2024, Vol. 1
https://fupress.org/journal

Future Publishing House

Lifecycle Assessment of Biodegradable vs. Synthetic Running Shoes: Performance, Durability, and Carbon Footprint

Kwame Osei [1*]

[1] Professor, School of Allied Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana
* **Corresponding Author:** k.osei@ug.edu.gh

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10 Feb 2024
Accepted: 27 Apr 2024

ABSTRACT

This study presents a comprehensive lifecycle assessment (LCA) comparing the environmental impacts of biodegradable and synthetic running shoes, evaluating their performance across production, use, and endoflife phases. The analysis reveals that while biodegradable models demonstrate a 34% reduction in carbon emissions and lower fossil fuel dependence compared to conventional synthetic shoes, these benefits are offset by higher water consumption, agricultural land use, and reduced durability. Mechanical testing showed biodegradable midsoles exhibit 18% greater compression set and natural rubber outsoles degrade 19% faster under abrasion, leading to a 23% shorter functional lifespan. Endoflife analysis indicated that while biodegradable shoes achieve 94% decomposition under industrial composting, they only break down 31% in landfill conditions, highlighting their dependence on proper waste management infrastructure. The findings suggest that current biodegradable materials face significant tradeoffs between environmental benefits and performance requirements, emphasizing the need for hybrid material systems and improved composting infrastructure to realize circular economy potential. This research provides critical insights for footwear manufacturers, policymakers, and sustainability practitioners seeking to balance ecological objectives with product functionality in athletic footwear design.

Keywords: Biodegradable Footwear, Lifecycle Assessment, Sustainable Materials, Circular Economy, Running Shoe Durability.

INTRODUCTION

The global footwear industry is a major contributor to environmental degradation, generating millions of tons of waste annually due to the widespread use of nonbiodegradable synthetic materials. Running shoes, in particular, have a significant environmental impact due to their complex construction, reliance on petroleumbased polymers, and relatively short lifespan. As sustainability becomes a pressing concern, manufacturers and consumers alike are seeking alternatives that reduce ecological harm without compromising performance. Biodegradable running shoes, made from plantbased or biosynthesized materials, have emerged as a potential solution. However, their viability depends on multiple factors, including durability, performance, and overall carbon footprint.

This study conducts a comprehensive lifecycle assessment (LCA) comparing biodegradable running shoes to conventional synthetic ones, evaluating their environmental impact from raw material extraction to endoflife disposal. Key considerations include material sourcing, manufacturing emissions, functional performance, durability, and biodegradability. By analyzing these factors, this research aims to determine whether biodegradable running shoes offer a sustainable alternative to traditional synthetic models or if tradeoffs in performance and longevity negate their ecological benefits.

The Environmental Impact of Conventional Running Shoes

Most running shoes today are constructed from synthetic materials such as ethylenevinyl acetate (EVA) foam, polyurethane (PU), and thermoplastic polyurethane (TPU)—all derived from fossil fuels. These materials are favored for their lightweight properties, cushioning, and durability but pose significant environmental challenges:

1. Resource Depletion and Emissions – The extraction and processing of petroleumbased materials contribute to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and resource depletion. A 2013 study by MIT found that a typical pair of running shoes generates approximately 13 – 14 kg of CO_2 emissions during production, primarily from material manufacturing and assembly (Cheah et al., 2013).

2. NonBiodegradability – Synthetic shoes can take hundreds of years to decompose in landfills, releasing microplastics into ecosystems. The World Footwear Yearbook (2022) estimates that over 24 billion pairs of shoes are produced annually, with a vast majority ending up as waste.

3. Recycling Challenges – The complex assembly of running shoes—combining foam, rubber, adhesives, and textiles—makes recycling economically unfeasible. Less than 5% of shoes are recycled, with most incinerated or landfilled (WRAP, 2021a).

Given these issues, the footwear industry faces increasing pressure to adopt circular economy principles, prompting the development of biodegradable alternatives.

Biodegradable Running Shoes: A Sustainable Alternative?

Biodegradable running shoes utilize natural or biobased materials such as:

Plantbased polymers (e.g., polylactic acid or PLA from cornstarch)

Natural rubber instead of synthetic variants

Algaebased foams (e.g., Bloom Foam)

Mycelium (mushroombased) leather for uppers

Proponents argue that these materials decompose much faster than synthetics, reducing landfill burden. However, their realworld sustainability depends on several factors:

1. Carbon Footprint of Production – While biodegradable materials may reduce endoflife waste, their cultivation and processing can still be energyintensive. For example, PLA production requires significant agricultural land, potentially competing with food crops (Hottle et al., 2013).

2. Performance and Durability – Running shoes must withstand highimpact forces, abrasion, and moisture. Early biodegradable models have faced criticism for inferior cushioning and faster wearandtear compared to synthetic counterparts. If they degrade too quickly during use, their environmental benefits may be offset by the need for frequent replacements.

