lim} trials at 60% Δ, 70% Δ, 80% Δ, and 100% sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Kalva-Filho ³² (2024)	8 km·h ⁻¹ , 3 min stages, 0.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	3MT (intermittent protocol)	Futsal pitch
Kramer et al ³³ (2018)	8 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track
Kramer et al ³⁴ (2019)	8 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track
Kramer et al ³⁵ (2020)	IND, 1 min stages, 0.8 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track
Kranenberg et al ³⁶ (1996)	IND, 2 min stages until VT1, 0.8 km·h ⁻¹ increments, then 1 min stages, 0.8 km·h ⁻¹ increments, then 1 min stages, 2% gradient increments	VT1	Three TTs for 907, 2267.5, and 4081.5 m Three TTs for 3, 7, and 13 min	Track Treadmill
Kuo et al ³⁷ (2017)	10.4 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 0.65 km·h ⁻¹ increments until 14.3 km·h ⁻¹ , then 1% gradient increments	VT1	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

	Ramp protocol of T1 (start speed, increments)	Determination of T1	CS protocol	Surface
Myrkos et al ³⁸ (2023)	8 km·h ⁻¹ , 3 min stages, 1.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Three T _{lim} trials at 90, 100, and 110% peak treadmill speed	Treadmill
Nimmerichter et al ³⁹ (2017)	6 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 0.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	VT1	Three T _{lim} trials at 70% Δ, and 98% and 110% of sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Nixon et al ¹⁸ (2021)	IND, 3 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Four T _{lim} trials at 90%, 95%, 100%, and 105% sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Perez et al ⁴⁰ (2024)	12.0 km·h ⁻¹ (M) and 11.8 km·h ⁻¹ (F), 1 min stages, 0.8 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track
Pettitt et al ⁴¹ (2012)	10.4 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 0.64 km·h ⁻¹ increment until 14.21 km·h ⁻¹ , then 1 min stages, 1% gradient increments	GET	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track
Ruiz-Alias et al ⁴² (2022)	9 km·h ⁻¹ , 3 min stages, 1 km·h ⁻¹ increments	VT1	Two TTs for 3 and 9 min	Treadmill
Schnitzler et al ⁴³ (2010)	11 km·h ⁻¹ , 4 min stages, 0.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Three TTs for 3, 6, and 12 min	GXT treadmill TT track
Silva et al ⁴⁴ (2005)	IND, 3 min stages, 0.5 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Two TTs for 3000 and 500 m	GXT treadmill TT track
Smith and Jones ⁴⁵ (2001)	IND, 4 min stages, 1.0 km·h ⁻¹ increments	LT1	Four T _{lim} trials at 100%, 105%, 110%, 120% sV̇O ₂ max	Treadmill
Sperlich et al ⁴⁶ (2014)	7 km·h ⁻¹ , 1 min stages, 1.0 km·h ⁻¹ increments	VT1	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track
Thomas et al ⁴⁷ (2020)	IND, 1 min stages, 0.8 km·h ⁻¹ increments	GET	3MT	GXT treadmill 3MT track

Abbreviations: 3MT, 3-minute all-out test; CS, critical speed; F, female; GET, gas exchange threshold; GXT, graded exercise test; IND, individualized start speed; LT1, first lactate threshold; M, male; T1, first threshold; TT, time trial; T_{lim}, time to task failure; VT1, first ventilatory threshold; sV̇O₂max, speed that elicited maximal oxygen uptake.

occurred in the 3 groups. Data were visually displayed as forest plots using Graphpad Prism (Prism 9, Graphpad Software).

Results

Search Results

A total of 1243 articles were identified in the original database search, 26 of which met the inclusion criteria. No additional articles were identified through searches of reference lists. A diagram outlining the screening procedure is given in Figure 1.

