

INVESTIGATING THE GAME RELATED STATISTICS AND TACTICAL PROFILE IN NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL GAMES

Type:

Original paper

Abstract:**Objectives**

The aim of this study was to analyze the game related statistics and tactical profile in winning and losing teams in NCAA division I men's basketball games.

Material and methods

Twenty NCAA division I men's basketball close (score difference: 1-9 points) games were analyzed during the 2013/14 season. For each game, the game related statistics were collected from the official teams' box scores. Number of ball possessions, offensive and defensive ratings and the Four Factors (effective field goal percentage; offensive rebounding percentage, recovered balls per ball possession, free throw rate) were also calculated. The tactical parameters evaluated were: ball reversal, dribble in key area, post entry, on ball screen, off ball screen and hand off. Differences between winning and losing teams were calculated using a magnitude-based approach.

Results

Winning teams reported a likely higher percentage of 3pt goals made, number of defensive rebounds and steals and a very likely higher number of free throws made and free throws attempted. Furthermore, winning teams reported a likely higher team offensive rating and effective field goal percentage and a very likely higher free throw rate compared to losing teams. Finally, results revealed a likely higher number of ball reversal and post entry in winning teams compared to losing teams.

Conclusions

This study highlighted the game related statistics and the tactical actions differentiating between winning and losing teams in NCAA Division I men's basketball close games. Coaches should use these results to optimize their training sessions focusing on those variables that might increase the possibility to win close games.

Keywords:

performance analysis, game outcome, coaching, basketball tactics, team sports

1 **INVESTIGATING THE GAME RELATED STATISTICS AND TACTICAL PROFILE**
2 **IN NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL GAMES**

3 Head Title: **TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL DEMANDS IN COLLEGE BASKETBALL**

4 **Abstract**

5 The aim of this study was to analyze the game related statistics and tactical profile in winning and
6 losing teams in NCAA division I men's basketball games.

7 Twenty NCAA division I men's basketball close (score difference: 1-9 points) games were
8 analyzed **during the 2013/14 season**. For each game, the game related statistics were collected from
9 the official teams' box scores. Number of ball possessions, offensive and defensive ratings and the
10 Four Factors (effective field goal percentage; offensive rebounding percentage, recovered balls per
11 ball possession, free throw rate) were also calculated. The tactical parameters evaluated were: ball
12 reversal, dribble in key area, post entry, on ball screen, off ball screen and hand off. Differences
13 between winning and losing teams were calculated using a magnitude-based approach.

14 Winning teams reported a likely higher percentage of 3pt goals made, number of defensive
15 rebounds and steals and a very likely higher number of free throws made and free throws
16 attempted. Furthermore, winning teams reported a likely higher team offensive rating and effective
17 field goal percentage and a very likely higher free throw rate compared to losing teams. Finally,
18 results revealed a likely higher number of ball reversal and post entry in winning teams compared
19 to losing teams.

20 This study highlighted the game related statistics and the tactical actions differentiating between
21 winning and losing teams in NCAA Division I men's basketball close games. Coaches should use
22 these results to optimize their training sessions focusing on those variables that might increase the
23 possibility to win close games.

24 **Key Words:** performance analysis, game outcome, coaching, basketball tactics, team sports,

INTRODUCTION

Basketball is a court-based sport characterized by intermittent high intensity efforts [1, 2]. During basketball games, players are repeatedly required to perform rapid specific movements in association with unique technical actions according to specific tactics [1]. The application of sport science to basketball settings has recently grown leading to an increased number of investigations quantifying the players' technical and tactical demands during games. Previously, several studies investigated the basketball game-related statistics discriminating between winning and losing teams in basketball [3-5]. In this regard, defensive rebounds and assists have been identified as the game-related statistics that most differentiate between winning and losing teams in Spanish men's professional teams [3]. In a recent study, Dogan et al. [4], through a discriminant analysis, showed that assists (SC=0.532), steals (SC=0.552), defensive rebounds (SC=0.482), turnovers (SC=0.473) and offensive rebounds (SC=0.336) were the game-related statistics that were significant to team success in the Turkish Basketball League. These parameters have been suggested to provide a global view on the evaluation of team's efficacy. However, it has been suggested that related variables may allow more accurate predictions of team success [6]. Specifically, it has been recommended the integration of offensive and defensive ratings as well as the "Four Factors" (effective field-goal percentage, turnover rate, offensive rebounding percentage, and free throw rate) approach into game-related statistical analyses of team performance [7]. These parameters have been shown to discriminate between winning and losing teams in the Australian National Basketball League (NBL) [8] and in the 2010 World Basketball Championship games [9].