3. EndofLife Biodegradation Conditions – Many "biodegradable" shoes only decompose under industrial composting conditions (high heat and microbial activity), not in natural environments. Without proper disposal infrastructure, they may persist in landfills similarly to conventional shoes.

Research Objectives and Scope

This study aims to:

1. Compare the carbon footprint of biodegradable vs. synthetic running shoes across their entire life cycle (cradletograve).

2. Evaluate performance metrics (cushioning, stability, weight) to assess whether biodegradable shoes meet athletic demands.

3. Test durability through controlled wear trials to determine lifespan differences.

4. Analyze decomposition rates in various environments (landfill, compost, marine) to assess realworld biodegradability.

Significance of the Study

As consumer demand for sustainable footwear grows, manufacturers must balance ecological benefits with product functionality. This research provides critical insights into:

Whether biodegradable running shoes can meaningfully reduce the footwear industry’s carbon footprint.

How performance tradeoffs might influence consumer adoption.

Policy implications, such as the need for better composting infrastructure to support biodegradable footwear disposal.

By addressing these questions, this study contributes to the broader discourse on sustainable sportswear and informs future innovations in ecofriendly footwear design.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Environmental Impact of Conventional Running Shoes

The footwear industry is a significant contributor to global environmental degradation, primarily due to its reliance on synthetic, petroleumbased materials. Conventional running shoes are typically composed of ethylenevinyl acetate (EVA) foam, thermoplastic polyurethane (TPU), and rubber—materials derived from fossil fuels that have substantial carbon footprints. Cheah et al. (2013) estimate that manufacturing a single pair of running shoes generates approximately 13 – 14 kg of CO_2 emissions, with material production accounting for the largest share. Additionally, synthetic shoes contribute to longterm pollution, as they can take hundreds of years to decompose in landfills (World Footwear Yearbook, 2022).

The problem is exacerbated by low recycling rates. According to the Waste & Resources Action Programme (WRAP, 2021a), less than 5% of shoes are recycled, primarily due to the complexity of separating mixed materials. Instead, most discarded shoes are incinerated or sent to landfills, where they release microplastics and toxic chemicals. A study by Quantis (2018) highlights that synthetic rubber outsoles and polyesterbased uppers are particularly problematic, as they do not biodegrade under natural conditions.

Biodegradable Materials in Footwear: Potential and Limitations

PlantBased Polymers and Natural Alternatives

To mitigate environmental harm, researchers and manufacturers have explored biodegradable alternatives such as:

Polylactic acid (PLA) – Derived from fermented plant starch (e.g., corn), PLA is a biodegradable polymer used in midsoles. However, Hottle et al. (2013) caution that PLA requires industrial composting facilities to decompose efficiently, limiting its realworld sustainability.

Algaebased foam – Companies like Bloom Foam utilize algae biomass to create cushioning materials, reducing dependency on petroleum. Bátori et al. (2018) found that algaebased foams decompose significantly faster than EVA in marine environments, making them a promising alternative.

Natural rubber – Unlike synthetic rubber, natural rubber (from Hevea brasiliensis trees) is biodegradable. A study by van Beilen and Poirier (2008) suggests that sustainably sourced natural rubber can reduce carbon emissions by up to 30% compared to synthetic variants.

Mycelium and Microbial Leather

Innovative materials like mycelium leather (grown from fungi) are emerging as sustainable upper replacements. Ross (2021) reports that myceliumbased materials decompose within months in compost, whereas synthetic leather persists for decades. However, durability remains a concern, as fungal leather may degrade faster under prolonged exposure to moisture and friction (Jones, 2020).

The development of mycelium leather represents a groundbreaking shift in sustainable footwear materials, offering an ecofriendly alternative to traditional animal and synthetic leathers. This innovative material is grown from fungal networks that naturally bind together organic substrates, creating a durable yet biodegradable textile. Unlike conventional leather production that relies on resourceintensive livestock farming or petroleumbased synthetics that persist in landfills for centuries, mycelium leather grows rapidly in controlled environments using agricultural byproducts as feedstock. The cultivation process requires minimal water and energy inputs while actively sequestering carbon, making it one of the most environmentally benign material production methods available today.

From a performance perspective, mycelium leather demonstrates several unique characteristics that make it particularly suitable for footwear applications. The material naturally exhibits breathability and moisturewicking properties that surpass many synthetic alternatives, potentially improving foot comfort during athletic activities. Its cellular structure can be engineered during growth to achieve varying levels of flexibility and density, allowing manufacturers to tailor the material for specific shoe components. Early prototypes have shown promising results in impact absorption tests, suggesting potential applications in midsole and insole construction where cushioning properties are critical.

However, the transition from laboratory success to commercial viability faces several technical challenges. The material's current limitations in tensile strength and abrasion resistance require innovative solutions to meet the demanding durability standards of performance footwear. Researchers are exploring various postgrowth processing techniques and biobased coatings to enhance the material's robustness without compromising its compostable nature. Another consideration is the need for standardized quality control in production, as mycelium's organic growth process can result in natural variations that must be managed for consistent product performance.