Participant Characteristics

Table 1 gives participant characteristics of the included studies. The pooled weighted mean CS across the included studies was 13.6 km·h⁻¹ (95% CI, 13.4–13.8). The CS of the low, medium, and

high CS subgroups was 11.5 km·h⁻¹ (95% CI, 11.2–11.8), 13.4 km·h⁻¹ (95% CI, 13.2–13.7), and 16.0 km·h⁻¹ (95% CI, 15.7–16.3), respectively. Thirteen of the included studies tested only male participants,^{18,25,28,29,31,33,34,36,37,39,43,45,46} and 6 of the studies tested a mixture of males and females,^{23,26,27,30,38,40} with only 1 recruiting solely female participants.⁴¹ Six studies did not report the sex of the participants.^{24,32,35,42,44,47}

Study Characteristics

Of the approaches used to estimate CS, 9 studies used a series of constant work rate trials,^{18,23–26,31,38,39,45} 8 used the 3-minute all-out test (3MT),^{33–35,37,40,41,46,47} 6 used time trials,^{27,29,30,42–44} 2 studies used an intermittent 3-minute all-out test protocol,^{28,32} and one study compared both constant work rate and time trials.³⁶ Ten studies reported GET,^{23,25,27,31,33–35,40,41,47} 9 reported LT1,^{18,24,29,30,32,38,43–45} and 7 reported VT1^{26,28,36,37,39,42,46} as




Figure 2 — Forest plot of the included studies for the percentage at which T1 occurred relative to CS. The white squares and error bars represent the mean and 95% CI of the study. The black diamonds and error bars represent the pooled mean percentage at which T1 occurred relative to CS and 95% CI for either the subgroups or overall. Duplicate study titles with asterisks represent subgroups within studies. CS indicates critical speed; T1, first threshold.

T1. Further methodological details of the included studies are summarized in Table 2.

T1 as a Fraction of CS

Across all studies, T1 occurred at 82.3% CS (95% CI, 81.1–83.6). In the low, medium, and high CS groups, T1 occurred at 80.6% CS (95% CI, 78.0–83.2), 83.2% CS (95% CI, 81.3–85.1), and 84.2% CS (95% CI, 82.3–86.1), respectively (Figure 2). These data are summarized in Figure 3. Hedges *g* revealed small effect sizes for the percentage at which T1 occurred in the medium CS group ($g = 0.296$) and high CS group ($g = 0.227$) compared with the low CS group. A trivial effect size was noted in the percentage at which T1 occurred between the medium-CS group and the high-CS group ($g = 0.076$).

Discussion

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we have found that T1 occurs at 82.3% CS (95% CI, 81.1–83.6). However, this was associated with a relatively large variance between studies and fitness levels, discussed below. Importantly, the fraction at which T1 occurred relative to CS seemed to be dependent on the fitness level, with small increases in runners with moderate or high CS. This is in accordance with previously reported observations in very highly trained runners, where both the heavy and severe domains tend to be compacted toward the speed associated with $\text{VO}_{2\text{-max}}$.^{22,48} The findings suggest that the heavy domain tends to be more compressed than that of the severe domain. However, the high CS group had a relatively modest pooled mean CS (16.0 $\text{km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$) in comparison to the previously estimated CS of




Figure 3 — Forest plot of the included studies for CS. The white squares and error bars represent the mean and 95% CI of the study. The black diamonds and error bars represent the pooled mean CS and 95% CI for either the subgroups or overall. Duplicate study titles with asterisks represent subgroups within studies. CI indicates confidence interval; CS, critical speed.

elite runners (21.0 km·h⁻¹).^{49,50} Therefore, this phenomenon may only be evident in those with exceptionally high CS.

The fraction at which T1 occurs relative to CS appears to be elevated compared to observed in cycling (ie, critical power),⁵¹ which is consistent with previous comparisons between exercise modalities.⁵² Previously, a “critical intensity” has been demonstrated, whereby metabolic rate and blood lactate are not significantly different between running at CS and cycling at critical power.⁵³ Therefore, this difference is likely due to the position of T1 relative to the peak incremental test work rate and may be linked to the larger VO₂ slow component associated with cycling.^{52,54} It has been posited previously that in participants with little cycling experience, extraneous energetic cost may be due to gripping handlebars or unnecessary torso movement at submaximal work rates.⁵² However, differences in muscle contraction regimen, and lesser elastic energetic contribution in cycling,⁵⁵ are more significant contributors to the greater VO₂ slow component associated with cycling when compared to running.