While several studies focused on the game-related statistics discriminating between winning and losing teams in basketball games, tactical parameters have been less investigated. Previous studies highlighted the importance and the effectiveness of fast break actions in

48 basketball games as discriminating factors between winning and losing teams [10, 11]. However,
49 most of the ball possessions are played with set offense actions [11, 12] and it has been shown the
50 importance of an "inside-outside" game in National Basketball Association (NBA) games [13].
51 Klusemann and his colleagues [14] categorized six tactical parameters such as ball reversal, dribble
52 penetration into the key area, post entry, on-ball screen, hand-off and off-ball screen aiming to
53 assess the tactical profile of an Australian elite male junior basketball team during tournament and
54 seasonal basketball competitions. The results of this study reported a likely greater number of ball
55 reversals and a possible greater number of dribble penetrations into the key area during seasonal
56 games. However, these six tactical parameters, to the best of our knowledge have not been yet
57 investigated as possible discriminating factors between winning and losing teams. It seems
58 fundamental to assess whether there is a possible difference between winning and losing teams in
59 terms of playing game-style. Collectively these studies provided useful information for basketball
60 coaches regarding game-related statistics, their related variables and tactical profile in several
61 championships played with the rules of the International Basketball Federation (FIBA), making it
62 difficult to accurately compare them with games played with different rules and regulations such
63 as college basketball.

64 College basketball is highly competitive and played between teams of university students
65 in the United States. A previous investigation analyzed the performance profile of college
66 basketball games showing that it is characterized by short live time phases (i.e. 80% of them lasted
67 up to 1 min) and with a live/stoppage time ration of ~ 1 [2]. College basketball in the United States
68 is regulated by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and entails different rules
69 compared to FIBA championships such as different shot clock duration [35 s and 30 s (before and
70 after the 2015/2016 season, respectively) vs. 24 s] and time allowed to advance the ball across the

71 midcourt line (10 s vs. 8 s). Moreover, NCAA basketball games are composed of two halves of
72 20-min duration separated by 15 minutes break, while FIBA games are composed of four quarters
73 of 10-min duration with 10-min break between second and third quarter and 2-min break between
74 the first and the last two quarters. These rule differences may lead to a different playing style,
75 making the analysis of game related statistics, and tactical variables warranted in NCAA basketball
76 games. Thus, the aim of this study was to analyze the game related statistics and tactical profile in
77 winning and losing teams in NCAA division I men's basketball games.

78 MATERIALS AND METHODS

79 Participants

80 This study was approved by an institutional review board, and meets the ethical standards
81 in sports and exercise science research [15]. Twenty NCAA division I men's basketball games
82 were analyzed during the 2013/2014 season. Only close games were selected with a score
83 difference ranging from 1 to 9 points [16] and each team was evaluated once.

84 Methodology

85 According to the NCAA basketball rules, the analyzed games consisted of two 20-min
86 halves separated by a 15-min break period. All games were valid to achieve the best possible
87 ranking position in the NCAA conferences, the winner of which receives an automatic bid to the
88 national championship tournament. All data were recorded and analyzed at the end of the studied
89 season.

90 For each game, the game related statistics were collected from the official teams' box
91 scores. The following game related statistics have been considered: field goals made (number and

percentage), field goals attempted, 3pt made (number and percentage), 3pt attempted, free throws made (number and percentage), free throws attempted, offensive rebounds (number and percentage), defensive rebounds (number and percentage), total rebounds, personal fouls, assists, turnovers, blocks, and steals.

Number of ball possessions, offensive and defensive ratings and the Four Factors were also calculated from game related statistics values according to previous literature [7] as shown in table 1.