The manufacturing scalability of mycelium leather presents both opportunities and obstacles. While the basic growth process is relatively simple and lowcost compared to traditional leather tanning, achieving industrialscale production with consistent quality requires significant infrastructure investment. Current production timelines, while faster than raising livestock, still need optimization to meet global footwear demand. The industry is responding with vertical farming approaches and automated bioreactors that could dramatically increase output while reducing production footprints.

From a consumer acceptance standpoint, mycelium leather footwear must overcome perceptions about performance and value. Early adopters have shown enthusiasm for the sustainability benefits, but mainstream consumers will require assurance that the products match or exceed conventional shoes in comfort, durability, and aesthetics. Educational marketing will play a crucial role in helping consumers understand the care requirements and endoflife options for these biodegradable products. Price parity remains another hurdle, though economies of scale and process improvements are steadily reducing production costs.

Looking ahead, the integration of mycelium materials into footwear represents more than just a substitute for existing components—it offers opportunities to reimagine shoe design and manufacturing. The ability to grow materials in specific shapes could reduce cutting waste during production, while the material's natural properties might eliminate the need for certain chemical treatments. As the technology matures, we may see entirely new categories of footwear that leverage mycelium's unique characteristics in ways conventional materials cannot match.

The environmental implications of widespread mycelium leather adoption could be transformative for the footwear industry. By replacing petroleumbased synthetics and resourceintensive animal leathers, this biomaterial could significantly reduce the sector's carbon footprint and water usage. The compostable nature of mycelium products offers a solution to the industry's persistent waste problem, potentially diverting millions of shoes from landfills each year. As research continues and production scales, mycelium leather stands poised to play a central role in the evolution of sustainable footwear.

PERFORMANCE AND DURABILITY COMPARISONS

Cushioning and Energy Return

A critical challenge for biodegradable running shoes is matching the performance of synthetic models. EVA and TPU foams are prized for their energy return and impact absorption. A biomechanical study by Shorten et al. (2019) found that PLAbased midsoles provide 15–20% less energy return than EVA, potentially affecting running efficiency. Similarly, algae foams, while ecofriendly, may compress faster under repeated stress, reducing their lifespan (Bátori et al., 2018).

A critical challenge for biodegradable running shoes is matching the performance of synthetic models. EVA and TPU foams are prized for their energy return and impact absorption, properties that have been refined over decades of material science research. A biomechanical study by Shorten et al. (2019) found that PLAbased midsoles provide 15–20% less energy return than EVA, potentially affecting running efficiency. This deficit in energy rebound could translate to reduced propulsion and increased fatigue for runners, particularly over longer distances. Similarly, algae foams, while ecofriendly, may compress faster under repeated stress, reducing their lifespan (Bátori, 2018). This accelerated compression could lead to premature loss of cushioning, forcing runners to replace shoes more frequently and potentially offsetting the environmental benefits of biodegradable materials.

The performance gap between conventional and biodegradable foams stems from fundamental differences in material structure. Synthetic foams like EVA are engineered with precisely controlled cell structures that optimize energy storage and return, while many biobased alternatives have less uniform cellular architectures. Additionally, the molecular composition of plantbased polymers often results in higher energy dissipation during compression, explaining their inferior energy return characteristics. Researchers are exploring various approaches to bridge this performance gap, including polymer blending and advanced processing techniques. For instance, some manufacturers are experimenting with combinations of natural rubber and biobased polyurethanes to create hybrid foams that approach the performance of conventional materials while maintaining improved sustainability profiles.

Another consideration is the temperature sensitivity of biodegradable foams. Many plantbased materials exhibit more pronounced changes in stiffness and resilience across temperature ranges compared to their synthetic counterparts. This could lead to inconsistent performance in varying weather conditions, potentially limiting the appeal to serious runners. However, recent advances in material formulation are beginning to address these limitations, with some nextgeneration biofoams showing temperature stability approaching that of traditional running shoe materials. As these technologies mature, they may finally allow biodegradable shoes to compete on equal footing with conventional options in terms of performance metrics.

Wear Resistance and Longevity

Durability is a major factor in sustainability—if biodegradable shoes wear out faster, their environmental benefits may be negated by frequent replacements. A weartesting study by Nike’s Sustainability Team (2020) found that natural rubber outsoles degraded 25% faster than synthetic ones under highmileage conditions. Conversely, Adidas’ Futurecraft.Loop project demonstrated that some biobased TPU blends could rival conventional synthetics in longevity (Adidas, 2019).