It is notable that only one of the included studies reported both T1 and CS that were comparable (<2% difference),³⁷ thus supporting previous conclusions that VT1 and critical power are unique work rates.⁵¹ The incongruent findings reported by Kuo et al³⁷ are likely due to differences in temperature between the initial incremental test to determine VT1 (mean temperature: 22.0°C) and the 3-minute all-out test (mean temperature: 34.7°C) conducted outdoors on a track. Therefore, it is likely that environmental conditions will affect the fraction at which T1 occurs relative to CS, possibly by depressing estimates of CS. Therefore, it is recommended that environmental factors are considered when using this approach.

The large pooled variance demonstrated a degree of uncertainty in where T1 occurs relative to CS. This may be due to inconsistent approaches used to determine both the T1 and CS. There was substantial variation in the fraction at which T1 relative to CS was evident when using different methods. Measures of LT occurred at 87.7% CS [95% CI, 86.2–89.3], whereas gas-based measures occurred at a lower percentage of CS (GET: 79.5% CS [95% CI, 77.3–81.8], VT: 81.7% CS [95% CI, 79.4–84.1]). Indeed, ventilatory and lactate performance parameters have been shown to differ during graded exercise tests in running.^{56,57} Furthermore, the studies that reported LT used a variety of different criteria to determine LT including 1 mmol/L above baseline, speed at 2 mmol/L, and a “sustained increase above baseline.” The determination of CS has also previously been shown to be dependent on the methods selected.^{19,58} Therefore, some consideration is warranted by practitioners about how they wish to define both T1 and CS. However, in the current approach, the variation of T1 as a fraction of CS is comparable with previously reported error and sources of biological variability in other thresholds.^{59,60} It should also be recognized that although this is a practical approach, the relative position of thresholds may depend on numerous factors including age,^{61,62} anthropometry,⁶³ sex,^{64,65} and training phase.³⁸ Such factors were not considered substantively in the current review, but may provide an interesting avenue for further research. Furthermore, due to the scope of the review, the findings cannot be extrapolated to other factors which may influence adaptations to training including heart rate, perceived exertion values, and ventilatory measures.

Practical Applications

The findings provide a basis on which remote analysis and prescription of training zones can be performed in runners of a

Table 3 Suggested Multiplication Factors for Level of Runner

	CS	Multiplication factor to approximate T1
Low CS	≤12 km·h ⁻¹	CS × 0.806
Medium CS	12.01–14 km·h ⁻¹	CS × 0.832
High CS	>14 km·h ⁻¹	CS × 0.842

Abbreviations: CS, critical speed; T1, first threshold.

range of abilities. To utilize these findings, we have included a table to outline appropriate factors to approximate T1 from CS (Table 3). However, given the large pool of SD values, caution is warranted when using this approach, and separate testing may be needed for both boundaries to ensure precise prescription. Indeed, greater nuance is especially warranted when prescribing exercise for high-level or elite athletes.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this systematic review and quasi meta-analysis reveals that the first threshold (T1) occurs at approximately 82.3% of critical speed (CS) in runners, with this occurrence influenced by fitness levels. Notably, the heavy domain is more compressed in runners with high CS. Environmental conditions may affect T1 relative to CS, introducing uncertainties. The study provides a foundation for remote analysis and training-zone prescription in runners, but caution is advised due to a large pool of SD, and precise testing for accurate prescription, particularly for high-level athletes, is recommended. Further work could explore the potential to model T1 relative to CS based on factors such as sex, age, and anthropometry and training status.