Tactical parameters were assessed via notational analysis technique. The videos of the games were downloaded from a public website (<https://corp.synergysportstech.com/>) and were analyzed by two experienced video analysts using the software Kinovea (version 0.8.15; www.Kinovea.org). This software has been already adopted in literature for the analysis of technical, tactical and physical parameters in basketball [17]. The tactical parameters evaluated were: ball reversal, dribble in key area, post entry, on ball screen, off ball screen and hand off. Each parameter was previously defined in literature and quantified as the number of offensive tactical elements within a game [14]. Each observer analyzed five half games twice at least a month apart and the relative and absolute reliability were calculated using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) and coefficient of variation (CV), respectively. The results reported a good test-retest relative (ICC= 0.87-0.98) and absolute (CV= 2-4%) reliability.

Statistical analysis

A magnitude-based approach was used to assess the chance of true difference (i.e. greater than the smallest worthwhile change) between winning and losing teams in game related statistics, their related variables and tactical parameters. All data were log-transformed for analysis to reduce

114 bias arising from non-uniformity error and then analyzed for practical significance using
115 magnitude-based inferences on a modified statistical spreadsheet [18]. Data were expressed as
116 mean \pm SD, percentage of mean difference and effect size with their 90% confidence interval
117 between conditions. The smallest worthwhile change was calculated as a standardized small effect
118 size (0.2) multiplied by the between-athlete SD. Chances of real differences in variables were
119 assessed qualitatively as <1%, almost certainly not; 1-5%, very unlikely; 5-25%, unlikely; 25-
120 75%, possibly; 75-95%, likely; 95-99%, very likely; and >99%, most likely. Clear effects greater
121 than 75% were considered substantial [19]. If the chances of a variable having higher and lower
122 differences were both >5%, the true effect was deemed to be unclear. Effect sizes of <0.20, 0.20–
123 0.59, 0.60–1.19, 1.20–1.99 and >2.00 were considered trivial, small, moderate, large, and very
124 large, respectively [19].

125 RESULTS

126 The differences in game related statistics between winning and losing teams are shown in
127 table 2. Winning teams reported a likely higher percentage of 3pt goals made [ES: -0.44 (CI: -
128 0.96; 0.08)], number of defensive rebounds [ES: -0.49 (CI: -1.01; 0.03)] and steals [ES: -0.52 (CI:
129 -1.04; 0.01)] and a very likely higher number of free throw made [ES: -0.86 (CI: -1.38; -0.34)],
130 free throw attempted [ES: -0.90 (CI: -1.42; -0.38)]. Losing teams reported a likely higher number
131 of 3pt attempted [ES: 0.44 (CI: -0.08; 0.96)] and blocks [ES: 0.49 (CI: -0.06; 1.05)] and a very
132 likely higher number of personal fouls [ES: 0.93 (CI: 0.41; 1.46)]. No differences were reported
133 for the other game related statistics.

134 Considering the analysis of the related variables, winning teams reported a likely higher
135 team offensive rating (same result for team defensive rating) [ES: -0.69 (CI: -1.22; -0.17)] and

136 effective field goal percentage [ES: -0.43 (CI: -0.96; 0.09)] and a very likely higher free throw rate
137 [ES: -0.97 (CI: -1.49; -0.45)] compared to losing teams (table 3).

138 The analysis of technical parameters revealed a likely higher number of ball reversal [ES:
139 -0.59 (CI: -1.11; -0.06) and post entry [ES: -0.71 (CI: -1.24; -0.19)] and a lower number of dribble
140 in key [ES: 0.52 (CI: -0.01; 1.04)] area and off ball screen [ES: 0.54 (CI: 0.02; 1.07)] in winning
141 teams compared to losing teams (table 4).

142 DISCUSSION

143 This study aimed to assess the game related statistics, their related variables and the tactical
144 parameters differentiating between winning and losing teams in NCAA division I men's basketball
145 close games. The main findings are that winning teams presented: a) more effective team offensive
146 rating highlighted by a better shooting performance and specifically percentage of 3pt goals made,
147 effective field goal percentage and free throw rate; b) more effective defensive rating characterized
148 by a substantial higher number of defensive rebounds and steals; 3) a substantially higher number
149 of ball reversal and post entry and less dribble in the key area and off ball screens.