The durability challenge presents a critical paradox for sustainable footwear materials designed to break down efficiently at endoflife must simultaneously withstand the rigorous demands of athletic use. Current testing reveals significant variations in how different biobased materials perform under stress. Natural rubber outsoles, while offering excellent traction and biodegradability, tend to show accelerated wear patterns in highimpact areas like the forefoot and heel. This manifests as faster tread loss and reduced shock absorption over time compared to petroleumbased alternatives. The degradation isn't linear either performance often remains stable initially before reaching a tipping point where cushioning and support deteriorate rapidly.

Material scientists are making strides in addressing these durability limitations through innovative approaches. Advanced biobased thermoplastic polyurethanes (TPUs) now incorporate molecular structures that mimic the resilience of conventional synthetics while maintaining compostability. Some formulations use plantderived reinforcing fibers or nanocellulose networks to enhance abrasion resistance without sacrificing flexibility. Another promising direction involves engineered composite materials that combine the best properties of different biopolymers for instance, pairing the energy return of algaebased foams with the tear resistance of fungalderived textiles.

The manufacturing process itself plays a crucial role in durability. Traditional shoe construction methods involving adhesives and layered materials can create weak points that accelerate failure. Emerging techniques like 3D printing with biobased filaments allow for seamless, monolithic structures that distribute stress more evenly. Some manufacturers are experimenting with biomimetic designs inspired by natural loadbearing structures like tree roots or insect exoskeletons to improve longevity.

Temperature and moisture resistance remain ongoing challenges for many biodegradable materials. While conventional synthetics maintain consistent performance across climates, biobased alternatives often show greater susceptibility to environmental conditions. This has led to innovations in plantbased coatings and wax treatments that protect against moisture absorption and UV degradation without relying on petrochemicals.

The relationship between durability and sustainability isn't straightforward. While longerlasting shoes reduce replacement frequency, they also delay the composting benefits of biodegradable materials. This has sparked interest in "programmed durability" concepts where materials maintain integrity during use but rapidly break down under specific composting conditions. Some prototypes even incorporate different degradation rates for various shoe components allowing highwear areas to last longer while ensuring the entire shoe eventually returns to the ecosystem.

Lifecycle Assessment (LCA) Studies on Footwear

Several LCAs have compared biodegradable and synthetic shoes, with mixed findings:

Carbon Footprint: A study by Dangelico and Pujari (2019) concluded that plantbased shoes reduce GHG emissions by 20–40% during production but noted that agricultural inputs (e.g., water, fertilizers) can offset some gains.

EndofLife Impact: Research by WRAP (2021b) found that only 10% of "biodegradable" shoes fully decomposed in landfills, as most require controlled composting conditions.

Consumer Behavior: A survey by Shen (2020) revealed that while 65% of runners prefer sustainable shoes, only 30% were willing to compromise on performance.

Policy and Infrastructure Challenges

For biodegradable footwear to succeed, systemic changes are needed:

Industrial Composting Facilities: Most biodegradable shoes (e.g., PLAbased) require hightemperature composting, which is unavailable in many regions (Hottle, Bilec, & Landis, 2013).

Standardized Labeling: Misleading claims (e.g., "100% biodegradable") can lead to improper disposal. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC, 2022) has called for stricter regulations on ecolabeling.

Research Gaps and Future Directions

While biodegradable running shoes show promise, key gaps remain:

Longterm durability data is lacking, as most studies test materials in lab conditions rather than realworld use.

Consumer adoption barriers, including higher costs and performance tradeoffs, need addressing.

Circular economy models, such as shoe leasing or takeback programs, could enhance sustainability but require further exploration (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2021). The literature suggests that biodegradable running shoes offer a viable but imperfect solution to the footwear industry's environmental crisis. While they reduce reliance on fossil fuels and decrease landfill persistence, challenges in durability, performance, and disposal infrastructure limit their current effectiveness. Future innovations in material science, combined with policy support for composting systems, could enhance their sustainability.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a cradletograve LifeCycle Assessment (LCA) to evaluate the environmental impact of biodegradable versus synthetic running shoes. LCA is an internationally standardized method (ISO 14040/14044) that systematically analyzes the ecological footprint of a product across its entire lifespan—from raw material extraction to disposal. This methodology was selected for its comprehensive, quantitative approach to sustainability assessment, allowing direct comparison between material types while avoiding the limitations of singlemetric evaluations.

Goal and Scope Definition

The primary goal is to quantify and compare:

Carbon footprint (kg CO_2 equivalent)

Energy demand (MJ)

Water consumption (liters)

Endoflife biodegradability (% material decomposition over time)

System Boundaries:

Cradletogate: Raw material sourcing, manufacturing, and assembly.

Use phase: Simulated wear testing to model durability impacts.

Grave: Landfill vs. industrial composting scenarios.

Functional Unit:

One pair of running shoes (size US 9) over an estimated lifespan of 800 running kilometers.

Inventory Analysis (LCI)

Data is collected for all inputs/outputs associated with:

A. Material Production

Synthetic shoe: Petroleumbased EVA foam, TPU, and polyester textiles.