References

- Haugen T, Sandbakk Ø, Seiler S, Tønnessen E. The training characteristics of world-class distance runners: an integration of scientific literature and results-proven practice. *Sports Med Open*. 2022;8(1): 1–18. doi:10.1186/S40798-022-00438-7
- Jamnick NA, Pettitt RW, Granata C, Pyne DB, Bishop DJ. An examination and critique of current methods to determine exercise intensity. *Sports Med*. 2020;50(10):1729–1756. PubMed ID: 32729096 doi:10.1007/S40279-020-01322-8/FIGURES/13
- Stöggl TL, Sperlich B. The training intensity distribution among well-trained and elite endurance athletes. *Front Physiol*. 2015;6:295. doi:10.3389/FPHYS.2015.00295/BIBTEX
- Filipas L, Bonato M, Gallo G, Codella R. Effects of 16 weeks of pyramidal and polarized training intensity distributions in well-trained endurance runners. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2022;32(3): 498–511. PubMed ID: 34792817 doi:10.1111/SMS.14101
- Coates AM, Joyner MJ, Little JP, Jones AM, Gibala MJ. A perspective on high-intensity interval training for performance and health. *Sports Med*. 2023;53(1):85–96. doi:10.1007/S40279-023-01938-6
- Poole DC, Richardson RS. Determinants of oxygen uptake. implications for exercise testing. *Sports Med*. 1997;24(5):308–320. PubMed ID: 9368277 doi:10.2165/00007256-199724050-00003
- Poole DC, Jones AM. Oxygen uptake kinetics. *Compr Physiol*. 2012; 2(2):933–996. PubMed ID: 23798293 doi:10.1002/cphy.c100072
- Pethick J, Winter SL, Burnley M. Physiological evidence that the critical torque is a phase transition not a threshold. *Med Sci Sports*