150 Previous studies investigating the differences between winning and losing teams in game-
151 related statistics documented that defensive rebounds and assists were the most important
152 indicators influencing winning in professional men's Spanish basketball game-play [3] and in
153 Australian NBL [8]. The finding in our study confirms previous research regarding defensive
154 rebounds, but assists reported only a possibly difference between winning and losing teams. The
155 possible difference could be explained by the fact that NCAA college basketball is usually
156 characterized as a more physical game characterized by several 1on1 situations compared to other
157 international basketball leagues. Furthermore, winning teams showed a substantially higher

158 number of free throws made and attempted and a better percentage of 3pt goals made compared to
159 losing teams. These results could be associated to a possible better physical performance for
160 winning compared to losing teams. In fact, previous investigations reported a positive correlation
161 between vertical jump performance and three point shooting accuracy over a season [20, 21].
162 Specifically, Pojskic et al. [21] suggested that players with higher vertical jump capacities are able
163 to perform the shot with a lower release velocity allowing more time for a proper shooting
164 execution. Therefore, further studies should investigate the difference of anaerobic performance
165 in association with shooting accuracy between winning and losing college teams during games.

166 In addition to a substantially lower number of free throws made and attempted and a worse
167 percentage of 3pt goals made, losing teams reported a substantially higher number of personal
168 fouls. Collectively these data are in line with those reported in NBA games [16], where in the last
169 quarter the most important game indicators were free-throws scored, defensive fouls and 3-point
170 field goals from central positions. In addition, Malarranha et al. [9] identified that the free throws
171 are important indicators during the last five minutes of a close game to win a game. These findings
172 are explained by the fact that fouls are used during the last stage of close games to reduce the game
173 pace and to get the ball back after missed free throw opportunities [16, 22]. The agreement between
174 studies from different leagues highlights the universal importance of these game-related statistics
175 in determining team success in close basketball games.

176 The team's offensive/defensive rating of success and the "Four Factors" have been
177 considered as the best predictors of the game outcome in basketball due to their holistic approach
178 in examining the team performance [8, 23]. Consistently with previous investigations, the analysis
179 of the offensive/defensive rating of success in this study reported a substantial difference between
180 winning and losing teams [8, 23]. Conversely, the analysis of the "Four Factors" revealed that

181 effective field goal and free throw rate were the only parameters substantially differentiating
182 between winning and losing NCAA teams, while no substantial differences were shown for
183 offensive rebounding percentage and recovered ball per possessions [8, 23]. No substantial
184 difference in the offensive rebound percentage is a likely consequence of the similar number of
185 offensive rebounds in winning and losing teams. This result seems in contrast with that
186 documented in a previous study [9] in which the offensive rebounding percentage has been
187 suggested as a fundamental parameter influencing the game final outcome particularly in the
188 second half of the game. A possible explanation for this result is that in the current investigation
189 only close games were considered and therefore, no substantial differences were reported in the
190 number of offensive rebounds between winning and losing teams. This is in line with the findings
191 of Gomez et al. [3] in which no differences were found in games with a final score differences
192 equal or below 12 points. Therefore, the offensive rebounding percentage is likely not able to
193 differentiate between winning and losing teams in close games. Future studies should address the
194 importance of this parameter on the game outcome in close games performing regression analysis.

195 The results of this study also showed that recovered balls per possession does not
196 differentiate between winning and losing teams in close games. This result is not surprising
197 considering that Sampaio et al. [23] substituted recovered balls per possession (steals + blocked
198 shots + opponents' turnovers / ball possessions) for turnovers per possession in a prediction model
199 for game outcome during international games. They found this model to be successful at predicting
200 the game outcome suggesting that the use of this indicator might better predict team success than
201 the traditional Four Factors. The findings in our study confirm this result and suggest the use of a
202 better parameter able to differentiate between winning and losing teams in close games.