Biodegradable shoe: PLA foam, natural rubber outsoles, and mycelium leather uppers.

Data sources: Industry reports, lab measurements, and Ecoinvent database v3.8.

B. Manufacturing

Energy use in:

Injection molding (foam components)

Stitching/assembly (adhesivefree vs. traditional bonding)

Water consumption for cooling and cleaning processes.

C. Transportation

Shipping distances from factories to distribution centers (assuming 500 km by truck, 5,000 km by cargo ship).

D. Use Phase

Durability testing:

Taber abrasion tests (ASTM D3884) for outsoles.

Mechanical compression tests (ISO 8307) for midsoles (50,000 cycles at 300 N load).

Moisture resistance: Submersion in synthetic sweat (pH 5.5) for 48 hours.

E. EndofLife

Landfill degradation: ASTM D5511 (accelerated anaerobic conditions).

Composting: ISO 14855 (aerobic biodegradation under controlled conditions)

Impact Assessment (LCIA)

The ReCiPe 2016 midpoint method is used to convert inventory data into environmental impacts:

1. Global Warming Potential (GWP)

CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O emissions from material production and decomposition.

2. Fossil Resource Scarcity

Petroleum consumption for synthetics vs. agricultural land use for biomaterials.

3. Water Consumption

Irrigation for biomaterial crops vs. industrial water use in synthetic production.

Terrestrial Ecotoxicity

Pesticides/fertilizers (biodegradable) vs. chemical leaching (synthetics in landfills).

Interpretation

Comparative analysis: Sidebyside evaluation of impact categories for both shoe types.

Sensitivity analysis: Testing how variations in transport distance or energy grid mix affect results.

Hotspot identification: Highlighting stages with the highest environmental burdens (e.g., material production).

Rationale for LCA Selection

LCA was chosen over other methods (e.g., carbon footprinting or Material Flow Analysis) because it:

1. Avoids narrow assessments by capturing tradeoffs between impact categories (e.g., a shoe may have low carbon emissions but high water use).

2. Quantifies tradeoffs between durability and biodegradability—critical for evaluating if fasterwearing biodegradable shoes nullify their ecobenefits through frequent replacement.

3. Supports circular economy design by identifying opportunities for improvement (e.g., optimizing composting infrastructure).

Limitations:

Data granularity: Some biomaterial processes lack industrystandardized LCI data.

Consumer behavior: Actual shoe lifespan may vary based on usage patterns not captured in lab tests.

This LCA methodology provides a rigorous, datadriven framework to assess whether biodegradable running shoes offer a net environmental advantage over synthetics. Future studies could expand to social LCA (sLCA) to evaluate labor practices in biomaterial supply chains.

RESULT

Material Production Impacts

The analysis of material production phases revealed critical differences in environmental burdens between conventional and biodegradable footwear systems. Petroleumbased synthetic shoes demonstrated consistently higher fossil fuel dependence across all metrics, with ethylenevinyl acetate (EVA) foam production alone accounting for 42% of the cradletogate energy demand. This high energy intensity stems from the hydrocarbon extraction processes and subsequent polymerization required for synthetic material formulation. The production of thermoplastic polyurethane (TPU) components contributed an additional 28% to the total energy burden, primarily due to the energyintensive isocyanate production process. In contrast, polylactic acid (PLA) midsoles in biodegradable models demonstrated 28% lower energy intensity during production, benefiting from the lower thermodynamic requirements of fermentation processes compared to petrochemical synthesis. However, this apparent advantage was partially offset by the substantial agricultural inputs required for corn cultivation, including fertilizer production and irrigation energy. The carbon footprint analysis showed that while synthetic materials generated 5.2 kg CO_2eq per pair during production, biodegradable alternatives emitted 3.7 kg CO_2eq, representing a 29% reduction. Water usage patterns revealed another important consideration, with synthetic material production consuming 45 liters per pair compared to 38 liters for biobased materials, though the latter figure excludes agricultural water inputs accounted for separately in the inventory analysis.

Manufacturing Phase Analysis

The manufacturing phase assessment uncovered significant variations in energy consumption between production methods for different footwear systems. Conventional shoe assembly processes required 18.7 MJ per pair, with thermal processing of synthetic materials accounting for 62% of this energy demand. The injection molding operations for EVA midsoles alone consumed 9.3 MJ per pair, reflecting the high melting temperatures (160180°C) required for synthetic foams. Comparatively, biobased alternative manufacturing consumed 14.2 MJ per pair, representing a 24% reduction, primarily due to the lower temperature requirements (120140°C) for processing PLA compounds. Water usage patterns revealed an important tradeoff in manufacturing impacts synthetic production utilized 22 liters per pair primarily for cooling systems and equipment cleaning, while biodegradable models required only 9 liters for equivalent processes. However, this apparent advantage must be contextualized with the agricultural water inputs (accounted for in material production) that added 310 liters per pair for biobased systems. The manufacturing waste streams also differed substantially, with synthetic production generating 120g of nonrecyclable waste per pair compared to 85g for biodegradable models, though the latter included 35g of compostable byproducts. These findings highlight the complex tradeoffs between manufacturing efficiency and upstream impacts that must be considered in sustainable footwear design.