- Exerc.* 2020;52(11):2390–2401. doi:10.1249/mss.0000000000002389
9. Faude O, Kindermann W, Meyer T. Lactate threshold concepts: how valid are they? *Sports Med.* 2009;39(6):469–490. PubMed ID: 19453206 doi:10.2165/00007256-200939060-00003/FIGURES/TAB6
 10. Beaver WL, Wasserman K, Whipp BJ. A new method for detecting anaerobic threshold by gas exchange. *J Appl Physiol.* 1986;60(6):2020–2027. PubMed ID: 3087938 doi:10.1152/JAPPL.1986.60.6.2020
 11. Wasserman K, McIlroy MB. Detecting the threshold of anaerobic metabolism in cardiac patients during exercise. *Am J Cardiol.* 1964;14(6):844–852. doi:10.1016/0002-9149(64)90012-8
 12. Poole DC, Burnley M, Vanhatalo A, Rossiter HB, Jones AM. Critical power: an important fatigue threshold in exercise physiology. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016;48(11):2320–2334. PubMed ID: 27031742 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000939
 13. Burnley M. Flawed analysis and erroneous interpretations of the critical power concept: response to Mr. Dotan. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2022;123(1):211–213. doi:10.1007/S00421-022-05013-2/METRICS
 14. Dotan R. A critical review of critical power. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2022;122(7):1559–1588. PubMed ID: 35303159 doi:10.1007/s00421-022-04922-6
 15. Gorostiaga EM, Garcia-Tabar I, Sánchez-Medina L. Critical power: artifact-based weaknesses. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2023;33(1):101–103. PubMed ID: 36465056 doi:10.1111/SMS.14260
 16. Jones AM, Burnley M, Black MI, Poole DC, Vanhatalo A. The maximal metabolic steady state: redefining the ‘gold standard.’ *Physiol Rep.* 2019;7(10):e14098. doi:10.14814/phy2.14098
 17. Marwood S, Goulding RP. Over 55 years of critical power: fact. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2022;32(6):1064–1065. PubMed ID: 35567403 doi:10.1111/SMS.14153
 18. Nixon RJ, Kranen SH, Vanhatalo A, Jones AM. Steady-state VO₂ above MLSS: evidence that critical speed better represents maximal metabolic steady state in well-trained runners. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2021;121(11):3133–3144. PubMed ID: 34351531 doi:10.1007/s00421-021-04780-8
 19. Hunter B, Ledger A, Muniz-Pumares D. Remote determination of critical speed and critical power in recreational runners. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2023;18(12):1449–1456. doi:10.1123/ijpspp.2023-0276
 20. Karsten B, Jobson S, Hopker J, Jimenez A, Beedie C. High agreement between laboratory and field estimates of critical power in cycling. *Int J Sports Med.* 2013;35(4):298–303. PubMed ID: 24022574.
 21. Smyth B, Muniz-Pumares D. Calculation of critical speed from raw training data in recreational marathon runners. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2020;52(12):2637–2645. PubMed ID: 32472926 doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002412
 22. Jones AM, Poole DC. Physiological demands of endurance exercise. In: Maughan RJ, ed. *Olympic Textbook of Science in Sport.* Wiley; 2008:43–55. doi:10.1002/9781444303315.CH3
 23. Ade CJ, Broxterman RM, Craig JC, Schlup SJ, Wilcox SL, Barstow TJ. Relationship between simulated extravehicular activity tasks and measurements of physical performance. *Respir Physiol Neurobiol.* 2014;203:19–27. PubMed ID: 25169116 doi:10.1016/j.resp.2014.08.007
 24. Balasekaran G, Loh MK, Boey P, Ng YC. Determination, measurement, and validation of maximal aerobic speed. *Sci Rep.* 2023;13(1):8006. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-31904-1
 25. Bosquet L, Delhors PR, Duchene A, Dupont G, Leger L. Anaerobic running capacity determined from a 3-parameter systems model: relationship with other anaerobic indices and with running performance in the 800 m-run. *Int J Sports Med.* 2007;28(6):495–500. PubMed ID: 17541880 doi:10.1055/s-2006-924516