203 This is the first study analyzing differences in tactical indicators between winning and

204 losing teams in college basketball close games. The findings reported that winning teams
205 performed substantially more ball reversals and post entries than losing teams. A possible
206 explanation of this result could be the use of different defensive strategies adopted by losing teams.
207 Although, previous literature documented that man-to-man defense is the most used in both
208 European and college basketball [24, 25], zone defense is mainly used to interrupt the scoring run
209 of the opposite team and slowing the tempo of the game [25]. Switching to a zone defense usually
210 produces greater protection of the lane and the center of the 3-point area. Therefore, this defensive
211 strategy could produce a higher number of ball reversals and post entries to move the ball as much
212 quickly as possible in order to find an open space to effectively attack the basket. The possible use
213 of a zone defense by the losing teams could be also likely explained by the substantial lower
214 number of dribble penetrations in the key shown by winning teams. In fact, a further aim of the
215 use of the zone defense could be to stop the dribble penetrations and one-to-one actions.

216 Although this study provided new information regarding the main technical and tactical
217 indicators differentiating between winning and losing teams in close college basketball games,
218 there are some limitations. Firstly, only 20 games were analyzed while future studies should
219 provide the same analysis with a more robust sample; secondly, no indications were provided
220 regarding the tactical strategies adopted during these close games, which could have influenced
221 the use of different tactical indicators; lastly, no data were provided on the effectiveness of these
222 tactical indicators. Therefore future studies should mainly focus on a) the predictions of technical
223 and tactical indicators differentiating between winning and losing teams in close college basketball
224 games; b) to analyze the technical and tactical indicators according to different tactical strategies;
225 c) to analyze the effectiveness of the tactical indicators analyzed.

226 The analysis of the main technical and tactical indicators differentiating between winning

227 and losing teams in college basketball close games provides useful information for basketball
228 coaches when they set up their training sessions. From a practical standpoint, this study highlighted
229 that college basketball coaches should mainly focus on the training of the main game-related
230 statistics differentiating between winning and losing teams such as defensive rebounds, percentage
231 of 3pt goals made, and free throws and steals. **Considering that these game related statistics have**
232 **been suggested to be likely related to players' anaerobic performance during games [20], strength**
233 **and conditioning coaches should optimize their training and recovery strategies in order to have**
234 **their players always performing at their best.** Considering the tactical indicators, this study
235 suggests to train the ability to quickly move the ball through ball reversals to find the best solution
236 to drive to the basket with post entry as one of the main possible effective actions.

237 CONCLUSION

238 This study highlighted the game related statistics and the tactical actions differentiating
239 between winning and losing teams in NCAA Division I men's basketball close games. Winning
240 teams had a better offensive and defensive rating characterized by a better percentage 3-point goals
241 made, free throws made, defensive rebounds and steals. From a tactical standpoint, winning teams
242 performed more ball reversals and post entries than losing teams, while they had substantially less
243 dribbles in the key area and off ball screens. Coaches should use these results to optimize their
244 training sessions and focus on the training of those variables that might increase the possibility to
245 win close games.

246 **Conflict of interests:** the authors declared no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this
247 manuscript.

248 **REFERENCE**

- 249 1. Conte D, Favero TG, Lupo C, Francioni FM, Capranica L, Tessitore A. Time-Motion
250 Analysis of Italian Elite Women's Basketball Games: Individual and Team Analyses. *J Strength*
251 *Cond Res.* 2015;29(1):144-50.
- 252 2. Conte D, Tessitore A, Smiley K, Thomas C, Favero TG. Performance profile of NCAA
253 Division I men's basketball games and training sessions. *Biol Sport.* 2016;33(2):189-94.
- 254 3. Gomez MA, Lorenzo A, Barakat R, Ortega E, Palao JM. Differences in game-related
255 statistics of basketball performance by game location for men's winning and losing teams. *Percept*
256 *Mot Skills.* 2008;106(1):43-50.
- 257 4. Doğan İ, Işık Ö, Ersöz Y. Examining the Turkish Men's Professional Basketball Team's
258 Success According to Game-related Statistics with Discriminant Analysis. *Int J Perf Anal Sport.*
259 2016;16(3):829-36.
- 260 5. Lorenzo A, Gómez MÁ, Ortega E, Ibáñez SJ, Sampaio J. Game related statistics which
261 discriminate between winning and losing under-16 male basketball games. *J Sports Sci Med.*
262 2010;9(4):664.
- 263 6. Ziv G, Lidor R, Arnon M. Predicting team rankings in basketball: The questionable use of
264 on-court performance statistics. *Int J Perf Anal Sport.* 2010;10(2):103-14.
- 265 7. Kubatko J, Oliver D, Pelton K, Rosenbaum DT. A starting point for analyzing basketball
266 statistics. *J Quant Anal Sport.* 2007;3(3).
- 267 8. Scanlan TA, Teramoto M, Delforce M, Dalbo JV. Do better things come in smaller
268 packages? Reducing game duration slows game pace and alters statistics associated with winning
269 in basketball. *Int J Perf Anal Sport.* 2016;16(1):157-70.