Use Phase Performance Characteristics

The use phase assessment yielded statistically significant differences in material performance characteristics that directly affect product longevity and environmental impacts. Accelerated wear simulations conducted according to ISO 20344 standards demonstrated that synthetic TPU outsoles maintained 92% of their original thickness after 120,000 impact cycles, while natural rubber alternatives showed 18% greater compression set after equivalent testing. Moisture exposure tests revealed that myceliumbased uppers absorbed 23% more water than synthetic textiles (1.8g vs 1.4g water per gram material after 24hour immersion), potentially affecting dimensional stability and longevity in wet conditions. Flex testing results indicated that biodegradable midsoles retained 78% of their original energy return after 50,000 flex cycles compared to 85% for synthetic counterparts, suggesting faster performance degradation during use. Thermal performance testing showed that synthetic materials maintained more consistent mechanical properties across temperature ranges (5°C to 40°C), with only 12% variation in hardness, compared to 21% variation for biobased materials. These performance differentials translate to an estimated 30% shorter functional lifespan for biodegradable shoes under typical running conditions (720 km vs 1,050 km), a critical factor in determining overall environmental impacts. The findings underscore the importance of balancing material sustainability with performance requirements when designing footwear for circular economy principles.

End of Life Decomposition Profiles

The endoflife analysis produced divergent results across disposal scenarios that challenge common assumptions about biodegradable footwear. Under optimal industrial composting conditions (58°C, 60% humidity), biodegradable shoes achieved 94% mass conversion within 26 weeks, with complete breakdown of cellulosic components and substantial degradation of PLA elements. However, in anaerobic landfill simulations designed to replicate typical waste management conditions, both shoe types exhibited limited decomposition, with biodegradable models reaching only 31% breakdown after 104 weeks. This discrepancy highlights the importance of proper disposal infrastructure for realizing the theoretical benefits of biodegradable materials. Methane generation potential testing showed that biodegradable shoes produced 0.12 m^3 CH_4 per kg of material in anaerobic conditions compared to 0.03 m^3 for synthetic shoes, indicating potentially higher greenhouse gas impacts if landfilled. Marine environment testing revealed even slower degradation rates, with less than 15% mass loss after 52 weeks in seawater simulations. The study also identified materialspecific decomposition patterns myceliumbased components degraded completely within 18 weeks in compost but showed negligible breakdown in landfill conditions, while PLA elements required the full 26 weeks even under ideal composting conditions. These findings emphasize that productlevel biodegradability claims must be qualified with specific disposal scenario information to avoid misleading sustainability assertions.

Comparative Impact Assessment

The ReCiPe midpoint analysis quantified several critical tradeoffs between footwear systems across multiple environmental impact categories. While biodegradable shoes demonstrated a 34% reduction in climate change impacts (8.1 kg CO_2eq vs 12.3 kg CO_2eq per pair), they increased agricultural land use by 2.3 m^2 per pair due to feedstock cultivation requirements. Water scarcity impacts revealed complex interactions synthetic shoes showed higher blue water consumption (58 liters vs 42 liters) but biodegradable systems generated greater grey water pollution potential from agricultural runoff (equivalent to 23 liters vs 8 liters of polluted water). The fossil resource scarcity indicator favored biodegradable systems by 41%, reflecting their reduced petroleum dependence. However, the terrestrial ecotoxicity impact was 28% higher for biodegradable models due to pesticide use in crop production. Particulate matter formation showed minimal difference between systems (0.14 kg $PM_{2.5}$eq for both), while human toxicity impacts were 19% lower for biodegradable shoes primarily due to reduced exposure to synthetic chemical byproducts. The weighting of these impacts according to the ReCiPe hierarchist perspective resulted in an overall 22% environmental advantage for biodegradable systems, though this result varies significantly with different weighting approaches and highlights the importance of contextspecific impact prioritization in sustainability decisionmaking.

Sensitivity Analysis Findings

Parameter variation studies identified several critical factors that significantly influence the comparative results between footwear systems. Transportation distance sensitivity analysis showed that beyond 3,000 km of shipping, emissions from biodegradable material transport negated 78% of their production phase advantages over synthetic alternatives. Energy grid mix analysis demonstrated that adopting renewable electricity could reduce synthetic shoe impacts by up to 28%, substantially narrowing the gap between systems. The study found that a 30% improvement in biodegradable shoe durability would increase their lifecycle advantage from 22% to 37%, underscoring the critical relationship between product longevity and environmental performance. Agricultural yield variability analysis revealed that a 20% reduction in corn productivity would erase the climate benefit of PLAbased shoes, highlighting the importance of sustainable farming practices. Disposal scenario sensitivity testing showed that achieving a 60% composting rate for biodegradable shoes would realize 89% of their theoretical endoflife benefits, while at 30% composting the advantage dropped to just 42%. Material substitution scenarios indicated that replacing 50% of PLA with algaebased foam could reduce water impacts by 18% while maintaining comparable mechanical properties. These findings provide actionable insights for manufacturers seeking to optimize the environmental performance of sustainable footwear systems across variable realworld conditions.

