



HAL
open science

Identify team sport team signature through passing network

Quentin Bourgeais, Guillaume Hacques, Rodolphe Charrier, Eric Sanlaville,
Ludovic Seifert

► To cite this version:

Quentin Bourgeais, Guillaume Hacques, Rodolphe Charrier, Eric Sanlaville, Ludovic Seifert. Identify team sport team signature through passing network: the effect of defensive imbalance on players interactions in basketball and in rugby. European College of Sport Science, Jul 2023, Paris, France. hal-04159194

HAL Id: hal-04159194

<https://hal.science/hal-04159194>

Submitted on 11 Jul 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0
International License

Identify team sport team signature through passing network: the effect of defensive imbalance on players interactions in basketball and in rugby

Quentin Bourgeois¹, Guillaume Hacques¹, Rodolphe Charrier², Eric Sanlaville², Ludovic Seifert¹
¹CETAPS UR3832, Université de Rouen Normandie, France
²Normandie Univ, UNIHAVRE, UNIROUEN, INSA Rouen, LITIS, Le Havre, France
 Contact: quentin.bourgeois@univ-rouen.fr

Framework

A team sport team can be considered as a **complex adaptative system**¹ as there are entities (players) in **interaction** that produce a **collective behavior** that must be adapted to the surrounding **constraints**.

⇒ Network analysis helps to understand such system by highlighting the interactions. For example, we can build a **passing network** with the passes between the players to characterize the collective behavior.



Each team can have preferences in the way they organize and reorganize their collective behavior to a constraint: we define it as a **team signature**².

⇒ We can analyze **patterns of interaction** using **graphlets** (= connected networks with a small number of nodes³ – see figure above) to assess collective behavior and compute their frequency to obtain a network **profile**.

Experimental situation & Data





24 rugby and 18 basketball teams of 3 young elite players repeated 24 times a controlled SSG (Small-Sided Game) played in 2 different situations (= 12 times each) characterized by 2 different levels of **defensive imbalance** (= high/low) induced by the defenders' positioning – see top/center figure.

Objectives & Methods

Each trial is characterized by a graphlet, then we computed **team profiles** (= 1 profile for the 12 trials of 1 team in 1 situation) and **average profiles** (= 1 profile for all trials in 1 situation, including all teams) on each sport...

- By comparing average profiles (with the χ^2 independence test) we compare sports, and we investigate the effect of defensive imbalance on the emergence of the collective behavior – see bottom/center figure.
- By clustering team profiles (with the Hartigan-Wong algorithm) and looking at the assigned cluster of each team in each situation, we aim to identify team signatures – see figures on the right part.

Note: we kept only trials in which rugby team scores a try (excluding 39% of the trials) and in which basketball team takes a shot (excluding 18%).



Basketball:
 14/18 (77.8%) assigned in C2 for 'imbalanced'
 12/18 (66.7%) assigned in C1 for 'balanced'
 with 10/18 (55.6%) sharing both assignment

Rugby:
 12/24 (50.0%) assigned in C1 for 'imbalanced'
 10/24 (41.7%) assigned in C2 for 'balanced'
 with 5/18 (20.8%) sharing both assignment

Discussion

On average profiles...

- Basketball and rugby teams can be differentiated by the patterns of passes used by the players (here with more complex ones and with more diversity in rugby).
- Playing situation affects collective behavior in both sports with a reinforcement of the main pattern's prevalence ('12' in basket, '123' in rugby) as the level of imbalance increases.

⇒ Differences may be due to the nature of the two sports, but also to differences in the design of our situations as it is impossible to have the exact same 2 situations in 2 different sports (e.g. basketball situations looked like counter-attacks while rugby ones were more like transition).

On team profiles...

- The basketball teams' clustering mostly matches to the level of defensive imbalance, showing a significant effect of this constraint.
- The rugby team's clustering solution is more complex, but it explains a greater proportion of the variance, and reveal more teams signature, with more diversity of behavior,

References:
¹ Silva, P. et al (2016). Sports teams as complex adaptive systems: manipulating player numbers shapes behaviours during football small-sided games. *SpringerPlus*, 5, 1-10.
² Hughes, M., & Franks, I. (2005). Analysis of passing sequences, shots and goals in soccer. *Journal of sports sciences*, 23(5), 509-514.
³ Pržulj, N., Corneil, D. G., & Jurisica, I. (2004). Modeling interactome: scale-free or geometric? *Bioinformatics*, 20(18), 3508-3515.