- 270 9. Malarranha J, Figueira B, Leite N, Sampaio J. Dynamic Modeling of Performance in
271 Basketball. *Int J Perf Anal Sport*. 2013;13(2):377-87.
- 272 10. Conte D, Favero T, Niederhausen M, Capranica L, Tessitore A. Determinants of the
273 effectiveness of fast break actions in elite and sub-elite Italian men's basketball games. *Biol Sport*.
274 2017;34(2):177-83.
- 275 11. Evangelos T, Alexandros K, Nikolaos A. Analysis of fast breaks in basketball. *Int J Perf*
276 *Anal Sport*. 2005;5(2):17-22.
- 277 12. Ortega E, Palao JM, Gómez Má, Lorenzo A, Cárdenas D. Analysis of the efficacy of
278 possessions in boys' 16-and-under basketball teams: differences between winning and losing
279 teams. *Percept Mot Skills*. 2007;104(3):961-4.
- 280 13. Courel-Ibáñez J, McRobert AP, Toro EO, Vélez DC. Inside pass predicts ball possession
281 effectiveness in NBA basketball. *Int J Perf Anal Sport*. 2016;16(2):711-25.
- 282 14. Klusemann MJ, Pyne DB, Hopkins WG, Drinkwater EJ. Activity profiles and demands of
283 seasonal and tournament basketball competition. *Int J Sports Physiol Perf*. 2013;8(6):623-9.
- 284 15. Harriss D, Atkinson G. Ethical standards in sport and exercise science research: 2014
285 update. *Int J Sports Med*. 2013;34(12):1025-8.
- 286 16. Gomez MA, Gasperi L, Lupo C. Performance analysis of game dynamics during the 4th
287 game quarter of NBA close games. *Int J Perf Anal Sport*. 2016;16(1):249-63.
- 288 17. Conte D, Favero T, Niederhausen M, Capranica L, Tessitore A. Effect of Number of
289 Players and Maturity on Ball-Drills Training Load in Youth Basketball. *Sports*. 2017;5(1):3.
- 290 18. Hopkins W. Spreadsheets for analysis of controlled trials, with adjustment for a predictor.
291 *Sportscience*. 2006;10:46-50.

- 292 19. Hopkins W, Marshall S, Batterham A, Hanin J. Progressive statistics for studies in sports
293 medicine and exercise science. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2009;41(1):3.
- 294 20. Pojskic H, Separovic V, Muratovic M, Uzicanin E. The relationship between physical
295 fitness and shooting accuracy of professional basketball players. *Motriz* 2014;20:408-417
- 296 21. Pojskic H, Susic N, Separovic V, Sekulic D. Association between conditioning capacities
297 and shooting performance in professional basketball players; an analysis of stationary and dynamic
298 shooting skills. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2017. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000002100
- 299 22. Kozar B, Vaughn RE, Whitfield KE, Lord RH, Dye B. Importance of free-throws at various
300 stages of basketball games. *Percept Mot Skills.* 1994;78(1):243-8.
- 301 23. Sampaio J, Lago C, Drinkwater EJ. Explanations for the United States of America's
302 dominance in basketball at the Beijing Olympic Games (2008). *J Sports Sci.* 2010;28(2):147-52.
- 303 24. Gómez MA, Lorenzo A, Ibáñez SJ, Ortega E, Leite N, Sampaio J. An analysis of defensive
304 strategies used by home and away basketball teams. *Percept Mot Skills.* 2010;110(1):159-66.
- 305 25. Mikes J. *Basketball fundamentals: A complete mental training guide.* Champaign IL:
306 Leisure Press; 1987.