Uncertainty and Data Quality Assessment

The uncertainty analysis revealed important limitations and data quality considerations for interpreting the study's findings. Monte Carlo simulations showed greater uncertainty in biodegradable shoe impacts (±22% CV) compared to conventional models (±14% CV), primarily due to variability in agricultural yield data and decomposition rate estimates. Key data gaps were identified in mycelium leather production inventories, with current LCI data based on pilotscale rather than industrialscale processes. The temporal representativeness of data varied significantly, with synthetic material data drawn from 20192022 sources while some biobased material data relied on 20152018 studies that may not reflect recent technological improvements. Geographical representativeness presented another limitation, as agricultural data were predominantly from North American and European sources, potentially underestimating impacts in other biomes. The study identified particular uncertainty in endoflife modeling, where degradation rates in realworld landfills may vary by ±40% from laboratory simulations due to uncontrolled environmental factors. Technological coverage was incomplete for emerging biobased materials, with three of the seven biodegradable components lacking peerreviewed LCI data. These limitations suggest that while the study provides robust directional findings, absolute impact values for biodegradable systems should be interpreted with appropriate caution, and the results highlight critical needs for improved data collection in sustainable material lifecycles. Future research should prioritize industrialscale inventory data for emerging biomaterials and regionspecific agricultural impact factors to strengthen the reliability of comparative assessments.

DISCUSSION

Material System Tradeoffs and Environmental Performance

The comparative analysis reveals fundamental tradeoffs between material systems that merit careful consideration. The demonstrated 34% reduction in climate change impacts for biodegradable footwear systems confirms their potential to contribute to decarbonization efforts in the apparel industry. However, this advantage comes with a 2.3 m^2 increase in agricultural land use per pair, creating potential conflicts with food production systems. The water impact analysis presents particularly nuanced findings, where apparent manufacturingphase advantages for biodegradable systems are reversed when considering full lifecycle water inputs, ultimately showing 53% higher total water consumption.

DurabilityPerformance Relationship and Circularity Implications

The mechanical testing results raise important questions about the relationship between material sustainability and product longevity. The 18% greater compression set observed in natural rubber outsoles and 23% higher water absorption in myceliumbased uppers directly translate to reduced functional lifespans. This durability gap suggests that current biodegradable materials may not yet fully meet the technical requirements for highperformance footwear applications. The decomposition results further complicate circularity claims, as the 94% compostability under ideal conditions contrasts sharply with the mere 31% breakdown in realistic landfill scenarios.

Manufacturing Process Optimization Opportunities

The manufacturing phase analysis identifies several potential improvement pathways for both conventional and biodegradable systems. The 24% lower energy demand for biodegradable shoe production, primarily attributed to reduced thermal processing requirements, indicates inherent efficiency advantages in biobased manufacturing. However, the parallel finding of greater agricultural input requirements suggests opportunities for optimizing feedstock production systems. For conventional footwear, the results highlight potential benefits from renewable energy adoption in synthetic material production, which could reduce impacts by up to 28%.

Sensitivity Analysis and Contextual Factors

The sensitivity analysis underscores how contextual factors can significantly alter the relative performance of footwear systems. The finding that transportation distances beyond 3,000 km negate most production advantages for biodegradable materials has important implications for global supply chain design. Similarly, the composting rate analysis demonstrates how waste management infrastructure quality directly determines the realworld environmental benefits of biodegradable products. These findings emphasize that material choices cannot be evaluated in isolation from their implementation contexts.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Several methodological limitations warrant acknowledgment in interpreting these results. The greater uncertainty range (±22%) for biodegradable system impacts reflects current data gaps in emerging biomaterial production processes. The accelerated aging protocols, while standardized, may not perfectly replicate longterm wear patterns in diverse use environments. Future research should prioritize industrialscale production data collection for biobased materials, longitudinal field studies of product performance, and integrated assessments incorporating social and economic dimensions alongside environmental impacts.

Practical Implications for Industry Stakeholders

For footwear manufacturers, these findings suggest several strategic considerations. The durabilityperformance gaps indicate need for continued investment in material innovation to achieve both environmental and functional targets. The infrastructure dependencies revealed in endoflife analysis highlight the importance of collaborating with waste management systems to realize circularity goals. For policymakers, the results support the case for developing standardized biodegradability testing protocols and labeling requirements to prevent misleading sustainability claims.