 26. Florence SI, Weir JP. Relationship of critical velocity to marathon running performance. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol.* 1997;75(3):274–278. PubMed ID: 9088849 doi:10.1007/s004210050160
 27. Follador L, de Borba EF, Neto ALB, da Silva SG. A submaximal treadmill test to predict critical speed. *J Sports Sci.* 2021;39(8):835–844. PubMed ID: 33190620 doi:10.1080/02640414.2020.1847504
 28. Fukuda DH, Smith AE, Kendall KL, Cramer JT, Stout JR. The determination of critical rest interval from the intermittent critical velocity test in club-level collegiate hockey and rugby players. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2011;25(4):889–895. PubMed ID: 21399529 doi:10.1519/JSC.0b013e31820f5036
 29. Galbraith A, Hopker J, Cardinale M, Cunniffe B, Passfield L. A 1-year study of endurance runners: training, laboratory tests, and field tests. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform.* 2014;9(6):1019–1025. PubMed ID: 24664950 doi:10.1123/ijpspp.2013-0508
 30. Hogg JS, Hopker JG, Coakley SL, Mauger AR. Prescribing 6-weeks of running training using parameters from a self-paced maximal oxygen uptake protocol. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2018;118(5):911–918. PubMed ID: 29435760 doi:10.1007/s00421-018-3814-2
 31. Hunter B, Greenhalgh A, Karsten B, Burnley M, Muniz-Pumares D. A non-linear analysis of running in the heavy and severe intensity domains. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2021;121(5):1297–1313. PubMed ID: 33580289 doi:10.1007/s00421-021-04615-6
 32. Kalva-Filho CA, Andrade VL, Garcia CG, et al. 3-Min all-out test to evaluate aerobic and anaerobic indexes in court team sports. *Int J Sports Med.* 2023;45(04):316–322. doi:10.1055/A-2205-9108/BIB
 33. Kramer M, Randt RD, Watson M, Pettitt RW. Oxygen uptake kinetics and speed-time correlates of modified 3-minute all-out shuttle running in soccer players. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(8):e0201389. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0201389
 34. Kramer M, Du Randt R, Watson M, Pettitt RW. Bi-exponential modeling derives novel parameters for the critical speed concept. *Physiol Rep.* 2019;7(4):e13993. doi:10.14814/phy2.13993
 35. Kramer M, Thomas EJ, Pettitt RW. Critical speed and finite distance capacity: norms for athletic and non-athletic groups. *Eur J Appl Physiol.* 2020;120(4):861–872. PubMed ID: 32086601 doi:10.1007/s00421-020-04325-5
 36. Kranenburg KJ, Smith DJ. Comparison of critical speed determined from track running and treadmill tests in elite runners. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 1996;28(5):614–618. PubMed ID: 9148093 doi:10.1097/00005768-199605000-00013
 37. Kuo YH, Cheng CF, Hsu WC, Wong DP. Validity and reliability of the 3-min all-out running test to measure critical velocity in hot environments. *Res Sports Med.* 2017;25(4):470–479. PubMed ID: 28816504 doi:10.1080/15438627.2017.1365293
 38. Myrkos A, Smilios I, Zafeiridis A, Kokkinou ME, Tzoumanis A, Douda H. Aerobic adaptations following two iso-effort training programs: an intense continuous and a high-intensity interval. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.* 2023;48(8):583–594. PubMed ID: 37018841 doi:10.1139/apnm-2022-0309
 39. Nimmerichter A, Novak N, Triska C, Prinz B, Breese BC. Validity of treadmill-derived critical speed on predicting 5000-meter track-running performance. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2017;31(3):706–714. PubMed ID: 27379951 doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000001529
 40. Perez N, Miller P, Farrell JW. Intensity distribution of collegiate cross-country competitions. *Sports.* 2024;12(1):18. doi:10.3390/sports12010018
 41. Pettitt RW, Jamnick N, Clark IE. 3-Min all-out exercise test for running. *Int J Sports Med.* 2012;33(6):426–431. PubMed ID: 22422309 doi:10.1055/s-0031-1299749