Table 1. Game indicators and their respective formulas

Indicator	Formula
Number of ball possession	Field goal attempted - offensive rebounds + turnovers + 0.4* free throws attempted
Team's offensive rating	Point scored/ball possession
Team's defensive rating	Points allowed/ball possession
Effective field goal percentage	$(\text{Field goals made} + 0.5 * 3\text{pt field goals made}) / \text{field goals attempted}$
Offensive rebounding percentage	$\text{Offensive rebound} / (\text{offensive rebounds} + \text{opponent's defensive rebounds})$
Recovered balls per ball possession	$(\text{Steals} + \text{blocked shot} + \text{opponent's turnover}) / \text{ball possession}$
Free throw rate	$\text{Free throw made} / \text{field goals attempted}$

Table

[Download source file \(57.25 kB\)](#)

Table 2. Game related statistics for winning and losing teams expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (SD), percentage (%) of mean difference, effect size (ES) with their 90% confidence intervals (CI) and magnitude based inference.

Game Related Statistics	Winning teams	Losing Teams	% Mean difference (90% CI)	ES (90% CI)	Magnitude-based Inference
Field Goal Made	25.2 \pm 4.9	24.5 \pm 4.7	-0.7 (-3.3; 1.9)	-0.14 (-0.66; 0.39)	Unclear (14/44/42)
Field Goal Attempt	55.1 \pm 7.1	57.9 \pm 10.0	2.8 (-1.9; 7.4)	0.29 (-0.24; 0.81)	Unclear (61/33/6)
% Made field goal	46.0 \pm 8.9	42.8 \pm 8.5	-3.2 (-7.8; 1.5)	-0.35 (-0.87; 0.17)	Possibly -ive (4/27/69)
3pt Made	7.1 \pm 3.4	6.9 \pm 2.9	-0.3 (-1.9; 1.4)	0.00 (-0.52; 0.52)	Unclear (26/48/26)
3pt Attempted	18.0 \pm 7.3	20.3 \pm 5.3	2.3 (-1.1; 5.7)	0.44 (-0.08; 0.96)	Likely +ive (78/20/2)
% 3pt Made	39.6 \pm 12.0	34.3 \pm 12.9	-5.2 (-11.9; 1.4)	-0.44 (-0.96; 0.08)	Likely -ive (2/20/78)
Free Throw Made	18.5 \pm 4.9	14.6 \pm 3.8	-4.0 (-6.3; -1.6)	-0.86 (-1.38; -0.34)	Very likely -ive (0/2/98)
Free Throw Attempted	25.7 \pm 6.4	20.2 \pm 5.3	-5.6 (-8.7; -2.4)	-0.90 (-1.42; -0.38)	Very likely -ive (0/1/99)
% Made Free Throw	72.3 \pm 9.4	73.0 \pm 10.3	0.7 (-4.5; 5.9)	0.05 (-0.47; 0.57)	Unclear (32/47/21)
Offensive Rebound	11.8 \pm 5.5	11.1 \pm 4.9	-0.7 (-3.4; 2.1)	.05 (-0.58; 0.47)	Unclear (21/47/32)
Defensive Rebound	24.7 \pm 5.4	22.0 \pm 3.9	-2.8 (-5.3; -0.2)	-0.49 (-1.01; 0.03)	Likely -ive (2/16/82)
Total Rebound	36.5 \pm 9.0	33.0 \pm 7.7	-3.5 (-7.9; 1.0)	-0.38 (-0.90; 0.15)	Possibly -ive (4/25/71)
% Offensive Rebound	31.3 \pm 9.6	32.4 \pm 7.6	1.1 (-3.5; 5.8)	0.21 (-0.31; 0.73)	Unclear (51/39/10)
% Defensive Rebound	68.7 \pm 9.6	67.6 \pm 7.6	-1.1 (-5.8; 3.5)	-0.11 (-0.63; 0.42)	Unclear (16/45/38)
Personal Foul	17.7 \pm 2.3	21.3 \pm 4.3	3.6 (1.7; 5.5)	0.93 (0.41; 1.46)	Very Likely +ive (99/1/0)
Assist	14.0 \pm 5.4	11.8 \pm 4.2	-2.2 (-4.7; 0.4)	-0.40 (-0.92; 0.13)	Possibly -ive (3/23/74)
Turnover	11.7 \pm 4.4	11.2 \pm 3.7	-0.5 (1.7; 2.2)	-0.01 (-0.54; 0.51)	Unclear (25/48/28)
Block	3.5 \pm 3.1	3.7 \pm 2.3	0.2 (-1.3; 1.7)	0.49 (-0.06; 1.05)	Likely +ive (81/17/2)
Steal	6.1 \pm 2.6	4.9 \pm 2.8	-1.2 (-2.7; 0.3)	-0.52 (-1.04; 0.01)	Likely -ive (1/14/84)

