June 3, 2016

Secretariat, International Weightlifting Federation
H-1146 Budapest,
Istvánmezei út 1-3.
Hungary

Dear Sir/Madam:

I read recently that the IWF is considering adding a new heavyweight women's weight class. I think this is a fine idea. As I reflected on what the weight class should be, I decided to reassemble all of my thoughts on weight classes for both men and women. My broad conclusion is that both men's and women's classes should be adjusted and should be the same within the range the two sets of weight classes overlap. I submit the following proposal for your consideration in the hope you might find it of value, in whole or in part.

Sincerely,
Carlo Moneti
Syracuse, NY
USA
cmoneti@twcny.rr.com

Recommendation to match men's and women's weight classes where the class ranges overlap and to better distribute the range of classes.

Suggestion:

Women	Men	
new --> 50	--	
new --> 56	56	<-- consider dropping
new --> 62	62	
69	69	
new --> 77	77	
new --> 85	85	
new --> 94	94	
new --> +94	105	
	116	<-- new
	+116	<-- new

Rationale:

1) There seems to be no good reason for women's classes to be different from men's other than having different lower and upper ranges due to the smaller average stature of women; nor is there a convincing reason to use one multiplier to separate the weight classes of the men and a different one for the women since different class ranges already address the difference in average stature.

2) Participation rates – Weight classes determined by participation rates seem mostly a self-fulfilling prophecy. Potential lifters of non-existing weight classes are invisible to this statistic. The more fundamental statistic is the height distribution across the population; it captures both the existing and potential lifters.

3) Scientific inquiry – Having the same men's and women's classes wherever they overlap in the ranges provides easy comparisons for scientific research. Secondarily, it makes it easier for the public to make

comparisons as well as chat more about the sport (differences between men and women is a very popular subject), which may draw more public attention to it.

4) Womens Sinclair coefficient – It does not work well because the heavy distribution toward lower weight classes creates a downward concave shape in the Sinclair curve. Redistributing and extending upward the range of classes will engender a more rational upward concave Sinclair curve. This seems quite important considering the dependence on the Sinclair formula in some competitions, and even in selecting athletes for teams and for higher training support. It is also important for scientific inquiry.

5) Women's 50kg class – Most of the top women in the 48kg class seem quite slender, suggesting that bumping the class to 50kg would be broadly beneficial.

6) Women's 77kg, 85kg, 94kg classes – There is a huge gap between the 75kg class and the weight of top +75kg class lifters. Surely there is a large slice of the female population who are medium tall and would be too slender to compete at 75kg and also unwilling or not tall enough to bulk up and compete against +110kg women of the +75kg class. The new classes will encourage many of today's +75kg lifters to compete at a lean bodyweight, which is good for the aesthetics and promotion of the sport, good for scientific inquiry, and further improves the women's Sinclair coefficient.

7) Optionally drop men's 56kg class – As with women's 48kg class, many top competitors are quite slender and appear below an optimal muscular thickness for their height. Suleymanoglu was only 148cm tall and at his best at 60kg; Mutlu was 150cm tall. Yet, average height of top lifters in the 56kg class is roughly 156cm. Secondarily, it equalizes the number of weight classes of men and women.

8) Men's 116kg class – Most of the past decade, the 105kg world records have been held by only medium height lifters: Aramnau (173cm) and Ilyn (174cm). As with women, medium tall men may not want or be able to bulk up to the level of 150kg lifters; moreover, many top +105kg lifters are/were grossly obese, and some could have achieved their best totals at or near a lean 116kg. The 116kg class will encourage many of today's +105kg lifters to compete at a lean bodyweight, which is good for the aesthetics and promotion of the sport, good for scientific inquiry, and further improves the men's Sinclair coefficient.

9) Preferably, preserve existing men's classes to minimize disruption of World Records; the women's classes require more changes; and those changes fit better into the men's classes than vice versa.

10) Consider assigning competition records of the lower closest old class to the new classes (eg, assign the W48 record to the new W50 class; W53–>W56; W58–>W62; W69 preserved; W75–>W77; W+75–>W+94). A threshold value should be established for W85, W94, and M116 classes (e.g., 5% below what the estimated Sinclair coefficient for the new weight class indicates, and/or be guided by totals of top W+75 and M+105 lifters when they weighed near 85kg and 94kg or 116kg). This is to avoid having all participants in the first competition with new classes become technically WR breakers/holders—which would cheapen the meaning of WR and WR holder.

Notes:

1. Used the men's class separation factor (1.11), and used the 56kg class as the calculation starting point to determine the new classes.

2. There seems to be no special significance in the existing men's class separation factor (1.11); it serves only to establish an arbitrary (preferred) number of classes within a desired range.

* * *