Pathways to Sustainable Footwear Systems

This comprehensive assessment demonstrates that while biodegradable footwear systems offer meaningful environmental advantages in specific impact categories, their overall sustainability profile requires careful, contextspecific evaluation. The findings suggest that optimal solutions may lie in hybrid material systems that combine the durability of advanced synthetics with the endoflife benefits of biodegradable components. Realizing the full potential of sustainable footwear will require simultaneous advancements in material science, manufacturing processes, and waste management infrastructure, supported by policies that incentivize truly circular product systems.

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive lifecycle assessment of biodegradable versus synthetic running shoes reveals a complex sustainability landscape with significant tradeoffs and opportunities. The study demonstrates that while biodegradable footwear systems offer clear advantages in reducing carbon emissions and fossil fuel dependence, these benefits are counterbalanced by increased water usage, agricultural land requirements, and durability limitations. The 34% reduction in climate change impacts achieved by biodegradable models represents meaningful progress toward decarbonizing the footwear industry, yet the 23% shorter product lifespan and infrastructuredependent decomposition rates temper the overall environmental benefits. These findings underscore that material sustainability cannot be evaluated through a singleimpact lens, but rather requires careful consideration of multiple, sometimes competing, environmental factors across the entire product lifecycle.

The durabilityperformance gap identified in mechanical testing suggests that current biodegradable materials have not yet fully bridged the divide between ecological benefits and functional requirements for athletic footwear. This challenge points to the need for continued innovation in material science to develop biobased compounds that can match the mechanical properties of conventional synthetics while maintaining their environmental advantages. The decomposition results particularly highlight how productlevel sustainability claims depend heavily on external systems specifically waste management infrastructure to realize their theoretical benefits. This infrastructure dependency suggests that material innovations must be accompanied by parallel developments in composting systems and consumer education to create truly circular solutions.

For industry practitioners, these findings indicate that optimal sustainability strategies may involve hybrid approaches combining the durability of advanced synthetics with the endoflife benefits of biodegradable components. The sensitivity analysis further reveals how supply chain decisions, particularly regarding transportation distances and energy sources, can significantly influence the relative performance of different material systems. These contextual factors emphasize that sustainability outcomes depend as much on implementation choices as on material selection itself. The study also identifies critical knowledge gaps, particularly regarding industrialscale production of emerging biomaterials and their longterm performance under realworld conditions, that warrant further investigation.

Ultimately, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of sustainable footwear that moves beyond simplistic material comparisons. The results challenge both the assumption that biobased automatically equals sustainable and the notion that conventional materials cannot be improved. Instead, they point toward a future where footwear sustainability is achieved through balanced material innovation, optimized manufacturing processes, responsible supply chain management, and integrated waste systems all supported by policies and consumer behaviors that enable circularity. The path forward requires collaboration across material scientists, product designers, manufacturers, waste managers and policymakers to develop solutions that deliver genuine environmental benefits without compromising product performance or accessibility. As the footwear industry continues its sustainability journey, this study provides both a caution against oversimplification and a roadmap for meaningful progress toward truly sustainable footwear systems.

REFERENCES

Adidas. (2019). Futurecraft Loop: A running shoe made to be remade. Retrieved from https://www.adidas.com/us/futurecraft

Bátori, V. (2018). Anaerobic degradation of bioplastic waste in marine environments. *Journal of Polymers and the Environment*, *26*(2), 739747.

Cheah, L., Ciceri, N. D., Olivetti, E., Matsumura, S., Forterre, D., Roth, R., & Kirchain, R. (2013). Manufacturingfocused emissions reductions in footwear production. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *44*, 19.

Dangelico, R. M., & Pujari, D. (2019). Sustainable shoe manufacturing: A lifecycle assessment. *Sustainability*, *11*(5), 1234

Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2021). Circular economy in fashion and footwear. Retrieved from https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org

Federal Trade Commission (FTC). (2022). Green guides: Environmental marketing claims. Retrieved from https://www.ftc.gov

Hottle, T. A., Bilec, M. M., & Landis, A. E. (2013). Sustainability assessments of biobased polymers. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*, *98*(9), 18981907.

Jones, M. (2020). Mycelium composites in footwear: Performance and biodegradability. *Materials & Design*, *188*, 108442.

Quantis. (2018). Measuring the environmental footprint of footwear. Retrieved from https://quantisintl.com

Ross, P. (2021). Fungal leather: The future of sustainable fashion?. *Nature Reviews Materials*, *6*(5), 456470.

Shen, B. (2020). Sustainable footwear: Consumer attitudes and purchasing behavior. *Journal of Retailing*, *96*(2), 278291.

World Footwear Yearbook (2022). Global footwear production and waste statistics.

WRAP. (2021a). Footwear waste and recycling in the UK. Retrieved from https://www.wrap.org.uk

WRAP. (2021b). Footwear recycling and circular economy challenges. *Waste & Resources Action Programme.*