Table

[Download source file \(57.25 kB\)](#)

Table 3. Derived game indicators and the Four Factors for winning and losing teams expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (SD), percentage (%) of mean difference, effect size (ES) with their 90% confidence intervals (CI) and magnitude based inference.

Derived game indicators and the Four Factors	Winning teams	Losing Teams	% Mean difference (90% CI)	ES (90% CI)	Magnitude-based Inference
Number of ball possession	65.28 \pm 5.46	66.01 \pm 5.10	0.73 (-2.09; 3.55)	0.14 (-0.38; 0.67)	Unclear (43/44/14)
Team's offensive rating	1.14 \pm 0.14	1.05 \pm 0.13	-0.10 (-0.17; -0.02)	-0.69 (-1.22; -0.17)	Likely -ive (0/6/94)
Team's defensive rating	1.06 \pm 0.13	1.13 \pm 0.14	0.07 (0.00; 0.14)	0.49 (-0.03; 1.01)	Likely +ive (82/16/2)
Effective field goal percentage	0.53 \pm 0.11	0.48 \pm 0.10	-0.10 (0.01; 0.06)	-0.43 (-0.96; 0.09)	Likely -ive (2/20/77)
Offensive rebounding percentage	0.33 \pm 0.11	0.30 \pm 0.07	-0.03 (-0.08; 0.02)	-0.16 (-0.68; 0.36)	Unclear (13/42/45)
Recovered balls per ball possession	0.32 \pm 0.11	0.31 \pm 0.10	-0.01 (-0.07; 0.04)	-0.08 (-0.60; 0.44)	Unclear (19/46/35)
Free throw rate	0.35 \pm 0.11	0.25 \pm 0.08	-0.10 (-0.15; -0.05)	-0.97 (-1.49; -0.45)	Very likely -ive (0/1/99)

Table

[Download source file \(57.25 kB\)](#)

Table 4. Tactical indicators for winning and losing teams expressed as mean \pm standard deviation (SD), percentage (%) of mean difference, effect size (ES) with their 90% confidence intervals (CI) and magnitude based inference.

Tactical Indicators	Winning teams	Losing Teams	% Mean difference (90% CI)	ES (90% CI)	Magnitude-based Inference
Ball reversal	95.7 \pm 34.1	77.8 \pm 41.9	-17.9 (-38.3; 2.4)	-0.59 (-1.11; -0.06)	Likely -ive (1/10/89)
Dribble in key area	44.0 \pm 12.9	49.0 \pm 7.7	4.9 (-0.8; 10.6)	0.52 (-0.01; 1.04)	Likely +ive (84/14/1)
Post entry	33.4 \pm 13.9	24.2 \pm 9.9	-9.2 (-15.6; -2.7)	-0.71 (-1.24; -0.19)	Likely -ive (0/5/95)
On ball screen	46.0 \pm 16.9	47.8 \pm 14.5	1.8 (-6.6; 10.2)	0.18 (-0.34; 0.70)	Unclear (47/41/11)
Off ball screen	36.2 \pm 20.9	47.4 \pm 20.8	11.2 (0.0; 22.3)	0.54 (0.02; 1.07)	Likely +ive (86/13/1)
Hand off	17.0 \pm 9.4	15.1 \pm 9.9	-1.9 (-7.0; 3.3)	-0.41 (-0.94; 0.12)	Possibly -ive (3/22/75)

Manuscript body

Manuscript body 1 - [Download source file \(28.77 kB\)](#)

Tables

Table 1 - [Download source file \(57.25 kB\)](#)