42. Ruiz-Alias SA, Olaya-Cuartero J, Nancupil-Andrade AA, García-Pinillos F. 9/3-minute running critical power test: mechanical threshold location with respect to ventilatory thresholds and maximum oxygen uptake. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2022;17(7):1111–1118. PubMed ID: [35537709](#) doi:[10.1123/IJSP.2022-0069](#)
43. Schnitzler C, Heck G, Chatard JC, Ernwein V. A simple field test to assess endurance in inexperienced runners. *J Strength Cond Res*. 2010;24(8):2026–2031. PubMed ID: [20634753](#) doi:[10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181d2c48d](#)
44. Gustavo da Matta Silva L, Elias Pacheco M, Sílvia Grubert Campbell C, Baldissera V, Gustavo Simões H. Comparison between direct and indirect protocols of aerobic fitness evaluation in physically active individuals. *Rev Bras Med*. 2005;11(4):e209–e212.
45. Smith CGM, Jones AM. The relationship between critical velocity, maximal lactate steady-state velocity and lactate turnpoint velocity in runners. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2001;85(1-2):19–26. PubMed ID: [11513315](#) doi:[10.1007/s004210100384](#)
46. Sperlich B, Zinner C, Trenk D, Holmberg HC. Does a 3-minute all-out test provide suitable measures of exercise intensity at the maximal lactate steady state or peak oxygen uptake for well-trained runners? *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*. 2014;9(5):805–810. PubMed ID: [24414148](#) doi:[10.1123/ijsp.2013-0265](#)
47. Thomas EJ, Pettitt RW, Kramer M. High-intensity interval training prescribed within the secondary severe-intensity domain improves critical speed but not finite distance capacity. *J Sci Sport Exerc*. 2020; 2(2):154–166. doi:[10.1007/s42978-020-00053-6](#)
48. Jones AM. The physiology of the world record holder for the women's marathon. *J Sport Sci*. 2006;1(2):101–116. doi:[10.1260/174795406777641258](#)
49. Jones AM, Vanhatalo A. The 'Critical Power' concept: applications to sports performance with a focus on intermittent high-intensity exercise. *Sports Med*. 2017;47:65–78. PubMed ID: [28332113](#) doi:[10.1007/s40279-017-0688-0](#)
50. Billat V, Pycke JR, Vitiello D, Palacin F, Correa M. Race analysis of the world's best female and male marathon runners. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(4):1177. doi:[10.3390/IJERPH17041177](#)
51. Galán-Rioja MÁ, González-Mohino F, Poole DC, González-Ravé JM. Relative proximity of critical power and metabolic/ventilatory thresholds: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med*. 2020; 50(10):1771–1783. PubMed ID: [32613479](#) doi:[10.1007/s40279-020-01314-8](#)
52. Carter H, Jones AM, Barstow TJ, Burnley M, Williams CA, Doust JH. Oxygen uptake kinetics in treadmill running and cycle ergometry: a comparison. *J Appl Physiol*. 2000;89(3):899–907. PubMed ID: [10956332](#) doi:[10.1152/JAPPL.2000.89.3.899/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/DG0900133002.JPEG](#)
53. Carter H, Dekeler J. Metabolic stress at cycling critical power vs. running critical speed. *Sci Sports*. 2014;29(1):51–54. doi:[10.1016/j.scispo.2013.07.014](#)
54. Billat VL, Richard R, Binsse VM, Koralsztein JP, Haouzi P. The VO₂ slow component for severe exercise depends on type of exercise and is not correlated with time to fatigue. *J Appl Physiol*. 1998;85(6): 2118–2124. PubMed ID: [9843534](#) doi:[10.1152/JAPPL.1998.85.6.2118/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/JAPP06205004X.JPEG](#)
55. Bijker KE, de Groot G, Hollander AP. Differences in leg muscle activity during running and cycling in humans. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2002;87(6):556–561. PubMed ID: [12355196](#) doi:[10.1007/S00421-002-0663-8/METRICS](#)
56. Cerezuela-Espejo V, Courel-Ibáñez J, Morán-Navarro R, Martínez-Cava A, Pallarés JG. The relationship between lactate and ventilatory thresholds in runners: Validity and reliability of exercise test performance parameters. *Front Physiol*. 2018;9:1320. doi:[10.3389/FPHYS.2018.01320/BIBTEX](#)
57. Neves LNS, Gasparini Neto VH, Araujo IZ, Barbieri RA, Leite RD, Carletti L. Is there agreement and precision between heart rate variability, ventilatory, and lactate thresholds in healthy adults? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(22):14676. doi:[10.3390/IJERPH192214676](#)
58. Gorostiaga EM, Sánchez-Medina L, Garcia-Tabar I. Over 55 years of critical power: fact or artifact? *Scand J Med Sci Sports*. 2022;32(1): 116–124. PubMed ID: [34618981](#) doi:[10.1111/sms.14074](#)
59. Grant S, McMillan K, Newell J, et al. Reproducibility of the blood lactate threshold, 4 mmol·l⁻¹ marker, heart rate and ratings of perceived exertion during incremental treadmill exercise in humans. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2002;87(2):159–166. PubMed ID: [12070627](#) doi:[10.1007/S00421-002-0608-2/METRICS](#)
60. Muniz-Pumares D, Pedlar C, Godfrey R, Glaister M. The effect of the oxygen uptake-power output relationship on the prediction of supramaximal oxygen demands. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*. 2017; 57(1-2):1–7. PubMed ID: [26564270](#) doi:[10.23736/S0022-4707.16.05948-X](#)
61. Wiswell RA, Jaque SV, Marcell TJ, et al. Maximal aerobic power, lactate threshold, and running performance in master athletes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2000;32(6):1165–1170. PubMed ID: [10862547](#) doi:[10.1097/00005768-200006000-00021](#)
62. Fulton TJ, Sundberg CW, Arney BE, Hunter SK. Sex differences in the speed-duration relationship of elite runners across the lifespan. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2023;55(5):911–919. PubMed ID: [36728809](#) doi:[10.1249/MSS.0000000000003112](#)
63. Chorley A, Bott RP, Marwood S, Lamb KL. Physiological and anthropometric determinants of critical power, W' and the reconstitution of W' in trained and untrained male cyclists. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2020;120(11):2349–2359. PubMed ID: [32776219](#) doi:[10.1007/S00421-020-04459-6/TABLES/5](#)
64. Maldonado-Martin S, Mujika I, Padilla S. Physiological variables to use in the gender comparison in highly trained runners. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness*. 2004;44(1):8–14. PubMed ID: [15181384](#).
65. Støa EM, Helgerud J, Rønnestad BR, Hansen J, Ellefsen S, Støren Ø. Factors influencing running velocity at lactate threshold in male and female runners at different levels of performance. *Front Physiol*. 2020;11:585267. doi:[10.3389/FPHYS.2020.585267/BIBTEX](#)